SECTION XXI.

ACCOUNT OF THE SHAMSIAH SULTANS IN HIND.

The frailest of the servants of the Divine threshold, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, Jūrjānī—God grant him the attainment of his wishes! states that, when the eternal will of God, the Most High and Holy, has willed to imprint on the forehead of a servant the signs of dominion and the light of power, and the mother of time becomes pregnant with an embryo of such a character, the gleam [characteristic] of such a burden will shine upon her brow.

When the time of her delivery arrives, and that lord of felicity becomes enveloped in the swaddling of his birthplace, joy, at the sight of that birth, becomes manifest in all things; and, from the period of his nativity to the time of his removal from this abode of service to the mansion of bliss, whether in activity or in repose, all his actions will be a source of gladness unto mankind, and of honour to both high and low. If his neck should be placed in the collar of servitude, his master becomes the possessor of affluence; and, if his footsteps venture upon journeys and in travelling stages, he will cause his companions to become the masters of prosperity, as in the case of the Patriarch Yūsuf. When Yūsuf was sold to Malik the son of Du’ar, at his

1 Our author here follows the life of men destined for sovereignty from the conception, and applies to them, somewhat blasphemously, the theory of the mār [light, &c.] of Muḥammad. The theologians assert that the first thing created was the light of Muḥammad. It shone forth from Adam’s forehead until Eve became pregnant by him of a son, when it was transferred to her. When she gave birth to the son [which? Cain or Abel?], it, of course, dwelt in him, and thus it was transferred, as the theologians aver, from the foreheads of the fathers to the wombs of the mothers, until it assumed flesh in Muḥammad. Our author has altered the theory in applying it to kings, in as far as the ray of light, which emanates from the child, shines forth from the brow of “the mother of time.”

2 In other words, when the child is born.
invocation, twenty [sons like] pearls⁸ befitting a king were strung upon the thread of his line; and, notwithstanding he came [as a slave] into the dwelling of 'Aziz, he made, in the end, his ['Aziz's] spouse Queen of Miṣr; and, forasmuch as the infant in the cradle bore testimony to the purity of his garment's skirt—"a witness of the family bore testimony"—at length, in his ['Aziz's] service, Yūsuf became the Wazīr of that kingdom.

I. SULTĀN-UL-MU'AZZAM, SHAMS-UD-DUNYĀ WA UD-DĪN, ABŪ-Ļ-MUẒAFFAR, I-YAL-TIMISH⁴, THE SULTĀN.

Since the Most High and Holy God, from all eternity, had predestined that the states of Hindūstān should come under the shadow of the guardianship of the great Sultān, the supreme monarch, Shams-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn, the shadow of God in the worlds, Abū-l-Muẓaffar, I-yal-timish, the Sultān, the right arm of the Vicegerent of God, the aider of the Lord of the Faithful⁴—God illumine his convictions and weight the balance with the effects of his equity and beneficence, and preserve the dynasty of his descendants, on whom, of those who have passed away, be peace! and may the Nāsirīyah Maḥmūdīyah sovereignty⁶ perpetually continue in security and safety from the troubles of the end of time, and from the accidents and vicissitudes of the world!—that just and munificent Sultān, upright, benefi-

³ I do not know what account of Yūsuf our author may have read, but this is different to what is contained in Ṭabarī and other writers of authority, and very different to the account given in the Kur'ān [Chap. xii.], and to his own account of Yūsuf in the first Section of this work. Yūsuf was sold for twenty pieces of silver.

⁴ Written in some few copies of the text and by some other historians I-yal-timish, and I-yal-timish in some works, but the above appears the correct mode of spelling. My oldest MS. gives the diacritical points. The first part of this compound word, which it evidently is, is the same as in I-yal-Arsalān, I-yal-dūz, &c.; and the latter part of it is the same as occurs in Kal-timish and the like. See note ², page 133. Budā'īnīf says he was so called from having been born on a night during an eclipse of the moon, and that the Turks call a child born on such an occasion I-yal-timish. I doubt this, however, for the reasons just mentioned in the beginning of this note.

⁵ Yamīn-i-Khaliṭāh U'llah, Nāṣir-i-Amīr-ul-Muminīn. See pages 617 and 624.

⁶ The sovereignty of his son, our author's patron—Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh.
cent, a zealous and steadfast warrior against infidels, the patronizer of the learned, the dispenser of justice, in pomp like Faridun, in disposition like Kubad, in fame like Kā-ūs, in empire like Sikandar, and in majesty like Bahrām, was, Yūsuf like, from out of the Ilbarī [or Albarī] tribes of Turkistan, delivered over to merchants, until, from one degree to another, he was raised to the throne of empire and seat of dominion, so that the back of the Muhammadian religion, through his sovereignty, waxed strong, and the development of the Aḥmādī faith, through his valour, acquired pre-eminence. In intrepidity he turned out another impetuous Ṭāl, and, in liberality, a second Ḥātim-i-Ṭā-i. Although the beneficent Sulṭān, Kūṭb-ud-Dīn—on whom be peace! displayed to the world the bestowal of hundreds of thousands, the august and beneficent Sulṭān, Shams-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn—may he rest in peace!—in place of every hundred thousand of his, used to bestow a hundred [times a] hundred thousand, both in capacity and in computation, as, both in this world and in the next, may be accounted [in his favour].

Towards men of various sorts and degrees, Kāzīs, Imāms, Muftis, and the like, and to darweshes and monks, landowners and farmers, traders, strangers and travellers from great cities, his benefactions were universal. From the very outset of his reign, and the dawn of the morning of his sovereignty, in the congregating of eminent doctors of religion and law, venerable Sayyids, Malikīs, Amīrs, Ṣadrs, and [other] great men, the Sulṭān used, yearly, to expend about ten millions; and people from various parts of the world he gathered together at the capital city of Dihlī, which is

---

7 What coin, whether tangah or jital, is not stated—there is a vast difference between them.

8 An author, describing Dihlī, states that, in the year 440 of Bikhāmsīf, Rājāh Anang-pāl Tūr or Tūnār—the ṣ is nasal [This is the word which, written mercifully, in some works, instead of  and  and  and  , has been mistakent for  and  See note 9, page 84, para. 2; and Elliot, vol. ii., pages 47, 426, and 427; and Thomas: Pathān Kings of Dehli, page 57]—founded the city of Dihlī, near to Indra-prastha. Subsequently, in the year 1200, or a little later, of the same era, Rāj Pithorī founded a city and fortress which were named after himself. Outside this fort, to the east, he raised a lofty structure which is still styled the Mahāl of Rāj Pithorī. In the fortress Sulṭān Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, and Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh, dwelt. The Shahr-i-Zaghān [?] or Ghiyāṣ-pūr was founded in 666 H.; and Ghiū-Khatār [—not “Mīr Gārhi,” as Cunningham calls it] in 686 H.
the seat of government of Hindūstān, and the centre of
the circle of Islām, the sanctuary of the mandates and in-
hibitions of the law, the kernel of the Muḥammadi religion,
the marrow of the Aḥmadī belief, and the tabernacle of the
eastern parts of the universe—Guard it, O God, from
calamities, and molestation! This city, through the number
of the grants, and unbounded munificence of that pious
monarch, became the retreat and resting-place for the
learned, the virtuous, and the excellent of the various parts
of the world; and those who, by the mercy of God, the
most High, escaped from the toils of the calamities sus-
tained by the provinces and cities of 'Ajam, and the mis-
fortunes caused by the [irruption of the] infidel Mughals,
made the capital—the asylum of the universe—of that sove-
reign their asylum, refuge, resting-place, and point of safety;
and, up to the present day, those same rules are observed
and remain unchanged, and such may they ever continue!

From a number of credible persons⁹ it has been heard
narrated after this manner, that, when the beneficent
Sultān, Shams-ud-Dīn, was young in years, and was called,
by command of the Most High, from the territory of
Turkistān and the families of the Ibarī [tribe] to the
empire of Islām and dominion of Hindūstān, it so hap-
pened that his father, who was named I-lam Khān¹⁰, had
numerous kindred, relations, dependents, and followers;
and [that] this [future] sovereign, from his earliest years,
was endowed with comeliness, intelligence, and goodness
of disposition to a great degree, so much so that his
brothers began to grow envious of these endowments.
They therefore brought him away from his mother and
father under the pretence that he should get sight of a
herd of horses¹. Like as in the case of Yūsuf, they said,

but it must have been begun or have been a suburb long before, as it is men-
tioned certainly over fifty years before by our author. Tughlak-ābād, the
Kushk-i-La‘l, and Fīrūz-ābād, now called the Kotilkh of Fīrūz Shāh, were
founded subsequently, besides many other additions of minor extent made. I
have not space to say more.

⁹ Often referred to, but their names never mentioned.

¹⁰ Others say his father was the head or chief of a small community among
the divisions or clans of the Iībarī tribe in Turkistān. His name is written
Yilam—μι—Khān by some writers, and I-yal—ι—Khān by others.

¹ Some say he was taken by his brothers to some garden, under pretence of
going thither for recreation and diversion.
'Why, O father, dost thou not intrust Yûsuf to us, seeing that we are true friends of his? Send him along with us to-morrow into the pastures that he may divert himself, and we will be his protectors'; and, when they brought him where the herds of horses were, they sold him to certain merchants; and some say that his uncle's sons were among the party that sold him. The merchants brought him towards Bukhârâ, and sold him to one of the kinsmen of the Sadr-i-Jahân [the chief ecclesiastic] of Bukhârâ, and, for some time, in that family of eminence and sanctity, he remained. The most beneficent of that family used to nourish him in the hall of his kindness, like his own children in infancy.

One of the trustworthy has related, saying: "'I heard from the blessed lips of that monarch himself, who said, 'On a certain occasion, one of the [above-mentioned] family gave me a small piece of money, saying: 'Go into the market and buy some grapes and bring them.' When I set out for the market, I lost by the way that bit of money; and through my youthful age, out of fear at what had happened, I fell a crying. Whilst thus lamenting, I was joined by a good Darwesh who took me by the hand, and purchased for me some grapes which he gave me; and he made me promise [saying]: 'When thou attainest unto power and dominion thou wilt ever regard devotees and ascetics with reverence, and watch over their weal.' I gave him my promise; and all the prosperity and blessings, which I acquired, I acquired through the compassionate regard of that Darwesh.'" The probability is that never

3 Kur'ân, Chap. xii.

3 Others say that his brothers and brothers' sons were concerned in this affair, and that the merchants were of Bukhârâ.

4 See Dowson, in Elliot: INDIA, vol. ii. page 320-i, who says—"'When they brought him to the drove of horses they sold him to the dealer. . . . The horse-dealers took him to Bukhârâ, and sold him to one of the relations of the chief judge of that city' &c. The printed text here is perfectly correct and as rendered above, with the exception of merchant for merchants in the first sentence. The word bâsargân does not mean "horse-dealer" any more than ass-dealer, for it signifies a merchant or trader.

Sadr also does not mean judge only: it has other meanings.

6 Being himself in this Sulțân's service, our author might have made himself acquainted with the events of his early days, instead of trusting to "one of the trustworthy," and particularly as he stood so high in the monarch's favour.
was a sovereign of such exemplary faith, and of such kind-heartedness and reverence towards recluses, devotees, divines, and doctors of religion and law, from the mother of creation ever enwrapped in the swaddling bands of dominion.

From that priestly and saintly family a merchant, whom they used to call the Bu khārā Ḥājī, purchased Shams-ud-Dīn. Subsequently, another merchant, whom they were wont to style Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, of the Tight Tunic, purchased him of the Bu khārā Ḥājī, and brought him to the city of Ghāznīn. At that period, no Turk superior to him in comeliness, commendable qualities, agreeable manners, and of such indications of intelligence and sagacity, had they brought to that capital. He was mentioned in terms of commendation to the Sulṭān-i-Ghāzī, Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Sām, and command was given [by the Sulṭān] that they should name his price. He, along with another Turk, was in one team, and the latter Turk they were in the habit of calling I-bak. The sum of a thousand dinārs of pure Ruknī gold was specified for the two.

6 The following curious anecdote is related of Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīnah, by some authors. Sulṭān I-yal-timīnah was greatly enamoured of a Turkish slave-girl in his harem, whom he had purchased, and sought her caresses, but was always unable, from some latent cause, to effect his object. This happened upon several occasions. One day he was seated, having his head anointed with some perfumed oil by the hands of that same slave-girl, when he felt some tears fall on his head from above. On looking up, he found that she was weeping. He inquired of her the cause. She replied “Once I had a brother who had just such a bald place on his head as you have, and it reminds me of him.” On making further inquiries it was found that the slave-girl was his own sister. They had both been sold as slaves, in their early childhood, by their inhuman half-brothers; and thus had Almighty God saved him from committing a great crime. Budāʿūnī states in his work, “I heard this story myself, from the Emperor Akbar’s own lips, and the monarch stated that this anecdote had been orally traced to Sulṭān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Balban himself.”

7 Compare Elliott, vol. ii. page 321. Our author must certainly have had a recent birth in his family about the time he penned this account, or have been expecting one, since he uses so many “swaddling bands.”

8 The Muntakhb-ut-Tawārīkh states that, by some accounts, the kinsman of the Šadr-i-Jahān of Bu khārā sold Shams-ud-Dīn to Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, and that some say Kūf-ud-Dīn purchased him, and took him to Hind.

9 A few copies have two thousand, but one seems to be correct. Another author says the sum was 1000 Kabīl dinārs, a second that it was 1000 for each, and Budāʿūnī says 1 lakh of tangaks. It is not to be supposed that the Sulṭān fixed the price. There were brokers whose business it was to value
The Khwājah [merchant or master], Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, of the Tight Tunic, declined selling him [Shams-ud-Dīn] for that amount; and the Sūltān commanded that no one should purchase him, and that [the sale] should be prohibited.

The Khwājah, Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, after that he had stayed at Ghaznīn a year, determined to proceed to Bukhārā, and he took Shams-ud-Dīn along with him thither, and, for another three years, he remained in Bukhārā. After that he was brought to Ghaznīn a second time, and continued there for the period of another year, because it was not permitted that any one should purchase him, until Sūltān 1 Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, after the holy war of Nahrwālah and the conquest 2 of Gujārāt, along with Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Husain-i-Khar-Mīl 3, proceeded to Ghaznīn, and heard his story. Kuṭb-ud-Dīn solicited permission from Sūltān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, to purchase him. The Sūltān replied: “Since a command has been issued that he should not be purchased at Ghaznīn, let them take him to the city of Dihlī and there he can be purchased 4.”

Kuṭb-ud-Dīn gave directions to Niẓām-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad 4, to remain behind at Ghaznīn, for the purpose of transacting some affairs of his, and, after his own determination of returning to Hindūstān, requested him, on his return, to bring along with him to Dihlī, Jamāl-ud-Dīn of the Tight Tunic, in order that the purchase of Shams-ud-Dīn might be there effected. According to Kuṭb-ud-Dīn’s command, Niẓām-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, on his return, brought them [the two slaves] along with him to the capital, Dihlī; and Malik Kuṭb-ud-Dīn purchased both slaves, and another writer says “the brokers fixed the price of the two as our author states.”

1 Malik Kuṭb-ud-Dīn then, and still a mamlūk or slave.
2 For the events of this so-called conquest, see the notes to the account of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak. The word used signifies victory, taking a city, &c., as well as conquest. The Mir’āt-i-Jahān-Numā more correctly says, after taking Nahrwālah and chastisement [notes on Bhīm Dīw. See notes 1 and 2, p. 516.
3 ʿIzz-ud-Dīn, Husain, son of Khar-mīl probably, although he may have had a brother named Naṣīr-ud-Dīn. See page 516.
4 The idiom varies considerably here in the different sets of copies of the text. Another writer says “buying or selling him in Ghaznīn is not proper, after commands to the contrary: let them take him into the Dihlī territory and there sell him.”
5 See note 3, page 516, paragraphs 6 and 7.
the Turks for the sum of a hundred thousand jital. The
other Turk, named I-bak, received the name of Tam-ghaj, and
was made Amir of Tabarhindah; and, subsequently, in the
engagement which took place between Sultan Taq-
ud-Din, Yal-duz, and that beneficient of his time—Sultan
Kutb-ud-Din, I-bak, he was killed. Shams-ud-Din, I-yal-
timish, was made Sar-i-Jan-dar [chief of the Jan-dars or
Guards'] to Kutb-ud-Din, who styled him son, and
retained him near himself, and he continued to rise in
office and in dignity daily; and Kutb-ud-Din, discerning
within him proofs of rectitude and integrity, both in move-
ment and at rest, outwardly as well as inwardly, by the
light thereof, advanced him from one position to another
until he raised him to the office of Amir-i-Shikar [Chief-

6 This sum is mentioned by several authors, but they probably copy our
author's words. Respecting the jital see note 2, page 584. If this is correct
it is evident that the jital must have been of a far higher value than there
mentioned, and much more than that assigned to it by Thomas in his
"PATHAN KINGS OF DELHI," page 160 = \( \frac{1}{2} \) of a silver tangah—about 2s.
or a rupia, or 100,000 jital = 15624 rupias. As his Khwaja had refused the
sum of 1000 rubini dinars for the two slaves, it is natural to suppose that he
would not have sold them for less than that to Kutb-ud-Din, yet, at the value
assigned to the jital by the Haft-Iklim—1280 to the rupia—Kutb-ud-Din
would have purchased them for little over 78 rupias and 8 annas, an impossible
sum. Another work, the Tagkarat-ul-Mulk, says 50 laks of jital, but even
this would be but little over 3900 rupias. The sum mentioned by Budafun is
far more probable, namely a lak of tangahs. I have given elsewhere the
meaning of rubini. See Blochmann's translation of the Ala, page 31.

The name of the other Mamluk, I-bak, is turned into Taghakh, instead of
Tamghaj, in the revised text of Firizah, and instead of Tabarhindah it has
Pathindah—\( \text{\`a} \) Firizah also asserts that Malik Kutb-ud-Din, I-bak,
gave the other slave, who bore another name, that of I-yal-timish, but the
opposite is the fact. The same writer also states that I-yal-timish accom-
ppanied his master in the expedition against Kalijnar in 599 H. Tamghaj must
have been superior in every way, at that time, to have been, at once, made
Amir of Tabarhindah.

7 The significations assigned by lexicographers to this word is armour-
bearer, but Jan-der also signifies a guardian, custodian, conservator, and the
like. Under the Suljans of Egypt it was the title of a class of officers, whose
duty was to guard the door of the Sultan, to convey and enforce his orders
with respect to Amir, and guard the prison styled the Zardah-khanah [Zard
or Zardul], in which persons of rank were confined. The Amir-i-Jan-der—
equivalent to Sar-i-Jan-der here—was the chief of these officers. This is the
title, which, in Elliot, is turned into Sirjandar Turki referred to in note 8,
page 608. See also Lane's Arabian Nights, note 1 to Chap. 3. Firizah
says the Jan-dars were the \( \text{\`a} \) which means slaves; but such cannot be cor-
rect, for Sultan Muizz-ud-Din himself was Sar-i-Jan-der to his brother Ghias-
ud-Din. The Jan-dars were generally slaves, as most trustworthy, no doubt.
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Huntsman]. Subsequently, when Gwalliyur was taken, he became Amir of Gwalliyur; and, after that, he acquired the fief of the town of Baran and its dependencies. Some time after this, as proofs of tact, energy, valour, and high-mindedness were unmistakeably displayed by him, and the beneficent Sultan, Kutb-ud-Din, I-bak, noticed and marked all these [accomplishments] in him, he conferred upon Shams-ud-Din the fief of the territory of Bud’a’un.

When the Sultan-i-Ghazi, Mu’izz-ud-Din, Muhammad, son of Sâm, returned from his campaign against Khwârazm, and when, in the engagement at And-khûd, a reverse befell the troops of Khiţâ, and the Khokhar tribes had begun to rebel and manifest contumacy, he moved from Ghaznîn for the purpose of making war on that unbelieving people. Malik Kutb-ud-Din, I-bak, in conformity with the Sultan’s orders, led the [available] forces of Hindûstân to the scene of action; and Shams-ud-Din, with the contingent troops of Bud’a’un, accompanied him.

During the engagement [which ensued], in the height of the conflict, Shams-ud-Din, in all his panoply, rode right into the water of the river Jîlam [Jhilam] in which those active rascals had made their place of shelter, and displayed great valour, and by the wounds inflicted by [his men’s?] arrows discomfited them; and his warlike feats,

8 After it was surrendered rather. See page 546. Another writer states that Baran and its dependencies were added to his fief of Gwalliyur.
9 At this time, and for some time after, the fief of the territory of Bud’a’un was the highest in the Dihli kingdom.
1 Our author in all the copies of the text, and the printed text likewise, both here, as well as under the reign of Sultan Mu’izz-ud-Din, makes the false statement, which his own words prove untrue, that the forces of Khiţâ were defeated, when Mu’izz-ud-Din was so utterly overthrown with the loss of his whole army before Andkhûd [Inddakhûd], and would have been taken captive but for the intervention of Sultan ‘Usmân of Samrîkand. Compare Elliot, vol. ii. page 322.
2 See note 1, page 481.
3 These people were converted to Muhammadanism, according to Firightah, who perhaps had no authority for so stating, previous to this. See same note, last para., page 484.
4 See note 1, page 481, para. 4.
5 Shams-ud-Din, according to another writer, having assembled together a considerable force from Bud’a’un and the Koh-pâyah, joined his master, Malik Kutb-ud-Din.
6 In some copies “rabbet rout” or “set of vagabonds,” &c. They appear to have taken shelter in one of the islands of the Jhilam.
7 The original merely mentions that “by arrow wounds he caused those
whilst in that water, reached such a pitch, that he was
despaching those infidels from the height of the waters to
the lowest depths" of Hell:—"They were drowned, and
cast into the fire [of hell]."

During that feat of agility and gallant exploit, the eye
of the Sultān-i-Ghāzi, Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of
Sām, fell on these proofs of boldness and valour, and he
directed inquiry to be made respecting his quality. When
the royal mind became enlightened on the subject of who
he was, he sent for Shams-ud-Dīn, and distinguished him
by conferring a special dress of honour upon him; and
commanded Malik Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, saying: "Treat
I-yal-timish well, for he will distinguish himself." The
Sultān further directed that they should draw up the deed
of his freedom, and regarded him with his royal counte-
nance, and conferred upon him the felicity of the free.

When Sultān Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, died at Lohor, the
Sipah-Sālar [Commander of Troops] 'Alī-i-Ismāʾīl, who
was the Amir-i-Dād [Lord Justice] of the capital city, Dihlī,
in concert with other Amirs and high officials, wrote letters

infidels discomfiture," but it can scarcely refer to the arrows he alone may have
discharged. Firīshah asserts that "he defeated the Khokhars, and killed
[his followers did?] 10,000 or 12,000 of them, and was subsequently made
Amīr-ul-Umrā;" but, unfortunately for this statement of the Dakhanī historian,
no such office or title existed in those days.

Two different words of the same signification are here used in the two sets
of copies which agree with each other, some have حسین and the others حسین.
The different copyists could scarcely have been the cause of these differences in
the idiom which are very numerous throughout our author's work.

Kūrān, chap. Ixxi. verse 25.

There was no such Europeanized term in those days as "commander-in-
chief," and, if there were, there would have been a great number of commanders,
for the term Sipah-Sālar is applied to several persons often at one and the
same time. One of the oldest copies of the text calls 'Alī-i-Ismāʾīl [i. e. 'Alī,
out the word Sipah-Sālar altogether, and that reading would remove all
difficulty, but it is a solitary instance, for all the others have Amīr-i-Dād. Dād
certainly means justice, equity, &c., and perhaps the person in question may
have heard complaints and disposed of them with the aid of Muftis and
Īāls; but the command of troops seems incompatible with the office of
judge. Some other authors say the Sipah-Sālar 'Alī-i-Ismāʾīl, and the Amīr-
i-Dād, and other grandees and officials, invited him to come to Dihlī and
assume the sovereignty, and some say 'Alī-i-Ismāʾīl was governor of Dihlī,
and they style the other Amīr Dāʾīd. Another writer says "Amīr of Dihlī,"
which is more probable. Firīshah, according to the revised text, has "Amīr
Dāʾīd, the Dīlāmī." The latter word is absurd here. See note 4, page 529.
to Shams-ud-Din, I-yal-timish, at Budain, and besought him [to come thither and assume authority]. Having come, he ascended the throne of the kingdom of Dihli in the year 607 H., and took possession of it. As the Turks and Kuftbi Amirs from different parts had gathered together before Dihli, and some of the Turks and Mu'izzI Amirs had also united with them, and were intent upon resistance [to this usurpation of authority on the part of I-yal-timish], they left Dihli, and came out, and they [all] combined in the immediate neighbourhood, and broke out into sedition and rebellion. The august Sultan Shams-ud-Din, with the cavalry of the centre [contingents forming the centre division of the Dihli troops] and his own immediate followers, issued from the city of Dihli, and, in front of the plain of Jud, overthrew them, and put most of the leaders [of the party] to the sword.

2 Compare Elliot, vol. ii., page 323.
3 The Taj-ul-Ma'asir says, in its usual inflated style, that "the Sar-i-Jandar, who was a Turk [he was not named Sirjandar Turk]," as in Elliot, vol. ii., page 237—for Sar-i-Jandar is the office this Turk held, see note 7, page 603], who was the head of all sedition, and who put forth his arm to shed Musalmân blood, with a body of sanguinary Turks [the Turks in the service of the Ghurian Sultans were Musalmans], broke out into rebellion. Although the Sultan had been often urged to repulse their outbreak, he refrained, for some time, from doing so. At length he resolved to reduce them, and with a considerable army," &c.

This is no other than the affair mentioned under the account of Sultan Aram Shâh, which see. What our author here means to say is, that those Turks and Mu'izzI and Kuftbi Amirs, and men of note, then in Dihli, did not join the Shamsi party, and they left the city and joined the partisans of the late Sultan's son, or, rather, adopted son, Aram Shâh. The Amirs and Turks, however, were not finally reduced till some time after. See next page.

Another writer states that most of the Kuftbi Amirs submitted, but that some of them, in concert with several Mu'izzI Amirs who were in Dihli and parts around, rose, collected together, and came to an engagement with Shams-ud-Din and his party; but their efforts were without avail, and they were defeated and put to the sword.

The Taj-ul-Ma'asir states that the battle was fought close to the Bagh-i-Jân [Jud?] near the capital, but other authors I have been quoting from time to time agree with the more modern copies of the text, and say it occurred in the Jân plain [waste plain, &c.]; but all the oldest copies have as above. The Bagh-i-Jân, not Jân, is often mentioned by our author.

The Zubdat-ut-Tawirikh says the defeated Amirs were put to death at different times. See page 529, and note 4.

4 Some few modern copies and the printed text have "and directed that their heads should be brought under the sword," but there is not a word about their "horsemen." Firighatb says two of the principal Amirs, Ak-Sunkar
Subsequently to this, Sultan Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, from Lōhor and Ghaznīn entered into a compact with him, and sent him a canopy of state and a Dūr-bāsh. Between Sultan Shāms-ud-Dīn and Malik [Sultan] Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Kabā-jah, contention used continually to arise for the possession of Lohor, Tabarhindah, and Kuhrām; and, in the year 614 H., the former inflicted a defeat upon Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Kabā-jah.

Upon several other occasions, in different parts of the territories of Hindūstān, hostilities arose between him [Shāms-ud-Dīn] and the Amīrs and Turks; but, as the favour of the Most High was his aider and defender, He used to award victory to him, and all those who used to revolt against him, or rebel against his authority, used to be reduced. The Divine assistance and protection having, for a considerable time, been extended towards him, Sultan and Farrukh Shāh, were killed, and that the Sar-i-Jān-dār fled with some others. The same author also states, contrary to his predecessors, that in 608 H. I-yal-timīsh marched against the ruler of the Kāshāh [I] of Jālūr—who bore the name of Ūdfsah [Ūdf Sah?], reduced him and extorted tribute! His authority for this is not given. At this period I-yal-timīsh was scarcely master of the Dīhil kingdom.

This passage is thus rendered in ELLIOT, vol. ii. page 323. "Sultan Tāju-ud-dīn made a treaty with him from Lahore and Ghazni and sent him some insignia of royalty."

The Dūr-bāsh here referred to, which literally signifies "stand aside!" and does not mean "baton," was a kind of spear with two horns or branches, the wood of the staff of which used to be studded with jewels and ornamented with gold and silver. This used to be carried before the sovereign when he issued forth, in order that people, perceiving it from a distance, might know that the king was coming, and that they might make way for him by standing on one side. In battle also it was carried, so that, in case any one should cast a lasso—which was made of leather, and continued in use down to nearly recent times—in the direction of the king, it might, by the Dūr-bāsh, be turned aside. Some others say, a canopy of state and other emblems of royalty were sent to I-yal-timīsh.

Firūghtah states that I-yal-timīsh accepted a canopy of state and a standard from the Ḥākīm of Ghaznīn for the latter's honour's sake! The Dakhani historian truly is a very great authority!

Tāj-pd-Dīn, I-yal-duz, was strong and powerful at this time, and the probability is that Shāms-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh, sought to be recognized by him as ruler of Ghaznīn in succession to Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, thinking that such recognition would tend to make the Mu'izzīf chief and Turks more compliant to his rule. Ghīyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, Mu'izz-ud-Dīn’s nephew, at this time was either dead—for there is great discrepancy as to dates—or he was powerless. See note 8, page 526, para. 5.

Hindūstān refers here to the country immediately east of Dīhil, the Do-īb of Antarbed, &c.
Shams-ud-Din brought under his jurisdiction all the different parts of the kingdom, and the dependencies of the capital, Dihlī, together with Budā’ūn, Awadh, Banāras, and the Siwālikh.

Sultān Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, being obliged to evacuate [his territory] before the Khwārazmī army, retired towards Lohor; and between him and Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn, hostilities arose about the boundaries [of their dominions], and an engagement took place between their respective armies at Tarā’in, in the year 612 H., and Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn was victorious. Sultān Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, was taken prisoner, and, in accordance with his [Shams-ud-Dīn’s] command, they brought Yal-duz to Dihlī, and sent him [from thence] to Budā’ūn, and there he was buried.

1 Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, came into the Lāhor province and took possession of it and its capital, and ousted the followers of Kābā-jah. See page 505.

2 This engagement took place in the neighbourhood of Tarā’in, the scene of Sultān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn’s defeat and subsequent victory over Rāc Pithorā. The Tāj-ul-Ma’āṣir says, at this time, Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīgh, was about to undertake an expedition against some part of the Hindū territories as yet unsubdued, or some Hindū chief, who, during the late disturbances consequent on the death of Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, and the dethronement of his son [adopted son], by Shams-ud-Dīn, had freed himself from the Musalmān yoke. See ELLIOT, vol. ii. page 239, note 1, where these Turks—Turkish slaves or Turkish chiefs, such as are referred to under Ārām Shāh’s reign—are turned into uncrowned [for which there is not a shadow of authority] Turks, and are made out to have caused a revival of Hindū power, because, in the flatulent words of the Tāj-ul-Ma’āṣir, one, who is styled [not in the original however] Sirjándār Turki, “opened his hand to shed the blood of Musalmāns.” In the meantime, Sultān Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, in 611 H., made some demands upon Shams-ud-Dīn, who, from the fact of his accepting the dūr-bāsh and canopy of state, had acknowledged his superiority. Shams-ud-Dīn, being unwilling to accept these demands, whatever they were—for they are not specified in any author—I-yal-duz, who had possessed himself of the Panjāb, advanced as far as Thānsar, resolved to enforce them, and was moving upon Dihlī, when Shams-ud-Dīn, now sufficiently powerful to resist them, resolved to oppose him, and advanced to Sāmānd [Sāmānah?], and the troops of the two kingdoms encountered near Tarā’in on the 3rd of Shawa’l, 612 H. I-yal-duz’s troops fell suddenly upon the left wing of the Dihlī troops during the engagement [they did so probably at the outset], but I-yal-duz was wounded by an arrow aimed at him by the Mu’ayyid-ul-Mulk [this is his title only—the name is wanting. I-yal-duz’s own Wazīr bore that title, which is one given to Wazīrs], and I-yal-duz’s forces were defeated, and he was himself taken prisoner.

3 Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, was taken to Dihlī to be paraded, and was sent away to the fortress of Budā’ūn. Why he was sent there—the fief of Budā’ūn had been so long Shams-ud-Dīn’s—is obvious enough. Our author too
Subsequently, in the year 614 H., Shams-ud-Din fought an engagement with Malik [Sultān] Nāsir-ud-Din, Kābājah, and the latter was overthrown; and, when the calamities, consequent upon the appearance of Chingiz Khān, the Mughal, fell upon Khurāsān, in the year 618 H., Sultān Jalāl-ud-Din, Khwārazm Shāh, defeated by the army of infidels, retired in the direction of Hindūstān. The sedition of the Khwārazm Shāhis reached the limits of [the province of] Lohor; and Sultān Shams-ud-Din marched from Dihli towards Lohor with the forces of Hindūstān, and Sultān Jalāl-ud-Din, Khwārazm Shāh, having turned aside buries him silently without mentioning his death. The Tabakat-i-Akbarf and a few others say that he was kept at Budā'ūn until he died, but others state that he was put to death there in the same year. The Tāj-ul-Ma'āṣir which was written at that period, at Dihil, of course, is silent on this part of the subject. See page 505, note 8, and page 506.

1 Budā'ūn makes a great blunder about this affair: he says this was the third time Shams-ud-Din had marched against Kābājah, in 614 H., and that the latter was drowned in the Panj-āb [the five rivers] in 615 H. The Taškara-i-Mulūk says the first notice Kābājah had of Shams-ud-Din's hostility was his appearance on the frontier of his province of Uchchah in 614 H. See note 6, page 534.

2 Faṣīḥ-ī says in 617 H., but that some say 618 H. The best St. Petersburg copy of the text has 620 H.

3 At this period, and for sometime after, the frontier of the Dihil kingdom only extended to the Makhsīlah Hills or Salt Range. See note 1, page 534.

4 In his account of Sultān Jalāl-ud-Din, page 293, our author says, Shams-ud-Din "despatched a force from his armies" against him. In the former place the words used are ابی—here فارسیا—Farsiā Compare ELLIOT, vol. ii. page 324.

The words used here in all the copies, and in the printed text also, are which mean "turned aside," and "sent before," is incorrect, and the text says nothing whatever about "some fighting followed on the frontiers of Lahore": the words are خوازوشمان. Compare ELLIOT, vol. ii. page 324.

Sultān Jalāl-ud-Din had only about 10,000 men with him: otherwise, from the easy way in which he overthrew Kābājah, there is great probability that, being of Turkish lineage himself, on his mother's side, the Turks in Hindūstān might have gone over to him, and he would have overthrown the kingdom of Dihil. All that the "august" Sultān appears to have done was to have Jalāl-ud-Din's envoy put to death—some say he had him poisoned—under pretence that he was plotting against him, then, in order to gain time, sending an emissary with rich presents to mollify the Sultān, and, in order to try and get him into his power, offering him an asylum near Dihil—an asylum possibly like I-yal-dūs met with at Budā'ūn—a tomb. No doubt Shams-ud-Din got troops ready, and no doubt despatched some towards the Panjāb, but he did not go himself to face Jalāl-ud-Din. See note 8, page 293. The Khulāṣat-ut-Tawāriḵ states that Jalāl-ud-Din did actually invest Lābor for a time.

The Taškara of Daulat Shāh, quoted by Elliot, says Sultān Jalāl-ud-Din was joined whilst in the Sind-Sāgar Do-ābah by the Lakhsī Hazārahs,
from the host of Hindūstān, marched away towards Sind and Siwastān.

After these events, in the year 622 H., Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn marched an army towards the territory of Lakhana-waṭl, and [Sulṭān] Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, Khalji, placed the neck of service within the yoke of subjection, and presented thirty elephants and eighty laks of treasure, and read the Khubthah, and stamped the coin, in the sacred name of the august Sulṭān, Shams-ud-Dīn.

In the year 623 H., the Sulṭān determined to take the fort of Rantabhār, which, for its exceeding strength, solidity, and impregnability, is famous and notorious throughout all numbering 700 men, from the neighbourhood of Balkh, and that the ruler of Multān [Kābī-jah] made peace with Jalāl-ud-Dīn; and, what is more astonishing, that 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Kai-Κubād, the son of the king of Hind, gave Jalāl-ud-Dīn his daughter in marriage, and the latter maintained power in Hind for three years and seven months. Here is a perfect jumble of events, and the Khokhar chief has been mistaken for the "King of Hind."

A European writer however [D'Ahsson] makes still greater blunders. He says that, when Jalāl-ud-Dīn heard that Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish, was moving "to the assistance of Kubacha," he went to meet him, but, instead of fighting, I-yal-timish proposed peace and the hand of his daughter, which were both accepted by the Sulṭān! See note 1, para. 2, page 293. Here Burāk, the Hājib, governor of Kirmān, is mistaken for I-yal-timish!

One would scarcely conceive, from this, that Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn annexed great part of the Panjāb and Sind, and that he remained nearly three years in those parts, and only left them, on the despatch of a great army of Mughals against him, and the fact of his presence being much required in Irāq. See the reign of Jalāl-ud-Dīn, pages 285—299.

Elphinstone, led astray by some translation probably, for no History makes such a statement, makes several terrible errors here. He has: "In the same year with this expedition to Sind [It took place two years after the Lakhana-waṭl affair, in 624.5 H.], Altamsh marched against Bakhtiār Khilji [Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, who is here referred to, had been then dead twenty years], who looked upon Behār and Bengal as his own conquest; and, though he professed obedience to Kubu dīn (to whose daughter he was married), openly disclaimed all dependence on his successor. [It was I-yal-timish—his Altamsh—not Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, who married Kust-ud-Dīn's daughter.] Altamsh was successful in this undertaking; he deprived Bakhtiār of Behār, (the government of which he conferred on his own son,) and obliged him to hold Bengal under the crown of Dehli. Bakhtiār made a subsequent attempt to retrieve his losses, was defeated by the prince who governed Behār, and lost his life in the conflict." Thus Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, Muḥammad, son of Sherān, 'Alī, son of Mardān, and Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz—four different rulers are made one. This truly is pretty history "to teach the young idea!" See pages 574 and 594, and note 2.

There is not a word about "current coin" in the text, but the Tabakat-i-Akbar and some authors who copy from it say, 80,000 silver tanyaks. See note 2, page 584.
Hindūstān. They have narrated in the Chronicles of the people of Hind after this manner, that seventy kings and more had appeared [at various times] at the foot of its walls, and not one of them had been able to reduce it. After some time, however, in the year 623 H., it was taken by the hands of the Sultan’s servants, through the favour of the Creator. A year subsequent to this, in 624 H., he marched against the fort of Mandawar within the limits of the Siwālikh [territory], and its capture, likewise, the Almighty God facilitated for him, and he came back, and much booty fell into the hands of the servants of his dynasty.

Subsequently, in 625 H., the august Sultan Shams-ud-Din, I-yal-timish, came with an army from the capital city, Dihlī, into the territories of Úchchah and Multān; and the writer of these words, the Maulānā Minhāj-i-Sarāj, in the

---

9 According to the Tāj-ul-Ma‘āṣir, Rantabhūr was in the possession of the Musalmāns in the time of Sultan Mu‘izz-ud-Din. See Elliot: vol. ii. page 219, and note 3, page 516, para 4. 1 Months in some copies of the text.

2 This remark shows that he was not himself present there.

3 The oldest copies are as above—but some others have Mandū, and the Tabakat-i-Akbarī has Mandawar; while Budā‘īnī, who copies from it, has Mandū in some copies, and Mandawar in others; and adds that I-yal-timish annexed, with that stronghold, the Koh-i-Siwālikh. Mir‘at-i-Jahān-Numā says, "Mandawar with all the forts and kashāk of the Siwālikh." Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh has "Mandawar— which is totally incorrect—and all Siwālikh."

Our author, at page 468, mentions "the seat of government, Ajmīr, with the whole of the Siwālikh [territory], such as Hānsī, Sursūṭh, &c.; and includes the whole tract of country south of the Himālayah, between the Ganges and the Sutlaj, and extending as far south as Hānsī in the Siwālikh or Koh-i-Siwālikh; and at page 200 he states that Nāg-awr is in the Siwālikh also. Some writers state that the Siwālikh extends as far west as the borders of Kasgīrī. See note 4, page 468; and Elliot, vol. ii. page 325, note 1. Tod says: "Mundore [Mandawar] was the capital of the Purīhara," and capital of Mārwār, "five miles N. of Jodpur." There is no doubt but that this is the place, the ruins of which indicate what its immense strength must have been at the time in question. It is described in Tod, vol. i. page 721; and in another place he says it was taken from "Mokul," the Purīhara prince, by "Rahup," who "obtained Cheetore in S. 1257 (A.D. 1201), and shortly after sustained the attack of Shemsudin [Sultan Shams-ud-Din is referred to], whom he [Rahup] met and overcame in battle at Nagore." Of course I who could defeat Rājpūts? Shams-ud-Din did not come to the throne for nine years after the above date. There is a Mandawar—2;—even now, a large kashāk, with extensive buildings of burnt brick, and several great masjīdī, the remains of former days, on the route between Dārā-nagar and Sahāran-pūr, included in the Siwālikh as above mentioned, but not the place here referred to.
month of Rajab, in the year 624 H., had reached the territories of Sind, Üchchah, and Multān, from the side of Ghūr and Khurāsān. On the 1st of Rabī‘-ul-Awwal, 625 H., the august Sultān, Shams-ud-Din, I-yal-timish, reached the foot of the walls of the fort of Üchchah. Malik [Sultān] Naṣīr-ud-Din, Kāba-jah, had his camp pitched before the gate of the kašbah [town] of Ahrawat, and the whole of his fleet and boats, on board of which the baggage and followers of his army were embarked, were moored in the river in front of the camp, when, on a Friday, after [noon-day] prayers, swift messengers arrived from the direction of Multān and gave information that Malik Naṣīr-ud-Din, Ai-ytim, the feudatory of Lohor, had appeared before the walls of Multān.

The august Sultān, Shams-ud-Din, having set out by way of Tabārhindah towards Üchchah, the capital of Malik [Sultān] Naṣīr-ud-Din, Kāba-jah, he fled to his fleet, and, taking along with him all his forces, retired towards

---

4 See note 4, page 544, where he contradicts this statement, and mentions other dates. Chingiz Khān died in 624 H. Several authors, including that of the Tabākāt-i-Akbari and his protégé, Budā‘īnīf, leave out this expedition of I-yal-timish against Kāba-jah; but drown the latter in 614 H., having confounded the first hostilities between them with the last. See note 4, page 532.

6 At page 541 he says he came "from Khurāsān by way of Ghaznīn and Banfān."

8 In his notice of Malik Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ai-ytim, in Section XXII., our author also says 625 H., but at page 541 he says 624 H. Under the account of Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Gazlak Khān, in the same Section, our author contradicts his statement here made, and says that this Malik was the first of the nobles of the Dhib dynasty with whom he came into contact, and that he arrived before Üchchah with troops fifteen days before Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn’s arrival, and that he—the author—came out of Üchchah and went to his camp to obtain an interview with Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn on the 16th of Shārī, 625 H. At the bottom of the same page, however, he makes another statement, and gives 628 H. as the date, and, over leaf, a different statement.

7 This place is not now known, and the correct pronunciation may be Ḩrāwat. In some copies it is written Ahrawat, in others Ahurat, and in one Harwat; but it is evidently the same word, with the first letter left out by the copyist. The courses of the rivers in this tract have greatly altered since these days.

8 This is the meaning of the word şefī here used, but facing or opposite would be more appropriate; as, wherever the camp might have been pitched, it would have its front, not its rear, to the land.

9 In the account given of this chief, in the next Section, the vowel points are given with the word ܡܠ. Some few copies have what appears like ܡܠ—but what is supposed to be ܡܠ is but the end of the letter ܡ carelessly written.

1 He succeeded in getting possession of that stronghold by capitulation, and the dependencies at once followed.
Bhakar, with orders to his Wazir, the 'Ain-ul-Mulk, Ḥusain-i-Asha'rf, to convey the treasure contained within the fort of Uchchah towards the fort of Bhakar. Sultan Shams-ud-Din pushed forward the van of his forces to the foot of the walls of Uchchah, under the [two] great Maliks at the head of those troops, one [of whom] was Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Muḥammad-i-Sālārī, who was the Amir-i-Ḥajib [Lord Chamberlain] of the Court, and the other, Malik Tāj-ud-Din, Sanjar-i-Gazlak Ḫān, Sultan Shamsī, who was the Malik of Tabarhindah. Four days after this, the Sultan himself, with the rest of the army, the elephants, baggage, and followers, arrived before the walls of Uchchah, and the camp was pitched. The Wazir of his kingdom, the Nizām-ul-Mulk, Muḥammad, Junaidī, and other Maliks, were then despatched towards the fort of Bhakar in pursuit of Malik [Sultan] Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḫabā-jah.

For a period of three months, hostilities went on at the foot of the fortress of Uchchah; and, on Tuesday, the 28th [of the sacred month, Jamādi-ul-Awwal, in the year 625 H.], that fort surrendered on terms of capitulation. Malik [Sultan] Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḫabā-jah, in that same month,
of Jamādi-ul-Awwal, in the same year, threw himself from
the walls of the fortress of Bhakar into the Panj-āb, and
drowned himself. Some time previous to this, he had
despatched his son, Malik ʿAlā-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, to
the presence of Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīṣh; and,
subsequently to that, the treasures and the remainder of
the followers of Malik [Sulṭān] Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḫabā-ījah,
reached the presence of the Court, the Asylum of the
World.

That country [Sind], as far as the shore of the ocean, was
acquired, and Malik Sinān-ud-Dīn, Ḡāṭǐ-sar [or ḽaṭ-sar], *

* The three oldest and best copies of the text have Ḡāṭǐ-sar—Ãţr—and
Ẓaṭ-sar—ståţ—respectively. Of the other copies, taking the best in rota-
tion, one has Ṣṭr—which is evidently intended for one of the two former,
because the three points, which look like that of Ṣ—are intended to mark Ṣ
thus 隳—in distinction to $j$—and to prevent it being mistaken for the latter
letter; another Ṣṭr—a third Ṣṭr—and the rest Ṣṭr—which has been read
as Ḥabash, which means an Abyssinian. The Sūmrah were, however, not
Africans, but of Rāj-pāt descent. All Ṣṭr has Ṣ— but not very distinct, and
Jāmī’-ut-Tawārīḵ—jāmī—without points.

The historians of Sind state that that territory, up to the year 583 Ḥ.,
acknowledged the sway of the Ghaznavīs, and that, on the downfall of the
last of that dynasty, his dominions fell to Sulṭān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad,
Ghūrī [Muʿizz-ud-Dīn’s elder brother], and Sind was then included in the
Mūltān province; but all Sind cannot be meant here—not what we under-
stand by Sind. Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, brother of Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, as early as
578 Ḥ. [see note 2, page 452], had reduced the territory of Dīwāl or Dībāl.
Mr Maṭṭūm says that, after Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn’s assassination, Ḵub-ud-
Dīn, I-bak, possessed himself of Hind and Sind, and held sway over them,
and the Ḫuṭbāh was read for him, fourteen years [four, no doubt, is meant],
after which his son, Ārām Shāh, succeeded him, but he was dethroned from
incapacity, and Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīṣh, raised to the sovereignty. “At
this period,” he continues, “the territory of Hindūstān was divided into four
states [that portion of Hindūstān under Musalmān sway rather]—Dīhī, which
pertained to Shams-ud-Dīn; Mūltān, ʿOchāchā, and Sind, to Ḫabā-ījah;
Lāhor, to the officers of I-yal-dūṣ, Sulṭān of Ghazmīn; and Lakhānawatī, to
the Khālji.” He then passes on to the Khālji in Sīwastān, and Shams-ud-
Dīn’s invasion of Ḫabā-ījah’s dominions. See note 6, page 542, para. 6.

Previous to this time, however, Dībāl, or Lower Sind [Ṭḥāṭhāh was not even
founded at this period], had fallen into the hands of the Sūmrah tribe, which
paid, nominally at least, allegiance to the Ghaznavīs. Before the downfall
of that dynasty, Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Ghūrī, subdued that territory; but still the
Ghūrīs hold upon it was nominal almost.

Of the Sūmrah dynasty no less than seventeen chiefs ruled in Lower Sind,
according to the Muntakḥab-ut-Tawārīḵ of Muḥammad Yūṣuf; and, as near
as can be computed, from the years they are said to have reigned, the eleventh
of that dynasty, who lived at the time Shams-ud-Dīn ruled at Dīhī, was named
Chānsār—ṣār—but this might be, and in all probability is meant for
—there being but the difference of the dot of w between them. It is,
who was Wālī [ruler] of Diwal, presented himself at the Shamsī Court; and, when the blessed mind of that monarch became disengaged through the successes [gained] in that territory, he turned his face towards the sublime seat of government, the city of Dīhī.

The author of this book, and writer of these pages, gained the presence of the sublime Court of that monarch of the orthodox, on the first day that the royal camp was pitched before the walls of the fort of Ùchchah; and, having found favour in his sacred sight, when the royal camp moved back again from before the walls of Ùchchah, the author was directed to deliver discourses within the enclosure of the sublime tents; and, in association with the victorious retinue of that benificent sovereign, he arrived at the city of Dīhī in the month of Ramażān, 625 H.¹

therefore, perfectly clear, that the name given by our author refers to the eleventh of the Sūmrah rulers, but the fourteenth according to the Tuhfat-ul-Kirām. Ḥabash, of course, is totally out of the question. See also Elliot, vol. i. page 485; and vol. ii. note ², page 389; and Thomas: Pathān Kings, page 99, note ⁴.

² To pay court to the winning side, and, afterwards, as far as our pious author was concerned, the son of Kābā-jah, and the Firuz College too, might follow Kābā-jah to the bottom of the Indus.

¹ It has already been mentioned [note ², para. 6, page 542] that one reason—or, at least, the plea—why I-yal-timīgh attacked Kābā-jah again, and marched against Ùchchah, was, that the Khalīj fugitives, after their defeat by Kābā-jah, and their chief had fallen in the battle, threw themselves upon his protection. This happened towards the end of 623 H., and, early in 625 H., I-yal-timīgh appeared before Kābā-jah’s capital.

If our author is correct as to the Sultan’s leaving Ùchchah for Dīhī, the Tāj-ul-Ma’āṣir [and Ražat-ul-Ṣafā], which copies it probably is very much out; for that work states that I-yal-timīgh left the Wazīr to carry on the operations, and reached Dīhī again on the 14th of Rabī-ul-Awwal [the third month] of 624 H.; whilst our author says he reached the capital in Ramażān [the ninth month] of 625 H., a difference of eighteen months. One of the oldest copies of the text, however, has 626 H., while the other two oldest leave out the rest of the sentence after the word “Dīhī,” thus giving no date.

Mir Maʿṣūm, in his History, says:—“I-yal-timīgh left his Wazīr to carry on operations against Ùchchah, and returned to his capital, thus agreeing with Tāj-ul-Ma’āṣir, and that it capitulated, and was taken possession of on the 28th of Jamād-ul-Awwal [fifth month] of 625 H.” It was the Wazīr who advanced against Bhaqar and penetrated into Lower Sind, and, therefore, it is impossible that Sinān-ud-Dīn, Chattfars or Jatisar, the Sūmrah chief of Dīhī, could have presented himself at the Shamsī Court, when the Sultan did not go farther south than Ùchchah. He did so to the Wazīr probably, or to the subsequent governor of the new conquest.

The Tāj-ul-Ma’āṣir further states that, at this time [of the Wazīr’s invasion of Lower Sind], twelve celebrated forts, which had never before been acquired,
At this time, emissaries from the Khalifah's Court, bearing honours rich and ample, had reached the limits of Nāg-awr; and, on Monday, the 22nd of the month of Rabī‘-ul-Awwal, 626 H., they reached the Capital. The city was decorated [for the occasion] and this sovereign, and the Maliks, his sons—may they rest in peace!—and other Maliks, his suite, and Slaves likewise, were honoured through this act of policy [on the part] of the Khalifah's Court.

After so much festivity and rejoicing, in the month of Jamādī-ul-Awwal, of the before-mentioned year [626 H.],

were taken possession of with Sīwastān and Lūk, as far as the shores of the ocean; and that the Khūṭbah was read for the Sulṭān, and the coin was stamped with his titles and name through all the countries of Hindūstān [1], and in the territories of Kūdār and Mūkrān! The Wazīr, according to Mīr Maṣūm, was left in charge of the government of Sind, and remained in that country up to the year 630 H., when he returned to Court, leaving Nūr-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, in charge of Sind.

Our author, however, in his notice of Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Gazlak Khān, who accompanied the Wazīr in his advance upon Bhakar, states that he, not the Wazīr, was left in charge of the newly-acquired territory; and he is, doubtless, correct. The Wazīr had other duties to perform, and Mīr Maṣūm has evidently mistaken the one for the other.

No doubt the new governor extended the Shamsī authority in those parts, but it was very temporary, and ceased almost with the reign of I-yał-timish. Lūk is the place referred to at page 200, and has no connexion either with the town, district, or mountains of Lakkī in Sind. There is, I think, some connexion between the Lakh tribe of Kurds, at that time, and subsequently, located in the southern part of Sijistān, and Kīrmān, mentioned at page 317, note[5].

3 Budā‘ūnī, who differs from all other writers, here, and contrary to the work of his patron, says these were ‘Arab envoys from Mīṣr, bearing with them a dress of honour and honorary titles [a diploma conveying them], but the ‘Abbāsī Khalīfah of Baghdaḍ, not of Mīṣr, was the sender—the Khalīfah, Abū Ja‘far-i-Manṣūr, entitled Al-Mustanṣīr B‘llah, the 36th ‘Abbāsī—the Ubaidd Ismā‘īlī Khalīfah of Mīṣr terminated in 567 H.

3 When the inhabitants of eastern cities are ordered to decorate their houses on the occasion of rejoicings such as above indicated, the tradespeople, in particular, deck out their shops by hanging out rich shawls, brocades, fine dresses, all kinds of costly articles of merchandize, and even the ornaments and trinkets of their women. Lamps and flags, attached to cords, are drawn across the streets, and the doors and lower parts of private dwellings painted in the gayest colours procurable. The ābād Khābārī, followed by Fīrāshṭah and others, says Kubbahs—arches, domes, &c. — were erected on this joyful occasion.

According to the translation of this passage in our author in ELLIOT, vol. ii. page 326, the city was only “adorned with their presence;” but the printed text, in this instance, is quite correct, and, like the other copies of the text, has which means “to prepare,” “to adorn,” and the like.

4 Several copies of the text, including the printed text, with but two exceptions, have צוות—dress of honour—for צוות — service, also action, pro-
information arrived of the decease of the august Malik, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, [the eldest son of Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn]; and Balkā Malik-i-Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, cadre, policy, &c. It is ridiculous to imagine that honorary dresses would have been sent by the Khalīfah for all the Princes, Malikṣ, the Sulṭān's suite, and his Slaves. Confering such honours broadcast would have lessened the honour. Dresses might have been sent for the Sulṭān's sons, but even this was unusual. The Tāj-ul-Ma'āṣīr's statement about this event is the most reliable. It says that the Imām, Mustanṣır B'ilāh, sent I-yal-timīṣ a dress of honour, and a diploma confirming him in the sovereignty of Hindūstān, with the title of "Great Sulṭān, which was received with much veneration. Next day, 23rd of Rabī'-ul-Awwal, 626 H., was fixed for a general reception, at which the Khalīfah's diploma was read in the presence of the Sulṭān, his sons, and great nobles. In this diploma it was declared that I-yal-timīṣ was thereby confirmed in the possession of all the territory which he had subdued. Great joy was manifested on this auspicious occasion, and the Sulṭān conferred robes of honour upon the Khalīfah's envoys, and his own chiefs and nobles."

What led to the arrival of these agents is not stated by historians, but it is probable that I-yal-timīṣ sought this investiture from the Khalīfah, and a title, considering his dynasty sufficiently established to warrant it, when he, some years before, despatched an agent to the Court of Baghdād, or that the Khalīfah had some policy of his own to serve in sending it. We may presume that the title bestowed was that mentioned by our author at page 624; but that is the same as bestowed by Mustanṣır's predecessor, Un-Nāṣir, upon Sulṭān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām. Towards the end of the reign of I-yal-timīṣ, the Wazīr-ship is said to have been conferred upon the Fakhru'l-Mulk, 'Īṣāmī, who for thirty years had been Wazīr of Baghdād. He became irritated through some cause or other, left the Khalīfah's court, and came to Dihlī, which was not quite such an Ultima Thule as one modern writer supposes, the Khustbah being read weekly for the Khalīfah.

That is to say, Balkā Malik, son of Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz [Sulṭān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz], the Khalīj. In some copies of the text the date is 627 H., but, in the oldest, and, in the majority, it is 628 H.

The hold, acquired over the territory of Lakhanawatī by I-yal-timīṣ, appears to have been of a very partial and temporary character; and the events, which happened subsequently to his accommodation with Sulṭān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, after he extorted tribute, as mentioned on a previous page, are involved in much obscurity for many years subsequently. In the first place, there is some discrepancy with respect to the year of Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz's, death, which, according to some accounts, including that of the Gau̱r MS., took place as early as 617 H., after a reign of twelve years, namely, from 606 H. to 617 H.

I had better first mention, very briefly, what our author states, in his account of the different Malikṣ, with reference to the occurrences following the defeat of Ghīyās ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, by Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, I-yal-timīṣ's son, and Ghīyās-ud-Dīn's being put to death by that prince, and then give the accounts of others, as our author has either suppressed some things, or his ideas of them were confused; and he does not [like other writers] even mention where Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, died, and we must suppose it was in Awadh, not in Lakhanawatī.

Our author says, in his account of Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-UGHchah, but without giving any dates, that, when Sulṭān I-yal-timīṣ led his forces into the territory of Lakhanawatī, and they had overthrown Balkā the Khalīj—who, in
the Khalj, rebelled in the territory of Lakhānawātī. Sultan Shams-ud-Din led the contingents of Hindūstān into that country; and, in the year 628 H., that rebel was secured. The Sultan conferred the throne of Lakhānawatī upon Malik 'Alā-ud-Din, Jānī,—on whom be peace!—and, in the month the list at the end of this reign, is styled Malik Ikhīyār-ud-Din, Daulat Shāh-i-Balkā, Malik of Lakhānawatī—he set out on his return to the capital, Dihlī, and, on the way, received intimation that, through the decease of Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Gaz-Lak Khān, at Üchchah, that province and its dependencies had been conferred upon him. Then he says, that, after the decease of the son of I yal-timīsh, and that sovereign’s proceeding himself into Lakhānawatī to suppress the outbreak of Balkā, the Khalj, he conferred the throne of Lakhānawatī upon Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī [the same who is styled, in the list at the end of this reign, “Shāh-zādah of Turkistān”], and that, on his removal from or loss of that dignity—but no date is given—Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I bak-i-Yughān-Tat, got it. He greatly distinguished himself in those parts, and, on one occasion, captured a number of elephants in the territory of Bang, which he despatched to Dihlī. For this affair he received the title of Yughān-Tat. He held the government until 631 H., when he died in Lakhānawatī. On his death, Malik ‘Izz-ud-Dīn, Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān, was made governor of Lakhānawatī, and there he was at the time of I yal-timīsh’s death, after which events arose which I shall have to refer to subsequently; but, I may mention that, up to this time, the territory on both sides the Gang was not under his authority, and that he only held the Barindah side.

I will now state what other writers say on this subject. After Sultan Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, ‘Iwaş, was put to death by Nāsir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, son of I yal-timīsh, the former’s son, styled Nāsir-ud-Dīn-i-‘Iwaş, by some, and Ḥusām-ud-Dīn-i-‘Iwaş, by others, but these latter no doubt mean Balkā Malik, the son of Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, ‘Iwaş, which was the father’s name before he took the title of Sultan Ghīyās-ud-Dīn [see page 580], assumed the sovereignty over his father’s dominions, and held it some time; and, after the death of Nāsir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, who held mere nominal authority over Lakhānawatī for one year, and, according to the Gaur MS., and Jāmi‘-ut-Tawārīḵh [not Rashid-ud-Dīn’s], from 618 H. to 619 H., although both those works state that he died in 626 H., affairs assumed such an aspect that I yal-timīsh had to march into that country with the forces of Hindūstān “to quell the sedition.” No particulars are given respecting these operations, nor is the fate of Balkā Malik mentioned; but, as most writers state that he fell into the power of I yal-timīsh, his fate may well be supposed.

Zubdat-ut-Tawārīḵh, in one place, says I yal-timīsh entered the Lakhānawatī territory in 627 H., and, in another place, that, in 628 H., he succeeded in taking the son of Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, ‘Iwaş, after which he gave the throne to ‘Izw-ul-Mulūk, Malik ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī; and, in this, other writers agree.

The Jāmi‘-ut-Tawārīḵh, as well as Zubdat, says that ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī, reigned for three years and some months, but the former and the Gaur MS. have “from 620 H. to 623 H.” Saif-ud-Dīn, I bak-i-Yughān-Tat, succeeded, on the removal of ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī, and ruled up to the time of his death, which happened in 631 H.; but the Gaur MS. says he ruled nine years—from 624 H. to 632 H.—till he died. Malik ‘Izz-ud-Dīn, Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān, succeeded, and held the government for nearly fourteen years. Further mention of the feudatories of this province will be found in the next Section.
of Rajab of the same year, he returned again to the illustrious capital, Dihlī.

In the year 629 H., the Sultān came to the determination of undertaking the reduction of the fort of Gwāliyūr⁶; and, when the pavilion of his dominion was set up at the foot of that stronghold, Mangal Diw⁷, the accursed, the son of the accursed Māl Diw, commenced hostilities. The Sultān continued before that fortress for a period of eleven months; and the writer of these words, in the month of Shā'bān of the same year, set out from Dihlī, and turned his face towards the threshold of sovereignty, and attained that felicity. The author, at certain stated periods, was commanded to deliver discourses at the private pavilion. Three times in each week discourses were fixed; and, when the month of Ramaḍān came round, a discourse used to be delivered daily. During the whole ten days of Zī-Ḥijjah, and ten days of Muḥarram, discourses were delivered daily; but, during the other months, those same three stated periods were observed weekly, so that ninety-five times congregations were convened at the entrance of the sublime pavilion⁸. On both days of the respective festivals, Fīṭr and Uṣhā⁹, in three different places, the

⁶ After the decease of Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, during the convulsion that then ensued, the Hindus recovered this fortress, which had been surrendered to Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn, after Bahā-ud-Dīn, Ṭughrīl, had reduced it to extremity, as mentioned at page 546. Up to this time the Musalmāns had no opportunity of recovering it.
⁷ The name of this Rāc is very plainly written in several copies of the text, including two of the three oldest and best copies, but the third—the best St. Petersburg copy—has Ṭīlī—쌀드로—with Ṭīlī—Seall dīv—and Ṭīlī—Mīgāl [evidently intended for Ṭīlī—Mīgāl] Bhawa Diw—being thus different to all the other copies of the text. The other copies have Ṭīlī—Mīgāl or Milāk, and Ṭīlī—Mīgāl or Milāk.
⁸ There is equal, if not more, discrepancy with respect to the father’s name also; but, while the St. Petersburg MS. has Māl Diw plainly written, the other two oldest copies have Ṭīlī—Seall dīv—and Ṭīlī—Seall dīv which may be Ṭīlī Diw. The remaining copies of the text collated have what appear to be Ṭīlī—Seall—and the like, which are unintelligible.

The Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh has Mangal Diw, son of Birbal or Barbal Diw, Ṭabakāt-i-Akbarī Mir’āt-i-Jahān-Numā the Taqkarat-ul-Mulāk and Fīrāštah. All these latter works, however, do not mention the father’s name. At page 545, note⁹, the ruler of Gwāliyūr is styled Rāc Solān Pāl, according to the Tāj-ul-Ma’āṣir.
⁹ In his notice of Malik Hindu Khān, in Section XXII., our author relates these matters in quite a different manner, contradicting a good deal of what he here mentions.
⁸ The festival, on breaking fast after the Muḥammadan fast month, is called
prayers, prescribed for the festivals, were said, in which number of places, on the greater festival of Uṣḥā, this servant of the state, who is Minhāj-i-Sarāj, was commanded to read the Khuṭbah for the Uṣḥā festival, and the appointed prayers, at a spot opposite the northern face of the fortress of Gwāliyūr¹, on which side the town is; and he was honoured with the presentation of a valuable dress of honour.

The fortress was kept under investment, until Tuesday, the 26th of the month Ṣafar, 630 II., when the stronghold of Gwāliyūr was acquired. During the night, the accursed Mangal Dīw evacuated the fort and fled; and about seven hundred Gabrs² were directed to be brought to public execution before the entrance of the sublime pavilion. After that, Amīrs and eminent men were appointed [to different offices]. To the Majd-ul-Umūrā, Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Junaidī, the Sulṭān gave the office of Amīr-i-Dād, the Sipah-Sālār [Commander of Troops], Rashīd-ud-Dīn, 'Alī, was directed to assume the office of Seneschal, and the Maulānā, the writer of this book, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, was nominated to the offices of Kāzī, Khaṭīb, and Imām, and appointed to preside over all matters of the law, and a rich dress of honour, and an ample present, were conferred upon him³. May the Most High God become the sustainer of the purified soul and fragrant body of that victorious, beneficent, and just sovereign, and patron of the enlightened! On the 2nd of the month, Rabī'-ul-Ākhir, of this same year⁴, the Sulṭān withdrew from before the fortress of Gwāliyūr, and placed the camp at about the distance of a league from the foot of the walls in the direction of Dihlī, the capital; and, at that

¹Id-i-Fiṭr; and the Uṣḥā is on the tenth day of the last month of the Muḥam-madan year, in commemoration of Ibrāhīm’s offering up his son Ismā’īl, who, according to their creed, was offered and not Išāk.

²Compare Elliot, vol. ii. page 327. Our author, as there stated, could scarcely have repeated prayers “at the fort of Gwalior on the northern side” before the fort was taken. The town is situated to the N.W. of the fortress.

³The word used is Gabrs, not “persons”; and does not necessarily refer to Pārsīs, but is here applied to infidels or pagans, and, therefore, an essay on “Fire-Worship” in these parts is wholly unnecessary. Some writers say 300 Gabrs, but the printed text has 800.

⁴In this year, 630 H., I yal timish purchased Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Balban, who, subsequently, in the year 664 H., succeeded this Sulṭān’s son on the throne of Dihlī.
halting ground, the imperial naubat five times daily was assumed.

After he returned to the capital, in the year 632 H., the

* The imperial naubat, which has been already explained at page 383, note 2, is turned into "a halt of five days" in Elliot, which see.

* In some copies the date is left out altogether, and, in others, the year 631 H. is given, and, in this, several other writers agree, but Alfi has 630 H. Bhilsan, also, is not mentioned at all in some works; and, moreover, our author has confused matters here. There were not two great idol temples destroyed, and it was the great temple dedicated to Mahâ-kâl at Ujjain which was three hundred years in building, not at Bhilsan—the town and fortress of that name was destroyed. It is amusing to hear a Hindû relate that "the idol was carried off to Dihlî, and cast down before the gateway of the jami' masjid [not the present one, which was built by Shâh-i-Jahân] for people to kick and trample upon."

It may interest the archaeologist to know that the idol is stated, by several writers, to have been buried just beneath the surface "close to the minârah of red sandstone, which is of great height and solidity, one of the many buildings founded by Sulṭân Shams-ud-Dîn, I-yal-timîsh, as is mentioned in two inscriptions in the second and third stories," but the numerous titles given to that Sulṭân are the mere fancy of the artist. Another writer who wrote in Jahângîr's time states that "in old Dihlî is the great Masjid, outside of which is a minârah of immense height, to ascend to the top of which is impossible. Those who have measured it say it is 80 paces round at the base, and its height 130 [?] cubits [19]." A third author, who wrote an account of Dihlî from a personal survey nearly a century since, confirms the above statements generally, and gives some further particulars. He says:—"In the mahâll of Râe Pithorâ are two minârahs, one of red sandstone, which consisted of seven [eight?] stories or divisions, and about 200 yards [cubits] in height, and 15 in thickness [sic in MSS.]. Two of the stories have fallen from the effects of lightning, and, from the building, thousands of muns of lead have been taken. The erection of this minârah is, among many other buildings, attributed to Sulṭân Shams-ud-Dîn, I-yal-timîsh, as inscribed thereon in two or three places, and close to it, on the west side, is the sepulchre of that great man. This minârah is known by the name of the Lâth of Kûth Șâhib"—neither the minâr nor the lâth of Kûth-ud-Dîn, I-bak, sovereign of Dihlî, the authority for assigning it to whom it would be curious to trace. "On the north side is an obelisk of brass [19] about 10 cubits in height and 2 thick, of very great antiquity; and upon it is a vast deal of writing, both in the Hindû-î and Persian character. In the Kotilah of Fîrûz Shâh is another minârah of considerable height. It is said to have been constructed of corundum stone [kurand], ground, and mixed with lacc, [sic]. The other work previously quoted says with respect to this second minârah: "Within a structure called the Shîkâr-gah of Sulṭân Fîrûz Shâh is a column in height about 30 cubits [19], and about 3 in thickness, which is supposed to be of one piece of stone, and that an equal length lies buried among the bricks and rubbish around it. This would make it, in all, a single stone of 60 cubits in total length, which it would have been impossible to have set upright," &c.

The Kûth minârah is supposed by European writers and archaeologists—misled, probably, by some incorrect translation of Persian works—to have been not only named after Sulṭân Kûth-ud-Dîn, I-bak, the first Turk Sulṭân
Sultān led the hosts of Islam towards Malwah, and took the fortress and town [or city] of Bhilsān, and demolished the idol-temple which took three hundred years in building, and which, in altitude, was about one hundred ells. From thence he advanced to Ujjain-Nagarī, and destroyed the idol-temple of Mahā-kāl Diw. The effigy of Bikramajīt who was sovereign of Ujjain-Nagarī, and from whose reign to the present time one thousand, three hundred 7, and sixteen years have elapsed, and from whose reign they date the Hindū-ī era, together with other effigies besides his, of Dihī, but to have been founded by him also. The word Kutb was quite sufficient for in their imaginations; but it is totally incorrect. The minārah is styled the Lāth of Kutb Sahīb, after a celebrated Muḥammadan saint, Khwājah Kutb-ud-Dīn, Bakhṭ-yār, Kākī, the Üshī [native of Üsh near Baghdād], whom the Afgāns claim as their peculiar saint by the title of “the Afghan Kutb or Pole,” the reason for which does not appear, but he probably resided for a time in the Afghan country. He came into Hind, and, first, proceeded to Multān during the reign of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Kābā-jah. Subsequently, he went to Dihī. Such was his sanctity and the veneration in which he was held, that Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh, himself, came forth from the city to receive him and do him reverence, and accompanied him into Dihī. The Khwājah, however, took up his residence at Gīlī-khārī on account of the scarcity of water in the city. When Shaikh Jalāl-ud-Dīn, the Bustāmī, who was the Shaikh-ul-Islām, died, I-yal-timīsh wished him to take that office, but the Kutb-i-Afgān declined it. He died on the 24th of the month of Rabīʿ-ul-Awwal, 633 H. See the Mirāṭ-ul-Afghanīh, Makhzan Afgānī, and Tārikh-i-Murassā [Puśhto] of Afaq Khān, Khatak. Dorn, in his translation of Niʿmat-Ullah’s work [Part II., pages 2—57], gives 603 H. as the date of his death, but, in a note, says he thinks the number ten has been left out, but it was thirty, not ten. The correct date is 633 H.

It may be asked, How is it that the name of Kutb-ud-Dīn, Ḳībak, is inscribed on the minārah, and certain dates recorded? to which the very natural reply may be given, that gratitude led I-yal-timīsh to record, on the monument of his erection, the name of his own master, benefactor, and father-in-law. The first date, 589 H., refers to the occupation of Dihī as the Muḥammadan capital, the second, 592 H., to the foundation, probably, of the Kutb masjid, the third date, 594 H., to its completion, and the fourth, 629 H., evidently refers to the year in which I-yal-timīsh founded the Minārah of Kutb Sahīb.

The insertion of the name of Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, as the Sultān-us-Salāṭīn or Lord Paramount at the time of the conquest, is also natural, but it is passing strange—if the copy of the inscription as given by Thomas [PATHAN KINGS, pages 21—22] is correct—that the name of his brother—Muʿizz-ud-Dīn—the conqueror of Rāc Pithorā, and establisher of the Muḥammadan rule at Dihī, should be left out. I cannot but think that the inscription is not correctly given. See also APPENDIX A., pages iv. and v.

A writer in the BENGAL ASIATIC JOURNAL, vol. xx., page 353, many years back, endeavoured to correct the great error I have referred to. He says:—“The Qotb Minār has not its name from Qotb(aldyn) Aybak as Ritter supposes, but from the Saint—Qotb aldyn Baktyar Kāky who is buried not far from it.” See also note 2, page 658.

7 In some copies two hundred.
which were formed of molten brass, together with the stone [idol] of Mahā-kāl, were carried away to Dihlī, the capital.

In the year 633 H., the Sultān led the forces of Hindūstān towards Banfān [or Banyān 8], and, during that march, weakness subdued his blessed person; and, when, through bodily affliction, he came back from thence, on Wednesday, the first of the month, Sha'bān, early in the forenoon, the time chosen by the Astrologers, seated in a covered litter 9, he entered the capital of his kingdom, the illustrious city of Dihlī. After nineteen days, his illness having increased, on Monday, the 20th of Sha'bān 1, in the year 633 H., he was removed from the abode of mortality to the everlasting mansion 2. His reign extended to a period of twenty-six years. God enlighten his understanding!

8 This is precisely the same tract that is mentioned at page 541, and which has been turned into "Miḥan" in ELLIOT, vol. ii. page 303, and is referred to in several places in connexion with coming from Ghaznīn, Karmān and Nandanaḥ into Sind and Multān. In all the best copies it is written بیان—Banfān—generally, but sometimes بیان—Banbān. Further research may tend to throw some light upon its exact situation, but it evidently lies in the hill tracts of the Sind-Sāgar Do-bah, or the opposite side of the Sind adjoining that part of the Do-bah in question—the country immediately west of the Salt Range. It will be referred to again farther on. Nizām-ud-Dīn, Ahmād, and Budā'ūnī, and Firīstah—the two latter copy the former—all have Multān, and are totally incorrect in this instance.

9 Turned into "a howdah on the back of an elephant" in ELLIOT, but there is not a word about an elephant in the original or in the printed text either.

ELPHINSTONE [page 323] makes very short work of the events of the last eight years of this reign. After incorrectly stating that Kāhā-jah was drowned in 622 H. and "Bakkar" taken, he says "Altamsh" was occupied for upwards of six years in "reducing the part of Hindostan which had remained independent. He began by taking Rintambor. . . . He next took Māndu [see page 611] in Mālwa; Gwālior, which had revolted, was recovered; Bilsa was likewise taken; and the occupation of the ancient capital Ujēn, with the destruction of its celebrated temple, completed the conquest of Mālwa." All this is supposed to have taken place between 623 H., and 630 H., and yet Ujjain-Nagarī was not taken till two years after this.

1 There is some discrepancy respecting the date of I-yal-timīsh's death. The oldest copy of the text says the 26th, and, in this, two other copies agree, but some have Saturday, the 26th. Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh has Monday, the 26th of Sha'bān, Tabākāt-i-Akbarî, the 20th, Tagkaraṭ-ul-Mulūk, the 8th of Sha'bān, and so has the Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh. Mr Ma'ṣūm in one MS. says the 23rd, and, in two others, the 26th; and Fāsiḥ-ī says the 21st of Sha'bān, 634 H., and that he was buried in the old jāmī' masjid. Firīstah follows the Tabākāt-i-Akbarī; but neither Budā'ūnī, the Haft Iklīm, Khulāṣat-ut-Tawārīkh, Raṣūt-ud-Ṣafa, nor Lubb-ut-Tawārīkh-i-Hind, give the day of the month, and some merely mention the year 633 H.

2 Our author having given an account of the attack by the Mulāṣūdād
Titles and names of the Sultan.

US-SULTĀN-UL-MU’AZZAM.

SHAMS-UD-DUNYÂ WA UD-DĪN,

ABŪ-UL-MUZAFFAR, I-YAL-TIMISH,

NĀṢIR-I-AMĪR-UL-MŪMINĪN.

Heretics on the congregation in the great masjid in the year 634 H. under the reign of Raṣīyyat, it is strange that he is silent about the attack by the same heretics on Sultan I-yal-timish, which is related by other writers. I-yal-timish, who was considered a pattern of orthodoxy, and a most pious and God-fearing ruler, was in the habit of going, without any ostentation, to the great masjid on the Musalmān sabbath to say his prayers along with the congregation, and to listen to the Imam’s discourse. The Molḥids of Dihlī, aware of his custom, plotted to take his life; and a body of them armed, whilst the people of the congregation were occupied in their own devotions, flocked into the masjid, drew their swords, and attempted to reach the place where the Sultan was, and martyred several persons in so doing. The Sultan, however, succeeded in getting safely away, although the Molḥids endeavoured to follow him. The people now crowded the roofs and walls and gate-ways of the masjid, and with arrows, bricks, and stones, annihilated the heretics. I-yal-timish is said to have afterwards put a number of this sect to the sword in revenge for this attempt upon his life.

* In the work I have before referred to the following is said to have been the inscription on one of I-yal-timish’s early coins,

Reverse— غُرف هذا الديانةِ دخلِ مندِ انذا عُكر و سَعايَة
Obverse—قطع العفر والإلاحِ مستانِ مسَ الدينِ جَمَلِ عَهِد

According to which 612 H. was the first of his reign. The inscriptions may be thus rendered:—Reverse:—“This Dīnār [was] struck in the capital [city] Dihlī, in the year 612.” Obverse:—“The Destroyer of paganism and error, Sultan Shams-ud-Dīn, in the first [year] of his reign.” Budā‘īnīf says his title was Yamin-i-Amīr-ul-Āmīn, but this is only one of the many titles given him by our author. See note 4, page 597, and note 8, page 614.
Sultān Rażiyyat.
Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Din, Bahrām Shāh.
[Malik] Kūṭb-ud-Din, Muḥammad.
Malik Jalāl-ud-Din, Mas'ūd Shāh.
Malik Shihāb-ud-Din, Muḥammad.
Sultān Nāṣir-ud-Din, Maḥmūd Shāh of Lakhnawatī.
Sultān Rukn-ud-Din, Firūz Shāh.
Sultān Nāṣir-ud-Din, Maḥmūd Shāh.
Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, son of Rukn-ud-Dīn,
Firūz Shāh.

Length of his reign:
Twenty-six years.

Kāzīs of his Court.
Kāzī Sa'd-ud-Dīn, Gardaizī.
Kāzī Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Ghaznawīl.
Kāzī Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Kāzīlī.
Kāzī Kabir-ud-Dīn, Kāzī of the Army.

Wasīr of the Kingdom.
The Nizām-ul-Mulk, Kamāl-ud-Dīn, [Muḥammad ?]
-ī-Abū-Sā'id, Junaidī.

Standards.
On the right, Black: On the left, Red.

Motto on his august signet.
"Greatness appertaineth unto God alone."

Capital of his Kingdom.
The city of Dīhlī.

His Maliks.
Malik Firūz, I-yal-timīsh, the Sālār, Shāh-zādah [Prince]
of Khwārazm.

4 Or "Greatness belongs to God" [is exclusively His attribute]. Kur'ān: chap. 45; verse 36.
5 These names are only contained in a few copies of the text, and do not agree in all points. The above are contained in the two oldest copies, and the others agree except where otherwise mentioned.
6 This is the person mentioned at page 199, but he should be more correctly styled Malik-zādah as he was not a Prince, but merely connected, on the mother's side, with the Khwārazmī Sultān, Muḥammad, father of Jalāl-ud-
Malik Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of 'Alī, son of Abī 'Alī, Malik of Ghūr'.
Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz'.
Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain.
Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Gajz-lak Khān.
Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Daulat Shāh-i-Balkā, son of Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, 'Īwāz, Khalji, Malik of Lakhnawaṭī'.
Malik-ul-Umrā, Ifṭikhār-ud-Dīn, Amīr of Karah.
Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn, Ḥamzah-i-'Abd-ul-Malik.
Malik Bahā-ud-Dīn, Būlād [Pūlād]-i-Nāṣīrī.
The Malik of Ghūr, Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn, Mādīnī, Shansabānī.
Malik Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn, Mardān Shāh, Muḥammad-i-Chā-ūsh [the Pursuivant'].
Malik Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn of Bindār [or Pindār], the Chā-ūsh.
Malik Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn-i-Tughān, Feoffee of Budā'ūn.
Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Tughrīl, Kuṭbī [Bahā-i].
Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Baḥkht-yār, the Khaljī.

Dīn. After the Ghūrs took Nīshāpūr in 596 H. [see page 380], he came into Hindūstān with his cousin, Tāj-ud-Dīn, Bināl-Tigīn, afterwards ruler of Nīmrozd of Sijistān. See pages 199—202.

The same who commanded the right wing of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Utsuz's, army when that ruler of Ghūr lost his life. See page 416. He is called Ḥasan in some copies of the text in this place. He was not Malik of Ghūr but one of the Ghūrlān Maliks. He is mentioned many times in this work.
The best Paris copy and the I. O. L. MS. No. 1952, which generally agree, have, after the above, Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Sālār-i-Harabī Miḥdī, which name is again mentioned in the List preceding the reign of Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmund Shāh, farther on.


In two copies styled Ī-rān Shāh-i-Balkā, the Khaljī.

In one copy, Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Ḥarīf-i-Mardān Shāh, and Miṁān Shāh, and, in another, as two different persons. Chā-ūsh has probably been read by the copyist as Ḥarīf, but, in another, Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn, Miṁān Shāh, son of Muḥammad-i-Chā-ūsh, Khaljī.

This must be meant for Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān, who held the fief of Budā'ūn in 630 H.

This is a specimen of the dependence we can place on our author's names and statements. If he refers here to the conqueror of Bihār and Lakhnawaṭī, he was dead five years before i-yal-timīgh was raised to the throne, in fact, before i-yal-timīgh's former master received his manumission. The word Khaljī occurs in every copy containing these names, with the exception of one, which
Malik Karâ Sunkar-i-Nâshîr.
Malik Nasîr-ud-Dîn, Ai-yîtim-i-Bahâ-i.*
Malik Asad-ud-Dîn, Tez Khân-i-Kuṭbî.
Malik Husâm-ud-Dîn, Āghül-Bak, Malik of Awadh.
Malik 'Izz-ud-Dîn, 'Alî, Nâgawri, Siwâlikhî.

Victories and Conquests.

Budâ'un, Banâras and defeat of Râe Mân, fortress of Rantabhûr [or Ranthabhûr], Jâlor, victory over Tâj-ud-Dîn, Yal-dûz and taking him prisoner, occupation of Lohor, victory over the hostile Amîrs in front of the Bâgh-i-Jûd [the Jûd Garden], Tabarhindah, Sursutî, Kuhrâm, victory over Nâsîr-ud-Dîn, Kâbâ-jah, subjugation of Lakhanawaţi and its territory, taking of Kînnauj-i-Sher-gârh, Lalehr or Alehr[*?], Tirhut, Gwâliyûr, Nandana, Gûjah [or Kûjah], and Sîl-kôt, Janjers[*?], and Mûndûdah or Mûdâh[*?], Ajmîr, Bihâr, occupation of the fortress of Lakhanawaţi a second time, fortress of Mandawar, has Ghûrîf. If this last name be correct, of course, the conqueror of Lakhanawaţi is not referred to.

The f. O. L. MS. has Malik Sherân, the Khâlj, after this; but he was no more one of I-yal-timîsh's Maliks than Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yâr, was.
* So styled from having been, at first, the slave of Malik Bahâ-ud-Dîn, Tughril, Sulâtân Mu'izz-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad-i-Sâm's slave.
* These two last-named personages were Maliks of Sulâtân Mu'izz-ud-Dîn's reign, and were but nominally dependent on Kût-ud-Dîn, I-bak, whilst he was the Sulâtân's Deputy in Hind. They are the same as those referred to at page 548, and were the entertainers and patrons of Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yâr, the Khâlj, after he had been refused service at Ghaznân, and also at Dîhî.

Of the twenty-five Maliks, most of whom were the slaves of I-yal-timîsh, separate accounts of whom are given in the next Section, but three can be recognized among the twenty-one here recorded; but several are mentioned here, as well as in the account of his reign, who are not mentioned in that Section; while some others, mentioned under his reign, are not mentioned here.

6 In one copy for رئي سان—another رئي سان—and in another واعصر—another Wâsâm. The last three are wholly unintelligible.
7 Two of the oldest copies have—"and taking him prisoner," but he was not taken.
* This is wholly unintelligible. It is written وَبَلَمْ and لِلَّهِ and الْهَرُجُ and پر וَبَلَمْ or پر وَبَلَمْ—Kâthîr or Kâther—is meant.
* This place or tract is constantly mentioned in connexion with Nandana, and lies in that direction, without the shadow of doubt. In two copies of the text, however—one the best Paris copy—it is کهراوت and کهراوت respectively. It cannot be intended for جر وک وک—Koh-i-Jûd, for it is clearly written several times in the text. In one place—in one of the oldest copies—it is written کهراوت but in several places it is کهراوت as above.
fort of Bhakar, Ùchchah and Multan, Siwastan, Dibal, fort of Tànkir, fort of Bhilsan, Mälwah and the expedi-
tion against the unbelievers and extortion of tribute, fort of Ujjain-Nagarì and bringing away of the idol
of Mahà-käl, which they have planted before the gateway
of the Fâmi` Masjid at the capital city of Dihlí in order
that all true believers might tread upon it.

II. MALIK-US-SA‘ID, NÀŚIR-UD-DÌN, MAHMÚD.SHÀH, SON
OF SULTÀN SHAMS-UD-DÌN, I-YAL-TIMISH.

Malik Nàśir-ud-Dìn, Maḥmùd Shàh, was the eldest son
of Sultàn Shams-ud-Dìn; and he was a beneficent, intelli-
gent, sensible, and sagacious Prince; and was endowed
with great energy and gallantry, and was munificent, and
benevolent.

The first sief which the Sultàn conferred upon him was
the district of Hânsì; and, after a considerable time, in
the year 623 H., the territory of Awadh was entrusted to
his charge. In that country that Prince performed nume-
rous commendable actions, and carried on holy war, as by
the tenets of the faith enjoined, so that his praise for man-
liness and boldness became diffused throughout the area of
Hindústàn.

The accursed Bartù [or Britù], beneath whose sword
above a hundred and twenty thousand Musalmãns had

2 One copy of the text, not one of the oldest three, but a good copy, has
Jâj-nagar here entered as one of the victories or conquests!

The greater number of the above so-called victories and conquests are not
even mentioned in the reign of I-yal-timish, and several of those that are were
affected by his Maliks; but neither these nor the remainder are all mentioned
in the account given of their lives. What our author often calls a victory may
be judged of from the mention of Kuhram, Budá‘un [which I-yal-timish held
the sief of], Kinnauj, and several other places, which were taken in Sultàn
Muizz-ud-Dìn's reign either by himself, or Malik Kutb-ud-Dìn, I-bak.

3 Our author styles him “Bâdghâh,” which signifies a prince, as well as a
king. If he had any claims to be accounted a “sovereign,” beyond the
assignment to him of a canopy of state by his father, he should have been
included among the kings of Lakhanawatf, or styled sovereign of Awadh;
for he never reigned at the capital, Dihlí. His “reigning” over Lakhanawatf
may be judged of from note 3, page 617. He never coined money in his
own name.

4 The Tâj-ul-Ma‘àsir says Lahor was his first sief. See also note 4, page 532.
attained martyrdom, he overthrew and sent to Hell; and the refractory infidels, who were in different parts of the country of Awadh, he reduced and overcame, and brought a considerable number under obedience.

From Awadh he resolved to march into Lakhaṇawatī, and the forces of Hindūstān, by command of the Sultān, his father, were nominated to serve under him, and Maliks of renown, such as Pūlān, and Malik 'Alā-ud-Din, Jānī, all of them proceeded towards Lakhaṇawatī in attendance on him. Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Din, 'Iwāz, the Khalj, had marched forces from Lakhaṇawatī with the intention of [entering] the territory of Bang, and had left his head-quarters empty [of defenders]. When the august Malik, Nāṣir-ud-Din, Maḥmūd Shāh, reached that territory with his forces, the fortress of Basan-koṭ and the city of Lakhaṇawatī fell into his hands.

When the news reached Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Din, 'Iwāz, the Khalj, he set out for Lakhaṇawatī from the place where he then was. Malik Nāṣir-ud-Din, Maḥmūd Shāh, with his forces, proceeded against him and defeated him, and captured Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Din, 'Iwāz, with all his kinsmen and the Khalj Amīrs, his treasures, and elephants. He had Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Din, 'Iwāz, put to death, and appropriated his treasures. From Lakhaṇawatī Malik Nāṣir-ud-Din, Maḥmūd Shāh, sent sums of money in the shape of presents to all the 'Ulamā, the Sayyids, devotees, recluses, and pious men of the capital, Dihlī, and other cities and towns. When the dresses of distinction from Baghdād, the capital of the Khilāfat, reached the presence

---

8 Who this Hindū chief was we have no means of discovering, I fear, as other subsequent writers do not notice these events at all. He is styled in some of the best copies as above, which is probably meant for Prithu—but, in others, the word is written which may be Bārūh, Birtūh, or Bārūh, &c., but is often written for by copyists.

6 By the "forces of Hindūstān" are meant the contingents of the feudatories east of the Jīn and Gang. The word Hindūstān is used by our author with reference to the Antarbed Do-šībah generally, but, sometimes, to the tracts east of the Gang as well.

7 In some copies of the text and . The best copies are as above, but no such person is mentioned anywhere in the whole work, and I think it may be the nick-name of some chief, who might be recognized under his right name, unless it refers to the teath in the List, page 626.

8 These events, and those which followed, have been detailed at length in note 4, page 617.
of Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn, from among them he selected one dress of great value and despatched it to Lakhānawātī along with a red canopy of state; and Malik Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn, Māhmūd Shāh, became exalted by [the bestowal of] that canopy of state, the dress of honour, and great distinction.

All the Maliks and grandees of the kingdom of Hind had their eyes upon him, that he would be the heir to the Shamsī dominions, but the decree of destiny, according to [the saying]—"Man proposes, but God disposes"—harmonizes not with human conceptions! A year and a half afterwards, his sacred person became afflicted with disease and weakness, and he died. When the news of his decease reached the capital [city of] Dihlī, all the people manifested great grief thereat. May Almighty God make the Sultān of Islām, Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn, Māhmūd Shāh, as he is the heir to his name and title, the heir, during his lifetime, of the whole of the Maliks and Sultāns of that dynasty, for the sake of His prophet and the whole of his posterity!

III. SULṬĀN RUKN-UD-DĪN, FĪRŪZ SHĀH, SON OF THE SULṬĀN [I-YAL-TIMĪSH].

Sultān Rukn-ud-Dīn, Firūz Shāh, was a beneficent sovereign, of handsome exterior, was endowed with gentleness and humanity to perfection, and in bountifullness and liberality he was a second Hātim.

His mother, Shāh Turkān, was a Turkish hand-maid, and the head [woman] of all the Sultān's ḥaram, and

9 "I'homme propose, mais Dieu dispose."

1 He died in 626 H. Our author, subsequently, refers to him as the "martyred" Malik. [Māhmūd Shāh: an error, probably, for Māhmūd Shāh: august Malik], at least such are the words in the various copies of the text, but why he does not say, neither does he state how or where he died. Subsequent writers who depended upon our author for information dismiss this Prince in a few words; but Fīrūzah states that he died in or at Lakhānawātī, but this, like a good many more of his statements, requires confirmation.

2 In the work I have previously referred to, the following is given as the inscription on the first coins of this monarch:

Reverse:—"The throne when left by Shams-ud-Dīn, his foot thereon placed Rukn-ud-Dīn." Obverse:—"Coined at Dihlī in the first year of his reign with prosperity associated, 633 H."

3 In some copies styled "Khudāwandah-i-Jahān, Shāh Turkān."
great was the bounty, benevolence, and charity, of that Malikah⁴, towards 'Ulamā, Sayyids, priests, and recluse
In the year 625 H.⁵, Sultan Rukn-ud-Din, Firuz Shāh, obtained the fief of Budā'ūn, and a green canopy of state, and the 'Ain-ul-Mulk, Ḥusain-i-Ash'arī, who was [had been?] Wazir of Malik [Sultan] Nāṣir-ud-Din, Ḵabā-jah, at this time, became the Wazir⁶ of Sultan Rukn-ud-Din, Firuz Shāh.

When Sultan Shams-ud-Din returned to the capital, Dihlī, from Gwāliyūr, after the capture of that fortress and country, the territory of Lohor, which had been the seat of government of the Khusrav Maliki⁷ [dynasty], was conferred upon Sultan Rukn-ud-Din, Firuz Shāh; and, on Sultan Shams-ud-Din's return from his last expedition, from the river Sind and Banfān⁸, he brought along with him, to the capital, his son Rukn-ud-Din, Firuz Shāh, for the people had their eyes upon him, since, after [the late] Malik Nāṣir-ud-Din, Mahmūd Shāh, he was the eldest of Sultan Shams-ud-Din's sons⁹.

When that august Sultan passed from the kingdom of this world to the throne of the world to come, the Maliks and grandees of the kingdom, by agreement, seated Rukn-

⁴ At page 638, our author himself states that the mother of Rašiyāyat was
the chief of all the ladies—head wife—of the late Sultan's haram.

The word here used signifies that she was the first concubine the late Sultan possessed, not the chief wife of his haram, nūr is she entitled to be styled Malikah, for the married women are the first in rank, and, of these, one was Sultan Ḵutb-ud-Din, I-bak's daughter.

⁵ Ṭabakat-i-Akbar, and several others, have, like our author, who was
their chief authority for these events, 625 H., but Firīghtah has 626 H. His authority, however, is of no importance whatever for the events of this early period—even less than I was inclined to give him credit for—for I find, on examination of his history for this and the five following reigns, that he has bodily appropriated the text, in many places verbatim, of the Ṭabakat-i-Akbar, even to the poetical quotations. The only difference is occasional verbal alterations, and that, in most instances in which the former disposes of an event in a few words, Firīghtah, by exaggeration and hyperbole, manages to lengthen out his own account.

⁶ Or, in other words, his governor or tutor. Our author, however, does not mean to say that he was styled Sultan at this period. See page 613.

⁷ The last of the Ghazín dynasty—Sultan Khusrav Malik.

⁸ The Ṭabakat-i-Akbar [and Firīghtah, of course] has Sfwastān, which is a mistake for Banfān, which is never mentioned in the former.

⁹ The people may have had their eyes upon him, but I-yal Timiḥān had already named his talented daughter, Rašiyāyat Khāṭūn, as his successor. See pages 638, 639.
ud-Din upon the throne, on Tuesday, the 21st of the month Sha'bān, 633 Ḥ., and the diadem and throne acquired beauty and splendour from his dignity, and excellence, and elegance; and all rejoiced at his accession, and donned honorary dresses [to testify their joy].

When the different Malik returned from the capital [to their various posts], Sultān Rukn-ud-Dīn, Firūz Shāh, opened the door of his treasuries, and gave himself up to pleasure, and began to expend, in the most profuse fashion, the funds of the Bait-ul-Māl in an improper manner. Such was his excessive appetite for pleasure and sensual enjoyments, that the business of the country, the concerns of the state, and the regulation of the affairs of the kingdom fell into a state of disorder and confusion; and his mother, Shāh Turkān, began to assume the decision and disposal of state affairs, and used to issue [her] commands. Perhaps it was by reason of this, that, during the lifetime of the august Sultān, Shams-ud-Dīn, she had experienced envy and jealousy on the part of [some of the] other ladies of the haram, that she [now] brought misfortune upon that party among the inmates of the haram, and, by tyranny and cruelty, destroyed several of them. The minds of men in authority became troubled at their [the mother's

1 Two copies of the text, one an old one, have Tuesday, the 29th of Sha'bān. Ṭabakat-i-Akbarī has Saturday, 633 Ḥ., without date or month, and, of course, Firūzū has the same.
2 Their joy was soon turned into grief. His dignified behaviour, and the "adornment and splendour" the crown and throne derived from him is related farther on.
3 When they "returned home," Elliot: vol. ii. page 330. The original is مراجع لسودند—there is not a word of home—a word unknown in the East.
4 See note 4, page 62.
5 She, on the contrary, enviéd and was jealous of the others through their having taken her place. No sooner did she obtain an opportunity than she had the noble women—free-born women—who had been married to the late Sultān, put to death with much degradation, and the other Turkish concubines—women held in esteem by I-yal-timīgh—she treated with great ignominy, and wreaked upon them retribution for many years of envy and jealousy which she had nourished towards them. Our author's own words respecting her, farther on, contradict this statement as to her benevolence, unless charity towards recluses and the like—in his opinion—covered the multitude of her sins.

There is no authority whatever beyond what our author says here for styling this concubine "Queen Mother," and, at page 638, he himself says, Rašīyyat's mother was the chief wife of I-yal-timīgh. See Thomas: Pathān Kings, page 105, and Elliot: India, vol. ii. page 330.
and son's] conduct; and, in the face of all these acts, they caused a son of the [late] Sultan, who was styled Kutil-ud-Din, and a youth of great worth and promise, by their directions, to be deprived of the sight of both eyes, and afterwards had him put to death. From these causes, the hostility of the Malikis, in different parts, began to be manifested.

Malik Ghayyás-ud-Din, Muhammed Shāh, son of Sultan Shams-ud-Din, who was younger in years than Rukn-ud-Din, Firuz Shāh, displayed his hostility in Awadh, and took possession of the whole of the treasure of Lahana-waṭi which was being conveyed to the capital, and, after that, sacked and plundered several of the towns of Hindūstān. Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Muhammed, Sālārī, who was the feudatory of Budā‘ūn, broke out into rebellion; and, in another direction, Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Kabir Khān-i-Ayāz, feoffee of Multān, Malik Saif-ud-Din, Kūji, who was feu-

The youngest of Shams-ud-Din, I-yal-timīsh's sons, quite a child, by another concubine. Malik Saif-ud-Din, I-bak-i-Ūchchah, was feudatory of Ūchchah when Sultan I-yal-timīsh died, and, soon after, whilst Sultan Rukn-ud-Din, Firuz Shāh, and his Maliks were squabbling together, Malik Saif-ud-Din, Hasan, the KārlUGH, from the direction of Banfān, advanced into the Panjāb, and appeared before Multān. Saif-ud-Din, I-bak, marched out of Ūchchah with his forces, and gave him battle, and overthrew him. This was a great success, as, since the death of I-yal-timīsh, enemies had sprung up on all sides. Our author does not give the date of this success; but it must have been about the end of 633 H., or early in 634 H. In the former year Malik Ḥasan, the KārlUGH, coined money: he then held Ghazni, Kārmān, and Banfān,

What became of him is not known. He was probably put to death. Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Din, Tā-yasa'ī, was put in charge of the sief of Awadh by Sultan Rāṣiyāt.

At this period likewise, the feudatories of Lahana-waṭi and Lahana-or were contending together, and the latter was defeated and slain by the former, and his sief seized. See next Section.

In the account of him, in next Section, our author says he was removed from Multān by Sultan Rukn-ud-Din, Firuz Shāh, and the sief of Sundām was conferred upon him instead of Multān.

Firighah, according to the "revised text" by Briggs, and "Munshi Mir Kheitrat Ali Khan," makes a terrible mess of the names of persons here [Dow, of course, is sufficiently ridiculous in this matter, and makes them totally unintelligible], although he had the Tabakāt-i-Akbar, in which they are pretty correct, to copy from. He could not have taken them from our author's work. For example; Sālārī is turned into Sālār, 'Alā-ud-Din, Jānī, is turned into Sher Khānī, and Kabir Khān into Kabir Khānī—with — the ya'd-misbat, signifying "of, or relating to a Khān," Khān-shīp, &c., as if they were merely officers or slaves of a Sher Khān and a Kabir Khān, instead of the words being their own titles; and, in the same work, the word as in 'Izz-ud-Din, is invariably turned into as ! !
datory of Hánsí, and Malik 'Alá-ud-Dín, Jání, who held the sief of Lohor, united together, and began to act with hostility and contumacy.  Sultán Rukn-ud-Dín, Firúz Sháh, with the determination of coercing them, moved an army from the capital. The Wazír of the kingdom, the Nižám-ul-Mulk, Muḥammad, Junaidí, became frightened, and fled from Gílú-khari, and retired towards Kol, and from thence joined Malik 'Izz-ud-Dín, Muḥammad, Sálárí; and both of them joined Malik Jání and Malik Kúfí.

Sultán Rukn-ud-Dín, Firúz Sháh, led his army towards Kuhárám. The Turk Amírs and the slaves of the household, who were serving with the centre [the contingents forming the centre], followed the example; and, in the

Another writer says, that 'Izz-ud-Dín, Kabír Khán-i-Ayáz, feudatory of Multán, was incited to usurp the sovereignty of Díhlí, and was advancing for the purpose, but, before he could reach Kuhárám, the other nobles seized Rukn-ud-Dín, and set up his sister. Malik Ikhutíyár-ud-Dín, Yús-Bak-i-Tughrí Khán, who then held the office of Amír-i-Majlis, was also concerned in this outbreak, but the ringleader appears to have been Malik 'Izz-ud-Dín, Balbán-i-Kasbí Khán, whose contumacy was continual.


2. Firíštah's text makes him "advance" to Gílú-khari, as if it were a place many miles away, instead of being a suburb of the capital, Díhlí.

One of the many new "cities," so called, adjoining and included in the name of Díhlí, but more correctly a new suburb. It has been generally stated by Muḥammadan writers, that it was founded by Sultán Muʾizz-ud-Dín Kái-Kúbád, in 686 H., but that cannot be correct from what our author says in his account of Ulugh Khán farther on, where he styles it "the Shahr-i-Nau of Gílú-khari." When it was founded "the river Jún or Jaman flowed close under its walls; but now the river is some two kurok to the east of it. The tomb of the venerated Musálman saint, Sháh Nižám-ud-Dín, the Budá'úní, is situated in Gílú-khari."

Compare Elliot: vol. ii. page 331. We have so little information respecting the organization of the Díhlí armies before the time of the Mughal emperors that it is difficult to understand what is really meant here, as well as in several other places, by the mere word "kalb." All the Musálman armies appear to have been arranged in the field, after one and the same fashion—a centre, which was the king's post, a right and left wing, an advance guard or van, supports, &c. The 'Arabic word kalb signifies "heart, soul, kernel, marrow, middle," &c., and, with respect to an army, the "centre," which, according to the arrangement above-mentioned, would be perfectly intelligible with regard to an army in the field, but here might be understood, by the reader, as if the centre division of a corps d'armée, under a regular military organization, was stationed at Díhlí, which is not the case; but, from what I gather from the Tárjíh-i-Firúz Sháhí, and other works, it evidently refers to the contingents which formed the kalb or centre of the Díhlí forces when in the field. These contingents were furnished by numerous feudatories,
vicinity of Manşūr-pūr and Tarā'in 4, they martyred the Tāj-ul-Mulk, Maḥmūd, the Dabīr [Secretary] 6, the son of the Muḥriḍ-i-Mamālik 6, and Bahā-ud-Dīn, Ḥasan [Husain?] i-Ash'arī, Karīm-ud-Dīn-i-Zāhīd [the Recluse], Ẓiyā-ul-Mulk [ud-Dīn?], the son of the Niẓām-ul-Mulk, Muḥammad, Junaidī, Niẓām-ud-Dīn, Shafūrkhānī 7, the Khwājah Rashīd-ud-Dīn, Mālkānī 8, Amir Fakhr-ud-Dīn, the Dabīr [Secretary], and a number of other Tājīk officials 9; and, in the month of Rabi'-ul-Awwal, in the year 634 H., Sulṭān Rażiyāyat, who was the eldest daughter 1 of Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn, entered upon open hostility with the mother of Sulṭān Rukn-ud-Dīn, Fīrūz Shāh, at Dīhlī, and he, as a matter of necessity, returned again towards the capital. His mother had conspired against Sulṭān Rażiyāyat to put great and small, whose fiefs lay in the immediate vicinity of the capital, and whose contingents could be summoned to the king's standard at a very short notice. The Turk ghulāms also formed part of the ḥalīb, and they served wherever the Sulṭān happened to be.

4 Tarā'in, the place of Rāe Pithorā's overthrew, so often mentioned, the modern Talāwarī. There would be some difficulty in finding "Nārāín" I expect.

5 This is the person who wrote a congratulatory poem on the debauchee's accession.

6 A number of titles and names of offices occur in the following pages, many of which, being pure old Turkīsh, it is impossible to fix exactly without a knowledge of the Turkish language; and, although, as far as similar names go, some few of the offices in question existed in Akbar's time, still there is much doubt whether such offices under the Mughal dynasty were equivalent to those of a similar designation during the reigns of the Turkish Slave dynasty, and would require some years of study fully to elucidate. See the note on this subject under the eighth year of Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh's reign farther on.

7 Shafūrkhānī or Shabūrgānī—a native of Shafūrkhān or Shabūrgān. In some copies, Shārkānī and Sarkānī. See note 1, page 127.

8 In the best copies of the text this word is written as above, but in some others it is Mālkānī, Bālkānī, and Mānkānī or Māngānī.

9 The Ṭabākhāt-i-Akbarī makes a terrible blunder here, and Firīghtah, as a matter of course, follows, as well as Budā'īnī. The former work states that all these persons, who were put to death, "separated from the Sulṭān's army, went off to Dīhlī, and pledged their allegiance to Rażiyāyat Khāṭīn, eldest daughter of the late Sulṭān, and raised her to the throne"!! Several other authors who copy from the former work all fall into the same error without mentioning the names. Compare Elliot, vol. ii. page 331, where this very plain and easy passage, which is perfectly correct in the printed text, is construed so as to make all these Tājīk officials, who were killed, the "killers of "the Tājīk," and Firīghtah [Briggs?] is quoted to prove that they deserted Rukn-ud-Dīn, Fīrūz Shāh.

1 I-yal-timīsh had, himself, declared her his heir and successor, as stated farther on. She was not his only daughter it is said.
her to death. The people of the city, upon this, rose, and attacked the royal Қāsr [Castle], and seized the mother of Rukn-ud-Din, Firūz Shāh.

When Rukn-ud-Din, Firūz Shāh, reached the city,\(^2\) insurrection had [already] broken out therein, and his mother had been made prisoner. The centre contingents [of the Dihlī forces] and the Turk Amīrs all entered Dihlī and joined Sultān Rażiyyat, pledged their allegiance to her, and placed her on the throne. Having ascended the throne, she despatched a force consisting of the Turkish slaves and Amīrs to Gīlū-kharī, so that they made prisoner of Sultān Rukn-ud-Din, Firūz Shāh, and brought him into the city.\(^3\) He was imprisoned and confined, and, in that prison, he was received into the Almighty's mercy. This circumstance of his seizure, imprisonment, and death\(^4\) occurred on Sunday, the 18th of the month Rabi‘-ul-Awwal, in the year 634 H.; and his reign was six months and twenty-six days\(^5\).

Sultān Rukn-ud-Din, Firūz Shāh, in munificence and liberality, was a second Ḥātim, and what he did, in expending wealth, in conferring so many honorary dresses, and the superfluity of presents, no king, at any time, or in any reign, had done the like of; but his misfortune was this, that his inclinations were wholly towards buffoonery, sensuality, and diversion, and that he was entirely enslaved by dissipation and debauchery; and most of his honorary dresses and his presents were made to such people as musicians and singers, buffoons and Ganymēdes.\(^6\) His excessive waste of money was to such degree, that, while

---

\(^2\) Two modern copies of the text have Gīlū-kharī.

\(^3\) Whilst all this was going on at Dihlī, the feudatories of Lakhanawāt\(^7\) and Lakhan-or were having a private war of their own. See account of Malik No. VII., in the next Section.

\(^4\) If all this happened in one day, it is very certain that he must have been put to death. Some copies have ١٠ instead of ١١.

\(^5\) Some copies have “twenty-eight days:” from the 20th of Ṣha‘bān, 633 H., the date of I-yal-timīsh’s decease, to the 18th of Rabi‘-ul-Awwal, 634 H., is exactly six months and twenty-seven days.

\(^6\) This is the person from whose dignity and elegance “the crown and throne acquired adornment and splendour”! One author states, that, during the short time he reigned, he and his mother managed to empty the treasury, and to spend all the wealth accumulated during the reign of Қuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, and Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh.
in a state of intoxication, seated on the back of an elephant, he would drive through the bāzār of the city, scattering tangals of red gold which the people in the street used to pick up, and gain advantage by. He had a passion for frolic, and for riding elephants, and the whole class of elephant drivers derived immense benefit from his riches and good-nature. It was not in his nature and disposition to injure a human being, and this fact was the cause of the wane of his dominion.

It is essential above all things, that sovereigns should have justice in order that their subjects should dwell in tranquillity and repose, and that they possess beneficence so that their followers may be satisfied and contented; and revelry and merriment, and companionship with the base and ignoble, becomes the means of an empire’s ruin. The Almighty pardon him!

IV. SULTĀN RAŻIYYAT-UD-DUNYĀ WA UD-DĪN, DAUGHTER OF SULTĀN I-YAL-TIMISH.

Sultān Rażiyyat—may she rest in peace!—was a great sovereign, and sagacious, just, beneficent, the patron of the learned, a dispenser of justice, the cherisher of her subjects, and of warlike talent, and was endowed with all the admirable attributes and qualifications necessary for kings;

7 Elliot: vol. ii. page 332—‘He was very fond of playing with and riding upon elephants.’ Rather rough play.
8 Rażiyyat has a meaning, but ‘Rasiya’ and ‘Riziah’ mean nothing. Sultān, from سلطان, signifies to have or possess power, to rule, &c.—a sovereign—and is therefore as equally applicable to a female as a male, and does not appear to have had anything to do with ‘affectation of the superior sex,’ nor her assumption, subsequently, of male attire when she rode forth. Her name or title, like that of most other Muḥammadans in these pages, is pure ‘Arabic, the feminine form of the by no means uncommon name of Rażī-ud-Dīn. See Thomas: Pathān Kings, page 108.

The following is said to have been the inscription on the first coins of this queen regnant, in which she is styled ‘Umdat-un-Nizwān—the great, or illustrious among women:

Obverse: عندم النسوان ملَّعته، زمان سلطان رؤية بخت خمس الدين البكش
Reverse: فرب بلده دهلي سنة 133 جلاد
which may be translated:—Reverse:—‘The illustrious among women, the Queen of the Age, Sultān Rażiyyat, daughter of Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish.’ Obverse:—‘Coined at the city of Dīhil, 643 h., the first of the reign.’

9 Compare Elliot: vol. ii. page 332.
but, as she did not attain the destiny, in her creation, of being computed among men, of what advantage were all these excellent qualifications unto her?

During the lifetime of the august Sulṭān, her father, she exercised authority, and possessed great grandeur, on this account, that her mother, Turkān Khātūn, was the greatest [of the ladies] of the sublime haram, and her place of residence was the royal palace, the Kushk-i-Firūzī [Firūzī Castle]. As the august Sulṭān Shams-ud-Din used to notice in her indications of sovereignty and high spirit, although she was a daughter, and [consequently] veiled from public gaze, when he returned after acquiring possession of Gwāliyūr, he commanded the Tāj-ul-Mulk, Maḥmūd, the secretary—on whom be peace!—who was the Mushrif-i-Mamālik [Secretary of the State], to write out a decree, naming his daughter as his heir-apparent, and she was made his heir [accordingly].

Whilst this decree was being written out, those servants of the state, who had access to the presence of the Sulṭān, made representation, saying: "Inasmuch as he has grown-up sons who are eligible for the sovereignty, what scheme and what object has the Sulṭān of Islām in view in making a daughter sovereign and heir-apparent? Be pleased to

1 This proves what our author meant by the word ژه- with respect to Rukn-ud-Din, Firūz Shāh's mother, namely, that, in point of time or age, she was the oldest of I-yal-timish’s concubines. Rašīyyat Khātūn was his eldest child and, in all probability, her mother was Kutb-ud-Dīn, I-bak’s daughter.

Our author is about the only authority available for the events of this period—all other works, since written, merely copy from him and add from their own fertile imaginations—and there is no authority for stating [Thomas: Pathān Kings, page 104] that Rašīyyat was "brought up under a greater degree of freedom from the inclusion enjoined for females by the more severe custom of ordering Muslim households," for our author here states she was "veiled from public gaze," and it was only just before the end of her reign that she assumed the dress of a male, which, really, is not very different from that of a female—the addition of a head dress and tunic—as our author states. Dow, as usual, misinterpreting Firāštah, who copies from the Tabakat-i-Akbarī, which copies our author, incorrectly states that "on her accession, changing her apparel, she assumed the imperial robes." The "imperial robes" equally with the rest are all his own.

2 In Elliot, it is made "the chief royal palace in the Kushk-firoz!"

Tāj-ul-Mulk signifies the crown of the state: “Tāju-i-Malik” nothing. The word —mushrif—signifies an examiner or authenticator of records and other writings, but not a wazir certainly. —dābir—a retary, a clerk, a scribe. —mudabbir—an administrator, director, counsellor, &c.

Compare Elliot: vol. ii. page 333.
remove this difficulty from our minds, as this deed does not seem advisable to your humble servants." The Sulta\n replied: "My sons are engrossed in the pleasures of youth, and none of them possesses the capability of managing the affairs of the country, and by them the government of the kingdom will not be carried out. After my death it will be seen that not one of them will be found to be more worthy of the heir-apparentship than she, my daughter." The case turned out as that august monarch had pre-
dicted.

When Sulta\n Ra\'iyyat ascended the throne of the king-
dom, all things returned to their usual rules and customs; but the Wazir of the kingdom, the Nizam-ul-Mulk, Mu-
hammad, Junaidi, did not acknowledge her; and Malik 'Ala-ud-Din, Jani, Malik Saif-ud-Din, Kuchi, Malik 'Izz-ud-
Din, Kabir Kh\an-i-Ay\a\z, Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Muhammad, Salar\i, and the Nizam-ul-Mulk, Muhammad, Junaidi, assembled from different parts before the gate of the city of Dihli, and commenced hostilities against Sulta\n Ra\'iyyat, and this opposition continued for a considerable time. At this period Malik Nasrat-ud-Din, Ta\-ayas\'i, the Mu\'izz\i, who was feoffee of Awadh, marched with his forces from that province, for the purpose of rendering aid to Sulta\n Ra\'iyyat, in conformity with [her] commands, towards Dihli, the capital. After he had crossed the river Gang,

4 The Ta\shkarat-ul-Mulk says "one reason why I\-yal-timish named her as his successor was, that his son, N\sir-ud-Din, Mah\mud Sh\a\h—the second son of that name—was so young in years; and the Sulta\n remarked to his minister, at the time, that, although in the form of a woman, she was in reality a man."
6 He is styled, by some more modern writers, Chandiri, as if he were a native of Chandiri or that that was a by-name of his, but it is incorrect. He had been I-yal-timish's wazir for a considerable time.
6 These are the same who, as stated in Elliot, killed "the Tazik."
7 He had been made feudatory of Awadh by Ra\'iyyat after Ghiyas-ud-Din, Muhammad Sh\a\h's rebellion. See page 633.
8 Previous to these events, the feudatory of K\nnauj, Malik Tamur Kh\an-i-K\ira\n, was despatched by Sulta\n Ra\'iyyat into the Gwalior territory and Malwa in command of a force, and the expedition was successful, but no particulars are given. The same Malik, when feudatory of Awadh, penetrated as far as the Tirhut territory, and compelled the Raes and Ranahs, and independent Hind\u tribes in that part to pay tribute. He plundered the territory of Bhat\-ch\u\n [anglicised Bhatrong] in Nipal on several occasions, but neither particulars nor dates are given, but they all happened before this period.
the hostile Malik\textsuperscript{9} who were before the city of Dihil unexpectedly advanced to meet him, and took him prisoner, and affliction overcame him, and he died\textsuperscript{1}. The stay of the hostile Malik\textsuperscript{s} before the gate of Dihil was prolonged for a considerable time; but, as the good fortune of Sulţân Raşiyyat was at the point of ascendancy, the Sulţân issued from the city, and directed her sublime tent to be pitched at a place on the bank of the river Jûn; and, between the Turk Amîrs who served at the stirrup of sovereignty, and the hostile Malik\textsuperscript{s}, conflicts took place upon several occasions. At last, an accommodation was arranged, but in a deceptive manner, and by the subtile contrivance of Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Muḥammad, Sâlârî\textsuperscript{2}, and Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Kabîr, Khân-i-Ayâz, who, secretly, went over to the Sulţân's side, and, one night, met before the entrance to the royal tent, with this stipulation, that Malik Jâni, Malik Saîf-ud-Din, Kûjî, and the Niţâm-ul-Mulk, Muḥammad, Junaidî, should be summoned, and be taken into custody and imprisoned, in order that the sedition might be quelled.

When these Malik\textsuperscript{s} became aware that the state of affairs was on this wise, they left their camp and fled. The Sulţân's horsemen followed in pursuit, and Malik Saîf-ud-Din, Kûjî, and his brother, Fâkhr-ud-Din, fell into their hands, and, subsequently to that, they were put to death in prison. Malik 'Alâ-ud-Din, Jâni, was killed within the limits of Pâyal\textsuperscript{3}, at a village named Nakawân\textsuperscript{4}, and his

\textsuperscript{9} There is nothing about "hostile generals" in the whole passage.
\textsuperscript{1} He appears to have been suffering from illness when Sulţân Raşiyyat summoned him to her aid.

Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Baḥban-i-Kashli Khân, who was so ambitious, and, afterwards, gave so much trouble, was taken prisoner by the hostile Malik\textsuperscript{s} upon this occasion, but was subsequently released by them. He was treated with great honour by Sulţân Raşiyyat. Compare Elliot here also.

\textsuperscript{2} The Taβakât-i-ʻAkbarî, which copies so much from our author, asserts, however, that it was Sulţân Raşiyyat, who, by her able contrivance, succeeded in upsetting and confounding the disaffected Amîr. Firîstah, of course, agrees.

\textsuperscript{3} Elliot, Bâbul; Briggs, from Firîstah, Babool, Firîstah, text, Bâbal—[ki]—and Dow, omitted altogether. Pâyal, or Pâyl, is the name of a very old place, giving name to the district, with a very lofty brick fort visible from a great distance—I mention it as it appeared about a century since—on one of the routes from Dihil to Lûtîfānah. The Taβakât-i-ʻAkbarî gives the name of the district correctly, but leaves out the name of the place. It is in Long. 76° 5', Lat. 30° 40'.

\textsuperscript{4} In some copies Nakâwân or Nagâwân [ناکوان], but the majority of the best
head was brought to the capital; and the Niẓām-ul-Mulk, Muḥammad, Junaidī, retired to the hills of Sir-mūr Bardār, and there, after some time, he died.

Now that the affairs of Sulṭān Raṣīyyat’s government became arranged, she gave the office of Wazīr to the Khwājāh, Muḥazzab, who was the deputy of the Niẓām-ul-Mulk, and he likewise received the title of Niẓām-ul-Mulk. The charge of the army, as her lieutenant, was conferred upon Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-Bihak, who received the title of Ḫūṭlūgh Khān; and Malik ʾIzz-ud-Dīn, Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz, received the sīf of Lohor, and the kingdom became pacified, and the power of the state widely extended. From the territory of Lakhānawāṭī to Diwal and Damrīlah, all the Malikṣ and Amīrs manifested their obedience and submission. Suddenly, Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-Bihak, died, and the charge of the army was

copies of the text are as above. The I. O. L. MS. No. 1952 and that of the R. A. S. MS. have both  

6 See farther on, under the reign of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, respecting this tract of country.

6 He is turned into Muḥazzab, Ghasmāwī, by Firīṣtah, and by his translators, Dow and Briggs, respectively, “Chaja Ghiznavi” and “Mihdy Ghizimvy.”

Muḥazzab, but not Makṣab—which is meaningless—certainly does mean “good, sincere,” &c., but in Elliot, vol. ii. page 334, this passage is rendered “she conferred the office of wazīr on an upright officer who had been the deputy of Nizām-ul-Mulk, and he likewise received the title of Nizām-ul-Mulk;” but Khwājāh does not mean officer, and Muḥazzab—i. e. Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn—is a proper name. Why not translate it always, and also translate Niẓām-ul-Mulk, which means regulator of the state, &c., and all other proper names in the book after the same fashion? They all have meanings, the same as Muḥazzab has. The amusing part of it is that four pages farther on, page 338, he is styled “the wazīr Makṣab-ud-dīn Muḥammad ‘Aṣūr Mustaftā,” and so on until that “upright officer,” than whom no greater rascal is mentioned in this work, met his reward in the “plain Hauz-rānī.” See pages 651—653, 658, and 662, for the doings of that “upright officer.”

7 This word is written  and  and is doubtful.

8 The Ṭabākāt-i-Akbārī here copies our author nearly word for word, and Firīṣtah copies the former in the same way. The Taṣkārat-ul-Mulik says, “through God's assistance she reduced the disaffected Malikṣ to submission and even the Malik of Lakhānawāṭī became obedient to her authority.”

Malik ʾIzz-ud-Dīn, Ṭaghṣirīl-i-Tughān Khān, on her accession, despatched emissaries to the capital, and, to testify his homage, was continually sending offerings of great value from Lakhānawāṭī. On this account Sulṭān Raṣīyyat conferred upon him a canopy of state, and standards, and great honour. At this period Malik Mu-aṣayyid-ud-Dīn, Hindū Khān, held the sīf of Ḫūshāḥ, which was conferred upon him by Sulṭān Raṣīyyat.
bestowed upon Malik Ḵuṭb-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of 'Alī, Ghūrī⁹, and he was appointed to [march and relieve] the fortress of Rantabhr, because the Ḥindūs, after the decease of the august Sultān, Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish, had, for a considerable time, invested that preserved town and stronghold. ¹ MALIK Ḵuṭb-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, conducted the forces to that part, withdrew the Musalmān Amirs [and their troops?] out of that fortification, destroyed the works, and retired, and returned to the capital again.

At this time, the Malik-i-Kabīr [Great Malik] Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Aet-kīn⁸, became Amīr-i-Ḥājib, and Malik Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Yā-ḵūt, the Ḥabashi [Abyssinian or Ethiopian], who was Lord of the Stables, acquired favour in attendance upon the Sultān, so that the Turk Amirs and

⁹ This great noble, whose name will be found in the list at the end of I-yal-timish’s reign, is styled Ḥusayn as well as Ḥasan in several copies indiscriminately, but the first appears correct. Much more about him will be found in the last Section. He was forced to leave Ghūr through the power of the Mughals.

¹ After he had raised the investment and relieved the place, the garrison was withdrawn, and no effort made to hold the place. The reason does not appear, and their giving up a strong place like this which had defied the efforts of the Hindūs so long seems strange. It was soon restored, however, by the Hindūs. What a flourish might have been made of this affair in the Rājpūt annals! It is mentioned in several places farther on.

⁸ Firgītah has not copied the Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbār correctly here, and turns him into Alb-Tīghn in the “revised text,” and Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Yā-ḵūt, is turned into a Amīr-ul-Umrā, which, although such a title did exist from Akbar’s time downwards, was entirely unknown in these days.

⁸ I think the character of this Princess has been assailed without just cause. Thomas says [Pathān Kings, page 106]:—“It was not that a virgin Queen was forbidden to love—she might have indulged herself in a submissive Prince Consort, or revelled almost unchecked in the dark recesses of the Palace Harem—but wayward fancy pointed in a wrong direction, and led her to prefer a person employed about her Court [he was Amīr-i-Ākhur, or Lord of the Stables—Master of the Horse—a high office only conferred upon distinguished persons], an Abyssinian moreover, the favours extended to whom the Tūrkī nobles resented with one accord.”

Elphinstone, who draws his inspiration from Briggs, is more correct in his estimation of her character [and both Dow and Briggs are more correct than usual in their rendering of Firgītah’s words here] and says [page 324, Third ed.]:—“But her talents and virtues were insufficient to protect her from a single weakness. It was shown in the extraordinary [?] marks of favour which she showered [?] on her Master of the Horse; who, to make her partiality more degrading, was an Abyssinian slave [Who says he was a slave? If he was, he was only a slave like most of her other Malikis and Amirs]. It does not appear that her fondness [?] was criminal, since the
Maliks began to be envious therein; and it so chanced to happen that Sulṭān Raẓiyyat laid aside the female dress and issued from [her] seclusion, and donned the tunic, and assumed the head-dress [of a man], and appeared among the people; and, when she rode out on an elephant, at the time of mounting it, all people used, openly, to see her.

At this period she issued commands for her troops to proceed to Gwāliyūr, and bestowed rich and valuable presents. As disobedience was out of the question⁴, this servant

greatest breach of decorum alleged against her is her allowing the Abyssinian to lift her on her horse [a horse she never rode—always an elephant].”

Here is a proof of what a deal may be made out of a little. Our author is the sole authority for these statements in the Ṭabakāt-i-Ākbarī, Firżīlah, and Budā'īnī, each of whom, in rotation, enlarge upon, and exaggerate our author’s words—the last reverses them by saying that when she mounted an elephant or horse she leant upon him, Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Yā-kūt, the Abyssinian. He was Amīr-i-Ākhor before she came to the throne apparently, for she does not seem to have raised him to that office; and it was only in the last year of her reign that she assumed male attire, when she appeared in public. Our author does not say so, but all the Ṭabakāt-i-Ākbarī mentions is, that Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Yā-kūt, was treated with favour, a mere transliteration of our author’s words—fefī ʿabbād—the same term as he uses with respect to Sulṭān Muʿīzz-ud-Dīn’s favour towards his slave, Kūfīh-ud-Dīn, Ī-bak—and that the Turk Maliks and Amīrs were envious in consequence. All that that work states, in addition to our author’s words—for he does not say so—is, that when she mounted to ride forth, the Master of the Horse, who had become Amīr-ul-Umrā [such an office did not exist in those days, and our author never mentions such an office], used to aid her to mount by taking her under the arm-pit [ ylabel]—but leaning on his arm or shoulder, in mounting, would seem to be nearer the intended meaning. Now it is very possible that it was part of the duty of the Lord of the Stables, or his privilege, to assist his sovereign to mount when he or she rode forth, and that such an act might not have been occasioned through any undue familiarity; only what was applicable to a male sovereign, according to Muslīm ideas, was not so to a female. However, the Lord of the Stables being an Abyssinian, this was, with her assumption of male attire, plea sufficient to the rebellious Turk Maliks—the remainder of the “Chihiṅ-gānī Mamlūks,” of whom more hereafter—to rebel against a sovereign too energetic for them in their ambitious designs. The Zubdāt-ut-Tawāḥīkh makes no reference to the Abyssinian whatever.

⁴ I cannot conceive why our author should be styled a rebel—“a forgiven rebel”—because of this sentence in the text. Gwāliyūr had a governor or seneschal placed therein by Sulṭān Raẓiyyat’s father in 630 H., and our author was Kāḏī there. When Raẓiyyat came to the throne, she sent a force under Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjār [No. XIV. in the next Section], and relieved the garrison, and, as the governor—Rasḥīl-ud-Dīn, ‘Alī—from our author’s invocation respecting him, appears to have died there, a new feudatory was despatched, at the same time probably, although he is not mentioned, as, after the death of Rasḥīl-ud-Dīn, ‘Alī, the next official in authority was the Amīr-i-Dād, Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Junaida, who, being a kinsman of
of the victorious kingdom, Minhâj-i-Sarâj, in conjunction with the Malik 4-ul-Umrâ [the chief of Amârs] Ziyâ-ud-Din, Junaidî, who was the Amîr-i-Dâd [chief magistrate] of Gwâliyûr, and with other persons of note, came out of the preserved fortress of Gwâliyûr on the 1st of the month Sha' bân, 635 H., and returned to Dihlî, the capital; and, in this same month, Sulţân Rašîyyat committed to the charge of this servant [the author] the Nâsîriâh College at the capital, to which was added the Kâšî-ship of Gwâliyûr.

In the year 637 H. Malik 'Izz-ud-Dîn, Kâbir Khân-i-Ayâz, who was the feudatory of Lohor, began to show a rebellious spirit.1 Sulţân Rašîyyat led an army towards the rebel Wâzîr, who refused to acknowledge Sulţân Rašîyyat, may have been suspected of disaffection. No cause for rebellion appears, neither is any rebellion mentioned; and, on our author's arrival at Dihlî, another office was bestowed upon him, in addition to his Kâšî-ship of Gwâliyûr, which he still held. See Thomas: Pathân kings, page 105.

"In 631 H. some emissaries from Balkâ Khân, son of Tûshî [Jûjî], son of Chingiz Khân, arrived at the Court of Sulţân I-yl-imîrîh from Êlîhâk, bringing presents for him, but, as that Sulţân had refrained from holding any intercourse whatever with the Mughal Khâns, and was wont to send their agents out of his territory when they came, he would not put these emissaries to death, and desired to dismiss them kindly. They were sent to Gwâliyûr, however, [this was one way of dismissing them kindly], and the party, being all Musalmâns, used to present themselves in the Masjid there every Friday, and said their prayers behind the author of this book [he acting as Imâm], until the reign of Sulţân Rašîyyat, when the author, after six years' absence, returned to Dihlî from Gwâliyûr, and was promoted, by the favour of that sovereign. At this time directions were given for these emissaries of Balkâ Khân to be removed to Kînnauj, and there detained, and there they were kept until they died."2

6 In some copies, Majd-ul-Umrâ, but the above seems the correct title. Majd signifies glory, grandeur—the glory or grandeur of Amîrs does not sound very correct. It was an honorary title merely.

6 In this case he—"the pardoned" rebel—must have performed one of these two offices by deputy.

7 In the account of this Malik our author states that Kâbir Khân-i-Ayâz began to act contumaciously in 636 H., in which year Sulţân Rašîyyat advanced at the head of her troops into the Panjâb against him. He retired before her towards the Indus, until he reached the neighbourhood of the Sûdharah [he could not go much farther, for immediately to the west he would have fallen into hostile hands]. When the royal troops crossed the Râwî, Kâbir Khân-i-Ayâz made his submission, but he was removed from the fief of Lâhor, and Multân was placed in his charge, and the feudatory of the latter—Malik Kârî-Kush Khân—sent to Lâhor.

In this year, 636 H., Malik Salt-ud-Dîn, Hasan, the Kârîlugh, hard pressed by the Mughals, had to abandon his territories, and he retired towards the territory of Multân and Sînd, in hope, probably, of being more successful on
that part from Dihlī, and followed in pursuit of him. At last an accommodation took place, and he presented himself; and the province of Multān, which Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Karā-Kūsh Khān-i-Acīt-kin, held, was made over to the charge of Malik Ḥizz-ud-Dīn, Kābir Khān-i-Ayāz. Sultān Rašīyyat returned again to the capital on Thursday, the 19th of the month of Sha'bān, 637 H.

Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūnīah, who held the fief of Tabarhindah, broke out into rebellion, and, secretly, some of the Amīrs of the Court abetted him in this treason. Sultān Rašīyyat, on Wednesday, the 9th of the sacred month Ramażān of this same year [637 H.], set out from the capital, with numerous forces, for the purpose of putting down Malik Altūnīah's rebellion. When she reached that place [Tabarhindah], through circumstances which supervened, the Turk Amīrs rose against her, and put to death Amīr Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Yā-kūt, the Ḥābashī, seized Sultān Rašīyyat and put her in durance, and sent her to the fortress of Tabarhindah.

this than on the former occasion. Hasan's eldest son, whose name has not transpired, taking advantage of Rašīyyat's presence in the Panjāb, presented himself before her, was well received, and the fief of Baran, east of Dihlī, was conferred upon him. Soon after, however, he left, without leave and without the cause being known, and rejoined his father, who still was able to hold Banfān, and, soon after, the Kārlūghās gained possession of Multān. At this period Malik Mu'ayyid-ud-Dīn, Hindū Khān, held the fief of Uchchah.

8 Ramażān, in some copies of the text.

9 Altūnīah was only lately made secedatory of Tabarhindah, for, when Rašīyyat came to the throne, she gave him his first fief, that of Baran. Briggs styles him "of the Toorky tribe of Chelgany"—a nice blunder, but Dow leaves this part of the sentence out. See last para. of note 8, page 643, and the meaning of Chihih-gānī in next Section.

1 In some copies of the text, "with the forces composing the ḫalb" or centre, the signification of which has been given in note 8, page 634.

2 But not "on the way" thither as in Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbarf and Firīštah.

3 Our author says "martyred," here equivalent to his being put to death unjustly. Raüşat-ṭ-Safā says, Yā-kūt commanded her troops, a very unlikely thing, when the Turk Malikīs and Amīrs hated him so greatly. He may have commanded Rašīyyat's own personal followers. Raüşat-ṭ-Safā, indeed, says so. For the detail of these events see the account of Malik Altūnīah in the next Section.

4 Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbarf and Budā'ūnī have Tarhīndah—in all cases, and Firīštah ["revised text"], wherever this place is mentioned, under whatever reign it may be, has Pathīndah and Bathīndah.
Among the events which happened in the beginning of Sultān Raṣiyyat's reign, the greatest was that the Ḟi-rāmiṭah and Mulāḥidah heretics of Hindūstān, incited by a person, a sort of learned man, named Nūr-ud-Dīn, a Turk⁶, whom they used to style Nūr, the Turk, collected together at Dihlí, from different parts of the territory of Hind, such as Gujarāt, and the country of Sind, and the parts round about the capital, Dihlí, and the banks of the rivers Jūn and Gang. In secret they pledged themselves to be faithful to each other, and, at the instigation of Nūr, the Turk, they conspired against Islām. This Nūr, the Turk, used to harangue, and the mob would collect around him. He used to call the 'Ulamā of the orthodox people⁶ Nāṣībī [setters-up], and to style them Murji'⁷ [procrastinators], and used to incite the common people to animosity against the orders of 'Ulamā of the sects of Abū-Ḥanifah and Shāf‘ī until a day was fixed upon. The whole of the fraternities of the Mulāḥidah and Ḟi-rāmiṭah entered the Ġāmi‘ Masjid of the city of Dihlí, on Friday, the 6th of the month of Rajab, in the year 634 H., to the number of about one thousand persons, armed with swords and shields. Having divided into two bodies, one body, from the side of the Ḩiṣār-i-Nau [the new Citadel], entered the gateway of the Ġāmi‘ Masjid on the northern side, and the second body, passing through the Bāzār-i-Bazāzān [the Bāzār of the Cloth-Merchants], entered the gateway of the Mu‘izzī College under the supposition that it was the Ġāmi‘ Masjid, and, on both sides, fell upon the Musalmāns with [their] swords. A great number of people, some by the swords of those heretics, and some [trodden] under people's feet, attained martyrdom.

On an outcry having arisen from the city on account of

⁶ He was not called "Nūr Turk," but he was a Turk, and his name was Nūr-ud-Dīn.

⁷ That is the Sunnī, in contradistinction to the Shi‘as and other schismatics. Neither Ṭabaḳāt-i-Akbarī, Budā‘ūnī, nor Firīghtah, refer to this "outbreak," but other writers do. The fact of Firīghtah's being a Shi‘a may account for his eschewing the matter.

⁸ The name of one of the heretical sects among the Muḥammadans, who procrastinate, and consider good works unnecessary, and faith sufficient, and that all Musalmāns will be saved, as hell is only reserved for infidels. See Sale: Kur'ān, Preliminary Discourse, for an account of these different sects of schismatics, pages 122, 130, and 131.
this outbreak, the warriors of the city, such as Naṣir-ud-Din, Ai-yitim, the Balārmī, and Amīr, Imām-i-Nāṣiri, the Poet, and other armed men, from different directions, rode fully equipped [as they were] with cuirass, and other defensive armour, steel cap, spear, and shield, into the Jāmi’ Masjid, by the minārah entrance, and plied their swords upon the Mulāhidah and Kīrāmtīsah heretics; and the Musalmāns, who were on the roof of the Jāmi’ Masjid, poured down stones and bricks upon them, and sent the whole of the Mulāhidahs and Kīrāmtīsahs to hell, and quelled that outbreak. Thanks be to God for the blessing of safety and the honour of religion!

When they imprisoned Sulțān Raḥiyyat within the stronghold of Tabarhindah, Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Din, Altūnīah, entered into a matrimonial contract with her, and espoused her, and marched an army towards Dīlī, in order to take possession of the kingdom a second time. Malik ’Izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Sālārī, and Malik Ċarā-Kusb rebelled and quitted the capital, Dīlī, and went and joined them.

Sulțān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh [Raḥiyyat’s brother], was [at this time] seated on the throne; and Ikhtī-

9 The Taṣkarat-ul-Mulīk and some other works state that Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūnīah, contracted marriage with Sulțān Raḥiyyat, nosens velens. He then took up her cause. He was no longer a rebel, because he imagined he would get the upper hand of his brother rebels; and Raḥiyyat now managed to raise a considerable force consisting of Khokhars [this large tribe appear to have extended, at that period, a considerable distance east of the Bīāh, and the good horses to be obtained in the Talwardhīs of the Khokhars are often mentioned], Jaṭs, and others of the tribes about Tabarhindah, and some Amīrs likewise, from the adjoining sīefs, went over to her. The Taḥkapāt-i-Akbar, and Zubdat-ut-Tawārikh, also mention Khokhars, but Firīghtah, here, as well as elsewhere, not knowing the difference between and turns the former into Ghakars, a people, in his time, in some repute, and when a chief or two of the tribe were serving the Mughals emperors.

ELPHINSTONE, states that “Rezia”—he refers to Raḥiyyat—“when force failed her had recourse to art, and she so far gained over Altūnīa by the influence of love or ambition, that he agreed to marry her,” &c. I wonder what “authentic history” that is recorded in, or how proved? The reason of the change in Malik Altūnīāh’s policy is apparent, as shown by a Muḥammadan writer in a following note. Others had obtained power at Dīlīf and he had been left out in the cold after being made a tool of, and now, therefore, he who formerly rebelled against Sulțān Raḥiyyat became, out of revenge, her champion.

1 Half-brother apparently.
yār-ud-Dīn, Aet-kin, the Amīr-i-Ḥājib, having been assassinated, Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunḳar, the Rūmī, had become Amīr-i-Ḥājib. In the month of Rabī’-ul-Awwal, in the year 638 H., Sulṭān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, led an army out of Dihlī for the purpose of resisting Sulṭān Raẓīyyat and Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūnīah, and they were routed, and, having reached Kaithal, the troops along with them all abandoned them, and Sulṭān Raẓīyyat and Malik Altūnīah fell captive into the hands of Hindūs, and attained martyrdom.

Their defeat took place on the 24th of the month, Rabī’-ul-Awwal; and the martyrdom of Sulṭān Raẓīyyat took place on Tuesday, the 25th of Rabī’-ul-Awwal, in the year 638 H. Her reign extended over a period of three years, six months, and six days.

The author of the Tabaḵāt-i-Akbarf, who seems to know—without naming any authority—better than those persons who were eye-witnesses of what they relate, and other authors who preceded him, asserts that Sulṭān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, sent an army against Raẓīyyat under Malik ‘Īzz-ud-Dīn, Balban [in some copies Tīgin], who afterwards attained the title of Ulugh Khān, and Firīṣṭāh, of course, follows. The amusing part of it is that our author’s patron was neither styled ‘Īzz-ud-Dīn, at this time, nor at any other; and he had not attained such a high position at that period as to be put in the command of an army, as may be gathered from the account of him in the next Section. He was, at first, Khāṣāh-dār to Sulṭān Raẓīyyat, and, afterwards, during her reign, became Amīr-i-Shīkār. The above-mentioned work also places this defeat and death of Raẓīyyat in 637 H.—a year too soon.

The Zubdat-ut-Tawārīḵh, as well as the Tabaḵāt-i-Akbarf, makes two affairs of this, and says that it was after the first defeat, but gives no date for it, that Raẓīyyat raised a force of Khokhars and other tribes, and that the second defeat took place near Kaithal, on the 4th of Rabī’-ul-Awwal, 638 H., after which the Khokhars and others abandoned her, and she and her husband fell into the hands of the Hindūs, who put them to death on the 25th of the same month. See further details of these transactions in the account of Malik Altūnīah in the next Section.

In some copies, Saturday, the 29th of Rabī’-ul-Ākhir, but the date cannot be correct. See also the account of Malik Altūnīah in the next Section, where the 25th of Rabī’-ul-Ākhir is given as the date.

Ibn-Baṭūṭah, who is sometimes quoted as an authority on Indian history, says [Lee’s translation] that Raẓīyyat’s brother, having “polluted his reign by killing his brothers, was, therefore, killed himself. Upon this, the army agreed to place his sister, El Malikā Razā, upon the throne, who reigned four years. This woman usually rode about among the army, just as men do. She, however, gave up the government, on account of some circumstances that presented themselves. After this, her younger brother, Nāṣīr Oddin, became possessed of the government, which he held for twenty years”!! So much for Ibn-Baṭūṭah’s authority on Indian history.
V. SULTĀN MU'IZZ-UD-DUNYĀ WA UD-DIN, BAHRAM SHĀH⁶, SON OF THE SULTĀN [I-YAL-TIMISH].

Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Din, Bahram Shāh—on whom be peace!—was a conquering monarch, fearless and full of courage, and sanguinary; but he was endowed with some laudable attributes and excellent qualities. He was in nature unassuming and frank, and never had about his person jewelry and finery after the custom of the kings of this world, nor did he ever evince any desire for girdles, silken garments, decoration, banners, or display.

When they imprisoned Sultān Rażiyyat in the preserved city of Tabarhindi, the Malik and Amīrs, in accord, despatched letters to the capital city of Dihlī, and Mu'izz-ud-Din, Bahram Shāh, on Monday, the 28th of the month Ramażān, in the year 637 H., they raised to the throne of sovereignty. When, on Sunday, the 11th of the month of Shawwāl of that same year, the Malik and Amīrs and the rest of the forces returned to the city again, they publicly pledged their allegiance to his sovereignty within the Daulat Khānah [Royal residence] on the stipulation of the Deputyship being conferred upon Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Din, Aet-kin⁷; and, on that day, after [pledging] allegiance, the writer of these words, by way of benediction, in order to congratulate him [on his accession], recited this strophe:—

"Well done, on thy account, the uprearing of the emblems of sovereignty!
Bravo to thy good fortune, heaped up, the ensigns of dominion!
Mu'izz-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn, Mughīs-ul-Khālik b'il haqk,
Of dignity like Sulīmān: under thy command are both jinn [genii] and mankind.

Though the sovereignty of Hind be the heritage of the Shamsī family,
Praise be to God, a second I-yal-timīsh, of its sons art thou.

When the whole world saw thee, that, by right, thou art the kingdom's heir,
They made thy diadem their kiblah-gāh, for thou art all-powerful and wise.

⁶ The inscription given as that of his first coining is as follows:—

Overse—"Fātir dar al-falāṣ, dīnār dīrām wa al-dinaris wa al-dīrāmis wa al-nāmis wa al-mā".

Reverse—The name of Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh, conferreth glory on dinār and dirām. Year 637."

which may be thus translated:—Overse—"The name of Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh, conferreth glory on dinār and dirām. Year 637." Reverse—"Struck at the seat of empire, Dihlī, in the first year [of the reign]."

⁷ He was to act as Deputy or Regent for one year. See the account of this Malik in the next Section. Firāghah turns this name into "Alp-Tiggin," but Dow leaves out the titles altogether, and makes Tīggi of him.
Like as Minhāj-i-Saḥāj's, for thee the creation's prayer is this:—
'O God! mayest thou on the kingdom's throne to eternity continue:
Straight like the spear may the universe during thy reign become,
So that, save in the hair-tuft of thy standard, no one may disorder
behold 8.'"

When Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Aet-kin, became Deputy 9, by virtue of his deputy-ship, he took the affairs of the kingdom into his own hands, and, in conjunction with the Wazīr, the Niẓām-ul-Mulk, the Khwājah, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Iwāz, the Mustaufī 1, assumed control over the disposal of state affairs 9.

After a month or two had passed away, this fact began to press heavily upon the noble mind of Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn; and a sister of the Sulṭān, who had been married to the son of the Kāżī, Naṣīr-ud-Dīn 8, and had, at her own request, been repudiated 4 by him, the Deputy [Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Aet-kin], having taken to wife, assumed the triple naubah, and stationed an elephant at the entrance of his own residence 6 [out of parade], and the grandeur of his

8 I have translated and inserted this strophe here, not for any particular merit it possesses, but to show the style of our author's unctuous and flatulent poetical effusions. Although his work was completed twenty-one years after this event, and the true character of the Prince he composed those lines upon was then known to him, whatever good opinion he may have had of him at the time of his accession, he did not think it necessary to omit this piece of fulsome adulation to this “Sulīmān in dignity,” this “second I-yal-timīgh.” This translation will not be again burdened with any more of our author's own poetry.

9 On account of Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh's youth, as was determined when the Maliks agreed to raise him to the throne. He was to act as Deputy one year.

1 Mustaufī is not a proper name. It signifies the head clerk of a department, an auditor, &c., and to the office previously held by “the upright officer,” as Muḥazzab has been translated, or by his father or ancestors. See Blochmann's translation of the Ā'īn for the meanings of such words, and compare Elliot: INDIA, vol. ii. page 338.

2 That is, he, in concert with the Wazīr, ruled the country, whilst the “Sulīmān,” whose commands swayed “the jinn and mankind,” was king in name merely.

3 Turned into Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn by Firighah—in the “revised text”—who turns the Malik of that name into Alb-Tigīn!

4 She had been repudiated by her own desire from aversion to her husband. In such cases the wife resigns the dowry and all presents made to her, &c.

5 In the account of this Malik in the next Section, our author states that he applied for permission to use the naubah—already described in note 8, page 383—on becoming Deputy. At this period kings only were allowed to have elephants in this way, unless specially granted, as in Malik ʿIzz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kaghālī Khān's case, mentioned in the account of him in the next Section.
affairs and the execution of his mandates lasted until the month of Muḥarram of the year 638 H., when, unexpectedly, on Monday, the 8th of that month, by command of the Sulṭān, a discourse was delivered within the Kaṣr named Safed [the White Castle]. After the termination of the discourse, Sulṭān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, from the upper part of the palace, despatched two reckless Turks, after the manner of Fidā-īs, so that, in front of the dais, in the royal Audience Hall of the Kaṣr-i-Safed, they martyred Malik Ikhtiyyār-ud-Dīn, Aet-kin, by the wound of a knife. They inflicted on the Wazir, the Niẓām-ul-Mulk, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, two wounds in the side; but, as his appointed time was not come, he got away from them and escaped outside. Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunḵar, the Rūmī, became Amir-i-Ḥājib, and assumed the direction of

6 The printed text has قفر سعيد نام instead of قفر سعيد نام as above, and so the former is rendered in ELLIOT, vol. ii. page 338, "the Palace of the White-roof." I hope the Archæologists will not search for it under the latter name. The 'Arabic word kaṣr, and its Persian equivalent kūshk, does not mean a palace exactly, but, more strictly speaking, a castle—a fortified residence. Windsor Castle, for example, in the feudal times, was a kaṣr. See also note 2, page 331.

7 Our author makes a totally different statement in his account of this Malik in the next Section. He says that the Sūlār, the late Aḥmad-i-Sa‘d, came secretly to the Sulṭān and instigated him to this act.

The Taḵbāt-i-Akbari cuts this matter very short, and Budā‘unī perpetrates the blunder of killing Aet-kīn and the Wazīr both at one time. Firgītah here makes an altogether different statement to our author’s, but does not quote his authority, and, as our author is about the only one for the reigns of the Shamsī dynasty, the Dakhānī historian’s statement may be valued accordingly. He says Sulṭān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, instigated two Turks among his confidants to feign drunkenness, and to assassinate Alb-Tīgin [Aet-kīn] and the Wazīr. They entered the royal Audience Hall of the Kaṣr-i-Safed for this purpose, and Alb-Tīgin [Aet-kīn], who was standing up in the row of Amīrs before the Sulṭān—who is made out to have been present by Firgītah—moved to stop them and prohibit their approach [seeing the condition they pretended to be in, as if the guards were not enough for the purpose], when, having the opportunity they wanted, they slew him with their "life-taking daggers," and then attacked the Wazīr, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, and inflicted two wounds on him. The other nobles present now making a rush, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn managed to escape. The Sulṭān, that day, ordered the two Turks to be imprisoned for their act, but very soon released them. The Lubb-i-Tawārīkh-i-Hind gives a similar account, but the names are correctly given.

Fidā-ī is the name applied to the agents of the Chief of the Assassins, or Shiikh-ul-Jībāl, who carried out his decrees against people’s lives. Fidā means a sacrifice, one who is devoted to carry out any deed.

It was Malik Ikhtiyyār-ud-Dīn, Aet-kīn, who incited Malik Altūnīah to revolt against Sulṭān Raṣīyyat, and so he met his deserts.
state affairs; and, when Sultan Raziyyat, along with Malik Ikhṭiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūnīyah, from Tabarhindah, determined to move towards Dihlī, and revoked that intention, and withdrew, and Sultan Raziyyat and Altūnīyah attained martyrdom at the hands of the Hindūs, as has previously been recorded, the affairs of Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunḵar, took a new turn. Moreover, because, in the execution of his own mandates, and the administration of the affairs of the kingdom, he did not possess the authority of the Sultan of Islām, and used to seek to acquire superiority over the Wazīr, the Niẓām-ul-Mulk, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, and used to issue his own orders, the Wazīr, secretly, was in the habit of influencing the Sultan's disposition against Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunḵar, to such degree, that the Sultan's temper became quite changed towards him.

When Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunḵar, discovered this fact, he grew apprehensive of the Sultan. He was desirous by some suitable means of removing the Sultan and placing one of the latter's brothers upon the throne. On Monday, the 17th1 of the month of Šafar, 639 H., at the residence of the Šadr-ul-Mulk, the Sayyid, Tāj-ud-Dīn, 'Alī, Mūsāwī, who was the Muḥṣrif-i-Mamālīk [Secretary of the Kingdom], Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunḵar, convened a party of the Šadrs and chief men of the capital, such as the Kaẓī-i-Mamālīk [Kaẓī of the Kingdom], Jalāl-ud-Dīn, the Kāsānī, Kaẓī Kabīr-ud-Dīn, Shaikh Muḥammad-i-Shāmī [the Syrian], and other Amīrs2 and important personages. When they had assembled, and deliberated respecting the change of government, they despatched the Šadr-ul-Mulk [Šadr of the State—Chief Šadr] to the presence of the Wazīr, the Niẓām-ul-Mulk, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, in order that he

---

1 This Malik was the patron of Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Balban, subsequently, Ulugh Khān-i-Aʿzān; and, when the former became Amīr-i-Ḥajīb, through his patronage, Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Balban, who, up to this time, had not attained a higher office than that of Chief Huntsman, was promoted to the dignity of Amīr-i-Āḵḥur [Lord of the Stables].

2 In other places, the date of this event, in some copies, is the 14th, and in others the 10th.

1 Šadr-ul-Mulk signifies Judge or Administrator of the State, but here it is only his title or degree, as his office is Muḥṣrif-i-Mamālīk.

2 A native of Kāsān.—Kazan of modern maps.

3 The word Amīr here, it will be seen, is applied to Kaẓīs and ecclesiastics.
might be present [with them], and that, in accord with him, they might carry out their object effectively.

One of the Sultān's favourites and confidants was at the Wazir's side when the Ṣadr-ul-Mulk reached his residence; and when the Wazir, the Niẓām-ul-Mulk, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, heard the announcement of the Ṣadr-ul-Mulk's coming, he concealed that confidential person of the Sultān in a place where he might hear their conversation. The Ṣadr-ul-Mulk entered, and stated to him all about the [proposed] change in the state of the highest personages of the sublime Court, and craved the Khwājah, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, the Wazir's attendance. The Khwājah, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, replied: "It behoveth that you should return again, so that I may perform afresh the ablution of purification, and follow [you] to the presence of the grandees." When the Ṣadr-ul-Mulk retired, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn brought forth the Sultān's confidant, and said to him: "Didst thou hear what the Ṣadr-ul-Mulk said? Proceed quickly to the royal presence and represent that it is advisable that the Sultān should mount and come upon that seditious party so that they may not have dispersed."

4 The difference of idioms in the text, so often mentioned, is considerable here also.

5 The Dakhanī historian—who has made "such conscientious and excellent use of his predecessors," and whose works he has "so entirely exhausted of all prominent facts mentioned by them," as to have rendered their works "almost useless"—FIRĪṢṬAH, by his wholesale appropriations of the text of the Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbārī—in many places verbatim, although he pretends, now and then, to differ from it, whilst copying the identical statement at the same time—has, in this instance, "exhausted" that work so faithfully and conscientiously that he betrays himself, and endorses the same great blunder that the author of the Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbārī perpetrates here, even to the incorrect name given to one of the parties, which is totally contrary to our author's account, and which the other's own words subsequently contradict, and then his statement agrees with our author, from whose work he took it, for there is no other contemporary writer to recur to. The Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbārī says, after Aet-kin had been assassinated and Muḥazzab wounded, that "Malik Bāḍr-ud-Dīn, Sunḳar, the Rūmī, became Amīr-i-Ḥājib, and he administered the affairs according to the old laws and usages. It so happened, that, at the instigation of a clique of the seditious, he took counsel with the Ṣadrs and conspicuous persons respecting a change of sovereignty. On Monday, the 18th of Safar, all the chief men assembled at the abode of the Ṣadr-ul-Mulk, Tāj-ud-Dīn, who was the Muḥrīf-i-Mamālīk, and there held counsel respecting the proposed change in the government. They despatched the Ṣadr-ul-Mulk [Tāj-ud-Dīn] to the presence of the Niẓām-ul-Mulk, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, the Wazir, in order that
When they stated this matter to the Sulțān, he, at once, mounted, and that disaffected party became struck with amazement, and Baḍr-ud-Dīn, Sunḳar, joined the Sulțān, who returned, and held a council in his own royal residence, and forthwith a mandate was issued that Baḍr-ud-Dīn, Sunḳar, should proceed to Budāʿūn, and that district was made his fief. Kāẓī Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Kāsānī, was removed from the chief Kāẓī-ship, and Kāẓī Kabīr-ud-Dīn, and Shaikh Muḥammad-i-Shāmī, together with him, became apprehensive, and left the city.

After a period of four months, Malik Baḍr-ud-Dīn, Sunḳar, returned to the capital, and, as the Sulṭān was incensed against him, he ordered him to be imprisoned; and the Sayyid, Tāj-ud-Dīn, 'Alī, Mūsāwī, was also ordered to be imprisoned, and, at last, both of them were martyred. This occurrence totally changed the disposition of the Amirs, and all of them became frightened and apprehensive of the Sulṭān, and not one among them he also might attend the meeting and take part in the consultation. At once, the Šadr-ud-Mulk gave intimation to Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, and, having placed a confidential follower of the Sulṭān’s in a place of concealment, [where? in another man’s house to betray himself?] went to the Nizām-ud-Mulk’s [Muhazzab, the Wazir’s] abodes and informed him of the presence [at his own house!] of Kāẓī Jalāl-ud-Dīn, the Kāsānī, Kāẓī Kabīr-ud-Dīn, Shaikh Muḥammad, and other personages there assembled [and asked him to come along with him], but Muhazzab-ud-Dīn put off his coming to the time of afternoon prayers. The Šadr-ud-Mulk represented what was doing by means of the Sulṭān’s servant, whom he had concealed, and apprised that monarch of the state of affairs, who, that very hour, set out, and came upon them; &c. &c. The Šadr-ud-Mulk, Tāj-ud-Dīn, as mentioned in the next page, was imprisoned and put to death for his share in this affair. Some others of the smaller fry of historians copy this blunder from the Tabakat-i-Akbār as well as Firīghtah, and, from the fact of the latter making the very same blunder as the former—he, indeed, uses his very words—I am much inclined to doubt whether Firīghtah ever saw our author’s work, and I think that nothing will be found in Firīghtah, taken from our author’s history, but such as is contained in the Tabakat-i-Akbār. Compare Elliot here also.

6 He took up his residence in the dwelling of Malik Kûtb-ud-Dīn. This is the illustrious Ghiyār chief, Malik Kûtb-ud-Dīn, Husain, son of ‘Alī, whose execution is recorded at page 702. He is again mentioned in the last Section.

7 See note 4, preceding page.

8 Whether in prison or out is not said. Compare Elliot here. In the next Section it is said to have taken place on Wednesday, the 14th of Jamādī-ul-Awwal, 639 H., but in some copies Rabī-ul-Awwal is stated to have been the month, but this is impossible as Rabī-ul-Awwal follows next to the month Ṣafar, and Jamādī-ul-Awwal is only the third month after Ṣafar, and from what is stated just before Jamādī-ul-Akhīr would be most correct.
placed any further confidence, in him. The Wazir, too, in order to avenge the wounds he had received, desired that all the Amirs, the Maliks, and the Turks should rebel against the Sultān. He continued to raise the Sultān's apprehensions against the Amirs and Turks, and was exciting the fears of the Amirs against the Sultān, until, at last, this fact spread abroad like a pestilence, and was the cause of the dethronement of the Sultān, and rebellion among the people.

Among the calamities which happened during the reign of Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Din, Bahram Shāh, was the matter of the city of Lohor, when an army of the infidel Mughals from the direction of Khorāsān and Ghaznīn appeared before that city, and, for a considerable time, carried on hostilities. The feudatory of Lohor was Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Din, Karā-Kash, and he, by nature, was very warlike, energetic, intrepid, and fearless, but the inhabitants of Lohor did not act as the conditions of union demanded, and in fighting, and in keeping guard at night, showed much neglect. When that disposition became evident to Malik Karā-Kash, he put his retainers in motion, and, at night, evacuated the city, and set out towards the capital, Dīhlī. The infidel Mughals pursued him, but the Most High God preserved him under His own guardianship, and he escaped in safety from them. As no ruler remained within the city of Lohor, on Monday, the 16th of the month of Jamādī-ul-Ākhir, 639 H., the infidel Mughals obtained possession of that city, martyred the Musalmāns, and made captive their dependents.

---

1 Compare ELLIOT, vol. ii. page 339.
2 Dow turns him into "Mallek," as if that was his name, and Briggs always into "Malik Kurragoon"!
3 As usual with our author, instead of giving the details of this affair here, he postpones it, gives a few additional particulars in his account of Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Din, Karā-Kash Khān, in the next Section in his account of the various Maliks, but leaves the details for the last Section. Alī says it was in 638 H.

The Mughals, at first, intended to attack Multān—which was still held by Malik Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz—but, finding they were likely to meet with a warm reception, turned their faces towards Lāhor, at that time, totally unprepared to offer an efficient defence, being without stores of provisions or munitions of war. Many of the principal inhabitants of Lāhor at this period were merchants, who had travelled into Upper Khorāsān and Turkistān with
When the dreadful intelligence of this calamity reached the capital, Sultân Mu‘izz-ud-Dîn, Bahrâm Shâh, assembled the people of the city of Dîhilî in the Kaşr-i-Safed [White Castle], and to the author, the writer of these lines, he gave command to deliver a discourse, and the people pledged their fealty [anew] to the Sultân⁴.

their merchandize, and had provided themselves with letters of protection from the Mughal rulers, and they seemed not to care what happened, and the remainder of the chief inhabitants were also remiss. Seeing this, Malik Kaşā-Kaşh determined to leave them, more particularly as there was but little chance of being succoured from Dîhilî. The Turk and Ghûrîî Malik, being disaffected towards Sultân Mu‘izz-nd-Dîn, Bahrâm Shâh, were not very active in obeying his summons to assemble their followers and the “upright officer”—the arch rebel [referred to in note ⁸, page 641], Muhazzab-ud-Dîn, the Wazîr—even after the army had reached the Fâhâ, instead of pushing on to Lâhor, was occupied in plotting the destruction of his master. Finding resistance hopeless, Malik Kaşā-Kaşh, under pretence of making a night attack upon the Mughal camp, assembled his family and followers, cut his way out, and made towards Dîhilî. After he had left, when too late, the inhabitants made some effort to defend the place, under the guidance of the Koť-wâl [Seneschal], Ak-Sûnkar, and a few others. During the fighting that went on in the streets of the city, after the Mughals effected a lodgment, the Bahâdûr, Ta-îr, the Mughal commander, according to our author, was encountered, lance to lance, by Ak-Sûnkar, and each wounded the other so severely that both died of their wounds.

There is considerable discrepancy here between our author and Faşi ib-I and others which will be noticed in the last Section, and as to the Bahâdûr, Ta-îr, being killed, according to Faşi ib-I and others, he was alive in 644 H., and, moreover, the Nû-ylûn, Mangûtab, was the commander of the Mughals, and the Bahâdûr, Ta-îr, was under him. After the departure of the Mughals, the Khokharis, and other Hindû Gabras, seized upon Lâhor; and, after this, we no more hear of a feudatory of Lâhor in the whole work.

Briggs, in his version of Firîshthâ’s history, but not on his authority, assures us that the Mughal in question was “a famous Toorkey leader named Toormooshrîun [sic] Khan”. Dow, however, turns Malik Kaşā-Kaşh into “Malleck, the viceroy,” but leaves out this “famous Toorkey leader.”

Lâhor was sacked, numbers of its people were massacred and curried away into captivity.

At the time of this invasion, Kaňûn Khâm-i-îyáz, whom Sultân Rašîyyat had removed from the sîf of Lâhor to that of Multân, assumed a canopy of state and independence, and took possession of Üchchah and its dependencies. He however died shortly after this act of disloyalty, in 639 H. His son, Tâj-ud-Dîn, Aû-î-Bïkr, brought Sind under his authority, and several times attacked the Karlughs before the gate of Multân. More respecting these events will be found in the next two Sections.

⁸ Compare Elliot, li. 340.

Elliot—“He had lived for some time quietly in the Sultân’s water palace.” The Kaşr or castle here mentioned had been erected on the edge, or, more probably, in the midst of the Hauz which Fûal-timûh made, which was named the Hauz-i-Sultân, and Hauz-i-Shâmsî. It is often mentioned; and,
There was a Darwesh, a Turk-mân, who was named Aiyūb, a hermit clothed in garb of hair-cloth, who, for some time, dwelt, engaged in his devotions, at the Hauz [reservoir] of the Kašr-i-Sultân [the Sultân’s Castle], and there he acquired intimacy with Sultân Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Bahrām Shāh, and the Sultân manifested a partiality for him. This Darwesh began to interfere in state affairs. Before this the Darwesh in question had dwelt at the town of Mihir, and had been persecuted by Każī Shams-ud-Dîn of Mihir. At this time, that the Darwesh’s words were revered by, and he had acquired ascendancy over, Sultân Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Bahrām Shāh, he used his endeavours until the Sultân had Każī Shams-ud-Dîn of Mihir thrown before the feet of an elephant.

As soon as this catastrophe became known, the people again became wholly afraid of the Sultân. In order to repel the infidel Mughals who were then before the gates of the city of Lohor, the Sultân nominated Malik Kuṭb-ud-Dîn, Ḥusain, son of ‘Alî, the Ghūrî, along with the Wazîr [the Khwâjah, Muhazzab-ud-Dîn], and several Amir and Malik, with the forces of Hindûstân, to advance towards Lohor, for the purpose of guarding the frontiers. At this period, Sultân Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Bahrām Shāh, on

in after times, Sultân Firûz Shāh repaired it, as well as many other buildings, masjids, tombs, &c.

Darweshes of this kind, however, do not live in palaces, they would not be Darweshes if they did: this one took up his residence near the building, in some small masjid or other religious building.

Here likewise, because the Tabâkât-i-Akbarî makes a mistake in including Kaţî Shams-ud-Dîn among those connected with the plot mentioned in note 6, page 653, and throws him at the elephant’s feet then, Firîstah, of course, does precisely the same; but this Darwesh is not mentioned in either work. The Kaţî’s death does not appear to have been connected, in any way, with the plot in question.

6 The “STUDENT’S MANUAL OF INDIAN HISTORY,” however, assures us, contrary to the Muḥammadan historians, that his name was “Yekhtar ood Deen, the vizier,” whilst Dow, on the other hand, is more correct, according to Firîstah, and calls him “Hassen Ghori,” but puts an additional piece upon it, and says he was “chief secretary of the empire”!

7 Kuṭb-ud-Dîn, Ḥusain, commanded this force, the Wazîr merely accompanied him in a civil capacity. Compare Thomas: “PATHÂN KINGS,” page 118.

6 Above, our author states it was to repel the Mughals, but here, from what he says, the relief of Lāhor was not the object, but merely the guarding of the frontiers. The Mughals took the city on the 16th of Jamâdi-ul-Akhir, 639 H.
Saturday, the 10th of Jamādi-ul-Awwal, in the year 639 H., entrusted this author with the Ḟāṣīr-ship of the empire, together with the Ḟāṣīr-ship of the capital, and conferred upon him a robe of honour and liberal presents. After this, the troops received orders [to move].

When the forces assembled on the bank of the Biāh, the Khwājah, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, the Wazīr, in order to take vengeance upon the Sulṭān, so that, by some means or other, he might oust him from the throne, indited a representation secretly to the Sulṭān from the camp, saying: “These Amīrs and Turks will never become obedient. It is advisable that an edict should be issued by His Majesty, that I, and Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, should destroy all the Amīrs and Turks, by such means as may be attainable, in order that the country may be clear [of them].” When that representation reached the Sulṭān, he, according to the way of precipitancy and youthfulness, did not take this order into consideration nor deliberate upon it, and commanded so that an edict of the desired form was written out and despatched to the camp.

As soon as the edict reached the camp, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn showed the very edict itself to the Amīrs and Turks, saying: “The Sulṭān writes and commands respecting you on this subject.” All of them became excessively incensed against the Sulṭān, and, at the suggestion of the Khwājah, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, the Wazīr, they pledged themselves to effect the expulsion and dethronement of the Sulṭān. When the news of this disaffection on the part of those Amīrs and troops reached the capital, the Shaikh-ul-Islām

---

8 Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbarī says “when the army reached the banks of the river Biāh, near which, at this period, the town of Sulṭān-pūr has been founded.” Firīghtah has precisely the same words.
9 Compare Elliott. “Amīr” does not mean “generals.”
1 Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbarī says that Muḥazzab—the “upright officer” of Elliott [vol. ii. page 334]—requested the Sulṭān to come himself, or permit him,” &c. Firīghtah follows. “The Raṣūl-ul-Ṣafā says, contrary to others, that Muḥazzab ud-Dīn included Malik Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn, Ḥasan [Ḥusain], among the number he asked leave to put to death, but this is not correct.
2 The Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbarī says the Sulṭān despatched Shaikh Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn, Ḍakht-yār, Ḫshī [i.e. of Ḫsh near Baghdād] to the insurgents, and Firīghtah adds a little and makes him the Shaikh-ul-Islām besides. Dow, translating Firīghtah, calls him [vol. i. page 177] “Islaam, a venerable and learned Omrah.” I wonder what “Omrah” can mean. I have heard of Umrāh, but that is the plural of Amīr. This first statement, however, is an error, and he is
[the Muḥammadan Patriarch] of the capital was Sayyid Ḳutb-ud-Dīn, and him the Sultān despatched to the army for the purpose of allaying that sedition. He proceeded to the camp, and used his endeavours in stirring up and augmenting that sedition, and came back again, and the army followed after him, and arrived before the gates of Dihlī, and fighting was commenced.

This servant of the state, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, and [several] priests of eminence of the city, used the utmost endeavours to make peace and allay the disaffection, but in no manner could an agreement be effected. The arrival of the forces before the gate of the city of Dihlī happened on Saturday, the 19th of the month of Sha'bān, 639 H., and, until the month of Zi-Ka'dah, hostilities were carried on against the fortress, and, on both sides, a great number of people perished and others were disabled. All the environs of the city were destroyed; and the cause of the prolongation of this sedition was this. There was a head Farrāsh in the Sultān's service whom they used to style Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Mubārak Shāh, Farrukhī, who, in the employ of the Sultān, had found favour, and had acquired complete ascendancy over his mind, and whatever he said to the Sultān that the Sultān would do, and this Farrāsh would, in no way, assent to an accommodation.

On Friday, the 7th of the month Zi-Ka'dah, the depen-

a different person from the Sayyid Ṭo'th-ud-Dīn here referred to by our author. The former, whose full names are, Khwājah—not Sayyid— Ṭo'th-ud-Dīn, Bakhshyār, Kākī, Uṣūl, after whom the Ṭo'th minārah at Dihlī is named. He died six years previous to this time. See note 6, page 621, para. 3.

6 Among those of the great Malik who supported Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Bahārū Shāh, was Malik Kārā-Kash, feudatory of Bhāfān, and Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Yūz-Bak-i-Tughrīl Khān. They were both imprisoned however, on the 9th of Ramaṣān, at the instigation of the Farrāsh, Fakhr-ud-Dīn, Mubārak Shāh, and only obtained their release when Dihlī was taken by the confederate Maliks.

6 Farrāshīs are servants of the houses of great men who spread the carpets, make the beds, and pitch the tents on journeys. This head Farrāsh is styled Mihtār Mubārak in the next Section.

6 Nothing of this affair of the head Farrāsh is mentioned in Rauṣat-us-Safā, or in the Tābāqat-i-Akbār, and, consequently, not in Firīżtah either; but the Zubdat-at-Tawārīkh and some others refer to it. See the account of Malik Yūz-Bak-i-Tughrīl Khān in the next Section. Our author was so intent upon his own tale here that he has left out most of the particulars.

7 In some copies the 17th of Zi-Ka'dah.
dents of the Khwājah, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, gave 3000 jītals to a body of stupid fellows, and stirred up some of the same cloth as the author, who were persons of position at the capital, and, after the conclusion of the Friday prayers, they rose in the Fāmi’ Masjid, and drew swords upon the author. By the favour of the Most High God, he had with him a staff containing a knife, and drew it, and was accompanied by a few armed slaves, and succeeded in getting out of the tumult. On the following night the Amirs and the Turks took the fortress, and, next day, Saturday, the 8th of Zi-Ka’dah, 639 H., they gained possession of the whole city, and imprisoned the Sultān. Mubārak Shāh, the Farrāsh, who used to endeavour to stimulate the rebellion, they made a public example of and executed; and, on the night of Tuesday, the 13th of the month before-mentioned, Sultān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, attained martyrdom—may he rest in peace!—and the period of his reign was two years, one month, and a half.

VI. SULTĀN ’ALĀ-UD-DUNYĀ WA UD-DĪN, MAS’UD SHĀH, SON OF SULTĀN RUKN-UD-DĪN, FĪRŪZ SHĀH.

Sultān ’Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas’ūd Shāh, was the son of Sultān Rukn-ud-Dīn, Fīrūz Shāh, and was a beneficent Prince and of good disposition, and was endowed with all noble qualities.

On Saturday, the 8th of Zi-Ka’dah, 639 H., when the city of Dihlī passed out of the possession of Sultān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, the Malikīs and Amīrs, with one consent, brought forth, from confinement, all three Princes

1 In another place, in the next Section, it is said, Tuesday, the 8th, but neither of these days can be correct, if the 13th was Tuesday. In this case, the 8th would be Thursday; and, if Saturday was the 8th, the 13th would be Friday. A few lines farther down Saturday is again said to be the 8th.

2 The following is given, in the work previously quoted, as the inscription on the coins first struck in ’Alā-ud-Dīn’s reign:

Obverse—الحق بنظام الملك في أهالي السلطان ولادين مسعود ناه
Reverse—مرب الخوّاجة دهل ساحة إسطوس و سمنة جلوب أحمد

which may be thus rendered:—Obverse—“The prosperity of the government of the state through God. Sultān ’Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas’ūd Shāh.” Reverse—“Struck at the city of Dihlī [in the] year six hundred and forty, the first of the reign.”

1 Malik ’Izz-ud-Dīn, Balḥan-i-Kašhī Khān, was also one of the ring-leaders in this outbreak against Mu’izz-ud-Dīn. Early in the day on which
[the sons and grandsons of Sultan Shams-ud-Din, I-yaltimish], namely, Sultan [subsequently] Nasir ud-Din, Malik Jalaal-ud-Din, and Sultan 'Ala-ud-Din, Mas'ud Shah, and conducted them from the Ksir-i-Safed [White Castle] to the Ksir-i-Firuzi-i-Daulat-Khanah [the Firuzi Castle, the royal residence], and agreed to the sovereignty of 'Ala-ud-Din, Mas'ud Shah, after that Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Balban-i-Kashl Khana, had assumed the throne within the royal residence, and after he had been proclaimed outside the Ksir, and a proclamation, in his name, respecting his [assumption] of the sovereignty, had been once published about the city. In that matter the other Malik, not having agreed, placed Sultan 'Ala-ud-Din, Mas'ud Shah, upon the throne, and administered a public pledge of fealty to the people. Malik Kutb-ud-Din, Husain, son of 'Ali, the Ghuri, became Deputy of the kingdom, the Khwaja, Muazzam-ud-Din, the Nizam-ul-Mulk, was [again] made Wazir, and Malik Ikhtiyar-ud-Din, Kara-Kash, became Amiri-Hajib [Lord Chamberlain]. The provinces of Naghawr, Mandaur, and Ajmir, were made over to Malik 'Izz-ud-

the Turk Amirs took the city—our author says in another place—Malik Balban entered it, and proceeded to the royal Ksir, and issued a proclamation intimating his assumption of the sovereignty; but, immediately on this becoming known, Malik Ikhtiyar-ud-Din, Aet-kin, and Malik Taj-ud-Din, Sanjar-i-Kilkuk, and others, assembled at the mausoleum of Sultan I-yaltimish, and repudiated that proclamation, and, in concert, went, and brought forth from their confinement in the Ksir-i-Safed, which appears to have been used as a state prison, the princes in durance there, the sons and grandson of I-yaltimish, and set up 'Ala-ud-Din, Mas'ud Shah. When Malik Balban became aware of this, he joined them, and acted in concert with them. This can scarcely be called "the elevation of two kings in one day" [Thomson: Pathan Kings, page 120]. The new Sultan conferred the sief of Nagawr upon Malik Balban-i-Kashl Khana, together with permission to have an elephant, which was equivalent to his being considered as belonging to the royal family, and the first Malik of the kingdom; and it is he who must have been I-yaltimish's son-in-law—if either of the two Balbans were—or the husband of his sister—for 'ala means both—and not Ghiyas-ud-Din, Balban, afterwards Ulugh Khana, which latter, the Tabakhat-i-Akbari—and Firishtah likewise, as a matter of course—invariably confuse with 'Izz-ud-Din, Balban-i-Kashl Khana. In neither of these works is he called by his correct name. The first calls him 'Izz-ud-Din, Tigin-i-Buzurg, and gives the same title of 'Izz-ud-Din to Balban-i-Khurd [i.e. Ulugh Khana] whose title was Ghiyas-ud-Din, and never 'Izz-ud-Din. The Tabakhat-i-Akbari confuses one with the other. Firishtah [revised text however], as previously mentioned, uses the word day for in both their titles.

1 Tabakhat-i-Akbari says Nagawr, Sind, and Ajmir, and Firishtah copies
Dīn, Balban-i-Kašlū Khān, and the territory of Budāʿūn was given to Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Kīk-luḫ. The writer of these words, on the fourth day from the capture of Dihlī, requested permission to resign the Kāzī-ship, and, for a period of twenty-six days, the office was in abeyance until the 4th of the month of Zī-Ḥijjah, when the office of Kāzī was entrusted to Kāzī 'Imād-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, the Shafūrḵānī.

The Khwājah, Muḥazzab-ud-Dīn, the Nīzām-ul-Mulk, acquired complete power over the kingdom, and appropriated [the district of] Kol as his own fief. Previous to this he had established the naubāt, and stationed an elephant at the gate of his own residence. He took all functions out of the hands of the Turk Amīrs, so that their hearts became greatly irritated [against him], and those Amīrs, in concert together, put him to death, within the camp before the city [of Dihlī], in the plain of the Rānī’s Reservoir, on Wednesday, the 2nd of the month of Jamāḍī-ul-Awwal, 640 H.

At this period, the author determined to undertake a proposed journey to Lakhānawatī, and, on Friday, the 9th of the month of Rajab, 640 H., he quitted Dihlī. In the territory of Budāʿūn, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Kīk-luḵ, and, in Awadh, Malik Kāmr-ud-Dīn, Kīr-ān-i-Tamur Khān, showed him abundant kindness—Almighty God immerse the both of them in forgiveness! At this time, Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān, the feudatory

its text verbatim here, as in most other places, with but very slight verbal alterations.

8 See note at foot of page 128.
4 Described in note 8, page 383. See Elliot also : INDIA, vol. ii. page 343—“Previous to this he had caused music to play,” &c. The translator I trow never heard such music himself—music not capable of “charming the savage breast,” but of making any breast, however charming, savagery.
8 I wonder what “Haus-rānī” may be, but Ḫauṣ-i-Rānī signifies the Reservoir of the Rānī or Queen—Rānī being the feminine form of Rānā and Rājah. See Elliot, ibid. A little before, the Ḫaṣr-i Ḫauṣ-i-Sulpān is rendered “the Sultān’s water palace.”
6 See the account of Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Kīk-luḵ, and Malik Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunḵār, the Rūmā, in the next Section.
7 The month previous to this, in Jamāḍī-ul-Akhir, 640 H., the Khaḷīfah Abū-Jaʿfār-i-Mānsūr, styled Al-Mustanṣīr Bʾillah, died, and was succeeded by his son, the last of the 'Abbāsīs of Baghdād—Abū-ʾAbḥād-l-ʿAbdullāḥ, entituled Al-Mustaʾṣīm Bʾillah.
of Lakhanawatī, advanced to the frontiers of Karah with
troops and vessels, and the author joined him from Awadh. Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn returned again to Lakhanawatī, and
the writer went along with him thither, and, on Sunday, the
17th of the month of Zi-Ḥijjah, reached the Lakhanawatī
territory. The writer left all his children, family, and
dependents, in Awadh, and, subsequently, confidential per-
sons were sent, and his family [and children] were removed
to Lakhanawatī. From Malik Tughril-i-Tughān Khān the
author experienced the utmost generosity, and received innu-
merable gifts—the Almighty reward him!—and he remained
in the territory of Lakhanawatī for a period of two years.

During those two years Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd
Shāh, effected, in different parts of the kingdom, many
victories; and, after the Khwājah, Muhazzab-ud-Dīn, was
put to death, the office of Wazīr passed to the Sadr-ul-

8 It was at this time that Malik Tughril-i-Tughān Khān, the feudatory of
Lakhanawatī, instigated by his adviser, Bahā-ud-Dīn, Ḥilāl, attempted to
take possession of the territories of Awadh, Karah, and Manikpur, and Upper
Andes. See next Section.

9 It is strange that these "many victories" are not named by our author.
They must refer to some minor affairs which he refers to in the next Section,
and which may be summed up in a few words. In 640 H. Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn,
Sanjar-i-Kīk-luk, the feudatory of Budā'īn, overthrew the infidels of Kāthehr,
and a namesake of his, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Gurait Khān, gained
some successes over the Hindūs in Awadh, and, subsequently, is said to have
"entered Bihār and plundered that territory, and was killed before the fortified
city of Bihār." In this case it is evident that the Hindūs had regained
possession of it from the Musalmāns immediately after the death of Kūtb-
ud-Dīn, I-bak, or, possibly, only after the decease of I-yal-timīsh. See note 8,
page 633.

About the same period, the son of Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kabir Khān-i-Ayār,
feudatory of Mulkān, who had thrown off his allegiance on the invasion of the
Panjāb by the Mughals in 639 H.—Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Abū-Bikr—who remained
in possession of his father's fief after his decease, several times attacked and
defeated the Karughs who had advanced to the very gates of Mulkān. In 642 H.
the infidels of Jāī-nagar were defeated, and the author was present. This is the
affair which the I. O. L. copy of the text, No. 1952, and the R. A. S. MS.,
through the carelessness or ignorance of their copyists, turn into "Mughals of
Changiz Khān," referred to farther on.

In the account of Ulugh Khān, in the next Section, some successes are said
to have been gained over the independent tribes in the Do-āb in 642 H.

These are the only successes which appear to have been gained during this
period, as a set off to so many disasters and disturbances.

1 One of the best and oldest copies of the text, as well as the more modern
ones, have "two years after the Khwājah, Muhazzab-ud-Dīn, was put to
death," but this can scarcely be correct, as, in such case, the Wazīr-ship must
have been in abeyance.
Mulk, Najm-ud-Dīn, Abū-Bikr, and the office of Amīr-i-Ḥājib of the capital was entrusted to Ulugh Khān-i-Mu'azzam:—may his good fortune continue!—and the sīf of Ḥānsī was assigned to him; and, at this time, many holy expeditions, as by creed enjoined, were undertaken, and much wealth came in from all parts.

When Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Tughril-i-Tughān Khān, returned from Kārah towards Lakhānawatī, he despatched the Sharf-ul-Mulk, the Aṣha'ri, to the capital to the presence of Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh; and, from the capital, Kāzī Jalāl-ud-Dīn, the Kāsānī, who was the Kāzī of Awadh at this period, was nominated to proceed to Lakhānawatī with a red canopy of state, and an honorary robe. On Sunday, the 11th of the month of Rabī'-ul-Ākhir, 641 H., the envoy's party reached Lakhānawatī, and Malik Tughril-i-Tughān Khān was honoured by being invested with that honorary robe.

At this time, among the praiseworthy incidents which

2 In Elliot, vol. ii. page 343, he is turned into Dāru-l Mulk Bāligh Khān! Dāru-l-Mulk signifies "the seat of government," "capital," &c. Ulugh in Turkı signifies "great," "the greater," &c., what "Bāligh" may be intended for who knows?

3 In some of the more modern copies of the text, the invocation, here used for Ulugh Khān's prosperity or good fortune, varies, through carelessness or ignorance on the part of copyists, and in place of they have and occasionally and, in consequence of this last blunder, some modern writers on Oriental subjects jump at the conclusion that the whole work "must have been written" after Ulugh Khān ascended the throne; but, had those writers gone a little farther on, they would have found, in several places, both at the end of this Section, and in the next, that our author distinctly states that Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, was reigning when he finished his work; and he continued to reign for nearly six years more. See Elliot: India: vol. ii. note 2, page 362.

4 The Tabaḳāt-i-Akbarī gives this name, as it does most names, correctly—Aṣha'ī—but Firīshṭah turns it into Sankūrī, Dow leaves it out and a great deal more of the reign, and Briggs turns it into Shunkry, thus making a Hindū of him, and he invariably turns 'Izz-ud-Dīn into Eiz-ood-Deen.

5 The Tabaḳāt-i-Akbarī quotes our author very correctly here, with the exception of turning the Kāzī into a Hakīm, but the Tabaḳāt-i-Akbarī's shadow—Firīshṭah—although using nearly the same words, makes a terrible hash of the names.

6 See the account of Tughril-i-Tughān Khān in the next Section. There it is stated that he despatched his agent, the Sharf-ul-Mulk, to the Court for aid, after having been repulsed before Katāsin, the frontier post of Jāj-nagar, and that happened on the 6th of Zī-Ḳa'dah—the eleventh month—of 641 H., whilst Rabī'-ul-Awwal is the third month. 642 H. must be meant.
happily occurred during Sultân 'Alâ-ud-Din, Mas'ûd Shâh's reign was this, that, in concurrence with the Maliks and Amîrs of the Court, he commanded both his uncles to be released, and they were brought forth accordingly. Malik Jaâlâl-ud-Din was given the province of Kinnauj, and the preserved city of Bharâ'îj with its dependencies was conferred upon Sultân Nâsîr-ud-Din, Ma'hmûd; after which, both of them, in their respective districts, in carrying on holy war, as by creed enjoined, and in [attending to] the prosperity of the peasants, exhibited commendable examples.

In the year 642 H. the infidels of Jâj-nagar appeared before the gate of Lakhânavaţî; and, on the 1st of the

7 Subsequently, when he succeeded to the throne. This uncle had then attained the mature age of fifteen, the other was younger still.

8 Most authors, with the exception of the one who was living at the time, and even staying in the Lakhânavaţî territory, and along with the Musalmân army—our author—and a few others, such as the authors of Târîkh-i-Mubârak-Shâhî, Raûzat-ûs-Şafâ, and Zabdat-ut-Tawârîkîh, who could discriminate, and did so, before they entered events in their writings, and did not jump at conclusions—have perpetrated a ridiculous blunder here, which has been handed down by those Musalmân writers who copied the events in their histories from the Tabaqât-i-Akbarî, like Budâî'nî, and Firûstah in particular. From the version of this last-named writer the blunder, like the "Pathan Dynasty," has been made over to English writers by its translators, and, in all the Histories of India, and Manuals of Indian History, up to this hour, the blunder is duly recorded.

There was no invasion of Bangâlah nor of Lakhânavaţî by the Mughals of Chingiz Khân—who died eighteen years before—in fact, no invasion of the kind ever occurred.

Some careless copyist of the identical copy of the text of our author's work [such an imperfect copy for example as the I. O. L. MS. 1952, or the R. A. S. MS., on which first-mentioned copy the Calcutta printed text is chiefly based] which fell under the notice of Nizâm-ud-Dîn, Âhmâd, the author of the Tabaqât-i-Akbarî, when compiling his work—instead of copying our author's words which occur in every other copy of the text, which are as follow:—

—کاره جامع کردر رستمی رستمی آمده—did not think it fit or advisable to read it the right way but in the wrong—like the editors of the Calcutta printed text, although the right reading was before them, in at least one MS. copy they had to refer to, namely جامع کردر رستمی آمده—leaving for a note!

It is hardly correct to say that Nizâm-ud-Dîn, Âhmâd “reproduces it,” for it will not be found in any prior history; still, if the author of the Tabaqât-i-Akbarî, Abû-l-Fâsl, and the rest of those who copy the blunder, and if the editors of the Calcutta printed text likewise, had used a little discrimination, they might have seen that, in the two separate accounts of Malik Tughril-i-Tughân Khân, and Malik Khân-i-Tamur Khân, the correct reading is given, as both the I. O. L. MS., the R. A. S. MS., and the Calcutta printed text also have it in the accounts of those Maliks. The
month of Zi'-Hijjah, Malik Kamar-ud-Din, Kī-rān-i-Tamur Khān, with troops and Amirs, in conformity with the commands of Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Din, Mas'ūd Shāh, arrived at Muḥammadun writers who lighted upon this incorrect passage also speculate upon the route by which Chingiz [his ghost?] came; and they—one following the other: the blind leading the blind—come to the conclusion that it must have been by the same route as that by which Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, the Khaļji, penetrated into Tibbat!! Firidzhah also enters upon—or rather copies—the same speculations; and this fact tends to confirm me in my suspicions that he never saw our author's work, but merely "exhausted" him from his predecessors, including the Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbarf.

Stewart, in his History of Bengal, noticed [page 97] that Firidzhah was wrong, but did not know that the Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbarf was his source of information, and Thomas [Pathān Kings, page 121], very properly, totally discredits the statement as rendered from the printed text, in Elliot [India, vol. ii. pages 264 and 344]. This invasion, I expect, took place much about the same time that Changiz struck that very rare coin given in Thomas [page 94], styling himself by an Arabic title, and acknowledging the Khalfah of Baghādād—"Nāsir-ud-Din Ulūh, Amir-ul-Mūminin"! More on this head in last Section.

Elphinstone, however, boldly asserts on the faith of the translations of Firidzhah—for there is no doubt expressed about it—that the Mughals penetrated "through Tibet into Bengal."

The facts are that the Rāa of Jāj-nagar, in 641 H., began to molest the Lakanawatī territory, and, in Shawwāl of that year, Malik Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān marched towards Jāj-nagar to avenge this hostility, and our author accompanied him. An engagement took place on the frontier of the Jāj-nagar state, in the following month. After the infidels were routed they rallied on finding the Musalmāns off their guard, and victory was turned into a reverse. Malik Tughrīl sent to Dīhilī for aid, and Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, sent it, but, with the object of ousting Malik Tughrīl, who, it appears, was too strong to be ousted except by treachery: so, immediately the infidels of Jāj-nagar [the Mughals of Chingiz Khān of the Calcutta text, and I. O. L. Ms., No. 1592, and R. A. S. Ms., and Elliot], who had advanced opposite to the city of Lakanawatī itself, and fled on the approach of the forces under Tamur Khān-i-Kī-rān from Awadh, he possessed himself of Lakanawatī, by treachery, and Malik Tughrīl had to relinquish the city and territory and return to the capital. This last event happened in the last month of 642 H. See next Section. Malik Tughrīl, shortly after, was appointed to the sief of Awadh and proceeded into that territory, but died in Shawwāl, 644 H. His rival, Tamur Khān, died the very same night in Lakanawatī. See Maliks VII. and VIII. in next Section.

9 The Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbarf turns him into 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Tughān Timūr Khān Kāra-Beg, and makes him quarrel with himself under the name of Malik Kī-rān, by confusing and incorrectly copying his names and titles; but Firidzhah, copying from that work, adds from his imagination, and states that the Sulṭān despatched Malik Kān-Beg, Timūr Khān, who was one of the Khwājah-Tāsh slaves [see note 9, page 665]; and that between him and jī ["j"] ud-Dīn, Tughān, and Malik Kār-Beg hostilities arose: he does not mention the name Kī-rān at all! The correct details will be found in the account of Malik Tughrīl-i-Tughān Khān in the next Section.
Lakhaṇawati. Between him and Malik Ṭughril-i-Ṭughān Khān distrust showed itself, and, on Wednesday, the 6th of the month of Zi-Ka’dah of the same year, an accommodation took place, and he [Malik Ṭughril-i-Ṭughān Khān] relinquished Lakhaṇawati to Malik Ḳi-rān-i-Tamur Khān, and determined to proceed to Dihli. The writer of this book, in his company, reached the capital on Monday, the 14th of the month of Ṣafar, 643 H., and permission to pay homage at the sublime Court was obtained. On Thursday, the 17th of the month of Ṣafar, through the patronage of Ulugh Khān-i-Mu’azzam 1—the Almighty perpetuate his vicegerency!—the Naṣarīlah College, together with the superintendence of its endowments, the Kaẓī-ship of Gwāliyūr, and the lecture-ship of the Jāmi’ Masjid, all these, were confirmed to the author, according to former grant, and that Malik [Ulugh Khān-i-Mu’azzam] conferred upon the author a special honorary robe, and a caparisoned horse, such as no other among his brethren of the same profession 4 had ever obtained. God reward him for it!

In the month of Rajab 8 of this same year, news was received, from the upper provinces, of an army of infidel Ṭughals which had advanced towards Īchchah, and of which force the accursed Mangūtah was the leader. Sultān Ḵālūd-Dīn, Mas’ūd Shāh, for the purpose of repelling the Mughal forces, assembled the troops of Ḩusayn from various parts 4. On their arrival on the banks of the Biāh, the

---

1 In the year 642 H., Ghīyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Balbān, who, up to that time, was Amīr-i-Ḵānrā, became Amīr-i-Ḥaṣb. The Ṭabakāt-i-Ḵānrā, however, assures us that Malik Balbān [in some MSS. Tīḡn-i-Ḵānrā, who then held the title of Ulugh Khān, became Amīr-i-Ḥaṣb. Ghīyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Balbān, did not obtain that title until five years after this, in 647 H. Our author does not mean that he was styled Ulugh Khān at this time, although he calls him so: he was Ulugh Khān when our author wrote his book.

2 The word here used does not mean, “family.” Elliot: vol. ii. page 344.

3 Previous to this the royal forces went on an expedition in the Do-āb of the Jūn and Gang, the particulars of which, or rather some meagre particulars, will be found in the account of Ulugh Khān in the next Section.

4 The particulars of these events which happened in 643 H.—not 642 H.—will be found in the last Section of this work, and referred to in the next. Mangūtah, the Nū-yīn—whom the translator of this passage of our author’s work, in Elliot [page 344], has been pleased to turn into Mangū Khān here, but leaves him under the name of Mankūtī farther on [page 364], not being aware, seemingly, that they were one and the same person—was one of Chīngiṣ Khān’s own immediate followers and confidants, now grown old. He was very thin, tall, and blind of an eye. Mangū Kān, the grandson of
infidels withdrew from before Üçchah, and that success was gained. The writer of this work was in attendance on the sublime Court on that expedition, and persons of understanding and men of judgment agreed, that no one could point out to view anything of an army like that host and gathering in years gone by. When information of the number and efficiency of the victorious forces of Islam reached the infidels, they decamped and retired towards Khurāsān again.

A number of very worthless persons in that army had clandestinely gained access to the presence of Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, and used to influence him in the committal of unworthy acts and habits, so much so that Chingiz, did not succeed to his father's sovereignty until some time after this event, and was never east of the Indus in his life. It is strange how people will jump at impossible conclusions; and, because one of the Mughal sovereigns was called ʿAskarī immediately they at once assume that the former must be meant, just in the same way as the Khālij Turks have been turned into Ghulāf Afghāns.

Üçchah was invested for some time, and therefore the Mughals did not retire without fighting as in Thomas [PATHKING, page 121], and they made several unsuccessful attempts to storm it after they had reached the walls, in the last of which, at night, the greatest champion of the Mughal army, in attempting to descend from the breach into the interior of the place, fell into a ditch filled with mud, which the defenders had made in rear of the breach, and was smothered. Soon after this unsuccessful attempt, hearing of the flank movement of the Dihli army, and its advance along the banks of the Bāb, the Mughals raised the investment and retired; and, subsequently, the Dihli army advanced as far as the banks of the Sudcharah. In the account of Ghiyas-ud-Dīn, Ballaban, afterwards Ulugh Khan-i-Aẓam, and in the last Section, the prompt advance of the Dihli army is ascribed entirely to the energy of that Malik; but, under this reign, in which these events happened, our author does not mention even his name! See the notice of him in next Section, under this date.

Tāj-ud-Dīn, Abū-Bikr, the son of Malik Kabir Khān-i-Ayāz, was now dead, and Üçchah was in the hands of a slave of his father's, an eunuch named Mulkhīs-ud-Dīn, and gallantly he defended it. Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kasbū Khan, at this time, held the seif of Nāg-awr, and he joined the Sultān's army, with his contingent, upon this occasion.

At this period, Lāhor was in ruins, and Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Hasan, the Karlugh, who, on account of the pressure of the Mughals, had been obliged to leave his own territories, was in possession of Multān; and, on the Mughal invaders approaching the Indus, by our author's account, he embarkd, with his family, dependents, and effects, on board of boats and dropped down the river towards Swastān and Dīwal. See also next Section, Malik, No. XX., and the last Section, where a different statement is made.

* The Tabākāt-i-Akbārī copies our author verbatim here, and Fīrūghtah, of course, agrees.
[the custom of] killing and seizing his Maliks was gaining a place in his nature, and he was steadfast in resolve [in that habit]. All his good qualities turned away from the laudable path and inclined towards sensuality, pleasure, drinking, and the chase, to such a degree of excess, that disaffection began to spread through the country, and the affairs of the kingdom to be neglected. The Maliks and Amirs agreed together, and despatched letters secretly to Sultan Nasir-ud-Din—the Almighty perpetuate his kingdom and sovereignty!—and prayed for the appearance of his auspicious retinue, as will, subsequently, be recorded, please God! On Sunday, the 23rd of the month of Muharram⁶, 644 II., Sultan 'Ala-ud-Din, Mas'ud Shāh, was imprisoned, and during that confinement he was received into the Almighty's mercy.

His reign extended to a period of four years, one month, and one day.


The birth of the Sultan-i-Mu'azzam, Nasir-ud-Din, Mahmūd Shāh⁶, took place at the Kašr-Bāgh [the Garden Castle⁸] of Dihli, in the year 626 II., and, as his birth took

⁶ Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh states that he died on the 23rd of the month of Muharram, and, if this be correct, he must have been put to death on the same day as he was imprisoned, but no other writer gives the precise date of his death. A single copy of our author's text, not a very old one, has—"after a month he was received," &c.

⁷ In the following pages, a totally different title is given to him. This is a title given to his father at page 624. According to the Khulāṣat-ul-Ārbāb, Sultan Barkfarūk, the Saljūk [see note ², page 143] also held the title of Kāsim-i-Amīr-ul-Mūminīn previous to the Shansabānī Sultan. See page 316, and page 368, note ⁸.

⁸ Elphinstone turns him into "a grandson of Altamsh;" and Marshall, following him in that also, turns his name into Nasīr-ood-Deen. These are some of "the facts" in his "History" probably, of which he is "prepared to vouch for the accuracy."

Ibn Baṭūṭah, who is quoted by some as an authority on the history of India, and, makes I-yal-timish Kutb-ud-Din, I-bak's son, says Nasir-ud-Din succeeded his sister Raṣīyyat. He is the ninth of Thomas's Pathān Kings.

⁹ The garden with the Kašr or Castle in it.
place after the decease of the august Malik, Nāšir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh 1—on whom be peace!—at the seat of government of the august Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh. The Almighty illumine his tomb!—this sovereign [Nāšir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh]—May his sovereignty long continue!—was distinguished by the title and name of the [late] eldest son [of the Sulṭān]. His mother [with her infant] was sent to the Kaşr [Castle] at the town of Lūnī 2, so that there he was brought up in the hall of dominion and the lap of sovereignty, and, thank God! the foster-mother of the Most High Creator’s grace nourished him in such wise that he became endowed with all laudable qualities, and from the breasts of humanity he imbibed the milk of benevolence to such degree that all his affairs and all his deeds became the means of the stability of his kingdom, and the glory of his sovereignty 3.

In every matter which becomes unfolded to illustrious monarchs in their old age, after the experiences and incidents of time, all such matters—indeed, twice as much—became realized and conceived in the auspicious constitution and august soul of this monarch of blooming prospects, of Saturn[-like] throne 4, in excellence a Jupiter, in sternness a Mars, in mien a Sun, in beauty a Venus, in intelligence a Mercury, in majesty a Moon in the outset of its youth and the morning of its existence, in firmness, steadfastness, and sedateness, like Bū-Ḵais and Ḥirā 5, and in liberality and beneficence [he] became the envied of Ḥummān’s [pearl-giving] sea; and the most excellent service is that of that sublime Court—May it never experience wane, and may its grandeur ever increase!

Every one of the learned [personages] of the realm, and eminent men of the kingdom, have composed benedictions and panegyrics [in his praise], and particles of those odours they have threaded on the string of recital and writing; and

1 Firīshtah asserts that “Nāšir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh,” was the youngest son of I-yal-timīsh: he was the youngest of that name and title, but Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn, the child put to death by Shāh Turkān, mother of Rukn-ud-Dīn, Firūz Shāh, was the youngest of all the sons.
2 A well-known place a few miles north of Dihīf. It is sometimes called Lopī.
3 Compare Elliot: vol. ii. page 345.
4 That is, in the seventh heaven.
5 In Arabia.
this frail one, who is the servant of this court of glory and altar of felicity, by way of felicitation, has composed some poetry and prose. Of these poetical [compositions], one, after the manner of a Kāṣīdah⁴, and the other, in the manner of a mulamma'⁷ strophe, have been inscribed in these pages, in order that, when the notice of observers may glance over them, they may utter a prayer for the sovereign of Islām, and invoke a blessing on the author of them⁸.

[These fulsome poems may be judged of from what is foregoing, and still more so from what follows, and need scarcely be inserted here⁹].

_Titles and Names of the Sultān._

US-SULTĀN-UL-A'ZAM-
UL-MU'AZZAM,
NĀŠIR-UD-DUNYĀ WA UD-DĪN,
ABŪ-L-MUZAFFAR-I-MAḤMŪD SHAH
SON OF THE SULTĀN, I-YAL-TIMISH,
YAMLĀH-I-KHALĪFAH ULLĀH,
NĀŠIR-I-AMĪR-UL-MŪMININ¹.

---

⁴ A poem, a eulogium, a long ode.
⁷ _Mulamma_ means "of different colours," but, in poetry, it is applied to verses alternately 'Arabic and Persian, but our author's strophe is not exactly in accord with that description.
⁸ The text varies here, and, in some copies, there is a longer prayer for the Sultān.
⁹ If anything were wanting to convince me that Firīghtah's knowledge of our author's work was derived _solely_ from what he copied out of the Ṭabakāt-i-Akbarf, it would be found with respect to these poems. The Ṭabakāt-i-Akbarf copies the first four lines of the Kāṣīdah, and Firīghtah has precisely the same and no more; and this plainly shows whence he obtained them.
¹ The I. O. L. _MS._ No. 1952, instead of this last title, has Kāṣīm-i-Amīr-ul-Mūminīn. See note ⁴, page 310.
Offspring:

Malik Rukn-ud-Dīn, Frūz Shāh, the late.
Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Ibrāhīm Shāh, the late.
Malik Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, the late.
Malik Shihāb-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad Shāh, the late.

Length of his reign:

Twenty-two years.

Motto on the Royal Signet:

"Greatness belongeth unto God alone."

Standards:

On the right, Black. On the left, Red.

The following is given as the inscription on two of his first coins, a dirham and dinār:

Obverse—

기적이라는 수호성의 자아, 시원한 마중을 고대하고, 중생의 군주를 지지하는

Reverse—

which may be thus translated—Obverse—"This diram [is] stamped with the name of the Just and Beneficent Sulṭān, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh." Reverse—"Struck at the city of Dīhīf, in the year 644 H., the first of the reign."

The other runs thus:

Obverse—

Which may be rendered thus—Obverse—"The defender of the ordinances of the Law for the sake of the true [faith], Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn. The first year of the reign." Reverse—"This coin, a dinār, [was struck] at the capital, Dīhīf, in the year six hundred and forty-four."

The oldest copies have عـبـارة about—offspring—and not ابـنـاه about—kinsmen, kindred, relations—as in some modern copies of the text, and the printed text. After each name the invocation—"on whom be mercy or compassion"—equivalent to "the late"—occurs, thus showing that they were dead when our author wrote, but this is left out in the best Parīs MS. In the account of the Sulṭān's reign, the birth of a son is recorded in the fourteenth year, but no more. Two of the above names are certainly similar to those of two of his brothers—the first and third—but the other two are not the names of any of his other brothers, who, in all, were six. Had six been mentioned here, and all the names agreed, we might suppose that the brothers were referred to, but, such not being the case, we can only suppose that these are the names of sons born to Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, and that they died young, but it is remarkable that our author is silent as to their births after mentioning their names.

2 In one copy of the text, Maḥmūd.

4 Just the same as his father's.
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His Maliks.

On the right:—

Malik-al-Kabir, Jalâl-ud-Din, Kulich Khan, son of [the lat.] Malik 'Alâ-ud-Din, Janâ-i-Ghâzi, Malik of Lakhânawaṭî and Kaṟâḥ.

Malik-al-Kabir, Noṣrat-ud-Din, Shâr Khan, Sunkar-i-Saghalsus, Malik of Sind and of Hind.

Malik Saif-ud-Din, Bat Khan-i-Ī-bak, the Khitā-i, Malik of Kuṟâm.

Malik Ikhtiyâr-ud-Din, Buktam-i-Aor Khan.

Malik Naṣir-ud-Din [Tâj-ud-Din ?], Arsalân Khan, Sanjar-i-Chast, Malik of Awadh.

Malik Saif-ud-Din, I-bak-i-Balkâ Khan, Shanāt.

Malik Tamur Khan-i-Sunkar, the 'Ajâml, Malik of Kuhrâm.

Malik Ikhtiyâr-ud-Din, Yûz-Bak-i-Tughrîl Khan, the late, Malik of Lakhânawaṭî.

Malik Naṣir-ud-Din, Maḥmûd, Tughrîl-i-Alb Khan.

On the left:—

Malik-al-Kabir-ul-Mu'azzam, Kutb-ud-Din, Husain, son of 'Alî, the Ghûrf.

Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Muḥammad-i-Sâlârî, Mahdi.

Malik 'Izz-ud-Din, Tughrîl-i-Tughân Khan, Malik of Lakhânawaṭî.

Malik-al-Karim, Kamar-ud-Din, Tamur Khan-i-Kî-rân, Malik of Awadh and Lakhânawaṭî.

8 This list is evidently defective. No Wâzîr or Kâfî are given, and several eminent Malikas, mentioned in the following account of the reign, such as No. XXI. in the next Section—Malik Noṣrat Khan, Badr-ud-Din, Sunkar-i-Ṣûfî, the Rûmî; No. XXII.—Malik Saif-ud-Din, I-bak, the Shamasî, the chief Dâd-Bak; the son of Kâghî Khan, Ulugh Khan's-nephew; and several others, and no list of victories is given in any copy of the text. All this shows, I think, that our author intended to continue his work as he afterwards states.

9 In some copies, Tughrîl and Khalîj, but these can scarcely be correct, and Tughrîl is most likely the name of the third Malik below, which, from the names being sometimes copied in a circle, or one after the other, have got mixed up one with the other.

7 In nearly every copy of the text containing this List.

6 This word is doubtful. See Malik No. XVI. in the next Section.

6 This word is doubtful also. See Malik No. XIX.

1 Shanât—doubtful: in one copy and in another.

2 In one or two copies, Noṣrat-ud-Din, Muḥammad, &c.
Malik-al-Kabir, 'Izz-ud-Din, Balban-i-Kašhlů Khān, Malik of Sind and of Hind.  
Malik Karā-Kush Khān-i-Aet-Kīn, Malik of Lōhor.  
Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-Kašhlī Khān, Mubārak-i-Bār-Bak, the late.  
Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Kuret Khān, Malik of Awadh.  
Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Tez Khān, Malik of Awadh.

Such attributes of the saints, and endowments of the prophets, which the Most High God hath implanted in the great soul of this monarch and son of a monarch, and instilled into his august nature—piety, faith, probity, abstinence, compassion, clemency, mercy, beneficence, impartiality, bounty, generosity, humility, purity, constancy, steadfastness, fasting and prayer, the perusal of the Holy Word, forbearance, gentleness, benevolence, harmlessness, justness, the love of the learned and of learning, regard for ecclesiastics, along with other admirable principles and inestimable qualities which are the requirements of sovereignty and principles of government, such as vigour, dignity, manliness, ardour, spirit, impartiality, kindness, liberality, and the conferring of obligations, with the concurrence of the people of the time—will not be found united in the person of any of the monarchs among the Sulṭāns of by-gone days, or of the Malikās of past ages—The Almighty sanctify their tombs!—and the purity of the garment, and [other] admirable qualities, both external and internal, of this Sulṭān, and son of the Sulṭān—The Almighty exalt his dignity and enlighten his understanding!—are so abundant that they cannot be comprised

---

3 Nuğrat-ud-Dīn, Sher Khān-i-Sunkar, as well as Balban-i-Kašhlů Khān, is called Malik of Sind and Hind. This may be in some way connected with the terms applied to the country east of the Sind or Indus, in the map of Sind in the Masālīk wa Mamālīk, in which the country S.E. of Maṭṣūrah is called Bīlab-US-Sind, and that immediately north of it, Bīlab-ul-Hind.

4 The best Paris MS.—the "autograph" probably—and two or three others which are also comparatively modern, invariably make the great blunder of styling Ulugh Khān—"Ulū Khān"!
within record or recital. The Almighty God preserve him on the throne of his dominion continual and perpetual!  

Inasmuch as the accession of this Sulțân, the son of the Sulțân, to the throne of dominion took place in the beginning of the year 644 H.,—the Almighty perpetuate his sovereignty!—and that up to the period of this Chronicle will be fifteen years, each year thereof has been separated, in order that the events may be more accessible to the understanding.

**FIRST YEAR: 644 H.**

The Sulțân-i-Mu'azzam, Nāṣir-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Din, Maḥmūd Shāh, under a happy conjunction of the planets, with auspicious fortune, at a propitious time, and, with daily-increasing prosperity, ascended the throne of sovereignty within the Kaṣr-i-Sabz [Green Castle] in the capital city of Dihlī, on Sunday, the 23rd of the month of Muḥarram 6, in the year 644 H.; and the Malik and Amirs, the Şadrs and Grandees, and the Sayyids and 'Ulamā, hastened to present themselves 7 at the sublime Court—may its sublimity never decrease!—and performed the ceremony of kissing the blessed hands of this king of kings

---

6 Several of the words used by our author to express all these perfections, the like of which no other son of Adam ever possessed, are of the same signification; and, therefore, I have not repeated their meanings again; but the context shows, that, however amiable and harmless he may have been, he was by no means fitted for his position, and was a mere tool or puppet. Our author’s flattering account of him must have been intended for Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh’s own perusal. Compare ELLIOT here.

The Ṭabaṣṣīt-i-Akbarg states that he copied Qur’āns, and completed two in each year—not excessive work—which were sold, and the proceeds he subsisted on. The author then goes on to say that he had but one wife, and no servant or slave girl, and that she used to cook his victuals and do all the work. This story, however, is very stale indeed—as stale as the days of one of the early Khalifas. It is not likely that Ulugh Khān would have allowed his daughter to be treated after that fashion; but the account of the brilliancy of the Court of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, which may be gathered from the account given by our author at the end of the next Section, belies such a statement. The Sulțân was God-fearing and pious—in the Musalmān sense of the word—and no doubt copied Qur’āns, but that he lived on the price they fetched, and that he could not afford to purchase a slave woman to do the household duties is absurd, when he could present forty head of slaves to our author to send to his “dear sister” in Khurāsān. See page 686, and the account of Ulugh Khān in the next Section.

7 The first month of the Muḥammadān year.

Compare ELLIOT: vol. ii. page 346.
of august footstep; and all of them, each in a manner befitting his own position, tendered the homage of congratulation on his accession to the throne. On Tuesday, the 25th of this same month, the Sultān held a public reception in the audience-hall of the Kūshk-i-Firūzī [the Firūzi Castle]—the royal residence; and all the people made public pledge of allegiance to the sovereignty and of submission to the mandates, of the beneficent monarch of excellent disposition and kingly countenance. All were rejoiced at the reconstitution of this dynasty, and all parts of the territory of Hindūstān were pleased at this prosperous reign; and may it be prolonged to the utmost limits of possibility!

When the Sultān of Islām, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Māhmūd Shāh, set out from Dihlī towards Bharā‘īj on that fief being assigned to him [by his nephew, Sultān ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas‘ūd Shāh], his mother, the Malikah-i-Jahān, Jalāl-ud-Dunyā wa ud-Dīn—may her prosperity endure!—accompanied him. He undertook many expeditions against the infidels in that territory and the mountains [adjacent]; and the province of Bharā‘īj, through his auspicious arrival there, assumed a most flourishing condition.

When, on account of those holy expeditions, and the flourishing condition [of the province], the fame of his government became diffused through the different parts of Hindūstān, the Maliks and Amīrs of the kingdom, having become apprehensive of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, Mas‘ūd Shāh, secretly despatched, to his presence, a written petition [to the effect] that, if the sacred footstep should turn towards the capital, Dihlī, it would be a source of congratulation.

8 The “approval” of “the people” was neither asked nor required; in those days there was not so much fuss made about “the people” as at present.
9 This prosperous reign may be judged of from the following pages—constant outbreaks, and continual inroads on the part of the Mughals, and Sind, Multān, and Lāhor lost, or very nearly so, and not recovered for a long period.
1 See page 665.
2 Who his mother was is not known, but it does not follow that she was a “princess” as in Elliot: in all probability she was a concubine. She caused trouble enough afterwards.
3 This maker of holy war upon the infidels was then fifteen years old—a very experienced warrior doubtless.
4 A few copies have “and solicited his auspicious departure towards the capital.”
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The Malikah-i-Jahān, his mother, adopting a good expedient, represented to the people to the effect that her son was going to the city of Dihlī for the purpose of obtaining medicine and remedy for sickness; and she placed the Sultān in a litter; and the Malikah, his mother, taking him along with her, and, attended by a great number of domestics on foot and on horseback, set out from Bharā'īj towards the capital, Dihlī. When night came on, they covered the blessed face of the Sultān with a woman's veil and placed him on horseback, and, proceeding with the utmost expedition, in a short space of time they reached Dihlī on such wise that not a living being had information of the arrival of the august cavalcade of this monarch of felicitous reign until the day that he ascended the throne.

After the seat of dominion became beautified and ornamented by the grace and splendour of his person, in the month of Rajab, in the year 644 H., he raised his imperial standards and brought out his forces for the purpose of marching to the banks of the river Sind, and Bānāṅ, and the destruction of the infidels of Chin [the Mughals], and moved by successive marches. On Sunday, the 1st of

---

1 The I. O. L. MS., No. 1952, and R. A. S. MS. have Multān.

2 This passage plainly indicates that Bānāṅ must be the hilly tract west of the upper part of the Sind-Sāgar Do-ābah. It is not known by that name now. For the events of the Shamsī dynasty, after I-yal-timish himself, as I have before stated, the only contemporary authority then living in the kingdom of Dihlī was our author; but, for reasons we are not cognizant of, scarcely from want of information, he has not given many details respecting the different Mughal invasions and other events which took place in these reigns, and above we have a specimen of his concealment of facts. He gives some details, however, in the last Section in his account of the Mughals, for which place I shall reserve my remarks, merely mentioning here that, in the beginning of this year, 644 H., the Mughals extorted 100,000 dirams from Multān, then moved on to Lāhor, and extorted 30,000 dirams, 30 kharwārs of soft goods [cloths], and 100 head of captives. Our author must have passed all this over, as well as much more, to feed the vanity of his patrons. See also his account of Ulugh Khān for a few more details. In Elliot's India, all the important events in our author's work concerning the Mughal raids on the frontiers of India have been ignored.

The Tārikh-i-Firuz-Shāhī, copied in the Tabakat-i-Akbarī, and its followers, would make us believe, contrary to our author, that, at the very outset of his reign, Sultān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, assigned a canopy of state, a dürā-bāgh, and the dignity of Khān to Ulugh Khān, but this is incorrect. Had the two former been allowed him, our author was not one to conceal such honour towards his great patron.

In this part of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn's reign, the Dakhani historian, in his
the month of Zi-ka’da, 644 H., he crossed the river of Lobo (Rawi’), and issued commands to the forces of Islam to ravage the Jūd Hills and around Nandanah. Ulugh Khān-i-A’zam—may his good fortune continue!—who held the office of Amīr-i Ḥājib, was nominated to the head of that army, and the Sultan with the camp, the followers, heavy material, and the elephants, encamped on the bank of the Südharah.

Ulugh Khān-i-A’zam took that army, and, by the favour and aid of the Creator, he ravaged the Jūd Hills and Jilam [Jhilam], and the Khokhars, and other con-
endeavours to spin out his tale, inserts the nonsense about the removal of the feudatories of the Panjāb, and with it quotes the stale story about Alexander’s message to Aristotle for advice, which is related in Gūzēdah and others long before Firīstah wrote, respecting a king of Khwārizm.

7 See Elliot here also [India: vol. ii. page 346], where the editor, in a note, says “the text [printed text?] has nandalānda, but it is evidently a mistake for Sindāh, or the river Indus, which agrees with what follows, and with Firīshtah’s statement.” When Nandanah, in some places, is turned into “Nurdin,” and in one place is made “a fortified village near Kanauj,” we can scarcely expect to find it in its right place. The Tabakat-i-Akbar copies our author quite correctly and has Nandanah likewise, and Firīstah—the MSS. copies of the work—follows the former likewise, with some additions of his own concoction; but in the “revised text” of Briggs Nandanah is turned into Mulān, and that text has neither “Nanda” nor “Sind,” and both Dow and Briggs, in their versions of Firīstah, have “territories near the Indus,” and “provinces on the Indus,” respectively. The words in our author’s text are بنبد كوه جود و آباد فناد فیان داد See also the account of Ulugh Khān in the next Section for further particulars.

8 Mu’azzam signifies great—A’zam is the comparative of ‘Azām, and signifies greatest, and Ulugh is Turkish, and signifies great, being equivalent to the Persian bāzūr. Dow, referring to his appointment as Wazir—as Firīstah styles him Balban-i-Khūrd, copying the Tabakat-i-Akbar, to distinguish him from Balban-i-Buzurg, as ‘Īz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kagenta Khān is styled in the Tārīkh-i-Firūs-Shāhī—calls him “young Balin!” Ulugh Khān, or Balban the Lesser or Minor, as the term signifies, was then only past forty! This however is not so absurd as Lee, who, in his translation of Ibn Batūta [Ibn Batūtah], [page 114] quoting the Tabakat-i-Akbar, to prove Dow wrong in calling him Balin, says that he was called Balaban the Dwarf, and actually gives the words بلغ هوورد being a dwarf in his vocabulary!!

9 The printed text has سلسلة here for دَولَة and constantly makes the same mistake.

1 Or Südharā—“is a town two and a half kurok to the north-west of Wazirābād. In former times, the river Chināb—which, at this place, is also called the Südharā—flowed close to the place, on the northern side, but now it is a kurok to the north of it. There is no river “Sodra.” See the account of Ulugh Khān in the next Section.
tumacious infidels in great numbers he sent to hell. He pushed on as far as the bank of the river Sind and ravaged and plundered those parts, and returned again from thence on account of the difficulty of obtaining subsistence and necessaries for his troops. When he presented himself at the sublime Court after such success, and such a great renown, on Thursday, the 25th of Zi-Ka'dah of this same year, the auspicious standards moved from the bank of the river Südhahar, and the force set out on its return towards the illustrious capital, the city of Dihlī. The prayers for the 'Id-i-Azḥā were said in the karah [the hall of a Kārwān Sarāe or of a College] of Jalandar [Jalbandar], and from thence, stage by stage, the capital was reached.

On this day, likewise, this servant of the state, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, who is the writer of this [work], was presented [by order of the Sultān] with a cloak, a turban, and a horse, with ornamented stirrups and bridle befitting a king.

SECOND YEAR: 645 H.

The capital city Dihlī was reached on the 2nd of Muḥarram, 645 H., and the Sultān remained at Dihlī on account of the abundance of rain and severity of the rainy season. In the month of Jamādi-ul-Ākhir of this same year, the camp and the royal pavilion were pitched in the direction of Pāni-pat, and, in Sha'bān, [the Sultān] returned again [to Dihlī]; and the sublime standards moved towards the part of Hindūstān situated in the Do-āb. Within the limits of [the district] of Kinnauj there was a fortified place and strong fort, the name of which was Talsandah,

And yet the Dakhani historian, Firīghtah, in his account of Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, Ghūrī’s reign, says the Khokhars were converted to Islam at that time.

The printed text has Jūf—mountain, range of hills or mountains, instead of Jūf as above, and, consequently, in ELLIOT, the Sultān “offered up his prayers on the hills of Jalandar,” which lies in a perfectly level tract of country, with no hill whatever within some forty miles of it. Karah and hujrah are of very nearly the same signification.

Such as Şūfis and Darwešes wear.

In this year Malik Ikhtiyyār-ud-Dīn, Kārā-Kūsh Khān-i-Aet-kīn, the feudatory of Kārah, was killed in that territory, but how, or by whom, is not said.

This place which is plainly written تالند — Talsandah in all the copies of the text—with two exceptions, where it is تالند — Talsandah—and تالند — Talbandah—is turned into Nandana in the printed text and in ELLIOT, and THOMAS follows the incorrect reading [PATHÁN KINGS, page 125], and although Nandamak, which is not only impossible, but does not occur in any copy of
which was reported to be as stout as the wall of Sikandar. In that fort a body of infidel Hindūs sought a place of security, and washed their hands of their lives. For a period of ten days, the troops of Islām in attendance at the august stirrup carried on the conflict against that place with the Hindūs until they despatched the whole of those rebels to hell, and the place was taken.

[An account of] this holy war, as by the faith prescribed, this servant of the realm has composed in poetry on five or six sheets of paper; and all that happened on this expedition—the ravages by the way, the onsloughts and the slaughtering of the contumacious infidels, and taking of that stronghold, the successes which attended Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam in the slaying [of infidels] and taking Dalkī and Malkī*, are, in those sections [of paper], fully

the text, Gen. Cunningham [see THOMAS: ibid.] identifies it "as Deo-hali or NO-PO-TI-PO-KIN-LO of Huen Thsang, i.e. Nova deva kala, close to Rājgir, the fort of Alha and Udal, about four miles S.E. of Kanauj." I, however, fail to find the latter places even in the Indian Atlas.

The Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbar does not mention the name of this place, but Firīghtah [BRIGGS "revised text"] has, which may be anything almost; but Dow, in this instance, is much more correct here, and has Tilindah, thus showing that the MSS. of Firīghtah used by him, although not "revised," were correct; whilst Briggs, in his version of Firīghtah, styles it "Bitunda" and identifies it with Bulandshahr [Anglicized into Boolandshahur], the former name of which was Baran. The latter place is some forty miles S.E. of Dihlī, while Bīthāndah is about 200 miles to the N.W. of it.

There is TILSURRA—what the vernacular form of it is I do not know—about twelve miles S.S.W. of Kīnnaj, but off the present high road, and Thutte, about eight miles S., and Tīrtaa about ten miles S.W. of Kīnnaj. The first mentioned place if written in the vernacular with 5 = َ which, in all probability, it is, might, by a foreigner, be written لثْحَث. See also the account of Ulugh Khān in the next Section.

7 The Sadd-i-Sikandar, Sadd-i-Vājūj Mājūj [wall of Gog and Magog], or Bāb-ul-Abwāb, the bulwark built to restrain the incursions of the northern barbarians into the Persian empire, and attributed to an ancient king, Alexander, not Alexander of Macedon.

* A sheet of paper folded to make a jus or eight pages.

Every copy of the text here has, between the words لثْحَثَ وَلَي which seems meant for the copulative conjunction; but, farther on, under this reign, and also in the account of Ulugh Khān, there is no . If is correct, and is intended for and, "Dalkī and Malkī" cannot possibly be the name of one person, and we are plainly told that a Rānah is referred to. Without the , the passage could be read Dalkī of Malkī, the latter would then refer to his stronghold or territory, the former being the most probable, or Dalkī the Malkī, and the last word would then refer to some office or title of the Rānah in question. The best St. Petersburg
and completely described in verse, and, after the name of the Sultān, it was entitled the Nāsirī Nāmah. In satisfaction thereof the author received from his Majesty the Sultān-i-Mu‘azzam—may his sovereignty continue!—a permanent grant which should be received yearly; and, from the Khākān-i-Mu‘azzam Ulugh Khān-i-A‘zam—the Almighty prolong his power!—he obtained the grant of a village within the Hāns province—may the Most High God preserve and continue the both of them on the seat of sovereignty and cushion of vicegerency! I now return to my Chronicle again.

On Thursday, the 24th of the month of Shawwāl, 645 H., that fort, after much fighting and great slaughter, was captured, and, after that, on Tuesday, the 12th of the month of Zi‘-Ka‘dah of the same year, the territory of Kārah was reached. Thirty days previous to that, Ulugh Khān-i-A‘zam, with the whole of the Malikis and Amirs and forces appointed to serve under him, had been despatched on an expedition; and that lion-hearted Khān, of Rustam-like nature, like Suhrāb in battle, and of elephant-like person, during that movement, showed such proofs of spirit and skill, as cannot be sufficiently praised, in important battles, the capture of strongholds and forts,

MS., however, has only the following words here: “the slaughtering of the contumacious, and the taking of Dalkī and Malik,” respecting which passage see note, page 682.

10 Because our author, in his usual fulsome manner, styles him Khākān-i-Mu‘azzam, signifying great king or emperor, it does not follow, nor does it mean, that he was king when this was written. Our author generally uses the word "Darān" with respect to Ulugh Khān, which has many significations; and, as he ruled Nāsir-ud-Dīn as well as the country, it would not be a matter of surprise to find "rule" or "power" used here, without its being turned into a proof that he must have been on the throne when the identical passage was written.

1 In the account of Ulugh Khān it is stated that he rejoined the Sultān, with his force, on his return from this expedition, on the last day—the 29th—of the month Shawwāl, and that, after the festival of the Aḥbār—10th of Zi‘-Hijjah, the last month of the year—the forces set out towards the capital, which was reached on the 24th of the first month of the following year—646 H. See page 683.

2 Some copies of the text have Monday. Ṭabākāt-i-Akbarī says the Sultān moved towards Kārah on the 10th of that month.

3 In some copies of the text three days, but that is evidently too short a time, as the context proves.

4 Strong like an elephant he probably means. See Ibn Baṭṭūtah’s account of Ulugh Khān in a note to the account of that Malik in the next Section.
making way through forests and wilds, the slaughter of obdurrate infidels, the acquirement of booty and captives, together with making prisoners of the dependents of great Rāes and Rānahs such as cannot be fully contained in the writing of the scribe nor the narrative of the detailer: a little has been rendered into verse in the book [entitled] the ṢASIRI NĀMAH.

There was a Rānah in those mountains and that tract [of country] which they were wont to call Dalkī and Malkī.

Here, contrary to the preceding passage just noticed, no 垡 is used in the majority of the copies of the text, including the oldest and best ones; and in the account of Ulugh Khān also, in the next Section, no 垡 is used. There our author says that “a Rānah was in the vicinity of the river Jin which is between Kāninjar and Kapah,” and evidently referring to the country, not the Rānah. He then says that: “this stronghold was taken, together with the whole of the Rānah’s family, kinsmen, and children, &c.” Ropes and ladders had to be used in gaining access “to the place.” It is scarcely probable that our author would write two or three different versions of this affair—he wrote one in verse, as mentioned above—without referring to the name of the country or the place taken, and this tends to prove that one of these names—at least, if not both, refers to the Rānah’s country or fortress. They cannot possibly both refer to the name of one man: that is simply impossible, as “a Rānah” is plainly indicated both here and farther on. Without the 垡, the words would form a very improbable Hindī proper name, but they might then be read Dalkī or Malkī, the last word being the name of his stronghold or country, which is possible, or Dalkī the Malkī, when the last word would refer to some title or office, which seems improbable. As no vowel points are given, and as 垡 may stand for 垡 as well as for 垡, the words may be Dalkī, Dalakī, Mulkī, and Malkī, or Dulgit and Malgit or Dalagit and Malagit, and the like. The more correct spelling may be ملكي—Dalkī or Dulgit, and ملكي—Mulkī or Mahalkī, as foreigners are very apt to leave out the م in Hindī words, and to write د for د. There is a place similarly named ملكي in the Antarbed Do-ābah, thus showing that it is not uncommon. See the note to this passage in the account of Ulugh Khān in the following Section.

In the best St. Petersburg copy of the text, which I have found particularly correct in most instances where others have been most defective, and also in the best British Museum copy, this passage is different from that in all the other copies of the text collated, and throws quite a different light upon the matter by the mere difference of the pronoun, they having 垡—that instead of 垡—as, &c., and I have, consequently, taking the reasons above stated with this rendering of the passage in those two first-named copies, no hesitation in adopting this solution of this very tedious passage, which is as follows:—

و رانه بود در آن جبال و او ایشان خد آی را دالکی دالکی [درکی و ملقی] ملکی

and as I have rendered it above. The only doubt remaining is, whether the word دالکی may refer to the Rānah or not, as with, or without the 垡 both words might refer to the country.

The Ṣabkāt-i-Akbarī copies from our author here, but merely says that ‘the Rānah’s جم [district, place, town, &c.] was taken.”
with numerous dependents, and fighting men beyond compute, and possessing dominions and wealth unlimited, and strong places, and defiles and passes of excessive strength, the whole of which he [Ulugh Khan] devastated, and captured all the dependents, together with the women and children of that accursed one, and obtained great booty. Of one description of horses alone, fifteen hundred head fell into the hands of the Musalmān forces, and, from this, one may infer the extent of other booty. After he [Ulugh Khan] thus felicitously had rejoined the sublīme Court, all expressed exultation at these successes; and the imperial standards, on Thursday, the 12th of the month of Zi-Ḥijjah, 645 H., returned from that territory [Karāh 4].

On this march, Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, who was the feudatory of Kinnauj, and the Sultān's brother, presented himself at the Court. He accomplished [the ceremony of] kissing the sublime hand, and returned; and the army of Islām and the imperial standards, by regular marches, continued moving towards the illustrious capital, Dīhlī, until the

**Third Year: 646 H.**

When, on Wednesday, the 24th of the month of Muḥarram, 646 H., the Sultān [with his forces] reached the seat of empire again on his return from this expedition. The city was decorated for the occasion, and with felicity and majesty he took his place in the seat of sovereignty 7. At this period, Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh [the

Firāstah copies from it in the same manner nearly, with some additions of his own; but he does not mention anything whatever of two rājahs, as rendered by BRIGGS, "the Rajahs Dulky and Mulky," but, on the other hand, "a rājah."

The situation of this Rāmah's country is plainly indicated in the passage in the account of Ulugh Khan, and refers to the tract immediately west of the S.W. Tons river. I think "Garwa near Sheorājpur [Shīw-rāj-pūr?] in Parganah Bārah of Allahabad," referred to by Mr. T. E. Atkinson in the proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for June, 1874, pages 123-4, is too far east to have been one of the places destroyed by Ulugh Khan.

4 Compare ELLIOT here.

7 In ELLIOT this sentence is rendered, "On Wednesday, &c., the Sultān reached Dehlī, and took his seat upon the throne with great state." I have already mentioned how oriental cities are decorated, note 8, page 616.
Sultân’s brother, who, when he presented himself to the Sultân [on his march back from Karah], had been nominated to the siefs of Sanbhal and Budâ’un, became suddenly filled with fear and terror, and from Sanbhal and Budâ’un proceeded towards Lohor\(^8\), by way of the hills of Sihnûr.

The Sultân-i-Mu’azzam continued at the capital for a period of seven months, until the month of Sha’bân, 646 H., when the sublime standards moved out of Dihli, and [the Sultân] gave directions for undertaking expeditions against the infidels in different parts of the hills and plains, and, having nominated Amîrs to proceed to different parts, he returned to the capital; and, on this expedition, the Sultân did not happen to proceed a greater distance. On Wednesday, the 9th of the sacred month of Zi-Ḥijjah, in felicity and power, he reached the capital\(^9\).

The forces of Islâm pushed on towards the Koh-pâyah [skirts of the hills—of Mewât] and Rantabhûr. On this

\(^8\) Rendered in ELLIOT, “When Malik Jalal-d-dîn waited upon the king as he was returning, he was appointed governor of Sambul and Badûn, but he all at once took alarm about these two districts and came to the capital.” The I. O. L. MS., the R. A. S. MS., the best Paris MS., and the Calcutta printed text, are minus one line or more here. There was no cause of alarm about those districts, and the capital was the place, above all others, that he would avoid. Our author makes a mystery of this affair. In his account of Ulugh Khân, he says, the Dihli troops marched to the banks of the Bâh and back again in 646 H., but no reason is given; and this movement was evidently connected, in some way, with the Prince’s flight. In the account of Izz-ud-Dîn, Balban-i-Kasih Khân, and Naṣīr-ud-Dîn, Sher Khân-i-Sunkar, in the next Section, and in the last Section, some farther references will be found to this matter. It is said he fled to the Mughals.

\(^9\) Compare ELLIOT, vol. ii. page 349. This passage is certainly imperfect, for, on turning to the corresponding month and year, in the account of Ulugh Khân, it is in a manner explained. It was in Sha’bân, 646 H., that Naṣīr-ud-Dîn, Mahmûd Shâh, moved towards the upper provinces, referred to in the preceding note, which evidently was connected with the flight of his brother to Lâhor. The paragraph mentioning this circumstance might almost be inserted above, and it would make the matter clear. It is as follows:—“In the month of Sha’bân, 646 H., the royal standards moved towards the upper provinces, as far as the extreme frontiers, and the bank of the river Bâh, and from thence returned to the capital.” It was after this that Amîrs were sent on the expeditions against the infidels, it not being considered advisable, seemingly, to pass beyond the Bâh, and therefore Naṣīr-ud-Dîn, Mahmûd Shâh, returned to the capital again, after appointing some of his Amîrs to move against some of his contumacious Hûndi subjects.

It is remarkable that, since the year 639 H., after the sack of Lâhor by the Mughals, we do not find it again mentioned as a province of the Dihli kingdom, and this passage confirms it.
expedition, and during the stay of the Sultan at the capital, two events occurred. The one was this, that Kazi Jamâl-ud-Din, the Shafurkâni [i.e. Shaburghâni] was accused, and, from Friday, the 9th of the month of Zî-Hijjah, in the Kasr-i-Safed [the White Castle], was removed from his Kazi-ship, and, by command, left the city and departed towards Budâwin; and, on the 12th of Zî-Hijjah, by the endeavour, of ‘Imâd-ud-Din-i-Rayhân, he was put to death¹: the other was that Malik Bahâ-ud-Din, I-bak, the Khwâjah, in the vicinity of the fortress of Rantabhûr², attained martyrdom at the hands of the infidel Hindûs, on Sunday, the 11th of the month of Zî-Hijjah—may he receive grace and forgiveness!

FOURTH YEAR: 647 H.

On Monday, the 3rd of the month of Şafar, 647 H., Ulugh Khân-i-A’zam, with the forces of Islâm, and the sublime standards, returned in triumph to the capital again³. As Ulugh Khân-i-A’zam was the asylum of the Sultan’s dynasty, the prop of the army, and the strength of the kingdom, with the concurrence of all the Grandees and Maliks of the realm, it was his daughter’s good fortune to become the Malikah-i-Jahân⁴ [Queen of the Universe—the Royal consort], and this marriage took place on

¹ Compare Elliot, vol. ii. page 349. ‘Imâd-ud-Din did not kill him.
² For further particulars of this expedition, meagre as they are, see the account of Ulugh Khân in the next Section.
³ This is the first occasion that the “sublime standards” are said to have accompanied Ulugh Khân.
⁴ This passage is inverted altogether in Elliot [page 349]. The printed text is perfectly correct here, and has, like the MSS. copies of the work, the words—فرزند، or MLAĐ—which have been rendered totally contrary to their meaning, viz. that the Sultan “gave his daughter to the son of the Khân”! Nâşir-ud-Din, Mahmûd Shâh, was, at this time, in the 21st year of his age. Thomas [Pathân Kings, page 125], led astray by the above translation probably, falls into the same error.

Our author has forgotten to state here, although he has remembered it in his account of him, that it was shortly after this event that Malik Ghîyâz-ud-Din, Balban, was dignified with the title of Ulugh Khân, the Deputy-ship of the kingdom, and leadership of the troops, and that his brother, Malik Saif-ud-Din, I-bak-i-Kashîf Khân, was made Amîr-i-Hijûb, and, on Nâg-awr being taken from Malik Balban-i-Kashîlî Khân, that sif was made over to the new Amîr-i-Hijûb. See the account of him in next Section.
Monday, the 20th of Rabî‘-ul-Âkhîr, 647 H. May the Most High God preserve all three, the protection and prop of the Muḥammadan faith, in sovereignty, honour, and prosperity!

In this year likewise, on the 10th of Jamādi-ul-Âkhîr, Kâzi Jalâl-ud-Dîn, Kâsâni, arrived from Awadh, and became Kâzi of the realm. On Monday, the 22nd of the month of Sha‘bân, the imperial standards moved out of the capital, Dîhil, and, on Sunday, the 4th of the month of Shawwâl of this same year, crossed the Jûn, for the purpose of undertaking a holy expedition against the Hindûs; and forces were told off to operate in that tract.

Letters from the sister of this frail individual [the author] arrived from Khurâsân, and they were represented to the sublime consideration, and the Sulṭân—Long may his Khilâfat continue! through the recommendation of Ulugh Khân-i-A‘zam—may Almighty God long preserve and prolong both their lives!—conferred an honorary robe, a misâl [royal grant] for forty head of captives, and a hundred khar-wârs weight of gifts.

---

6 Some copies have the 6th of Jamâdi-ul-Âkhîr, but the date and month above is confirmed in the account of Ulugh Khân.

6 Farther on, in the next Section, our author says that Ulugh Khân moved from the capital on Monday, the 9th of Sha‘bân, and the camp was pitched at the ford over the Jûn, and hostilities at once commenced against the infidels.

7 The translator of this passage in Elliot [vol. ii. page 350] turns 40 captives into 100 beasts of burden! The words in the text, the Calcutta printed text included, are perfectly plain, and to make it unmistakably so, the word p—nafar, applied solely to human beings, is used. The passage is thus rendered in Elliot:—“he [the Sulṭân] was pleased to give her one hundred beasts of burden, and one hundred ass-loads of presents.” In a footnote, the Editor states “the word used is نفر, for which the dictionaries give the meaning [it is an every-day word almost in the Persian of the East] of ‘captive, slave, servant.’ It can hardly bear this meaning here, and in other places it is connected with [?] اسب (horse) so I have translated it ‘beast of burden,’ from the verb burden to carry”!!

If bardak cannot bear this meaning here, how is it that, at page 371 of the same work, the Editor does not translate the same word, printed in italics, beast of burden? Why cannot it bear this meaning? Was it too shocking to think that captives should thus be sent away to be sold? It was a common practice nevertheless, and the meaning is captives who had been made slaves of. Our author, in the next Section, gives the particulars of his proceeding to Mulân with his slaves, to despatch them to his “dear sister” in Khurâsân, and there he uses the word قلما—qulmân, an ‘Arabic word, whilst sîr—bardak is pure Persian; and, in his account of Ulugh Khân, in the next Section, but which identical part has been omitted in Elliot [page 368] as
On Wednesday, the 24th of the month of Zil-Ḥijjah, the august standards returned to the capital; and, on Monday, the 29th of the same month, the author set out from Dihli for the purpose of proceeding to Multān, in order to despatch the captives to Khurāsān. When he reached the Hānṣī district, by the sublime command of the Khān-i-Mu’azzam, Ulugh Khān-i-A’zam, the author took possession of the village conferred on him by Ulugh Khān*, and opportunity offered of proceeding to Multān by way of Abūhar*; and, in the

FIFTH YEAR: 648 H.,

On Sunday, the 11th of the month of Ṣafar, 648 H., an interview was obtained with Malik Sher Khān-i-Sunkar, on the bank of the Blāh¹, and from thence, proceeding

"matters personal of the author,"—but not more so than a vast deal more in this work, and as personal here as there—our author again mentions forty head of captives, &c. Khār-wār, although literally an ass-load, is here used to signify the weight of an ass-load, but it does not follow that the loads were carried by asses.

Further details respecting these matters will be found in the account of Ulugh Khān in the next Section.

Ibn Baṭṭūṭah, who proceeded "from Multān, the principal city of Sind," towards Dihli, says, "the first city [town?] we reached appertaining to Hindūstān, and the first in this direction, was Abūhar. It is of small size and closely built, and has much water and cultivation."

This statement of our author respecting this interview proves beyond a doubt, that, at this period, the Blāh flowed in its old bed, between the present Sutlaj and the Chināb, as it would have been impossible, in proceeding direct from Abūhar to Multān, to have otherwise met Sher Khān on the Blāh. See remarks on "The Lost River" in last Section.

¹ The I. O. L. MS. No. 1952, and R. A. S. MS., and Calcutta printed text, here have لياب سنده و بياه—the bank of the water [river] Sindh and Biyah—and the words are thus translated in ELLIOT [vol. ii. page 350] "on the banks of the river Sind and Biyah," but for two persons to hold an interview on these two rivers at the same time is rather difficult from three other rivers and vast tracts of country—in fact the whole Panjāb—intervening between them. Our author’s words are perfectly clear and intelligible, but the words "Sind and"—"Sindh and"—are not contained in the text. One modern copy has لياب سنده بياه—the bank of the Sind-i-Biāh [i.e. the river of Blāh], which probably the editors of the Calcutta text took for the Indus, as the term is used—in a proper sense of course—both to signify the Indus, and also any river, its proper Sanskrit meaning.

In a note to the above passage in ELLIOT, the Editor says, with reference to the words—"mulikāt-i Sher Khān āstil shud"—"our text has no nominative in this sentence," and, that "the words show that the person who had the interview was not superior in rank to Sher Khān." As the subject.
onwards towards Multān, the author, on Wednesday, the 6th of Rabī‘-ul-Awwal of that year, reached it. Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kashlū Khān, arrived that same day from Úchchah for the purpose of taking Multān, and there was an opportunity of an interview with him. The author continued to remain there up to the 26th of the month of Rabī‘-ul-Ākhir, and the capture of Multān, which was in the hands of a retainer of Malik Sher Khān, was not effected. The author set out to return to the capital, and Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kashlū Khān, retired towards Úchchah. The author returned by the route of the fort of Marūt to Sursutī and Hānsī, and reached Dihlī again on the 22nd of Jamādī-ul-Ākhir.

In the month of Shawwāl of this same year, Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn-i-Kurez, from Multān, made a great number of Mughals captive, and sent them to the capital; and the city of Dihlī was decorated for this success of the Nāširi dynasty. In this year likewise, on Friday, the 17th of a mere continuation of the sentence above there can be no doubt as to who is referred to, and, as the nominative to a passive verb is never expressed in the Persian language, it is not astonishing that our author does not use it here. The words above are "the interview with Sher Khān [lit. of Sher Khān] was attained or acquired," not "had an interview;" but what proves—except the previous sentence, which is clear enough—the superiority or inferiority of the two persons, I am at a loss to discern.

It is the Tabakat-i-Akbarī, not Firāshtah—for he is a mere copyist of the former work, as I have often shown here already—who takes the Sultan, who never left Dihlī that year, to the Bīhār, and says that Sher Khān joined him there, but does not mention anything about 20,000 horse. The same work takes the Sultan to Multān and Úchchah, the former of which places he is therein stated to have reached on the 6th of Rabī‘-ul-Awwal, 648 H. In this case our author has only been mistaken for the Sultan! See the account of Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kashlū Khān, in the next Section.

The printed text turns Kashlū Khān-i-Balban into Lashkar Khān, and in Elliot [vol. ii. page 350] it is so translated, and Thomas [Pathan Kings, page 125] turns Sher Khān into the brother of Ulugh Khān! He was his uncle's son—his cousin merely.

Marūt is a well known place on the route from Dihlī to Úchchah. "Mirāt" is utterly impossible. One is W. of Dihlī, and the other E. A person would go a little out of his way to go to Multān from Dihlī by way of "Mirāt." See the account of Ulugh Khān, and Elliot, vol. ii. page 350. Our author went as far as the river Jhiłām to see the captives off.

It is strange that no particulars are given respecting the capture of these Mughal prisoners by Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn-i-Kurez from, not at, Multān, which caused Dihlī to be decorated. It is not even referred to in the account of Ulugh Khān. It was quite time to gain some success—although this is a very doubtful one—over the Mughals, for they were continually encroaching
the month of Zi-ka'dah, Kāzi Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Kāsānī, resigned his existence to the most sublime dynasty—the immaculate Ruler of the Universe.

**Sixth Year: 649 H.**

Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kashlū Khān, having commenced to act in a refractory manner at Nāg-awr, in this year the august standards moved towards that place, upon which Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kashlū Khān, presented himself and made his submission, and the sublime standards returned [to the capital].

Subsequently to this, Malik Sher Khān marched from Multān* against Uchchah, and Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kashlū Khān, pressed on from Nāg-awr towards Uchchah, and went to Malik Sher Khān [in his camp] and was detained, and relinquished the fort of Uchchah to him*, and, leaving it, turned his face towards the capital.

upon the Panjāb, and by and by we shall find them permanently located on the banks of the Bāhā. This is the affair out of which Firāghāh, but not the Tabakūt-i-Akbar, makes Sher Khān take Ghazānī from the Mughals referred in note 6, page 690, and in the account of Sher Khān in the next Section.

Some time previous to this, in 647 H., Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Hasān, the Karlugh, who was able to hold his territory of Banfān notwithstanding the Mughals, advanced from that tract to attack Multān, which fief Malik Balban-i-Kashlū Khān then held, together with Uchchah. He advanced from Uchchah to drive away the Karlugh army. An engagement ensued near Maltān, Hasān, the Karlugh, was slain, but his people kept his death secret—although a party of horsemen, in Malik Balban’s army, devoted themselves to kill the Karlugh chief—and Malik Balban was under the necessity of delivering up Multān, which he had entered after the engagement. We must suppose that Hasān’s eldest son—the Malik Nāẓir-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad—hereafter to be mentioned, took the command of the Karlugh army, to whom Malik Balban had to surrender Multān, which Malik Sher Khān shortly after recovered from them, when he installed there his own retainer—Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn-i-Kures, above alluded to. See the account of Sher Khān in the next Section.

I have already mentioned how eastern cities are decorated. Compare Elliot also here.

* Ulugh Khān’s brother was put in charge of Nāg-awr.

6 In his account of Malik Balban, in the next Section, our author says Sher Khān advanced from Tabarhindah and Lāhor upon Uchchah.

7 In Elliot, vol. ii. page 351, this is rendered “but he was captured in his encounter with Sher Khān and quietly surrendered the fort.” No encounter whatever took place between them, and the event happened precisely as our author relates above. The details of it will be found in the account of Balban-i-Kashlū Khān and of Sher Khān in the next Section, which see.
On Sunday, the 17th of the month of Rabi’-ul-Akhir, 649 H., he presented himself at the sublime Court, and the fief of the district and city of Buda’ūn was assigned to him.

In this year, likewise, on Sunday, the 10th of the month of Jamādī-ul-Awwal, for the second time, the Kāzi-ship of the realm, together with the jurisdiction of the capital, was entrusted to this servant of the state, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, by the sublime command; and, on Tuesday, the 25th of the month of Sha’ban, the sublime standards moved towards Gwāliyūr, Chandīrī, Nurwul [Nurwur], and the Tabaqât-i-Akbarf places this event immediately after the taking of the stronghold of Nurwur, instead of before, although our author says that the Sulṭān set out for Chandīrī and Mālwa in Sha’ban, which is the eighth month of the year.

One of the two most important fiefs of the kingdom of Dihīf in those days.

That exceedingly trustworthy historian, Firighṭah, perpetrates a nice blunder here. He states immediately after the Nurwur affair, that “Sher Khān took Ghazān from the Mughals, and, for some time, read the Khvābah and coined the money there in the name of Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn”! All this ridiculous nonsense is concocted from the affair of Ikhtiyyar-ud-Dīn-i-Kurez and the Mughals mentioned previously by our author. Elphinstone is also led away by this nonsense, through the translations of that writer’s work, and Marshman and some others of the compilers of Indian history follow suit of course. The last-named writer adds that it is the only irruption recorded from that quarter during the period of “authentic history.” So much for the authentic history. See page 694, and account of Sher Khān in the next Section.

This refers to his duties as Kāzī no doubt, but the word used in the text is—jurisdiction, authority, sway, &c., and does not mean magistracy, although it might, in a proper place, mean magistracy.

There is no doubt respecting the name of this place: Nurwul and Nurwur, or Nirwul and Nirwur, are one and the same thing, the letters, and j in Hindī being interchangeable. It is no doubtful place, and lies some 40 miles east of Bhūpāl, in Lat. 23° 18′, Long. 78°. The other places mentioned with it indicate its whereabouts. The majority of the best copies of the text have jāh-i-chāhar-ajār, and one jāh-i-chāhar but in M.S. and are often confounded. It is probably the manner in which a Musalmān, and a foreigner, would write chāhaqāh—Chāhaqah—by putting , to represent the sound of Sanskrit . The word here written ajār—ajār or ochār, in one copy of the text, in the account of Nūṣrat-ud-Dīn, Tā-yana, in the next Section, has ajārnah, which may be meant for ajārnah—ajāryah, j standing for .

This Rājāh is, probably, “Chāhaqād Dhwa,” as referred to by Thomas [Pathān Kings: pages 69-70], but it seems very doubtful whether he was ever tributary to I-yal-timāh. The second word is, probably, meant for chāh—a spiritual guide, or teacher, &c., only, in other places farther on, he is styled Rānāh of Ajār, and that Hindū fellow, the Ajār, or, of Ajār, and Rānāh of Ajār, and
Mālwa, and, on this expedition, they reached near unto Mālwa. Chāhar, the Ajār, who was the greatest of all the Rāsīs of that tract of country, who had about 5000 horsemen well trained to arms, and 200,000 footmen, was routed; and the fortress which had been constructed by him, among defiles and passes, was taken and plundered, and booty and captives fell into the hands of the Musalmān army. During this expedition the Khān-i-Mu'azzam, Ulugh Khān-i-A'gam, displayed proofs of much energy and skill; and, in safety, and under the protection of God,

and Jāhir the Ajārī, who was a Rānah, &c., all of which various designations make the identification difficult.

In Sanskrit, Achārī means strict in the observance of religious ceremonies, and Achāraj and Achārya mean a spiritual guide or preceptor. Hodgson, in his "Sketch of Buddhism" contained in Part I., Vol. 2nd, of the "Transactions of the Ro. As. Soc. for 1829," pages 231 and 245, mentions the Vajra Achārya. He says "The Bandayas are divided into two classes; those who follow the Vāhya-charya, and those who adopt the Abhyasatara-charya—words equivalent to the Grihashta dīram and Vairāqi dīram of the Brāhmanas. The first class is denominated Bhikshu; the second, Vajra Acharaya." This last term is evidently similar in some way to the same name applied to this great "Rānā." See also the account of this affair, in the notice of Ulugh Khān in the next Section, and compare Elliot, vol. ii. page 351.

The Tāfīkh-i-Mubarak-Shāhī styles him Haṛja Dīw, and the Taškarat-ul-Mulūk Haṛja Dīw—but in all probability the Ī is merely Ī or ū with the points omitted, as no Hindū name would have the peculiar "Arabic Ī—and says he had 60,000 horse and 200,000 foot, but these latter would be mere rabble in any case, that he was one of the Rājāhs of Chandārī and Mālwa, and that, on the way back from this expedition, the fortress of Nurwūr or Nirwūr was taken.

The Taḥkāt-i-Akbar states that the Sultan marched against Aḥār Dīw, with a large army, on the 6th of Sābān of this year, mentions the number of the hostile troops as given by our author, and that a great battle took place in which Aḥār Dīw was overthrown, after which his stronghold was taken by assault, and the Sultan returned to Dihlī.

Firuztah copies the above, but styles him Aḥār Dīw [the MS. used by Dow however appears to have had Aḥār Dīw—Sāhīr Dīw] and adds that he had very recently built this stronghold of Nurwūr or Nirwūr, which, in Briggs' revised text, is turned into Ṭūr—Tirūr, which, of course, is totally incorrect.

According to Tod [vol. i. page 89], this stronghold was erected by a branch of the Cushwāha [he probably means the Kachwāhā—Rājpūts] and was "a celebrated fortress" and "the abode of the celebrated Raja Nala, whose descendants continued to hold possession throughout all the vicissitudes of the Tatar and Moghal dominion, when deprived of it by the Mahrattas," &c. Of course: who ever heard of Rājpūts being overcome by Musalmāns except by accident or mistake or some black treachery, according to the Rājpūt romances? Our author, consequently, must be wrong, and the Rājpūts right. It seems strange that such a great Rānah as this was is not mentioned by the Rājpūt annalists.
the sublime standards moved back again towards the capital.

SEVENTH YEAR: 650 H.

The sublime standards returned to Dihli on Monday, the 23rd of the month of Rabī’-ul-Awwal, 650 H., after which, for a period of seven months, attended by auspicious fortune and increasing felicity, the Sultan continued at the illustrious seat of government, and, during this period, was engaged in the diffusion of goodness and establishing usages of justice and equity.

On Monday, the 22nd of the month of Shawwāl of this year, the Sultan departed in the direction of Lohor with the intention of marching to Úchchah and Multān, and at the time of bidding farewell, in the vicinity of Kaithal, the Sultan bestowed upon the author a special honorary robe, together with a horse with complete furniture and trappings ornamented with gold and a saddle.

During this march all the Khāns, Maliks, and Amirs of the adjacent parts, assembled and attended the sublime stirrup; and Kutlug Khān from the territory of Bhānah,

---

3 Rendered in Elliot, “in great comfort and splendour.” The original

4 The I. O. L. MS., R. A. S. MS., the best Paris MS., and printed text here, have “the Sultan departed towards Lohor and Ghazwīn by the way of Úchchah and Multān.”!! The Editors of the printed text must have had peculiar ideas of their own on geographical matters not to have detected this blunder of the copyists. Where Ghazwīn? where Lohor? The word Ḥamīd in the original text has been turned into Ḥamīd by the copyists of the three former, but a very little discrimination would have convinced any one of the utter impossibility of its being correct. The Calcutta text, however, is faithfully followed in Elliot. See vol. ii. page 352.

What was the object of proceeding in the direction of Lāhor with the intention of marching to Multān and Úchchah does not appear, unless it was to deprive Sher Khān, Ulugh Khān’s kinsman, of those places and their dependencies, and restore them to Malik Balban-i-Kaśhūlū Khān [which was done], and that this was the first move in the Rayḥāni plot, which the latter Malik supported against Ulugh Khān; for, as yet, Malik Sher Khān had not left the country, and Malik Balban was feudatory of Budā‘ūn. The Mughal raids may possibly have been the cause; but, whatever it may have been, the Bihār was the farthest point reached upon this occasion. See the account of Balban-i-Kaśhūlū Khān in next Section.

4 Turned into “Sīhwān” and “Sīhwān” respectively in the Tabakāt-i-

Abkarī and Fir巢tah, and the latter has the impossible ی for ی in the title of ‘Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kaśhūlū Khān.
and 'Izz-ud-Din, Balban-i-Kashlū Ḵān, from Budāʿūn, with their respective followings, accompanied the sublime standards to the boundary of the river Biāh. 'Imād-ud-Din-i-Rayḥān [at this time] secretly subverted the mind of the Sultān and the Malik's towards Ulugh Khān-i-A'ẓām, and their minds were greatly changed.

**EIGHTH YEAR: 651 H.**

When the new year came round, on Tuesday, the 1st of the month of Muhaarram, 651 H., command was given to Ulugh Khān-i-A'ẓām, from the encampment at Hasirah, to proceed to his fiefs, the territory of Siwālikh and Hānsī. When the Khān-i-Mu'azzam, in conformity with that command, reached Hānsī, the Sultān, with his forces, in the beginning of the month of Rabi'-ul-Awwal of this same year, returned to the capital, and changed the feelings of the grandees [as well as] the offices [they held].

In the month of Jamādī-ul-Awwal, the masnād of the Wazīr-ship was transferred to the 'Ayn-ul-Mulk', the Niẓām-ul-Mulk, Muhammad, Jūnāidī, and to Malik

---

8 The Calcutta text turns him into Laskhar Khān, but such a name does not occur throughout the whole of our author's work.
6 In the next Section, the last day of Muhaarram.
7 This name is doubtful, and I fail to recognize the place. It is scarcely written twice exactly alike in any of the copies of the text collated, but it certainly is not "'Rohtak." In the different copies of the text it is مسير-مسير and البلاه-بلاه and the like.
8 Both here and in the account of Ulugh Khān in the next Section, in Elliot [vol. ii. pages 352 and 370], this is translated "his estates in the Siwālik hills;" but they were exceedingly extensive estates. Ulugh Khān held the province of Hānsī and the Siwālikh in fief, which then appears to have been the peculiar appanage of the Amfīr-i-Hājib.
9 In Elliot, "directed his attention to the nobles and public affairs," but the context plainly shows what is meant, and it is to be presumed that the Sultān, during Ulugh Khān's tenure of office, directed his attention to public affairs and to the great also.
1 This title, signifying the eye of the state, like the following, signifying the regulator of the country, &c., is a mere title peculiar to Wazira. Muḥammād was the name of the person in question.
2 Firāqtah asserts that 'Imād-ud-Din-i-Rayḥān was a protégé of Ulugh Khān's, but, as this is not contained in the Tabakat-i-Akbār, and is not referred to by our author, I am inclined to doubt its correctness. The Dakhānī historian also refers to the 'Ayn-ul-Mulk, as if he were a foreigner whom chance had brought to Dīhlī.
Saif-ud-Din, I-bak-i-Kaşhî Khân, the Amîr-i-Ḥâjib and Ulugh Bâr-Bâk [the Lord Chamberlain and Chief Master of the Ceremonies], who was the brother of the Khân-i-Mu‘âṣṣam, Ulugh Khân-i-A‘zam, the sieg of Kârah was given, and he was sent thither. In Šamâl-ul-Awwal likewise, 'Imâd-ud-Din-i-Rayhan became Wâkîl-i-Dar [Re-presentative in Dar-bâr], and the Sultân [and his forces], with the object of removing Ulugh Khân-i-A‘zam—may his power endure!—moved from the capital towards Hânîfî.

'Imâd-ud-Din-i-Rayhan brought Kâzî Shams-ud-Dîn, of Bharîj [to the capital], and on the 27th of the month of Rajab, 651 H., transferred to him the Kâzî-ship of the realm. Ulugh Khân-i-A‘zam moved from Hânîfî and

---

3 Compare Elliott here, where Malik Kaşîlî Khân is divided into two, and one half of him is made “lord chamberlain,” instead of being deprived of the office because of his relationship to Ulugh Khân, and his other half, as “Ulugh Mubarak Alîbak,” is sent to Karra!! Bâr-Bâk is an officer, equivalent to the Bâr-Begî of the Persian Court.

4 Bartous is perfectly correct in reading Wâkîl-i-Dar, since “wâkîlder” is meaningless; but he is wrong in translating it “officer of the doer,” one “who superintends the ceremonies of presentation,” for the meaning assigned to the words by Vûllers is correct—procurator patalli regii, i.e. vicarius. Wazîr no doubt means Prime Minister from the time of the first Khâlfahs down to the present time, as in Turkey and Persia at this moment. Blochmann, in his translation of the Â’în-i-Akbarî [vol. i. page 527], translates “Wâkîl” [Wâkîl] as “prime minister,” and “Wâzîr” [Wazîr] as “minister of finances.” I refer to the pre-Mughal period; but even as regards the reign of Akbar, who, being half a Hindus, and not half a Musalmân, and who, hating the very name of Muḥammad and Aḥmad, delighted in making innovations contrary to Muḥammadan usages, this rendering would furnish matter for much argument; but what I refer to in this place is Wâkîl-i-Dar, or Wâkîl-i-Dar-bâr—for the two are equivalent—to which the Musalmân writers assign the following significations:

A Wâkîl is, essentially, a person entrusted to act in the absence of another—a substitute, alter ego, locum tenens; but, at the same time, it must be remembered, that the office of Wâkîl-i-Dar is different from that of Nâyab-i-Mamilkât—Deputy or Lieutenant of the kingdom—as shown distinctly at page 702. Ulugh Khân was made Nâyab-i-Mamilkât in 647 H., and not Wâkîl-i-Dar, which office Imâd-ud-Dîn-i-Rayhan obtained after Ulugh Khân was sent to his sieg; but Imâd-ud-Dîn did not become Wazîr, for the first line of this paragraph of the text above shows, that Muḥammad, Junaidî, was the Wazîr. The term, Rayhan, is applied to a slave or eunuch generally. See also note 4, page 635.

This is related differently in the account of Ulugh Khân in the next Section, which see.

* Our author’s own office. See also the account of Ulugh Khân farther on. It was in this year, 651 H., that he gained great successes over the Râjpûts.
retired to Nāg-awr, and the fief of Hānsī, together with the office of Amir-i-Ḥājib, was entrusted to Prince Rukn-ud-Dīn [Firuz Shāh*]; and in the month of Sha'bān [on the 17th] the Sultan [with his forces] returned to the capital.

In the beginning of Shawwāl of this year, the Sultan marched from Dihlī for the purpose of securing *Uchchah and Multān. On arriving in the vicinity of the river Blāh, a force was despatched towards Tabarhindah.

Previous to this, Malik Sher Khān-i-Sunkār had withdrawn from an engagement on the banks of the Sind ¹, and had retired towards Turkistān; and *Uchchah, Multān, and Tabarhindah, had been left in the hands of his dependents. On Monday, the 26th of the month of Zī-Ḥijjah of this year, they were gained possession of, and were made over to the charge of Arsalān Khān, Sanjar-i-Chast ², and the

¹ The word here used—جاء—to mean "intend." ² Among the names of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn's offspring in the list, at page 672a, this name is given, together with the names of three others. These must have been mere children, as Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, himself, was only born in 626 H., and now only in his twenty-sixth year. The fief as well as the office of Amir-i-Ḥājib must have been held by Deputy in this case, by some creature of ʻImād-ud-Dīn-i-Raybān's clique, but only for a very short time. The mention of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh's offspring fully disproves the statement of the Tabakāt-i-Akbarf, and some other works, as to his having had but one wife—he may have had only one at a time—for, as yet, Ulugh Khān's daughter had borne him no offspring. See page 714.

² The word _INTRUDUCTIO_ is here used, which has different meanings. "Subduing" is rather too strong, as the object was merely to obtain possession of those places from Malik Sher Khān's dependents, and to place them under the charge of Malik Taj-ud-Dīn, Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjār, as will be detailed in the account of him farther on. Malik Kurez, Sher Khān's deputy at Multān, had, only two or three years before [in 648 H.], sent Mughal captives to Dihlī, which caused such rejoicing.

The Tabakāt-i-Akbarf says "Sher Khān sustained a defeat at the hands of the Sindfān," and Firāštah copies with some blunders of his own; but, as the first mentioned work agrees in every other respect with our author's statements here, "the banks of the Sind" have, evidently, been mistaken for Sindfān.

¹ A few copies of the text, but of the more modern ones, including the best Paris MS., have "Sher Khān had retired from an engagement with the infidels of Sind" ⁴—کار سد—but those words appear to be a mistake for ⁴ کار سد as in the translation above.

² Our author, in the next Section, says nothing about this movement towards *Uchchah and Multān, merely that the fief of Tabarhindah was assigned to him, and that previously [subsequently?] he held the office of ʻImād-i-Dar. He joined Ulugh Khān from Tabarhindah, when the latter marched from Nāg-awr to oust ʻImād-ud-Dīn-i-Raybān from power.

In the account of Malik Balbān it is stated that he, having been ousted from
Sultan [with his forces] retired from the banks of the Belah⁴, and, in the same manner, returned to the capital.

Ninth Year: 652 H.

When the year 652 H. commenced, the river Jun was passed, and, in the vicinity of the Koh-payah [skirt of the mountains] of Bardar and Bijnor⁴ many successes were gained, and vast booty acquired.

Uchchah by Sher Khan, who had previously obtained possession of Multan, went to Court and was made feudatory of Badaulin, and that, subsequent to this, hostility having arisen between Sher Khan and the Malik of the Court, Sher Khan left the country and retired into Turkistan, but no battle whatever is referred to. Subsequently—previous to the year 655 H., in 653 H. or 654 H.—Malik Balban had been again put in charge of Uchchah and Multan, and had made overtures to Halak Khun, the Mughal, who ruled over Irân on the part of his brother, the Great Khân, Mangu, and had asked for a Mughal Shakhnâh, or Commissioner.

In the account of Malik Sher Khan on the other hand, our author states that the reason, why Sher Khan retired towards Upper Turkistan to proceed to the ardâs of Mangu Khân, was, that, when his cousin, Ulugh Khân, was banished from the Court through 'Imad-ud-Dîn-i-Rayhan's intrigues, and proceeded to Nag-awr, strife went on between the cousins on the banks of the Sind.

In the account of Ulugh Khan, the march towards the upper provinces in 650 H. is mentioned when the Rayhanî plot took place, but no reference whatever is made to Sher Khan's retirement, nor to any fighting. Under any circumstances Sher Khan could not have remained long absent from Hind, as he joined the Sultan's brother, Malik Jalâl-ud-Dîn, Mas'ûd Shâh, in 652 H., at Lâhor, which territory, a fact to which I have before drawn attention, appears to have been then severed from the sovereignty of Dîlî. There is a great deal of mystery about Jalâl-ud-Dîn, Mas'ûd Shâh's movements, but further mention of him, with reference to the Mughals, in the last Section, will throw some more light upon them.

³ It must be borne in mind that all the references in these pages to the Belah, and the banks of the Belah, refer to that river when it flowed in its own bed which ran about midway through the Bûr Dû-ab, and Shamâlî Kachîf Dû-ab, and joined the other rivers of the Panjâb ten miles north of Uchchah: otherwise, to advance to the Belah as it now flows, to operate against Multan and Uchchah, would be of no more effect than advancing to the Gâng or Jûn for the purpose. I shall have to refer to its change of bed farther on.

⁴ As in all the copies of the text—Bijnor and Bijnour—Bijnor [the Bijnour of the Indian Atlas]. It is a place of considerable antiquity, with many ruins still to be seen.

The very "candid" writer, our author, makes no other mention of this affair in the account of Ulugh Khân—in fact, it is not even alluded to. The Tabakât-i-Akbârî, however, refers to it, but is evidently quite at sea as to the geography, as I shall clearly prove. That work states, that, in 652 H., the Sultan "marched an army into the boundaries of the Koh-payah [skirt of the
On Thursday, the 13th of the month of Muḥarram of this year, the river Gang was crossed [by the Sultān and his troops] in front of Mīā-pūr, and in the same manner, keeping along the skirt of the mountains, the force proceeded as far as the banks of the river Rahab. During these holy expeditions, on Sunday, the 15th of the month of Šafar, at Tiklah-Bānī, Malik Rażī-ul-Mulk, 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Durmashi [Durmashāni ?], attained martyrdom. On mountains of Bijnor, and, having obtained great booty, crossed the river Gang at the Mīā-pūr [another MS. Mahā-pūr] ferry, and, keeping along the skirt of the mountains, reached the river Bihat [which is the Jhilam]; and that, "at Talkah-māni—[another MS. تکل مانی] on Sunday, the 15th of Šafar, of that year [652 H.], Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Rażī-ul-Mulk, whilst in a state of intoxication [!] was martyred by the Zamīndārs of Kaithal and Kuhrām. The Sultān, to avenge his blood, having gone to Kaithal and Kuhrām, inflicted chastisement upon the contumacious of that part, and then proceeded towards Budā'un," &c. If any one will take the trouble to look at a map, it will be at once seen what utter absurdity this is, and what ignorance it displays. The author of that work evidently wrote without attending to the geography, and has mistaken Kāṭheher for Kaithal—had he not added Kuhrām by way of riveting his blunder, I should have imagined Kaithal an error of the copyist—and so made a precious hash of the two expeditions, and made one of them, as well as mistaking a place situated in Lat. 29° 49', Long. 76° 28', for another—a tract of country—more than three degrees farther east. Firighthah follows, implicitly, thus proving that, in this instance certainly, he did not see our author's work. He, however, leaves out the name of Tiklah-Bānī altogether. The simple mention of Budā'un should have been sufficient to have guided the author of the first work to Kāṭheher, or Kāṭheher, as it is also written.

In the original میان [مینا] Tiklah-Māni, Tiklah or Talkah-Bānī [تکل مانی], Tiklah-Bamī [تکل بامی], Talkah-Bānī [تکل بانی], Talkleh-Pānī [تکل پانی], and also Sakah-Māni [سک مانی]. The first mentioned is contained in the majority of the best copies. The identification of places is very difficult in the Indian Atlas sheets, as well as in other less valuable maps, from the manner in which the names of places are written. For example, in Sheet No. 67, the word Tīlak, in the name Tīlak-pūr, is written Tiklok-poor, Tiklok-poor, Tiklok-poor, and the like, just according to the fancy of the different surveyors or engravers. In my humble opinion, in the case of survey maps, at least, the local name, written in the vernacular, should be first obtained, and then, after transliteration, inserted in the map, the long and short vowels being properly marked, as well as guttural, nasal, aspirated, and other peculiar, letters, and then the public would not be at the mercy of Gazetteer writers and their crude theories. A recent article in the Bengal Asiatic Journal, No. iv. of 1874, by Mr. F. L. Growse, is very much to the point.

There is a place called Figree Barehne in the sheet referred to in Lat. 29°, Long. 79° 40'; what the vernacular may be I cannot tell.

That most absurd blunder, whereby an innocent man is turned into a drugkhand, occurs in the above passage. The author of the تابکت-اکهار read the word دیشی-Durmashi [which signifies that he was a native of}
the following day, the 16th of Şafar, the Sultān of Islām, in order to avenge that act, inflicted such a chastisement upon the infidels of Kāthheher as [the people of] that territory will remember for the rest of their lifetime, and [afterwards] departed towards Budā‘ūn; and, on Thursday, the 19th of the month of Şafar, the district of Budā‘ūn became adorned with the magnificence and dignity of his auspicious canopy of state and sublime standards. The Sultān halted there for nine days, and, after that, decided upon a return to the capital.

On Sunday, the 6th of the month of Rabī‘-ul-Awwal, the Wazārat-i-Mamālik 7 [Wazīr-ship of the realm] fell to the charge, for the second time, of the Şadr-ul-Mulk, Najm-ud-Din, Abū-Bikr; and, on Sunday, the 20th of Rabī‘-ul-Awwal, within the limits of Kol, the Sultān honoured this vassal of the dynasty [the author] with the title of Şadr-i-Jahān 8—the Almighty long preserve him in the sovereignty!—and, on Saturday 9, the 26th of Rabī‘-ul-Awwal, the capital, Dīhlī, was reached.

The Sultān continued at Dīhlī for a period of five

—Darmāsh, or that his family, originally, came from a place so called. The same name has already occurred. See page 489, and note 4, as—در سنی "in intoxication," whilst Firāštah, by way of clenching the absurdity, and showing plainly whence he obtained his information, puts an additional word در خالت سنی—"in a state of intoxication"!!

I had some faith in the Ţabākāt-i-Akbārī before I compared its statements with respect to this Shamsī dynasty. I found it a mere transcript, with verbal alterations, of our author’s statements, plus the geographical and other blunders referred to. All this shows what errors may be made even by native Muḥammadan compilers of Indian history: what then may we not expect from European compilers who are wholly dependent on translations for their materials?

7 At page 352 of ELLIOT, vol. ii., “wazīr” is not translated at all, and, a few lines under, “wakilder” is translated “prime minister,” but here Wazīr-i-Mamālik is rendered “minister.” Now it is clear, from our author’s statements, that Wakkīl-i-Dar and Wazīr are totally distinct offices, and, therefore, the former office, as described by the Muḥammadan authors, is no doubt correct. ‘Imād-ud-Dīn-i-Raybān was still Wakkīl-i-Dar at this period.

No mention of Abū-Bikr’s [“Abū Bakr” must be “Turānī”] obtaining the Wazīr-ship is made in the account of Ulugh Khān, although it enters into much more detail of these events.

8 Compare ELLIOT: vol. ii. page 353. In Akbar’s reign, the Şadr-i-Jahān was the Chief Justice and Administrator of the Empire. See Blochmann’s translation of the Ā’in-i-Akbārī.

9 Saturday, not Tuesday, is correct, for, if Sunday is the 20th, how is it possible for the 26th to be Tuesday?
months¹, when information arrived respecting the assem-
blage of the Maliks who had gathered about Malik Jalāl-
ud-Dīn, Masʿūd Shāh [the Sultān’s brother]². The sublime
standards [accordingly], in the month of Sha’bān, moved
towards Sunām and Tabarhindah, and the ‘Id-i-Fiṭr [the
festival at the end of the Fast Month—Ramażān] was cel-
brated at Sunām. The forces of the Maliks, namely, Malik
Tāj-ud-Dīn, Arsalān Khān, Sanjar-i-Chast³, of Tabarhind-
ah, Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Bat Khān⁴, I-bak, the Khiṭā-i, and
Ulugh Khān-i-A’zam from Nāg-awr, were along with
Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Masʿūd Shāh, in the neighbourhood
of Tabarhindah. The Sultān [with the forces of his party]
left Sunām and retired to Hānsī, and those Maliks moved
towards Kuhām and Kaithal⁵. The Sultān [on this] marched from Hānsī [8th of Shawwāl] in the same direc-

¹ The inscription over the entrance of the mināra at ’Alī-gār [Anglicized,
Allygurh] is dated 10th of Rajab of this same year, and in it is said to occur
the name of Malik-ul-Kabīr-ul-Mu’azzam, Kūlūgh Khān, Balbān-ūg-Shamsī,
which has been ascribed, by Thomas [Pathān Kings, pages 109-30], to
Ulugh Khān, but “the amiable king” never bestowed upon Ulugh Khān the
title of Kūlūgh Khān according to the records in this work. Our author says
this was the title by which Nāṣir-ud-Dīn’s step-father was known, and by no
other name is he mentioned in these pages, and he bore that title for a long
time after. See under the events of the next year. The name probably refers
to the person who held the sif when the mināra was erected.

² Further details of this outbreak will be found in the account of Ulugh
Khān in the next Section. It was the occasion upon which the Sultān’s
brother, Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Masʿūd Shāh, is said to have gone to the camp of
Mangū Khān, son of Tūf, son of Chingīz, but our author makes a mystery of
it. More about this will be mentioned farther on.

³ Fīrīštah, in his utter ignorance, turns the Sultān’s brother into Malik Jalāl-
ud-Dīn Khān [I have already referred to this blunder of turning Khān into
Khānīf, at page 633, note ¹], and says he was one of the “Turkān-i,
Khwājah-Tāsh,” referred to in note ¹, para. 6, page 717. He seems totally
unaware that Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Masʿūd Shāh, was the Sultān’s own brother.
Sher Khān, after the same fashion, is turned into Sher Khān, Rayhānī, in the
“revised” text of Briggs¹¹.

⁴ See the Malik No. XIX, in the next Section.

⁵ The Malik No. XVI in the following Section is referred to. This title or
by-name is often mentioned in the accounts of the Turks.

⁶ This affair probably led the author of the Tabākāt-i-Akbarī astray, and
to mistake Kaithal, when Kāthheer was meant. See Elliot: vol. ii.
page 354. A slight skirmish did actually take place, and the greatest confusion
arose in the Sultān’s camp. The particulars of this affair will be found in the
account of Ulugh Khān farther on, under its proper date. Fīrīštah, but not
the Tabākāt-i-Akbarī, brings Malik Sher Khān upon the scene here. Sher
Khān does not appear to have had anything to do with this matter. See the
account of him in next Section.
tion. A party of Amirs now interposed between the two personages [the Sultān and Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh], and spoke words of peace, and 'Imād-ud-Dīn-i-Rayhān was the cause of discord on both sides, until, on Saturday, the 22nd of Shawwāl of this same year, the Sultān of Islām commanded that 'Imād-ud-Dīn-i-Rayhān should be sent to Budā'ūn, and that that territory should be his fief; and that accommodation was effected.

On Tuesday, the 17th of the month of Zil-Qu'dah, after vows, pledges, and stipulations, Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, and the whole of the Amirs and Maliks presented themselves, and [the province of] Lohor became the fief of Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh; and, attended by security and felicity, the Sultān and his forces entered the capital city of Dīhil, under a fortunate star, on Tuesday, the 9th of the month of Zil-Ḥijjah—May Almighty God ever adorn the

6 The original as above. The persons referred to are the Sultān and his brother, but Ulugh Khān was also concerned. Compare Elliot also here.

7 "Wednesday" is utterly impossible, if Tuesday is the 17th of Zil-Qu'dah. In the account of Ulugh Khān it is said the 22nd of Shawwāl was Saturday.

8 This is the first time Lāhor has been referred to as a fief since it was taken by the Mughals in 639 H. It was still in ruins, and was not rebuilt until some time after. Some authors state that Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd Shāh, held Lāhor independent of the Dīhil kingdom, and that he was countenanced by the Mughals. More on this subject will be found in the last Section. Even above it is not said that Lāhor was conferred upon him; merely that it became his fief.

In the account of Sher Khān in the next Section, it is stated that, on his return with honour from the urdū of the Great Khān, Mangā Khān, in Turān [this shows the state of the Dīhil kingdom, when even Ulugh Khān's own cousin went to the Mughal Court], he, Sher Khān, joined Malik Jalāl-ud-Dīn; but there it is stated that contention arose between the latter and Sher Khān at last, that Jalāl-ud-Dīn retired in disappointment, and that his dependents and followers fell into the hands of Sher Khān's followers. This however, it must be borne in mind, had nothing whatever to do with these events, and happened a year or two afterwards. Sher Khān then endeavoured to recover Tabarhindah from the feudatory, Malik Taj-ud-Dīn, Aruṣān Khān, but he, having sallied out to encounter him, Sher Khān had to withdraw. Swift messengers were sent after him from Dīhil, and pledges were entered into [to induce him not to retire to the Mughals probably], and he was induced to proceed to Dīhil, whether the feudatory of Tabarhindah was also summoned. The latter was sent to govern the fief of Awadh, and Sher Khān received back all the frontier fiefs he had previously held. Contention, however, again went on between him and Malik Balban-i-Kashān Khān as before, Tabarhindah and its dependencies were conferred upon another Malik, Nuṣrat Khān, Badr-ud-Dīn-i-Sūnṣkār, and Sher Khān obtained another fief, as stated in note 2, page 713, and note 4, page 714, which see.
sublime standards of the Sultān with the emblems of victory for the sake of his illustrious Prophet!

**Tenth Year: 653 H.**

When the new year of 653 H. came round, an uncommon thing happened, and it was on this wise, that the decrees of destiny suffered the blessed heart of the Sultān to change towards his mother, the Malikah-i-Jahān; and, as she was married [a second time]⁹ to Kutlugh Khān, command was given to both of them that Awadh should be their fief, and that they should proceed to it¹. In conformity with this command, they repaired to their fief; and this circumstance happened on Tuesday, the 6th of the month of Muḥarram of this year.

When the month of Rabi'-ul-Awwal came round, on Sunday, the 23rd of the same month, the Sultān of Islām,—May his sovereignty continue!—entrusted to the charge of this servant of the state, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, under the same covenant as on a previous occasion, the Kāzi-ship of the realm and jurisdiction over the capital city, Dihlī.

⁹ There appears to have been some secrecy with respect to this match, and it is on account of the proceedings of the Sultān's mother and her second husband that he is excluded from the account of the great Malikas. Compare Elliot here also.

¹ Some time previous to this period, but when or in what year is not stated—more than between the beginning of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh's reign, and the putting to death of Malik Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, Husain, the Ghūrī, in the middle of 653 H.—Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Yūz-Bak-i-Tūghril Khān, who had previously held the fief of Khinauj, having showed a rebellious spirit, Malik Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, Husain, the Ghūrī, was sent against him, and he succeeded in bringing Malik Yūz-Bak to the capital. The latter was then appointed to the charge of the fief of Awadh, and, subsequently, that of Lakhanawatī was conferred upon him. Hostility arose between him and the infidels of Jāj-nagar who renewed their attempts against the Lakhanawatī territory. Malik Yūz-Bak was at first unsuccessful against them, but, at last, he penetrated into their country, and appeared before its capital. After this success, Malik Yūz-Bak, who was continually acting contumaciously towards the Court, assumed three canopies of state, invaded Awadh, and assumed the title of Sultān Mughis-ud-Dīn. The kingdom of Dihlī appears to have been in such a state of disorder that its ruler was powerless to oust him from Lakhanawatī; and, subsequently, Malik Yūz-Bak invaded Kām-rūd, but was defeated and taken prisoner, and died. Further particulars will be found in the next Section, but our author gives not a single date, and his accounts differ considerably.
In the month of Rabī’-ul-Ākhir, they conveyed to the hearing of the Sultān a remark from Malik Kūṭb-ud-Din, Ḥusain, son of 'Ali, the Ghūrī, who was Nāyab [Lieutenant] of the kingdom, which was contrary to the sublime opinion, and, on Tuesday, the 23rd of Rabī’-ul-Ākhir, he cited Malik Kūṭb-ud-Din, Ḥusain*, and ordered him to be arrested and imprisoned; and that Malik obtained martyrdom*—Almighty God long preserve the monarch of Islām!

On Monday, the 7th of Jamādi-ul-Awwal, the sief of Mīrāḥth was assigned to Malik Kāshī Khān, Saif-ud-Din, I-bak, the Sultānī Shamsī, Ulugh Kūtlugh-i-A’ẓam, the Bār-Bak [the full brother of Ulugh Khān-i-A’ẓam], after he had presented himself at court 'subsequent to his return from Karah—The Almighty's mercy be upon him'! On Tuesday, the 13th of the sacred month of Rajab of this same year, the office of Shaikh-ul-Islām [patriarch] of the capital was consigned to that Bāyīzīd of the age, the Shaikh-ul-Islām, Jamāl-ud-Din, the Būstāmī*; and, in this

---

* See the List at page 673 for his full titles.

* This is another of our author's mysteries and suppressions of facts. In his account of Ulugh Khān in the next Section, he says Ulugh Khān was made Nāyab or Deputy of the kingdom, in 647 H., soon after his daughter was espoused by the Sultān. On the banishment of Ulugh Khān to his sief of Nāg-awr in 650–51 H., through 'Imād-ud-Dīn-i-Rayhān's machinations, he was, of course, deprived of his office; but, neither under this reign, nor in the account of Ulugh Khān, is it stated whom Ulugh Khān succeeded in that office, or who succeeded him; but, from the statement above, it is evident that Malik Kūṭb-ud-Din, Husain, was made Nāyab when Ulugh Khān was sent to Nāg-awr, and that he held the office up to this time. From what is mentioned about Malik Kūṭb-ud-Din, Husain, in the account of Ulugh Khān, where the latter's return to Court is detailed, and 'Imād-ud-Dīn-i-Rayhān's banishment, at the end of the year 652 H., it is also evident that the former—he was no slave either, but a free-born Ghūrī noble of royal descent—held a high position in the state, second only to the Sultān himself. His fate evidently was connected, in some way, with the Kūtlugh or Rayhānī factions, from what is mentioned respecting the occurrences of this year, in the account of Ulugh Khān: or, he may have merely been in the way of Ulugh Khān’s ambition, for, immediately after he was got rid of, his extensive sief of Mīrāḥth was given to Ulugh Khān’s brother.

* "Upon his coming from Karra to pay his respects to the Sultān.” ELLIOTT: vol. ii. page 354.

* He died in 657 H.

* Būstām is the name of a celebrated town in Khurāsān, of which Jamāl-ud-Dīn was a native, hence he is styled Būstāmī, and Shaikh Abū-Yafrīd or Hāyāfīd is the name of the saint who has made Būstām so famous among Musālmāns. Some write the word Būstām. See page 419.
month likewise, Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn-i-Sanjar, the Sihwastānī, managed to get out of Awadh, and ousted 'Imād-ud-Dīn-i-Rayhān from Bharāīj, and he departed on a journey from this world. In the month of Shawwāl of this year likewise, the Sultān with his forces departed from the capital towards Hindūstān [i.e. east of the Jūn]; and, on Sunday, the 17th of the month of Zi-Ka'dah, Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam set out for Hānṣī for the purpose of organizing the affairs of the Siwālik contingent, and, having got those troops ready, returned to the capital, Dihlī, with them⁷; and, on Wednesday, the 19th of the month of Zi-Hijjah, at the close of this year, he joined the royal camp [with his contingent].

Previous to this a peremptory command had been issued that Malik Kūtlugh Khān [the Sultān's step-father] should leave the province of Awadh, and proceed to the fief of Bha-raīj, and he had not obeyed that mandate; and Malik Bak-Tamur⁸, the Ruknī, was directed to proceed from the capital with a force and expel him [from Awadh]. The forces on either side came in contact in the neighbourhood of Budā'ūn ⁴, and Malik Bak-Tamur was martyred. On this, the Sultān with his forces set out towards Awadh for the purpose of remedying this mishap; and, on his arrival in that part, Malik Kūtlugh Khān retired before him, and the

⁷ There are three Malik mentioned in the next Section bearing a similar name and title, one Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Kuret Khān, another Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Tez Khān, who lived in this reign, and, at this period, held the fief of Budā'ūn, and a third, Tāj-ud-Dīn, Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjar, but the Tāj-ud-Dīn-i-Sanjar, here referred to, must be a totally different person, and is not mentioned among those in the next Section. See also note ⁶, page 704.

In the account of Ulugh Khān he is styled Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Māhpeşānī [of the moon-like brow], "Out of the city of Awadh"—the ancient capital—is here meant, where he was confined. Further particulars will be found under Ulugh Khān, which see. Firāštah, who certainly did not obtain the names of persons from our author, turns him into Tāj-ud-Dīn, the Turk.

⁸ On the 3rd of the month, Zi-Hijjah. In Muharram, the first month of the year 654 H., the army reached the frontier of Awadh.

⁹ In some copies this name appears Bak-tam—(Point—but it is an error. What appears the long stroke of .Point—merely the way in which some writers, writing quickly, would write  —Bak-Tamur; but the I. H. L. MS., R. A. S. MS., and Paris MS., have Bak-Tamur or Bak-tam. Ruknī refers to Sultān Rukn-ud-Dīn, Firūz Shāh, in whose reign this Malik was raised to that dignity, probably. He is styled Malik Bak-Tamur-i-Aor Khān in the next Section.

¹ It is said, in the next Section, that they met at Samrā-mū.
Sultān moved towards Kālair.² Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam [with a part of the army] followed in pursuit of Malik Kutlugh Khān, but did not meet with him, and, with great booty, he rejoined the Sultān’s [camp]³.

Eleventh Year: 654 H.

When the new year, 654 H., came round, the Sultān’s forces, in the month of Muḥarram, 654 H., having achieved that success⁴, attended with felicity and victory, and aided by the protection of the Creator Most High, the Sultān turned his face towards Dihlī, and, on Tuesday, the 4th of Rabi‘-ul-Ākhir, 654 H., the capital was reached.

When Malik Kutlugh Khān became aware that the Sultān’s forces had retired towards the capital, he began to appropriate the territories of Kārah and Mānikpur, and between him and [the feudatory] Arsalān Khān, Sanjar-i-Chast, a conflict took place, but the victory remained with Arsalān Khān⁴. As it became impracticable for Malik Kutlugh Khān to make further resistance in Hindūstān, he determined to move upwards [towards the Biāh and Lāhor] through the border tracts, and proceeded in the direction of

² The name of this place is doubtful in all copies of the text, but is written Kāler or Kālair—کلیر—in the most trustworthy copies. The probability is that it refers to—کلنیر—a few miles north-east of Ṣurfī. It is the remains of an ancient city. In some copies of the text the word is الکلیر—Kalinjar, but, of course, the celebrated stronghold of that name is not, and cannot be, referred to. In the account of Ulugh Khān, in the next Section, the scene of these events is said to have been near the frontier of Tirhat.
³ Near Kasmandah, or Kasmandī, for it is written in both ways, on the 16th of Rabi‘-ul-Awwal.
⁴ It was a great success, certainly, not to catch a rebel.
⁵ Two Maliks living at this time, whose names and titles are somewhat similar, and are thereby liable to be mistaken one for the other—one, Taj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar-i-Tez Khān; the other, Taj-ud-Dīn, Arsalān Khān, Sanjar-i-Chast. The first-mentioned became Wakīl-i-Dar and feudatory of Buda‘īn in 654 H. He was, subsequently, sent against Kutlugh Khān, but had to retreat; and, some time after, the sieg of Awadh was conferred upon him. The latter had married the daughter of Sultān Bahā-ud-Dīn, Tughril, the Mu‘izzī [see page 544], and had great interest. When Malik Sher Khān retired from Sindh and Tabarhindah, Arsalān Khān was sent to Tabarhindah. He was afterwards sent against Kutlug Khān, when feudatory of Awadh, and was more successful, and compelled Kutlug Khān’s faction to disperse. This is what is referred to above. See Maliks, Nos. XVII. and XIX., next Section.
THE SHAMSIAH SULTANS OF HIND.

Santūr⁶, and sought shelter among the independent [Hindū] tribes⁷. The Sultān with his forces moved from the capital, Dihlī, on Monday, the 20th of Zi-li-Ḥijjah, to quell this sedition of his; and, as the new year, 655 H.⁸, came round, the army, in that year, marched towards Santūr,

⁶ See the account of Ulugh Khān, in the next Section, respecting Santūr.
⁷ There is not a word about "the highlands" here, as given in Elliot [vol. ii. page 355]. The word is made a tract of country in that work! The words are—مَوَاسِسْ—مَوَاسِسْ عَرَبَةٍ خَالِقٍ—as above.

The editor of the above-mentioned work adds, in a foot-note, that "These two names are written مَوَاسِسْ and مَوَاسِسْ (var. مَوَاسِسْ). The former is probably مَوَاسِسْ, and the hills the Aţāvālī mountains. Briggs says there is a town called Santpūr, near Abū. Thornton has a "Santoo, eighty-four miles S.S.W. from Jodhpur"! Where will they lead us next? They are entirely out, however, both in their latitude and longitude here, only about five degrees too far W. and S.!! Where "Mewār" where the Himalayah mountains? Perhaps "Bahādūk" is near "Jodhpur" also. Firıghtah turns ستور into ستور—Jfūr—and ستور—Jfūr or, rather, the "revised text" of Briggs does. Dow has ستور, as in the Ṭabāḳāt-i-Akbarī, which proves that the MS. of Firıghtah used by him was correct, for ستور in a MS. might be read, by a person not knowing what place was referred to, ستور. The "revised" text of Firıghtah might be revised from other MSS. of that work with much advantage.

There is some difficulty with respect to the exact meaning which our author desired to convey by the word مَوَاسِسْ—مَوَاسِسْ—مَوَاسِسْ—mawāsāt used elsewhere. The latter word seems as if intended for the plural form of it, according to Arabic ideas or, otherwise, for the Arabic word signifying "society," "neighbourhood," "fellowship," &c. There is also a Hindī word written in the same way—مَوَاسِسْ—meaning "refuge," "protection," "retreat," "asylum," and the like, which might be used here: but, from the way in which the second form of the word, viz. مَوَاسِسْ is used in the account of Ulugh Khān, and in other places farther on, respecting these events, both words evidently refer to neighbouring independent Hindū tribes and the tracts they dwelt in, adjoining the Dihlī territory, but not under the sway of the Dihlī kings, and as such I shall use the word here.

The country of the Mews or Mewrās is certainly not meant, for Mewāt is far too south-west. The events here recorded happened in and around the Upper Do-āb, in and near the lower ranges of the Himalayah mountains, as far east as the district of Tirhūt, and as far as the Biḥān on the west.

I have in my possession detailed geographical accounts of these tracts, but neither of the words used in the text is mentioned. There is a possibility that the name Mawāsāt is local, but, at the same time, there seems but little doubt of their being the same, or one among the aboriginal Hindū tribes, referred to in Dalton's Ethnology [pages 154, 221, 230, 231, 280], and in the Ilm. Geogr. Journal, 11. of 1855, under the name of Mawsia, which is used like the term ستور—gānōr—by some native writers, applied to a nomad people of Hindustan.

⁸ These are the events of the next year, not of 654 H. In the account of Ulugh Khān it is stated that the Sultān's troops only began their march in the third month of 655 H.
and hostilities were commenced between the forces of Islām and the Hindus of the Koh-pāyah [skirt of the hills]. Kutlugh Khān was among that people; and a party among the Musalmān Amīrs, who were apprehensive, through being falsely accused, joined him, but, as they had not the power to withstand [the Sultān’s troops], they consequently turned their backs [and retired], and Ulugh Khān-i-A’zam, by stroke of sword, turned that mountain tract upside down, and pushed on through passes and defiles to Silmūr [i.e. Sirmūr], and devastated the Koh-i-Silmūr [the hill tract of Sirmūr], and waged holy war as by the faith enjoined, over which tract no sovereign had acquired power, and which no Musalmān army had ever before reached, and caused such a number of villainous Hindu rebels to be slain as cannot be defined nor numbered, nor be contained in record nor in narration.

Twelfth Year: 655 H.

After withdrawing from thence [the hill tract of Sirmūr], on Sunday, the 6th of Rabi’-ul-Awwal, 655 H., Malik Saif-ud-Din, Ban Khān, I-bak, the Khīṭā-i, sustained a fall from his horse and died from the effects of the injuries he sustained, and the Sultān’s forces turned their faces towards the capital, and, on Sunday, the 26th of the month of Rabi-ul-Ākhir, he reached the illustrious seat of government, Dīhilī.

9 The Sub-Himālayah is here meant, not the hills of Mewāt.
1 This is rendered in ELLIOT [vol. ii. page 356] “a party of nobles in the royal army, &c., went and joined them,” as if they deserted from the Sultān’s army. The text, however, does not admit of this rendering, and the words are incorrect. The Musalmān Amīrs were not with the royal forces at this time. See under Ulugh Khān.
2 In a few of the more modern copies of the text Kshabakh—town is used instead of Koh—mountain, hill-tract, &c. Silmūr and Sirmūr is one and the same thing. The chief town bore that name as well as the tract of country. For further particulars respecting this part, see the account of Ulugh Khān in the next Section. There the Hīşār—fortress, or fortified town—of Silmūr is mentioned.
3 It was on the last day of Shawwāl of this year, although some say the following day—the 1st of of Zi-Ka’dah—that Rukan-ud-Din, Khār Shāh, the last of the Mūlahidah rulers of Alamūt, came down from his stronghold of Maimūn-Dūj and presented himself before Hulākū Khān, the Mughal.
4 It was the 25th according to the statement in the account of Ulugh Khān, which see.
On the return of the victorious forces, Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kašhlū Khān, who, with the troops of Įchchah and Multān, was [then] in the neighbourhood of the banks of the river Blāh, advanced still farther [north-eastwards], and Malik Kutlugh Khān, and those Amīrs who were in combination with him, joined Malik Balban-i-Kašhlū Khān, and advanced to the limits of Maṅsūr-pūr and Samānah. When information of the movement of this faction came to the sublime hearing, Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam with the troops was appointed [to march against them], and, on Thursday, the 15th of Jamādī-ul-Awwal, 655 H., he moved from the capital.

When Ulugh Khān-i-A'zam, with the forces under him, arrived near unto the army of the faction, so that between the two armies about ten kuroh [about 18 miles] distance remained, a party at the capital, such as the Shaikh-ul-Islām [patriarch], Jamāl-ud-Dīn, the Sayyid, Ḳutb-ud-Dīn, and Ḳāżī Shams-ud-Dīn, the Bharāʾījī, wrote letters secretly, and despatched them to Malik Kutlugh Khān and Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kašhlū Khān [urging them] to come to the capital, and that they would give up the gates [of the city] to them; and every one within the city they were getting to pledge their support to this movement, this advance was made with an object, as will appear in the account of Ulugh Khān.

Kutlugh Khān and his faction, skirting the lower range of the Himāłayah, advanced towards the Blāh, keeping north of Sīrhind, and Balban-i-Kašhlū Khān moved up from the Multān district to meet him, along the banks of the Blāh—which, at that period, from our author's remark in his account of Balban-i-Kašhlū Khān, was the boundary of the Dihlī kingdom. It flowed in its old bed at this period. See remarks on the "Lost River" in last section.

Our author's account here differs considerably from that given in his notice of Ulugh Khān, and that again differs, in a great measure, from the other two in his notice of Balban-i-Kašhlū Khān. Under Ulugh Khān, our author states that, when he, with his troops, drew near to the rebels in the vicinity of Kaithal, on the 15th of Jamādī-ul-Awwal, certain persons at the capital wrote letters, &c.

He is again turned into his namesake, Balban, by Firīshtah, who styles him Ẹdli. The title of his namesake, however, was 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kašhlū Khān. Ulugh Khān never went by the title of 'Izz-ud-Dīn. The Taḥkīt-i-Akbart, which copies from our author, is perfectly correct, but Firīshtah imagines that "Kašhlū [not Kašhi] Khān, Ḥākim of Sind" and 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban, was another person altogether, and makes two persons of him in nearly every instance throughout his account of this reign.
and were entering into compacts, and making stipulations with them. Certain loyal informants [however] wrote intimation of this sedition to Ulugh Khan-i-A'zam who, in consequence of this treason, from his camp, imparted information to the sublime Court respecting the fact of this disaffection on the part of a party of turban-wearers' [priest-hood], and requested, in the event of its being expedient in the sublime opinion, that a royal mandate should be issued by his Majesty unto them to the effect that those [among them] who held fiefs in the neighbourhood of the capital should repair to their respective fiefs, and that their return to the city again should be prohibited, by his Majesty's command, until that sedition should be quelled.

On Sunday, the 2nd of Jamadi-ul-Akhir, 655 H., the mandate was issued that the Sayyid Kuthub-ud-Din, the Shaikh-ul-Islam, Jamal-ud-Din, and Kazi Shams-ud-Din, Bhara'ij, should proceed to their fiefs.

On their letters from the capital having reached Malik Kutlugh Khan and Malik Izz-ud-Din, Balban-i-Kashlulu Khan, they, at once, without the least delay, marched from their position, with the whole of their forces, and pushed on towards Dihli. This forced march of theirs upon the capital, from their camp near Samanah, was begun on Monday, the 3rd of the month of Jamadi-ul-Akhir\(^1\), and they pushed on with such celerity that they marched a distance of one hundred kuroh [about 180 miles] in two days and a half; and, on Thursday, the 6th of Jamadi-ul-Akhir, they alighted at the Bagh-i-Jud [the Jud Garden]\(^2\). The next morning, at dawn, after morning

---

\(^{1}\) How is it possible that the hostile Maliks could have started on the 3rd of Jamadi-ul-Akhir, even if the information sent by the loyal party arrived the same day as that in which the letters of the turban-wearers reached the hostile camp? Ulugh Khan had to despatch the news to the Sultan, at Dihli, and he had to issue his mandate to expel them; and this, our author says, he did on the 2nd of Jamadi-ul-Akhir—the day before the letters from the different partisans reached the respective camps! These two dates cannot both be correct.

\(^{2}\) The printed text here has a typographical error of دستارديدان does not mean "nobles."
prayers, they made for the city gate, and made a circuit in the vicinity of the capital, and at night, pitched their camp in the suburbs of Dihlī, between the Bāgh-i-Jūd, and Gilū-khart, and the city.

When those Maliks and [their] forces, in expectation of the fulfilment of the promise [contained] in those letters, reached the Bāgh-i-Jūd, the favour of Almighty God was such that, two days previous to their arrival, the party disaffected had been sent away from the city; and, when those [hostile] Maliks became aware of their story, their proceedings became suspended, and a command had issued from the Sultān's court, so that they [the authorities] secured the city gates; and, as the [royal] troops were absent from it, they made dispositions for defence. The Amir-ul-Ḥujjāb [Lord or Head of the Chamberlains] 'Alā-ud-Dīn, son of Ayāz, the Zinjānī, and the Deputy Amir-i-Ḥājib, and the Ulugh Kōṭwāl-Bak [the great Lord, the Seneschal], Jamāl-ud-Dīn, the Nīshāpūrī, with the Diwān-i-'Āriz-i-Mamālik [Muster-Master of the Kingdom], that same night, in organizing the fighting men for the defence of the city, greatly distinguished themselves, and Amirs, heads of families, and respectable persons, were appointed to the ramparts.

gardens [plural] (outside the city)," &c. Immediately under, the same is repeated in the text, but printed correctly—but, in Elliot, Bāgh-i-Jūd is discarded altogether, and the words "gardens on the Jamna" are substituted, and the editor adds, in a note:—"the text has "Jūd," which I take to be a mistake for Jūn = Jumna!" When our author is perfectly correct he is, in this manner, made out to be wrong.

From its situation, the Jūd Bāgh is probably that which now goes by the name of the Bāgh-i-Shālimār, some distance W. of the old city of Dihlī.

This affair will be found much more detailed in the account of Malik Balban-i-Kashlā Khān, and of Ulugh Khān, farther on, and the Jūd Garden is again referred to.

There is nothing about walls in this part of the sentence.

They became very cautious in their proceedings," &c. The original word here signifies delaying, suspending, retarding, &c.

He had succeeded, as Deputy of Ulugh Khān's brother, Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-Kashlī Khān, who had been sent to the sief of Mfraqh after Malik Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, Hūsain, the Ghūrī, had been got rid of.

Malik Badr-ud-Dīn-i-Sunkar, the Rūmī, feudatory of Bhānāh, also reached the capital with a body of troops, and this timely aid tended to the security of the city. As usual with our author, he gives part of the details here, but retains the greater part of the particulars for his account of Balbani-Kashlī Khān, and Ulugh Khān, which see.
When the morning of Friday [the 7th of Jamādī-ul-Ākhīr] dawned, God Almighty prepared a pleasure [for them], and Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kašhū Khān, proposed to retire. The other Maliks along with the Sultān’s mother, the Malikah-i-Jahān, when they perceived that his intention was to be abandoned, all concurred in retiring. The greater portion of their following [however] did not accompany them at the time of their withdrawal, and took up their quarters in the vicinity of the city, and many of the great and notable persons among them sought to be admitted to terms, and presented themselves before the sublime court; and those [disaffected] Maliks retired towards the Siwālikh [territory] foiled in their objects.

When information of their intention [to march against Dihlī, previously related] reached Ulugh Khān-i-A’zam, and the [other] Maliks and Amīrs of the royal army, they moved from the position they were then in, and pressed forward towards the capital, until, when they arrived near unto it, the state of affairs became manifest to Ulugh Khān-i-A’zam, and he reached the capital again, safely, prosperously, victoriously, and triumphantly, on the 14th of Jamādī-ul-Ākhīr—May Almighty God perpetuate the sovereignty of this dynasty, and make lasting the fortune and power of this Khān-ship, and preserve the people of Islām, through His illustrious Prophet Muḥammad!

Subsequently to these events, on Wednesday, the 8th of the blessed month of Ramaḍān of this year, the masnad of the Wazir-ship was entrusted to the Ziyā-ul-Mulk, Tāj-ud-Dīn, with the title of Niẓām-ul-Mulk, and the masnad of the [office of] Aṣḥāf-i-Mamālik was committed to the

---

7 That is, they presented themselves to make their submission, after terms were entered into, and do homage to the Sultān. In the account of Malik Balban-i-Kašhū Khān, in the next Section, it is said that only 200 or 300 followers accompanied him on his retreat.

8 The Siwālikh has been previously described.

9 Without even a skirmish having taken place between them! So much for our “candid and conscientious narrator.”

In the account of Ulugh Khān the date is the 10th of Jamādī-ul-Ākhīr.

1 No further notice of Kuttugh Khān and his wife, the Sultān’s mother, occurs throughout this work, although our author, no doubt, was well aware of their fate; and it is not recorded anywhere else. They probably retired within the Mughal dominions, or remained with Kašhū Khān in Sind.

2 See note 9, page 635, respecting these titles.
Şadr-ul-Mulk; and, at the end of this year, an army of infidels Mughals from Khurāsān reached the territory of Üchchah and Multān, and Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balbani-Kashlu Khān, entered into a compact with them, and joined the camp of their leader, the Nū-yīn, Sālin, the Mughal.

THIRTEENTH YEAR: 656 H.

When the new year came round, and the month of Muḥarram, 656 H., was entered upon, on Sunday, the 6th of Muḥarram, the sublime standards moved from the capital for the purpose of making holy war upon and repelling the Mughal infidels, and a camp was formed in sight of the city of Dihlī.

Trustworthy persons have related on this wise, that on Wednesday, the 9th of this same month, Hulāū [or Hulākū], who was the head of the Mughal infidels [in 'Irāk], fled discomfited before the troops of the Lord of the Faithful, Musta'ṣīm B‘illah, from the gate of Baghdād.

8 In Zil-Ḥijjah, the last month of the year.
4 ELLIOT [vol. ii. page 358]—“at the camp of Sālin-nawlin”! This leader is styled Sārī by our author in the account of Ulugh Khān, and Sālī—r and l being interchangeable—in other places, and by other authors.

The Tabakāt-i-Akbarf dismisses this invasion in a few words, and has: “At the end of this year an army of Mughals came into the territories of Üchchah and Multān, and the Sultān marched to repel them, and the Mughal army retired without fighting, and the Sultān also returned.”

The “revised” text of Firāštah has which, if correct, shows that writer knew not what he was writing about, for it can only be rendered—“an army of Mughals came to Sārī and the territories of Üchchah and Multān.” The name of the leader has been mistaken for a place, and his rank seemingly for a territory also. He adds, what is neither contained in our author nor in the Tabakāt-i-Akbarf—“the Sultān brought forth his red tent [pavilion] and pitched it, and after four months, when his forces had assembled, he set out by continuous marches, and, as the Mughals retired without fighting, the Sultān also retired,” all of which is totally incorrect, and his own concoction. The Sultān never moved from his capital, nor did the troops either, and there they remained. The Mughals did just what they liked, and ravaged the frontiers of the Dihlī kingdom; and Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balbani-Kashlu Khān, who was independent, all but in name, of the Dihlī government, had lately returned from a visit to Hulāū [or Hulākū, both being correct] Khān’s camp, and was saddled with the presence of a Mughal intendant or commissioner in his territory. See the account of Balbani-Kashlu Khān and Ulugh Khān farther on.

8 The editors of the Calcutta text add a note here to the effect that this
When the Sulțān's troops issued forth for the purpose of carrying on war against the infidels, Malik and Amīrs, with bodies of troops, were appointed to all parts; and the centre [division] of the Sulțān's [own] troops returned to the capital on the 1st of the month of Ramażān, where the Sulțān continued for a period of five [seven?] months. On the 18th of the month of Zī-Ḥijjah of this same year, the kingdom of Lakhānawatī was conferred upon Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mas'ūd, son of [the late] Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī.

FOURTEENTH YEAR: 657 H.

The new year having come round, on Thursday, the 13th of Muḥarram, 657 H., the Sulțān's forces moved for the purpose of carrying on war against the infidels; and, on Sunday, the 21st of the month of Șafar, the territories of Bhiānah, Kol, Balarām, and Gwāliyūr were placed in Malik statement is contained "in all four M.SS. used by them," and that it is "contrary to the truth." I can assure you that it is contained in eleven M.SS. and more, that, wherever a M.S. of the text is found, therein will this statement be found also, and still more, that the statement is perfectly true that the Mughals—the van of Hulā'ū's army, amounting to 30,000 horse—on approaching the gates of Baghdād on the west side of the Dijlah, were encountered by the Khalfān's troops under his general Sulīmān Shāh, and other leaders, and repulsed. This was but a temporary success however. Al-Musta'ṣīm Bīllah, Abū ʿAbd-ullāh, was martyred by the Mughals, together with four of his sons and other members of his family, on the 6th of Șafar, 656 H.

6 Where these bodies of troops were sent may be seen in the account of Ulugh Khān, and may partly account for the forces of Dīhīf, concentrated at the capital, being unable to move against the Mughals.

7 All the copies of the text have five months, but, from the 6th of Muḥarram—the first month of the year—mentioned above, to the 1st of Ramażān, is exactly eight months less five days.

8 In some copies Zī-Ka'dah.

9 He is styled "Shāh" in some of the best copies of the text, which is certainly redundant, for we nowhere meet with it except for the princes of this dynasty. In the List at the commencement of this reign he is called Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Kūlīkh Khān, son of the late Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī, who is certainly, at page 625, styled Shāh-zādah of Turkiştān. In other places the son is called Malik Kūlīkh, Mas'ūd, son of Jānī, and also Kūlī and Kūlīj, Mas'ūd, son of Jānī. See the account of Ulugh Khān for notice of other discrepancies respecting Lakhānawatī and its governors.

1 No movement was made, according to this, for a period of four months and twelve days, from the 1st of Ramażān, 656 H. to the 13th of Muḥarram, 657 H. The infidels referred to were Hindūs, as will appear.
Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn, Sher Khān-i-Sunkar's charge, and the Malik-un-Nawwāb, I-bak, was nominated to proceed with a force against the infidels of Rantabhūr, and the Sultān's forces returned to the illustrious seat of the kingdom's glory again.

On Wednesday, the 4th of the month of Jamādi-ul-Ākhir of this year, two elephants and some treasure from the territory of Lakhanawatī reached the sublime Court; and, on the 6th [26th?] of the aforesaid month, the Shaikh-ul-Islām [Patriarch] of the capital, Jamāl-ud-Dīn, the Bustāmī died, and on the 24th of the month Kāzi Kabir-ud-Dīn departed this life—the Almighty's mercy be upon them!—and their offices were conferred, with king-like benevolence, upon their sons. In the month of Rajab of this same year, Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak, Kāshī Khān ‘i-Ażam, the Bār-Bak, passed to the eternal mansion of the Most Compassionate, and the office of Amir-i-Hājib was assigned to his son, Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad. On the 1st of Ramażān, the Imām, Ḥamid-ud-Dīn of Mār-galāh, died likewise, and his grants, by the royal favour, were confirmed to his sons.

* In the account of Malik Sher Khān, and of Ulugh Khān, besides these fiefs, Baltārah, Baltādah, or Paltārah—for the word is written thus in the best copies of the text—and Mihir and Mahāwan, are also said to have been conferred upon him. See note *., last para. page 714.

Firīghtah, who, of course, knows more than any one else, and is always so correct as I have shown, says, immediately after mentioning the "Sultān's return from marching against the Mughals"—which was not correct, as shown in the previous note—that the Panjāb was entrusted to Sher Khān's charge, and that Kāshī Khān, Ulugh Khān's brother, got Bhīānah, Kol, Jāลīsār, and Gwāliyūr, which is equally fallacious. The Sultān did not possess the Panjāb to give him: the Mughals had overran that part, as will be found farther on. The frontier territory possessed by the Sultān at this period—657 H. [when all Indian Histories suddenly cease from giving any further accounts of the reign, because dependent on our author for them]—was made over to the charge of Malik Nuṣrat Khān, Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunkār, the Rūmī, as mentioned in a following note, and he was still stationed in that part, with a considerable body of forces, when our author ended his history.

* See the account of Malik Taj-ud-Dīn, Arsalān Khān, in next Section.

Firīghtah, of course, kills the wrong person. He records the death of Malik ẓ [for ẓ]-ud-Dīn, Kāshī Khān, who was still living when our author finished his work.

* This nephew of Ulugh Khān rose to high rank in his reign, and held the offices his father had held; and his title was 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Kāshī Khān, Ulugh Kulugh-i-Mu’azzam, the Bar-Bak. He was very munificent, a great archer and hunter, and very skilful in the game of Chaugān.

* Of Mār-galāh in the Panjāb.
After such turmoil, when the prosperity of the state, and the dominion of the great Sultān’s kingdom, had its face turned to extension, and all fractures were set and all wounds were alleviated, on the branch of continuity on the stately tree of monarchy, a new flower bloomed, and a tender bud opened, and the ripening fruit grew; and, on the 29th of the month of Ramażān, the abundant grace of the Creator of the Sultān [imperial] stem, from the illustrious shell of Khānī [the daughter of Ulugh Khān], bestowed a son; and such an amount of favours and benefactions reached both gentle and simple—noble and plebeian—in gratitude for these blessings, as the pen of the record-writer cannot record, nor the breath of the narrator be sufficiently capable of narrating. May the Almighty God ever keep the parterre of sovereignty and garden of dominion adorned with the trees and fruits of continuation!

At the end of the month of Shawwāl of this same year, Malik Tāj-ud-Din, Sanjar-i-Tez Khān, with a force duly organized and equipped, in accordance with the sublime mandate, reached the capital.

**Fifteenth Year: 658 H.**

When the new year of 658 H. came in, the sun of sovereignty rose from the horizon of prosperity, and the

1 This son was by Ulugh Khān’s daughter, but he did not live long.
2 Our “author’s flourishes” seem to have been “greatly compressed” here, in Elliot, as well as in the account of the following year.
3 The word here used signifies—reached, arrived—not returned. He came from Awadh in order to accompany Ulugh Khān in his expedition into the Koh-pāyah; but, in the account of him in the next Section, it is said he arrived at the capital in 658 H., when our author finished his history.

In this year “when all fractures were set,” and the Mughals harassing the frontier, Malik Badr-ud-Din, Sunka, the Rūmī, on account of the implicit faith placed in him by the Court, and on account of the continual hostility between Malik Sher Khān, who held Tabarhindah and its dependencies, and Malik Balban-i-Kashgā Khān of Multān and Īshqābād, was made feudatory of Tabarhindah, Sunām, Jhasar, Lakhwāl, and as far as the ferries of the Bīshāb, and despatched there with a large force. On this occasion, the title of Nūrāt Khān was conferred upon him. Sher Khān received the siefs of Kol and Bhāsāh, Bilārām, Jallsar, Bāltārāh, Mīhar, and Mahāwan, and the fortress of Gwāliyūr—a very considerable tract of territory. Both Malik’s held these siefs when our author closed his history.
moon of dominion shone forth from the zodiac of happiness.

On the 13th of the month of Safar, the Khān-i-Muʿazzam, Ulugh Khān-i-Aʿzam, marched towards the Koh-pāyah of Dihlí, to put down the violence of the contumacious Mew, of whom a demon would be horrified, and about 10,000 horsemen in defensive armour, warlike and relentless warriors, followed his august stirrup. The next day vast booty, and cattle in great numbers, arrived. He [the Khān] plundered and devastated difficult passes, and attacked strong mountain tracts, and Hindus beyond computation fell beneath the unsparing swords of the holy-warriors.

Since the accomplishment of this History has reached this place, with this holy-warfare, and victory and success conferred by God, it is concluded. Should life be prolonged, and eternity extend the time, and aptitude remain, whatever events may hereafter occur will be recorded.

The hope and reliance [of the author] on such persons as may look into this Tābakāt and into these Annals, and take into consideration these Chronicles and Narrations, or if an atom of these accounts or a hint of these statements should come to their hearing, is, that, if an error, mistake, inadvertency, or omission should enter their

1 Mew, Mewra, or Mewrah, or Mewātīs, a most contumacious race down even to modern times. In Akbar’s time they were employed as spies, and Dāk runners. The words Mew and Mewra or Mewrah are both singular and plural.

2 There is nothing whatever in the text about “their Deo,” nor about “and a large army,” as in Elliott [vol. ii. page 359], which compare here. The force consisted of about 10,000 cavalry only.

3 The words كوراه-ئ-هاشین — do not signify “strong forts.”

4 The details of these operations, but related in quite a different manner, will be found in the account of Ulugh Khān, in the next Section, together with the account of the reception of the emissaries from Khurāsān, and the circumstances which led to their coming. These persons certainly came from— or rather returned from—the camp of Hulākū Khān, but they were not envoys from him, nor from the Mughals. Ulugh Khān returned from this expedition on the 24th of Rabī’-ul-Awwal, 658 H., the emissaries from Khurāsān were received in the middle of the following month, Rabī’-ul-Ākhīr, and, on the 24th of Rajab, the seventh month of the year, Ulugh Khān again moved towards the hill tracts—Koh-pāyah. His return is not mentioned, but he had returned again, no doubt, when our author finally ended his history, in the tenth month of the year—Shawwāl—658 H.
generous minds or reach their recipient ears, they will veil it with the garment of forgiveness, and endeavour to correct and rectify it, since whatever had been read in previous histories from the narrations and chronicles of Prophets, Malik's, and Sultan's, has been copied, and whatever the eye has beheld has been recorded.

It is remarkable, but nevertheless true, and I do not think the fact has been particularly noticed before, that all the Muhammadan Indian histories of this dynasty suddenly end where our author terminates his account of it, and that no farther account of Nasir-ud-Din, Mahmud Shah's, reign is contained in any of them.

The Tabakat-i-Akbar relates but two events in the year 657 H., and then suddenly comes to a conclusion with a short account of that Sultan's mode of life, and his death, and no other event is mentioned. Budanufi goes on a little farther, and gives a few lines more, but only as far as our author goes in his account of Ulugh Khan in the next Section, and then gives several Kasvdahs, of many pages, by way of lengthening the account. Firuztah also manages to spin out his tale to the same date, but relates nothing farther than is contained in Budanufi and our author, whose last date here mentioned is 13th of Safar—the second month of the year 658 H.; and, in the account of Ulugh Khan, the last date given is Shawal—the tenth month of that year, and all after is a perfect blank in Indian history, until the reign of Ulugh Khan,—Sultan Ghiyas-ud-Din, Balban—with which Ziyad-i-Baran begins his history, the Tarikh-i-Firuz-Shah; but he relates nothing respecting the events of the period in question, although he says he commenced his history where 'the Sad-i-Jahan, Minhaj-i-Saraj, Jurjani, left off.'

Most writers agree that Nasir-ud-Din, Mahmud Shah, was taken ill in 663 H., and died on the 17th of Jamadi-ul-Awwal, 664 H. His reign was exactly twenty years, three months, and seventeen days, and yet, with the dates before them, the authors of the Tarikh-i-Firuz-Shah, the Tarikh-i-Mubarak-Shah, Zubdat-ul-Tawarikh, Tabakat-i-Akbar, and several others, make it one year less!

One reason of this significant silence on the part of our author [who died in the next reign] for a period of nearly six years, is, probably, that the Mughals, being so powerful in the Panjab, harassed the western frontier of the Dehli territory, and occasioned considerable confusion therein; and, not being able to chronicle victories, he refrained from continuing his history. Our author's health does not seem to have hindered him, as he continued for some time in employment in Balban's reign. There may have been another reason for his silence, as some authors attribute the death of Nasir-ud-Din to poison administered by Ulugh Khan, although this is extremely doubtful, and some say he was starved to death whilst confined by Balban's orders. Be this as it may, the silence is ominous.

Nasir-ud-Din, Mahmud Shah, left neither offspring nor heir, but, before his death, he had nominated Ulugh Khan as his successor. This was natural, as Ulugh Khan was his own father-in-law; that the latter was son-in-law to Nasir's father, I-yal-timig, is a mistake of the Tabakat-i-Akbar and its copyists who confound him with Balban-i-Kashfii Khan; but I know of no proof that he even was son-in-law of that Sultan. Ulugh Khan's own son, Nasir-ud-Din, Mahmud, surnamed Bugha Khan, had married a daughter of Sultan Nasir-ud-
May the Most High God preserve and continue the dynasty of the Sultān-i-Mu’azzam, the great king of kings, Nāṣir-ud-Dunya wa ud-Dīn, Abū-l-Muzaffār-i-Mahmūd Shāh, son of the Sultān I-yal-timīsh, on the throne of sovereignty and the couch of dominion to the utmost bounds of possibility, and may He grant His forgiveness to the compiler of this Tabākāt, for the sake of the illustrious Prophet Muḥammad!

Dīn, Mahmūd Shāh, who was the mother of Ulugh Khān’s [Sultān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Balban’s] successor, Kār-Kubād; and, therefore, it is not surprising that, on the death of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Mahmūd Shāh, Ulugh Khān, who had, in reality, governed the kingdom since the fall of ‘Imād-ud-Dīn-i-Rayhān, with the accord of all the great Malikis, was raised to the throne.

Sultān Fīrūz Shāh, whenever he had occasion to mention the name of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Mahmūd Shāh, used, always, to style him, in a contemptuous manner, by the name of “the Khwājah-Tāsh slave”—Khwājah-Tāsh-signifying one of a number of slaves of one master, and, also, servants of one lord.

It is related that Nāṣir’s humility was so great that he requested, that, when he died, his face should be blackened, a rope tied to his feet, and his body drawn along the ground and thrown into a cavern. When his death took place, and consultation was held as to the carrying out of his wishes, “some wise persons among the Malikis and ‘Ulamā advised that the face of the corpse should be covered with a piece of the [old] drapery of the mosque at Makka, which is black, his bier so constructed with long legs that it might be drawn along the ground by a rope to a cavern prepared for it. This was done, and over that cavern his sepulchre still stands, which since that time has become a place of pilgrimage.”

Among some of the events of the year 658 H., the Malik of Kābul, whose name is not mentioned, after he had carried on war against the Mughals for nearly two years, was taken by Prince Yugh-mūt and I-yal-ka, the Nāâyin. He was brought to the presence of Ḥalākū Khān, who ordered his flesh to be cut from his body, and he was compelled to eat it until he died.

In the year 603 H., on the 9th of Rabî‘-ul-Awwal, Ḥulākū died in Azarbājān, aged forty-eight, after ruling, over Irān, nine years and three months.

In 664 H., the Imām, Bahā-ud-Dīn, Zakariyā, the Multānī, died, leaving seven sons.

Fāṭih—like Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Baraft—says Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Ulugh Khān, ascended the throne of Dīhlī in 662 H.
ADDITIONAL NOTE.—At page 525, where I have given what is said to have been the inscription on the coins of Sulṭan Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, I have stated, as will be observed, that the inscription is given as "contained in a work in my possession, and which the coins are said to have borne." I did not vouch for its accuracy; and this refers equally to the inscriptions subsequently given up to the reign just concluded.

I am under the necessity of burdening this translation, with these additional remarks because Mr. H. Blochmann, M.A., imagines he has made an important discovery. He says ["Contributions to the History and Geography of Bengal," No. III., page 136, last para.,] "I, too, have a work in my possession on the 'Coins of the Salātīn i Hind,' a modern demi-quarto Dihli lithograph, based on Sayyid Ahmad's Asr wa'īnādīlīd, and I dare say I have discovered the source of Major Raverty's information." In this, as in some other matters, however, he is totally mistaken. I do not know of, nor have I seen, any Āsār-i-Sanādīlī, by Sayyid Ahmad—although I dare say anything from the Sayyid's pen is valuable. The work I refer to is a MS., of which I had a copy taken by my Afgān Maulawī of Kandahār—a real Paṭān—some ten years since, and, from what I can discover, it had been used by, or belonged to, the late W. Marsden. I can put Mr. Blochmann in the way of finding the MS., should he ever come to England.