SECTION XXII.

ACCOUNT OF THE SHAMSIAH MALIKS IN HIND.

[Our author—after laying much stress on the necessity of showing due gratitude to benefactors for favours and benefits conferred by them, which necessity is clear to every well ordered mind, and which the most wise and pious men have inculcated and enjoined, for, as philosophers have said: 'They who have no gratitude for man have no gratitude for God,'—therefore returns his grateful thanks, as in duty bound—in highly-coloured terms—to the august Sultān of the Sultāns of Islām, Shams-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Din, I-yal-timish, and to those sovereigns, his children [and grandchildren], who have placed the foot of dignity on the throne of empire, for their manifold donations and benefactions, and also to those Malik and Khāns, the servants of that dynasty, who have attained to the hall of their sovereignty—the arena of dominion—for their kindnesses and favours towards himself, his children, his dependents, and his followers, from the year 625 H., up to this present time which is the year 658 H., and which benefits and favours, day by day, and hour by hour, have been increasing and augmenting by the granting of offices and dignities, by gifts and benefactions, the enumeration of which cannot be contained within the limits of this abbreviated work. "I have now," he says, "reached the point of my design;" and here I must render what he says, as nearly as possible, in his own words.]

Since Almighty God of His favour prolonged the reign of the Sultāns of the I-yal-timish dynasties, and raised on
high the standards of jurisdiction of His servants in the decree of duration, this frail one, in repayment of some of those many debts of gratitude, desired that he should thread upon the thread of description, and string on the string of writing, an account of those Malik's and Khāns, the servants of that Court which is the asylum of the universe, more particularly the mention of the successive benefits, and increasing generosity of that Khākān-i-Mu'azzam¹, Shahr-yār-i-Ādil wa Akram, Khusrau-i-Bani Adam, Bahā-ul-Ḥakī wa ud-Dīn, Mughīs-ul-Mulūk-i-Islām wa ul-Muslimin, Žil-l-ullah fi ul-Ālamin, 'Uzd-ud-Daulah wa us-Sultānat, Yamīn-ul-Mamlakat, Kuṭb-ul-Ma'āli, Rukn-ul-'Ālā, Ulugh Kutlugh-i-A'zam, ULUGH KḤAN-I-BALBAN-US-SULTāNİ², Abī-Salāṭin, Zahir-i-Amīr-ul-Mūminin. [The Great King, the Most Just and Most Generous Prince, the Khusrav of the race of Adam, the precious of God and of the Faith, the auxiliary of the Malik of Islām and of Musalmāns, the shadow of the Almighty upon the worlds, the pole-star of grandeur, the sublime prop, the arm of the kingdom and empire.

¹ It must not be supposed that these are his actual titles: the greater part of them are conferred on him by our author out of gratitude for favours received; neither do these titles prove that Ulugh KḤan-i-Balbān was Sultān of Dihlī when these words were penned. The contrary is proved over and over again in the following pages. As to the word Khākān, which signifies a king or emperor [particularly the rulers of Fārs and Ghūr], being applied to a great noble, without his being a sovereign prince, I have myself seen it applied to a petty Afghāni of Multān, who had been a servant of the late Dīwan Mulrāj on the liberal salary of 15 rūpees monthly. Our author has also styled Ulugh KḤān the father of kings, although he could not tell whether either of Balban's sons would succeed their father, who was not king in 658 H., when he finished this History. Moreover, had Ulugh KḤān been Sultān of Dihlī at this time, he would not have been styled "the right arm of the state," &c. See next page, and note ⁶.

² In his titles given farther on, as here, he is styled "Khākān-i-Mu'azzam," in the same line being called "the Sultān's slave." His brother also is styled "Ulugh Kutlugh" by our author after the same fashion. It will also be noticed that, with some of these titles, our author uses the Arabic article al; but with others no al is given; and, actually, although no rdjahs are written, he means them to be used, otherwise the names and titles would be unintelligible nonsense. I suppose however, after the fashion of "īrāqī," "Khān Zāmīn," "Khān KḤānīn," Mr. Blochmann will consider this too "a dangerous innovation," but I prefer to read them according to the Fārsi fashion, which by the bye, Mr. Blochmann is sometimes guilty of - as "Kustam-i-Zamīn," KḤan-i-Ālām," "Khān-i-Kalān," &c.
the right hand of the state, the most great Ulugh Kutlugh, Ulugh Khan-i-Balban of the [time of the] I-yal-timish dynast, the father of Sulthan, the Supporter of the Lord of the Faithful)—May the Almighty exalt his Helper and double his power!—for, since the pen of the orbit of existence on the pages of the dawn of empire delineated the tracery of prosperity and the figure of dominion, it hath not depicted a countenance of felicity more charming than the aspect of his power; and the exalting hand of time, a standard more sublime than his precious and superb banner, hath never raised. The Court of no sovereign of the universe, either in the east or the west, who hath placed the foot on the throne of dominion, hath had a servant more sagacious, and no ear hath heard a tale of the might of dominion more brilliant than the narration of his rule, for verily his equitable age appears like the succession of 'Umr, his benevolence tells of the liberality of Hatim, his sword reminds [one] of the force of Rustam's blow, and his arrow the penetration of the arm of Arash. May God crown his banner with victory: make strong his nobles and chiefs: and annihilate his foes!

In the way of repayment therefore of debts [of gratitude] due to those renowned Maliks, and more particularly for the mention of the rule of that powerful prince [Ulugh Khan], this Tabakaii has been written after the manner of a miscellany, in order that scrutinizers, when they look into these pages, may, according to the benediction for those departed and the invocation for the preservation of those remaining, have the character of every one of them clearly defined upon the page of the mind. In the arrangement also of this Tabakaii, some Maliks were earlier, in time, than they appear here, and some have been mentioned later, arising from the period that the author arrived at this Court. May the Most High God preserve the Sulthan of Sulthan and the Ulugh-i-A'zam, Ulugh Khan-i-Mu'azzam,

---

1 One of the old Persian heroes—the famous archer—who is also mentioned in the Shah-Namah.

2 Several are not mentioned at all, the reason of which does not appear.

3 This proves what I have already alluded to at page 720. Our author would scarcely have invoked blessings upon Ulugh Khan, as “a great monarch,” while Nasir-ud-Din, Mahmud Shah, was alive, and prayed for in the same sentence. His manumission is never noticed.
in the hall of existence to the utmost limits of possibility. Amin ¹

I. TĀJ-UD-DĪN, SANJAR-I-GAJZ-LAK KHĀN ⁷.

The arrival of the author [of this history] at the Court—the asylum of the world—of the beneficent king of kings [I-yal-timish] took place on Wednesday, the 1st of the month of Rabi'-ul-Awwal, 625 H., before [the walls of] the preserved city of Üchchah, at the period when the Shamsî forces had marched from the capital city of Dihlî for the purpose of taking possession of the kingdom of Sind, and had turned their faces towards that country. Fifteen days prior to this, the victorious troops of that monarch, comprising the force under Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Gajz-lak Khān—The Almighty’s mercy be upon him!—had arrived before Üchchah; and the first personage among the Maliks of that Court who was seen by the author was Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Gajz-lak Khān.

When, on Wednesday, the 16th of the month of Safar, the author proceeded from the city of Üchchah, and reached the camp of the victorious [forces], that Malik of good disposition treated him with reverence, and rose from his masnad, and went through the ceremonial of receiving him, and came to meet him, and seated the author in his own place, and put a rosy apple ⁸ into his hand, and

---

¹ To translate that portion of our author’s work referring to the kings of Dihlî, without translating this Section, which throws much light on the previous ones, would be much like the play of Hamlet with the Prince of Denmark left out.

⁷ He is also called Gaz-lak Khān.

⁸ Literally “apple of ruby.” Apples grow in Upper Sind, but they are small. The description of apple here referred to, was probably such as the traders, up to this day, bring down from above the Passes. It is usual to carry an apple in the hand for its grateful perfume. I have witnessed this constantly, and, probably, the custom is not now.

The printed text, which has lately become of considerable authority, because its statements, in its very defective state, happen to coincide with some errors and erroneous statements made on the faith of translations from Firigah, has, contrary to all MSS. copies collated, the words لب ل سبب لس بع—i.e. twenty rubies—instead of لس بع لسبب لب. If these words—seb la’l—are translated without that “dangerous innovation,” the kasrah of description—کسرو تومینی—they mean “apple ruby”—which is nonsense of course, but, with the necessary “innovation,” would be seb-i-la’l—an apple of ruby, that is an apple red as a ruby.
observed: “Take this Maulānā, that it may be a good
omen.” I found Malik Taj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Gajz-lak
Khān, a Malik of sufficiently formidable aspect, his form of
magnitude, and his piety pure, and with a numerous suite,
and followers countless.

Trustworthy persons have related on this wise, that the
august Sultān [I-yal-timish] purchased Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn,
Sanjar-i-Gajz-lak Khān, during the reign of the late Sultān,
Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, from the Khwājah, ‘Āli, the Bastābādī
[of Bastābād'9], when he held the government of the
fief of Baran, and gave him to his eldest son, the late
Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, and in the hall of
felicity, along with him, was he nurtured and brought up.
After some time, when the Sultān perceived signs of merit
upon his forehead, he removed him from attendance on
Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, and took him into
his own immediate service, and gave him the office of
Chāshni-gir [Comptroller of the [royal] Kitchen]. After
serving [in this office] for some time, he became Amīr-i-
Ākhur [Lord or Head of the Stables]. Subsequently, in
the year in which the Sultān proceeded towards Multān,
namely, in 625 h, the territory of Wanj-rūṭ1 of Multān
was made over to him. When the Sultān returned from
thence, he conferred upon Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-
Gajz-lak Khān, the fief of Kuhrām. After some time, the
preserved city of Tabarhindah was given to him, and, in
that year, the author reached the Court.

The Sultān had despatched him [Gajz-lak Khān] in ad-

cance, at the head of a force, in concert with Malik 'Izz-ud-

These words might, certainly, be translated “a ruby like an apple in shape,”
but I think this very unlikely for the reasons above stated; and a ruby of that
size would be a very costly present, and not to be carried about in one's hand.

9 Or might be, Bust-ābād. The name is doubtful.

1 This place, in most of the copies of the text is written لجنت سبینا گنج رشت، but Wanj-rūṭ is a well-
known place, giving name to a parganah. At present there is a tolerably
strong fort there, and it is now contained in the Bahāwal-pūr state. At the period
Gajz-lak Khān held it, it was in the Multān province, the river Bāhān then
flowed in its old bed. Between Wanj-rūṭ and Multān no river then existed,
whilst the Lost River—the Ḩakrā and its ferders, now the Sutlaj or Ghārā,
separated it from Bikānīr. In Persian words بہار is sometimes used for بہار,
but in Sanskrit words, or words derived from that language, بہار is often substituted
for بہار and vice versa. The printed text, which displays such a profound know-
ledge of the geography of India, has Gujarāt and Multān'11.
Din, Muḥammad-i-Sālārī—The Almighty's mercy be upon him!—from the frontier of the territory of Sind to the foot [of the walls] of Üchchah.

When Sultan Shams-ud-Din [I-yal-timish], with his army, pitched his camp before the fortress of Üchchah, in the year 625 H., Malik Tāj-ud-Din, Sanjar-i-Gajz-lak Khān, was despatched [at the head of a force] in attendance on the Wazir of the realm, the Niqām-ul-Mulk, Muḥammad, the Junaidī, against the fortress of Bakhar. After some time, that fortress was taken, and Malik [Sultan] Naṣir-ud-Din, Ḵabājah—The Almighty's mercy be on him!—was drowned in the river Sind, and the fortress fell into their hands, as has been before recorded. The preserved city of Üchchah, with its dependencies and territories, was all placed in Malik Tāj-ud-Din, Sanjar's charge.

When the Sultan with his forces returned towards the glorious capital, Dihli, Malik Tāj-ud-Din, Sanjar-i-Gajz-lak Khān, assumed jurisdiction over those territories, and caused them to flourish and prosper; and he brought the scattered people, both gentle and simple, together, who dwelt happily under the justice and benevolence of this Malik of good disposition. He continued to pursue the beaten track of impartiality and kindness towards all, and exerted his powers for the security, safety, and repose of the peasantry, and the welfare of all [the people]; and, after some time, under the safeguard of faith, and alms for pious uses, charitable foundations, and works of public utility, he came to a happy end, and was removed from the house of this world to the mansions of life eternal, in the year 629 H. The Almighty's mercy and pardon be upon him!

II. MALIK 'IZZ-UD-DIN, KABIR KHĀN, AVĀZ-I-HĀZĀR-MARDĀH, UL-MU'TZZĪ. *

Malik Kabir Khān-i-Ayāz was a Rūmi Turk, and he had been the slave of Malik Naṣir-ud-Din, Ḥusain, the

---

* Turned into Thangīr in the printed text.
* What Üchchah was in those days may be gathered from the account of its investment by the Mughals in the last Section.
* So styled because he was the slave of Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Din, Muḥammad-i-Sām, Ghūrī.
Amir-i-Shikār [Chief Huntsman] of Ghaznīn, and, after he was put to death, Kabir Khān-i-Ayāz, along with his children, reached the country of Hindūstān. He attracted the benevolent notice of the august Sultān [I-yal-timīsh], and served him in every degree of employment. He was a Turk, wise, prudent, and experienced, and, in agility and martial accomplishments, was the incomparable of his time. Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, the Amir-i-Shikār of Ghaznīn, who was his owner and lord, was the theme of every tongue throughout the whole of the countries of Ghūr, Ghaznīn, Khurāsān, and Khwārazm, for warlike powers and skill; and Malik Kabir Khān-i-Ayāz had accompanied his master, in all circumstances and situations, and had learnt from him martial accomplishments and the modes of warfare, and had become a perfect master in the art.

When Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, was put to death by the Turks of Ghaznīn, his sons, namely Sher Khān-i-Surkh [the Red], and his brother, reached the presence of the sublime Court, and Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh, purchased 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kabir Khān-i-Ayāz, direct from them. Some have related on this wise, that, when the august Sultān brought the territory of Multān under his sway in the year 625 H., he conferred upon 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kabir Khān-i-Ayāz, the city and fortress of Multān, with the whole of its towns, districts, and dependencies, and installed him in the government of that territory, and exalted him to the title of Kabir Khān-i-Man-girī; and, although he used to be styled by people Ayāz-i-Hazār-Mardah—the name he was famed by—he, consequently, became celebrated under the title of Kabir Khān-i-Man-girī. On the return of the Sultān [with his forces] to Dihlī, the capital, Kabir Khān-i-Ayāz took possession of that territory and brought it under his jurisdiction, and

---

6 He had shown disaffection, and, when I-yal-dūz marched towards Dihlī against I-yal-timīsh, the Turkish chiefs of Ghaznīn put him, as well as the former Wazīr, to death. See pages 504-5.

6 This fact is not mentioned under the reign of I-yal-timīsh, and, in the account of the preceding Malik, it is stated that he—Gażj-lak Khān—had the territory of Wanj-rūf of Multān conferred upon him in that same year, 625 H.

7 This name is somewhat doubtful. In the most trustworthy copies of the text it is is Man-girī—as above, and also Man-girī; but in others it is written all sorts of ways. The word is Turkish, in all probability.
caused it to flourish; and, after a period of two, three, or four years, he was recalled to the capital, and Palwal was assigned to him for his maintenance.

When the Shamsi reign came to its termination, and Sultan Rukn-ud-Din, Firuz Shah, succeeded, he conferred upon Kabir Khan-i-Ayaz the district of Sunam; and, when Malik 'Ala-ud-Din, Jani, from Lohor, and Malik Saiyud-Din, Kuki, from Hansi, assembled with hostile intent against the Court, Kabir Khan-i-Ayaz joined them; and, for a considerable period, they alarmed and distracted the forces of Sultan Rukn-ud-Din, Firuz Shah. At last, when Sultan Raziyat ascended the throne, they advanced upon the capital, and for a considerable period molested the city and parts around, and engaged in conflict with the servants of the Court of the Sultan of Islam, until Sultan Raziyat, secretly, by promises of favour, detached him from that party; and he, in concert with Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Muhammad-i-Salar, went over to the service of the Court. Through their coming [over to the Court party], the Sultan, the servants of her Court, and the people of the city, gained a great accession of strength, and Malik Jani and Malik Kuki, baffled, withdrew.

Sultan Raziyat showed Kabir Khan-i-Ayaz great honour, and conferred upon him the province of Lohor, with the whole of the dependencies and districts belonging to that territory; but, after a year or two, a slight change manifested itself in the mind of Sultan Raziyat towards him, and, in the year 636 H., her sublime standards advanced towards Lohor. Kabir Khan-i-Ayaz retired before her, crossed the Rawah of Lohor, and retreated as far as the borders of Sudharah, and the army marched in pursuit of him. Finding it was impossible to follow any other course,

---

8 He must have, consequently, fallen under the Sultan's displeasure, for some reason.
9 See under the reign of Rukn-ud-Din, Firuz Shah, at page 633.
1 Here too is a "dangerous innovation:" I have ventured to spell the name of this queen the right way, and different to the "best authorities."
2 Most copies of the text have "some years," and a few "some time." Raziyat only reigned three years and a half.
3 Thus written in the oldest copies of the text—رواوت شهداء. See also the account of the march against the Mughals in 643 H. in the notice of Ulugh Khan farther on.
4 See the reign under, page 645.
he made his submission, and Multān was again placed under his charge. After a considerable period had passed away, and, when an army of Mughals, under the accursed Mangūta, the Nu-in, and the Bahādur, Ta-ir, turned its face towards Lohor, Kabir Khan-i-Ayāz [assumed sovereignty] in the territory of Sind, and a canopy of state, and possessed himself of Ûchchah. Shortly after this disaffection, in the year 639 H., he died.

After his decease, his son, Tāj-ud-Din, Abū-Bikr-i-Ayāz, who was a young man of good disposition, fiery, very impetuous, and courageous, brought the territory of Sind under his sway. Several times he attacked the Karlugh army before the gate of Multān and put it to flight, and showed such great skill and high-spiritedness that he was noted for his manliness and valour, when, suddenly, in the morning of life and flower of his youth, he passed to the Almighty’s mercy. May God have mercy upon them both [father and son].

III. MALIK NAŞİR-UD-DĪN, AI-YITIM-UL-BAḤĀ-I.

Malik Naşir-ud-Din, Ai-yitim, was the slave of Malik Bahā-ud-Din, Ṭughril, the slave of Sultān Mu‘izz-ud-Din, Muḥammad-i-Sām, and some [persons] have related that the august Sultān, Shams-ud-Din, I-yal-timish, had purchased Malik Naşir-ud-Din, Ai-yitim, from the heirs of Bahā-ud-Din, Ṭughril.  

5 The feudatory of Multān got the sief of Lāhor in lieu of it. See page 747.
6 This indicates that the province of Multān, as well as Ûchchah, was called Sind in those days. Some writers style all the tract as far north as the Salt Range by the name of Sind; but see next page.
7 Also Ḵārlugh. I have given an account of them in the last Section. See note 6, para. 2, page 374. This was the second invasion of the Ḵarlughs. See page 730.

This shows the state of the Dīhil kingdom at this time, for, although the father had openly thrown off allegiance to its sovereign, the latter appears to have been unable to recover possession of those provinces until after some time elapsed on the death of the son, Abū-Bikr-i-Ayār. Nothing whatever respecting this assumption of sovereignty is mentioned under Mu‘izz-ud-Din, Bahram Shāh’s reign. The iqāfat here stands for bin. Ayāz was the father’s name, another of thousands of undoubted proofs, were any wanting, to show that “the use of the iqāfat” is not “restricted to poetry, and that it constantly occurs in prose for bin or pisr.” See Blochmann’s “Contributions,” Part III., page 138, last line, and note 1.

8 See page 544 for an account of Malik Bahā-ud-Din, Ṭughril.
Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ai-yitim, was a man of great prudence and experience, intrepid and steadfast, and just. When he first was honoured by the august Sulṭān’s service, he became Sar-i-Jān-dār [Chief or Head of the Jān dārs], and, after some time, having done good service, the sīf of Lohor was assigned to him. When in the year 625 H. the august Sulṭān [I yal-timish] came for the purpose of seizing the territory of Sind, and Uchchah and Mūltān, by the Sulṭān’s command, Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ai-yitim, advanced from Lohor and appeared before the fortress of Mūltān, and did good service in the acquisition of that fortification; and, at length, that stronghold and city he gained possession of by capitulation. When the Sulṭān came back from the territory of Sind, and returned to the capital, Dihli, the Siwālikh country, and Ajmīr, Lāwah, Kāsīlī, and Sanbhar Namak, he made over to his charge, and the Sulṭān assigned him an elephant, and in this honour he was distinguished above the other Maliks.

On Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ai-yitim’s proceeding to Ajmīr, he showed many proofs of vigour and judgment, in undertaking expeditions and making holy-war upon the infidel Hindūs and devastating their country, and performed great achievements. Once, during the time he held that government, the author found him in the territory of Sanbhar Namak, and he was pleased to show him much honour and respect; and, of a verity, he was a Malik of exemplary faith. Suddenly, he set out on an expedition against the infidel Hindūs into the Būndī territory, and came upon the Hindūs in a position in a defile, and was under the necessity of passing a river which lay at that place. Being heavily armed with cuirass, and other defensive armour, he sank in that river, and was drowned.—The Almighty’s mercy be upon him!

1 Already described, in note 7, page 603.
2 He says 624 H. at page 542; at pages 723, 725, and 731, we have 625 H. See also under the reign of I yal timish.
3 See under Ḥabīb-jāh page 544, and I yal timish’s reign, pages 611 and 612.
4 Sānbhar—Sānbhal—which our author writes as above, and also Sanbhal, with A, is the name of a town and district, on the great Salt Lake in Rājpūtānah, north of Ajmīr. Kāsīlī is written Kassullie in Tod’s map, but, in the Indian Atlas, sheet No. 33, it is turned into Kāsīlī. Lāwah is more to the S W., in Long. 74°, Lat. 25°, 10.
IV. MALIK SAIF-UD-DĪN, I-BAK-Ł-I-UŞCHAH.

Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak, was the slave of the august Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish, and was a Turk of energy and sagacity, and exemplary faith, and the Sultān had purchased him from Jamāl ud-Dīn, the Armourer, at Budā′ūn.

At first he was made Sar-i-Jān-dār [Head of the Jāndārs]. He was directed to enter upon that office against his wishes; and the sum of three laks of jitals for the maintenance of his position he did not receive with appreciation. When this came to the Sultān's hearing he in-

4 From the fact of so many chiefs, mentioned in this work, being styled ʿal as well as Sultān Kutb-ud-Dīn, there is some room to doubt whether this word may not here be intended to be pronounced otherwise than I-bak, since all of them would have fingers, although all could scarcely have had any peculiarity of finger; and, as regards Kutb-ud-Dīn, the matter is cleared up by the adjective shāl or shal added to it. With other vowel points—the word Ai-bak—signifies but—idol, or, may be a compound word, from ʿal ai—moon, and ʿal bak—lord—the moon-lord—which, although it might be the by-name of one, could scarcely be the by-name of several individuals, all of whom were sold as slaves. The probability however is that Ai-bak is the most correct meaning here, viz. ʿal—moon, and bak—face, countenance—the moon-faced, but even then it would be strange that there were so many of them. Another matter for consideration is, that the word ʿal has several other meanings, and is written with ʿ—b—but described as Persian b, which signifies ʿ—p; and that the vowel points also may change its meaning; for example: pak means a finger joint, and the heel, and also, beauty, grace, &c.; and puk signifies a frog.

I have never met with the word written ʿal and but once met with ʿāl with madd over the Ai— and that is Turkish and signifies female, not moon. Another matter for consideration is, that, if we divide the word ʿal—assuming it to be a compound word—and take the last portion of it—āl—it has various significations, most of which are said to be Turkish, according to the pronunciation as shown by the vowel points, and also whether the ʿ and ā are described as 'Arabic or Persian letters, the former being b and k, and the latter p and g; but, at the same time, it must be understood that they are continually used indiscriminately, for example: Bīl, a lord or chief. 2. A wild cucumber. Būk, cheek, countenance. 2. Ignorant, stupid. 3. Weak, languid, &c. Bīk, finger. 2. A live coal. Pāk, aid, help. 2. A defender, patron. 3. The finger joint, the heel. 4. A turban. Pāk, in Persian is the same in signification as the 'Arabic ʿal—which means, relaxed, weak, languid. 2. Lean, ignorant, &c. As well as 3. Delicate, beautiful. There are some other meanings which I need not mention, but I fear we shall be unable to come to any certain or satisfactory conclusion until some competent scholar, who is thoroughly acquainted with the old Turkish dialects, shall examine this and several other titles in this Section which are undoubtedly Turkish.

5 Literally, one who gives to swords or armour the fine water, as it is termed, so much esteemed in the east.
quired of him the reason of his not regarding it. Appre-
hensive, he replied: "My lord, the Sultân, in the first place, commands his slave to take an office of affliction, while his humble servant is unable to practise blood-shedding, torture, extortion, and oppression upon Muslims and subjects. Let the Sultân be pleased to assign other employment to his slave." The Sultân showed great reliance on him [in consequence] and made Nãrnûl his sief. He served in the government of that sief for sometime, and, subsequently, the sief of Baran was assigned to him, and, after that again, the sief of Sunâm was conferred upon him. When the expedition into Lahanawaštî was undertaken, and the force had reduced Balkâ, the Khalj, and was on its way back to the capital, Malik Tâj-ud-Dîn, Sanjar-i-Gajz-lak Khân, died at Ûchchah [while holding the government of Sind], and the august Sultân, Shams-ud-Dîn, I-yal-tîmiîh, assigned the sief of Ûchchah, and the fortress and city of Ûchchah to Malik Saïf-ud-Dîn, I-bak.

For a considerable period he exercised the government, and was guardian of the people of that country, and brought it under his control. When the Sultân passed to the Creator's mercy, Malik Saïf-ud-Dîn, I-bak, became very powerful; and, at that juncture, Malik Saïf-ud-Dîn, Hasan, the Karlugh, became covetous of the possession of Ûchchah and the Panjâb territory, and he arrived before the gate of the city of Ûchchah, from the direction of Baniân with a large army. Malik Saïf-ud-Dîn, I-bak, with a well organized force, in battle array, marched out of the fortress of Ûchchah and encountered them in battle. Almighty God gave him the victory, and the Karlugh forces were routed, and retired without gaining their object.

This, truly, was a very important victory, at this time, because, at this period, through the decease of Sultân

6 This is the tract of country so often mentioned in these pages and which I have already indicated the position of; but it is often written in a very careless manner [the Calcutta printed text sometimes turns it into Multân], and this fact has led Thomas into a great error, at page 76 of his "PATHân KINGS OF DEHIL." All the references made by him to the printed text in the foot-note to that page refer to Baniân—بہت، and not to Multân.

7 This, of course, has been omitted under the reign to which it properly belongs. It was the first occasion on which the Karlugh, or Karlugh—the word is written both ways—invaded the Dihî kingdom after Shams-ud-Dîn, I-yal-tiimiîh's decease. See also page 677.
Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish, awe and fear of the kingdom of Hindūstān in [people's] hearts had sustained detriment, and enemies had sprung up on all sides of the empire, and the vain desire of appropriating its territory began to trouble their minds, when Almighty God bestowed this victory on him. The good name of Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak, remained in that country, and in all the territory of Hindūstān his renown was diffused.

Shortly after this victory, Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak, sustained a fall from his horse, and the animal kicked him in a mortal place, and he was killed. The mercy and forgiveness of the Almighty be upon him!

V. MALIK SAIF-UD-DĪN, I-BAK-I-YUGHĀN-TAT.

Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-Yughān-tat, was a Khītā-i Turk, and was, both externally and internally, adorned and endowed with divers manly qualities. The august Sulṭān [Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish] had purchased him from the heirs of Iḵtiyār-ud-Dīn-i-Chust-Ḵabā Ḵ Ḵ [of the tight-fitting vest], and he distinguished him by his intimacy, and conferred upon him the office of Amīr-i-Majlis [Lord of the Assembly or Council]. After he had performed good service in that appointment, he was raised to a high position, and the fief of the district of Sursutī was bestowed upon him. At the time of this honour being conferred upon him, he gave directions for the presentation of a horse to each of the Amirs, Maliks, and Grandees; and this gift caused him to be remembered, and his acquirement of some influence.

In the year 625 Ḥ., at the time that the author found the Sulṭān’s camp in the territory of Üchchah of Multān, Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak, was the feudatory of Sursutī, and, in the presence of the Sulṭān, he possesses much influence and intimacy; and when, after some time, he had done distinguished services, the fief of Bihār was entrusted to his charge. On Malik ’Alā-ud-Dīn, Jāni’s Ḵ Ḵ being deposed from

---

* This appears to have been the nick-name of two persons who dealt in slaves, since I-yal-timish himself was sold to Ḵuṭb-ud-Dīn, by Jamāl-ud-Dīn-i-Chust-Ḵabā.

* Referred to in the List of Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish’s Maliks as Prince of Turkistān, who gave such trouble in the reign of Sulṭān Raḥiyyat.
the fief of Lakhanawaṭi, that country was made over to Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak.

In that territory he displayed great vigour, and captured several elephants from the country of Bang, and despatched them to the most sublime Court; and, from the Sulṭān, he received the title of Yughān-tat, and his name became great. He held the government of that country for some time, and in the year 631 H.¹ he died. The Almighty’s mercy and pardon be upon him!

VI. MALIK NUṢRAT-UD-DĪN, TĀ-YASA’I.²

Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn, Tā-yasa’i, was the slave of the illustrious martyr, Sulṭān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām. He was a Turk of short sight, but Almighty God had adorned him with all manly virtues and humanity, and he was endowed with great resolution, gallantry, and vigour, and possessed perfect sense, and sagacity.

At the time that the writer of this Ṭabākāt, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, attached himself to the sublime Shamsī court, Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn, Tā-yasa’i, was the feudatory of Jīnd [Jhīnd], Barwālah, and Hānsī. After some time, as he had performed approved services, two years subsequent to the taking of the fortress of Gwāliyūr, the august Sulṭān [Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yāl-timish] entrusted Bhiānah and Sulṭān-kot to³ his charge, together with the Superintendency⁴ of the territory of Gwāliyūr, and he received directions likewise to make Gwāliyūr [the fortress] his

¹ Stewart in his “History of Bengal” says [page 65] that Sief Addeen Yugan Tunt [!!] died in 651 H.—a mistake of only twenty years.
² In nearly every copy of the text this word or title is somewhat differently written; but the above—تانا تانا—Tā-yasa’i—seems most correct. In one copy it is written with vowel points thus تانا.
³ Vansberr considers it is a Chinese word, and that it means a writer, or secretary, but that does not seem applicable here. I think it undoubtedly Turkish, and it possibly may refer to his shortsightedness, but more probably to the name of some place. A somewhat similar term occurs in Sharf-ud-Dīn, ‘Alī’s, History, but written Tāishī, but it may be wholly different from the above.
⁴ Its being founded is mentioned in the account of Malik Bahā-ud-Tughrīl, at page 545.
⁵ The word here used is شاهناغی—Shahnagī—which is rarely used by our author except with reference to those states and territories over which the Mughals obtained sway. The meaning of Shahnag has been already given.
residence. The contingents of Kinnauj, and Mahir [or Mihar], and Mahā'ün were all placed under his control, in order that he might undertake an inroad into the Kālinjar and Chandīrī territories. In the year 631 H., he accordingly led an army from Gwāliyūr towards the Kālinjar country, and the Rāe of Kālinjar fled discomfited before him. He plundered the townships of that territory, and, in a very short period, obtained vast booty, in such wise, that, in the space of fifty days, the Sultān’s fifth share was set down at twenty-five laks [of jītal or dirams?].

On the return of Malik Nuşrat-ud-Dīn, Tā-yasa’ī, the Rānah of Ajār, Chāhar, by name, occupied the route of the Musalīmān forces, and blocked up the road in the narrow parts of [some] deep ravines, and was drawn up [with his forces], at the head of the road, prepared to oppose their passage. Malik Nuşrat-ud-Dīn, Tā-yasa’ī, was somewhat weak in body [from sickness?] at the time, and he divided his force into three bodies, at the head of three roads—the first body consisted of the unencumbered horsemen [under his own command]; the second body of the baggage, material, and, the followers of the force, with an Amīr in charge; and the third consisted of the booty and the cattle with an Amīr with it also. I heard Nuşrat-ud-Dīn himself state, saying: “Through the divine favour,

8 In the account of Ulugh Khān farther on, it is stated that this took place in 632 H., and Jamsū is mentioned as well as Kinnauj and the other places just mentioned; but 632 H. was the year in which I-yal-timish himself advanced into Mālwa, and took Bhīlsān and Ujjain. See under his reign, page 621.

6 This is according to the best copies of the text, which style him, respectively, Rānah, Ajār, and Ājārī; Ājārī, Rānah, and Ajār; Rānah, Ajār, and Ājārī; and all have the hamzah denoting the genitive case—Rānah of Ajār, Ajārī, or Ajārnah [probably Ajārīfah or Ājhārīfah], and state that his name was Chāhar. See page 691, and the account of Ulugh Khān farther on.

7 In his account of Ulugh Khān farther on, our author, in all the oldest copies, mentions “the ravines of the river ḳara—Karānah or Garānah” which, in the more modern copies of the text, is Sindi—Sindi. This latter river flows by the fortress of Nurwul, previously referred to at page 690, bounds the Gwāliyūr territory on the east, and falls into the Jūn or Yamanā. In about the direction Nuşrat-ud-Dīn must have taken on his return to Gwāliyūr, this river is about 200 yards broad in the rainy season, and about forty in the dry, and some two feet deep; and, at this part of its course, its banks are steep, and cut into numerous ravines. Whether the Karānah or Garānah and the Sindi be one and the same river it is difficult to say; but it is not improbable that the first is its proper name, as Sindi is, of course, derived from ḳara—a river, and that one and the same river is referred to.
never in Hindūstān had an enemy seen my back; and, on that day, that Hindū fellow fell upon me like a wolf upon a flock of sheep. I divided my force into three bodies in order that, in the event of the Hindū confronting me and the unincumbered horsemen, the baggage and war material and cattle might pass on in safety, and, in case he should show a desire towards the baggage and war material or cattle, I, together with the auxiliaries of the true faith, would come behind him and take satisfaction on his malignity." The Hindū confronted Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn's own division, and Almighty God gave him the victory. The Hindūs were routed, and numbers of them sent to hell, and he returned with his booty to the fortress of Gwāliyūr in safety.

An anecdote of an occurrence, showing his perfect sagacity, which happened during this expedition, which was made known [to the author], is here related, that readers may derive profit therefrom: and that anecdote is as follows. A milk sheep, from among his flocks, had been lost for some time—nearly a month and a half—during this inroad. One day, Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn was moving round the camp among the tents, after the force had been encamped at that same place a week, and every one had set up something or other to shade himself. Suddenly, during his perambulation, the bleating of a sheep reached his ear. He immediately said to his attendants: "That is the bleating of my sheep." They proceeded in the direction, and found that it was as that Amīr-i-Ghāzī had said: the animal was there, and they brought back the [stray] sheep again.

Many other acts of his sagacity and intelligence occurred during this expedition, and one of them is as follows. At the time when the Rāe of Kālinjar faced about and retired routed before him, Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn, Tā-yasa'ī, pursued him. Having succeeded in obtaining a Hindū guide, he set out, on their track, in pursuit of the fugitive [Hindūs] and pushed on for four nights and days, and part of the fifth night until half the night had passed, when the Hindū guide stated that he had lost the road, and was unacquainted with the route in advance. Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn commanded so that they sent the Hindū to hell, and began to
act as guide himself. So they reached some high ground,* at which place the fugitives had watered, and the cattle of their army had cast the water and heavy baggage away. In the victorious army every one said: "It is night and the enemy near: let it not be that we fall among them. Their camp must be near by." Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn Tāyasa'i dismounted from his horse, and went up round the place on foot, and examined the water cast away by the horses of the infidels. He exclaimed [after his examination]: "Be of good cheer, my friends: the force, which is here and has watered here, is the rearmost column of the enemy's army, by this proof. Had it been the van or the main body, in this place would have been the tracks of the rest of their army, but, on this place, there are no tracks: keep up your hearts, for we are on the rear of the enemy!" With these prognostics of victory he remounted, and, at dawn the following morning, came up with those infidels, and sent the whole [!] of them to hell, and captured the canopy of state, and the standards of the Rāe of Kālinjār and returned in safety from that expedition.9

When the reign of the Sūltān [Rukn-ud-Dīn, Fīrūz Shāh] terminated, and Malik Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad Shāh [his brother], son of Sūltān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish, became the victim of misfortune, Sūltān Rażiyyat conferred [the fief of] Awadh upon Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn, Tāyasa'i; and, at the period when Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī, and Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Kūjī, advanced to the gate of the city [of Dīhlī], and began to act in a rebellious manner, he set out from Awadh for the sublime Court of Sovereignty to render his services. Suddenly and unexpectedly, Malik Kūjī moved against him, and took Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn, Tā-yasa'i, prisoner.2 He was overcome by sickness

---

* The untrustworthy Calcutta printed text makes HasForeignKey—a bridge, of high ground, a height, &c.

9 This important expedition took place during the reign of I-yal-timish, in the year after he gained possession of Gvāliyūr, and the year before he took Bhīlāsān and Ujjain, but not the least reference is made to it under that Sūltān's reign, and no reference is made to either Rāhān Chāhār nor to the Rāe of Kālinjār. See the account of Ulugh Khān farther on, and page 690, and note 1.

1 This refers to his rebellion. See page 633.

2 See page 639.
at the time, and the malady carried him off, and he died. The mercy of the Almighty be upon him!

VII. MALIK 'IZZ-UD-DIN, TUGHRIIL-I-TUGHAN KHAN.

Malik Tughrili-Tughan Khan was a Turk of good looks and good disposition, and his origin was from Karah^4 Khita. He was adorned with all sorts of humanity and sagacity, and graced with many virtues and noble qualities, and in liberality, generosity, and winning men’s hearts, he had no equal, in that day, among the [royal] retinue or military.

When the Sultan [I-yal-timish] first purchased Tughrili-Tughan Khan, he made him his Saki-i-Khas [own personal Cup-bearer]^5; and, having served in that capacity for sometime, he became Sar-Dawat-dar [Chief Keeper of the Private Writing-case], when, suddenly, he lost the Sultan’s own jeweled pen-case. The Sultan administered to him a sound chastisement, but, subsequently, bestowed upon him a rich dress of honour and made him Chashmi-gir [Comptroller of the Royal Kitchen]. After a considerable time, Malik Tughrili-Tughan Khan became Amir-i-Akhur [Lord of the Stable], and, subsequently, in 630 H., was made feudatory of Budain. When the territory of Lakanawati was made the fief of Malik [Saif-ud-Din, I-bak]-Yughan-tat, the country of Bihar was conferred upon Malik Tughrili; and, when Malik Yughan-tat died [in 631 H.], Malik Tughrili-Tughan Khan became feudatory of the country of Lakanawati, and he brought that territory under his jurisdiction.

After the decease of the august Sultan [I-yal-timish], between him and the feudatory of Lakanawati-Lakanhor, I-bak, by name, whom they used to style Aor Khan, a Turk of great daring and impetuosity, enmity arose, and a

^ For the pronunciation of this Turkish word see note ^4, page 544. Tughan, in the Turkish language, is equivalent to the Persian word گاغ—a species of hawk.

^4 Our author writes this Turkish word Kar and Karah indiscriminately.

^5 It is worthy of notice regarding these great men of the so-called “PATHAN” dynasties, that nearly every one of these Maliks were Turkish Mamluks or purchased slaves; but did any one ever hear of an Afghan or Fathn a slave?
battle took place between them for [the possession of] the town of Basan-kot of Lakhanañawañî, within the environs of the city of Lakhanañawañî itself. During the engagement, Malik Tughrîl-i-Tughân Khan pierced Aor Khan with an arrow in a mortal place, and he forswitly died. Tughril's name became great [in consequence], and both sides of the country of Lakhanañawañî—the one part of which they style Râl [Rârh] which is towards Lakhân-or, and the other is named Barind [Barindah] on the side of Basan-kot—became one, and came into Malik Tughril's possession.

When the throne of the kingdom passed to Sulthan Rañiyat, Malik Tughril-i-Tughân Khan despatched some persons of note to the sublime Court, and he was dignified by being honoured with a canopy of state and standards, and was paid high honour. He made an inroad into the country of Tirhut from Lakhanañawañî, and acquired much valuable booty.

When the throne devolved upon Sulthan Mu'izz-ud-Din, Bahram Shâh, Malik Tughril-i-Tughân Khan was distinguished in the same manner, and was in the continual habit of sending for the service of the sublime Court offerings of great value. After the termination of the Mu'izzì dynasty, in the beginning of the 'Alâ-i reign [the reign of Sulthan 'Alâ-ud-Din, Mas'ud-Shâh], his confidential adviser, Bahâ-ud-Din, Hilal, the Suriâni [Syrian], instigated him to take possession of the territory of Awadh, and Karah and Mânik-pûr, and An-desah-i-Balâ-tar [Upper-most An-des— or Urnâ-desa]. In the year 640 H., when this author, with his dependents, and children, set out from the capital,
Dihlī, for Lakhānawatī, when he arrived in Awadh, Malik Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān had reached the country of Karah and Mānīk-pūr. The author, taking his family along with him, proceeded from Awadh and waited on him; and Malik Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān remained for sometime in that vicinity, close upon Awadh, but afterwards returned to Lakhānawatī again. The author accompanied him 1.

In the year 641 H., the Rāē of Jāj-nagar commenced molesting the Lakhānawatī territory; and, in the month of Shawwāl, 641 H., Malik Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān marched towards the Jāj-nagar country, and this servant of the state accompanied him on that holy expedition. On reaching Katāsin 2, which was the boundary of Jāj-nagar [on the side of Lakhānawatī], on Saturday, the 6th of the month of Zi-Ka’dah, 641 H., Malik Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān made his troops mount, and an engagement commenced. The holy-warriors of Islām passed over two ditches, and the Hindū infidels took to flight. So far as they continued in the author’s sight, except the fodder which was before their elephants, nothing fell into the hands of the foot-men of the army of Islām, and, moreover, Malik Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān’s commands were that no one should molest the elephants, and, for this reason, the fierce fire of battle subsided.

When the engagement had been kept up until mid-day the foot-men of the Musalmān army—every one of them—returned [to the camp?] to eat their food, and the Hindūs, in another direction, stole through the cane jangal, and took five elephants; and about two hundred foot and fifty horsemen came upon the rear of a portion of the Musalmān army 3. The Muḥammadans sustained an overthow, and a great number of those holy warriors attained martyrdom; and Malik Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān retired from that place without having effected his object, and returned to Lakhānawatī. He despatched the Sharf-ul-Mulk 4, the Ash’ārī,

1 See pages 662 and 663.
2 See note 4, para. 8, page 587.
3 In every copy of the text collated this sentence, like the preceding, is very defective—no two copies being alike—and, altogether, our author’s account of this affair seems imperfect. It appears improbable that 250 Hindūs only should throw a whole army into confusion, in broad daylight.
4 The title of the Malik’s minister probably, not his name. At page 664 it is stated that Kāfī Jalāl-ud-Dīn, who was Kāfī of Awadh, was directed to
to the Court of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, to solicit assistance. Kāẓī Jalāl-ud-Dīn, the Kāsānī—on whom be peace!—was deputed, along with the Šahr-šul-Mulk, bearing a rich robe of honour, a canopy of state, a standard and tent, coupled with [expressions of] much honour and reverence, to return to Lakhānawatī; and the forces of Hindūstān, under the orders of Kāmur-ud-Dīn, Tamūr Khān-i Kī-rān, who was feudatory of Awadh, moved towards Lakhānawatī, by the sublime command of the Sulṭān, to operate against the infidels of Jāj-nagar.

In this same year likewise [642 H.], the Rāe of Jāj-nagar, in order to avenge the plundering of Kātāsīn, which had taken place the preceding year, as has been already recorded, having turned his face towards the Lakhānawatī territory, on Tuesday, the 13th of the month of Šawwāl, 642 H., the army of infidels of Jāj-nagar, consisting of elephants, and pāyiks [foot-men] in great numbers, arrived opposite Lakhānawatī. Malik Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān came out of the city to confront them. The infidel host, on coming beyond the frontier of the Jāj-nagar territory, first took Lakhān-or; and Fakhr-šul-Mulk, Karīm-ud-Dīn, Lāghrī, who was the feudatory of I akhan-or, with a body of proceed to Lakhānawatī along with the Šahr-ul-Mulk, bearing a red canopy of state, and a robe of honour, and that they reached Lakhānawatī on the 11th of Rabī‘ul-Awwal, 641 H. This is impossible, as the repulse before Kātāsīn took place eight months after this date. The year must be 642 H. ’Another discrepancy is that [page 664], under the reign, it is said that the agent was sent to the Court, when Malik Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān returned from Karah towards Lakhānawatī!

4 That is of the Antarbād Do-ābah and distrīcts lying immediately east of the Gang.

6 Mr. Blochmann [”Contributions to the History and Geography of Bengal,” page 143, para. 4] is really too magnanimous when he says that ”Regarding Jānagar” I have ”come to the same conclusion” he ”had.” I beg leave to state that I had come to the conclusion in 1865, when I first made translations of the history of Bengal from as many works as I could find—eight in all, I think, or more—and then collected the materials which enabled me to insert the notes in question in this translation. I hope to publish the fruit of these translations not long hence, with additions since obtained.

The italics noticed in the same ”Contributions” [note 5, page 144] namely, Jānagar, page 592 of my translation, I daresay, do not imply a reference to Jāj-nagar; and, further, whether it be a mistake or not, the work I quoted has the word, and also the account of Kāḏhāh-Katankah. Perhaps Mr. Blochmann will refer to the Ma’dan-i-Akhbār-i-Aḥmādī and satisfy himself.

7 He must have succeeded I-bīk-i-Aor Khān in that title, under Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān perhaps. See page 736.
Musalmāns, they made martyrs of, and, after that, appeared before the gate of Lakhānawatī. The second day after that, swift messengers arrived from above [the Do-ābah and Awadh, &c.] and gave information respecting the army of Islām that it was near at hand. Panic now took possession of the infidels, and they decamped.

When the army from above reached the gate of Lakhānawatī, distrust arose between Malik Tughril-i-Tughān Khān and Malik Tamur Khān-i-Kī-rān, and led to strife; and a conflict took place between the two armies of Musalmāns before the gate of the city of Lakhānawatī, and continued from day-dawn to the early forenoon, when certain people appealed to them, and the two forces disengaged from each other, and each returned to its own camp. As Malik Tughril-i-Tughān Khān’s own quarters were before the city gate, by the time he had alighted at his own tent, the whole of his troops had returned to their own dwellings within the city, and he remained alone. Malik Tamur Khān-i-Kī-rān however, on returning to his camp, continued ready armed as before, when, finding opportunity, and becoming aware that Malik Tughril-i-Tughān Khān was all alone in his tent within his camp, he mounted with his whole force, and made a dash upon Malik Tughril-i-Tughān Khān’s camp. The latter was under the necessity of mounting and flying within the city; and this event took place on Tuesday, the 5th of the month of Zi-Ḥijjah, 642 H.

On Malik Tughril-i-Tughān Khān’s reaching the city, he employed the author, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, and despatched him out of the city to seek an accommodation and his safety; and a truce and compact were entered into between the two Maliks, under the engagement that Lakhānawatī should be delivered up to Malik Tamur Khān-i-Kī-rān, and that Malik Tughril-i-Tughān Khān should proceed to the Sublime Court, taking along with him his treasures.

* The Jāj-nagar forces must have crossed the Ganges before they could invest the city of Lakhānawatī, if the course of that river was then as it is at present. For further details of this—for our author appears to have been totally unable to give the details of one affair in one place—see the account of Malik Tamur Khān-i-Kī-rān at page 763, where the name of the leader of the infidels is also mentioned. These are the Mughals of Chingiz Khān referred to at page 665, and note 8.
and elephants, his dependents and followers. Under this agreement, Lakhanawati was delivered up to Malik Tamur Khan-i-Ki-ran, and Malik Tughril-i-Tughan Khan, in company with Malik Karakash Khan, Malik Taj-ud-Din, Sanjar-i-Mah-peshani [of the moon-like brow], and the [other?] Amirs of the Court, returned to the sublime presence. The author, with his family and dependents, returned to Dihli along with Malik Tughril-i-Tughan Khan, and the Sublime Court was reached, on Monday, the 14th of the month of Safar, 643 H.

On Malik Tughril-i-Tughan Khan's arrival at Court, he was distinguished by great honour and reverence, and, in the [following] month of Rabii-ul-Awwal of that same year, the territory of Awadh was consigned to him, and he received much comfort and encouragement.

When the throne of sovereignty acquired additional glory from [the accession of] the Sultani-Mu'azzam, Nasir-ud-Dunyâ wa ud-Din, Mahmud Shah, in the year 644 H., Malik Tughril-i-Tughan Khan proceeded into Awadh; and, a short time afterwards, on the night of Friday, the end of the month of Shawwal of that year, he passed to the Almighty's mercy. Of destiny's wonderful decrees one was this, that, enmity and contest having arisen between Malik Tughril-i-Tughan Khan and Malik Tamur Khan-i-Ki-ran, and each having seized the other's territory, Tamur Khan should have died in Lakhanawati, and Tughan Khan in Awadh [the same night], in such wise that neither of the two, in this world, was aware of the other's death.

On this subject, that prince of mortals of the great

9 The sending of a robe of honour and standards to Tughril-i-Tughan Khan must have been merely for the purpose of putting him off his guard, and it must have been previously determined to deprive him of his government. See pages 665—667.
1 Who had accompanied the troops sent to the relief of Lakhanawati, or, rather, under pretence of relieving it.
2 See Blochmann's "Contributions" previously referred to, page 38. 'Izz-ud-Din, Tughril-i-Tughan Khan, did not withdraw from Lakhanawati direct into Awadh, but proceeded to Dihlî first, and then, in Nasir-ud-Din's reign, proceeded to take charge of the latter fief, as shown immediately under, and at page 744.
3 Not so, by the writer's own account: Tughril-i-Tughan Khan's territory was seized by treachery, but he had not seized his rival's.
and of the less, Sharf-ud-Dīn, the Balkhī, composed a verse:

"On Friday, the end of the month entitled Shāwwāl,
In the year, according to the 'Arab era, khā, mīm, dāl,
Was Tamur Khān's and Tughān Khān's march from the world.
This [one] at the beginning of the night went, that at its close."

Doubtless, their meeting will have taken place in the Court of the King of Glory in the everlasting mansion in the other world. The Almighty's mercy be upon them!

VIII. MALIK KAMAR-UD-DĪN, KĪ-RĀN-I-TAMUR KHĀN-US-SULṬĀNĪ.

Malik Tamur Khān-i-Kī-rān was a Turk of good qualities and excellent disposition, and very hasty and impetuous, prudent and intrepid. His origin was from Khībāk, and he was good looking, and had a long beard and mustachios. The Sulṭān [I-yal-timīsh], at the outset [of his career], purchased him of Asad-ud-Dīn, Mankalī, the brother's son of Malik Fīrūz, for the sum of fifty thousand Sulṭānī dirams.

During the expedition to Chand-wāl [i.e. Chand-wār],

4 This paragraph, and these lines may be looked upon as an interpolation, for they are only contained in some of the more modern copies of the text.
5 The printed text has sin—w—but that letter stands for sixty, which is not correct. K’hā—c—stands for 600, mīm—r—for 40, and dāl→—for 4= 644. The last day of the month is the 29th.
6 Tamur, in Turkish, signifies iron.
7 In some copies, "brother" of Malik Fīrūz. This is the person who stands first in the list of the Maliks of Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh, and bore likewise the latter Turkish name. See page 625.
8 All the old copies have dirams, but the modern ones jītals.
9 Chand-wāl and Chand-wār are synonymous. It is, no doubt, the place referred to at page 470, near which Jai-Chand, Rājah of Kīnauj and Bānāras, was overthrown by Sulṭān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, Ghūrī. Its name even has nearly perished, and Fīrūzābād has arisen almost upon its ruins. It is situated about twenty-five miles east of Ḍārāgh on the banks of the Jūn or Yamanā. There are other places bearing similar names which led me to suppose, as stated in note 1, page 470, and, also from the loose manner in which native writers refer to it, as noticed in para. 5 to note at page 518, that it was a different place, several authors stating that the battle above referred to took place "in the neighbourhood of Chand-wār and Ḏāwah," while, at the same time, these two places are some forty or more miles apart. The ruins of the ancient city of Chand-wār cover the surrounding country for miles round Fīrūzābād—masjids, mausoleums, gateways, and other extensive buildings—indicating the size and importance of the place.
unexpectedly, the son of the Rāe of Chand-wāl, Laddah, by name, fell into his hands; and, when he brought him to the Sultān’s presence, Tāmur Khān-i-Ḵi-rān received suitable commendation. Subsequently, he became Nā’īb Amir-i-Ākhur [Deputy Lord of the Stable], and, at that time, the Amir-i-Ākhur was Tughril-i-Tughān Khān [No. vii.]. Having obtained this office, he performed approved service therein; and, when Tughril-i-Tughān Khān was assigned the sīf of Budaʿūn, Tamur Khān-i-Ḵi-rān became Amir-i-Ākhur.

During the reign of Sultān Raṣīyyat—on whom be the Almighty’s mercy!—he became feudatory of Kīnnauj; and, during that reign, by the sublime command, he was despatched towards Gwalīyūr and Mālwah in command of the Islāmī forces, and, during that expedition, he did good service¹. Subsequently, after he returned to the Court, the sīf of Kārah was entrusted to him, and, in that part, he undertook many expeditions against the infidels, and discharged, in a complete manner, all the duties of good general-ship.

When Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Ḍīn, Tā-yasaʾī, who was feudatory of Āwaḍh, died, the territory of Awadh, with its dependencies, was entrusted to Malik Tamur Khān-i-Ḵi-rān’s charge. In that part, as far as the frontier of the Tirhut territory, he performed great deeds, and obtained possession of vast booty; and compelled the Rāes and Rānās, and independent [Hindū] tribes², of that country, to pay him tribute. On several occasions he plundered the territory of Bhaṭī-ghor³, and extorted tribute.

In the year 642 H., when he proceeded to Lakhanawatī, his behaviour towards Malik Tughril-i-Tughān Khān, and to what point it reached, has been previously recorded in this Section⁴; and, whilst Malik Tughril-i-Tughān Khān

¹ No mention of this expedition occurs in the account of her reign.
² Here the word مواسات referred to in note 7, page 705, is used evidently as the plural of مواس. The meaning is apparent.
³ Bhaṭī-Ghorā, or Bhaṭī-Ghorah—the tract lying on the left bank of the Son, east of Banāras, in the centre of which Kālinjar is situated.
⁴ See pages 664—667. His death occurred on the 29th of Shawwal, 644 H. There is an inscription respecting him in the Bihār Museum, dated in the first month of this year, which has been published in the Bengal Asiatic Journal for 1871. That inscription tends to show that he considered himself inde-
was at the capital, he came, unattended, to Mānish, and removed his family, and the whole of his effects, from Awadh to Lakhanawatī. For a period of two years he continued, in rebellion, at Lakhanawatī, and afterwards died, on the same night in which Tughril-i-Tughān Khān took his departure from the world; and, as the daughter of Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-Yughān-tat, was his wife, she duly performed her obligation [to him], and took his corpse to Awadh from Lakhanawatī, and there he was buried. The Almighty's mercy be upon him!

IX. MALIK HINDŪ KHĀN, MU-AYYID-UD-DĪN, MIHTAR-I-MUBĀRAK-UL-KHĀZĪN-US-SULTĀNĪ.

Hindū Khān, Mihtar-i-Mubārak, was, by origin, of Mahir. When he first came into the august Sulṭān's service, the Sulṭān [I-yal-timish] purchased him of Fakhrudd-Dīn, the Ṣafahānī. Hindū Khān was a man of exceeding good disposition, and of exemplary conduct, of sincere piety, and, in the Sulṭān's service, had attained great intimacy with him, and had reached a position of the most

pendent, unless, as is often the case, and as repeatedly shown in this work, his subordinate has given him titles after his own fancy. This inscription is also given in Blochmann's "Contributions," page 37, with a translation. There is an error in the last however, the words Tughril-us-Sulṭānī do not mean Tughril, the Royal, but Tughril, the Sulṭān's [I-yal-timish's] slave—the Sulṭān Tughril—a term applied to the following Malik and to several of the great Maliks herein mentioned. See also note *, to page 41 of the same paper.

* This name is doubtful. In the most reliable copies it is مانش as above, but in others مانش and مانش. The Calcutta printed text has تاباس—Tabas.

* Some copies of the text have نشکر نشک—organization and conduct of troops—but it is evidently a mistake for سرکش—rebellion—from the facts of the matter, as the inscription previously referred to shows. It was the stormy period preceding the reign of Sulṭān Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh. See the latter part of 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Maṣ'ūd Shāh's reign, pages 667—669. Some modern copies have راہی—happiness, felicity, &c.

* In the printed text, the word farzand—child or daughter of—has been left out, so it may be imagined what a sentence it makes.

* The word Mihtar signifies greater, and a lord, the head or chief of a tribe, &c. It is here probably used as a title.

* If he was originally from Mihir or Mihīr, which is probably intended for the place of that name in the Sāgar and Narbadah territories, in Lat. 24° 16', Long. 80° 49'—for I know of no place of such name in Turkistān—Hindū Khān was probably a converted Hindū. This seems to show that there was a brisk trade carried on in Hindū as well as Turkish slaves.
perfect confidence. Throughout the whole reign of Sultan I-yal-timish—from the beginning to the close—and the reign of Sultan Raziyat likewise, he was honoured and esteemed, had held the office of Treasurer, and had done good services. All Sultan I-yal-timish's slaves who attained offices in the state, and positions of greatness, were objects of his regard and affection; and they all looked upon him as a kind and loving father.

When Hindu Khan first came into the Sultan's service, he became Yüz-ban [Keeper of the hunting leopards], and, subsequently, he was made Torch-bearer; and, whilst holding that office, within the limits of the territory of Baran, at the time when the Sultan [I-yal-timish] was feudatory of Baran [before he succeeded to the throne], in the reign of the beneficent Sultan, Kutb-ud-Din, I-bak, during a raid against one of the independent tribes of Hindu infidels, Hindu Khan Mihtar-i-Mubarak, with the spike of his torch, unhorsed a Hindu and sent the man to Hell. The Sultan [afterwards] made him his Tasht-dar [Ewer-bearer], and, in that capacity, he served for a considerable time.

When the affairs of the kingdom came under the administration of the Shamsi dynasty, the Mihtar-i-Mubarak became Treasurer to Sultan I-yal-timish, but he did not ever give up the office of Tasht-dar up to the end of the Sultan's lifetime, and used, as heretofore, to perform the duties of personal Ewer-bearer. When the august Sultan encamped before the preserved fortress of Gwâliyur, and took that place, this servant of the victorious dynasty, Minhâj-i-Saraj, during that expedition, for a period of seven months, in accordance with commands, was in the habit of delivering a discourse, twice in each week, at the entrance of the royal pavilion; and, throughout the month of Ramazan, and on the 1oth of Zi-Ḥijjah, and 1oth of Muḥarram, the author used to perform the service daily. After the fortress was taken possession of, as the just claims of his priestly duties had been established, the administration of all matters of law and religion of that fortress was entrusted to the author, and this installation took place in the year 630 H. This is mentioned because,

---

1 See page 619. There our author makes a different statement.
2 This appears to have been our author's first appointment under the government of Dihlî, at least the first one he mentions.
at the time of investing the author with the direction of law affairs, that Mihtar of Mihtars, Mihtar-i-Mubārak, Hindū Khān himself, was present in the royal treasury, and treated him with such kindness and encouragement that this servant of the state was much behofoon to him for such honour on his part. Almighty God reward him, and have mercy on him!

When the Shamsī reign came to a termination, in the reign of Sulṭān Raẓiyyat, the territory and fortress of Ūchchah was entrusted to Malik Hindū Khān’s charge; and, when the throne passed to Sulṭān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, he returned from that province to the Court, and the territory of Jalandhar [Jalhandar] was conferred upon him, and there also he died.

X. MALIK IKHTIYĀR-UD-DĪN, KARĀ-KASHI KHĀN-I-AET-KĪN.

Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Karā-Kash Khān-i-Aet-kīn, was from Karah-Khitā, and was a man of exceeding amiable disposition, magnanimous, pure in mind, and adorned with all manliness and valour, and was one of the ancient slaves of the Sulṭān [I-yal-timish].

When the august Sulṭān first purchased him, he made him his personal Cup-bearer, and, after he had served in that capacity for a considerable time, he acquired the sief of Barīhūn and Darangawān [Daran-gā-on?]⁴. Some years subsequently, he became the Superintendent of the Khāliṣah [crown province] of Tabarhindah; and, after that, also during the reign of the august Sulṭān, Multān became his sief, after Malik Kabīr Khān ⁶ [Izz-ud-Dīn, Ayāz-i-Hazār-Mardah], and his title then became Karā-Kash Khān.

On the expiration of the Shamsī reign, Sulṭān Raẓiyyat
took Lohor from Malik Kabir Khān-i-Ayāz, and made over to him, in lieu thereof, the sief of Multān, as has been previously narrated 7. What befell Malik Karā-Kaşh at Lohor, and his evacuation of that city, during the inroad of the infidel Mughals and their appearance before Lohor, will be recorded in the account of the Lohor disaster 8. He [then] had the territory of Bhiānah conferred upon him, and he continued in that part some time. When the reign of Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh, came, and the Maliks revolted, Malik Karā-Kaşh Khān, with Malik Yūz-Bak [Ikhtiyar-ud-Dīn, Tughril Khān], came to the capital and attached themselves to Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh. As Mihtar-i-Mubārak [Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Mubārak Shāh, the Farrāsh], Farruḵhi, conspired against the Turk Maliks and Amirs, he influenced Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh, against Malik Karā-Kaşh and Malik Yūz-Bak, and the Sultān imprisoned both of them 9.

After the city of Dihlī was taken, and the throne passed to Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas'ud Shāh, Malik Karā-Kaşh Khān, became Amir-i-Ḥājib, and, shortly afterwards, on Friday, the 25th of the month of Jamādī-ul-Awwal, 640 H., Bhiānah became his sief 1. After some time Karah was assigned to him; and, from thence, in company with Malik Tamur Khān-i-Ki-rān, with troops, he marched towards Lakhanaqātī, and returned from thence along with Malik Tughril-i-Tughān Khān 2.

When the throne of sovereignty acquired beauty and adornment from the auspicious dignity of the Sultān of the Universe, Nāṣir-ud-Dunya wa ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, in the year 644 H., Malik Karā-Kaşh Khān was killed within the limits of Karah 3. The Almighty's mercy be upon him!

7 At pages 644 and 727.
8 In the account of the Mughal irruption in the next Section. See also page 655.
9 See pages 659 and 761.
1 This must mean that he was restored to that sief again, because, just before, it is stated that he was made feudatory of Bhiānah after the evacuation of Lāhor, and that, from Bhiānah, he marched to support Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh.
2 See page 741.
3 No particulars of this affair occur anywhere throughout this work.
XI. MALIK IKHTIYĀR-UD-DĪN, ALTŪNĪAH, OF TABARHINDAH.

Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūnīah of Tabarhindah, was a great Malik, of vast boldness and gallantry, manliness and energy, lion-heartedness and magnanimity; and the whole of the Maliks of that time were unanimous as to his manliness and valour. At the time of the imprisonment of Sultān Rażiyyat—on whom be peace!—he had fought encounters with the forces of the disaffected Maliks, in conjunction with Sultān Rażiyyat, and had displayed great heroism.

When the august Sultān [I-yal-timish] first purchased him, he gave him the Sharāb-dāri [office—the care of the liquors]. After some time, as the Sultān had remarked proofs of manliness depicted upon his brow, he gave him the office of Sar Chatar-dār [Head of the state canopy-bearers]; and, when the Shamsī rule came to its termination, during the reign of Sultān Rażiyyat, the fief of Baran was conferred upon Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn. Subsequently, Tabarhindah was given to him; and, at the time when the hearts of the Turk Maliks and Amīrs, who were the slaves of the Shamsī dynasty, became changed towards Sultān Rażiyyat, on account of the favour Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Yā-kūt, the Abyssinian, had found with her, the Amīr-i-Ḥajib, Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn-i-Aet-kīn, and Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūnīah, of Tabarhindah, were connected by a firm compact of unanimity and friendship, and bonds of intimacy; and, by virtue of this fabric of union, Malik Aet-kīn, secretly, gave intimation of this change to the latter. Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūnīah, in the fortress of Tabarhindah, began openly to rebel, and withdrew his head from the yoke of obedience to that Sultān.

Sultān Rażiyyat, in the month of Ahār, moved from the

---

4 The ambitious and rebellious conduct of himself and his colleague in sedition was the cause of her downfall, as is stated under.

6 Not necessarily intoxicating.

8 This was a Khālisah district, as mentioned at page 746.

7 Ahār, from the Sanskrit—आहर—the third solar month of the Hindū—June—July. The Muhammadans, as early as this, it seems, had begun to use the names of the Hindū months. Under her reign it is said to have been the
capital towards Tabarhindah with the [contingents] comprising the centre [division] of her forces, as has been related [under her reign]; and, when Sulṭān Raẓiyyat was seized and imprisoned, and the Malik and Amirs returned to the capital again 9, and the throne of sovereignty came to Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūnīah, contracted marriage with Sulṭān Raẓiyyat, who was in duress [under his charge in the fort of Tabarhindah], and, by reason of that union, began to evince contumacy 1. When Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Aet-kīn [Altūnīah's confederate], was assassinated, and Malik Badr-ud-Dīn-i-Sunkar, the Rūmi, became Amir-i-Ḥājib, Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūnīah, brought forth Sulṭān Raẓiyyat from the fortress of Tabarhindah, assembled forces, and marched towards the capital. In the month of Rabīʿ-ul-Awwāl, however, they retired unsuccessful. Sulṭān Raẓiyyat was taken prisoner within the limits of Kaithal; and Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūnīah, was taken in the Manṣūr-pūr 3 district, and was martyred by Hindūs on Tuesday, the 25th of Rabīʿ-ul-Ākhir, 638 2. The Almighty's mercy be upon him!

XII. MALIK IKHTIYĀR-UD-DĪN, AET-KĪN.

Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Aet-kīn, was a Karah-Khitā-i, a well-favoured Turk, a man of good disposition and of handsome countenance, dignity, wisdom, and sagacity.

The august Sulṭān [I-yal-timish] purchased him from Amir I-bak, Sannā-ī 4, and he had served the Sulṭān long in

---

9th of Ramażān 637 2.—May, 1239, A.D. It was a great object with the rebels to make Sulṭān Raẓiyyat move in the hot season.

9 See note 3, page 634.

They lost no time, for on the 28th of the same month they set up Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh.

1 Contumacy towards the usurper of her throne. See under Raẓiyyat's reign, page 645, and 647. His confederates in sedition against Raẓiyyat had now been removed from the scene and their ambitious designs frustrated, and therefore Altūnīah thought it to his advantage to espouse her cause.

2 West of Dīhil, and north-west of Kaithal, Lat. 30° 21', Long. 76° 5'.

3 These events are related differently under Raẓiyyat's reign, which see.

4 In some copies Nisāwī—native of Nisā, and, in the list of Malik at the beginning of the Nāṣirī reign, page 673, there is a Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-Balkā Khān, styled, Sannā-ī, but not the person here referred to. He may have been the son of the above.
every office and degree, and become deserving of royal kindness and dignities of greatness. In the beginning of the Sultān’s reign, he was made Sar-i-Jān-dār [Head of the Jān-dārs], and, after some time, as proofs of merit were conspicuous upon his brow, Mānṣūr-pūr was given to him in fief. Some time after, Kūjāh and Nandanah were entrusted to his charge, and, on that frontier, he performed distinguished services. When the period of sovereignty devolved upon Sultān Rāziyyat, she summoned him to the Court, and assigned him the fief of Budā‘ūn. After some farther period, he attained the dignity of Aṃr-i-Ḥājib, and performed approved services before the throne; but, on account of the favour which Jamāl-ud-Din, Yā-kūt, the Abyssinian, had acquired, the whole of the Malikūs and Aṃrs, Turks, Ghūrīs, and Tājiks, were withdrawing from their attendance on the Court of Sultān Rāziyyat, and were afflicted in heart, particularly Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Din, Aet-kīn, the Aṃr-i-Ḥājib, as has been recorded in the account of Sultān Rāziyyat. For this reason, Jamāl-ud-Din, Yā-kūt, was martyred, and the throne passed to Mu‘izz-ud-Din, Bahram Shāh.

On the day of rendering fealty at the Kūshk [the

---

8 In some copies, Sar-i-Jamādār [Sar-i-Jamāh-dār] or Head of the Wardrobe, and, in one good copy, Shārt-badār.

9 This place is generally mentioned in connexion with Baniān and the Kārlūgh Turks. The word might be spelt with Ĺ—Gūjāh. The majority of copies and the oldest have كوفما but one has كوفما and a second. The Ĺ likewise may be intended for Ľ. See list of victories, page 627.

7 At pages 304 and 333, our author says the Ghūrīs are Tājiks, or Tāziks —i. e. descendants of Arabs born in 'Ajam—but here he evidently applies the term as it originally means, and Ghūrīs to natives of Ghūr only. The compilers of "Fathān" dynasties may see that such a term as theirs never occurs in any Muḥammadan History. Tājiks are not Scythians, I beg leave to say.

The "affliction" that appears to have troubled him was ambition and sedition, as may be gathered from the statement in the account of Malik Alūnīfah, just related, and a little farther on.

The modern copies of the text have an additional sentence and a verse here, but it is evidently an interpolation: they are as follows:—"As sovereignty turned its face from Sultān Rāziyyat, on this account, a wag gives these lines:

'Sovereignty from her robe's skirt turned away,
When it perceived black dust on the hem thereof.'"

Our author, who was resident at her Court, does not attempt to make us believe that Sultān Rāziyyat was guilty of any criminal familiarity with the Abyssinian, although more modern writers do insinuate it, but, I believe, without reason.
every office and degree, and become deserving of royal kindness and dignities of greatness. In the beginning of the Sultān’s reign, he was made Sar-i-Jān-dār [Head of the Jān-dārs], and, after some time, as proofs of merit were conspicuous upon his brow, Mansūr-pūr was given to him in fief. Some time after, Kūjāh and Nandanah were entrusted to his charge, and, on that frontier, he performed distinguished services. When the period of sovereignty devolved upon Sultān Rażiyyat, she summoned him to the Court, and assigned him the fief of Budā‘ūn. After some further period, he attained the dignity of Amir-i-Hājib, and performed approved services before the throne; but, on account of the favour which Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Yā-ḵūt, the Abyssinian, had acquired, the whole of the Malik and Amīrs, Turks, Ghūrīs, and Tājiks, were withdrawing from their attendance on the Court of Sultān Rażiyyat, and were afflicted in heart, particularly Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Aet-ḵīn, the Amir-i-Hājib, as has been recorded in the account of Sultān Rażiyyat. For this reason, Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Yā-ḵūt, was martyred, and the throne passed to Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh.

On the day of rendering fealty at the Kūshk [the

---

* In some copies, Sar-i-Jamādār [Sar-i-Jāmah-dār?] or Head of the Wardrobe, and, in one good copy, Shārt-badār.

* This place is generally mentioned in connexion with Baniān and the Karlūgh Turks. The word might be spelt with ج—Gūjāh. The majority of copies and the oldest have كرفنا but one has كرفنا and a second. The ج likewise may be intended for ك. See list of victories, page 627.

* At pages 304 and 333, our author says the Ghūrīs are Tājiks, or Tāziks—that is, descendants of Arabs born in ‘Ajam—but here he evidently applies the term as it originally means, and Ghūrīs to natives of Ghūr only. The compilers of “Pathān” dynasties may see that such a term as theirs never occurs in any Muḥammadan History. Tājiks are not Scythians, I beg leave to say.

* The “affliction” that appears to have troubled him was ambition and sedition, as may be gathered from the statement in the account of Malik Aftūnšāh, just related, and a little farther on.

* The modern copies of the text have an additional sentence and a verse here, but it is evidently an interpolation: they are as follows:—"As sovereignty turned its face from Sultān Rażiyyat, on this account, a wag gives these lines:—

‘Sovereignty from her robe’s skirt turned away,
When it perceived black dust on the hem thereof.’"

Our author, who was resident at her Court, does not attempt to make us believe that Sultān Rażiyyat was guilty of any criminal familiarity with the Abyssinian, although more modern writers do insinuate it, but, I believe, without reason.
inflicted several wounds on the Khwājah, Muhazzab-ud-Din, the Wazīr, but he got away from them, wounded as he was, and made his escape.

XIII. MALIK BADR-UD-DIN, SUNKAR-I-RUMI.

Malik Badr-ud-Din, Sunkar, was a Rûmi [of Rûm—Rûmilah] by origin, and some of the trustworthy have related after this manner, that he was the son of a Musal-mān and had fallen into slavery; but he was a man of exceedingly good disposition, with comeliness and dignity, of admirable morality, humble, and endowed with kindness and laudable qualities for winning men.

When the Sultan [I-yal-timish] first purchased him, he became Tasht-dār [Ewer-bearer], and, after he had performed that office for some time, he became Bahlah-dār [Bearer of the Privy Purse]. Subsequently, he became Shāhnah [Superintendent] of the Zarrād Khatānah of Budā’īn; and, after some farther time, he rose to be Nā-ib Amīr-i-Akhūr [Deputy Lord of the Stable], and served the Sultan in every capacity, and did approved services. After he became Amīr-i-Akhūr, he used never to be absent from the gate of the royal stable for a moment save through unavoidable necessity; and, whether on the move or stationary, he used to be always present in attendance at the threshold of sovereignty. Whilst the fortress of Gwāliyūr was being invested, he was pleased to show such goodness and countenance towards the writer of these words, and to treat him with such honour and respect, that the impression of such benevolence will never be effaced from his heart. May the Almighty have mercy on him!

When the sovereignty passed to Sultan Razīyyat, the sief of Budā’īn was given him; and, in the year 638 H., at the time that Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Din, Aet-kin, was

---

*Sunkar, in the Rûmi [Turkish] dialect, is said to signify a black-eyed falcon, which lives to a great age, and to have the same meaning as Shunghar or Shunkar.

7 See note 4, page 732.

8 Whilst I-yal-timish held that sief before he came to the throne. The office was the same as that of Sar-i-Jān-dār. See note 7, page 603.

9 On the 8th of Muḥarram, 638 H.
assassinated, in the reign of Sultān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, the latter summoned Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunkār, from Budā‘ūn, and conferred upon him the office of Amīr-i-Hājib. When Malik Ikhṭiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūnīlah, of Tabarhindah, along with Sultān Rażiyyat, resolved to march upon the capital, and they arrived in the vicinity of Dihlī, in the quelling of that sedition, Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunkār, performed excellent services; but, after a short time, disagreement arose between him and the Khwājah, Muhazzab-ud-Dīn, the Wazīr, through a trifling cause which it behoveth not to mention. This irritation continued to increase, and, on this account, the Khwājah, Muhazzab-ud-Dīn¹, incited the Sultān against him, and the Sultān’s confidence in Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunkār, departed, and his faith in the Sultān likewise ceased. He [Badr-ud-Dīn Sunkār] convoked the great men of the capital, for the purpose [of discussing] a change in the government, at the mansion of Sayyid Tāj-ud-Dīn, Mūsāwī, on Monday, the 14th² of the month of Śafar, 639 H. The Khwājah, Muhazzab-ud-Dīn, gave intimation to the Sultān of this circumstance, and the Sultān mounted, and called upon Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunkār, to give up his intentions³. He joined the Sultān; and, on that same day, he was sent off [on his way] to Budā‘ūn.

After some time, the decree of destiny having gone forth, it brought him back to the capital again, without having received orders to return, and he came to the city of Dihlī, and alighted at the dwelling of Malik Kūṭb-ud-Dīn [Huṣain, son of ‘Alī, the Ghūrī]—on whom be the Almighty’s mercy!—thinking that perhaps, under his protection, he might obtain mercy. A mandate was issued from the sovereign’s Court so that they seized him, and he was cast into prison. He continued in imprisonment and confinement for some time, and, in the end, on the night of

¹ This is the “upright officer” in Elliot, referred to in note ⁶, page 641.
² Some copies here, as well as under the reign, disagree about this date. Some have the 10th, and some, the 17th, but two of the best copies have here, as well as previously, the 14th of Śafar.
³ The particulars of this affair have been already given under the reign, pages 652 and 653. Here likewise is additional proof, were any required, to show who the parties were, and who betrayed Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunkār.
Wednesday, the 14th of the month of Jamādí-ul-Awwal\(^4\), 639 H., he attained martyrdom\(^*\). The Almighty's mercy be upon him!

XIV. MALIK TĀJ-UD-DĪN, SANJAR-I-KĪK-LUḵ.

Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Kīk-luḵ, was a thorough man, and his native country was Khīschāḵ. He was a person of vast energy, manliness, sagacity, stateliness, gallantry, and valour, and in all endowments he had reached the acme. He was of great rectitude and continence, and no intoxicating drink was ever allowed to come near him.

The august Sulṭān [I-yal-timish] had purchased him from the Khwājah, Jamāl-ud-Dīn-i-Nadīmān; and, in the beginning of the Sulṭān's reign, he became Jāma-dār [Keeper of the Wardrobe]; and, after some time, he became Shaḥnāh \(^6\) [Superintendent] of the Stable, and in every department he performed distinguished services for the Sulṭān.

When the Shamsī reign came to a termination, and the throne devolved on Sulṭān Raẓiyyat, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Kīk-luḵ, became feudatory of Baran, and was appointed to proceed at the head of a body of troops towards the fortress of Gwāliyūr, and in Sha'bān, 635 H., the writer of these words, the servant of the victorious dynasty, Minḥāj-i-Sarāj, in company with Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Kīk-luḵ, came out of the fortress of Gwāliyūr\(^7\) and proceeded, and presented himself at the Court of Sulṭān Raẓiyyat. On the road Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar, showed

\(^4\) See note \(^6\), page 654.

\(^*\) There must have been some reason why he returned to the capital—probably to sue for pardon in person—and our author could, evidently, have said more, had he chosen to do so. Malik Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of 'Alī, the Ghūrī, is the same venerable chief as mentioned, at pages 658 and 661. He was one of the greatest of I-yal-timish's Maliks, and his name is entered in the list of them at the end of his reign. He too was made away with, in some mysterious manner, during the reign of that paragon of perfection, according to our author, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, in 653 H. The events, which induced him to seek an asylum in Hind, will be found in the account of the Mughal irruption in the next Section.

\(^6\) See note \(^4\), page 732.

\(^7\) See page 643, and note \(^4\).
such goodness towards the author as cannot be expressed. At the time of removing from Gwāliywūr he carried two chests of books, the private property of this servant, upon one of his own camels, and brought them to Mahāʿūn, and, upon other occasions, had treated the author with manifold kindness—May the Almighty make him be acceptable, and have mercy upon him!

On his reaching the capital again, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar, became feudatory of the district of Sursūṭī; and, when the throne of sovereignty came to Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh, he performed abundant services. On the termination of the Muʿizzī reign, and the throne passing to ʿAlā-ud-Dīn, Masʿūd Shāh, he became feudatory of Budāʿūn; and, in the year 640 H., he overthrew the independent [Hindū] tribes of Kaṭhehr of Budāʿūn, and performed many exploits against the infidels, and founded Jāmī Masjids in several places, and established pulpits for the Khāṭibs. He assembled a numerous body of forces—8000 horse and foot, besides pāyiks with horses—and his determination was to lead a force towards Kālinjar and Mahobah, and reduce that tract of country to subjection. A certain party [however] began to be envious of the number of his following, the quantity and efficiency of his war material, the greatness of his power, the awe in which he was held, and his intrepidity in leading troops. The deceitful promptings of the spirit of devilry moved them, so that they prepared some poison placed in a betel leaf and administered it to him, and disease of the bowels supervened, and, from that disorder, in a few days, he joined the Almighty’s mercy. May the Most High God accept, in behalf of that amiable Malik, in repayment of the many debts of gratitude he owed him, the prayers of this frail one!

One among those debts of gratitude due to him is this. In the year 640 H., when the author resolved upon leaving

---

8 In the oldest copy of the text the name of this city and district is always written بدنان - Budānūn — the middle n is nasal, and this is the correct mode of writing the word.

9 There seem to have been numbers of the Mew tribe in that part in those days.

1 The preacher who pronounces the Khutbah already explained.

2 All the copies of the text are alike here—mounted pāyiks is a novel term I think—considering that the word means foot-man.
the capital city of Dihli, on a journey to Lakhaṇa-waṭi, and sent off his family and dependents, in advance, towards Budāʻun, that Malik of excellent disposition assigned a stipend for his family and children, and treated them with all sorts of honour and reverence. Five months afterwards, when the author, following after his family, reached Budāʻun, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar, bestowed upon him so many gifts, and treated him with such honour as cannot be contained within the area of writing. He was pleased to assign the author a fief with a residence at Budāʻun, together with ample benefits and favours; but, as destiny, and the means of livelihood, was attracting him to the country of Lakhaṇa-waṭi, and the decree of fate was carrying him, the writer proceeded thither. May Almighty God accept in his favour the kindness [towards the author] of that Malik of good disposition!

XV. MALIK TĀJ-UD-DĪN, SANJAR-Ī-KURET KHĀN.

Malik Kuret Khān was a Turk of Khīšchāk, of great manhood and courage, energy and wisdom, and among warriors, for warlike accomplishments, he was the peerless in all the ranks of the army of Islām; and, in horsemanship and skill in arms, he had no equal. For example, he would have two horses under saddle, one of which he would ride, and the other he would lead after him, and thus used to dash on, and, whilst the horses were galloping, he would leap from this horse to that with agility, would return to this first one again, so that, during a gallop, he used several times to mount two horses. In archery he was so skilful that no enemy in battle, and no animal in the chase used to escape his arrow. He never used to take along with him into any Shīkār-gāh [chase] either leopard, hawk, or sporting dog; he brought down all with his own arrow; and in every fastness in which he imagined there would be game he would be in advance of the whole of his retinue.

* Our author was evidently unable to remain at Dihli, in safety, after the attack made upon him by the Khwājah Muhazzab-ud-Dīn's creatures, and hence resolved to retire for a time. See under the reign of 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, pages 659 to 662.

* This is the only Malik among twenty-five who was not a slave.
He was the Shahnah [Superintendent] of rivers and vessels; and this author had a great regard and affection for him. May Almighty God immerse him in forgiveness! When the Turks of the [late] Sultan [I-yal-timish] first rose against the Khwajah, Muazzab-ud-Din, the Wazir, on Wednesday, the 2nd of the month of Jamadi-ul-Awwal, 640 H., the ring-leader of the party in that outbreak was Malik Taj-ud-Din, Sanjar-i-Kuret Khan; and a slave of the Khwajah, Muazzab-ud-Din, Mihtar Jattā [by name], a Farrāsh [carpet-spreader, &c.], wounded the Malik on the face with a sword in such manner that the mark of it ever after remained.

After the Khwajah, Muazzab-ud-Din, was put to death, Malik Sanjar-i-Kuret Khan became Shahnah [Superintendent] of the elephants, and, after that, was made Sar-i-Jan-dār [Head of the Jan-dārs]. Subsequently, he was made feudatory of Buda‘ūn, and, some time after that again, obtained the fief of Awadh. In that part he undertook many holy expeditions against infidels, achieved numerous gallant exploits, and reduced several powerful independent [Hindū] tribes. From Awadh he proceeded into Bihār and plundered that territory. Suddenly, when before the preserved city of Bihār, an arrow struck him in a mortal place, and he attained martyrdom. The mercy of the Almighty be upon him!


Malik Saif-ud-Din, Bat Khan-i-I-bak, the Khiṭā-i, was a

3 The word used is رود—ocean, sea, great river, which last meaning must be intended here, as the Dihlī kings had no more to do with the seas and going vessels than Sher Shāh the Afghān had, who is said, by a modern translator, to have “built great ships to convey Pilgrims to Makkah,” by land, possibly.

6 It was when the “upright officer”—the Khwajah, met with his deserts in the plain of the Rānī’s hawās, or reservoir.

7 From this it is apparent that, after the fall of the Khabal dynasty, and the death of I-yal-timish, Bihār could not have remained in Musalmān hands. We hear of the fief of Kārah, Mānik-pūr, Awadh, and Lakhapawat, but never of Bihār, which must have been recovered by the Hindūs in the same way as Kālinjar, Mahobah, and other places which, previously, our author says, were conquered, and as mentioned in the lists of victories of some of the Sultāns. The particulars respecting this chief’s death before Bihār, which would have been so interesting to us, our author either considered not worth mentioning, or has purposely suppressed.
person of very excellent qualities, gentle, humble, and of exemplary piety, and, in skill and warlike accomplishments, had become a master, and for manliness and sagacity was famed.

The august Sulṭān [I-yal-timish] purchased him in the beginning of his reign, and he became Sar Jāma-dār [Head Keeper of the Wardrobe]. Subsequently, in the reign of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas’ūd Shāh, he became Sar-i-Jān-dār [Head of the Jān-dārs] ⁸, and Kuhrām and Sāmānah became his fief. Afterwards he obtained the fief of Baran, and was appointed to proceed at the head of [a body of] forces for the purpose of taking possession of the territory of Üchchah and Multān ⁹. During that expedition, one of his sons, who, at the very outset of his youth, had become a proficient in manliness and skill, together with his horse, was drowned in the river Sind.

Some time after his return from thence, during the reign of the Sulṭān of Sulṭāns, Nāṣir-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak, the Kḥitā-ī, became Wakil-i-Dar [Representative in Dar-bār], and, in the service of the Sublime Court, performed distinguished services ¹.

He served for a considerable time during the Sulṭān's reign, and during the expedition to Santūr he suddenly sustained a fall from his horse and was killed ². The mercy and pardon of the Almighty be upon him!

---

⁸ See the printed text: the editors are sorely puzzled here.

⁹ This expedition is not referred to under the reign, but probably has reference, in some way, to the advance of the Dihlī forces to the Bīāh, the Mughals having appeared before Üchchah mentioned at page 667. Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak, was probably sent to Üchchah to take charge of it after the death of Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Abū-Bikr, son of Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kāfir Khān-i-Ayāz, mentioned at page 727.

There are two other persons named Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak, an account of one of whom has been given at page 729, and the other is Ulugh Khān's brother, an account of whom will be found farther on.

¹ See page 699. He appears to have become Wakil-i-Dar, when 'Imād-ud-Dīn-i-Rayḥān was disgraced, from what is stated in the account of Ulugh Khān farther on, in which the events of this period are much more detailed than under the different reigns.

² On Sunday, the 6th of Rabī‘-ul-Awwal, 655 H., the 12th year of Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh's reign.
XVII. MALIK TĀJ-UD-DĪN, SANJAR-I-TEZ KHĀN.

Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Tez Khān, is a Karkhī [of Karkh] ³, and is exceedingly impetuous, manly, sagacious, and intelligent, and is endowed with many excellent qualities, and numberless worthy habits. He is famed for his valour and military talents, and distinguished for his amiable disposition.

The august Sulṭān [I-yal-timish] purchased him; and, in the reign of Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, he became Amir-i-Ākhur. Subsequently, in the reign of Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Māhmūd Shāh, he was made Nā-ib Amir-i-Ḥājīb ⁴ [Deputy Lord Chamberlain] and Jhanjhānah was made his fief; and, when the Khān-i-Muʿazzām, Ulugh Khān-i-Aʿzam, in felicity, proceeded towards Nāg-awr, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Tez Khān, who was particularly devoted to his interest and friendship, received charge of the fief of Kasmandī ⁵ and Mandīānāh, of the country of Hindūstān, and there he continued some time. When the Khān-i-Muʿazzām, Ulugh Khān-i-Aʿzam, again joined the Court, Malik Tez Khān again returned to the capital, and Baran was made his fief, and there he remained a considerable time.

In the year 654 H., he became Wakil-i-Dar [Representative in Dar-bār] to the sovereign of Islām, and obtained the fief of Budāʿūn. Since Malik Kūtlugh Khān ⁶ remained in Awadh [as feudatory], contrary to the commands of the Sublime Court, and, with the forces of Hindūstān advanced

³ Karkh is the name of a village near Baghdād, but the name of this place is pronounced Karakh, with the difference of a vowel point. It is the name of a place [township] in Māwar-un-Nahr.

⁴ In Rajab, 647 H., shortly after the marriage of Ulugh Khān’s daughter to the Sulṭān.

⁵ A district in Awadh, a few miles N.W. of Lakhnau, also written Kasmandī in some copies of the text.

⁶ Who married Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn’s mother, and who appears to have held the fief in conjunction with her husband. These matters are related in quite a different way under the reign of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, page 703. There our author says that Malik Bak-Tamur, the Ruknī [i.e. of Sulṭān Rukn-ud-Dīn, Firuz Shāh’s, reign] was sent from the capital to expel Kūtlugh Khān from Awadh, and that Bak-Tamur was defeated and slain; and that, upon this, the Sulṭān had to take the field with Ulugh Khān. See also in the account of Ulugh Khān farther on, where these events are again differently related.
towards Budā’ūn, Malik Tez Khān, at the head of a body of troops, was nominated, along with Malik Bak-tam-i-Aor Khān, to march from the capital for the purpose of repelling the troops of Hindūstān. When the two armies met within the limits of Sihrā-mū, Malik Tez Khān was under the necessity of retiring, and he returned to the capital again. The fief of Awadh was now given to him, and he proceeded into that part, and brought that territory under his control; and gave the independent communities of infidels of Hindūstān a thorough chastisement, and extorted tribute from them.

Malik Tez Khān returned to the sublime presence in conformity with orders, and, at all times, kept the neck of service within the yoke of obedience; and, in the year in which this history was written, namely the year 658 H., he returned to the capital in conformity with the sublime command, and by the counsel of the Khān-i-Mu’āzzam, Ulugh Khān-i-A’zam, at the head of the [contingents forming the] centre [division] of the forces, and those at the capital, marched towards the Koh-pāyah of Mewāt, and performed distinguished services, and returned again to the presence of the Court, the asylum of the universe.

On a second occasion, in attendance at the illustrious stirrup of the Khān-i-Mu’āzzam, Ulugh Khān-i-A’zam, he again proceeded to the Koh-pāyah of Mewāt on an expedition and holy war against the Hindūs, and displayed great gallantry and activity. On his return to the capital, he was distinguished by being presented with ample honours; and he returned again towards [his fief of] Awadh. May the Almighty God preserve and continue the servants of the Nāșirī dynasty in power and dominion. Amin!

7 A place west of the Ghogra river, in Lat. 28° 19', Long. 80° 24', the Sera-Mow of the Indian Atlas.
8 The available troops at the capital probably. The kalb—or centre contingents forming it—has been explained in a previous note. See also the latter part of the year 657 H., under Nāṣir-ud-Dīn’s reign, page 714.
9 Our author ends his history, under Nāṣir-ud-Dīn’s reign, with the force leaving upon this expedition, on the 13th of Safar, 658 H., and the events of the following day. These operations, on this occasion, were against the Mew or Mewā. See page 715, and in the account of Ulugh Khān farther on, where these events are related in a totally different manner.
XVIII. MALIK IKHTIYAR-UD-DIN, YÜZ-BAK-I-TUGHRLIL KHAN.

Malik Ikhtiyar-ud-Din, Yüz-Bak-i-Tughril Khan, was a native of Khīsčāk, and the slave of the august Sultan, Shams-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Din, I-yal-timish; and during the investment of the preserved fortress of Gwāliyūr he was Nā-i-ib Chāshni-gir [Deputy Comptroller of the Royal Kitchen]. When Sultan Rukn-ud-Din, Fīrūz Shāh, came to the throne, the office of Amir i-Majlis [Lord of the Council] was entrusted to Malik Yüz-Bak, and he was confirmed therein. Subsequently, the Shāhnagī [Superintendency] of the elephants was assigned to him; and, during this reign, he became especially distinguished by the Sultan's intimacy and favour.

When the Turkish slaves of the Sultan broke out into rebellion in the plain of Tarā'in ¹, and a number of grandees, such as Tāj-ul-Mulk, Muḥammad [Maḥmūd?], the Secretary, Bahā-ud-Din, Ḥasan [Ḥusain?] -i-Asḥ'arī, Karim-ud-Din-i-Zāhid [the Recluse], and Niẓām-ud-Din, the Shafurkānī, were put to death, one of the ringleaders of the faction was Malik Yüz-Bak-i-Tughril Khan.²

When the throne came to Sultan Rażiyyat, he was made Amir-i-Ākhur [Lord of the Stable], and on Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Din, Bahram Shāh's, ascending the throne, and when, subsequently, a party of the Turkish Maliks and Amirs invested the city of Dihli ³, Malik Yüz-Bak, along with Malik Kārā-Kaşh, came into the city and attached themselves to Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Din, Bahram Shāh's party ⁴, on Tuesday, the last day of the month of Sha'bān, 639 H., and, upon several occasions, rendered approved service. Mihtar-i-Mubārak Shāh, Farrukhi, who had acquired entire power over the Sultan, and had caused the Turkish Maliks and Amirs to be expelled from the capital, instigated the Sultan in such manner that he seized Malik Yüz-Bak and

¹ The scene of Rāe Pithorā's victory over the forces of Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Din, Muḥammad-i-Sām, and of his own total overthrow in the following year—the present Talāwārī.
² See under the reign at page 635.
³ See the account of Malik Kārā-Kaşh Khan, page 747.
⁴ See under the reign, pages 658 and 659.
Malik Karā-Kash, and they were imprisoned on Wednesday, the 9th of the month of Ramażān, 639 H. When the city was taken, on Tuesday, the 8th of the month of Zl-Ka'dah, Malik Yūz-Bak was liberated.

When Sultan 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, ascended the throne, Tabarhindah was entrusted to his charge, and, subsequently, Lohor was made his fief. There he continued some time, when a feud arose between him and Malik Naṣir-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad of Bindār, and, subsequently, he began to rebel against the Court, for rashness and imperiousness were implanted in his nature and constitution, until Ulugh Khān-i-Mu'azzam, unexpectedly, brought him to the Court, and he was made much of. Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam likewise made a representation for the royal consideration so that Malik Yūz-Bak was distinguished by the Sultan's favour, and his disobedient conduct was pardoned. Subsequently, for some time, Kinnauj was his fief, when he again began to act in a contumacious manner, and Malik Kutb-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain [son of 'Ali, the Ghūri], on whom be peace!—was despatched from the capital, at the head of a body of troops, against him. He reduced Malik Yūz-Bak to duty and obedience, and brought him back to the sublime Court again.

After some time had passed, Awadh was entrusted to his charge. When he again returned to the capital, the territory of Lakanawati was made over to him. After he went to that part, and brought that country under his jurisdiction, hostility arose between him and the Rāe of Jāj-nagar. The leader of the forces of Jāj-nagar was a

---

8 See page 747.
9 Malik Karā-Kash was liberated at the same time.
7 The same person, no doubt, who is styled Chā-ūsh, or Pursuivant, in the list of I-yal-timish's Maliks at page 626.
8 There is nothing of all this referred to either under the reign of Sultan 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, Sultan Nasir-ud-Dīn, or in the account of Ulugh Khān.
9 This also is not mentioned under the two last reigns. Stewart, in his *History of Bengal,* page 65, states that "Ikhtyar Addeen Toghril Khan, Mulk [mulk signifies a country] Yuzbek," succeeded "Sief Addeen Yugan Tunt," who died in 651 H., as governor of Bengal, but, as he makes a mistake of only twenty years respecting the death of Saif-ud-Dīn, Ī-bak-i-Yughān-Tat, it may be imagined what dependence can be placed upon the statements in that work.
person, by name, Sāban-tar [Sāwan-tara?], the son-in-law of the Rāe, who, during the time of Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Tughril-i Tughān-Khān, had advanced to the bank of the river of Lakhanawatī, and, having shown the greatest audacity, had driven the Musalmān forces as far as the gate [of the city] of Lakhanawatī. In Malik Tughril Khān-i-Yūz-Bak's time, judging from the past, he [the Jāj-nagar leader] manifested great boldness, and fought, and was defeated. Again, another time, Malik Tughril Khān-i-Yūz-Bak fought an engagement with the Rāe of Jāj-nagar, and again came out victorious.

On a third occasion, Malik Yūz-Bak sustained a slight reverse, and a white elephant, than which there was no other more valuable in that part, and which was rutlish, got out of his hands in the field of battle, and fell into the hands of the infidels of Jāj-nagar.

The following year, however, Malik Yūz-Bak asked assistance from the Court of Dīhlī, and, then, marched an army from Lakhanawatī into the territory of Umurdan, and, unexpectedly, reached the Rāe's capital, which city [town] they style Umurdan. The Rāe of that place retired before Malik Yūz-Bak, and the whole of the Rāe's family, dependents, and followers, and his wealth, and elephants, fell into the hands of the Musalmān forces.

On his return to Lakhanawatī, Malik Yūz-Bak began to act contumaciously towards the Court, and assumed three canopies of state, red, black, and white. He then marched an army from Lakhanawatī towards Awadh, and entered the city of Awadh; and directed that the Khuțbah should

---

10 Evidently the Sanskrit—सार्वत—brave, heroic, and—तत् or तर—nature, bottom.

A branch of the Ganges is probably meant here, as it is styled in the original, the Āb-i-Lakhanawatī.

2 See page 740.

8 Compare STEWART; [page 65], who states that Tughril Khān-i-Yūz-Bak, "invaded the dominions of that prince"—the Rāe of Jāj-nagar, and "was completely defeated, and lost all his elephants; among which was a white one, esteemed a great curiosity."

4 This evidently refers to the capital of Jāj-nagar, and not a different territory—Sylhet—as STEWART makes it out.

In the oldest copies the word is أوردن as above, but in others Armurdan or Urmdarn, and أرميران—Azmurden or Uzmurdan. See note 4, page 587, para. 8.
be read for him, and styled himself Sulṭān Mughis-ud-Din. After a couple of weeks, one among the Turkish Amirs, belonging to the troops of the sovereign which were [located] in the vicinity of [the territory of] Awadh, unawares, pushed forward into Awadh [giving out] that the Sulṭān’s troops were at hand. Malik Yûz-Bakî, discomfited, embarked on board a vessel and returned to Lakhanaṭawati again.

This rebellious act on the part of Malik Yûz-Bakî, the whole of the people of the realm of Hindūstān—both clergy and laity, Musalmāns and Hindūs—condemned, that he should have become a traitor to his sovereign, and displayed such hostility and sedition. Undoubtedly the evil consequences attending such conduct befell him, and he fell from foundation and root. After he returned from Awadh to Lakhanaṭawati, he determined upon marching into Kāmrūd, and transported an army across the river Beg-matī. As the Rāe of Kāmrūd had not the power to resist him, he retired precipitately some whither. Malik Yûz-Bakî took the city of Kāmrūd and possessed himself of countless wealth and treasure, to such extent, that the amount and weight thereof cannot be contained within the area of record.

The author, at the time he was sojourning at Lakhanaṭawati, had heard from travellers whose statements are to be relied upon, that from the reign of Gushtāsib, Shāh of 'Ajam, who had invaded Chīn, and had come towards Hindūstān by that route [by way of Kāmrūd], twelve hundred hoards of treasure, all sealed, which were [there deposited], and any portion of which wealth and treasures not one of the Rāes had availed himself of, the whole fell into the hands of the Musalmān troops. The reading of the Khūṭbah, and Friday religious service were instituted

---

6 This remark would seem to show that the Hindūs were actually begun to be thought something of, or that even infidels reprobated such conduct.
6 Also written Beg-hatī and Bak-matī, as in the account of Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, and is the same river. The old capital of Kāmrūd was Komatu-pūr on the west bank of the Darlah river, and the mention of it and the Beg-matī here tends to elucidate what I have before stated respecting the route taken by Muhammad, son of Bakht-yār, referred to at page 561. See also notes 8 and 9 in the same page.
7 Gashāsib, as at page 561, in some copies.
in Kāmrūd, and signs of the people of Islām appeared there. But of what avail was all this, when the whole, from phrensy, he gave to the winds? for the wise have said that, “the seeking to perform overmuch work hath never turned out fortunate for the seeker.” Distich: —

“Wealth is best which will be falling and rising;
Wealth will be quick in springing up.”

After Kāmrūd was taken [possession of], so they related, several times the Rāe sent confidential persons [to Malik Yūz-Bak], saying: “Thou hast subdued this territory, and no Malik of the Musalmān people ever before obtained such success. Now do thou return, and replace me upon the throne, and I will send to thee tribute every year so many bags of gold, and so many elephants, and I will continue the Khūtbah unchanged, and the Musalmān stamped coin as established.”

Malik Yūz-Bak did not become willing to agree to this in any way; and the Rāe gave command that all his train, and the peasantry, should go to Malik Yūz-Bak, and get him to pledge his right hand [for their safety], and buy up all the grain procurable in [the city and country of?] Kāmrūd, at whatever price he might require, so that the Musalmān troops might have no provisions left. They did so accordingly, and bought up from them all the produce that was obtainable at a heavy rate.

Depending on the cultivated state and flourishing condition of the country, Malik Yūz-Bak did not lay up any stores of grain; and, when the time of the spring harvest came round, the Rāe, with the whole of his subjects, rose, and opened the water dykes all around, and brought Malik Yūz-Bak and the troops of Islām to a state of helplessness, in such wise, that they were near perishing through destitution. They now took counsel together, and came to the conclusion that it was necessary to retreat, otherwise they would die of starvation.

8 Out of this passage STEWART [History of Bengal, page 66] makes the following, which is rather a free translation, certainly—“Mulk [Malik probably: Mulk means country] Yuzbek ordered a mosque to be built: and, after the accustomed prayers and thanksgiving, for the success of the Mohammedan arms, had been read, he was proclaimed Sovereign of the United Kingdoms of Bengal and Kamrooip.”
They accordingly set out from Kamrud with the intention of proceeding towards Lakhanawati. The route through the plain [country] was flooded with water, and occupied by the Hindus. The Musalmans obtained a guide to bring them out of that country by conducting them towards the skirt of the mountains. After they had proceeded some few stages, they got entangled among passes and defiles, and narrow roads, and both their front and rear was seized by the Hindus. In a narrow place a fight took place in front of the leading rank between two elephants; the force fell into confusion, the Hindus came upon them from every side, and Musalmān and Hindu mingled pell mell together. Suddenly an arrow struck Malik Yūz-Bak, who was mounted on an elephant, in the breast, and he fell, and was made prisoner; and all his children, family, and dependents, and the whole of his force, were made captive.

When they carried Malik Yūz-Bak before the Rāe, he made a request that they would bring his son to him; and, when they brought his son to him, he placed his face to the face of his son, and yielded his soul to God. The Almighty’s mercy be upon him!

XIX. MALIK TĀJ-UD-DĪN, ARSALĀN KHĀN, SANJAR-I-CHAST.

Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Arsalān Khān, was an impetuous and warlike man, and had attained the acme of capacity and intrepidity. The august Sulṭān [I yal-timish] had purchased him from Ikhtiyār-ul-Mulk, Abū-Bikr, the Ḥabash [Abyssinian]. Ikhtiyār-ul-Mulk had brought him from ‘Adan; and some have narrated on this wise, that he was one among the sons of the Khwārazmī Amirs, in the territory of Shām [Syria], and Miṣr [Egypt], and had been carried away captive from those parts and sold to Ikhtiyār-ul-Mulk, Abū-Bikr.

When the Sulṭān first purchased him, he became Jāmah-dār [Keeper of the Wardrobe], and in that office he served

---

9 See pages 769 to 776, farther on, where our author makes a totally different statement from this, and also in the account of Ulugh Khān farther on.
1 Anglicized, Aden.
2 See page 230.
3 Some copies have Khāshah-dār, instead of Jāmah-dār.
the Sulṭān some time. When the period of the Shamsī sovereignty terminated, and the reign of Sulṭān Rukn-ud-Dīn, Firūz Shāh, also came to its conclusion, he became Chāshnī-gīr [Comptroller of the Royal Kitchen] in the reign of Sulṭān Rażīyyat. After some time, he obtained the fief of Balārām.

During his own lifetime, the august Sulṭān [I-yal-timish] conferred upon him, in marriage, a daughter of Malik [Sulṭān] Bahā-ud-Dīn, Ṭughril, of Bhīānāh, which territory and adjacent parts were, in the beginning of the Musalmān rule, rendered flourishing and cultivated by him. By this connexion, in the reign of Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh—May his sovereignty continue!—Bhīānāh was made Arsalān Khān’s fief. Some years subsequent to this, the dignity of Wakil-i-Dar [Representative in Darbār] was entrusted to him. Subsequently, when the preserved city of Tabarhindah was recovered from the dependents of Sher Khān [Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn, Sher Khān-i-Sunkar], it was made over to his charge, in the month of Zi-Ḥijjah, 651 H. After that, when by the sublme order of the Court, the Khān-i-Mu‘azzam, Ulugh Khān-i-A‘zam, had departed, and gone to Nāg-aWR, and proposed to return again to the service of the Court, Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjār attached himself to his service and accompanied him. When they arrived at the capital, Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjār received honour at the Court, the asylum of the universe, and returned again to Tabarhindah.

4 In Awadh. In some copies Balarām or Balārām.
5 Nearly every copy of the text here, the Calcutta Text included, has the words —august martyr, but it is a blunder of course.
6 It does not appear how I-yal-timish became possessed of the right to dispose of another man’s daughter; and we must suppose that, after Bahā-ud-Dīn, Tughril’s death, his family, in some way, came under Kūṭh-ud-Dīn, I-bak’s authority, and from him to I-yal-timish. See the account of Tughril, page 544.
7 See page 695.
8 This occurred some time after Ulugh Khān had been banished from the Court, and directed to proceed to Hānsī. See in the account of Ulugh Khān arther on.
9 Joined in the outbreak against ‘Imād-ud-Dīn-i-Rayhān, in the middle of the year 652 H.
10 This must have been early in 653 H.—in Muḥarram probably—as Ulugh Khān, having recovered power again, returned to Dihlī, in company with the
Malik Sher Khan, having come back again from Turkistan, determined upon [re-]possessing himself of Tabarhindah. He brought a large number of cavalry and infantry from the side of Lohor along with him against Tabarhindah, and, at night, appeared before the walls of the fortress. Sher Khan's troops dispersed themselves in the town, and about the fortress; and when, in the morning, the world became illumined with the sun's light, Arsalan Khan-i-Sanjar, with his sons and principal retainers, attacked him. As his cavalry had become dispersed, Sher Khan was under the necessity of retiring. When Sher Khan, subsequently to this affair, came to the sublime Court, in conformity with the royal command, Arsalan Khan-i-Sanjar likewise presented himself there.

He continued to sojourn at the capital for some time, after which Awadh was entrusted to his charge. On several occasions, Kutlug Khan, with those Amir who had confederated themselves with him, began to harass the borders of Awadh and Karah. Arsalan Khan averted this annoyance: he led a body of troops against them, and compelled that faction to disperse. After that, a slight change in his mind, antagonistic to the Court, became manifest; and the sublime standards moved towards Awadh and Karah for the purpose of suppressing his designs. When the sublime standards cast their shadow upon that country, Arsalan Khan-i-Sanjar retired before the [contingents forming the] centre division of the royal forces, and he despatched confidential persons, and sought safety for himself, under the Sultān, on the 9th of Zi-Hijjah, 652 H. See also the account of Sher Khan farther on.

See page 793. Sher Khan's fief of Tabarhindah was restored to him, together with others he had previously held. The year is not mentioned, but, from the occurrence of other events, it appears to have been early in 653 H.

The second husband of the Sultān's mother. The fief of Awadh was assigned to them; our author says, on the 6th of Muḥarram, 653 H. See page 701, and note 9. The statements there and in the account of Ulugh Khan, farther on, differ greatly from this.

In one of the oldest copies of the text, and a more modern one, "Awadh and the Koh-pâyah." The reason for this movement is very differently stated in the account of Ulugh Khan. Arsalan Khan is said there to have delayed joining the Sultān's army concentrated before Dihlī, on the invasion of Sind by the Mughals at the end of 655 H., and Kutlug Khan—there styled Kulij Khan, Mas'ūd-i-fānti—had done the same, and, consequently, they were in a state of apprehension.
ipulation that, when the Sulṭān's troops returned [to the
ipital], he, Arsalān Khān, along with Kutlugh Khān ⁶, son of [the late] Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī, should present themselves there. Their supplication was graciously complied with; and, when the royal army returned again to the bode of sovereignty and illustrious seat of government, Dihli, after some time, Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjar again attached himself to the sublime Court, and was distinguished by ample honour and deference.

After he had remained in attendance at the Court for some time, in the year 657 H., the city of Kaṟah ⁶ was assigned to him as a fief, and, in the beginning of that same year, he led an army from Kaṟah with the intention of illaging the country of Mālwah and Kālinjar. After he had advanced some stages, he turned aside and marched towards the territory of Lakhanawaṭī. At this time, the vandatory of Lakhanawaṭī [Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-‘ūz-Bakī] had proceeded towards the country of Bang and left the city of Lakhanawaṭī empty [of troops]. Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjar had not unfolded this secret to a single person among his Āmirs and Maliks, his sons and slaves, that he was entertaining the intention of marching against Lakhanawaṭī, and he had neither permission nor orders from the sublime Court for this undertaking. When he reached the frontier of that country, a number of his sons, Āmirs, and slaves, discovered that which he had resolved in his mind, and they refused to follow him. As, however, there was no means of returning, out of necessity, they accompanied him.

When Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjar arrived before the gate of the city of Lakhanawaṭī, the inhabitants thereof took refuge within the walls [and defended themselves]. Annalists have stated on this wise, that, for a space of three days, they fought, and, at the end of that time, Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjar took the city, and gave orders to sack it. The property, cattle, and Musalmān captives that fell into

⁶ This second Kutlugh Khān cannot be correct, and does not refer to the ultān’s step-father. The person here referred to, as stated in the previous note, is, in some places, styled Kulij and Kulīgh Khān. See also the List at age 673, and page 712, where he is styled Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas’ūd.

⁶ See following note, para. third. This is not mentioned in the account of Jāṣir-ud-Dīn, Majmūd Shāh’s reign.
the hands of his followers was very great; and, for a period of three days, that plunder, sack, and rapine was kept up. When that tumult had been allayed, and he had taken possession of the city, Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Balban-i-Yüz-Baki, who was the feudatory of Lakhānawatī, at the place he then was in, became acquainted with this misfortune. He returned from thence, and between him and Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjar an engagement took place.

From the sublime Court an order granting the investiture of the government of Lakhānawatī had been [previously] issued to Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Balban-i-Yüz-Baki, after that he had despatched, to the presence of the sublime Court, two elephants, valuable property, and precious things to a large amount.

Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjar thus gained the upper hand, and Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Balban-i-Yüz-Baki, became a captive, and it is so stated that he was martyred. This much,

7 Stewart appears to have used the I.O.L. MS., No. 1952, of our author's work, for his History of Bengal as well as another mentioned subsequently; and, when I mention that, on the margin of that MS., which is quite correct, he has written, in pencil, that "this person"—from his being also named Balban, I suppose—"is The Visier," it is not surprising that the History of Bengal, in that place, contains so many absurd errors.

8 One of the oldest and best copies has 'Alā-ud-Din, Balban, here, but in other places agrees with the above.

9 Very great discrepancy occurs here, and in other places in this work, with respect to the history of Lakhānawatī, which is the more to be regretted because our author is the sole authority, as a contemporary writer, for the events of this early period. This discrepancy is occasioned chiefly from the loose manner in which he records important events, which may have appeared to him of minor consequence, and from the fact of his mentioning them in different places, with, very often, considerable difference in the details. Another cause of confusion is his omission of dates, and, as his history is brought to conclusion in 658 H., just six years of the reign of Sultan Nasir-ud-Din, Mahmu'd Shah, is a perfect blank in the history of Muhammadan India which no other writer has supplied.

Since I wrote note 6 to page 617, some further facts have been gleaned about the previous obscure period in the history of Lakhānawatī, viz. from the putting to death or butchery of Sultan Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, 'Īwāz, the Khāji, by the eldest son of Sultan I-yal-timish—Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Mahmu'd Shāh [the first of that name]—who invaded his territory from Awadh whilst he was absent on an expedition into Bang and Kāmīrūd, and had left the ca.ital, the city of Lakhānawatī, denuded of troops, and the appointment, as feudatory, but of which the date is not given, of Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-Yughān-Tat [Malik, No. V.], who died there in 631 H.

I must, therefore, go back a little, in order to make the facts stand out a little more clearly; but, first, I must refer to Mr. Blochmann's "Contributions
that the author was aware of, as to the state of affairs in

_to the Geography and History of Bengal," as there are some errors and dis-
crepancies therein which require to be noticed and corrected.

At page 37 of Part I., he says the Muḥammadan period of the history of
Bengal may be "conveniently divided into five parts. I. The 'Initial period,'
or _reign_ of the _governors_ of Lak'ha-nauti appointed by the Dihli sover-
igns, from the conquest of Bengal by Muḥammad Bakhtyār Khiljī [i.e. Ḳẖiṭṭyār-ud-
Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, the Ḳẖaljī A.D. 1203
to 1338 A.D."

In Part III. of his "Contributions," page 134 [See also APPENDIX D,
page xxiv.], he criticizes my statement respecting the year of the conquest of
Bengal by the Ḳẖaljī chief, and says it was conquered in 594 H., or A.D. 1198,
whilst A.D. 1203, mentioned in the preceding paragraph, is equivalent to 600 H.
—a difference of only six years! He also calls these rulers "governors," and
says they were "appointed by the Dihli sovereigns," but this is erroneous.
The Ḳẖaljī rulers, from the "conquest" to the acknowledgment of I-yai-
timīż’s suzerainty by Sultan Ḳẖiyār-ud-Dīn, Ṭiwāz, in 622 H., were entirely
independent of the Dihli rulers with the single exception of the mad-man, 'Alî-
i-Mardān.

Mr. Blochmann also commences his ‘Initial period’ [Part I., page 38] with
"Ṭughril" in 613 H., but 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Tuğhril-i-Tughān Khān, was the third
feudatory of Lakhanawatī after the downfall of the Ḳẖaljī sovereigns. Mr.
Blochmann’s List [condensed] is as follows:—

"Saifuddīn Aibak. Dies at Lakha-nauti in 631 H.

"Tuğhril, 631 H., to 5th Zi Qa’dah, 642 H.

"Qamarud-dīn Timur [?] [See page 742, note 4] Khān, governor from 5th
Zi Qa’dah, 642, to 29th Shawwāl, 644.

"Ikhtiyāruddīn Yūzbak Tuğhril Khān, proclaims himself king under
the title of Sultan Mughīsuddīn. Perishes in Kāmrūp. No dates are given.

"Jalāluddīn Mas’ūd, Malik Jānī Khiljī [!] Khān, becomes governor, 18th Zi
Qa’dah 656."

[Mr. Blochmann eschews ẓaḥafs, and criticizes my use of them as _un_-Persian.
By not using an ẓaḥaf here, as is meant in the original, he turns Jalāl-ud-Dīn,
Mas’ūd, into his father, Malik Jānī, who was killed in 634 H., and at page 206
of the Calcutta Printed Text, what Mr. Thomas styles the impossible name
of Khiljī Khān is not given, but Ḳẖān—which is an error in the "official text,"
"officially imperfect" I suppose is meant—for Ḳẖān—Kulīkh. He is also
styled Ḳūlīkh, in some copies, but Malik ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī, who is
styled, at page 626 of this Translation [Calcutta Text, page 187, with ẓaḥaf
for Ḳẖān], Shāh-zādah of Turkistān, was his father.]

"‘Izzuddīn Balban, was governor in 657, in which year he was attacked by
Ṭājuddīn Aarsalān Khān Sanjar i Khwārazmi, who, however, was captured or
killed by ‘Izzuddīn. _Tabq_. p. 267 [in a foot-note]—Hence Ṭājuddīn Aarsalān
Khān should not be put among the governors of Bengal."

[He must be put among the Sultāns then, for he ruled some years. The
"official text" here kills the wrong man. It was ‘Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Yūz
Bakl, who was made captive by Aarsalān Khān-i-Sanjar, and "some say was
put to death." The certainty of this is proved from the fact that Tatār Khān,
who now follows in Mr. Blochmann’s list, was Aarsalān Khān-i-Sanjar’s son.]

"Muḥammad Aarsalān Tatār Khān, son of Aarsalān Khān Sanjar. He had
been for some time governor, when the _emperor_ Balban ascended the throne
[664]. _Baranī_, p. 66. After a few years he was succeeded by—
that country, and of the events which happened in those parts, is here recorded. May Almighty God have mercy

"Tughril, who proclaimed himself king under the name of Sultān Mughīṣ-uddin. His fate has been mentioned above. No dates are given."

See also note at page 589 of this translation.

In Part II. of his "Contributions," Mr. Blochmann varies the latter part of the above list; and, after "Muhammad Arsālān Tāṭār Kān," we have two additional names, "Sher Kān," "Amin Kān," and then Tughrīl [II.], Amin Kān's Aḏāb; but, as I do not propose, at present, to go into matters relating to the successor of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Māhmūd Shāh, I will here return to the Khaļj dynasty, with the object of giving a brief consecutive account of those rulers and the feudatories who succeeded them, from the time that Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, was forced to acknowledge the supremacy of I-yal-timīsh.

This event happened about the middle of 622 H., and the coins of Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz [See THOMAS: "Initial Coinage of Bengal," Journal R. A. Soc., vol. vi., 1873, pages 352—357], prove that he was an independent sovereign up to that period, and used the title of Kaʿīm-i-Amīr-ul-Miʿāmīn, which was peculiar to the Shāhsābāns of Fīrūz-koh, and never assumed by their mamlūk successors; but he did not necessarily "share his property" with the Khaļīfāh. For the origin of the title see note 9, page 315, and pages 368 and 389.

Mr. Thomas also gives, in the same paper, coins of Sultān I-yal-timīsh as early as 614 H. and 616 H.—eight and six years before Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, had to acknowledge a superior, and these coins are attributed by him to the Bengal mints. I am not aware how this conclusion has been arrived at, for I-yal-timīsh had certainly not been acknowledged by the ruler of Lakhānawatī at that time. I think the issue of these coins may be well accounted for, from a passage in our author [see pages 590—591], which may not have received such attention as it ought to have received! namely, that I-yal-timīsh, "on several occasions, sent forces from Dihīl towards Lakhānawatī, possessed himself of Bihār, and installed his own Amīrs therein;" but our author, unfortunately, mentions nothing definite until 622 H., when Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, was reduced.

We may therefore conclude that the coins bearing I-yal-timīsh's name and titles, attributed to the Bengal mints, were in track in Bihār on the occasions mentioned by our author in the passage above referred to, and before he had obtained any decided advantage over the Khaļj Sultān.

However, having compelled Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, about the middle of 622 H., to acknowledge him as suzerain and to coin the money in his name [page 593], I-yal-timīsh left Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī [who is called 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Jānī, at page 594], Shāh-zādah of Turkistān [see List, page 626] in charge of Bihār; but I-yal-timīsh had no sooner withdrawn than Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, marched into Bihār, compelled Malik Jānī to fly into Awadh, and took possession of that territory again. I should imagine the coins bearing the high-sounding titles given by Thomas, at page 357 of the same paper, must have been issued at that time—622 H. or 623 H.—but he reads the date 620. This, however, is not very material to the present subject.

With this fact before him, it seems inexplicable to me why Mr. Thomas calls him "this self-made king," and that "Altamsh" [I-yal-timīsh] "con-
on that great Khan, and long preserve the Sultan of Sul-

ceded the tardy justice of decreeing, that, in virtue of his good works, Ghiyās-
ud-dīn 'Iwāz ['Iwaq?] should, in his grave, be endowed with that coveted title of Sultan, which had been denied to him while living." Who denied it to him? Minhāj-ud-Dīn, even at page 163 of the Calcutta "Official Text," does not say so. What he did say will be found literally rendered at page 587 of this Translation. Sultan Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, was equally as much entitled to the "coveted title" of Sultan as his adversary, Iyl-timish, was. He had been chosen precisely in the same way, by the chief men of the country, he owed no fealty whatever to Dilīf or its sovereigns, was a Turk like his rival, what is more, was a free-born man, and not a manumitted slave— the slave of a slave— which Iyl-timish was, and was included among the great Malik of Sulṭān Mu'izz ud-Dīn, Muhīammad-i-Sām, master of Iyl-timish's master.

These erroneous ideas respecting the two Sulṭāns I have felt myself bound to correct, according to historical facts, and our author's statements.

I would also remark, en passant, that Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Kāhl-jāh, was not overcome by Iyl-timish until ten years after 614 H. See page 348 of "Initial Coinage of Bengal," and page 542 of this Translation, and Printed Text, page 144.

At the time Malik Jānī fled before the Khalj Sulṭān into Awadh, Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, the eldest son and heir-apparent of Iyl-timish, was there located, having been entrusted with the sief of Awadh in 623 H. About two years and a half after he had been compelled to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Dilīf Sulṭān, as shown by his coins, Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, having set out on an expedition against the infidels of Bang and Kāmrūd [See page 594], Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, incited by Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī [Iyl-timish was occupied elsewhere in 624 H., but he sent reinforcements to his son, see page 611], whom the Khalj Sulṭān had expelled from Bihār, seized the opportunity—no intimation, of course, having been given beforehand—and invaded Lakhānaωati, which had been left nearly empty of troops, seized the fortress of Bāsan-kot, and took possession of the city of Lakhānaωati. Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, on becoming aware of this pernicious act, flew to the rescue—with a portion only of his forces, from what our author states at page 595—encountered the son of Iyl-timish, but was defeated, and taken captive, along with "all the Khalj Amīrs," and the whole of them were butchered.

Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, died, or was killed, for there is some mystery about it, seemingly, some time in the month of Rabī'-us-Sānī probably, since the news reached Dilīf in the following month, or it may have happened in that same month. How or where he died our author, "the sole authority for this period," does not say, but he repeatedly styles him "the martyred Malik" [See note 1, page 630]. Firīshtah's assertion that he died at Lakhānaωati is like a good many of his assertions, without any proof whatever, and his own invention probably.

Immediately after the death of Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, it appears, another Khalj chief succeeded in acquiring power, but how, is not clear, and, I fear, can never be thoroughly made so. He is styled, by our author, at page 617, Balkā Malik-i-Husām-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz—that is to say, the son of Husām, &c., the isāfīst standing for son of [See Appendix I.], which is sufficiently proved, I imagine, from the fact that he was not at all likely to have been called by the precise title of his predecessor—Husām-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz—as well; at page 626,
in the List of I-yal-timish's Maliks, Daulat Shāh-i-Balkā, son [the ḥaṣafat understood] of Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, 'Iwaṣ, Malik of Lakhānawatī, thus showing beyond a doubt that he had been acknowledged by I-yal-timish as dependent ruler, otherwise why put him in the List of Maliks? [See Thomas, "Initial Coinage," page 366]; in two copies of the text, I-rān Shāh-i-Balkā; in one, his title is Abū-i-Maʿālī, and by others he is styled Nāṣir-ud-Dīn-i-'Iwaṣ [See pages 617—618]; in the Calcutta "Official Text," at page 177, Malik Gazlak Khān Daulat Shāh, Khalīf, with two names jumbled into one; and, the next page, I-rān Shāh, Balkā, Khalīf. Balkā is not peculiar to the Ghaznavī rulers: it is a purely Turkish name. There is another Balkā—Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-Balkā Khān—in the List of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh's Maliks at page 673, and, from what is said in the account of Malik Kashi Khān [No. XXIV.], there were many Khalj Amīrs in the time of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh.

From the coin given by Thomas ["Initial Coinage of Bengal," page 367], his titles and name—plate, fig. 9—are Abū-i-Maʿālī [Thomas, himself, as mentioned at page 367, was in doubt about abu al-malik being correct, and thought it ended in لی—i-Daulat Shāh, baṭ Mau-dūd [and there is nothing in the titular name of Sultan Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, who, before he came to the throne was entitled Husam-ud-Din-i-'Iwaṣ, to show that his name was not Mau-dūd], and, although he acknowledges the suzerainty of I-yal-timish, and styles him Sultan-ul-Aʿzam, he calls himself Shāhān-Shāh, and also inserts on his coin the name of the Khalīfah, and, doubtless, had received a patent conveying the titles from Baghdad. The date on this coin, the only one that has come to light, I believe, is Seh-i-Samāh, which may be either 627 or 629 H., the stubborn م occurring again. It is not to be wondered at that "the coin does not give him the name Husamuddin:" Husam-ud-Dīn was his title before he assumed that of Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, which he did—not at all an unusual thing—with the title of Sultan.

In 628 H., I-yal-timish had to move against this Khalj Sultan, who, doubtless, was getting too powerful to please the Dihlī sovereign, and he was overthrown, and "secured," as our author remarks, much in the same way, probably, as Taj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, was—in the grave. With him the Khalj dynasty finally terminated.

I-yal-timish now conferred the "throne of Lakhānawatī" upon Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī—the Shāh-zadah of Turkistan—but he was shortly after deposed, and then governors, or more correctly feudatories, were appointed from Dihlī, and the first of them was Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-Yughān-Tat, as he is styled at page 729, which see.

It will be noticed from the above that Mr. Blochmann has fallen into considerable error [See "Remarks on Mr. Thomas's readings," in the "Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal," No. x., December, 1872], in assuming that "Daulat shāh seems to be the Malik 'Alauddin Jānī mentioned in the Taqāfāt i Naṣīrī (Bibl. Ind. Edition), pp. 174, 178." Our author very distinctly shows that they were two totally different persons.

In the same way, I cannot agree with him that "The royal titles assumed by the early Bengal Governors were customary in those days," but, on the contrary, such titles were never assumed unless the feudatory rebelled as in the case of Malik [No. XVIII.] Ikhtiyar-ud-Dīn, Yūz-Bak-i-'Ughrīl Khān, who assumed the title of Sultan [see page 764]. Malik 'Ughrīl-i-'Ughān Khān
XX. MALIK 'IZZ-UD-DIN, BALBAN-I-KASHLU KHAN-US-SULTANI SHAMS.

Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Balban, is a native of Khishchak, and had been specially honoured by his sovereign [See note 4, page 641], hence he records it in the Bihār inscription, in which the words "'Ithgrih-us-Sultāni," with jā-i-nilbat, merely show, as in Mu'izzī, Kūṭbī, Shamsī, &c., that he was a slave of the reigning dynasty, as shown at page 736.

Under the events of the 13th year of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh's reign, it is stated that, on the 18th of Zī-qa'dah—the last month—656 H., the kingdom of Lakhānawātī was conferred upon Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, son of the late Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī—the same, who, in the List of Maliks at the end of Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīg's reign, is called "Prince of Turkistān," and who was made ruler of Lakhānawātī at the close of the Khāj dynasty, as already related, and subsequently held Lāhor, rebelled, and was slain in 634. See page 640. Afterwards, in the account of the 14th year of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh's reign, it is mentioned that, on the 4th of the month of Jamādī-ul-Ākhīr, 657 H., two elephants, treasure, &c., reached the capital from Lakhānawātī, but who the sender was is not mentioned.

In his account of Ulugh Khan, farther on, our author states that Arsalān Khan-i-Sanjār—the subject of the above notice—and Kutlugh [Kulich] Khan, Mas'ud-i-Jānī, i.e. son of [Alā-ud-Dīn], Jānī, on the advance of Ulugh Khan against them with the Sultān's forces, and as referred to in note 4, page 768, having agreed to present themselves at Court, did so on the 27th of Shawwāl—the tenth month—656 H. Two months after this, which would be the twelfth month of that year, the state of Lakhānawātī was conferred upon Kutlugh [Kulich] Khan—as he is styled—and the districts of the Koh-pāyah upon Arsalān Khan-i-Sanjār.

A few lines under, it is stated, that, on the 4th of Jamādī-ul-Ākhār, 657 H., only the sixth month after Lakhānawātī ḫaṣ said to have been conferred on Kutlugh [Kulich] Khan, two elephants, treasure, and other valuables, reached Dihlī from Lakhānawātī—some time must be allowed for Kutlugh [Kulich] Khan, so called, to have reached that part from Dihlī, and some time also for the elephants, &c., to have arrived from thence—and that the sender of these things was not Kutlugh [Kulich] Khan, but Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Yūz-Bakī; not Yūz-Bak [Yūz-Bakī refers to a dependent or slave, in the same manner as the terms, Kūṭbī, Shamsī, and the like]; and, that, through Ulugh Khan's exertions and good offices, the investiture of Lakhānawātī was conferred upon him, and that an honorary robe and other honours were despatched for him, stated above also, in this notice of Arsalān Khan-i-Sanjār.

From these statements of our author, it would appear, that 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Yūz-Bakī, would not allow Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd-i-Jānī—otherwise Kutlugh [Kulich] Khan—if he ever went there, to assume authority, or that he had died suddenly, and 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban, had assumed the government. Had the word been Yūz-Bak, and not Yūz-Bakī, we might safely assume that he was Tughri Khan-i-Yūz-Bakī's, otherwise Sultān Mughīs-ud-Dīn's, son, and the same that had been made prisoner with his father in the disastrous retreat from Kāmrūd [just related at page 766], and named successor by him. This assump-
a man impetuous and gallant, of good disposition, and the votary of 'Ulamā, upright and good men, and recluses.

tion, too, would have explained what appears strange above, namely, that the first mention of 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Yūz-Bakī, is that he was absent on an expedition, in Bāng, when Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjār took advantage of it to invade his sīf, slew him, and took possession of the territory.

This also shows what a state the Dihlī kingdom must have been in for one feudatory to make war upon another, put him to death, and seize his sīf and hold it with perfect impunity.

Our author himself is uncertain of the upshot of the circumstances; and it must also be remembered that these events must have happened about the time our author closes his history so abruptly, and leaves all the rest of the events of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn's reign a perfect blank; and, from the time he closed his history, no other writer, that we know of—or, at least, that is available—continued the history of the Dihlī sovereigns, until ninety-five years after, when Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Barānī, finished his work, which, however, only took up the events from the accession of Sultān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Balban, and still left the events of six years—from 658 H. to 664 H.—blank as before.

Very little is to be gathered from the Tarikh-i-Firuz-Shāhī of Ziyā-ud-Dīn respecting the events which happened in Lakhānawati—for the work is written in a gossipping style, and dates are rarely given. This much, however, is stated therein, that, in 662 H., on the accession of Sultān Balban [the date is corrected to 664 H. in a footnote—I quote from the printed text], sixty-two elephants were despatched from Lakhānawati to Dihlī by Tatār Khān, son of Arsalān Khān. From this it must be assumed that he held the sīf, but when or how he was appointed, or when and how he was removed, and whether Tughrīl, who subsequently rebelled, succeeded him or what, cannot be discovered therein. Mr. Blochmann ["Contributions," page 114, Part II.] says a person named Sher Khān succeeded Tatār Khān, and that another named Amin Khān succeeded him, but the authority is not stated. The title of Khān, given to both these persons, savours much of Firighat's statements.

No dependence whatever is to be placed on either the Tabakat-i-Akbarī, Budā'īnī, or Firighat, for the events of Sultān Balban's reign. They all copy one from another, and the first-mentioned work closes the reign of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, when our author does, takes the reign of Balban from Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Barānī, and says neither more nor less, except in an abbreviated form, than is contained in Ziyā-ud-Dīn's work.

Stewart is totally wrong in his statements [History of Bengal, pages 66 and 67] respecting this period. He says "Mulk—Mulk means a country Kingdom, &c.—Yuzbek"—he means Malik Ikhṭiyār-ud-Dīn, Tughrīl Khān-i-Yuz-Bakī; otherwise, Sultān Mughīs-ud-Dīn—"died, on the occasion of his being taken captive" [as related at page 766], "in 656 H.," but who says so? and in what work is such a statement to be found? Our author does not say so; and Stewart takes his account from him, for I have now before me the MS. copies of our author's work which Stewart used, with his writing in pencil, every here and there, on the margins of the pages, where he alters the names and makes those written correctly totally wrong—as "Aza Addeen," "Mulk Yuzbek," &c. At this very place, in one MS. which has 'Izz-ud-Dīn, he alters it with a pencil to Jalal Addeen Khān, and, in his History, this same name is thus given. This enabled me to discover that I had the identical copies he used, before me.
The august Sultān [I-yal-timish] purchased him of

As I have already shown, our author does not give the date of Tughril Khān-i-Yūz-Bakī's death [see page 766], and there is not a word more used than I have rendered above; yet Stewart goes on to say that Jalal Addeen Khany [Khany, that is Khānī, I suppose, signifying Khān-shif, the office or dignity of Khān] was sent to take possession of the province of Lucknowt, "as soon as the death of Mulk Yūz-bakī was known at Court." There is not the least authority for all this, more than our author's words above; and yet his statement respecting the elephants and treasure, and the name of 'Izz-ud-Dīn-Balban-i-Yūz-Bakī, is ignored altogether or changed at the caprice of Stewart into "Jalal Addeen Khany"!

Stewart then perpetrates a terrible blunder, in consequence of altering the names given by our author, in stating, that it was this Jalal Addeen Khany who was killed in battle with Isrīlān Khan [Arsalan Khān-i-Sanjār, the Imperial Governor of Kurrah [Karsh?]], who had "been intrusted with the command of an army to subdue the Raja of Callingar [Kāninār?], in Bundelcund," &c. [see our author's statement, page 769], and then crowns the blunder with another still greater in making Tāj-ud-Dīn, Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjār, whom he here styles "Iṣa Al Mulk, Tāj addeen Isrīlān Khan Sunjār," the sender of the elephants, for he says [page 68], that, in consequence of his sending "elephants, horses, and other property of the murdered chief, as a bribe to the flagitious minister [all this is his own amplification of our author's simple statements], the Vizier [Wāṣīr!] of the contemptible Court of Dehly, his conduct was overlooked."

He then goes on to say, under his account of "Iṣa Addeen," that, "The Governor, Jalal Addeen, returning soon afterwards, an engagement took place, in the month of Jumād [there are two months named Jumād—the first and second Jumād], 657, between the two chiefs. The latter (sic) was slain in the contest [he is the murdered chief just before]; and the plunder of his property having been remitted to Dehly procured the confirmation of the usurper. He continued to rule Bengal for two years, and died at Lucknowt in the year 659."

Whether Stewart obtained these dates from the very modern Rāz-us-Salātīn, which eschews its authorities, referred to by Mr. Blochmann in his "Contributions," page 1, I cannot say, or whether they were taken from some such work as I have shown Firistiḥtah's to be, but these dates are certainly to be doubted, unless some authority for them is forthcoming.

The Šabakāt-i-Akbarī says—evidently copying our author, after a fashion—in 656 H., "Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn-i-Jānī"—i. e. Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Jānī—"was presented with an honorary robe, and sent to Lakhnavatī," and that, "in 657 H., he sent two elephants, jewels, &c." Immediately after, it is stated that "Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kāshlī Khān, who is mentioned above, died in Rajab" of that year. Now this is a pretty hash, but if the reader will look at the passages under Našīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh's reign, and in the account of Ulugh Khān, previously referred to, and compare them with the work in question, he will find that the author of the Šabakāt-i-Akbarī has turned 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Yūz-Bakī, into 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kāshlī Khān, the seditious feudatory of Sind, who marched upon Dihli, in concert with Kūtlugh Khān, Našīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh's step-father, in 655 H., who is the person "mentioned above" immediately before in that work, and who was never in Bengal in his life. He, too, did not die in Rajab, 657 H., for he was living when our author closed his history, in 658 H., as may be found at page 786.

The Šabakāt-i-Akbarī, and Firistiḥtah, both make the same great blunder.
a merchant, when before the fortress of Mandā-
throughout Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh's reign of confusing 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Aṣḥālī Khān, with Ulugh Khān's brother, Sāfī-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-
Kashī Khān, who died on the 20th of Rajab, 657 H. In fact, because the
name Balban occurs, Kashī Khān is often mistaken, in that work, for Ulugh
Khān himself. Fīrāstāh of course, by copying from the Tabaḳāt-i-Akbarī, 
copies all its blunders, without exception.

From what our author states in different places in this work, it may be
supposed, merely, that, when Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn [Kulīch Khān], Mas'ud Shāh, 
son of the late Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī, was appointed to the government of
Lakhanawāfī, in the last month of the year 656 H., there must either have been
a vacancy, or the Court had determined to oust Iḵtiyār-ud-Dīn, Tughrīl
Khān-i-Yūz-Bak, who had invaded it, and usurped the sēf; and, if the former,
it must, in all probability, have been caused by his death.

If this latter supposition be correct, the 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Yūz-Bakī,
mentioned by our author, who is evidently the same person who is referred to at
page 827—Kutlugh Khān's [the Sultan's father-in-law] son-in-law—who
became Deputy Amr-i-Hājīb, when 'Imād ud-Dīn-i-Rayhān conspired against
Ulugh Khān, must have been confirmed in it by the Court of Dīlīf.

I think he must have been a dependent of Tughrīl's, not his son, for this
reason, that, when referring to a son, our author merely adds the father's name
to the son's, using the iqtāf for bin [see Appendix C], namely:—Muḥammad-
i-Sām, Mas'ūd-i-Jānī, Abū-Bikr-i-Ayāz, and the like; but, when he refers to a
retainer, freedman, or slave, he always adds the ya-i-nisbat, signifying relation
or connexion, to the person's name, as, Sultān, Kuṭbī, Shāmsī, Ayāzī, Yūz-
Bakī,—as previously stated.

The Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh, which quotes our author largely, as far it goes,
throws a little more light than others on this subject [Alīf, possibly, which I
have not the means of examining just at this time, might throw more], although
very meagre. It states that Malik, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī, ruled over Lakhanawafī
three years, and was removed.

Sāfī-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-Tughān-Tat, succeeded, and died in 633 H. Our
author says he died in 631 H.

'Izz-ud-Dīn, Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān, succeeded him and held the govern-
ment thirteen years and some months [to the end of the year 642 H. See
page 740].

Kī-rān-i-Tamur Khān succeeded and held it ten years [two years less two
months]. He died in 644 H. See page 741]; and, after him, in Nāṣir-ud-
Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh's reign, Iḵtiyār-ud-Dīn, Yūz-Bak-i-Tughrīl Khān, who
assumed the title of Sultān Muḥfiz-ud-Dīn, became feudatory.

The Tārīkh-i-Fīrūz-Shāhī says "this assumption of sovereignty took place
in Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Balban's reign, but God knows best." He ruled
over Lakhanawafī twenty-six years [from the death of Kī-rān-i-Tamur Khān,
twenty-six years would bring us to Shawwāl, 670 H., however], and, after
him, Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Balban, conferred Lakhanawafī upon his
youngest son, Bahūrī Khān.

The Gaūr M.S., previously referred to [in note 1, page 558], also states that
Yūz-Bak-i-Tughrīl Khān reigned twenty-six years, from 653 H. to 682 H.,
and both authors make the same mistake with respect to Kī-rān-i-Tamur
Khān's holding the government ten years instead of two; but, in this matter,
our author himself gives the date of his being ousted from Lakhanawafī as the
last month of 642 H.
war. At the outset [of his career] he became Cup-bearer, and, after he had served the Sultan some time, he was made Shrāb-Dār [Purveyor of Drinkables], when before the fortress of Gwāliyūr. Subsequently, Barhamūn, or Barhanmūn, was assigned to him in sīf; and, after some time, the sīf of Baran was entrusted to him.

When the Shamsī reign came to its termination, in the outbreak of the Turkish Amirs in the camp of Sultan Rukn-ud-Dīn, Fīruz Shāh, at Tarā'īn, he was the ringleader. On the Ruknī reign passing away, and the disaffection of Malik Jānī and Malik Kūfī towards Sultan Rażīyyat continuing, during the conflicts [which then took place] before the gate of the city of Dihli, between the Turkish Amirs who were the slaves of the [late] Sultan Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh, and who were present in the service of Sultan Rażīyyat’s Court, Malik Balban fell captive into the hands of the rebels. He again obtained his release, and was treated with distinguished honour and

It seems utterly impossible, in the face of Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Baraui’s statement about Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjar’s son—Tātār Khān—that Tughrīl Khān-i-Yūzliak, otherwise Sultan Mughīs-ud-Dīn, who is said to have been mortally wounded in the retreat from Kāmūrūd, and died there, and the Tughrīl, who also assumed the very same title of Mughīs-ud-Dīn, and was killed on the frontier of the Jāj-nagar territory, can be one and the same person; but such the works above quoted consider to be the case; and, from the remark of Mr. Blochmann, in his “Contributions” [Part I. fifth line, page 39], he seems to entertain the same opinion.

Further research may throw more light on this matter of Tughrīl Khān-i-Yūz-Bak’s, and Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjar’s successor to the sīf of Lakhānaswati; but, at present, the matter is clouded in obscurity.

Thomas, in his “PATHĀN KINGS OF DEHLI,” gives, at page 8, a list of the rulers and kings of Bengal, in which he styles Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Yūz-Bak’s Tughrīl Khān, Yuzbeg, and ‘Irz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Yūz-Bakl, Usbegi, and, in a note, says “These contrasts in the orthography follow the Persi text of Minhāj-us-Sirāj, who seems to have designed to mark a difference in the pronunciation!” This is erroneous: the words are—a-čh, and a-orz, yā-i-nisbat, is merely added to the last, and nothing indicates any g in the names. 2 This was in 624 H. See page 611.

1 This is of the two places referred to at page 746, and I fail to recognize it. It is written, in the original, in various ways; but the above is contained in the majority of the copies—Arberūm, and in others, according to the ratio in which they are to be depended upon, Arberūm—Arberūm—Arberūm. [Hindūr?] It may possibly be meant for Burhnawah, anglicized Burwnawa, Lat. 29° 7', Long. 77° 29'.

3 Now A'žim-ábād-i-Talāwarī, the scene of Rāh Pithorā’s victory and subsequent defeat. See page 635.

4 Not they only: there were several others. See page 639.
favour; and, when the reign of Sulṭān Razīyyat lapsed, and
the throne of sovereignty devolved on Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-
Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, he was honoured as heretofore, until
the time when the Khwājah, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, the Wazīr,
caused animosity to show itself between that Sulṭān and
his Turkish Amīrs, as is recorded [under his reign].
Previous to this, the whole of the Amīrs and Maliks had
entered into a compact together to expel Sulṭān Muʿizz-
ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, from the throne. In the year
640 H., the whole of them, in concert together, advanced to
the gate of the city of Dihlī⁴, and, for a period of five
months or more, this hostility and strife went on; and, when
the city was taken by the Maliks [and Amīrs], the ring-
leader in this outbreak was Malik Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-
Kashshū Khān.

Early in the day on which the troops of the Amīrs [and
Maliks] entered the city, Malik Balban proceeded to the
Royal Palace, and once, by his command, a proclamation
was circulated throughout the city [announcing his assump-
tion of the sovereignty]. Immediately, Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-
Dīn, Aʿīt-kīn, of Kuhrām, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Kik-
luk, and Malik Nasīr-ud-Dīn, Ai-yītim, and several other
Amīrs, assembled at the mausoleum of Sulṭān Shams-ud-
Dīn, I-yal-timīsh—May he rest in peace!—and repudiated
that proclamation⁴, and, in concert together, brought forth
the sons of the late Sulṭān [I-yal-timīsh], and the princes
who were in confinement. When Malik Balban became
aware of this, he took part with them, and they raised 'Alā-
ud-Dīn, Masʿūd Shāh, to the throne. He assigned the
territory of Nāg-awr, together with an elephant⁷, to Malik
Balban, and he proceeded thither.

After some time had passed, when an army of the
infidels of Chīn [Mughals] appeared before the fortress of
Üchchah, and Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Masʿūd Shāh, marched
from the capital with the troops of Islām towards the river
Bīāh to repel them, Malik Balban came from Nāg-awr with
a body of troops [and joined the Sulṭān's army], and that

⁴ See under the reign, pages 658–662.
⁵ See pages 660 and 661 and note 1.
⁷ This was accounted a great honour in these days, as may be seen from
what is stated at page 650, note 4.
momentous affair terminated successfully. When the army of infidels retired from before Üchchah precipitately, Malik Balban returned to Nāg-awr again, and Multān was placed under his charge 8.

When the Sulṭān of Islām, Nāṣir-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Din, ascended the throne of sovereignty—May it ever continue!—after Malik Balban had come [to Court?] he, on several occasions, made a request for Üchchah together with Multān. This was acquiesced in, under the understanding that the Siwālikh [territory] and Nāg-awr should be relinquished, by him, to other Maliks who are servants of the government, and that the Court should have the nomination [of them] 9.

After he brought Üchchah under his jurisdiction, he still continued to retain possession of Nāg-awr, and did not relinquish it. The Sulṭān-i-Mu'azzam—The Almighty perpetuate his reign!—with the Maliks of Islām—Be victory always theirs!—particularly the Khān-i-Mu'azzam, Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam—Be his Khilāfat 1 perpetuated!—determined to proceed from the capital in the direction of Nāg-awr. On the Sulṭān's reaching that part, after making much difficulty of the matter, and protracting as long as possible, in the semblance of submission, Malik Balban presented himself [in the Sulṭān's presence], relinquished Nāg-awr, and proceeded towards Üchchah.

When the territory of Üchchah and Multān was made over to Malik Balban's charge from the sublime Court, Malik Saif-ud-Din, Ḥasan, the Karlugh 2, from the direction of [the

8 See note 4, page 667, para. 4, and proceedings of Malik Saif-ud-Din, Ḥasan, the Karlugh, in the last Section.
9 Our author has just above said that Multān was made over to him before this. He means that the understanding was, that, if he got Üchchah as well as Multān, Nāg-awr was to be relinquished. After he was compelled to give it up, Ulugh Khān's brother, Saif-ud-Din, I-bak-i-Kashif Khān, got that fief. See page 798.
1 Khilāfat signifies deputyship, or lieutenancy, as well as imperial dignity and monarchy, but, under any circumstances, the Sulṭān was alive when this was written.
2 Some details are necessary respecting the Karlugh Turks, which I must reserve for the concluding Section, in which Malik Saif-ud-Din, Ḥasan, again appears, and his previous history is referred to. I will merely observe here, that he had appeared before Multān long before this—soon after the death of Sulṭān I-yal-timish, who, it will be remembered [page 623], was marching
territory of] Baniân brought an army before the gate of Multân in order to possess himself of that city [and fortress], and Malik Balban advanced from Üchchah to repel him. When the two armies came opposite to each other, a band of warriors and heroic men in Malik Balban’s service, to the number of about fifty picked horsemen, having formed a ring, attacked Malik Saif-ud-Dîn, Hasan, the Karlugh, charged into the centre [of his army], and Malik Hasan was slain, the greater part of those heroic men, who displayed such impetuosity, having fallen in the attack. Malik Balban entered the fortress of Multân; and the Karlugh troops kept the death of their Malik concealed, and pitched their camp before the gate of the city of Multân. Emissaries passed to and fro between the two armies and discussed terms of peace, and the surrender of Multân to the Karlugh. The peace was concluded, and Malik Balban delivered up Multân to the Karlugh, and returned towards Üchchah; and the Karlugh took possession of Multân.

When Malik Balban became aware that Malik Hasan, the Karlugh, had been killed, he repented of having given up Multân, but it was useless. After some time, Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Dîn, Sher Khân-i-Sunkar, wrested Multân out of the hands of the Karlugh, and took possession of it, and located there Malik Kurez. On Saturday, the 2nd of the month of Rabi’-ul-Awwal, 648 H., Malik Balban, having advanced from Üchchah for the purpose of regaining possession of Multân, appeared before the walls of that fortress. The writer of these words, two days subse-

towards the territory of Baniân, when taken ill, and obliged to return to Dihlî, where he soon after died.

8 The whole band must have fallen or have been taken, otherwise the news of Hasan’s having been slain would certainly have reached Malik Balban-i-Kashtli Khân. Or, perhaps, the band, or, rather, the remainder of it, did not know whether they had killed him or not, or whether he had only been left for dead. Hasan’s son, who is referred to under Sultan Rażìyyat’s reign [note 7, page 644], and in the account of Ulugh Khân, farther on, and in the last Section—Malik Nāṣîr-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad—would, probably, have been the person to whom Multân was surrendered; and it is strange our author does not mention who succeeded Malik Hasan in the command of the Karlugh.

9 He is the person referred to under the fifth year of Sultan Nāṣîr-ud-Dîn, Maḥmûd Shâh’s reign, page 688.

8 Under the events of the year 648 H., at page 688, our author states that he
quently [to that], arrived before Multān from the illustrious capital, Dihlī, for the purpose of despatching [a number] of male slaves to Khurāsān. After that he [the author] continued at that place for a period of two months; and the fortress did not come into Malik Balban's possession, and he returned again towards Uchchah.

Malik Sher Khān-i-Sunkar advanced from Tabarhindah and Lohor, and appeared before the fortress of Uchchah and invested it, and remained before it for some time. Malik Balban, who was away from it at this period, placing confidence in this, that they were both of one house and of one threshold, unexpectedly, presented himself in the camp of Malik Sher Khān-i-Sunkar, and seated himself down in the latter's pavilion, upon which Malik Sher Khān-i-Sunkar manifested some show of regard towards him, arose, and came out by way of the back of the pavilion, giving directions to guard Malik Balban, and not permit him to depart from the place until such time as the garrison of Uchchah should surrender that fortress. As Malik Balban was helpless and in straits, he gave directions to the garrison of the fortress to surrender it to Malik Sher Khān-i-Sunkar, who, after he had taken possession of the fortress of Uchchah, set Malik Balban at liberty, who came to the capital.

Having presented himself at Court, the [fief of the] reached Multān on Wednesday, the 6th of Rabi'-ul-Awwal, of that year, and that Malik Balban-i-Kashī Khān reached it from Uchchah, the same day. In his account of Ulugh Khān, farther on, the same date is given.

6 See note 7, page 686.

7 Under the events of Sultān Nasir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh's reign, 648 H., our author says he had an interview with Sher Khān, on the banks of the Bfāh, on the 11th day of the second month of that year, when proceeding to Multān [see page 687], and that Malik Balban-i-Kashī Khān reached Multān, to endeavour to take it, on the same day that he himself reached it—the 6th of the third month,

8 The "official" Calcutta Printed Text and the MSS. from which it is chiefly taken have ʿalā—nest—for ʿalā—threshold.

9 See page 689. There he says, under the events of 649 H., that Malik Balban-i-Kashī Khān began to act contumaciously at Nāg-awr in that year, and the Sultān had to move against him; and that, after that, in the fourth month of that same year, he presented himself at Dihlī. Between that date, and the date on which he made his submission, at Nāg-awr, he had fallen into Sher Khān's hands.

1 Under Sultān Nasir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh's reign, it is stated, that, on the 22nd of Shawwāl, 650 H. [in the account of Ulugh Khān, it is the 12th].
province of Budā'ūn with its dependencies was assigned to him; and, when the sublime standards advanced towards the upper parts [of the kingdom—the Biāh and Lohor], and the preserved city of Tabarhindah was recovered, forces were nominated to march towards Üchchah and Multān. Between Malik Sher Khān-i-Sunkar and the Malik of the Court, contention went on; and Sher Khān proceeded into Turkistān, and Üchchah and Multān were entrusted, a second time, to Malik Balban's charge.

No sooner had Malik Balban taken possession of that country than he became disloyal to the Court, and, making Malik Shams-ud-Dīn, Kurt, the Ghūrī, his medium, preferred a request [through him] to Hulā'ū [Hulākū] the Mughal, who was a Shāh-zādah [Prince] of Turkistān, for a Shāhnah [Intendant]. Malik Balban sent [to Hulākū's Court] a grand-son in pledge, and brought a Shāhnah thither [into Sind and Multān]. Subsequently, when the Khān-i-Mu'azzam, Ulugh Khān-i-A'ẓam, had returned to the Sultan moved towards Lāhor, intending to march to Üchchah and Multān, and that Malik Kūtlugh Khān from Bhiānāh, and Malik Balban-i-Kasghū Khān from Budā'ūn, with their contingents, accompanied him. On reaching the Biāh, however, 'Imād-ud-Dīn-i-Rayḥān's plot developed itself, and Ulugh Khān was banished to his sīf.

Under the year 651 H., it is again stated that the Sultan marched from Dihlī to "secure" Üchchah and Multān, and that, on reaching the Biāh [it flowed in its old bed then], a force was detached to Tabarhindah to secure it, as Malik Sher Khān-i-Sunkar had withdrawn to Turkistān, and that they were taken possession of on the 26th of Zi' Hiljah, the last month of 651 H., and made over to Malik Arsalān Khān, Sanjar-i-Chast; but, in the account of the latter Malik [page 767], it is said he got Tabarhindah, and Üchchah and Multān are not mentioned.

2 See pages 695 and 792, where are two other and different statements, with respect to the cause of Sher Khān-i-Sunkar's withdrawal.

3 His restoration to the sīf of Üchchah and Multān is never referred to in any other place in the present work save the above, but that he was restored to it there is, of course, no doubt from the context. It appears probable that, when Ulugh Khān succeeded in ejecting 'Imād-ud-Dīn-i-Rayḥān from power at the end of 652 H., and on his being sent to rule at Budā'ūn, Malik Balban-i-Kasghū Khān got Üchchah and Multān again, some time in 653 H. See also note 4, page 692.

4 He will be noticed in the last Section with reference to the Mughal invasion of the Panjāb.

5 Hulā'ū or Hulākū was, certainly, a Prince of Turkistān, but, at this time, ruled over Irān on the part of his brother, Mangū Kā'ān. More respecting him will be found in the next Section.

6 He thus threw off his allegiance to Dihlī.
the Court, and Malik Kutlugh Khan had separated from it and had joined Malik Balban, and the Sultan and his forces had returned to the capital, Malik Balban, in the year 655 H., suddenly resolved to advance to the frontiers of the kingdom of Dilli with the troops of Uchchah and Multan. When this determination and purpose [of the confederates] was represented before the sublimé throne, the royal command was given to repel that faction, and Malik Ulugh Khan-i-A'zam, with the whole of the Maliks and Amirs, marched against the troops of Malik Balban.

On the 15th of the month of Jamadi-ul-Awwal, 655 H., when, within the limits of [the districts of] Kuhram and Samanah, they drew near [Malik Balban's army], a faction of seditious [persons] of the capital city, Dilli, consisting of turban wearers [priest-hood] and cap-wearers [Sayyids], wrote and despatched letters secretly to Malik Balban, soliciting him to come thither, saying: "In order that we may deliver up the city to thee it behoveth thee to set out for it." Malik Balban accordingly moved towards Dilli, and, on Thursday, the 6th of Jamadi-ul-Akhir, 655 H., he [and Kutlugh Khan and their forces] reached the environs and suburbs of the city; but his conceptions were not realized, and the faction, who had written letters to him, had, by the sublime command, left the city.

When Malik Balban reached the Bagh-i-Jud [the Jud Garden], which is in the environs of the city of Dilli, along with Malik Kutlugh Khan and the Malikah-i-Jahân [Sultan Nasir-ud-Din's mother], the account of the expul-

7 He had been sent away from the Court, with his wife, the Sultan's mother, as early as 653 H., but the events here referred to took place in 655 H., some time previous to which Kutlugh Khan was in rebellion. See page 707.

8 See page 707.

9 Only turban-wearers are mentioned under the reign, but cap-wearers merely refers to others besides the regular priest-hood, such as the descendants and disciples of Zain-ud-Din, 'Alli, probably, who wore black caps or tiaras. The allusion is to Sayyid Kufb-ud-Din, the Shaikh-ul-Islam, and this party. See page 707.

1 They had been sent away out of the city four days before. See page 708.

2 In the Calcutta Printed Text, the word ḥud—Jud—has been invariably mistaken for ḥud—khud, which signifies self, &c., and thereby the Jud Garden is turned into his own garden. The Bagh-i-Jud, and Sahra-i-Jud, are often mentioned.

The account of this affair varies from that detailed under the reign, page 708, and in the account of Ulugh Khan farther on.
sion of that faction became known to them, and that flame of the fire of hope [from the faction] was extinguished with the water of disappointment. After the time of forenoon prayers, they advanced to the gate of the city, and made a perambulation round the place. They remained at the Bāgh-i-Jūd for the night, and, at morning dawn, they came to the determination to retire. On the Friday, which was the 7th of the month of Jamādi-ul-Ākhir, the troops of Ūchchah and Multān, the whole of them, separated from Malik Balban, and went off in bodies in various directions, but the greater number were those [among them] who entered the city, and who joined the service of the sublime Court.

Malik Balban—the Almighty have him in His keeping!—withdrew, and by way of the Siwālikh [country], and, with a slight retinue, less than 200 or 300 in number, returned to Ūchchah again. Subsequent to these events, Malik Balban came to the determination of undertaking a journey into Khurāsān, and proceeding into 'Irāk to the presence of Hulāū, the Mughal, who is a Shāh-zādah [Prince] of Turkistān, and presented himself before him. He returned from thence, and came back to his own place of residence again [to Ūchchah]; and, up to the date of this narrative, which was the year 658 II., he has despatched his own agents, along with the Shāhnah [the Mughal Intendant] of the territories of Sind, which was on account of the army of Mughals [then on the Dihli frontier], to the presence of the Court.

Please God, it may turn out well and advantageously,

---

3 Our author always uses the word "gate" when gates may be understood. In this instance he may mean the gate on the side of the Jūd plain and garden.
4 According to some copies the dates are, respectively, the 26th and 27th of Jamādi-ul-Ākhir.
5 It is remarkable that he should have gone to Hulākū's camp in 'Irāk, and Sher Khān to that of the Great Khān—Mangū Ka'ān, in Turkistān. Their object, probably, was the same.
6 This refers to the return of Ulugh Khān's agent despatched some time before to Malik Nāsir-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Ḥasan, the Kārūnī, the details of which affair will be found at the end of this Section. There he says Shāhnagān—Intendants—as if there were more than one at Ūchchah. The Mughal army referred to, is that of the Nū-Īn, Sāfī, or Sāfīn, as he is also called, which entered Sind, a few months after Malik Balban's attempt on Dihli, in the latter part of 655 II., an account of which will be found at page 711,
and may He long preserve the Sultān of Islām, Nāṣir-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn, Abū-l-Muẓaffar-i-Maḥmūd Shāh, on the throne of sovereignty!

XXI. MALIK NUṢRAT KHĀN, BADR-UD-DĪN, SUNKAR-I-ŠŪFI, THE RŪMĪ.

Malik Nuṣrat Khān-i-Sunkar, the Šūfī, is a Rūmī [Rūmilīān] by birth. He is a person of exceeding laudable qualities and inestimable virtues, valiant and warlike, and of good disposition, and adorned with all the attributes of manliness and resolution.

He was a slave of the august Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn [Iyāl-timīsh], and he had, in the reigns of every one of the Sultāns [his descendants], served in offices of every degree; but, in the reign of Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, in the year 640 H., when the Turk Amīrs rebelled and put the Khwājah, Muhazzab, the Wazir, to death, this Malik, Nuṣrat Khān-i-Sunkar, was one of the Amīrs, the principal ringleaders in that outbreak. After that event he became Amīr7 of Kol; and he brought that territory under his control, and, along with his retinue and the people, on the beaten track of equity and justice, he passed his days. In that same year [640 H.], the writer of these words, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, chanced to undertake a journey to Lakhānawati. On reaching the district of Kol, this Amīr of excellent disposition treated him with great kindness and encouragement.

Subsequently, Malik Nuṣrat Khān-i-Sunkar obtained other fiefs; and, in the reign of the Sultān of Sultāns, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, the territory of Bhīānah was made his fief. He continued to remain some time in that part, and many times punished the seditious and evil doers.

At the time when Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kashlū and in the biography of Ulugh Khān, but more particularly detailed in the last Section.

7 He was of the Šūfī sect, apparently.
8 Our author has never used the word Amīr like this before: he generally uses feudatory.
Khān, advanced out of the territory of Sind and appeared before the gate of Dihlī, Malik Nuṣrat Khān-i-Sunkar, with a numerous force, reached the city of Dihlī from Bhīānah. The inhabitants of the city, and grandees of the Court, were placed in safety by his arrival at the head of a body of troops. After that affair, in the year 657 H., from the implicit faith which the Sulṭān of Islām placed in Malik Nuṣrat Khān-i-Sunkar, and the powerful support of the Khān-i-Mu’azzam, Ulugh Khān-i-A’zam, the preserved city of Tabarhindah, and Sunām, Jhajhar, and Lakhwāl, and the frontiers, as far as the ferries over the river Biāh, all were conferred upon him⁹, and his title became Nuṣrat Khān.

On those frontiers he performed distinguished services, and assembled a numerous body of troops; and, up to the date of this book’s [being written], by the sublime command, he is still [stationed] on that frontier, with ample military resources, and a large army¹. May the Almighty long preserve the Sulṭān of Sulṭāns upon the throne of sovereignty!

XXII. AZ KULLĪ DĀD-BAK, MALIK SAIF-UD-DIN, I-BAK, THE SHAMSĪ, 'AJAMI.

Malik Saif-ud-Din, I-bak, the Shamsi, 'Ajamī, is, by

⁹ It was at this period that Malik Sher Khān-i-Sunkar had the extensive siefs of Bhīānah, Kol, Balarām, and Gwāliyūr, conferred upon him; but, under that year, in the Sulṭān’s reign, the placing of these frontier territories in Nuṣrat Khān-i-Sunkar’s charge is not stated. See page 794.

The mention of “the frontiers,” and the “ferries of the Biāh,” taken in connexion with the orders of Hulākū to his general, mentioned at the end of the account of Ulugh Khān, plainly indicates the limits within which the Dihlī territory was now confined.

The Biāh, as before stated, then flowed in its old bed, entirely separate from the Sutlaj.

¹ Why are not his “distinguished services” mentioned; and, if he had such “ample military resources and large army,” why did he not drive away Sārf, the Nū-īn, and his Mughals, who were making constant raids upon the Dihlī territory?

² The Calcutta Printed Text has خُلِل instead of خُلِل Amīr-i-Dād, and Dād-Bak, are synonymous, the former being Persian and the latter the Turkish form, and the office appears to have been much the same as that of Mīr-i-'Adl in Akbar’s time. The words as kulī show that he was the head of that department and exercised full powers. See note ⁴, page 529, and page 605, note ¹.
origin, of Khishchak, a Malik adorned with justice, sagacity, strictness, and judgment, and famed and celebrated for all manner of energy and ability. In the learning of the Musalmân faith he was proficient, in religiousness perfect, and in words and in deeds sincere, on the path of probity and justice staunch and regular.

It must be about eighteen years since the bench of the administration of justice was adorned by his dignity; and, during the whole period, he has followed the path of justice and equity, and been obedient to the canons of the [Muhammadan] law, and beyond those which the law decrees he has not added a tittle. The writer of this History, Maulana Minhaj-i-Saraj—God protect him!—upon two occasions, for nearly eight years, by the gracious command of the Sulthan of Sultans, Nasir-ud-Dunya wa ud-Din—The Almighty perpetuate his rule and sovereignty!—is seated on the same bench with that just Malik in the Court of Justice at the capital city, Dihli, and the author has seen that the whole of his acts, procedures, and expositions have been conformable with the faith and its ordinances. By the dignity of his punishments, and the majesty of his justice, the multitude of contumacious [persons] round about the capital, and the gangs of evil doers and robbers, having drawn back the hand of violence within the sleeve of relinquishment and suspension, are quiescent in the corner of fear and terror.

From the period when Malik Saif-ud-Din, I-bak, became enrolled among the series of slaves of the Court of the Shamsi dynasty—the asylum of the universe—he has, at all times, been reverenced; and every district, fief, or tract of country, which has been entrusted to his charge, through his equity and rigour, has become flourishing and pros-

3 His being styled "Shamsi, and 'Ajami," in this instance, means that, originally, he was the slave of the Khwajah Shams-ud-Din, the 'Ajami.

4 What year is referred to is left to conjecture, unless he means the year in which he closed this history—658 H. He was, however, appointed Kai of the realm, for the second time, in 649 H. See page 690.

5 This expression shows that the term Malik is not peculiar to the military only, and the fallacy of translating the word general, as in Elliot, in numerous places.

6 Nearly every copy of the text, Calcutta Printed Text included, has سلطان—Sultans—for مسلم—series, &c. In this instance the I. O. L. MS., No. 1952, and the R. A. S. MS., are both correct.
perous, and the commonalty have dwelt in quiet and tranquillity, and have continued safe and exempt from oppression and violence. During this period since he has been the Amir-i-Dād [Chief Justiciary] of the kingdom of Dihli, the customary fees at the rate of ten or fifteen per cent, which other Chief Justices before him have imposed, he has not extorted, nor has he had any concern with such, neither has he considered such to be legal.

At the outset of his career when he became severed from the tribes of Khishchāk and his native country, and through the discord of kindred became a captive in the bonds of misfortune, he chanced to fall into the service of the generous Khwājah, Shams-ud-Dīn, the 'Ajami, who was the Malik-ut-Tujjār [Chief of the Merchants] of the countries of 'Ajam, 'Irāk, Khwārazm, and Ghaznān, and, up to this period of time, they call Malik Sāif-ud-Dīn, I-bak, by the term Shamsī, after that great man.

When Malik Sāif-ud-Dīn, I-bak, reached the sublime Court of Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish [along with his master], and the Sulṭān purchased him, he acquired favour and influence. Perceiving the indications of energy and vigour which were depicted on his brow, the august Sulṭān used to send him upon important affairs into different parts of the kingdom, and assign him duties, until, in the reign of Sulṭān Rażīyyat, he became Sahm-ul-Ḥasham [Marshal of the Retinue*]. In the reign of Sulṭān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, he became Amir-i-Dād [Justiciary] of Kaṭah; and, when the throne devolved on Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas’ūd Shāh, in the year 640 H., he became Amir-i-Dād of the illustrious capital, the city of Dihli, and the sīef of the ‘Amīrs-i-Dād, and the bench [pertaining to that office] passed to him.

After some time, when the throne devolved upon the Sulṭān of Sulṭāns, Nāṣir-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, the sīef of Palwal and Kāmāh*, with the bench of

---

7 That is, Prince or Chief of the Merchants—a term often used in the Arabian Nights, and applied to the chief or general syndic of the merchants, trading exclusively with particular countries.

8 See note 6, page 150.

9 In the Bharat-pūr territory, on the route from Mathurah to Fīrūz-pūr, 39 miles N.W. of the former place, Lat. 27° 40', Long. 77° 20'. It was taken by Najaf Khān about eighty years since, and was then a small city fortified
the justice-ship, was entrusted to him; and, after some time, he obtained the fief of Baran; and, in that part, inflicted condign punishment upon the contumacious. Some time subsequently, Kasrak\(^1\) \(?\), with the office of chief justiciary, was given him in fief, and, after two years, he again obtained Baran; and, up to this present time, it is in his charge.

**XXIII. MALIK NUŠRAT-UD-DIN\(^5\), SHER KHĀN, SUNKAR-I-SAGHALSUS\(^6\).**

Malik Sher Khān is a person consummately brave and sagacious, and distinguished for all princely qualities, and famed for all kingly accomplishments. He is the uncle’s son of the Khān-i-Mu’azzam, Ulugh Khān-i-A’zam, and, in Turkistān, their fathers have been persons of importance, and among the families of the Ilbari\(^6\) [tribe] have borne the name of Khān, and, for their numerous clan and dependents, have been noted and renowned, each of whom will, Please God, in the account of that Malik of the Maliks of the universe, be separately mentioned.

Sher Khān was the slave of the august Sulṭān [I-yal-timish] who purchased him\(^6\); and he performed much ser-

with walls and towers. If sought after, perhaps some inscriptions might be found at this place.

\(^1\) I fail to find this place, and there is great doubt as to the correct reading. One of the oldest copies has كُرْكَ as above, the second كُرْكَ, the third is minus a whole line, and another copy has كُرْكَ—Karaku or Kuruk, which certainly is the name of a place in i arānāh, between Rot-hak and Bhawānī, in Lat. 28\(^\circ\), 49\(^\prime\), Long. 76\(^\circ\), 22\(^\prime\), about 58 miles W. of Dihlī. Other copies of the text have what appears to be كُرْكَ.

\(^2\) In some copies he is also styled Bahā-ul-Ḥak̄ wa ud-Dīn, instead of Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn.

\(^3\) This word, which probably refers to a tribe, a family, or tract of country, is contained in all the best copies of the text with the exception of the best British Museum MS., but is plainest in the best St. Petersburg MS. The various ways in which it is written, as near as types will permit, are as follows: معلومات معلومات معلومات. In a few copies he is also named Sanjar instead of Sunkar.

\(^4\) Thomas, however [PATHĀN KINGS OF DEHLĪ, page 125], turns him into a brother of Ulugh Khān’s!

\(^5\) It seems somewhat strange that I-yal-timish should also belong to the Ilbari tribe, as well as Ulugh Khān, his brother, and his cousin, and all be slaves of the former.

\(^6\) Our author relates how Ulugh Khān and his brother became slaves, and from whom they were purchased, but he appears not to have known much
vice before the throne, and the signs of worthiness were indicated upon his brow. He served the Sultāns of that dynasty much in every rank and degree; and, when he attained greatness, Sultān 'Alā-ud-Din, Mas'ūd Shāh, at the time he led an army from the capital towards Lohor', with the object of repelling the army of infidel Mughals which was before the walls of the fortress of Üchchah, assigned to Malik Sher Khān the fortress of Tabarhindah and the whole of its dependencies as his fief.

Afterwards, when the Karluughs wrested Multān out of the hands of Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Balban-i-Kashlū Khān, Malik Sher Khān led an army from the preserved city of Tabarhindah towards Multān, and liberated it again out of the hands of the Karluughs, and placed therein Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Din, Kurez'. Subsequently, upon several occasions, contention arose between Malik Sher Khān and Malik Balban, arising from their proximity to each other, as has been previously stated; and Malik Sher Khān wrested the fortress of Üchchah out of the hands of Malik Balban, and the whole of the territory of Sind came under the sway of Malik Sher Khān. When the Malik-i-Mu'azzam, Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam, led a body of forces towards Nāg-awr, and strife went on between Malik Sher Khān and him near the banks of the river Sind, Malik Sher Khān [retired from thence], and proceeded towards Upper Turkistān', and went to the urdū [camp] of the Mughal, and presented himself at the Court of Mangū [Kā'ān].

respecting Sher Khān's early years, or was unwilling to relate much on the subject.

7 See page 667, and page 811.
8 See also the account of Malik Balban-i-Kashlū Khān, page 782.
9 It will be seen, from this, that these great Maliks were like so many dependent kings, and had Maliks of their own. Kurez is the person who, in 648 H., sent some Mughal prisoners to Dihlī; and they were, evidently, so rare, that, even for this small mercy, Dihlī was decorated.
1 Our author gives no less than three other and different accounts of these events—one, at page 693, another at page 794, and a third in his account of Ulugh Khān, farther on. Leading "a body of forces towards Nāg-awr" is our author's mode of stating the fact of Ulugh Khān's banishment to his sief, when ousted from power by the Rayhānī plot, already referred to, and further detailed in the account of Ulugh Khān. Strife, with his cousin, seems altogether improbable, for, immediately on his return to Hind, he joined the party of his cousin, Ulugh Khān, in ousting the Rayhānī clique.
2 This whole sentence is one of the most defective in the entire work: there
He returned with honour from thence, and set out towards Lohor. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Lohor and these parts, he joined Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, son of the august Sultan Shams-ud-Dīn, Iyāl timiš. In the end, matters did not go on without disagreements between them, and Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, retired in disappointment, and his dependents and followers fell into the hands of Malik Sher Khān's train.

After that affair, Malik Sher Khān endeavoured to gain possession of Tabarhindah [again], but, as Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjār [the then feudatory], issued from the fortress [to oppose him], Malik Sher Khān was under the necessity of withdrawing again. Swift messengers went from the capital from the nobles, and a covenant and pledges were entered into, and Malik Sher Khān proceeded and presented himself at Court. Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Arsalān Khān, likewise came to the capital, and [the fief of] Awadh was assigned to him, and Tabarhindah was [again] committed to Malik Sher Khān, with the whole of the territory and fiefs which he had previously held.

For some time he remained upon that frontier, during

---

* The neighbourhood of Dihlī where our author wrote his History.
* This too is one of our author's mysteries. I shall have to refer to it again. See note 2, page 699, and note 1, page 767.
* For some further particulars respecting this Prince, whose proceedings are made a mystery of, see pages 683, 699, 818 and note 4, and pages 830 to 834. I shall have to refer to him, in connexion with the Mughals, in the last Section.

STEWART has written on the margin of the MS. I have referred to in note 9, page 776, notwithstanding it is plainly indicated who Jalāl-ud-Dīn was, that he is "Jalāl Addān King of Khwarism," who died or disappeared from the world nearly thirty-five years before!! See page 297, and note 9.

Although Lāhor is mentioned, after fourteen years' silence, as the fief of Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh—probably half-brother only of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh—in the ninth year of the latter's reign, page 700, it does not again occur. It also appears that Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, held Lāhor with foreign aid, independent of Dihlī. I shall have to refer to this matter again. The frontier here referred to indicates, as in several other places, the limits of the Dihlī kingdom in this direction—namely, the banks of the B夫h,
which contention used to go on between him and Malik Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kashlū Khān, as on former occasions. A mandate was issued from the sublime Court so that Malik Sher Khān returned to the capital; and, in order to avert strife on the frontier, the fief of Tabarhindah was entrusted to the charge of Malik Nuṣrat Khān, Sunḵar-i-Šūfī. The territory of Kol and Bhiānah, and Balārām, Jali-sar, Baltārah, Mihir and Mahāwan, and the fortress of Gwāliyūr, which is among the most famous strongholds of Islām, were placed in Malik Sher Khān's charge; and there he still is, up to the date that these pages were written, in the month of Rajab, 658 H.

May the Most High God long preserve the Sultān-i-Mu'azzām upon the throne of sovereignty!

not as it at present flows, but when it ran in its old bed. See also page 818, and note 4.

8 In the best copies ṣaḥ as above, but in one, instead of ṣaḥ we have šaḥ.
9 On the 21st of the month of Ṣafar, 657 H. See pages 712 and 788, and the account of Uluḡ Khān farther on. It is strange that such leniency was shown to Malik Balban-i-Kashlū Khān, for this was after his attempt to seize the capital, and after he had thrown off allegiance to the Dīhī kingdom, and had received a Mughal Shaḥnāh. He appears always to have been treated with the utmost consideration, and there must have been some reason for it.

1 It may not be amiss here to give an extract from the Tārikh-i-Fīrūz-Shāhī of Ziyā-ud-Dīn, respecting Sher Khān, as there may be somewhat of the leaven of correctness in it, but, at the same time, it shows that the statements of Ziyā-ud-Dīn are not to be wholly depended upon, at least for the accounts of Sultān Balban's reign. I take this from the printed text, which, in many places, is lamentably incorrect.

"After four or five years of Sultān Balban's reign [had passed], thirty years after the decease of Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn, Sher Khān, the uncle's son of Sultān Balban, who was a Khān greatly honoured, and who had become as the Sadd-i-Yājūj Mājūj [the Barrier of Gog and Magog, or Great Wall of China] to the Mughals, died."

[As Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn died in 633 H., Sher Khān, consequently, died in 663 H. According to Ziyā-ud-Dīn, himself, Balban came to the throne in 662 H., but, according to others, Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, did not die until 664 H.]

"I have heard from some credible persons, that he, Sher Khān, used not to come to Dīhī, and that Sultān Balban caused poison to be administered to him in his drink. [The word used is ʃū which is said to be a liquor made from barley and other things, a sort of beer.] This Sher Khān had built a lofty cupola at Bhaṭnār, and the fortresses of Bhaṭindah and Bhaṭnār are among the places founded by him.

"He was one of the great slaves of Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn, and one among the Chihl-gāniān—of that Sultān—Chihl—forty; gāniān—the plural form of the redundant particle used after numerals—Briggs' 'Turky tribe of

The Malik-ul-Hujab [Chief of Chamberlains], Saif-ud-Din, I-bak-i-Kashtli Khan—on whom be peace!—was the

HELQANY "!]—every one of whom became styled by the title of Khan, and Sher Khan had great confidence placed in him. From the reign of Nashir-ud-Din [Mahmud Shah], Sunnâm [in the text L2t, instead of L1—belonging to the first clause of the sentence—and 7\̣], Lohor, and Dibal-pur [in the text 7\̣Dinaal-pur !] and other seefs in the direction of the coming of the Mughals, the whole he held."

[The dependence to be placed upon the statements in this last sentence may be judged of from our author’s account above—the statement of a contemporary writer living at Dihl, who knew him personally, and the statement of one ‘who heard’ about these things ninety-five years after, and, who states that he has only taken up the history of these times from the end of Nashir-ud-Din, Mahmud Shah’s reign, where our author left off. Sher Khan did not hold these seefs during the period our author’s work embraces; and so the last years of Nashir-ud-Din, Mahmud Shah’s reign still remain a blank with Ziyâ-ud-Din, as with others.]

"He [Sher Khan] entertained many thousand well-organized and efficient cavalry in his service, and several times had he fallen upon the Mughals, turned them upside down, and dispersed them, and caused the Khutbah to be read for Sultan Nashir-ud-Din at Ghazni; and, on account of his vigilance, valour, strength, and grandeur, and the number of his followers, it was impossible for the Mughals to prowl around the frontiers of Hindustan " ! !

The statements contained in this paragraph are enough to stamp the Tarikh i-Firuz Shahi for the history of this period as utter rubbish. Our author’s statements respecting Sher Khan and the seefs he held, and of the state of the frontier on the Biâh, in the latter part of his account of Ulugh Khan, show, that these things were not true, and could not have been true. Malik Balban-i-Kashti Khan, who held Sind and Multân, and who was in league with the Mughals, is ignored altogether by Ziyâ-ud-Din; but he, like Sher Khan, was living when our author closed his history. Firishtah, probably, got his version of this absurdity about Ghazni from Ziyâ-ud-Din, only he relates it as taking place in 649 H. See page 689, and note 8.

According to Ziyâ-ud-Din, Sher Khan reduced under his subjection the Jats, Khokhars, Bhatis, the Minâis, and the Mandâhars, and was succeeded in the seef of Sunnâm by Tamur Khan, who was also one of the Chhind-gânâns. He is not the person referred to by our author, at page 741, he having died many years previously.

At page 702, he is styled Malik Kashti Khan, Saif-ud-Din, I-bak, Sultani Shamsi [i. e. the slave of Sultan Shams-ud-Din, I-yal-timish], and further entitled, "Ulugh Kutlugh, ‘A’jam-i-Bâr-Bak.”

There is no doubt, I think, but that the ’Alî-gârî inscription given by Thomas [PATHÂN KINGS OF DELHI, page 129, and by Blochmann, in his Contributions, page 40] refers to him, as his brother, Ulugh Khan, is neyer, throughout this work, styled “A’jam-i-Bâr-Bak,” but his brother did hold the office of Bâr-Bak, and is styled Kutlugh and Saif-ul-Hakk wa ud-Din. He
brother, paternally and maternally, of the Khān-i-Mu‘azzam, Ulugh Khān-i-A’zam. They were both two pearls of one shell, two suns and two moons of one exalted constellation, two rubies of one mine, two flowers of one parterre of prosperity, two Maliks of one royal Court, and two great lords of one imperial conclave. Their lineage was from the Khāns of the Ilbari; and, when the infidel Mughals acquired predominance over the countries of Turkistan and the tribes of Khīshāk, as a matter of necessity, it became incumbent on them to remove, with their families, dependents, and effects, from their accustomed place of abode.

Malik Kashī Khān-i-I-bak was the younger brother, and the Khān-i-Mu‘azzam, Ulugh Khān-i-A’zam, the elder. At this time the [future] Malik and Amir-i-Ḥājib was of tender years; and, when they [the tribe] decamped before the Mughals, on their way was marshy ground, and the [future] Malik, the Amir-i-Ḥājib, in the night, fell out of the waggon, in which he was, into the mud, and no one had the power to take him out of the quagmire, because the Mughals were at their heels. They urged forward their waggons, and he [the child] remained in that same place [where he fell]. Ulugh Khān returned to the spot where his little brother was, and took him up. A second time the Mughals came up behind them, and the [future] Malik, the Amir-i-Ḥājib, fell into their hands.

By the decrees of heaven, a merchant, having purchased him, brought him to the cities of Islām; and Ikhtiyār-ul-Mulk, Rashīd-ud-Din, Abū-Bikr, the Ḥabash [Abyssinian], who had proceeded from the Court of Dīhilī on a mission to Mīṣr [Egypt] and Baghdād 8, purchased the [future] Malik, the also held the sīf in which ‘Alī-gārḥ, otherwise Sābit gārḥ, is situated, but not until 653 H. I doubt, however, the correctness of the reading of Bālban in the inscription given in the first-named work.

The year 652 H., mentioned in the reading of this inscription, is that in which Ulugh Khān and his party, who had been ousted from power, succeeded, in the latter part of it, in regaining it; and, at this time, his brother had been recently deprived of his office, and sent to the sīf of Karah. Whoever he was, it would require a great stretch of the imagination to conceive what he had to do with China —{المالك}

8 This, evidently, is connected with the arrival of the emissaries from Baghdād with a robe of honour, from the Khalfah, for I-yal-timish, mentioned under the latter’s reign, at page 616, which see, and note 9.
Amīr-i-Ḥājib, from that merchant. Indications of rectitude were manifest on his brow, and Ikhtiyār-ul-Mulk brought him from thence 4 to the capital, Dihli, and the august Sultān [I-yal-timish] purchased him of Ikhtiyār-ul-Mulk. The lights of intellect and intelligence, and the indications of rectitude and sagacity were beaming upon his brow. These words are written from a sense of justice and truth, for, among the Turks, a Malik more sagacious, with more modesty or more constancy, the eye of beholder never gazed upon. The Most High God had graced him with divers endowments of manliness and humanity, and adorned him with laudable qualities and excellent conduct.

In wisdom and sagacity he excelled all the Wazīrs of the past, and, in valour and prowess, had placed the foot of manhood higher on the pinnacle [of perfection?] than the whole of the champions of Irān and Tūrān. May the Most High God, in the gardens of bliss on high, confer upon him pardon and mercy, and bless him; and continue the Khān-i-Mu’azzam 5 [his brother], in sway and authority, permanent and perpetual! We now come to the topic of history.

When the august Sultān purchased the [future] Malik, the Amīr-i-Ḥājib, he continued to serve in the Sultān's

I-yal-timish evidently despatched this envoy to the court of the Khalīfah of Baghdad to seek from him a deed of investiture as sovereign of Hindūstān. This was done probably after he had "secured" all his rivals, and found himself firmly established, and the person above mentioned was his envoy. The Khalī Sultān of Lakanawatī appears to have done the same. See note page 774.

4 No place mentioned, but, from what is stated above, he may have purchased him at Baghādād.

5 The Calcutta Printed Text, and two modern copies of the text, with slight variation, have the words—"who is the Bādshāh of the age, and the Shāhān-Shāh of the time" here; and, from this, Thomas says, it is a proof that this part of our author's work was written when Balban was King of Dihlī. There are, however, many proofs to the contrary, in the shape of several invocations for the reigning Sultān and for Ulugh Khan in the same sentence farther on, and a more particular proof in the fact, that this evident interpolation does not occur in two of the three oldest copies of the text, nor even in the I. O. L. MS. 1952, and R. A. S. MS. By what follows after the word Mu'azzam we need scarcely imagine, from the power which Ulugh Khan held as Deputy of the kingdom under the puppet Sultān—the former possessing and exercising the whole power in reality—that our author means that Nasir-ud-Dīn, Mahmidd Shāh, was dead, for, a few lines farther on, such a doubt is set at rest completely. Our author evidently refers to his authority as Deputy of the kingdom, and no more.