SECTION XX.

ACCOUNT OF THE MU'IZZIÁH SULTÁNS OF HIND.

Thus saith the feeble servant of the Almighty, Abú 'Umr-i-'Uśmān, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, Jūrjānī—the Almighty God preserve him from indiscretion!—that this Ṭabaḵāt is devoted to the mention of those Sultāns, who were the Slaves of the Court, and servants of the Sultān-i-Ghāzī, Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Sām 1—on whom be peace!—and

1 English writers on Indian History, with scarcely an exception, begin, from this point, their—I say their, because no native historian does so for obvious reasons—"Afghan or Patan Dynasty of Dehli," with the first Turkish slave king, Kūṯb-ud-Dīn, of the Powerless Finger,—although one or two of them commence with his Tājīk master, Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, son of Sām, Ghūrī,—as its founder.

This monstrous error, which has been handed down from one writer to another for more than a century, no doubt, originated with Dow, who, in 1768, published a version of Firīshṭāh's History, the commonest Persian historical work that is to be met with in India, and the one which is generally known to most educated Musalmāns. The work, in itself, which is a compilation from other works, and largely copies the histories composed in the reign of Akbar, is not very often incorrect; but, consequently, Firīshṭāh is not a very great authority, and, as regards non-Indian history, no authority at all.

Dow professes, in his Preface [which teems with monstrous errors, but which I must pass over here, as I have referred to it in another place. See Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society for the present year, 1875], to have entered into "more detail"—to have "clipped the wings of Firīshṭāh's turgid expressions, and rendered his metaphors into common language," and further states [p. ix] that he has "given as few as possible of the faults [1] of the author; but has been cautious enough, not unwittingly at least, to substitute any of his own in their place" [11].

Notwithstanding all this, the work was so translated, that Gibbon suspected "that, through some odd fatality, the style of Firīshṭāh had been improved by that of Ossian;" and, as it caused the late Sir H. Elliot, in his Biographical Index [p. 317], to say "his [Dow's] own remarks are so interwoven as to convey an entirely different meaning from that which Firīshṭāh intended," and "some of the commonest sentences are misunderstood, and the florid diction was occasionally used to gloss and embellish an imperfect comprehension of the original."

This is, by no means, an exaggerated picture of the translation, but, on the
who, in the empire of Hindūstān, sat upon the throne of sovereignty; to whom the throne of the kingdom of that

contrary, a very sober one, as I shall show in as brief a manner as possible, with regard to those passages only which have led some conscientious writers to turn Turkish slaves, Khālī Turks, the descendants of Jaṭṣ, low caste Hindūs, and Sayyids, into Afghāns or Paṭāns.

Passing over the numerous errors in the Preface of Dow's translation to save space, I begin with his Introduction, which is taken from Firżīthah's, but a vast deal of the original is left out, for obvious reasons, and what has been retained is full of ridiculous mistakes. In the account of a Hindī king styled Kid Rāj [page 8], he has: "The mountaineers of Cabul and Candahar, who are called Afgans [sic] or Patans, advanced against Keda-raja." The words in italics are not in Firżīthah.

At page 50, vol. i. Dow has: "In the following year, Mamood [Maḥmūd of Ghaznīn is meant, but the translator ignores the letter ͑—ḥ—in his name] led his army towards Ghor. One native prince of that country, Mahmmed of the Soor tribe of Afgans [sic], a principality in the mountains famous for giving birth to the Ghorian dynasty," &c. BRIGGS, too, follows Dow closely, and often verbatim, in his version of Firżīthah. This identical passage in his translation (vol. i, page 40) runs thus: "In the following year Mahmood led an army into Ghoor. The native prince of that country, Mahommed of the Afghan tribe of Soor (the same race which gave birth to the dynasty that eventually succeeded in subverting the family of Suboktunge)," &c.

There is not a word in Firżīthah about "the Afghan tribe of Soor:" the whole of the passages in italics, in both translations, are not in Firżīthah. From this particular passage it is, I suspect, that the monstrous error of making Paṭāns or Afgāns of all the rulers of Dihīf, Turk, Khālī, Jaṭṣ, or Sayyīd, has arisen. Compilers of Indian History, no doubt, felt assured that this statement, from its being repeated by both translators, must be in Firżīthah, and, being in Firżīthah, that it must be true; but it is not in Firżīthah, neither is such a statement correct, nor is such to be found in any Muhammadan history.

A few lines under the passage in question, thus incorrectly translated, added to, and altered from the original, Firżīthah refers to the Kitāb-i-Yāmīnī, and quotes our author's work as his authority with reference to the conversion of the Ghūrīns to Islām, and says: "but the author of the Tabakat-i-Nāṣīrī, and Fakhru-d-Dīn, Mubārak Shāh, Mawar-ar-Rūdī—i.e. of the town of Mawar-ar-Rūd—who composed a history," &c. [which Firżīthah never saw, but learnt of it from our author. See page 330]. Dow leaves this passage out entirely: but Briggs, who appears to have been equally smitten with "Afgan or Patān" monomania, translates [page 50], the last part of the sentence, "Fakhru-odd Deen Mubariāk Lōdy who wrote a history," &c. He reads مدرزو الرودى مدرزو الرودى [Lūdī], and so made a "Patan" of him too!!

At page 152, Dow has: "The generality of the kings of Ghor, according to the most authentic historians, could be traced up by the names, for three-and-twenty, and downwards nine generations, from Ali to Māmood, the son of Suboktargī," &c.

There is not one word of this in Firżīthah. He gives the names of their ancestors as our author [from whose work he copied them] and a few others give them, name by name, down to Zūhak the Tāżī; but not understanding; apparently, what followed in the original, Dow concisely—drew on his own
monarch passed—in the same manner as his own august
fertile imagination—the “nine generations down to Mamood” of Ghazín, to whom the Ghúrís were no more related than they were to Dow himself.
I have not a copy of Briggs’s version by me now, that I might compare it with Dow’s, but I should not be surprised if, in this instance also, he had drawn his inspiration from Dow. It was from this identical passage, probably, that the author of a “Student’s Manual of Indian History” was led to imagine that Maḥmúd of Ghazín was “the great ancestor of Shahab-odd-Den.”
As Sám was the name of Rustam’s family, the Tázik Ghúrís might have been, with equal plausibility, made descendants of Rustam, son of Zal, the Sigizf, and moreover Sigistán or Sijistán is close to Ghúr, and several of the Ghúrí chiefs were called Sám.
I now pass from the “Ghuzmi Patans” and the Turkish slave “Patans” to the Tuglák dynasty or “Tuglick Patans.”
Dow has, at page 209, vol. i.: “We have no true account of the pedigree of Tuglick. It is generally believed that his father, whose name was Tuglick, had been, in his youth, brought up as an imperial slave, by Balín. His mother was one of the tribe of Jits. But indeed the pedigrees of the Kings of the Patan empire make such a wretched figure in history, &c.
Not one of the words in italics is in Firihタ：the whole sentence is his own concoction. Compare Briggs also.
Under the reign of the Afghán ruler whom Dow styles “Shere” [vol. i. page 159], being more correct in his translation, he consequently contradicts some of his former assertions. He then describes Roh from Firistah [“The Student’s Manual of Indian History” however assures us that it is only “a town, in the province of Peshawur” ! ! !], but makes several mistakes in doing so; but Firistah himself blundered greatly when he said that the son of the Ghúrí chief who took up his abode among the Afgháns was called Muḥammad-i-Súrf, and that his posterity are known as the Súr Afgháns. The Afghán tradition is very different. According to it, the chief’s son was named Sháh Husain, he was said to have been descended from the younger branch of the Ghúrí race, while Muḥammad-i-Súrf, said to be the great-great grandfather of the two Sulţáns, Ghiyásh-ud-Dín and Mu‘izz-ud-Dín, was descended from the elder branch with whom the sovereignty lay. This Sháh Husain, by one of his Afghán wives, had three sons, Ghalíf, Ibráhím, surnamed Lodí and Lúdí—but properly, Lóc-daey—and Sarwáñf. Lúdí had two sons, one of whom was named Sáñf, who had two sons, Pránkí and Imá-nil. Pránkí is the ancestor in the eighth degree of the first Afghán or Patán that attained the sovereignty of Díhlí, namely, Sulţán Bah-Ilí, of the Sháhá Khel tribe of Lúdí, and founder of the Lúdíah dynasty. He is the thirteenth ruler of Díhlí counting from Kúsh-ud-Dín, the Turkish slave of Sulţán Mu‘izz-ud-Dín, Muḥammad-i-Súm, Ghúrí; but, according to Mr. E. Thomas: “Chronicles of the Pathán Kings of Dohlí,” he, under the name of “Buhódl Lodí,” is the thirty-second Patán ruler.
The other sons, of whom Sháh Husain is said to have been the father, formed separate tribes, one of which, the Ghalífs, I shall have to make a few remarks about, shortly.
Imá-nil, brother of Pránkí, and son of Sáñf, son of Lúdí, had two sons, one of whom was named Súr, who is the founder—not Muḥammad, son of Súr, the Ghiyásh—of the Afghán tribe, not of Súr, which here is a proper name, but of Súr. Súr, great-grandson of Lúdí, had four sons, from one of whom,
words had pronounced, and which have been previously
in the ninth degree, sprung Farid, afterwards Sher Shah, and therefore,
according to the Afghan mode of describing their peoples’ descent, he would
be styled, Sher Khan, of the Sher Khel, of the Surr subdivision of the
Ludf tribe of the Batani Afghans or Paisans. The name of Surr occurring
among the Ghur Tazaks, and Surr among the Afghans, immediately struck
 Firighah probably, and he, at once, jumped at the conclusion that they were
one and the same, and that the Ghurfs were Afghans, and Afghans Ghurfs.
But, although Firighah made this mistake—for he is the first who made it—he never turns Turkish slaves, Khalj Turks, Sayyids, and others into Paisans,
for, according to Firighah’s statements also, Bah- lul, Ludi, is the first Pastan
sovereign of Dihif, as stated by other authors who preceded him.

Under the reign of Saltan [Islam] Shah, Surr, Dow has [at page 191,
vol. ii.], when mentioning his death, “In this same year, Mahmod, the
Paistan King of Guzerat, and the Nisam of the Decan, was of the same
nation, died.”

Here we have the descendant of a converted Raja of the Tik sept, on
the one hand, and the descendant of a Brahman of Bija-nagar [Bi-jaya-
nagar], on the other, turned into Afghans; but I need scarcely add that
the words in italics are not contained in Firighah. Compare Briggs also
here.

One example more and I have done with these monstrous blunders; but there
are scores unnoticed still. At page 197, vol. ii. Dow, under the reign of
Ibrahim, Surr, has: “In the meantime, Mahommed of the Afghan family of
Ghor, governor of Bengal, rebelled against Mahommed.” The words in
italics are not contained in Firighah’s text; and what that author does
state is perfectly correct. What Briggs has I am not aware.
The last of the eight Afghans or Paistan sovereigns of Dihif, as Bah-lul was
the first, was Ahmad Khan, who, on ascending the throne, adopted the
title of Sultan Sikander.
The renowned Afghan chief, the warrior and poet, Khush-bul Khan of
the Khatpak tribe, who was well versed in the history of his people, mentions
the only two Paistan dynasties—Ludif and Surr, in one of his poems [See my
“Poetry of the Afghans,” page 197] in these words:—

“The whole of the deeds of the Paistan are better than those of the Mughals;
But they have no unity among them, and a great pity it is.
The fame of Bah- lul, and Sher Shah too, resoundeth in my ears—
Afghan emperors of India who swayed the sceptre effectually and well.
For six or seven generations did they govern so wisely,
That all their people were filled with admiration of them.”

He does not claim the Tazik Ghurfs, Turks, Paranshahs, and Sayyids however.
I must mention before finishing this, I fear, tiresome note, that Elphinstone
does not perpetrate the monstrous blunder I have been dilating on.
He very properly calls the Turkish slaves, the “Slave Dynasty;” and the
others under their proper designations. I do not say slaves in a contemptuous
sense, far from it, for they were most able rulers, and many of them were of
as good descent as their master; but they were not Paisans nor did they
belong to a Paistan dynasty. It was however left for the President of the
Archaeological Section, at the late Oriental Congress [on the authority
of Major-Gen. A. Cunningham probably] to crown this edifice of errors
with “Ghori Pathans,” “Khilji Pathans,” “Tughlak Pathans,” and “Afghans”
recorded—who became the heirs of his dominion, and the
august brows of whom became encircled with the imperial
diadem of that sovereign; and through whose sway the
signs of the lights of the Muḥammadan faith remained on
the records of the different parts and tracts of the territories
of Hindūstān: and may such evermore continue! The
Almighty’s mercy be on those passed away, and may He
prolong the empire of the remainder!

I. SULTĀN KUṬB-UD-DĪN, I-BAK, AL-MUʾIZZĪ US-SULTĀNI.

The beneficent Sultān Kuṭb-ud-Din, I-bak, the second
Ḥātim, was a high-spirited and open-handed monarch.
The Almighty God had endowed him with intrepidity and
beneficence, the like of which, in his day, no sovereign of
the world, either in the east or west, possessed; and, when
the Most High God desireth to make manifest a servant of
His in magnificence and glory in the hearts of mankind,
He endows him with these attributes of intrepidity and
beneficence, and makes him especially distinguished, both
by friend and foe, for bounteousness of generosity and the
display of martial prowess, like as this beneficent and vic-
torious monarch was, so that, by the liberality and the
enterprise of him, the region of Hindūstān became full of
friends and empty of enemies. His gifts were bestowed
by hundreds of thousands, and his slaughters likewise
were by hundreds of thousands, like as that master of elo-
quence, the Imām, Bahā-ud-Dīn, ʿUsḥī, observes in praise
of this beneficent sovereign:—

"Truly, the bestowal of lakṣ thou in the world didst bring:
Thy hand brought the mine’s affairs to a desperate state.
The blood-filled mine’s heart, through envy of thy hand,
Therefore produced the ruby as a pretext [within it]."

[Afghans are not “Pathans” here I], “Bengali Pathans,” and “Juanpuri
Pathans.” After this we may shortly expect Hindū Pathans and Parsī Pathans,
or even English, Irish, and Scotch Pathans.

* See page 497.
* That is the slave of Sultān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn.
* Hence he is also called “Lak Bakḥah”—the giver of lakṣ. See page
555, where Rās Lakhmanīḍah, his contemporary, is also said to have been a
Lak Bakḥah.
* He passed the greater part of his life in Hindūstān, and was one of the
most distinguished men of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn’s assembly.
* The liberality of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn became a proverb in Hindūstān, and still
At the outset of his career, when they brought him from Turkistān, Kûtb-ud-Dîn reached the city of Nishâpur. The Kāzī-ul-Kûzāt [Chief Kāzī], Fakhr-ud-Dîn, ’Abd-ul-Azîz-i-Kûfi, who was a descendant of the Imâm-i-A’zam, Abû Ḥanîfah of Kûfâ', the governor of the province of Nishâpur and its dependencies, purchased him; and, in attendance on, and along with his sons, he read the Word of God, and acquired instruction in horsemanship, and shooting with the bow and arrow, so that, in a short time, he became commended and favourably spoken of for his manly bearing. When he attained unto the period of adolescence, certain merchants brought him to the Court of Ghaznîn; and the Sultân-i-Ghâzî, Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Muḥammad, son of Sâm, purchased him from those traders. He was endowed with all laudable qualities and admirable impressions, but he possessed no outward comeliness; and the little finger [of one hand?] had a fracture, and on that account he used to be styled I-bak-i-Shîl [The powerless-fingered].

continues to be so. “The people of Hind, when they praise any one for liberality and generosity, say he is the ‘Kûtb-ud-Dîn-i-kal,’ that is, the Kûtb-ud-Dîn of the age, kal signifying the age, the time, &c.” Blood is a play on the ruby’s colour.

7 See page 384, and note 8.

8 Some say the Kâzî sold Kûtb-ud-Dîn to a merchant, but others, that, after the Kâzî’s death, a merchant purchased Kûtb-ud-Dîn from his sons, and took him, as something choice, to Ghaznîn, hearing of Mu’izz-ud-Dîn’s [then styled Shîhâb-ud-Dîn] predilection for the purchase of slaves, and that he purchased Kûtb-ud-Dîn of the merchant at a very high price. Another work states, that the merchant presented him to Mu’izz-ud-Dîn as an offering, but received a large sum of money in return.

Fîrûstah quotes from our author here correctly, but his translators manage to distort his statements, and Kûtb-ud-Dîn is made out a proficient in Arabic and Persian, indeed, a ripe scholar. “He made a wonderful progress in the Persian and Arabic languages, and all the polite arts and sciences” says Dow; and Briggs repeats it; but Fîrûstah’s statement was respecting his talent for government, and his accomplishments in the art of war. Elphinstone and others, led astray by the translators, copy their incorrect statements.

9 The printed text here has the words أَرْ دَسُّ which are not correct, and spoil the sense.

I-bak—alone is clearly not the real name of Kûtb-ud-Dîn, for, if it were, then the word shal—added to it would make it I-bak of the withered or paralyzed hand or limb; and, even if the word shîl were used for shal, it would make no material difference. Now we know that Kûtb-ud-Dîn was a very active and energetic man, and not at all paralyzed in his limbs; but, in every work in which he is mentioned, it is distinctly stated that he was called I-bak because one of his little fingers was broken or
At that period, Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Din, now and then was wont to give himself up to pleasure and jollity. One night he had given directions for an entertainment and conviviality, and, during the entertainment, he commanded a gift to be bestowed upon each of the slaves present, consisting of sums of ready money, and gold and silver, both wrought and unwrought. As to the portion of these gifts which came to Kutb-ud-Din's share, he came forth [with] from the jovial party, and bestowed the whole of the wealth upon the Turks, and janitors, and other attendants, so that nothing whatever, little or much, remained to him.

Next day, this story was conveyed to the royal hearing, and the Sultan distinguished Kutb-ud-Din by his favour and intimacy, and assigned to him an honourable post among the important offices before the throne and the royal audience hall, and he became the leader of a body of men, and a great official. Every day his affairs attained a high degree of importance, and, under the shadow of the patronage of the Sultan, used to go on increasing, until he became Amir-i-Akhir [Lord of the Stables]. In that office, when the Sultans of Ghur, Ghaznin, and Bamian, advanced towards Khurasan to repel and contend against Sultan Shah, the Khwārazmī, Kutb-ud-Din was at the head of the escort of the foragers of the stable [department], and used, every day, to move out in quest of forage.

Injured, and one author distinctly states that on this account the nick-name of I-bak-i-Shih was given to him. Some even state that Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Din gave him the name of Kutb-ud-din, while another author states that it was the Sultan who gave him the by-name of I-bak-i-Shih. It may also be remarked that there are a great many others mentioned in this work who are also styled I-bak. Fanakati, and the author of the Jami'ut-Tawarikh, both style him I-bak-i-Lang—and lang means maimed, injured, defective, &c., as well as lame.

I-bak, in the Turkish language, means finger only, and according to the vowel points, may be 'Arabic or Persian; but the 'Arabic shal, which means having the hand (or part) withered, is not meant here, but Persian shih, signifying, "soft, limp, weak, powerless, impotent, paralyzed," thus I-bak-i-Shih—the weak fingered. See Thomas: Pathān Kings of Dehlī, page 32.

2 Turkish guards, the slaves of the household.

3 The text is defective here in nearly every copy, but comparison makes the passage correct. The idiom also varies considerably for several lines, as in numerous other places, already referred to.

4 Others say Kutb-ud-Din, with the patrol under his command, had pushed up the river bank of the Murghāb, towards Marw, when he unexpectedly fell in with the army of Sultan Shah. All his endeavours to effect his retreat,
Unexpectedly [upon one occasion] the horsemen of Sultan Shāh came upon them and attacked them. Kutb-ud-Dīn displayed great energy; but, as the horsemen [with him] were few in numbers, he was taken prisoner; and, by Sultan Shāh’s commands, was put under restraint.

When a battle took place between Sultan Shāh and the Sultāns of Ghūr and Ghaznīn, and the former was put to the rout, the Sultan Mu’izz-ud-Dīn’s men brought Kutb-ud-Dīn, placed on a camel, in gyves of iron, as they found him, into the victorious Sultan’s presence. The Sultan commended and encouraged him; and, after he returned to the seat of government, Ghaznīn, the fief of Kuhrām was committed to Kutb-ud-Dīn’s charge. From thence he advanced towards Miraṭh, and took possession of that place in the year 587 H. From Miraṭh likewise he issued forth in the year 588 H. and captured Dihlī; and, in the and all the intrepidity he displayed, were futile, as his party was small. He was taken prisoner, and conducted to Sultan Shāh’s presence, and, by that prince’s orders, was put in durance. Firighṭah, copying from our author, and from others who also agree, states, that, when Mu’izz-ud-Dīn’s men found Kutb-ud-Dīn, in his place of confinement in Sultan Shāh’s camp, they placed him on a camel, with his feet still in fetters [as they had no means then of unfastening them], just as he was, and conducted him to the presence of his master, the Sultan. Dow and Briggs however improve upon it, and assert that “Eibuk was discovered sitting on a camel on the field,” and carried to his “old master,” &c. Such is not contained in Firighṭah. Both translators fall into the same error of calling Sultan Shāh—this is his name, not his title; [see page 245]—“king of Charizm and Khwarum,” and into this error Elphinstone likewise falls. See page 248, and note 3, page 456.

As a specimen of difference of idiom in the different copies of the text collated I may mention that one— the oldest— has بديشان یوسوع و جنه افرازیاد whilst the more modern set has براشان در میان کذال قائم کد This important expedition, in which three sovereigns were engaged, is what Elphinstone [page 319, third edition] refers to as “some border warfare with the Khazirmāns,” in which “he was taken prisoner.”

He was treated with great honour and much favour, and gifts were conferred upon him.

As the Sultan’s deputy or lieutenant; but this, by his own account, could not have been immediately on returning from that campaign, for as yet the battle of Tarīn was not gained. See page 469. Both Dow and Briggs state that, at this time, the title of Kutb-ud-Dīn—which the former correctly translates “the pole-star of religion,” and the latter incorrectly, “pole-star of the faithful,” was conferred upon him; but Firighṭah does not say so, nor any other writer that I am aware of. He had been so named long before this period.

This is the year in which Kutb-ud-Dīn, as Lord of the Stables only, was taken prisoner in Khurāsān, and is impossible. Our author constantly contradicts his own dates. See pages 379 and 469.
year 590 H., Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn proceeded, at the august stirrup of the victorious Sultān, along with the Sipah-Sālār, 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of Khar-mīl, both of them being the leaders of the van of the army, and fell upon the Rāe of Bānāras, Jai-Chaund, on the confines of Chaund-wāl \(^*\) and overthrew him.

Subsequently, in the year 591 H., Thānīr was taken; and, in 593 H., Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn marched towards Nahrwālah, and attacked Rāe Bhim Dīw \(^1\), and took vengeance upon that tribe [of people] for the Sultān-i-Ghāzlī'[s previous defeat]. He likewise subdued other territories of Hindūstān \(^3\), as far [south?] as the frontier of the territory of

\(^*\) See following note \(^{2}\), last para., page 518.

\(^1\) The best St. Petersburgh MS. has Thānīr Dīw \(\text{स्यंधुगो} \) here; but the majority, including the two other oldest copies of the text, are as above.

\(^2\) Our author omits mentioning many important events which are not touched upon in Mu'izz-ud-Dīn's reign, although, at page 507, he says he intends giving a detailed account of the Ḳuṭbī victories under Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn's reign. As this is one of the most important periods of Indian history, I am obliged, in order to give some connexion to the events of the Muḥammadan conquest, to burden this translation with an abstract of them, more particularly as they are not given, in any detail, except in two histories, and, even in them, the chronological order of events has not been strictly observed. The Tāj-ul-Ma'āṣir states that, after taking Ajmir, subsequent to the overthrow and death of Rāe Pithorā and the installation of his son as tributary ruler of that state, Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn proceeded towards Dihlī, which was then held by a kinsman of Khāndī [Gobind of our author] Rāe, the brother of Rāe Pithorā; but, on his tendering submission, and payment of a large sum as tribute, he was left unmolested, under the same terms as Ajmir had been left in possession of Rāe Pithorā's son, but some say his brother. Kuhṛām and Samānah were left in Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn's charge, and he was left at the former place as the Sultān's deputy or lieutenant, and Mu'izz-ud-Dīn himself returned to Ghazīnī. Elphinstone says, page 314, on the authority of Firīstāh's translators, I suppose, that, when "Shahāb u dīn," returned to Ghazīnī, he left "his former slave, Kutb u dīn Eībak," as his representative in India; and yet "his former slave" did not get his manumission until upwards of twelve years afterwards, as all native authors, including Firīstāh himself, state: and such is history!

Another account is, that, after being installed at Kuhṛām, Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn marched from thence against Mīrāṭ, and gained possession of it, after which he moved against Dihlī and invested it. The kinsman of Khāndī Rāe appealed to his Rājput countrymen for aid, and an army of Rājputs, in concert with the garrison, endeavoured to raise the investment by attacking Malik Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn and his forces in the plain before the city. The Hindūs, however, were overthrown, and the defenders, being reduced to straits, called for quarter, and surrendered the place.

In Ramaḍān, 588 H., according to the Tāj-ul-Ma'āṣir [Firīstāh, who often quotes it, says Ramaḍān, 589 H.], news reached Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn that an army of lāts [Firīstāh says "under a leader named Jatwān, a dependent of the Rāe of
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Ujjain⁵; and Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn ⁴, Muḥammad, son of Bakht-

³ Ujjain is as plainly written as it is possible to write, and the has the tashdīd mark over it in the two oldest and best copies of the text. Other copies have but it is evidently owing, in the first place, to a copyist or copyists dropping the that the error arose—thus and for Ujjain is the more probable, and certainly the more correct, if the map of India be consulted, and the account of his campaigns, in the abstract I have given, read. It is confirmed also by some other authors; but the generality of histories, which are comparatively modern, with the exception of Mirāt-i-Jahān-Numā, which has Ujjain, have Chīn. The only reason that will account for such an idea having arisen respecting Chīn must have been the raid of Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, the Khalj, into Tibbat, mentioned at page 564, which ended so disastrously.

⁴ Iktiyār-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, is his correct name, as our author himself states in his account of him. See page 548.

Nahrwālah ᵃ] had appeared before Hānsf. The governor of that tract, Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn, Sālārī, had been obliged to shut himself up within the walls, and to send to Kuṭb-ud-Dīn for aid. He flew to his assistance, marching the same night the news reached him twelve leagues. The enemy, hearing of his approach, decamped; but, being closely pursued, faced about, and were overthrown. Their leader was slain [Firāštah says he retired to Nahrwālah of Gujarāt], and Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, having again placed Hānsf in an efficient state, returned to Kuhrām, and soon after made Dihlī his head-quarters and the seat of government; but some authors state that he did not make it the capital until the following year, after taking Kol.

Kuṭb-ud-Dīn had soon to take the field again to support the son of Rāe Pithorā, who had been installed tributary ruler of Ajmīr. The Sadr-i-'Allī, Kīwām-ul-Mulk, Rukn-ud-Dīn, Hamzah, who held the siege of Rantabhrūr, sent information that Bhirāj [بہراہ], also written Bhirāj [بھرائ], who is called Hirāj [هیرائ] in some imperfect copies of the Tāj-ul-Maʿāṣir, Hemrāj by Firāštah, and Hamīr by some others, brother of the late Rāe Pithorā, had broken out into rebellion; that the son of Rāe Pithorā, who is sometimes called [the?] Golāh, but generally styled merely “the son,” was in great danger; and that the rebel was advancing against Rantabhrūr itself. Kuṭb-ud-Dīn marched from Dihlī against him; but Bhirāj [or Hamīr], on hearing of his coming, made off and took to the hills. Rāe Pithorā’s son [see Tod, who says his only son, Rainis, did not survive him! He further states that Dow, mistaking the appellation of Pīrthwirāja’s natural brother for a proper name, calls him Golāh. The error is Firāštah’s, however, not Dow’s, in this instance], ruler of Ajmīr, was, upon this occasion, invested with an honorary robe; in return he presented valuable offerings, among which were three golden melons [kettle-drums, in the shape of melons], and, in all probability, the very same as mentioned at page 404.

About this time, also, while Kuṭb-ud-Dīn was still absent from Dihlī, its former Rāe raised an army to make an effort against the Musalmāns. He was pursued and defeated by Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, taken prisoner, and his head struck off and sent to Dihlī.

According to the Tāj-ul-Maʿāṣir, Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, at this time, sent an account of his proceedings to his master, and was summoned to Ghazānīn. As it was then the hot season, he waited until the beginning of the rains to set out for the capital. Having reached Ghazānīn, and having been received with great honour
yār, the Khalj, in his [Malik Kuṭb-ud-Dīn's] time, and
and favour by the Sultān, he fell dangerously sick; but subsequently recovered, and "was permitted to return to Hindūstān again, and the government was again conferred upon him."

Our author, under the reign of I-yal-timlāh [see next Section], also refers to this journey, but he says it took place after the expedition against Nahrwālāh. It must have occupied some months; but, in the meantime, who acted as the Sultān's lieutenant at Dihli? It would almost seem as though Kuṭb-ud-Dīn had been suspected of being too powerful, and that this summons to Ghanāzīn was to test his obedience and loyalty. One thing, however, is certain, from the account of Malik Bahā-ud-Dīn, Tughril [page 544], and the mention of Malik Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, Āqīl-Bakr, and others [page 549], that there were powerful chiefs left by the Sultān in Hindūstān who held fiefs independent of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn. It was on this occasion, on his return to Dihli by way of Gardaiz and Karmanā [which Dow, translating FirīqĪIa, who is perfectly correct, renders "Persian Kirkman," and adds, in a note, that it is "the ancient Carmania"!], that Kuṭb-ud-Dīn espoused the daughter of Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dīz. This journey FirīqĪIa, who constantly quotes the Tāj-ul-Ma'āṣĪr, mentions as taking place in 592 H.

After remaining a short time at Dihli, Kuṭb-ud-Dīn marched from it in 590 H., crossed the Jūn, and took the strong fortress of Kol after an obstinate resistance, and acquired great booty. It was after this, according to some histories, including the Ṭabaqāt-I-Akbarī, — a work compiled from the best authorities,— that Kuṭb-ud-Dīn made Dihli the seat of his government; but the Tāj-ul-Ma'āṣīr seems to imply, but not exactly expressing it, that Dihli was made the seat of government in 583 H., although, by its own account, the Hindū ruler "was allowed [in that year] to hold it upon the same terms as Ajmīr was held," already mentioned.

Kuṭb-ud-Dīn now [590 H., but same say in 589 H., the same year in which Dihli was made the seat of government] received intimation of the Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn's having marched from Ghanāzīn on an expedition against Jai Chand [Jai Chandhara], Rājāh of Kinnauj and Bānārās, his former ally, against Rāc Pithorā, according to the Hindū Chroniclers, who, it is said, mediated an attack upon Kuṭb-ud-Dīn. On hearing of the Sultān's having crossed the Sutlaj, Kuṭb-ud-Dīn proceeded some stages in advance to receive him and do him honour, bearing along with him rich offerings. [FirīqĪIa, who gives an account of this matter, uses the word peshkāwāt — kāwār — which signifies meeting and conducting a superior or a guest; but his translators, Dow and Briggs, mistaking, say respectively that Kuṭb-ud-Dīn "proceeded as far as Peshawar" and "Peshawur" to meet him! Where Dihli? where Peshkāwār? where Kinnauj? Fancy his marching from Dihli with 50,000 horse at his heels, and crossing the five great rivers of the Panjāb, merely to meet his master marching to Kinnauj!]

Kuṭb-ud-Dīn's following, upon this occasion, amounted to 50,000 horse [the Muḥammadan forces of Hindūstān]; and, having joined the Sultān's army, he, in concert with 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of Khār-mīl [the same who afterwards turned traitor, and played such a false part towards Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, mentioned in note 9, page 257], led the vanguard [the principal division unencumbered with heavy baggage, not "a small detachment of 1000 horse"] of the Sultān's army. The Musalmāns came in contact with Jai Chand's forces in the environs of Chand-wār and Itāwah [another author says Chandā-war. It is probably Chand-wāl of Itāwah, a place a few miles S.E.
during his government, subdued the cities of Bihār and
of the latter town. See page 470], and compelled them to give way. Jai
Chand, in person, then led on his forces to renew the action, in the heat of
which an arrow struck him in one of his eyes, and he fell dead from his ele-
phant. See also note 9, page 470, and compare the absurd statement of the

It is truly amusing to compare Firishtah's account of this affair with the
versions of his translators. He, quoting the Tāj-ul-Ma'āṣir, says—I give his
own words—"At last Jai Chand, in person, appeared in the field against
Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, and, during the very heat of the fight, a life-taking arrow
[रौशनप] entered the pupil of the Rājā's eye, and he fell from his ele-
phant into the dust of contempt." Dow renders this: "But Cuttub, who
excelled in archery, sunk an arrow in the ball of his eye;" and Briggs has:
"Kootb ood Denv, who excelled in archery, came in contact with Raja Jye
Chand, and with his own hand shot the arrow which, piercing his eye, cost the
Rajah his life" !!!!

The Musalmaṇ troops, having overthrown Jai Chand's army, and taken
possession of the fortress of Āsī, where his treasures were kept, pushed on to
Bānāras, "one of the most central and considerable cities of Hind;" and
scores of idol temples were destroyed, and a vast amount of booty acquired,
including a large number of elephants, among which was a white one.
[Firishtah says this white elephant, a most rare animal, was presented by the
Sultān to Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, who used to ride it up to the time of his death, and
that it died of grief the day after. This, however, is mere supposition, for it
appears that this same white elephant was taken to Ghaznī, and from thence to
Ghūr, to Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Mu'izz-ud-Dīn's elder brother and
sovereign; and it was afterwards presented by Maḥmūd, the former's son, to
Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, when he became subject to that
monarch. See note 9, para. 9, page 402]. Elphinstone says this victory over
Jai-Chand "extended the Mussulman dominion unto Behār!" but this is not
correct. Muḥammad, son of Bākht-yār, it was who, shortly after these events,
took the city of that name by surprise.

After these successes Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn returned to Ghaznī, and Malik
Huṣām-ud-Dīn, Aḥḍūl-Bak [the same who took Muḥammad, son of Bākht-
yār, the Khālij, into his service, see page 549], was installed at Kol.
[Firishtah, in his work, gives his account of the expedition against Bhirāj
—para. 4 of this note—in this place.]

Kuṭb-ud-Dīn soon had to take the field again against Bhirāj [or Hamfr],
who had issued from the hills of Alwur, whither he had fled, first fought an
engagement with his nephew of Ajmīr, defeated him, compelled him to fly for
shelter to Rantabhūr, and took possession of Ajmīr, and despatched a force
under a leader named Jhat Rāe towards Dīhil; but Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, having
speedily selected a force of 20,000 horse, marched to encounter him. Jhat
Rāe faced about, and was pursued by the Musalmāns to Ajmīr. Bhirāj [or
Hamfr] then drew out his forces to give battle, but he was defeated, and
retired within the walls; and then, finding resistance fruitless, ascended a
funeral pyre and perished. After this a Muḥammādan governor was left in
charge of Ajmīr, but what became of Rāe Pithorā's son has not transpired.

After this, on disposing of the affairs of Ajmīr, Kuṭb-ud-Dīn is said to have
led his forces, in 591 H., towards Nahrwālah of Gujarāt, and encountered the
general of Bhīm Dīw [according to Tod, Komar-pāl was his name], Rāe of
Nahrwālah, who is styled by the name of Jatwān, and who was encamped with
his army under the walls of the place. On the appearance of Ķuṭb-ud-Dīn he retired, but was pursued, and, being hard pressed, faced about, made a stand, was defeated and slain. Bhīm Dīw fled from his capital to the farthest quarter of his dominions; and, Ķuṭb-ud-Dīn, having acquired enormous booty in that territory, returned by way of Hānsī to Dhihl.

In the year 592 H., the Jāmi' Masjid [now known as the Kūṭbī Masjid] at Dhihl, which Ķuṭb-ud-Dīn is said to have founded in 589 H., and on which the most skilful Musalmān artizans had been employed [not Hindūs solely, Mr. Grant Duff and General Cunningham notwithstanding], and no expense spared, is said to have been completed. [See note on the Minār, styled the Minār of Kūṭb Sāhib, under the reign of 1-yal-timish.] The date of its foundation, as given by Thomas, "PATHĀN KINGS OF DEHIL," page 22, c., note 1, is erroneous, as Dehil was not acquired, as I have shown [note 9, page 469], until subsequent to that date, in 589 H. It is evident that से seven—has been read instead of لف nine, the two words, without the points, on which all depends, being exactly alike; and, in writing such as the inscription is in, may be easily mistaken.

In this same year, 592 H., according to the Tāj-ul-Ma'āsir, but 591 H., according to our author, and 590 H., according to Alfī, Ķuṭb-ud-Dīn was preparing an expedition against Thankir or Thangir—also written Thakhr or Thangfr—the modern Bīnānah [a further notice of which will be found at page 545], when intimation reached him of Sultān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn’s moving from Ghaznīn for the same purpose. He went as far as Hānsī to meet his sovereign, and they marched in concert thither; and Ķuṭb-ud-Dīn brought about the surrender of that stronghold, which was made over to Malik Bahā-ud-Dīn, Tūghrīl. After this the royal forces advanced to Gwāliyūr, the Rājāh of which agreed to pay tribute, and he was left unmolested. For further particulars, see page 546, and note 2. After this event, Sultān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn returned again to Ghaznīn.

While Ķuṭb-ud-Dīn was at Ajmīr, according to the Tāj-ul-Ma'āsir [Firīsh-tah has, at Dhihl, in 592 H. The former work has 591 H., which cannot be correct, from the date it subsequently gives], information was brought to him that a body of rebel Mers or Mairs [not Mhers, for there is no ū in the word. Firīsh-tah says—رجمای نتران "the Tunur Rājahs"—and adds, "that is to say, Rājpūts." Dow translates the passage, "many Indian independent princes," which is pretty near Firīsh-tah’s meaning; but BRIGGS has: "The Rāja of Nāgoor and many other Hindoo Rājas"], having gathered together, sent emissaries to the Kāe of Nahrwālah, asking him to aid them in attacking the Musalmāns, who were but few in number. On becoming aware of this intention, Ķuṭb-ud-Dīn resolved to be beforehand with them; and, although it was the height of the hot season, early one morning fell upon the rebels, and kept up a conflict with them the whole of that day. Next morning the army of Nahrwālah appeared upon the scene, and handled the Musalmāns very roughly. Ķuṭb-ud-Dīn’s horse received a wound which brought it to the ground, and his troops, greatly disheartened, with much difficulty managed to mount him upon another horse, and carried him off to Ajmīr.

Too, referring to this affair, in his Rajasthan, vol. i., page 259, remarks, that "Samarsī [Prince of Cheetore] had several sons; but Kurna was his heir, and, during his minority, his mother, Korum-devi, a princess of Putun, nobly
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maintained what his father left. She headed her Rajpoots, and gave battle to Kootub-ud-din, near Amber, where the viceroy was wounded." In a note he adds: "This must be [of course] the battle referred to by Ferishta. See Dow, p. 169, vol. ii." The "wounded" must also have come from Dow or Briggs, for it is not in Ferishta. This statement of the translators, not Ferishta's, must have led Elphinstone astray, when he says [page 315 of third ed.]: "Kutb u Dīn was overpowered on this occasion, and had difficulty in making his way, covered with wounds, to Ajmir," &c. The statement of Ferishta is this: "But his horse, having received a wound, came to the ground. The army of Islam became heart-broken, and they, having by main force-[Jalā ilāh]-placed him on another horse, took him to Ajmir." This is all; but his translators certainly display much fertility of imagination in their rendering of Ferishta's words. Dow has: "But he was defeated, received six wounds, and was often dismounted; yet he fought like a man who had made death his companion. Forced, at last, by his own friends, to abandon the field, he was carried in a litter to Ajmere." Briggs has: "But he was defeated. After being frequently dismounted in the action, and having received six wounds, he still fought with his wonted courage, till, being forced at length by his attendants off the field, he was carried in a litter to Ajmeer." !!!!

Emboldened by this success, the rebel Hindus [the Ḥūr of Ferishta], with the troops of Nahrwālah, followed Kutb-ud-Din and his force, pursued them to Ajmir, and took up a position a short distance from it; and for several months they shut up Kutb-ud-Din within the walls, and carried on hostilities against the place. On intimation of the state of affairs having reached Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Din, he despatched a large force from Ghazin, under several of the great Amir's, to succour Kutb-ud-Din; but the infidels thought fit to retire before it arrived.

From 591 H. the Tāj-ul-Ma'āshr jumps at once to 593 H., although immediately before giving an account of the expedition against Thankanr or Thangir and Gwāliyār in 592 H., thus showing that 591 H. cannot be correct. The correct date of this reverse must be the ninth or tenth month of 592 H., as Ferishta states. To return, however, to the narrative. Kutb-ud-Din, finding himself thus supported, resolved upon taking vengeance on the Rāe of Gujārāt, and, in the middle of Safar—the second month of the year—593 H., which year is confirmed by our author and several others, he began his march towards Nahrwālah. When he reached the bounds of Pālī and Nadūl [these names are not certain, but such they appear in the Tāj-ul-Ma'āshr. In proceeding from Ajmir to Nahrwālah, Kutb-ud-Din had the choice of two routes, that on the eastern slopes of the Arawali mountains, by Udipūr and Īdūr, or that on the western or Mārwār side, clear of the mountains; and this last he would in all probability have chosen by the direct route of Pālī and Sirhoī, keeping Ābū on his left. Nadūl, where, as at Pālī, are the remains of ancient forts, lies about twenty-five miles or more south of Pālī, but off the direct line of route by Sirhoī; but it must also be mentioned that there are places named Pālī and Birgōnī close to the hills nearer to Sirhoī, and a Kuirā still nearer Ābū. Ferishta does not appear to have taken his account from the Tāj-ul-Ma'āshr in this instance, as the two names he gives may be either Ḥūtalī or Ḥūtalī and Bazūl or Barūl, or Rahī and Baru, and Naζūl or Nadūl, as above] he found those places abandoned—thus tending to show that they were in the lower and less tenable places—and the enemy under two leaders, one of whom is styled Rāē Karān [Karnah, probably] in the Tāj-ul-Ma'āshr, and Īrīff [i,]
Sām, attained martyrdom 4, Sultan Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Mah-

4 Fanākati makes a nice hash of this event. He says "after Shihāb-ud-Dīn, his slave, Kutb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, became the great Sultan [الله‌ی‌که], and paid homage to Shihāb-ud-Dīn's son, Maḥmūd by name, who was Wālī of Ghaznīn," and that writer makes out that Sultan Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn was the younger [ئی] brother, and Shihāb-ud-Dīn the elder. He has substituted Shihāb for Ghiyāṣ; and the same is stated in several copies of his work.

The Tāj-ul-Ma‘āṣir states, "when the mournful news reached Kutb ud-Dīn, and the period of mourning had expired, he sent out notifications to all parts of Hind and Sind, intimating his assumption of the sovereignty, which notifications were attended to by the chief rulers [feudatories?] in those territories; and, after the defeat of I-yal-dūz, the whole tract, from Ghaznīn [he should have added, as far as concerns Ghaznīn and its territory, for forty days and nights only] to the extremity of Hindūstān, came under his jurisdiction," and a great deal of such like exaggeration.

With respect to this matter, and the date, there is very great discrepancy

in Firistah; and the other, Rārābars or Dārābars in the former, and Wālīn [meaning] in the latter, were posted at the base of the hills of Abū-gaḍh [this word is written without points [اـبـعـگـادـح], and may be either Abū-gaḍh [اـبـعـگـادـح] or Abū-gaḍh [اـبـعـگـادـح]. Elphinstone has: "Two great feudatories of Guzerat strongly posted on the mountain of A'bu." If he had ever seen Abū, he would have understood that they might as well have been posted on the Himālayah as there, since the Musalmāns would not pass over or through it. Firistah says: "At the foot of the fort of Abū or Abū-gaḍh," at the entrance to a pass where the Musalmāns did not dare to attack them, as it was the very spot where Sultan Muḥammad-ı-Sām, Ghūrī, had been previously wounded, and it was deemed unpropitious to bring on an action there lest the same might happen. [Sultan Muizz-ud-Dīn is here referred to, and this statement does not tend to increase our confidence in what the Tāj-ul-Ma‘āṣir says, and it is quite certain that Muʻizz-ud-Dīn was never wounded but once, and then not near Ajmīr. Tod asserts [vol. i., page 695], upon Rājāpūt authority, no doubt, and therefore we must make every allowance, that it was at this very place [Nadole] that "Mahmoud's [Maḥmūd's?] arms were disgraced, the invader wounded, and forced to relinquish his enterprise." But in another place [page 249] he says "Nadole is mentioned in Firistah as falling a prey to one of Mahmood's invasions, who destroyed its ancient temples." Both the statements are much of a piece.] "Seeing their hesitation," says the Tāj-ul-Ma‘āṣir, "the Hindus advanced to encounter them [Firistah, on the other hand, says "Kutb-ud-Dīn entered those desiles, and broken ground, and defeated them"]; and, after facing them for some time, on Sunday, 13th of Rabī‘-ul-Awwal, 593 H. [about the 5th of January, 1197 A.D., the year 593 H. having commenced on the 23rd of November, 1196], a battle took place, which was obstinately contested from dawn to mid-day, and ended in the complete overthrow of the infidels, who are said to have lost nearly 50,000 [?] killed. [Firistah says "nearly 15,000 killed and 20,000 captives, thus avenging his former defeat." Rāc Karan escaped, leaving twenty elephants, and 20,000 captives, besides booty to a great amount. Nāhrwālah was taken possession of, and a Musalmān Amīr was located there [?], after which Kutb-ud-Dīn returned to Dihlī by way of Ajmīr; and offerings of jewels, and handsome male and female captives, were despatched to Ghūr [to Sultan Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn] and to Ghaznīn. [Gujarat could not have been retained for any time, as it was not
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mūd, son of [Ghiyās-ud-Dīn] Muḥammad, son of Sām, among historians. In the first place, however, I must mention, that our author himself states, at page 398, that, "when Ḳūṭb-ud-Dīn came to Ghazān [for the forty days] after which he ran away. See note 9, page 503], he despatched Niẓām-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, to Fīrūz-koh to the presence of Sultān Muḥāmūd;" and in 605 H. [much the most probable date, for reasons to be mentioned subsequently] he, Muḥāmūd, sent him a canopy of state, &c., thus contradicting his own statement here. See also page 398, and note 8, page 500, para. 2.

Several histories and authors, including Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmi, Taḥkāt-i-Akbarī, Luḥb-ut-Tawārikh-i-Hind, Taškīrat-ul-Mulūk, Budāʾīnī, &c., state that Ḳūṭb-ud-Dīn assumed sovereignty, at Lāhor, on Tuesday [one has Sunday, the 17th, another Wednesday], the 18th of Zīl-Ḵādāh, 602 H., which is much the same as our author says here, and just two months and a half from the date of the Sultān's decease. One of these works states that "Ḳūṭb-ud-Dīn had gone to Lāhor in order to receive the canopy of state, a standard, the deed of manumission, the title of Sultān—as he was styled Malik mostly up to this time and

permanently acquired by the Musalmāns until long after.] Promotions and favours were conferred upon the Muḥammadan chiefs, and even the poor and needy [Musalmāns] of Dihlī shared in Ḳūṭb-ud-Dīn's bounty and munificence.

No other operation is mentioned from this time to the year 599 H., a period of nearly six years; and it is somewhat surprising to find the Musalmāns in India so quiet for such a length of time. It may be partly accounted for, especially the last three years, through the Sultāns—Ghiyās-ud-Dīn and Muʿizz-ud-Dīn—being occupied with the affairs of Khurāsān since the accession of their powerful rival, Sultān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, the events of whose reign will throw some light upon this period.

In the year 599 H., the same in which Sultān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn died, and his brother, Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, became supreme sovereign, Ḳūṭb-ud-Dīn undertook an expedition against Kālinjār. The Rāe of Kālinjār of the Pramārah race made a desperate resistance in the field, according to the Tāj-ul-Maʿāṣir, before retiring within the walls; but Firīṣṭah asserts that, in "the twinkling of an eye, he faced about and fled for shelter to the fortress." He was invested therein, and shortly after he made terms, and agreed to submit to Ḳūṭb-ud-Dīn on terms the same as those upon which his ancestors had paid obedience to Sultān Muḥāmūd, Ghaẓawīd; and stipulated for the presentation of a large amount in jewels and other precious things, and a number of horses and elephants. It so happened that, next day, while engaged in collecting together this tribute, he was cut off by the hand of death. His Wakīl or minister, Ajāh Dīw [in Firīṣṭah, Jadah Dīw], bethinking himself of a never-failing spring of water in the upper part of the place, determined to resist the Musalmāns instead of agreeing to the terms; but, as fortune had turned its face from him, and adversity had come, the spring within a few days dried up, and the people within the walls, being helpless, were compelled to call for quarter; and they came out, and gave up the place. Vast booty in jewels, arms, elephants, and other property fell into the hands of the Musalmāns, who became rich from the spoils; and 50,000 captives, male and female, were taken, and were, according to Firīṣṭah, "exalted to the excellence of Islām," and the idol temples were converted into masjids.

It is amusing here also to find how Firīṣṭah, whose account is substantially the same as the preceding, has been translated. Dow says: "In the year 599 he mustered his forces, and marched to the tīqū of Calinger, where he was
who was Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn's brother's son, despatched
was still a slave—and the government of Hindūstān, which Maḥmūd had con-
ferred upon him, or rather, confirmed him in, and was greatly exalted and
honoured thereby." Our author, and some who copy him, state, that Kuṭb-
ud-Dīn returned to Dihlī after the expedition against the Khokhars; but it
must be remembered that Kuṭb-ud-Dīn accompanied his master, Muʿizz-ud-
Dīn, to Lāhor after that affair, and, as only two months and sixteen days
elapsed between the assassination of the Sulṭān and Kuṭb-ud-Dīn's assumption
of the sovereignty at Lāhor, it is therefore probable that, on bearing of the
assassination of the Sulṭān, which took place only fifteen days after the latter
left Lāhor, he returned to it at once, and possibly had not even left it when the
news reached him. After a time, he returned to Dihlī again. The Tāj-ul-
Maʿāṣir says he made Luhāwar his capital, "the place where the throne of
Sulṭāns had been established," but the reason, why he eventually returned to
Lāhor, and continued there to the day of his death, has been stated already in
another place. See note 4, page 503.

It is stated in another work, the Khulāṣat-ut-Tawārīḵh, that Kuṭb-ud-Dīn
met by Gola, the tributary prince of that country, whom he defeated; and, dismounting his cavalry [1], began to besiege him in the fort." All this is pure
invention: there is nothing of the kind in Firīghtah. BRIGGS has: "In the
year 599 he mustered his forces, and marched against Kalunjur, where he was
opposed by the Rāja of that country, whom he defeated; then, dismounting
his cavalry, he laid siege to the fort." A siege and an investment are far different
things. All about "the Hindoo flag being again hoisted on the fort" is also
purely imaginary, and is not contained in Firīghtah's text.

Here is another choice specimen of how Indian history is written. Its source,
of course, is DOW and BRIGGS, not Firīghtah. In MARSHMAN'S "History of
India," vol. i., page 197, is the following: "In the year 599 he mustered his
forces, and marched against Kalunjur, where he was opposed by the Rāja of
that country, whom he defeated; then, dismounting his cavalry, he laid siege
to the fort. The Rāja, seeing himself hard pressed, offered Kootb-ood-Deen
Eibuk the same tribute and presents which his ancestors had formerly paid to
Sooltan Mahmood. The proposal was accepted; but the Rāja's minister, who
resolved to hold out without coming to terms, caused his master to be assassi-
nated, while the presents were preparing. The Hindoo flag was again hoisted
on the fort, the siege recommenced, but the place was eventually reduced,
owing to the drying up of a spring upon the hill which supplied the garrison
with water."

From Kālinjar Kuṭb-ud-Dīn marched to the city of Mahobah, the capital of
the territory of Kālbī, which he took possession of, and returned to Dihlī by
way of Budāʿīn, one of the chief cities of Hind, which he also occupied.
[It is not Firīghtah who places "Badāʿīn between the Ganges and the Jamna"
(see Elliot, India, vol. ii., page 232, note 1), but DOW and BRIGGS, who mis-inter-
pret him.] It was whilst in this part that Muḥammad, son of Bakht-
yār, the Khālij, is said to have presented himself in Kuṭb-ud-Dīn's presence,
—not from Awadh and Bihār, but from A-dwānd-Bihār, noticed in the
account of that chief farther on—bearing rich presents in jewels and coin of
various descriptions; but this certainly took place ten years before 599 H.
He was received with great distinction, as his fame had extended over Hind
and Sind. When he was admitted to an audience to take leave, he received a
robe of honour, a standard, and other insignia, as will be found mentioned in
the account of him at page 548.
a canopy of state to Malik ʿUṯb-ud-Dīn, and conferred on him the title of Sulṭān⁶; and, in the year 602 H., he determined to proceed from Dihlī to the royal presence in Lohor⁷; and, on Tuesday, the 17th of the month, Zī-
ascended the throne, at Lāhor, on the 11th of Rabīʿ-ul-Awwal, 603 H., and that he read the ʿUṯb-bah for himself, and coined money in his own name, and yet, although the coins of others are, comparatively, so plentiful, it is stated that not one bearing the name of ʿUṯb-ud-Dīn has ever been found. A work in my possession, however, which contains specimens of the different coins of the Sulṭāns of Hind, with the inscriptions they are said to have borne, gives the following as a specimen of ʿUṯb-ud-Dīn's coins:

which may be thus rendered:—“Coin of the inheritor of the kingdom and signet of Sulṭān, ʿUṯb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, in the year 603 H.,” and on the reverse:—“Struck at the Dār-ul-Ḵhilāf, Dihlī, in the first [year] of [his] accession.”

I rather doubt the possibility of Malik [which was his only title up to his ascending the throne at Lāhor] ʿUṯb-ud-Dīn's having received the title of Sulṭān and the investiture of the sovereignty of Hindūstān as early as Zī-ḵa’dah, 602 H., because ʿAlāʾ-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, previously called by the name of Žiyā-ud-Dīn [See page 394] was, at that time, ruler of Ghūr and Fīrz-koh, and Muḥammad was at Bust, and it must have taken him some few months, at the very least, to dispossess ʿAlāʾ-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, and acquire possession of the sovereignty; and this would bring us to 603 H., as on the coin given above. One author, in fact, states, and it is not improbable, that ʿAlāʾ-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, who then held Ghūr, after the Sulṭān's assassination—in which case, 602 H. would be correct—sent ʿUṯb-ud-Dīn a canopy of state, and conferred on him the sovereignty of Hind, and that Muḥammad, subsequently, did the same; and one of the authors previously referred to says ʿUṯb-ud-Dīn was at Pūrghor, when Muḥammad's communication, conferring this dignity, reached him, and further states that he had gone there to guard the route into India.

Another thing to be remembered is, that, by our author's account, the statements of the Tāj-ul-Maʿāṣir, and the greater number of other histories, ʿUṯb-ud-Dīn died in 607—although some say in 609, and 610 H.—in what month is not stated, after a reign of little over four years; but, if we consider a little, four years from Zī-ḵa’dah, 602 H., only brings us to the same month of 606 H. Strange to say, Faṣīh-i, although mentioning the assassination of Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn in 602 H., does not mention ʿUṯb-ud-Dīn's acquirement of power as Sulṭān until 608 H.—“when the title of Sulṭān was conferred and he was manumitted”—one year before Muḥammad's assassination, which he says occurred in 609 H., and states that ʿUṯb-ud-Dīn was killed by a fall from his horse in 610 H. See note ⑤, page 528.

⁶ See note ②, page 500.

⁷ The text in most copies, including the printed text, is slightly defective here, causing a meaning contrary to what our author would convey. It is evident, from various events, that ʿUṯb-ud-Dīn did not “determine to go to the
Ka’dah, of that same year, he ascended the throne in the royal Ka’sr of Lohor.

After some time, hostility arose between him and Sultan Tay-ud-Din, Yal-duz, respecting Lohor, so much so, that that hostility led to an engagement; and, in that affair, the victory was with Sultan Kutb-ud-Din. Sultan Tay-ud-Din, Yal-duz, was defeated, and retreated before him; and capital, Lohor," as the words عَمَّيمُ حَضْرَتُ لاُموْرُوْرْ كِرِد alone mean; and, farther, Lāhor was not the capital. The correct reading is as above, namely—عَمَّيمُ بَابْ رَوْرْ حَضْرَتُ لاُموْرُوْرْ كِرِد and this refers, not to his going to the city of Lāhor merely, but into the Lāhor territory to join his master the Sultan against the Khokhars; he only relates it in the wrong place. After their overthrow, the Sultan came to Lāhor, accompanied by Kutb-ud-Din; and, subsequently, after the Sultan’s assassination, the latter assumed sovereignty there. Zf. Ka’dah is the eleventh month. This is evidently our author’s meaning. Kutb-ud-Din had no reason to "attack Lohor," as in Elliot, India: vol. ii. page 300, and the imperfect passage in the printed text even will not bear such a rendering.

I have, in a previous place [see page 502, note 9], referred to the proceedings of Tay-ud-Din, I-yal-dūz, towards Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Māḥmūd, and Kutb-ud-Dīn’s jealousy of I-yal-dūz, and his offer of aid to Abū-Dakur against him.

In the year 603 H., shortly after Kutb-ud-Dīn is said, by some, to have received his freedom, and the title of Sultan from Sultan Māḥmūd, I-yal-dūz, who considered the Panjāb part of the dominion of Ghaznī to which he had succeeded, and which had neither been assigned, by Māḥmūd, to Kutb-ud-Dīn, nor to the other slave, Kābhā-jah, Kutb-ud-Dīn’s son-in-law, despatched the Khwājah, the Mu-ayyid-‘ul-Mulk, Sanjarī, the Wazīr of Ghaznī, against Lāhor [but a few authors say he went himself], and ousted Kābhā-jah, who held it, nominally, for Kutb-ud-Dīn. Kutb-ud-Dīn, soon after, marched against I-yal-dūz with all the available troops of Hindūstān, and a battle took place between them, in the Panjāb, and I-yal-dūz was worsted, and retreated into the strong country of Karmān and Shalūzān. Kutb-ud-Dīn now pushed on to Ghaznī, which having obtained possession of, he gave himself up to wine and riot; and this, according to our author, at page 398, happened in 605 H., which is a more probable date than 603 H.

There are great discrepancies, however, in several works of authority, which are difficult to reconcile with the above in many respects, in Alīf, Yāfa-ī, and the Jāmi’-ut-Tawārīkh, which must be briefly alluded to.

It is said in the first-mentioned work that, soon after the death of Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz had to abandon the Ghaznī territory, because, through the treachery of Kutlagh-Tīgīn, a former slave of the late Sultan [can this be the slave who shut the gates upon his master mentioned in note 2, page 475?], and who, since his death, had been in Sultan Māḥmūd’s service, but was now one of I-yal-dūz’s principal Amirs and held Ghaznī for him, during a short absence, seized this opportunity of instigating Sultan Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, to seize it. I-yal-dūz, previous to this, had agreed to acknowledge the suzerainty of that monarch, and had despatched befitting presents; but the Sultan at once acted on the suggestion of Kutlagh-Tīgīn, and seized Ghaznī.

This event, according to Alīf, took place in 603 of the Rīhaḥ, and Yāfa-ī, Jāmi’-ut-Tawārīkh, and some others say in 611 H., and, according to those
Sultan Kūṭb-ud-Dīn proceeded towards the seat of government, the city of Ghaznī, and possessed himself of that kingdom likewise; and, during a period of forty days that he sat upon the throne of Ghaznī, he bestowed upon God's works, Sultan Mahmūd did not die until 609 H. [see also last para. of note 3, page 400], and Faṣiḥ-ī states that Kūṭb-ud-Dīn obtained sovereignty over Hindūstān in 608 H., and places his death as late as 610 H. These dates do not agree with those given by the Muḥammatan Historians of India, but they are not the most reliable authorities for events which happened out of that country.

In the state of affairs in which I-yal-dūz found himself, for Sultan Mahmūd was now but a mere vassal of the Khwārazmīs [See note 3, page 400], he was under the necessity of retiring towards Hind [the Panjāb], which he considered a portion of his own dominions. He reached Lāhor, encountered Kābā-jaḥ, and took possession of that capital and the whole Panjāb. See our author's account of Kābā-jaḥ, page 531, and early part of the reign of I-yal-timūs.

On Sultan Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, getting possession of Ghaznī, he put to death several of the Ghūrīān Amīrs, and made over his new acquisition to his son, Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mang-barnī; and a Khwārazmī noble was installed at Ghaznī as his deputy [This accounts, no doubt, for the reference made by Jalāl-ud-Dīn, when soliciting a temporary asylum from I-yal-timūs some years subsequently, to their having been "good neighbours previously." See note 4, para. 7, page 290], and the Sultan returned to Khwārazm. Kūṭb-ud-Dīn now marched into the Panjāb against I-yal-dūz [603 Riḥlat, 612 H.], who was defeated by him, and retired into Kārmān and Shalāzān. Kūṭb-ud-Dīn marched to Ghaznī, drove out the governor on Jalāl-ud-Dīn's part, and gave himself up to wine and pleasure.

Now we come to that part of the subject in which all agree; but it is amusing to notice how our author slurs over these doings. Kūṭb-ud-Dīn now giving himself up to amusements and debauchery, the people of Ghaznī, disgusted with his remissness and laxity, and the disordered state of affairs, sent a person, secretly, to I-yal-dūz, to whom they seem to have been much attached, and solicited him to return to the capital. He did so with promptness; and, as his appearance on the scene was quite unexpected by Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, he was unable to resist him, and he abandoned Ghaznī precipitately, and fled by way of Sang-i-Surākh [one of the routes between Ghaznī and the Panjāb, for he did not dare to take that through Kārmān], to Lāhor. This was the occasion of his "filling the throne of Ghaznī for forty days," for which our author considered it to be necessary to mention him [page 506], not only among the Sultāns of Hindūstān, but, separately, of Ghaznī likewise.

I cannot refrain from inserting here a specimen of history-writing, which will only be found in the writer's imagination. Mr. Marshman, in his "History of India," written for the University of Calcutta, states at page 47, vol. i., that "Kootub followed up the victory [over "Eldoze"] and recovered Ghwine [which he never before possessed], where he assumed the crown [not at Lāhor then!], but was soon after expelled by his rival, and driven back to India. . . The establishment of the Mahomedan empire in India is, therefore, considered to date from this event," &c. This is rich indeed.

Kūṭb-ud-Dīn does not appear to have returned to Dīlī any more; and, through fear of I-yal-dūz, continued at Lāhor until he met with the accident which ended his days.
people abundant benefactions, and innumerable favours, and returned again to Hindūstān, the account of which has been previously related. As the decree of fate supervened, in the year 607 H., he fell from his horse whilst engaged in playing ball on the course, and the horse came down upon him, in such wise that the prominent part of the front of the saddle came upon his blessed breast, and he died.

The period of his rule, from the first taking of Dihlī up to this time, was twenty years; and the stretch of his sovereignty, with a canopy of state, the Khūtbah, and coin [in his own name and titles], was four years and a little over.

II. SULTĀN ARĀM SHĀH, SON OF SULTĀN KUṬB-UD-DĪN, I-BAK.

When Sultān Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, died, the Amīrs and Maliks of Hindūstān at once considered it advisable for

Chaugān, something similar to modern Polo.

1 The eastern saddle is vastly different from ours, and those who have seen it in use in the Fast will easily conceive the effect of the high-pointed front coming in contact with the breast.

2 The generality of authors place his death in the year 607 H., but the month and date is not mentioned, and some place his death much later. One work, the Tārīkh i-Ibrāhīmī, however, gives a little more detail than others, and enables us to fix the month, at least, tolerably correctly. It is stated in that work that, having ascended the throne at Lāhor, in Zīl-Ka’oğah, 602 H., he died in 607 H., having ruled nineteen years, fourteen as the Sultān’s [Mu’izz-ud-Dīn’s] lieutenant, and five and a half years as absolute sovereign. From 588 H., the year in which he was first made the Sultān’s lieutenant, to the 2nd of Sha‘bān, 602 H., the date of the Sultān’s death, is fourteen years and a month, calculating from about the middle of the former year, if Mu’izz-ud-Dīn returned to Ghaznī before the rainy season of 588 H., which, in all probability, he did; and five years and six months from the middle of Zīl-Ka’oğah, 602 H., would bring us to the middle of Jamādi-1-ul-Awwal, the fifth month of 607 H., which will therefore be about the period at which Kuṭb-ud-Dīn is said to have died, and a little more than three months, by this calculation, after the death of Sultān Maḥmūd, if 607 H. be the correct year of the latter’s assassination. Faṣih-ı says Kuṭb-ud-Dīn died in 610 H., and the Mir‘at-i-Jahān-Numā and Lubb-ut-Tawārīkh say in 609 H. He was buried at Lāhor, and, for centuries after, his tomb continued to be a place of pilgrimage. It may now possibly be turned into a reading-room, a residence, or even a place of Christian worship, purposes for which many buildings of this kind are now used at Lāhor, without its being known whose dust they were built to cover.

* It seems strange that our author should give detailed lists of the offspring, kinsmen, Kaṣīs, nobles, and victories of his former slave and son-in-law, Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timāsh, and not of Sultān Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, himself, the pseudo-founder of the “Patān or Afghān” dynasty.
the sake of restraining tumult, for the tranquillity of the commonalty, and the content of the hearts of the soldiery, to place Arām Shāh upon the throne. 4

Sultān Kuṭb-ud-Dīn had three daughters, of whom two,

4 Although a number of authors agree in the statement that Arām Shāh was Kuṭb-ud-Dīn’s son, it nevertheless appears, from the statements of others, that Kuṭb-ud-Dīn had no son; and it is stated, more than once, by our author likewise, that three daughters were his only offspring. Some of these authors, moreover, who call Arām Shāh his son, afterwards add, “than whom he had no other heir;” but, if he was really his son, what better heir could be desired? Abū-l-Faṣīl makes the astonishing statement that Arām Shāh was Kuṭb-ud-Dīn’s brother!

On the sudden removal of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn from the scene, at Lāhor, the nobles and chief men, who were with him there, in order to preserve tranquillity, set up, at Lāhor, Arām Bakhsh, the adopted son of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, and hailed him by the title of Sultān Arām Shāh. What his real pedigree was is not mentioned, and he may have been a Turk. Mandates and decrees were now issued in his name, and the good news of justice and glad tidings of impartiality towards the people reached them. This was, it is said, in 607 H.

At this juncture, Amīr ‘Alī-i-Ismā’īl, the Sipah-Sālār, and governor of the city and province of Dīhlī, the Amīr-i-Dād [called Amīr Dā’ūd, by some], and other chief men in that part, conspired together, and sent off to Budā’īn and invited Malik I-yal-timīsh, the feeoffice of that part, Kuṭb-ud-Dīn’s former slave and son-in-law, and invited him to come thither and assume the sovereignty. He came with all his followers, and possessed himself of the city and fort and country round. At the same time, Nāsir-ud-Dīn, Kābā-jah, who had married two daughters of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn [in succession], appropriated Sind and Multān, Bhakar and Sīwastān, and, subsequently, the territory to the n.e., as far as Sursut and Kuhrām; the Khālīj chiefs in Bangālāh assumed independency there, and the Rājahs and Rāes on the frontiers [of the Musalmān dominions] began to show a rebellious and contumacious spirit.

Arām Shāh, on first becoming aware of these acts of I-yal-timīsh, at the advice of his supporters, summoned to his aid the old Amīrs and soldiers of his adopted father, and they, having rallied round him in considerable numbers from Amrohāh, and other parts, and he having inspired them, advanced with a strong force towards Dīhlī. Malik I-yal-timīsh, having gained possession of the capital, issued from it with his forces; and, in the plain of Jūd before Dīhlī, the rival forces encountered each other. After a feeble effort on the part of Arām Shāh’s troops, he was defeated and disappeared, and what became of him is not quite certain; but our author is probably correct in saying that he was put to death by his rival. After this, Malik I-yal-timīsh became independent ruler of Dīhlī, and the other great chiefs were left, for a while, in the possession of the territories they before held or had since appropriated. The reign of Arām Shāh, if such can be properly so called, is said by some to have terminated within the year; but others contend that it continued for three years. The work I have before alluded to gives the following inscriptions on a coin of Arām Shāh, and the date on another, given as I-yal-timīsh’s, corroborates the statement of those who say Arām Shāh’s reign extended over three years.
one after the [death of the] other, were wedded to Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Қabā-jah, and the third was married to Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh. At this time that Sulṭān Қutb-ud-Dīn died, and Ārām Shāh was raised to the throne, Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Қabā-jah proceeded to Ūchchah and Multān. Қutb-ud-Dīn had contemplated Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn’s acquiring dominion, and he had called him son, and had conferred upon him the fief of Budā‘ūn. The Maliks, in concert, brought him from Budā‘ūn, and raised him to the throne of Dihlī; and the daughter of Sulṭān Қutb-ud-Dīn was espoused by him; and they martyred Ārām Shāh. 7

Hindūstān became subdivided into four portions: the territory of Sind Malik [Sulṭān] Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Қabā-jah took possession of, the dominion of Dihlī pertained to Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh, the territory of Lakh-anawatī was appropriated by the Khalj Maliks and Sulṭāns, and the state of Lohor, according to alteration of circumstances, used to be seized upon, sometimes by Malik [Sulṭān] Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, sometimes by Malik [Sulṭān]

The following are the inscriptions on this coin:—

هذَا لِأَدْرَهْم مَسْكُوَة بِإِلْهِ الْمَلِك عَلِيُّ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ فِي سَنَةِ سِمَع وَسَمَاة

غُرْبَاءُ الرَّسُول بِلَدِيُّ لَهُوُر

which may be thus rendered:—“This diram [is] stamped with the name of the Malik, the shadow of the Almighty, Ārām Shāh, in the year 607,” and on the reverse:—“Struck in the Ḍār-us-Saltanat, the city of Lāhor.” The date given on the coin of I-yal-timīsh, which see farther on, Section XXI., is “612, the first of his reign.”

Those authors, who say Ārām Shāh was Қutb-ud-Dīn’s son, for the most part make a great blunder in stating that he was raised to the throne at Dihlī, and that those, who had set him up, repenting of having done so, through his incapacity—his incapacity seems to have been his incapacity to enforce obedience—invited I-yal-timīsh to assume authority, and that Ārām Shāh, becoming aware of their sedition, came out of Dihlī, and called on his father’s old followers to aid him, after which I-yal-timīsh secured it, and subsequently defeated Ārām Shāh.

6 From what our author states, a few lines under, it would appear that I-yal-timīsh only espoused Қutb-ud-Dīn’s daughter when he assumed the throne, at Dihlī.

6 In other words, he appropriated those places and their dependencies in the confusion consequent on I-yal-timīsh’s usurpation, and assumed the title of Sulṭān.

7 The idiom varies here. All the modern copies of the text, and one of the oldest also, have, instead of this sentence the words—“and the decree of destiny reached Ārām Shāh,” and the sentence ends. Compare Elliot: INDIA, vol. ii. page 301.
Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, ʿKabā-jah, and sometimes by Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn, I yal timish, as will, subsequently, be recorded, please God! in the account of each of those personages.

III. MALIK [SULṬĀN] NĀṢIR-UD-DĪN, ʿKABĀ-JAH, AL-MUʿIZZI-US-SULṬĀNĪ ⁸

Malik [Sultān] Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, ʿKabā-jah, was a great monarch, and the slave of the Sultān-i-Ghāzi, Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Muhammad-i-Sām.

He was endowed with very great intellect, sagacity, discretion, skill, wisdom, and experience, and had served Sultān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn many years in various departments of every sort of political employment, both important and subordinate, about the Court, in military affairs, and the administration of civil duties, and had acquired great influence.

Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn-i-Actamur, the feudalatory of Úch-

⁸ Sultān, on his coins, the title he assumed, and to which he was equally as much entitled as the “august” Sultān I yal timish.

Some authors—but they are mostly those either natives of or resident in India, and of comparatively modern days—write this name ʿKubā-chah, with ch. The Raṣāṣ-ul-Ṣafā writes it ʿKabāj merely. Our author, however, invariably writes it ʿKabā-jah, and I have therefore followed him. The letter ħ in writing, is constantly used for ḥ sometimes from ignorance, sometimes by mistake, and the two letters are very often interchangeable, and ẓ and ẓ are substituted for them; but, in this particular case, the name of this ruler occurs time after time in the same line with Úchchah, but the j of ʿKabā-jah and the ch of Úchchah are distinctly marked in the oldest copies of the text, and, in one, the vowel points are also given. Úchchah will be found constantly written with j which is intended for ch, in several copies of the text as well as in many other works, but we never find ʿKabā-jah written with ch in the text.

The idea appears to have prevailed that this probable nickname is derived from ʿu ʿKabā, an ‘Arabic word signifying a quilted jacket with short sleeves, or a tunic open in front, and that ʿu ʿchah is the Persian affixed particle of diminution = ʿKabā-chah, a short jacket or tunic, and thus his name would be Nāṣir-ud-Dīn of the short tunic or jacket; but, in this case, ʿKubā-chah with ẓ is impossible, because there is no ẓ in the ‘Arabic word ʿabā.

The letter j never occurs in a purely Persian word, nor does it ever occur in Hindi; and ẓ is often substituted for it, and vice versa. There are other meanings attached to a precisely similar word used in Persian, which is probably Türk, like the nick-names, I-bak, I yal dus, I-yal timish, and the like. This ʿKabā means, rending, tearing, cutting, paring, scraping, shaving, &c., while, in another form of it, the ẓ is doubled = ʿKabā signifying slender about the middle. To this last the Persian diminutive particle, chah, is of course applicable; but, besides this, chah signifies, much, great, abundance, and the like, and also fifteen, or, literally, three fives. Under these circumstances this nickname might mean “very slender waisted.” See also Elliot: India, vol i, page 131.
chah, in the engagement at Andkhūd— which took place between the Sultān-i-Ghāzi, Mu‘izz-ud-Din, and the forces of Khītā, and the Malikis of Turkistān—displayed great valour before the stirrup of the Sultān, and fought against the infidels as by orthodox law enjoined, and despatched great numbers of them to hell. The Malikis of the army of Khītā became dejected through the amount of slaughter inflicted [upon them] by Nāṣir-ud-Din-i-Aetamur, and they simultaneously came upon him, and he attained martyrdom. The Sultān-i-Ghāzi reached his capital and the throne of Ghaznīn in safety, from that disaster; and the government of Üchchah was entrusted to Malik Nāṣir-ud-Din, Ḳabā-jah. He was son-in-law to Sultān  Khátb-ud-Din, I-bak, through two daughters; and, by the elder daughter, he had a son—Malik 'Alā-ud-Din, Bahrām Shāh. He [Bahrām Shāh] was of handsome exterior and of good disposition, but addicted to pleasure; and, according to the way of youth, he had an excessive predilection for vice.

In short, when Malik Nāṣir-ud-Din, Ḳabā-jah, after the catastrophe of Sultān Khátb-ud-Din, I-bak, proceeded to Üchchah, he possessed himself of the city of Mūltān, and Shindūstān, and Diwāl, as far as the sea-coast. The whole he brought under his sway, and subjected the fortresses, cities, and towns of the territory of Sind, assumed two canopies of state, and annexed [the country to the eastward] as far as the limits of Tabarhindah, Kuhrām, and Sursūtī. He also took Lohor several times; and

---

6 This word is written, in one of the oldest copies of the text, with the vowel points. Inda-khūd— and, from further research, I find it is the proper mode of spelling the name of this place. In the present day the people of that part call it Ind-khūd and Ind-khū. I have retained the modern mode of spelling.

1 The printed text and two MS. copies of the text have Üchchah and Mūltān, but the ten best copies omit Mūltān.

2 One having previously died. Ḳabā-jah was likewise son-in-law of Tāj-ud-Din, I-yal-dūz, and, consequently, by the alliance with Khátb-ud-Din’s daughters, he married the daughters of his wife’s sister’s husband.

The Tāj-ul-Ma‘āṣir calls him ‘Alā-ud-Din, Mūḥammad, but I look upon our author as a better authority than the Tāj-ul-Ma‘āṣir for the events of this reign. What became of Ḳabā-jah’s son our author and others do not state.

3 That is, Sīwāstān, also called Shīw-astān, by some Hindū writers. The remarks which follow seem to indicate that all these were separate provinces or territories. Sīwastān is turned into Hindūstān in Elliot’s INDIA, page 302.

4 Vāfa-ī says each of the slaves seized upon the territory he held the govern-
fought an engagement with the troops of Ghaznīn which used to come [into the Panjāb] on the part of Sultān Tāj-
ment of at the time of Sultān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn’s assassination, and that Kabdā-jah appropriated Üchchah, Multān, Luhāwar, and Purghāwar, which territories, for the most part, Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn afterwards subjected.
Immediately after the decease of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, the so-called estabisher of “the Pathān or Afghān dynasty,” Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Kabdā-jah, foreseeing a struggle for power, or, at least, a weak government, appropriated all the forts and towns in the territories of Lāhor, Tabarhindah [some authors say Bathindah, some Sirhind], and Kuhṛām as far as Sursuti, he holding, at the time of Kuṭb-ud-
Dīn’s death, the fiefs of Üchchah and Multān, having previously held Lāhor for him. He was subsequently ousted from Lāhor, Multān, and Üchchah by the forces of Sultān Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, as our author mentions; but, after the defeat of I-yal-dūz, and he had been put to death in captivity by I-yal-
timish, Kabadā-jah got possession of these territories again, and apparently as a tributary of I-yal-timish, or in some way subject.
Our author leaves out here, but mentions in two lines, and under a wrong date, the first hostilities which arose between Kabadā-jah and I-yal-timish under the latter’s reign. These hostilities arose in 613 H., many years before the defeat of Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Khwārazm Shāh, by the Muḥghals. According to the Tāj-ul-Ma’āṣir, Kabadā-jah was tributary to I-yal-timish, and the tribute was in arrears. At the advice of his Wazīr, I-yal timish marched from Dihlī towards Lāhor to enforce payment; others say, and more probably, that it was for the possession of the province of Lāhor—in Jamālī-ul-Awwal, 613 H. [The Tabakat-i-Akbarī, Buda’unī, and some others, make a great blunder here. They state correctly enough that war arose between these two rulers about Lāhor, and that Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish, was always victorious; but add that, on the last occasion, in 614 H., Shams-ud-Dīn moved against him in person, and invested Üchchah, and then proceeded to mention Kabadā-jah’s death, which happened ten years or more after, thus confounding or mixing up the two events. Firīshthah is completely at sea about these events in Kabadā-jah’s life.]
Kabadā-jah with his forces was encamped on the Biāh [the Bias of Europeans] to defend its passage. Arrived on its banks, I-yal-timish, on the 14th of Shawwāl, began to cross with his army, without the aid of boats [this in Elliot, vol. ii. page 571, is called crossing the Indus!], at the ford near a village named Chamhāb [?]; but we must remember that the present course of the Biāh is not what it was then. In those days it separated into two branches at a village named Lowah-wāl, one branch flowing by Kuṣīr, Kabūlah, Khā-e, and Ḥujrah-i-Shāh Muḥīm, passed about a mile and a half n.w. of the fort of Dībāl-pūr, and fell into the river Ghārā. This branch was called Biāh and Nālah-i-Biāh; whilst the other branch, flowing southwards, fell into the Sutlaj, as the Ghārā, above its present confluence with the Biāh, is called. One author, copied from Firīshthah, states that this affair between Kabadā-jah and I-yal-
timish took place between Manṣūrīlah and the banks of the Chīnāb, which seems very unlikely, being too far west. Kabadā-jah, on witnessing this daring deed, according to the Tāj-ul-Ma’āṣir, abandoned his position and fled towards “Luhāwar,” whither he was pursued. His standard, kettle-drums, war materials, and other booty to a vast amount, fell into the hands of his rival. After this disaster, Kabadā-jah fled towards Üchchah, whither I-yal-timish appears not to have been then prepared to follow him.
I-yal-timish remained some time at Lāhor to arrange its affairs; and, having published the news of his success in all parts, conferred the government of that
ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, and was overthrown by the Khwājah, the Mu-ayyid-ul-Mulk, Muḥammad-i-'Abd-ullah, the Sanjarī, who was the Wazīr of the kingdom of Ghaznīn 6.

When [Sulṭān] Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḳabā-jah, became quietly established in the territory of Sind 6, during the calamities [attending the inroads] of the infidels of Chīn, a great number of the chief men of Khūrāsān, Ghūr, and Ghaznīn presented themselves before him, and he bestowed upon the whole of them ample presents, and provided liberally for them7. There used to be constant contention 6 between him and the august 6 Sulṭān, Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh, up to the time of the battle on the banks of the Sind, which was fought between Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn, son of Sulṭān Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, and Chingiz Khān, after which, Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Khwārazm Shāh, came into the land of Sind, and proceeded towards Dīwāl and Mukrān.

After the taking of Nandanaḥ 1 by the forces of the infidel territory upon his eldest son, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, and then returned to Dihlī. It was after these events that Ḳabā-jah's territory was invaded by Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Khwārazm Shāh, as already mentioned in note 6, page 293. The extent of the province of Lāhor may be judged of from what is mentioned in that note, and note 6, below.

6 This happened in 612 H., according to the Tāj-ul-Maʿāṣir, but it cannot be correct. That is the year in which I-yal-duz in person overthrew him: the Wazīr of Ghaznīn defeated Ḳabā-jah soon after the death of Ḳutb-ud-Dīn. The Mīrāt-i-Jahān-Numā states that engagements were fought between I-yal-duz and Ḳabā-jah several times in the neighbourhood of Lāhor for the possession of that province. See under the reign of I-yal-duz, pages 496—506.

6 Having been deprived of the province of Lāhor, Ḳabā-jah retired into Sind, and, devoting his energies to the consolidation of his rule therein, acquired great power.

7 See page 200.

8 Truly; and at page 294 he says that Ḳabā-jah was defeated by I-yal-timīsh in person in 614 H., which refers to the same events as related in the Tāj-ul-Maʿāṣir in note 4, page 532.

9 Saʿīd here means august, and not that his name was "Saʿīd," which it was not, nor was it "Sulṭān Saʿīd Shams."

1 Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn's defeat happened in the seventh month of the year 618 H. Compare Elliot's INDIA here, and throughout this Section, as the Calcula printed text happens to be pretty correct in this identical portion of it. In the translation in Elliot, vol. ii., page 303, this passage is thus rendered: — "When the battle between Jalālu dīn Khwārizm Shāh and Chingiz Khān was fought on the banks of the Indus, Jalālu dīn came into Sind, and went towards Dewal and Makrān. After the victory of NANDU-TARI the Moghal prince came with a large army, &c." Here it will be perceived that NANDANAH, the name of the fort which was taken and the district in which it lay, and TORTI, the name of the Moghal who led the troops engaged in it, have been very
Mughals, Tūrī, the Mughal Nū-īn, with a large army, appeared at the foot [of the walls] of the city of Multān, cleverly made into one name, and Chingiz Khān is brought to Multān, who was never east of the Indus in his life!

This passage cannot fail to be unintelligible to the reader without giving some explanation, and some details respecting the events to which it refers. Our author, no doubt, could have given more particulars, but here, as elsewhere, he has, for reasons of his own, concealed a great deal.

There are many discrepancies likewise in the generality of Muḥammadan authors about the investment of Multān. Some works, including Jahān-Kushāh, and Jāmī’-ut-Tawārīkh, agree with our author, and some others state that Multān was taken by the Mughals, while Faṣīḥ-ī, and others, which give such detailed accounts of the Mughal invasions and Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn’s career, say nothing about Nandānah, and do not refer to this expedition against Multān; and Faṣīḥ-ī farther states, what is rather improbable, that Chingiz Khān himself gave Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn to understand, that, “as long as he did not re-cross the Sind, he would not interfere with him.” The A’in-i-Akbarī says the Mughals subdued Multān, and that Ḫabājah again repulsed them, but the first statement is not correct.

European writers also differ considerably—I need not quote the absurd nonsense contained in D’Ohsson [iii. p. 4] and in Rampoldi, in his “Annales Musulmani”—in their accounts, extracted from the Muḥammadan writers, respecting the advance of the Mughals upon Multān. In the “History of the Tartars,” translated from the work of Abū-l-Ghazāl, Bahādur Khān, it is stated that Chingiz “dispatched Dubay, Noyan, and Bala, Noyan, in pursuit of the Sultān, but they, having followed him in vain as far as the frontiers of India, were obliged to return without being able to give any tidings respecting him.” Petit de la Croix, on the other hand, quoting Faṣīḥ-ūllah, says, “Bela, Noyan, with 20,000 men,” was sent “to resist” the Sultān, “if he appeared in the country of Multān,” and again, quoting Abū-l-Fidā, says “Multān fell into the hands of the Mughals.” Jahān-Kushāh, Jāmī’-ut-Tawārīkh and Alī are, however, greater authorities than those quoted by Petit de la Croix for these events.

After his defeat of Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn on the west bank of the Sind or Indus, Chingiz Khān, with the main body of his forces, halted in the country near the Kābul river and the Sind—in the plain of Peshāwar, or the Hashtrager Do-ābah, probably—pending negotiations with Sultān I-yal-timīsah—as stated by our author also farther on, only the negotiations of Chingiz were usually conducted upon quite a different plan: with the sword, not the pen—for permission to pass through upper Hindūstān and enter Chīn by way of Lakhanaqāf and Kāmrūd. Whilst there encamped, Chingiz, hearing of the progress of Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn, and the strength he was acquiring, detached the Nū-īn, Tūrī or Turtāh—both names are correct, and he is by some writers called Tūrmaṭī [not “Tūlī,” as stated in Thomas, “Pathān Kings of Dehlī”—“Tūlī was the son of Chingiz, and was elsewhere employed at this time. Firīsh-tah, on the other hand, says it was Chaghkhatāh, another of the sons, which is equally incorrect”—with two tūmans—20,000 men—in pursuit of him.

Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn, then in the western part of the Sind-Sāgar Do-ābah, being much too weak in point of numbers to face this Mughal army sent after him, retired farther into the Panjāb, after he had, with 150 men, attacked and routed some 2000 or 3000 of the troops of Hindūstān stationed in that part, beyond the river Bihāt, Wihat, or Jhilam, into the Chinhatāh Do-ābah [The
and, for a period of forty-two days, closely invested that strong fortress.

name of this Do-ábah is derived by combining the two first letters of the word ٮبٰح—Chināb—with the three last letters of ِهٮح—Bihatah or ِهٮح—Wihtah, ُ and ِ being inter changable—the Do-ábah of Chinhatah lying between those two rivers], where there were numbers of Khokhars at that period; and one writer states that the Sulṭān did actually invest Lāhor itself.

Turṭīf, having crossed the Sind, "pushed on until he reached the boundary of the district or tract of country belonging to Hindūstān which ُکروت-عُد-مین, Karmānī, had held, but had been dispossessed of it by one of the Sulṭān's [Jałāl-ud-Dean’s] Amīnā. This evidently refers to the tract of country which will be subsequently referred to in several places—Banbān or Banfān. In it was the strong fort of Nandanaḥ [ندانح—in two copies of Alīf it is written ِندانح and ِندانح, clerical errors probably, but the locality cannot be mistaken, and Nandanaḥ is evidently meant] which he took, and inflicted great slaughter upon its inhabitants." From whom this fort was taken is not mentioned, but it could scarcely have been then in the possession of Jałāl-ud-Dīn’s vassals. After this feat, Turṭīf set out towards Multān, keeping along the western bank of the Jhilān. "On arriving opposite Multān he found the river unfordable, and directed his followers to construct a bridge, which they did by means of rafts of wood—a floating bridge." He then crossed, and invested the place; but, after he had placed his catapults, and had discharged them a great number of times with much effect, and the fortress was about to fall, he had to abandon the siege on account of the excessive heat [It was the height of the hot season, and the heat of Multān is truly excessive]. He plundered the provinces of Multān and Lohāvar, re-crossed the Sind, and proceeded towards Ghaznīn. Jāmī’-ut-Tawārīkh and Alīf say he plundered the ِنیکهٰ—the country of Für or Porus—which is the same probably as the Malik-pūr and Malka-pūr of other writers, the meaning of the former not having been recognized, perhaps, from the two words being written as one—ملکپور and ِملکپور. See also Elliot, INDIA: vol. ii., page 559.

Our author, however, makes the matter of the investment of Multān by Turṭīf very confused, for, in a previous page [297], he states that "Turṭīf, the Mughal, who had invested Multān, left Chināk Khān, and came and joined Sulṭān Jałāl-ud-Dean, and became converted to the Muḥammadan faith."

To return, however, to Nandanaḥ. This name is first mentioned in the reign of Maḥmūd of Ghaznīn by 'Uṭbā' in the Kitāb-i-Yamīnī, and then by Abū-Sā'id, son of Ḥaiyāh, a native of Gardaiz in the Ghaznīn territory [probably an earlier writer even than Abū-l-Faṣl-i-Baihaḳī, though not much], in his Zain-ul-Akbār, who says that Maḥmūd, towards the end of 404 H., determined to attack that fort, and that Naro Jai-pāl, on becoming aware of it, placed a strong garrison therein and retired himself towards the valley of Kaḥmīr. Mines were sprung, and the Turks kept up such a fire of arrows against those who showed themselves upon the walls that the place surrendered in 405 H. This very rare and important work I have commenced translating.

The next mention of Nandanaḥ occurs in Abū-l-Faṣl-i-Baihaḳī’s work, wherein it is said it was "impossible to leave that ِسغبار—تر—a narrow pass between hills bordering upon a hostile country—where was the fort of Nandanaḥ, without being properly taken care of." Our author also mentions it in several places, and it is mentioned in some other works, including the Taḥḥāt-i-Akbār [It appears to have been copied from Zain-ul Akbār],
During that contest Malik [Sultân] Nâṣir-ud-Dîn, Kâbâjah, opened the door of his treasury, and conferred numer
Khulâsat-ut-Tawârikh, and Firigâthah, both under Mâhmûd’s reign, and in many other places, as well as by Abbâs, Sarwârî, the Afghan historian, and other writers; yet, by some means or other, it has been turned into “Nârîn” by a few Muhammadan writers—or rather copyists—and by almost all European translators, after the same fashion as Tarîq—the present Talâwarf—has been turned into “Nârîn.” No such places as “Nârîn” and “Nârîn” ever existed. See also Elliot, India: vol. ii., pages 448 to 450. Firigâthah’s mode of spelling it is Nandînah, and, in this instance, Dow spells it tolerably correct, and is followed by Briggs.

Although it is declared [Elliot, India: vol. ii. page 451] that “the name of Nîndunâ cannot be restored,” I shall make an effort to restore that of NANDANAH, and, I think, not unsuccessfully.

NANDANAH, as late as the latter part of the last century at least, was the name of a district, and formerly of a considerable tract of country, and a fortress, in the Sind-Sâgar Do-âbah of the Panjâb—but the name, to judge from the Panjâb Survey Maps, appears to have been dropped in recent times—lying on the west bank of the Bihat, Wihat, or Jhelam. It contained within it part of the hill country, including the talah or hill of the Jogî, Bâla-nâh, a sacred place of the Hindus, which hill country was known to the Muhammadan writers as the Koh-i-Jûd, Koh-i-Bâla-nâth, and to the people dwelling therein as the Makhfiâlah, Janjûf, or Jûd Mountains, which we style the Salt Range, from the number of mines of rock salt contained within them, and lay between Pind-i-Dâdan Kân [so called after a former Khokhar chief named Dâdan Khan] and Khush-âb, and now composes part of the Shâh-pûr [Für or Für. i.e. Porus] District of the present Râwal Pindâ District under the Panjâb Government. There was also another separate and smaller district named NANDAN-pûr, a little farther north, and there is a small river named Naundanah in the present district of Fath-i-Jang, in the Râwal Pindâ District, also to the north. There is also, in this district, a Malik-pûr, in ancient days, the residence of the provincial governors, which lies in the direct line of route from the NANDANAH district on the Jhelam to the locality in which Chingiz Kân had pitched his camp, previously alluded to.

It is not impossible that the name of NANDANAH was, previous to the reign of Akbar, applied to the eastern half of the hill tract between Khush-âb, Râwal-Pindâ, and the Jhelam, including the northern part of the Chûl-i-Jalâf—so called after Jalâl-ud-Dîn—in the midst of the Sind-Sâgar Do-âbah, which formed, during the rule of the Ghûrûfs and the Turkish Slave Kings of Dihlî, the north-western province of Hind and Sind. The authority of the last-named rulers does not seem to have extended to the eastern bank of the Sind, except on the advance of an army to enforce it, nor northwards over the mountain tracts; and the Khokhars, along with the Awan-kârs, Kathars, Ghâkars, and other less numerous tribes, and, like them, still inhabiting that strong country—the ancient Gandhârâ of the Hindus—were not reduced to the subjection of the rulers of Hindustân till the time of Akbar.

In the reign of Sultân Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Muhammad-i-Sâm, his rule, which extended from Ghaznîn to Lânor and Dihlî, did not extend, save very nominally, over this hilly country; and it was because the Khokhars, and others, in alliance with them, closed the route between Ghaznîn and Lâhor, as referred to in note 1, page 481, that he had to march into this very frontier district of NANDANAH to coerce them. The fortress of that name seems to have been
rous benefits upon the people, and showed such proofs of boldness, ability, expertness, and courage that the men-
for the same object as that for which Sher Shah, Afghān, founded the fort of Ruhās in after years. Whether it was founded on the site of the fort of Nandanaḥ it is difficult to say, but is more than probable, for Abūl-Fazl does not mention it in the list of forts in that sarḵār, which may account for the name being less used in later times, but, at a place on the route between Khushāb and Makkaq on the Sind, named at present Pakkā-koṭ, there are the remains of a very strong fortress of ancient times, which may be those of Nandanaḥ.

In the tract south of the Makkhālah Mountains or Koh-i-Jūd, as far as the Sind, and to the north among the hills likewise, and beyond the Sind towards Kārmān and Ghaznīn, are the remains of several large towns or cities, and substantial buildings, including the ruins of a considerable city, on the east side of the river, named Kahlūr [حرف], which were noticed in the latter part of the last century, built in the strongest and most substantial manner, and still to be seen, and which would be delightfully interesting to explore. The country between the Jhilam and the Sind, in the direction I have been referring to, teems with ruins of this kind, and the remains of numerous great wells, with stone steps to descend into them, named wān—the present termination of many village names—in the Panjābī dialect, bnū in Hindī, and sarīnāb in Persian. There are also the extensive ruins of the ancient city of Akarrah, and some others, in the Banū district, the whole of which give undoubted evidence of this tract south of the Makkhaḥāl or Jūd Mountains having been the chief route between Hind and Ghaznīn by Kārmān and Gardaiz. The more northern route by Jhilam, Rāwāl Pinḍī, Aṭāk, and Pešāwar was seldom, if ever used, for the Kháibar route was not under the control of the Dīhīf kings, nor was it so good and practicable as the other. [I notice that the periodical ravings about the “only two routes” from Afghānistān into India have not yet ceased.] This may be gathered from the account of Sulṭān Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd’s reign farther on, where he marches his forces as far as the Sūdharah and then sends Ulūgh Khān with his best troops to endeavour to expel the Mughals from this very tract, and also from the account of Ulūgh Khān in the following Section. The country on the west of the Sind and on the Kābul river nearest to it, on the decline of the Ghūrīs, Khwārazmīs, and Mughal powers, was occupied by confederacies of powerful tribes, among whom were Afghāns, and on the east side, in the hills, by the tribes before alluded to, some of whom, the Awān-kārs and a few others, also held lands on the west side near the river Sind, and some even farther west.

It was from this frontier province of Nandanaḥ that Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn sent an envoy to ʿI-yal-timīsh—who was made away with by hiun—with whom Chingiz is said by the author to have been at the same time negotiating [1]. ʿI-yal-timīsh-ḥad, at this time, ousted his rival Kbabā-jah from this portion of the Lāhūr territory, and had compelled him to content himself with Multān, Uχchab, and Sind, although, from what subsequently occurred, the hold of either of the rivals upon the frontier district of Nandanaḥ could not have been very firm or very secure. At page 293, our author says, that ʿI-yal-timīsh, on hearing of Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn’s overthrow by the Mughals on the Sind and retreat towards the frontiers of the Dīhīf kingdom, “despatched”—in his account of ʿI-yal-timīsh farther on, he says he “marched”—“the troops of Dīhīf towards Lāhūr [into the province of Lāhūr?] against the Sulṭān, who thereupon “turned aside, and proceeded towards Sind and Sfawstān.” They were in great terror of the Khwārazmīs’ at Dīhīf; but Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-Dīn,
tion thereof will endure upon the pages of time until the judgment day.

This affair of the fortress [of Multān] happened in the year 621 H.; and, one year and a half subsequently, the Malik of Ghūr, through the ravages of the Mughal infidels, joined Malik [Sultān] Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Kābā-jah; and, in the latter part of the year 623 H., a body of [the tribe of] Khalj, a part of the Khwārazmī forces, acquired supremacy over the district of Mansūrah, which is [one] of the cities of Sīwastān, and their head was Malik Khān, the Khalj.

who had no more than about 10,000 men with him, was unable to face the immense forces of the Dīhlī kingdom, and therefore he contented himself, for the time, with the Sind-Sāgar Do-ābah and part of Sind. Had he appeared on the scene a few years earlier, before the Turk chiefs of the Mu‘izzī and Kūfī dynasties had been overpowered and slaughtered by I-yal-timāh, he might easily have maintained a permanent footing in India.

From the fact of Nandanaḥ being contained in the List of I-yal-timāh’s victories, although no mention even of such an expedition is given under his reign, he may have endeavoured to gain possession of it; and he certainly was advancing towards that part when attacked by the illness which compelled him to return, and which shortly after caused his death. This frontier tract must have been held by the Mughals after taking the fort of Nandanaḥ, for the very first act of his son Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd, when he came to the throne, eleven years after, was to march into the Panjāb and despatch Ulugh Khān from the banks of the Sūdhrārah with his forces “to ravage the Kōh-i-Jūd and the parts about Nandanaḥ,” and to check the inroads of the Mughals, who, in the preceding reign of Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, Bahram Shāh, had taken Lahor and attacked Uchchah.

Who the “Maliks” of Ghūr were at this period will be found in the account of the Mughal invasion in the last Section. The ravages of the Mughal here referred to have nothing whatever to do with “this invasion” or irruption of Turf the Mughal. See Elliot, vol. ii. page 303.

Not even the printed text will admit of this sentence being rendered: “The army of Khalj, consisting of all the forces of Khwarism,” &c. Elliot, vol. ii. page 303.

The word used is arā of Mansūrah, and signifies literally depressed or low land; also a portion of land, country, region, tract, &c. With Sīwastān the word ʾārā is used, which is the plural of ʾārā— a district, province, country, as well as town, city, inhabited place.

It is possible that this may be our author’s version of Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn’s operations against Kābā-jah; but it is evident, from the fact that neither here nor in his account of Jalāl-ud-Dīn, Mang-barnī, does our author, any more than Ḥasan, Niṣāmī, the author of the Tāj-ul-Ma‘āsir, give a correct account of Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn’s subjugation of the Khokhars, and the defeat and reduction of Kābā-jah, and occupation of Sīwastān, that both writers studiously conceal as much as possible what must have been perfectly well known to both of them. Other Indian writers who came after them, probably considering that contemporary writers might be depended upon, have been led into the
Malik [Sultān] Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Қābā-jah, moved on to repel them, and a battle took place between the two error of not mentioning those matters, if they were aware of them. The Khwārazmī Sultāns were very obnoxious to the Ghūrīs and their parasites, and, as the Khwārazmī sovereigns were not on good terms with the Khalfāh of that day, our author's bigotry doubtless led him, as well as .createClassify=Label:Hasan, Niẓāmī; to conceal all that might tend to the honour and glory of those whom our author and his sect considered no better than heretics, as well as to pander to the vanity of his patrons. See page 609.

Eighteen months after the appearance of the Mughals on the Sind or Indus, and the investment of Multān by Tūrī or Tūrā some time in 623 H., a chief, named Malik Khān by several writers, and styled “of Hirāt,” with his followers and the Khalji tribe, or rather the remnant of the Khalji tribe [a portion of this great tribe was settled in Garmsfr, and some held lands in Nangrahār, north of the Kārmān district, centuries before the Afschāns came into it. It is included by some in Šanūzān or Šankūrān, or rather the latter is included in Nangrahār], the remnant of the Khwarāznī forces in these parts, pressed by the Mughal invaders, arrived on the n.w. frontier of Sind. This person, however, cannot be the great chief referred to at pages 287, 409, &c.—nor does our author say he is, but styles him “the Khalj,” but some other writers endeavour to make out that he is—for, according to Vāfa, Jāhn-Kushā, and other works, he was slain when endeavouring to reach Pārghor or Barahawar, when the right wing of Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn’s small force which he commanded was defeated on the banks of the Ḥudā. He was the son of Jalāl-ud-Dīn’s maternal uncle, and is styled by different names and titles in different histories. In Alī he is called, يامین Malik, in Jāmi‘-ut-Tawāriḥ, اعتماد Malik, and in Rauṣat-us-Ṣafā, and Ḥabīb-us-Siyar, یامین-ul-Mulk. It is apparent, however, that his correct name and titles were Malik Khān, یامین-ul-Mulk. See page 287.

Abū-l-Ghāzī, Bahādur Khān, in his history styles the person last referred to Khān Malik, Saif-ud-Dīn, Ighrāq, Malik of the hills of Kārmān—the Šankūrān or Šanūzān hills. This however is not correct, for that chief, together with others, ʿAqām Malik and Nūb, the Jān-dār, after their desertion of Sultān Jalāl-ud-Dīn, began to fall out and fight among themselves, so that within three months of their desertion all three were killed, and their followers dispersed; and, what with those killed by each other and those slain by Changiz Khān’s forces, after a short time no traces of them were left.

A Malik Khān commanded the left wing of Jalāl-ud-Dīn’s force in the battle on the Indus, and his fate is not recorded. He probably is the person meant by our author, and the remains of the deserters from Jalāl-ud-Dīn’s army after the victory at Barwān may have been his followers.

Our author does not appear to have known much more about the situation of Maḥsūrah and the district of which it was the chief place than Abū-l-Faṣl did. It was on the east side of the Indus, and nearly fifty miles from the present main stream, and was situated between forty-five and fifty miles n.w. of Ḥaldarābād. The Khalji fugitives appeared on the n.w. frontier of Sind, of which SĪwastān [which gave name to the province] or Sādūsān, the present Sīwān, was the chief city, and included that district and what we at present call Upper Sind. Қābā-jah moved against them and defeated them, and Malik Khān is said to have been killed in the engagement. The remaining Khalj and others of his followers sought the protection of Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish, Қābā-
armies, and the Khalj force was overthrown, and the Khân [Chief] of the Khalj was slain; and Malik [Sultan] Nâsir ud-Dîn, Kâbâ-jah, returned again to Ùchchah and Mul坦.

In this same year likewise, the writer of this work, Minhâj-i-Sarâj, reached the city of Ùchchah ⁶ from Khurâsân by way of Ghaznîn and Banîân, by boat, on Tuesday, the 27th of the month Jamâdi-ul-Awwal, in the year 624 H. In the month of Zi-Hijjah of the same year, the Firûzî College of Ùchchah was committed to the charge of the author, together with the office of Kâşî of the forces ⁸ of jah’s rival and enemy, who took them under his protection, and subsequently marched against Kâbâ-jah, supported by these fugitives.

Firûzâb, copying some other modern author, places this event in 615 H., but it is totally incorrect. He says they came from the outskirts of Ghaznîn. The Tabâkât-i-Akbarf copies from our author.

⁶ Ùchchah, also called Ùchchah-i-Jalâlî, the Europeanized Uch, Ooch, and Ouche, on the Ghârâ, consisted—I refer to it as it was a century ago—of seven villages of large size. That in which is the tomb of Sayyid Jamâl, Bukhârî, is called Ùchchah-i-Sharîf, or the Holy; and that in which another Muḥammadan saint—Makhdûm-i-Jâhânân-i-Jâhân—is buried is styled Ùchchah-i-Makhdûm. The part in which the Mughâl governors used to dwell is named Ùchchah-i-Mughal, and so on, all seven villages having separate names; but they may be considered as portions, although somewhat apart from each other, of one large town. Six or seven kuroh [each kuroh 1000 paces] to the northward of Ùchchah, the rivers Ghârâ, Chinâb, and their tributaries fall into the Sind, Ab-i-Sind, or Sind-Sâgar.

⁷ The Calcutta text has Mathân or Mithân—ماثان—here, but there is no such word in any copy of the text collated. The editor or editors, knowing probably that there was a place somewhere on the Indus called Mîthân-kot—not Mithân with long â—jumped at the conclusion that that must be the place referred to. The name contained in every copy of the text is written generally مبتان—Banîân, but occasionally بنیان—Banbân. See note ¹, page 536, and note ², page 623. The same name occurs in the reign of I-yal-timîsh, and in many other places; and, in the printed text, the name is, generally, correctly written. In a note, however, it is turned into مبتان, but in two of the most modern copies of the text it is turned into مبتان and مبتان, respectively! In Elliot’s INDIA the printed text is implicitly followed. There is no doubt whatever that Mûl坦 is not meant, and that it refers to some place between Ghaznîn, Kârmân, and the tract north or west of the Salt Range, perhaps Bâtî or near it; and further mention of it in the following pages of this work tends to confirm this supposition, but its precise position is difficult to fix. Mîthân-kot is a long distance below Ùchchah, and would have taken our author much out of his way in coming from Ghaznîn to that city.

⁸ Compare Elliot, INDIA, vol. ii. page 304, where the Kâşî-ship, or office of Kâşî, is turned into “provocation”! The passage is thus rendered:—“In the month of Zi-l Hijja of the same year the Firûzî college at Uch was consigned to the care of the author. On the provocation of the army of ‘Alâu-d dîn Bahîrâb Shâh, in the month of Râbi‘ul-awwal, A.H. 624, Sultan Sa‘îd Shamsu-d dîn encamped in sight of Uch”!
THE TABAKAT-I-NĀṢIRĪ.

'Alā-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh [the son of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḫabāj-hā]; and, in the month of Rābi'-ul-Awwal of the same year, 624 H., the august Sultān, Shams-ud-

There are numerous discrepancies among authors with respect to these events; and our author himself, who was present at Uqchah, makes a different statement here from that given by him under the reign of I-yal-timīsh, page 611; and there says these events happened in 625 H.

The Tāj-ul-Maʿāṣir, after stating that the fortress of "Uqchah-i-Multān" was "taken," i.e. Uqchah of Multān, or belonging to Multān, not "Uch Multān," and without mentioning that I-yal-timīsh was at Uqchah in person, says that I-yal-timīsh, hearing of Ḫabāj-hā's pride and arrogance, and that he had strongly fortified himself within the fort of Bhakar, despatched his Wazīr against him with a large army. See also Elliot, INDIA, vol. II, page 242.

Other writers again state that, on the flight of Ḫabāj-hā from Uqchah, I-yal-timīsh "left his Wazīr to carry on the investment of Uqchah, and returned himself to Dihlī;" and that "the Wazīr took that place after two months, and then marched against Bhakar."

Another work has that "I-yal-timīsh's Wazīr marched an army against Ḫabāj-hā, and invested him within the walls of Uqchah in 624 H." that "it was taken after two months, on the 22nd of Jamādī-ul-Ākhir, and that, "after it was taken, Ḫabāj-hā got on board a boat—not what we call boats in this country, but vessels of considerable size, with flat bottoms—in order to get to Bhakar, and was drowned."

The favourite author of Indian History writers [because translated probably], Firūzštah [not his translators], places this event "between 618 H. and 623 H.;" but, as he gives no authority for so doing, and no dates between, there is no knowing what year he means. He places it before the expedition against Rantabhūr, whereas it took place after; and in the lithographed text "revised" by BRIGGS, and also in the Calcutta text of our author, Bhakar is turned into Thānkīr, which is Bhīmāh. The Tabakat-i-Akbarī also places these events in 614 H. some ten years too soon: that was Ḫabāj-hā's first defeat by I-yal-timīsh. See page 294.

The real events appear to be as follow. Soon after the Khālij and Khwārazmī fugitives threw themselves on the protection of I-yal-timīsh, he, jealous of the power of Ḫabāj-hā, and his overthrow of that remnant of the Khwārazmī forces, moved with an army from Dihlī, by way of Tabarhindah towards Uqchah, whilst the governor of the Lāhor province, with another force, to create a diversion, marched against Multān. I-yal-timīsh reached Uqchah on the 1st of Rābi'-ul-Awwal, 625 H. [February, 1227 A.D.], having sent on the principal part of his army, under the Wazīr, the Nīzām-ul-Mulk, the Khwājah, Muḥammad, son of Abū-Saʿīd, Junaīdī, a few days in advance. He, I-yal-timīsh, sat down before the place and invested it, and detached his Wazīr, with a large force, against the fortress of Bhakar, whither Ḫabāj-hā, on becoming aware of I-yal-timīsh's coming against him, had withdrawn with most of his forces and his treasures. These events happened during the hot season of 625 H., and part of the Wazīr's force dropped down to Bhakar by water, and part went by land, and had to march through dense jangal.

It is remarkable that neither Lhūrī [now often pronounced Rohrī] nor Sakar are mentioned here where we might naturally have expected to have heard something about them, especially of Lhūrī, for on the plain immediately north of it the troops of I-yal-timīsh probably encamped. I say probably,
Dunyā wa ud-Dīn [I-yal-timish] pitched his camp in sight because there can be no doubt but that the course of the Indus, at this part, has greatly altered during the lapse of upward of six centuries, and with respect to the fortress of Bhakar in particular, and its connexion with Sakar.

To return to Üchchah however: some say it held out vigorously for a period of two months and twenty days; but, as it capitulated—some say it was taken—on Tuesday, the 29th—one author says the 22nd—of Jamādī-ul-Ākhir—this must be incorrect, as, between the two dates given for the arrival of I-yal-timish and the fall of Üchchah, is a period of exactly four months. Our author, although present, can scarcely be depended upon, for here he says it occurred in 624 H., and under I-yal-timish's reign says 625 H.

The author of the Tārikh-i-Sind, Mīr Ma'ṣūm, says that I-yal-timish marched an army against Ḵabā-jah in 624 H., but that the Wazīr was left to carry out the investment, and I-yal-timish returned to Dihlī; and that the place capitulated 28th of Jamādī-ul-Awwal, 625 H.

On becoming aware of the fall of Üchchah, Ḵabā-jah despatched his son, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Bahārān Shāh, to treat for an accommodation; but, although he was received with all outward marks of kindness, and matters had been discussed, he was not permitted to depart. As the Wazīr was close at hand to invest Bhakar, Ḵabā-jah was alarmed; and, with the fate of Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, before his eyes, threw himself on board a boat in order to escape, and was drowned by the sinking of the vessel on the 22nd of Jamādī-ul-Ākhir, 625 H.

According to the Tāj-ul-Ma'āṣir, Ḵabā-jah, having been invested in Bhakar by the Wazīr, and the place reduced to extremity, then despatched his son to I-yal-timish, with an offering of 100 laks of Dihlī-wāls [a coin so called, and 1000 dresses of different kinds; but, being alarmed at the detention of his son, shortly after, died of grief! He left treasures to the amount of 500 laks of Dihlī-wāls, 1000 large river boats, jewels and valuable pearls, inlaid vessels of silver and gold, costly garments and other valuable property, the whole of which was appropriated by I-yal-timish. What became of Muḥammad, Bahārān Shāh, Ḵabā-jah's son, is not known.

The Jāmi'-ul-Ḥikāyat, a book of anecdotes, written about this period, and dedicated to the Wazīr of I-yal-timish, states—but the statements contained in such works must be received with due caution—that "I-yal-timish sent an army to repress the encroachments of Ḵabā-jah," but does not mention Üchchah expressly, and adds, that "he, being unable to cope with this army, sent his forces to Bhakar in boats. The troops of Dihlī reached Bhakar on the 10th of Rabī'-ul-Awwal, 625 H., and preparations for attack were made. It was, however, not made until near seven weeks after, on 1st of Jamādī-ul-Awwal; but Ḵabā-jah, driven from the outer walls, lost the town and had to retire to the fort." This description, however, is not applicable to the island of Bhakar in its present extent. Ḵabā-jah is then said to have offered to capitulate, if he were allowed to send away his sons and his treasure. This was refused; and he, placing no faith in his conqueror [rival?], preferring death to surrender and captivity, cast himself from the wall into the water, the night of Thursday, the 19th of Jamādī-ul-Ākhir—one month and nineteen days after the first investment of the place.

As a specimen of the random manner in which history is often written, Bud'ā'īnī says that the Mughals invested Mulfān in 611 H., and that, in 624 H., Ḵabā-jah was made captive by Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn, "and took the road of the other world."
of Üçchah. Malik [Sultân] Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḳabā-jah, discomfited, embarked on boats [with his troops and followers?] and retired towards Bhakar; and [a body of?] the Sultân’s forces, along with the Wazir of the State, the Niẓām-ul-Mulk, set out in pursuit of him, and invested him within the fortress of Bhakar.

Sultân Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish, remained encamped before the gate of the fortress of Üçchah for a period of two months and twenty-seven days. On Saturday; the 27th of the month, Jamāḍī ul-Awwal¹, the citadel of Üçchah was given up. When the news of the capture of the place reached Malik [Sultân] Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḳabā-jah, he sent his son, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, to the presence of the Sultân. Subsequent to his reaching the camp of the Sultân, on the 22nd of the month, Jamāḍī-ul-Ākhīr, information arrived of the taking of Bhakar; and that Malik [Sultân] Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Ḳabā-jah, had drowned himself in the river Sind, and the term of his existence was severed².

The period of his rule in the land of Sind, and Üçchah, and Mūltān, was twenty-two years.

IV. MALIK BAHĀ-UD-DĪN, TUGHRLIL⁴, UL-MU‘IZZI-US-SULTĀNI.

Malik Bahā-ud-Dīn, Tughril, was a Malik of excellent disposition, scrupulously impartial, just, kind to the poor and strangers, and adorned with humility. He was one of the slaves of the early part of the reign of the Sultān-i-Ghāzi, Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, and the latter had raised him likewise to a high degree of rank; and,

¹ The printed text [and Frishtah in his work] turns this name into Thankir, which is Bhfānah, although Bhakar is mentioned correctly immediately after!
² Impossible, considering that Zi-Ḥijjah is the last month of the year, and Rabī‘-ul-Awwal the third. He must either mean that he reached Üçchah in 623 H., or that it was surrendered in 625 H. See page 296, where he contradicts both the date of his own arrival at Üçchah and also the year in which it was taken.
³ Compare Elliot here, vol. ii. page 304.
⁴ Tughril, with short u before the final l, is the name of a bird; but the name of this chief, like that of several of the Saljūq rulers, is spelt Tughril. All writers agree that Bahā-ud-Dīn, Tughril, was one of the greatest, most amiable, and most accomplished of Sultan Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn’s mamluks.
when the fortress of Thankir*, [or Thankir], which is [in?] the territory of Bhāñah, with the Rāe of which warfare was being carried on, was taken, it was made over to Bahā-ud-Dīn, Tughril’s charge, and that part became flourishing and prosperous through his means. From different parts of Hindūstān and Khurāsān merchants and men of repute had joined him, and to the whole of them he was in the habit of presenting houses and goods which used to become their property, so that, on this account, they would dwell near him.

As the fortress of Thankir was not suitable as a place of residence for him and his following, Malik Bahā-ud-Dīn, Tughril, founded, in the territory of Bhāñah, the city of Sulṭān-kot, and therein took up his abode, and used continually to despatch [bodies of] cavalry towards Gwāliyūr. When the Sulṭān-i-Ghāzī [Mu’izz-ud-Dīn] retired from the foot [of the walls] of the fort of Gwāliyūr, he said to Bahā-

* The discrepancies of authors with regard to the taking of this fortress, and the operations against Gwāliyūr are great.

Our author himself, under the reign of Sulṭān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, states that Ḫūṭb-ud-Dīn subdued Nahrwālah, Thankīr, Gwāliyūr, and Budā’ūn, and here contradicts himself.

The Tāj-ul-Ma’āṣir says Thankīr was taken in 592 h., and that Ḫūṭb-ud-Dīn, having joined the Sulṭān’s forces, the royal army moved against Gwāliyūr, and invested it in that same year. Rāe Solānkī Pāl sued for peace, became tributary, and was allowed to retain his possessions.

The Tabakāt-i-Akbārī says Sulṭān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn made the expedition to Khinauj and Banārās in 589 h., and, leaving Ḫūṭb-ud-Dīn as his representative in Hind, returned to Ghazīnī. Immediately after, that work states, “Ḥūṭb-ud-Dīn subdued Thankīr, Gwāliyūr, and Budā’ūn, and then invaded Nahrwālah,” but gives no dates; and then adds, without mentioning any other event between, that, “when between Ṭūs and Sarakhs, Sulṭān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn heard of the death of his brother,” which happened in 599 h., according to our author.

The Mirāt-i-Jahān-Numā also says that Sulṭān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, after the conquest of Khinauj and Banārās, left Ḫūṭb-ud-Dīn, as his deputy in India, and that the latter took Gwāliyūr, Budā’ūn, and other places, but Thankīr is not mentioned, and, in this statement, Ḩaft Iklīm and Budā’ūnī agree.

Alī, which is the most correct apparently, has, “Sulṭān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, again entered Hind in 590 h., and took Thankīr [or Thankīr], which was an exceedingly strong place, and then marched against Gwāliyūr,” about which more will be mentioned in the following note.

It is amusing to compare Fīrūd’s here—the text I mean—his account of these events, first, under the reign of Sulṭān Mu’izz-ud-Dīn, and, subsequently, in his account of Ḫūṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bāk, and Bahā-ud-Dīn, Tughrīl. They are related in three different ways, and neither in details nor in dates do they agree!
-ud-Din, Tughril: "I must leave this stronghold to thee [to take]." In concurrence with this hint, Malik Bahā-ud-Din, Tughril, stationed a body of forces from his own troops at the foot of the fort of Gwāliyūr, and near by, at the distance of one league, he erected a fortification, in order that the Musalmān horsemen might remain within it at night, and, when the day should break, push on to the foot of the fort [walls].

They were occupied in this manner for the period of a year; and, when the defenders of Gwāliyūr became reduced to straits, they sent emissaries to the Sultān-[Malik at that period] i-Karīm, Kuṭb-ud-Din, I-bak, and gave up the fort to him; and [consequently] between Malik Bahā-ud-Din,

* The more recent copies of the text differ somewhat from this; but the oldest and best copies are as above.

7 Neither here, nor under the reign of Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Din, does our author give us the details in consecutive order, his constant failing. The Sultān, having gained possession of Thangīr, moved against Gwāliyūr. Arrived there, he found it would be impossible to take it by a coup de main, and that the only way to reduce it would be by a regular investment, and reduction of the defenders to straits, which would occupy a considerable time. The Rāe of Gwāliyūr, becoming aware of the Sultān’s deliberations on the matter, hastened to present himself before him, with rich presents and offerings, and conciliated him, and, for a time, he was enabled to preserve his territory.

Elphinstone, led away by the translations of Fīrūzah—Briggs’s version of which he constantly quotes—and other histories probably, easily, but incorrectly, disposes of these affairs. He says, page 315, "next year, Shahāb ud-din came back to India, took Bīāna, west of Agra, and laid siege [!] to the strong fort of Gwāliūr, in Bundelkand. It is probable [!] that he was recalled by some attack or alarm in Khorāsān, for he left the conduct of the siege of Gwāliūr to his generals, and returned, without having performed anything of consequence [!], to Ghazni."

At the time of withdrawing from before the fort, the Sultān remarked to Tughril, that, if the fort should be taken [hereafter by his means], it should be made over to him. On this account, after the Sultān’s departure, Tughril founded the strong fortress of Sultān-koṭ in the Bhāfānāh territory and there took up his residence, and from thence made constant raids into the Gwāliyūr territory; but, finding this of no avail, he founded a strong fortification within two leagues [some say much nearer] of it, and made it his headquarters, and virtually blockaded Gwāliyūr. By making incessant raids upon the country round, he sought to reduce the place to extremity. After about a year, the defenders, being reduced to great straits, sent agents, with presents and rarities, not to Tughril, but to his rival, Malik Kuṭb-ud-Din, I-bak, and delivered up the fortress of Gwāliyūr to him. Kuṭb-ud-Din’s having accepted this offer was the cause of enmity between the two Turk mamlūka, and, had not Tughril been suddenly removed from the scene by the hand of death, hostilities would have arisen between them. The Taṣkārat-ul-Mulūk says Tughril died whilst the operations were being carried on.
Tughril, and [Malik] Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, there used to exist a little of the leaven of vexation.

Malik Bahā-ud-Dīn, Tughril, was a man of exemplary faith, and, in the district of Bhānah, numerous proofs of his goodness remained; and he died, and was received into the Almighty's mercy.

After this, an account will likewise be given in this Ṭabaḵat of the Khalj Maliks who were [among] those of the reign of the beneficent Sultan⁸ Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, and accounted among the servants of the Sultan-i-Ghāzī, Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, in order that, when the readers [of this work] acquire knowledge respecting all the Maliks and Amīrs of Hindūstān, they may utter a benediction upon the author, and pray unto the Omnipotent for the eternal dominion and perpetual sovereignty of Sultan Naṣir-ud-Dunya wa ud-Dīn, Abū-l-Muẓaffar-i-Māhmūd, the son of the Sultan, the Kāsim [co-sharer] of the Lord of the Faithful⁹: and may Almighty God perpetuate the dynasty, Amīn!

There is no date given of the surrender of Gwāliyūr to Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, but, from what our author states about the "leaven of vexation" between Kuṭb-ud-Dīn and Tughril, and what other writers say respecting Tughril's determination of appealing to arms on account of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn's interference with respect to this fortress, we may conclude that its surrender must have taken place just before or immediately after the death of Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, who would probably, had he lived longer, have interfered in this matter out of his great regard for Tughril, his ancient slave. Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, after the Sultan's death, would scarcely have kept himself entirely at Lāhor out of fear of Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, with another rival like Bahā-ud-Dīn, Tughril, in his rear, lest they might act in concert.

Firīštah mentions these events in his account of Tughril as though they had happened in 607 H. ¹ See also note ³, page 516.

Gwāliyūr did not long remain in Musalmān possession however, and it was recovered shortly after by the Hindūs, during the confusion which arose on the death of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, and the accession of his adopted son; and, it was not until many years after—in 630 H.—that I-yal-timīsh could gain possession of it. See under his reign farther on.

⁸ Not so: Malīk Kuṭb-ud-Dīn was a slave at this time, and continued a slave till after Sultan Mu'izz-ud-Dīn's assassination; and the first of the Khalj rulers of Lakhanaḍāf died before Kuṭb-ud-Dīn received his manumission.

⁹ See note ⁴, pages 310, 315, and 388, and note ⁷. On his later coins the title is Naṣir-i-Amīr-ul-Mūminīn, and as our author himself states in his account of Naṣir-ud-Dīn Maḥmūd's reign farther on.
V. MALIK-UL-GHĀZĪ, IKHTIYĀR-UD-DĪN, MUḤAMMAD, SON OF BAKHT-YAR, KHALJĪ, IN THE TERRITORY OF LAKHĀNAWATĪ.

Trustworthy persons have related on this wise, that this Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, belonged to the Khalj [tribe] of Ghūr, and the territory of Garmsīr; and that he was a man impetuous, enterprising, intrepid, bold, sagacious, and expert. He came from his tribes to the court of Ghaznīn, and [to] the Audience Hall of dominion of the Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām. In the Diwān-i-ʿĀriż

1 In the more recent copies of the text, the word ʿo—“son of” has been left out, but the iqṭāf—the kasra or i, governing the genitive, even in them is understood, if not written; and thus, with European and some local Indian Muḥammadan writers, the father has had the credit for what the son performed. The same error, of omitting the kasra or not understanding the grammatical structure, has caused the ancestor of the Ghūrīn Sulṭāns, Muḥammad, son of Sūrī, noticed at page 320, to be made Muḥammad Sūrī—one person—instead of two. The father’s name it appears was Bakht-yār [i. e. the Fortunate or Lucky], the son of Maḥmūd.

At page 517, in every copy of the text, our author styles him ʿIzz-ud-Dīn, instead of Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn.

2 My oldest copy of the text gives the vowel points as above. There is no doubt but that the correct name is LAKHMAṆA-WAṬĪ, or LAKŠMAṆA-WAṬĪ from Lakhmāna or Lakshmana, the son of Dasaratā, and half-brother of Rām Chandra, and wātī, the contraction of wāṭī—habitation, dwelling, home—the country of Lakhmāna.

3 The most absurd statements have been made with respect to the people named Khalj, the plural of which, according to the 'Arab mode of writing, is Akhlāj. It is also written, but rarely, Khalaj; but some few Muḥammadan Indian authors write it Khalīj and Khalījī, and most European writers have followed them [Dow, however, makes "Chilligies" of them, although Firishtah writes the word like other Muḥammadan authors]; but, according to the fertile imaginations of Europeans, the Khalj—are tribe and Ghalżī—are tribe are one people—in fact, some roundly assert that the Khalj are one and the same race as the Afghān tribe of Ghalżī, without there being a shadow of authority for such an assertion in any Muḥammadan writer whatever. Because the Khalj happened, in the days of the Ghūrfan Sulṭāns [and long prior], to have been located in that part of Khurāsān now included in what in the present day is styled by the general name of Afghānistān—a comparatively modern designation—such writers, in their innocence, jumped at the conclusion that they were Afghāns, and, more than that, that the Khalj and Ghalżī must be one and the same people.

The Khalj are a TURKISH tribe, an account of whom will be found in all the histories of that race—the Shajirah-ul-Atrak, Jāmiʿ-ut-Tawārīkh, Introduction to the Zafar Nāmah, &c.; and a portion of them had settled in Garmsīr long prior to the period under discussion, from whence they came into Hindustān and entered the service of Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn. See also note, page 550.
[department of the Muster-Master], because, in the sight of the head of that office, his outward appearance was humble and unprepossessing, but a small stipend was assigned him. This he rejected, and he left Ghaznîn and came into Hindûstân. Arrived at the capital, Dîhilî [there likewise], by reason of his humble condition, not finding favour in the sight of the [head of the] Muster-Master's department, he was also rejected.

Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yâr then left Dîhilî and proceeded to Budã'ûn, to the presence of the holder of that fief, the Sipah-Sâlar [Commander or Leader of troops], Hizâbr-ud-Dîn, Ḥasan-i-Adîb, and he fixed a certain salary for him.

The paternal uncle of Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yâr—Muḥammad, son of Maḥmûd—was in [the army of] Ghaznîn [and his nephew joined him]; and, when the battle was fought at Târâ'in in which the Golah [Râe Pithorâ] was defeated, 'Alî, [styled] Nâg-awrî, entertained Muḥammad-i-Maḥmûd [the uncle] in his own service. When he ['Alî] became feudatory of Nâg-awrî, he stood up among his brethren [sic], and conferred a kettle-drum and banner upon Muḥammad-i-Maḥmûd, and made over to him the fief of Kâsîmandi [or Kâsîmtandi]; and, after his [Muḥammad-i-Maḥmûd's] death, Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yâr became feudatory in his place.

After some time he proceeded into Awadh to the presence of Malik Ḥusâm-ud-Dîn, Āghûl-Bak. As he had acquired a horse and efficient arms, and in several places had shown activity and gallantry, Bhagwat or Bhugwat

---

4 This passage is defective more or less in every copy of the text collated, and most of them are—the most modern copies—hopelessly so. To make sense of it I have been obliged to add a few words, but they are those only which are in italics within brackets. The greater part of what is stated there, however, is corroborated by others; and the only parts which are doubtful are those respecting the nephew joining the uncle, and 'Alî, Nâg-awrî's "standing up among his brethren." The latter was probably a Khalîj.

The three chiefs here mentioned appear to have been quite independent, or very nearly so, of Malik Kûṭh-ud-Dîn, I-bak's authority; and this, seemingly, was why Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yâr, entered their service. The very fact of these Khâlîj rulers being put in the same Section with Kûṭh-ud-Dîn, I-bak, Nâṣîr-ud-Dîn, Kâhâ-jah, and Bahâ-ud-Dîn, Tûghrîl, and numbered consecutively, shows that Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yâr, was not an officer of Kûṭh-ud-Dîn, but only partially dependent on him as the Sultan's representative at Dîhilî; and, in the same manner, his successors were to all intents independent until the last was overcome by I-yal-timînî.
and Bhūlī or Bhīwalt[ ] were conferred upon him in sīf; and, being a man of valour and intrepidity, he was in the habit of making incursions into the territory of Muner and Bihār⁶, and used to obtain booty

⁶ These names are thus written in the oldest copies and are confirmed by the best of the modern copies of the text, and, as they are important, I give the original Persian. These sīfs were situated between the Ganges and the Karmañ̄-nasah, to the eastward of and adjoining Chīnār-gaṛh, and two parganahs still bear the same names. The town of Bhūlī [anglicized Bhodet] is still the chief town of the latter, but there is a difficulty with respect to the name of the principal place of the Bhagwat or Bhugwat parganah in those days, and it is most probable that the hill and fortress of Chīnār-gaṛh was included in it. See Indian Atlas, sheet 88. That the places mentioned in the text were in the part named is singularly corroborated by what others say were the names of Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār's sīfs, mentioned in the following note; for the places referred to are evidently the modern anglicized Pateetah and Kuntīl [Kuntilah?], the former being only two miles north and nine west, and the latter one mile north; and twenty-eight miles west of Bhūlī. All these three places moreover are immediately west of the Karmañ̄-nasah, which river was the boundary of the Bihār territory. In the printed text these places are turned into Sāhlat [Sāhlāt] or Sahlīst [Sāhlīst] and Sāhilī [Sāhilī] or Sīhwalt [Sīhwalt]—in fact, anything but what is correct. See Elliot: India, vol. ii., page 395.

⁶ There is considerable difference between our author and some other writers here, and also in other places; and, as I proceed I will give a short abstract of what they say.

Iktīwār-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār—as I shall in future style him—that is son of Bakht-yār, the Khalīj, who was never a slave [the “History of India” written for the Calcutta University notwithstanding], was one of the headmen of the Khalīj tribe dwelling in and on the south-west border of Ghūr. He was endowed with great valour, wisdom, and liberalty, was of robust and powerful form, with immensely long arms—as described by our author. During the reign of Sultān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn he came to Ghaznīn in search of service during those stirring times, and, subsequently, not obtaining employment such as he desired, he came into Hindu, and proceeded to Lāhor. There he did not get on with Kusht-ud-Dīn, it is said, so he proceeded farther eastward, and joined the Malik-ul-Mu‘azzam [the great Malik], Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, Uqailed-Bak [see note ⁶, page 516, para. 11], who held in sīf a considerable tract of country in the Do-āb, and on the east side of the river Gang, independent of Kusht-ud-Dīn’s authority. According to another author, Sultān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn conferred on Uqailed-Bak the fortress of Kol and its dependencies, which is in the Do-āb. Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār was taken into that Malik’s service, and, soon after, was despatched with some forces into Awadh [Compare Thomas, “Pathān Kings of Dehli,” page 110, who makes him “Sipahsālr of Oude” and note ⁷, page 558, farther on]; and, on several occasions, he gave proofs of his valour and prowess against his Hindu opponents.

After this, Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, Uqailed-Bak, conferred upon him the sīfs of Patidhīl—[Lat. 25°, Long. 82° 54'], and Kuntīlīh—[Lat. 25° 7', Long. 82° 35'], the Kuntīl of the Indian Atlas.

[From a similarity in the names, some comparatively modern Muḥammadān
from it, until he acquired ample resources in the shape of horses, arms, and men; and the fame of his alertness and bravery, and the booty [he had acquired], became noise abroad. Bodies of Akhlaj, from different parts of Hindustan, turned their faces towards him; and his reputation reached Sulthan [Malik] Kutb-ud-Din, who despatched a robe of distinction to him, and showed him honour. Having been honoured with such notice and favour, he led a force towards Bihār, and ravaged that territory.

He used to carry his depredations into those parts and that country until he organized an attack upon the fortified city of Bihār. Trustworthy persons have related on this wise, that he advanced to the gateway of the fortress of Bihār.

authors of Akbar's time, and some European translators and writers, have been led to suppose that these places referred to Patīlah—[Lat. 27° 41', Long. 79°-40'], and Kanpilah [45°], Lat. 27° 37', Long. 79° 21', lying on the southern bank of the Ganges a few miles N.N.W. of Budā'īn, but no less than three degrees west, and about the same distance north, of the places referred to by our author above; whilst Patīlah and Kuntlah are within a few miles of Bhūgātī and Bhiūlī, and situated in the same tract of country immediately west of the Karmah-nasah. They are equally convenient for Muner—a very old place at the confluence of the Soane [Sön] with the Ganges, on the right bank of the former—and Bihār, as well as Awadh. The town of Patīlah lies about five miles south of the fort of Chūnār-gār, and had a rampart and a fort when Chait Singh, the rebel Zamīndār of Banāras, garrisoned it in 1781; but it is not entered in the Indian Atlas, and may have since gone to comparative decay.

Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yar now began to carry his depredations into Bihār and Muner as well as into Awadh, on his own account, and acquired great booty. Hearing of his valour and prowess, Kutb-ud-Din, Í-bak, sent him [from Lāhor according to Budā'īn] a dress of honour of great value, for, at this period, Husam-ud-Din, Ûğhūl-Bak, is no more mentioned.

It will be seen from these statements, as well as from the statement of our author, that Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yar was never Sipah-Sālar in Awadh. The mistake appears to have arisen from his having entered the service of Husam-ud-Din, Ûğhūl-Bak, who was a Sipah-Sālar and held the sieg of Awadh, or by confounding Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yar's name with that of the Sipah-Sālar, Hizābar-ud-Din, mentioned above by our author. See Thomas: "PATHĀN KINGS OF DEHLI," page 110.

This favour, on the part of Kutb-ud-Din, as well as Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yar's valour and generosity becoming noise abroad, bodies of Akhlaj from the Sulṭān's forces in Hindustan from all parts began to flock around him, and he became very powerful. He subdued the territory of Bihār, after making great slaughter among the infidels of that part, and booty to a vast amount fell into his hands. After these successes he presented himself before Kutb-ud-Din, who had, at that time, taken up his residence at Dihil, but he was not "Sulṭān" Kutb-ud-Din, for his master was still alive and he himself was still a slave.
with two hundred horsemen in defensive armour, and suddenly attacked the place. There were two brothers of Farghānah, men of learning, one Nizām-ud-Dīn, the other Šamšām-ud-Dīn [by name], in the service of Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār; and the author of this book met with Šamšām-ud Dīn at Lakhaṇawatī in the year 641 H., and this account is from him. These two wise brothers were soldiers among that band of holy warriors when they reached the gateway of the fortress and began the attack, at which time Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār, by the force of his intrepidity, threw himself into the postern of the gateway of the place, and they captured the fortress, and acquired great booty. The greater number of the inhabitants of that place were Brahmans, and the whole of those Brahmans had their heads shaven; and they were all slain. There were a great number of books there; and, when all these books came under the observation of the Musalmāns, they summoned a number of Hindūs that they might give them information respecting the import of those books; but the whole of the Hindūs had been killed. On becoming acquainted [with the contents of those books], it was found that the whole of that fortress and city was a college, and in the Hindū tongue, they call a college مدرسة [Bihār].

When that victory was effected, Muḥammad-i-Bakhtyār returned with great booty, and came to the presence of the beneficent Sulṭān, Kutb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, and received great honour and distinction. A party of Amīrs at the capital [Dihilt], through the noising abroad of Muham-

8 A few modern copies say, "he, Šamšām-ud-Dīn, discovered the author," &c.
9 Jān-bāz, which does not mean "active."
1 Books on the religion of the Hindūs.
2 The Zubdat-ut-Tawārifī, which quotes our author verbatim on most occasions, says they sent for a number of Hindūs, who made them acquainted with the contents of the books, and in them it was written that that fortress and city was called a college, but, correctly, a Buddhist monastery.
3 In Persian words derived or borrowed from the Sanskrit the letter ḫ is often substituted for Nāgarī ॐ—व—thus, Bihār or Wihār, but there is no খ in the word: hence Behār is impossible.
4 He was not then Sulṭān, and his master, Sulṭān Muʿizz-ud-Dīn, was still alive, and was assassinated thirteen years afterwards, and, some time even after that event, Malik Kutb-ud-Dīn received his manumission and the title of Sulṭān from the nephew of Muʿizz-ud-Dīn. Our author does not mean that Kutb-ud-Dīn was Sulṭān at that very time. He was not Sulṭān, in fact, during the lifetime of Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yar.
mad-i-Bakht-yar's praises, and, at beholding the honour

6 After having gained possession of Bihir, Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar, taking along with him valuable presents, part of the spoils, proceeded to wait upon Malik Kuchb-ud-Din, at this time the representative of Sultan Muizz-ud-Din in Hindustan. By the generality of authors he is said, more probably, to have gone to Dihl for the purpose; but, as previously stated in next to last para. of note 5, page 516, it was whilst Kuchb-ud-Din was at Mahobah, in the Kahl territory, in 599 h.—which should be 589 h.—after taking Kailinar, that Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar presented himself, for it was in 589 h. that he moved from Bihir to invade Lakhanawash. See note 7, page 558. He was received with such distinction, and so many marks of favour were shown to him, that the chiefs and ministers of Kuchb-ud-Din's vice-regal court became filled with envy and hatred of Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar, and they began to calumniate him to Kuchb-ud-Din, and to report expressions of a scornful nature towards himself on the part of Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar which he had never used. It happened, upon the occasion of Kuchb-ud-Din's holding a public audience in the Kashi-i-Safed [White Castle], that a rampant elephant was brought forward for inspection, and these envious persons began saying, in a disdainful and contemptuous manner, that there was no who would venture to stand before that elephant, the like of which was not to be found in Hind. Kuchb-ud-Din, in whose mind they had succeeded in creating an unfriendly feeling towards Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar, proposed to him an encounter with the elephant. He agreed at once, and, with the mace he held in his hand, dealt it one blow, but that blow was so effectual that the elephant made off.

This anecdote is somewhat differently related by another writer, who says that these malignants stated to Kuchb-ud-Din that Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar was desirous of encountering an elephant, and that Kuchb-ud-Din had a white one, which was rampant, and so violent that the drivers were afraid of it, and which he directed should be brought on the course for Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar to encounter. He approached it near enough to deal it such a blow on the trunk with his mace as at once put it to flight.

After his performing this feat, Kuchb-ud-Din distinguished him with still greater favour. He conferred upon him a special dress of honour of great value and a large sum of money; and Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar, having donned the robe, added money of his own to Kuchb-ud-Din's gift, and distributed the whole among those present, and left the assembly with increased renown and honour. Kuchb-ud-Din further distinguished him by giving him a standard and other insignia, and confirmed him, on the part of his master, the Sultan, in the government of the tracts he had subdued, and such further conquests as he might make in the Lakhapawat territory; and Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar returned to Billar.

Here is a rich specimen of the history taught at present, at least, in the University of Calcutta, as it is from the "History of India" by Mr. Marshman:—"Kootub lost no time in dispatching one of his slaves, Bukhtiyar Ghiyaf, who had risen to command, by his native genius, to conquer Benar. The capital was sacked, and the country subdued, and the army returned within two years to Delhi, bending beneath the weight of plunder. An attempt was soon after made to supplant Bukhtiyar in his master's favour, but it was defeated by the prowess he exhibited in a single combat with a lion, which his enemies at court had forced on him. This event established him still more firmly in the confidence of Kootub, who sent him, in 1203, to reduce Bengal."

Now, in the whole of this statement, there is not one atom of truth, and in no author, Muhammadan or Hindii, will such a statement be found.
he received, and the gifts bestowed upon him by Sultan Kutb-ud-Din, became envious of Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar, and, at a convivial banquet, they treated him in a reproachful and supercilious manner, and were deriding him and uttering inuendoes; and matters reached such a pitch that he was directed to combat with an elephant at the Kasr-i-Safed [White Castle]. With one blow, which he dealt the elephant on the trunk with his mace⁶, the elephant fled discomfited.

When Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar gained that distinction, Sultan Kutb-ud-Din ordered him a rich robe of honour from his own special wardrobe, and conferred considerable presents upon him. The Sultan [likewise] commanded the Amir to make him presents, and he received such a number of gifts as could not be contained within the limits of writing. Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar moreover, in that same assembly, dispersed the whole of those presents and bestowed them upon the people; and, with the special imperial⁷ honorary robe, he departed, and set out towards Bihār.

Fear of him⁸ operated exceedingly in the hearts of the unbelievers of the different parts of the territories of Lakhanawati and Bihār, and the countries of Bang and Kamrud. Trustworthy persons have related after this manner, that the fame of the intrepidity, gallantry, and victories of Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar had [also] reached Rāe Lakhmanīah⁹, whose seat of government was the city of Nūdīlah, and who was a very great Rāe, and had been on the throne for a period of eighty years.

At this place, an Anecdote respecting the circumstances of that Rāe, which had been heard [by the writer], is here recorded; and it is this, that, when his father was

---

⁶ See Elliot: India, vol. ii. page 306. Curs signifies a mace, not a "battle-axe." In some modern copies of the text the words "fled discomfited" are left out, and we have instead "Muhammad-i-Bakht-yar pursued the elephant:" no more.

⁷ One of the robes probably which Kutb-ud-Din had himself received from his master, hence it is called a "Sultāni" robe.

⁸ His intrepidity and valour.

⁹ Another writer styles him Rāe Lakhmīah [rečē], intended, no doubt, for the Sanskrit लक्खमाण son of Rāe Lakhman [rečē]. See list of kings of Bangālah in Abū-l-Faṣl's A'īn-i-Akbarī, and Dr. Blochmann's translation, and note ⁷, page 559.
removed from this world, Rāe Lakhmanīah was in his mother’s womb. The crown was placed on the belly of his mother, and all girded up their loins in her service. The Rāes of Hind used to hold their family in great importance, and were wont to consider them in the position of Khalifah\(^1\) by descent.

When the birth of Lakhmanīah drew near, and the signs of giving birth became manifest to his mother, she assembled the astrologers together\(^2\), and they made observation whether the horoscope was auspicious. With one accord they represented: “If this child should be born at this hour, it will be unfortunate exceedingly, and will never attain unto sovereignty; but, if it should be born two hours subsequent to this time, it will reign for eighty years.” When his mother heard this conclusion from the astrologers, she commanded that she should be suspended with her head downwards, with her two legs bound together; and the astrologers were placed in order that they might continue to observe the horoscope. When the time came, they agreed that the [auspicious] hour of birth was now arrived. She directed that she should be taken down, and forthwith Lakhmanīah was born\(^3\). On reaching the ground, his mother, unable any longer to endure the agony of labour, died, and Lakhmanīah was placed upon the throne \(^4\).

He reigned for a period of eighty years, and trustworthy persons have related to this effect, that, little or much, never did any tyranny proceed from his hand; and whosoever preferred a request to him for anything, other than one lak [one hundred thousand] he did not bestow, after the manner of the beneficent Sulțān, Kuṭb-ud-Din, the Hātim of his time. It has been narrated on this wise, that,

\(^1\) The words “Khalifah by descent” [کورت خلیفه], here used by our author, and Peshswī, by others, plainly indicate that his family was looked upon in the light of heads or supreme leaders in spiritual, not temporal matters, and Rāe Lakhmanīah, not as a “powerful monarch” and “lord paramount,” for power of that kind he evidently did not possess. Compare Elliot’s INDIA, vol. ii. page 307.

\(^2\) There is not a word about “Brāhmans” in the best copies of the text.

\(^3\) Here is a specimen of the difference in idiom in the text, which I have before referred to. The oldest set of MSS. have لکہمہ تولد شد and the more modern لکہمہ را ولادان امد

\(^4\) His nobles, or rather the chief men of his kingdom—his late father’s ministers probably—carried on the government until such time as Rāe Lakhmanīah was able to assume the direction of affairs.
as in that country, the kaurî [shell] is current in place of silver 4, the least gift he used to bestow was a lak of kaurîs. The Almighty mitigate his punishment [in hell]!

I now return to the history of Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār. When he returned from the presence of Sultān Kūtb-ud-Dīn, and subdued Bihār 5, his fame had reached the hearing of Rāe Lakhmaṅlāh, and the different parts of his dominions likewise. A number of astrologers, wise men, and counsellors of his kingdom presented themselves before the Rāe, and represented, saying: “In our books of the ancient Brāhmans they have foretold that this country will fall into the hands of the Turks 7, and the time of its fulfilment has drawn near. The Turks have subjugated Bihār 8, and next year they will surely come into this country. It is expedient for us that the Rāe should consent 9 so that he, along with the whole people, should be removed from the country in order that we may be safe from the molestation of the Turks.”

The Rāe replied, saying: “Is there any token given in your books with respect to this man who is to subdue our country?” They replied: “The indication of him is this, that, when he stands upright on his two feet, and lets down his two hands, his hands will reach beyond the point of his knees in such wise that the fingers will touch the calves of his legs 1.” The Rāe answered: “It is advisable that

---

4 In every copy of the text collated, with the exception of two, which have jital, the word silver is used. In 1845 the rūpī was equivalent to 6,500 kaurîs, and a lak would be equal to a fraction over fifteen rūpīs. In ancient times they may have been estimated at a higher rate, but a lak of kaurîs could not have been a very desirable present to obtain, or a very convenient one. See note 4, page 383.

5 Our author must mean when Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār returned from the presence of Malīk Kūtb-ud-Dīn, whither he had gone after he subdued Bihār, because he did not go to Kūtb-ud-Dīn before, even by his own account. All the copies of the text, however, are as above.

6 But their predictions did not go so far as to foretell that the Calcutta University “History of India” would turn the Turks into Ghulāf Afghāns.

7 “Have this year subjugated Bihār, and next year will come into this country,” according to the Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh.

8 Compare Elliot: INDIA, vol. ii. page 308, where this sentence is translated: “It was therefore advisable that the Rāe should make peace with them” (یا مراجعه لکثری نوردو does not signify to make peace with the Turks, but to consent, approve, agree to, judge expedient, &c., their proposal.

9 Lit. “legs,” i.e. the leg in its true sense, the part below the knee. In ELLIOT the words ساق پا have been translated “shins.”
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trustworthy persons should be despatched in order that they may, in a proper manner, investigate those peculiar characteristics." In accordance with the Rāe's command, they sent trustworthy persons, and they made investigation respecting this matter, and, in the external form and figure of Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār, those characteristics they found.

When they became assured of these peculiarities, most of the Brāhmans and inhabitants of that place left, and retired into the province of Sankanāt, the cities and towns of Bang, and towards Kāmrūd; but to begin to abandon his country was not agreeable to Rāe Lakhmanīah. The following year after that, Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār caused a force to be prepared, pressed on from Bihār, and suddenly appeared before the city of Nūdīah, in such wise that no more than eighteen horsemen could keep up with him, and the other troops followed after him. On reaching the gate of the city, Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār did not molest any one, and proceeded onwards steadily and sedately, in such manner that the people of the place imagined that mayhap his party were merchants and had brought horses for sale, and did not imagine that it was Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār, until he reached the entrance to the palace of Rāe Lakhmanīah, when he drew his sword, and commenced an onslaught on the unbelievers.

At this time Rāe Lakhmanīah was seated at the head of his table, and dishes of gold and silver, full of victuals, were placed according to his accustomed routine, when a cry arose from the gateway of the Rāe's palace and the interior of the city. By the time he became certain what

2 All but the two oldest copies have Sāhān [from साह, which signifies merchants, shopkeepers, and the like—ineffensive people, not “chiefs.”
3 In the best and oldest copies of the text, Sanknāt—سکنات—is plainly written, with the exception of two, which have Sāknāt—سکنات The Zubdatut-Tawāfīk also has Sāknāt; but other works, including the Tabaḵāt-i-Akbar and the Taḵkaraat-ul-Mulūk, say Jaghnāth. The part meant by our author more probably refers to a province of eastern Bang.
4 The more modern copies of the text have làwdaar—لاودار—one even has لودار instead of لودی लोड़ा
5 The text varies in different copies here. It appears from the above remark, that traders were in the habit of bringing horses from Bihār into the Rāe's territory, and such is stated by some other more modern writers.
6 Not "at dinner" necessarily: it might have been the morning meal.
was the state of affairs, Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār had dashed forwards through the gateway into the palace, and had put several persons to the sword. The Rāe fled bare-footed by the back part of his palace; and the whole of his treasures, his wives, and [other] females, his domestics and servants, his particular attendants, were taken, and the Musalmāns captured a number of elephants, and such a vast amount of booty fell to their lot, as cannot be recorded. When the whole of Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār’s army arrived, and the city and round about had been taken possession of, he there took up his quarters; and Rāe Lakhmaṇīah got away towards Sankanāt and Bang, and there the period of his reign shortly afterwards came to a termination. His descendants, up to this time, are rulers in the country of Bang.

The Rāe, on hearing of the arrival of Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār, was dumbfounded. He fled alone and unattended, and succeeded in reaching a boat, and escaped. His boundless treasures, the accumulations of eighty years, fell into the possession of the Musalmāns; and a large portion of them, the greatest rarities, were transmitted to Malik Kūṭh-ud-Dīn, for the Sultān. According to Munfi Shīām Parshād, who wrote an account of Gaur [Gauḍah—i.58] for Major William Franklin [In referring to this work I shall call it the Gaur MS.], Rāe Lakhmaṇīah ruled from 510 to 590 H., which is correct. It was in the early part of the last-mentioned year that Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār took Nūdīlah.

His rule extended over a period of twelve years, and he was assassinated in the middle of the year 602 H.

Mr. Thomas, however, in his "PATHĀN KINGS OF DEHLĪ," page 110, says Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār, whom he erroneously makes "Sīpūl sādār" of Awadh, "in A.H. 599, pushed his forces southward, and expelled, with but little effort, the ancient Hindu dynasty of Nūdīlah." Here is an error of ten years: Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār moved from Bihār in 589 H., and in the following year took Nūdīlah by surprise. Were 599 H. correct, his sway over Lakhmaṇīah would have been less than three years, as he was assassinated about the middle of 602 H. See note 8, page 516, para. next to last, and note 9, page 572.

8 Here, as previously, some copies have Sāknāt, and the other authors, previously referred to, Jagnāth and Kāmrūd.

9 In some copies, the period of his life, &c.

The Rājāh, it is said, escaped in a boat to Bīḵrām-pūr or Wīḵrām-pūr. We shall also find that Sūṅgāṅw, near Bīḵrām-pūr, continued to be a place of refuge for those who were discontented at Gaur, and was not finally reduced for a long time after the overthrow of Rāe Lakhmaṇīah, who had a son, Madhob Sen, who had a son, Sū Sen, who by Hindūs is considered the last ruler. Bīḵrām-pūr is about eight miles south-east, from Dākakh, and is said to have been the principal residence of Balāl Sen, the predecessor of Adisūr, who preceded Lakhman Sen, the predecessor of our author’s Lakhmaṇīah, but he sometimes resided at Gaur, which did not become the
After Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār possessed himself of that territory [Rāe Lakhmanfah's], he left the city of Nūdfa in desolation, and the place which is [now] Lakhanaṇawatī he made the seat of government. He brought the different parts of that territory under his sway, and instituted therein, in every part, the reading of the Khuṭbah, and the coining of money; and, through his praiseworthy endea-

The name of Rāe Lakhmanfah's capital was spelt Nūdfa until the time of Aurangzeb, when words ending in —hā-i-mukhtafī—were ordered to be written with ١—as Nudfa.

Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār destroyed Nūdfa, and, leaving it in desolation, passed onwards [Rauṣat-ush-Safā says "he passed beyond the territory of the Rāe"], and, in place of that capital, founded another city [or town] at the place, according to the Tabākāt-i-Akbarī, where Lakhanaṇawatī has been [درود روست], and which, at this time [reign of Akbar], they call Gaur. The Gaur MS. says he made the mouza' [place, village, district] of Lakhanaṇawatī, his capital, now twelve miles from the Gang. The Mirāīt-i-Jahān-Numā says "he founded a city as his capital in the territory of Lakhanaṇawatī," which signifies Gaur of Bangālah, "at the place where Lakhanaṇawatī was." Budā'uni says Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār "destroyed the idol temples of the infidels and erected masjids and other buildings, and built a capital in his own name [١] which is now called Gaur." Gaur or Gudaḥ was the name of a division of the present country or tract styled Bangālah as well as of its ancient capital, and its inhabitants were Gaūriyā or Gaūdhiyā. According to Abū-I-Faẓl, the fort of Gaur was founded by Balāl Sen, the second of the Sen dynasty, one of eight [in some copies, seven] kings who reigned 106 years, out of which Balāl Sen reigned fifty years. According to the same author, the last of this dynasty was Rājāh [or ]-uṣūl. It would seem, from this, that the most ancient name of the city was Gaur, afterwards changed to Lakhanaṇawatī, and subsequently styled Gaur again. The emperor Humāyūn named it Bakht-âbâd. Bangālah itself is sometimes styled Jamnâ-tul-Bilâd. See note ١, page 584.

١ There is not a word in the text about causing "his name to be read in the Khuṭbah and struck on the coins." See note ١, page 572. According to the Zubdat-ut-Tawārikh he established "the Khuṭbah and money of Islam," and its author copies our author almost verbatim. Other writers, on the contrary, state that, having brought all the surrounding territory under his sway after the capture of Nūdfa, he assumed a canopy of state, read the Khuṭbah for himself, and issued coin in his own name, which is not correct. He would naturally have issued coin in the name of the Sulṭān, Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥam-
vours, and those of his Amirs, masjids, colleges, and monasteries [for Darweshes], were founded in those parts. Of the booty and wealth [taken] he despatched a large portion to the presence of Sultan Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak.

After some years had passed away 4, and he had ascertained the state of the different mountain tracts of Turkistan and Tibbat to the eastward of Lakhanawaṭī, the ambition of seizing the country of Turkistan and Tibbat began to torment his brain; and he had an army got ready, and about 10,000 horse were organized. In the different parts of those mountains which lie between Tibbat and the country of Lakhanawaṭī are three races of people, one called the Kūnch 6, the second the Mej [Meg], and the third the Tīhārū; and all have Turk countenances. They have a different idiom too, between the language of Hind and Turk 7. One of the chiefs of the tribes of Kūnch and Mej, whom they were wont to call Ḥalī, the Mej, fell into the hands of Muḥammad-i-Baḵt-yār, the Khalj, and, at his hand also, the former adopted the Muḥammadan faith.

mad-i-Sām, to whom he appears to have been most loyal [see page 571]. He had no occasion whatever to issue money in the name of Malik Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, who was still a slave; and Muḥammad-i-Baḵt-yār only died the same year in which Sultan Muʿizz-ud-Dīn was himself assassinated. See Thomas: “Pathān KINGS OF DEHLI,” page 110, and note 1, and Elliot: India, vol. ii, page 309.

4 This expedition must have been undertaken towards the close of the year 601 H. After Muḥammad-i-Baḵt-yār had acquired great power and grandeur, he turned his thoughts to the acquirement of further territory in Tibbat and Turkistan without probably being aware of the distance to be traversed, and the difficulties to be surmounted. He set out with a force of about 12,000 horse according to the generality of accounts, but the Raṣṭat-ūṣ-Ṣafā has “10,000 horse, and 30,000 foot” which is certainly incorrect.

Tibbat was a well-known name in our author’s time even, and yet Hamilton in his “Description of Hindostan,” vol. ii, page 566, makes the rash statement that it does not appear that the name Tibet is anywhere in general use to designate the province according to the European acceptance of the word! This may be true as to Tibet, for the country here referred to is written and called Tibbat.

The “Threro” [Tīhārū] caste, according to Buchanan, composes the greatest portion of the population that are dwellers in the plain of “Saptari,” in Makwānpūr adjoining the Mūrang on the north-west; and the inhabitants of the Mūrang to the east of Bijālpūr [Wijayāpūr] are chiefly Konč, and on the lower hills are many of the Megh, Mej, or Megh tribe.

6 Our author’s ideas of east and west are rather obscure, as may be noticed at page 431. In this instance he means to the north and north-east.

7 In some copies the nasal n is left out—Kūčh.

7 In some of the more modern copies of the text, “Hind and Tibbat,”
He agreed to conduct Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār into those hills, and act as guide; and he brought the latter to a place where there is a city, the name of which is Burdhan [koṭ]. They relate, after this manner, that, in ancient times, Shāh Gūstāsib returned from the country of Chīn, and came towards Kāmrūd, and, by that route, got into Hindūstān, and founded that city [Burdhan-koṭ]. A river flows in front of that place, of vast magnitude, the name of which is Beg-matī; and, when it enters the country of Hindūstān, they style it, in the Hindūf dialect, Samund [ocean]; and, in magnitude, breadth, and depth, it is three times more than the river Gang.

To the banks of this river Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār came; and 'Alī, the Mej, joined the army of Islām; and, for a period of ten days, he took the army up the river among the mountains, until he brought it to a place where, from remote times, they had built a bridge of hewn stone, and consisting of upwards of twenty arches. After the army

---

8 The oldest and best copies generally have as above, but two add koṭ, and one copy gives the vowel points. The Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh also has Burdhan twice. The other copies collated have Murdhan and Murdhan-koṭ, and the printed text, in a note, has Durdhan [Wurdhan?] as well as Burdhan.

9 Some copies have Gūstāsib and some Garghāsib, and one has Güdarz. In the Dīrāsī records Garghāsib, son of Zau, is not mentioned as having had aught to do with Hind or Chīn. The wars of Gūstāsib with Arjāsib, son of Aftāsīyāb, King of Türān, are narrated, but there is no mention of Gūstāsib's going into Türān or Chīn; but his son, Isfandiyār, according to the tradition, reduced the sovereign of Hind to submission, and also invaded Chīn. In the account of the reign of Kāi-Khusraw, Güdarz, with Rustam and Gīw, invaded Turkistān to revenge a previous defeat sustained from Aftāsīyāb who was aided on this occasion by the troops of Suflāb and Chīn, and Shankal, sovereign of Hind, was slain by the hand of Rustam. Our author, in another place, states that Güstāsib, who had gone into Chīn by that route, returned into Hind by way of the city of Kāmrūd, and that up to the period of the invasion of Kāmrūd by Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Yūz-Bak-i-Ṭughrīl Khān, governor of Lakhānawatī—some years after Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār's expedition—twelve hundred "hoards" of treasure, all still sealed as when left there by Güstāsib, fell into the hands of the Musalmāns!

1 The name of this river in the best and oldest copies is as above, but some others, the next best copies, have Beg-hatī, Bak-matī, or Bag-matī, and others have Bag-matī, Mag-matī, and Nang-matī, or Nag-matī. Bag-matī is not an uncommon name for a river, and is applied to more than one. The river of Nīpāl, which lowers down is called the Grandhak, is called Bag-matī.

2 Samund or Samudr or Samudra, the ocean. One of the best copies of the text has "when it enters the ocean or see [i.e.] of Hindūstān," &cc.

8 The reader cannot fail to notice that considerable discrepancy exists here in our author's statements respecting this river and bridge. From what he
of Islām passed over that bridge, he [Muḥammad-i-Bakhtyār] installed there, at the head of the bridge, two of his

says about the size we are led to conclude that this river, Beg-matī or Bekmatī, must be the Brahmatanpur; but what part of it is the question to be solved. When he adds that it is more than three times broader and deeper than the Ganges—and, of course, equally liable to inundation—the idea of its being spanned by a stone bridge of above twenty [i.e. between twenty and twenty-five] arches, shows that the narrator, or his informant, must have grossly exaggerated. We may suppose our author’s idea of the size of the Ganges was derived from what he had seen of that river on his journey from Dīhīl to Lakhānaqawatī; but, if we only take its average breadth at Banaras during the height of the hot season, viz. 1500 feet, our author’s river will be a mile or more in breadth; and, if we believe that this bridge consisted of even twenty-five arches, each of them would be above seventy yards in the span. Is this at all probable?

At page 561, our author says ‘Alī, the Mej, brought them to a place where stood the town of Burdhan or Aburdhan-kot, in front of which flows the mighty river Beg-matī, which, on entering Hindustān, they call the Samund, but the great bridge is not mentioned in connexion with it. He then says that ‘Alī, the Mej, joined the Musalmān forces on the banks of this river, and then conducted them “up the river for a period of ten days’ journey” [some 200 miles or more, even at the low computation of twenty miles a day for cavalry without encumbrance, would have brought them near to the Šānpū or upper part of the Brahmatanpur in Tibbat], and then, not before, they reached this great bridge, but no river is mentioned. At page 565, it is said that after passing this great river the forces pushed on for a further period of fifteen days [200 or 250 miles, even allowing for the extra difficulty of the country] when the open country of Tibbat was reached. Here it would appear that ‘Alī, the Mej, joined them, beyond the territory of the Rājah of Kāmrūd, and the latter’s message to Muḥammad, son of Bakhtyār, confirms it; but, farther on [page 569], this great bridge is said to be in [but probably adjoining] the Kāmrūd territory, or words to that effect.

The boundaries of Kāmrūd are very loosely described by Musalmān authors, and they apply the name to all the country between the northern frontiers of Muḥammadan Bangālah and the hills of Bhūṭān, its southern boundary being where the Lakhiyah river separates from the Brahmatanpur.

From the distinct mention of Tibbat and Turkistān, by others as well as by our author, together with other observations made by him, it is evident that Muḥammad, son of Bakhtyār—and his forces—marched from Dīf-w-kot, or Dībh-kot, in Dīnjā-tpur district, the most important post on the northern frontier of his territory, keeping the country of the Rājah of Kāmrūd on his right hand, and proceeding along the bank of the river Tīstah, through Sikhim, the tracts inhabited by the Kūŋgh, Mej, and Tihāru, to Burdhan-kot. They were not in the territory of the Rājah of Kāmrūd, as his message shows; yet, when the retreat is mentioned, the Musalmāns were, invested in the idol-temple by his people, but no reference is made to this temple’s being near the bridge in the account of their advance. Pushing onwards from Burdhan-kot, which may have been situated on a river, on the tenth day the Musalmāns reached the bank of the great river where was the bridge of stone “of above twenty arches.” If the town of Burdhan or Aburdhan-kot was situated on the farther side of the great bridge, it is strange Muḥammad, son of Bakhtyār,
own Amirs, one a Turk slave, and the other a Khalj, with troops, in order to guard it until his return. Then Muḥam-
did not occupy it, when he left a detachment behind to guard the bridge, and still more strange that, when he, on his retreat, reached the bridge and found two arches broken, he did not occupy that town, and compel its inhabitants to repair it or furnish him with all he required, and the means of crossing. If its gates had been closed against him, we can easily imagine why he would have had to take shelter in the great idol-temple, or that even with the town open to him, why he would prefer a strong post such as this was; but the town is never again mentioned by our author, although we might suppose this the place for obtaining boats or wood and other materials for rafts, and people to construct them. If the distance between this river and Dīw-kot was only ten days' journey, it was not impossible to have obtained aid from thence. All the Muḥammadan histories with which I am acquainted state that the Musalmāns entered Tibet. In my humble opinion, therefore, this great river here referred to is no other than the Tīstah, which contains a vast body of water, and, in Sikhim, has a bed of some 800 yards in breadth, containing, at all seasons, a good deal of water, with a swift stream broken by stones and rapids.

The territory of the Rāes of Kamūrūd, in ancient times, extended as far east as this; and the fact of the Rāe of Kamūrūd having promised Muḥammad-ī-Bakht-yār to precede the Musalmān forces the following year, shows that the country indicated was to the north. The route taken by the Musalmāns, therefore, was, I am inclined to think, much the same as that followed by Turner and Pemberton for part the way, and that the Musalmān army then turned more to the east, in the direction taken by Pemberton, for it is plainly indicated by our author, at page 568, that the tract entered lay between Kāmrūd and Tīrhot. The Sānpū, as the crow flies, is not more than 150 or 170 miles from Dīmā-pūr, and it may have been reached; but it is rather doubtful perhaps, whether cavalry could reach that river from the frontier of Bengal in ten days.

In the Twentieth Volume of the Bengal Asiatic Journal, page 291, is a drawing by Dalton of the bridge of Sīl Hāko, described by Hannay. "It is situated," he says "on the high alley [one of Ghāyās-ud-Dīn, Iwās's causeways probably] which, no doubt, formed at one time the principal line of land communication with ancient Gohāhātī (Pragiyotisha) in Western Kamrup [Kāmrūd]." He also considers that "it is not improbable that this is the stone bridge over which Bactyār Khiłji [Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār] and his Tartar cavalry passed previous to entering the outworks of the ancient city of Gohāhātī, the bridge being but a short distance from the line of hills bounding Gohāhātī on the N.N.W. and W., on which are still visible its line of defences extending for many miles on each side from the N.W. gate of entrance or pass through the hills. The Mohammedan general is said to have been obliged to retreat from an advanced position (perhaps Chārdār), hearing [?] that the Raja of Kamrup had dismantled the stone bridge in his rear; now it is quite evident from the marks on the stones of the platform, that they had been taken off and replaced somewhat irregularly."

The fact of the existence of this stone bridge is certainly curious, but I think it utterly impossible that it can be the bridge our author refers to. In all probability it is one of the bridges connecting "the high alley" or causeway above referred to, and there must have been very many of a similar description at one time. It is but 140 feet long and 8 feet broad, and has no regular arches—this last fact, however, is not material, as the partitions or divisions might be so
mad-i-Bakht-yar, with the whole of the rest of his forces, passed over that bridge; and, when the Râe of Kâmrûd became aware of the passage [over the bridge] by the conquering troops, he despatched trustworthy persons [saying]:—"It is not proper, at this time, to march into the country of Tibbat, and it is necessary to return, and to make ample preparations, when, in the coming year, I, who am the Râe of Kâmrûd, agree that I will embody my own forces, and will precede the Muḥammadan troops, and will cause that territory to be acquired." Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yar did not, in any way, accept this counsel, and he turned his face towards the mountains of Tibbat.

described by a person who had never seen the bridge—and consists of slabs of stone only 6 feet 9 inches long, and built, not over a mighty river three times broader and deeper than the Ganges, but across "what may have been a former bed of the Bar Nadî, or at one particular season a branch of the Brahmaputra, now indicating a well defined water-course through which, judging from the marks at the bridge, a considerable body of water must pass in the rains, and, at that season, from native accounts, the waters of the Brahmaputra still find access to it."

The chief reasons why the bridge of Sîl Hâko could not have been that over which Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yar, crossed with his army may be summed up as follow:—

I. Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yar marched through the tract between Kâmrûd and Tîrhit into Tibbat in a totally different direction to Gwâhâfat, through defiles and passes over lofty mountains, while between Gaur, Dîw-kot, and Gwâhâfat not a single pass or hill of any consequence is to be found.

II. In no place is it stated in this history, which is, I believe, the sole authority for the account of this expedition, that the Musalmâns entered "the outworks" of any city, much less those of Gwâhâfat.

III. If the great river in question was the Brahâ putr, and the small branch of it which the Sîl Hâko bridge spanned were too deep to be crossed by the Musalân cavalry, how could they have crossed the mighty Brahâmâ putr itself? They would not have been able to do so even had this bridge been intact.

IV. Our author states, that, after passing the great river and bridge, they pushed on for fifteen days—some 200 or 300 miles at least—and that, from the farthest point they reached, the great city, garrisoned by Turks, was five leagues distant. This description will not suit the situation of Gwâhâfat, which is quite close to the Brahâmâ putr.

V. The table-land of Tibbat is distinctly stated as the point reached, and it is subsequently mentioned that Chângiz Khân wished to proceed from the vicinity of the Kâbûl river, through northern India, and get into China by the same route through Tibbat as Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yar, took, but Gwâhâfat would have led him much away from the part of China he wished to reach.

VI. The disaster which befell the Musalmâns was owing, not only to two arches of the great bridge being destroyed, but to some of the horsemen of the force riding into the river and succeeding in fording it for the distance of a bow-shot,
One night, in the year 642 H., the author was sojourning, as a guest, at the dwelling of the Mu’tamad-ud-Daulah, a trusted vassal of Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār, at a place, in the territory of Lakhānawati, between Diw-kot and Bekānwhā, at which place his host was residing, and heard from him the whole of this account. He related on this wise, that, after passing that river, for a period of fifteen days, the troops wended their way, stages and journeys, through defiles and passes, ascending and descending among lofty mountains. On the sixteenth day the open country of Tibbat was reached. The whole of that tract was under cultivation, garnished with tribes of people and populous villages. They reached a place where there was a fort of which alone would be at least as many yards as the bridge is feet broad, and even then they had gone but a small part of the distance; and rafts and floats were being constructed to enable the army to cross.

VII. We are not told that this disaster took place in the rainy season, and few would attempt an expedition into Ashām at that period of the year. At all other times the water-course in question would have been fordable to cavalry.

VIII. And lastly, can any one imagine that two gaps of 6 feet 9 inches each—equal to 13 feet and 6 inches in all, would have deterred the Musalmān cavalry from crossing? The very bambūs, or brushwood, growing near would have enabled them to have, at once, repaired two such gaps, even if a tree or two could not have been found. A door from the idol temple would have been sufficient to have spanned the gap, of 13 feet 6 inches, or rather two gaps of 6 feet 9 inches, even if the materials which they had obtained to make rafts and floats had not been available for that purpose.

One reason why it might seem that Gowāhatā is referred to is, the fact of there being a famous idol temple near it, or close to the Brahmā-purtr; but there is no mention whatever that such was the case with regard to the great idol temple near the bridge and scene of Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār’s disaster. Moreover, the city of Gowāhatā is close by the river, while the Musalmāns after reaching Burdhan[kot] marched upwards 10 days until the great bridge was reached, and then pushed on from this bridge for 15 days more before they reached the fort, which even then was 5 leagues distant from the city of Kar-battan—the march from Burdhan[kot] to the fort 5 leagues from Kar-battan occupying in all 26 days. Can any argument be more conclusive than this?

4 In a few copies 641 H. Mu’tamad-ud-Daulah is but a title. In Elliot, instead of our author, Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār, who had been dead forty years, is made to halt at the place in question.

The oldest copies have Bekānwhā or Begānwhā and one Bekāwān or Begāwān—as plainly written as it is possible to write, while two more modern copies have Saqāwān [Sāqāwān]. The remainder have Bangāwān and Sagāwān. See Blochmann’s “Contributions to the Geography and History of Bengal,” note †, to page 9. It is somewhat remarkable that this place also should be confounded with Sāqāwān; but in the copies of the ‘ IN-I-AKBAR I have examined I find Baklānā—بکلانہ—instead of Baklā—بکلام—but this can scarcely be the place referred to by our author.
great strength, and the Musalmān army commenced plundering the country around\(^8\). The people of that fort and town and the parts adjacent advanced to repel the Muḥam-
dadan army, and they came to a battle\(^7\). From day-
break to the time of evening prayer a fierce encounter was
continued on, and a great number of the Musalmān army were
died and wounded. The whole of the defensive arms of
that host were of pieces of the spear bāmbū\(^8\), namely, their
hairasses and body armour, shields and helmets, which were
all slips of it, crudely fastened and stitched, overlapping
each other]; and all the people were Turks, archers, and
dressed with] long bows\(^9\).

When night came, and the Musalmān force encamped,
number [of the enemy], who had been made prisoners,
were brought forward, and they [the Musalmāns] made
inquiry of them. They stated on this wise, that, five leagues' istance from that place, there was a city which they called

\(^6\) The text varies considerably here.

\(^7\) Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh says the Musalmāns began to attack the fort.

\(^8\) There is nothing here, even in the printed text, which is correct [with the
exception of رضي اب — i.e. رضي اب — being altered to رضي اب but not رضي اب is silk], which
warrants the reading of this passage as in Elliot [INDIA: vol. ii. page 311]—
‘The only weapons of the enemy were bamboo spears, and their armour,
shields, and helmets, consisted only of raw silk strongly fastened and sewed
together.” A “shield” and “helmet” of raw silk would be curiosities certainly.

The bāmbū referred to in the text is the male bāmbū—the young shoots, prob-
ably, used for spear shafts—for which the hollow bāmbū is not adapted. Had
the spear bāmbū not been so plainly indicated in the text, we might suppose the
armour to have been something after the manner of that worn by the Duffahs,
and to have been formed of sections of the hollow bāmbū laid overlapping each
other as the rings of a coat of mail, but the male bāmbū could not be used in
this manner, and, therefore, their armour, shields, &c., must have been of
pieces of the male bāmbū overlapping each other, as in the literal translation
above. An officer with the Duffah expedition, writing on December 8, 1874,
says: “Each man has over his forehead a top-knot of his own hair, and now and
then a bit of bear’s fur in addition. Through this he runs a skewer of metal—
silver if he can afford it—and by means of the top-knot and skewer he fastens
on his cane-work helmet, a sort of close-fitting skull-cap worn on the back of
the head. This helmet is usually ornamented with the upper portion of the
hornbill’s beak to save the head from sword cuts. Round his loins over the
hips he wears a number of thin bāmbū or cane rings, unattached to one
another,” See also Dalton: ETHNOLOGY OF BENGAL, page 32.

\(^9\) Budā‘ūni says the people of this place were of the lineage [!] of Güḥtāsib
[Gurghāsib ?], and that the fortress had been founded by him. That author does
not give his authority for this statement. Our author says, at page 561, that
Güḥtāsib founded Burdhan[kot]. The Khalj were a Turkish tribe certainly,
but they had emigrated from northern Turkistān ages before this period.
Kar-battan [or Kar-pattan\(^1\), or Karar-pattan], and [that] in that place would be about 50,000 valiant Turk horsemen, archers\(^2\); and that, immediately upon the arrival of the Musalmān cavalry before the fort, messengers with a complaint had gone off to the city to give information, and that, at dawn next morning, those horsemen would arrive.

The author, when he was in the territory of Lakhānawatī, made inquiry respecting that [before] mentioned city. It is a city of great size, and the whole of its walls are of hewn stone, and [its inhabitants] are an assemblage of Brāhmans and Nūnīs\(^3\), and that city is under the authority of their Mihtar [chief or lord], and they hold the pagan faith\(^4\); and every day, at daybreak, in the cattle-market\(^5\) of that city, about one thousand five hundred horses are sold; and all the tangahan\(^6\) horses which reach the Lakh-

---

\(^1\) The text varies considerably here, and great discrepancy exists with respect to the name of this important place. The oldest copy has كرمان باتن—Kar-battan, possibly Kar-pattan, the next two oldest and best have كرمان باتن—Kar-battan or pattan, but what seems the second, in this word may be ن—thus Karan-pattan. All the other copies have كرمان باتن—Karam-battan or Karam-pattan. Zubdat-ut-Tawārif\(^7\) has كرمین باتن which might be read Karshīn, or Karan-ten; and some other histories have كرمین سین—Karam-sīn.

\(^2\) The best Paris copy—fondly imagined to be an "autograph" of our author's, but containing as many errors as the most modern copies generally, has 350,000!

\(^3\) In the oldest copies Nūnīán, and in the more modern ones Tūnīán.

\(^4\) One copy of the text however has "but-parastān" idol-worshippers.

\(^5\) The original is "dīn-i-tarsā-f." The word tarsā is very widely applied, to signify a Christian, also a worshipper of fire or gabr, a pagan, an infidel, and an unbeliever, and not to "any established religion" other than that of Islām. Here our author, I think, refers to Christians—Manicheans—the whole of Tārtary and other northern parts of Asia contained a vast number of Christians. See Travels of Father Avril and others in Tārtary. Christians are constantly referred to in the annals of the Mughals.

\(^6\) The word used is "nakhkhās," which signifies a seller of captives, cattle, or booty of any kind, and is used to signify a place where cattle and slaves are bought and sold.

\(^7\) The printed text, and that only, has copti\(^{as}\)-tang bastah. Where the editor or editors got this from it would be difficult to conceive, but they could scarcely have intended to convey the meaning of horses brought down with saddles on their backs ready to be mounted. The words in the copies of
aṅawaṭli country they bring from that place. The route by which they come is the Mahamhā-i [or Mahanmhā-i] Darah⁷ [Pass], and this road in that country is well known; for example, from the territory of Kāmrūd to that of Tirhut are thirty-five mountain passes, by which they bring the tangahan horses into the territory of Lakhanawaṭli.

In short, when Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār found out the nature of that tract—the Musalmān troops being fatigued and knocked up by the march, and a large number having been martyred and disabled on the first day—he held consultation with his Amirs. They came to the conclusion that it was necessary to retreat, in order that, next year, after making ample arrangements, they might return again into that country⁸. When they retreated, throughout the whole route, not a blade of grass nor a stick of firewood remained, as they [the inhabitants] had set fire to the whole of it, and burnt it; and all the inhabitants of those defiles and passes had moved off from the line of route. During these fifteen days⁹ not a pound of food nor a blade of grass did the cattle and horses obtain¹; and all

Our author's text are —  môn—asp-i tangahan—they are still well known. Stewart, who had no printed text to go by, read the name pretty correctly—"Tanghan." Hamilton says these horses are called Tanyan or Tangun "from Tangushan the general appellation of that assemblage of mountains which constitutes the territory of Bootan," &c. He must mean Tangistān, the region of tang or defiles. Abū-l-Faḍl also mentions these horses in his Ā’īn-i-Akbari—"In the lower parts [wāli] of Bangālāh near unto Kūj [Kūch], a [species] of horse between the gūṭ [gūnth] and the Turk [breed] is produced, called Tangahān," which is also written Tānganān, and gives the spelling of the word, but they are not born "ready saddled." Compare Elliott: INDIA, vol. ii. page 311, and note 4, and see Dr. Blochmann's translation of the Ā’īn.

⁷ Some copies—the more modern—and the best Paris copy, leave out the name of this pass, and make  مشتی—passes—of it; and, while all the oldest copies [and Zubdat] have Tirhut, the more modern ones have Tibbat.

⁸ Although the Musalmān troops were, at length, victorious, their victory cost them so many lives, and so many men were disabled, that, on hearing of a force of 50,000 valiant Turks being stationed so near at hand, Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, held counsel with his chiefs, and it was determined to retreat next day. Our author appears totally unable to tell the truth respecting a Musalmān reverse, even though such reverse may be far from dishonour, and may have been sustained under great difficulties or through their being greatly outnumbered.

⁹ The fifteen days which the retreat occupied he seems to mean, as the same route in going took that number of days. Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh says that the inhabitants also destroyed the roads—obstructed them, cut them up in some way.

¹ They must have brought some provisions and forage along with them, or
[the men] were killing their horses and eating them, until they issued from the mountains into the country of Kāmrūd, and reached the head of that bridge. They found two arches of the bridge destroyed, on this account, that enmity had arisen between both those Amīrs [left to guard it], and, in their discord, they had neglected to secure the bridge and protect the road, and had gone off, and the Hindūs of the Kāmrūd country had come and destroyed the bridge.

On the arrival at that place of Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār with his forces he found no way of crossing, and boats were not procurable. He was lost in surprise and bewilderment. They agreed that it was necessary to halt in some place, and contrive [about constructing] boats and floats, in order that they might be enabled to pass over the river. They pointed out an idol temple in the vicinity of that place [where they then were] of exceeding height, strength, and sublimity, and very handsome, and in it numerous idols both of gold and silver were deposited, and one great idol so [large] that its weight was by conjecture upwards of two or three thousand manās of beaten gold. Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār and the remainder of his followers sought shelter within that idol-temple, and began to devise means for obtained some food, or must have eaten each other. Perhaps our author means that many perished for want of sufficient food.

Two arches of any possible span—but not over seventy yards—would not have been such a difficult matter to repair, so near primeval forests, and with a town or city, as previously stated, close to the bridge. The town, however, is not once mentioned on their return.

The Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh states that the two Amīrs, to spite each other, abandoned guarding the bridge, and each went his own way. Budā‘īnīf says they first fought, and afterwards abandoned the bridge.

This remark, and what follows at page 571 again, tends to show that the bridge in question was beyond the Kāmrūd territory, although, a line or two before, it is stated that they came into Kāmrūd and reached the head of the bridge. See also page 561 and note.

Where was 'All, the Mej, all this time? He is not again mentioned; but his kinsmen are; and the country people are not even referred to, although the Hindūs of Kāmrūd are, see page 571.

Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh says "necessary to occupy some place until boats and floats could be constructed."

The more modern copies have ṭīqāls.

According to other authors, when the Musalmāns reached the bridge, they were filled with amazement and horror at finding two of its arches broken. The two Amīrs, who had been left to guard it, had not been on good terms for some time prior to being stationed there; and, as soon as their
obtaining wood and rope for the construction of rafts and
crossing the river, in such wise that the Rāe of Kāmrūd
became aware of the reverses and helplessness of the Musal-
mān army. He issued commands to the whole of the
Hindūs of the country, so that they came pouring in in
crowds, and round about the idol-temple were planting
spiked bāmbūs in the ground, and were weaving them to-
gether, so that it [their work] was appearing like unto walls.

When the Musalmān troops beheld that state of affairs,
they represented to Muḥammad-i-Baḵt-yār, [saying]:—
"If we remain like this, we shall all have fallen into the
trap of these infidels; it behoveth to adopt some means
chief had left, their hostility broke out afresh, and such was their enmity that,
rather than not prosecute their own designs against each other, they abandoned
it. After they had departed, the Rāe of Kāmrūd, on becoming aware of it,
sent his men, and destroyed the two arches. It is strange the names of these
two Amīrs are not given by our author, as his informant, previously mentioned,
must have known who they were.

Finding the bridge thus impassable, Muḥammad-i-Baḵt-yār determined to
occupy some strong place until such time as materials could be obtained to
enable them to effect the passage of the river. Here also we might expect to
hear something of the town and its people, but, as I have mentioned in
note 9, page 561, it is doubtful whether our author meant it to be under-
stood that Burdhan-kōt was on the banks of the Bag-madf river, where this
bridge was.

Spies brought information that there was an immense and exceedingly
strong idol-temple near by, and that was occupied by the Musalmāns accord-
ingly. Another writer states that they were ignorant, when they advanced,
of the existence of this temple.

Budāʿūnī states that the Musalmāns only passed the night in the idol-
temple, but this statement is absurd. Where were materials to be obtained
from, during the night, to make rafts?

9 Tīḫū Lāmbū or Digāṛchah, the seat of a Lāma in Lat. 29° 7′ N., Long.
89° 2′ E., a great monastery only 180 miles from Rang-pūr of Bengal [said
to have been founded by Muḥammad, son of Baḵt-yār], answers nearly to the
description of the idol-temple referred to, but it is on the southern not the
northern bank of the Sānpū river, and a few miles distant, and our author
says it was a Hindū temple. Perhaps, in his ideas, Hindūs and Buddhists
were much the same. From this point are roads leading into Bhūtān and
Bengal.

As soon as the Rāe of Kāmrūd became aware of the helpless state of
the Musalmāns, and that they had sought shelter in the great idol temple,
he gave orders for his people to assemble. They came in hosts, and began to
form a stockade all round it, by planting, at a certain distance, not their
"bamboo spears" as in Elliot [INDIA, vol ii. page 317], but bāmbūs spiked
at both ends [the mode of making stockades in that country], and afterwards
woven strongly together, which forms a strong defence. Ralph Fitch says,
respecting Kūčh "all the country is set with bamboos or canes made sharp at
both ends and stuck into the earth," &c.
whereby to effect extrication." With one accord they made a rush, and all at once issued from the idol-temple, attacked one point [in the stockade], and made a way for themselves, and reached the open plain, and the Hindüs after them. When they reached the river bank the Musal- mâns halted, and each one, to the best of his ability, sought means of crossing over. Suddenly some few of the soldiers urged their horses into the river, and, for the distance of about an arrow flight, the water was fordable. A cry arose in the force that they had found a ford, and the whole threw themselves into the water, and the Hindüs following them occupied the river's bank. When the Musal- mâns reached mid-stream, [where] was deep water, they all perished, [with the exception of] Muḥammad-i-Bakht- yār, who, with a few horsemen, a hundred more or less, succeeded, by great artifice, in effecting the passage of the river; and all the rest were drowned.

After Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār emerged from the water, information reached a body of the Kūnch and Mej. The guide, 'Alī, the Mej, had kinsmen at the passage, and they

1 Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, seeing through the object of the Hindüs, issued from the idol-temple at the head of his troops, and, with considerable difficulty, made a road for himself and followers. Having done this, he took up a position and halted on the bank of the river Bag-madī. Here he appears to have remained some days, while efforts were then made to construct rafts, the Hindüs not venturing to attack them in the open.

2 This is related differently by others. The Musalmâns were occupied in crossing, it is said, or, perhaps, more correctly, about to make the attempt with such means as they had procured, when a trooper [some say, a few troopers] rode his horse into the river to try the depth probably, and he succeeded in fording it for the distance of a bow-shot. Seeing this, the troops imagined that the river, after all, was fordable, and, anxious to escape the privations they had endured, and the danger they were in, as with the means at hand great time would have been occupied in crossing, without more ado, rushed in; but, as the greater part of the river was unfordable, they were carried out of their depth, and were drowned.

After his troops had been overwhelmed in the Bag-madī or Bak-madī, Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, with the few followers remaining with him, by means of what they had prepared [a raft or two probably], succeeded, with considerable difficulty, in reaching the opposite bank in safety, and, ultimately reached Dīw-kot again. Apparently, this river was close to the Mej frontier.

Budā'ūnī states that those who remained behind [on the river bank] fell martyrs to the infidels; and, that of the whole of that army but 300 or 400 reached Dīw-kot. He does not give his authority however, and generally copies verbatim from the work of his patron—the Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbarī—but such is not stated therein.

3 In some copies of the text, "one of the soldiers."
came forward to receive him [Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār], and rendered him great succour until he reached Diw-kot.

Through excessive grief sickness now overcame him, and mostly out of shame at the women and children of those of the Khālīj who had perished; and whenever he rode forth all the people, from the house-tops and the streets, [consisting] of women and children, would wail and utter imprecations against him and revile him, so that from henceforth he did not ride forth again. During that adversity he would be constantly saying: “Can any calamity have befallen the Sultān-i-Ghāzi that my good fortune hath deserted me!” and such was the case, for at that time the Sultān-i-Ghāzi, Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad-i-Sām, had attained martyrdom. In that state of anguish Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār became ill, and took to his bed, and died.

Some have related that there was an Amīr of his, ‘Alī i-Mardān, a Khālīj of great intrepidity and temerity, to whose charge the fief of Nārān-go-e [or Nārān-ko-e] was made over. When he obtained information of this disaster he came to Diw-kot, and Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār was confined to his bed through sickness, and three days had passed since any person was able to see him. ‘Alī-i-Mardān in some way went in unto him, drew the sheet

---

4 Zubdat-ut-Tawāraḵkh says “by the time he reached Diw-kot, through excessive grief and vexation, illness overcame him; and, whenever he rode forth, the women of those Khālīj who had perished stood on the house-tops and reviled him as he passed. This dishonour and reproach added to his illness,” &c.

Rauṣat-uṣ-Ṣafā said his mind gave way under his misfortunes, and the sense of the disaster he had brought about resulted in hopeless melancholy.

8 This was certainly just about the time of that Sultān’s assassination.


7 The name of this fief or district is mentioned twice or three times, and the three oldest copies, and one of the best copies next in age, and the most perfect of all the MSS., have تارکوکتی as above in all cases; and one—the best Peters burg copy—has a jāzīn over the last letter in addition, but all four have the کامیک. The Zubdat-ut-Tawāraḵkh also has تارکوکتی—Nārān-go-e or Nārnako-e. The next best copies of the text have تارکوکتی—in which, in all probability, the i has been mistaken for ī. The L. O. L. MS. 1952, the R. A. S. MS., and the printed text, have تارکوکتی—whilst the best Paris copy has this latter word, in one place, and تارکوکتی in other places; and another copy has تارکوکتی. In Elliot, vol. ii. page 314, it is turned into “Kūuf” in one place, and, sixteen lines under, into “Nārkotf.”

8 Zubdat-ut-Tawāraḵkh says “no one used to go near him”—the way of the world to desert one in misfortune.
from his face, and with a dagger assassinated him. These events and calamities happened in the year 602 H.9

VI. MALIK 'IZZ-UD-DIN, MUḤAMMAD, SON OF SHERĀN 1,
KHALJĪ, IN LAKHĀNAWAṬĪ.

Trustworthy persons have related after this manner, that Muḥammad-i-Sherān and Aḥmad-i-Sherān were two brothers, two among the Khalj Amirs in the service of Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār; and, when the latter led his troops towards the mountains of Kāmrūd and Tibbat, he [Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār] had despatched Muḥammad-i-Sherān, and his brother, with a portion of his forces, towards Lakhān-or and Jāj-nagar 2. When the news of these events [related above] reached Muḥammad-i-Sherān, he came

9 This date shows that the territory of Lakhānawatī was taken possession of in 590 H., the year in which Malik Kūtb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, took up his quarters at Dihlī. The conquest of Lakhānawatī is accounted among the victories of Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, because it took place in his reign. Kūtb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, was at this time still a slave, and neither attained his manumission nor the title of Sultān until some time after the death of Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār. See note 7, page 558.

Some authors consider him an independent sovereign, and say that he "reigned" for twelve years. He certainly ruled in quasi independence for that period; but, from the expressions made use of by him in his last sickness, he evidently was loyal to Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, and he probably paid some nominal obedience to Malik Kūtb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, as the Sultān's Deputy at Dihlī. It is not to be wondered at that Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, neither issued coin in his own name, nor in the name of his sovereign's slave: whilst that sovereign was alive—the latter would have been an impossible act. See Thomas, PATHĀN KINGS, note 1, page 111; and note 8, page 559.

1 Also styled, by some other authors, Sher-wān. Sher-ān, the plural of sher, lion, tiger, like Mard-ān, the plural of mard, man, is intended to express the superlative degree. The izāfat here—Muḥammad-i-Sherān—signifies son of Sherān, as proved beyond a doubt by what follows, as two brothers would not be so entitled.

8 Compare ELLIOT, vol. ii. page 314. The Paris copy of the text, the I. O. L. MS., the R. A. S. MS., and the printed text, have "to Lakhānawatī and Jāj-nagar"; but the rest have Lakhān-or or Lakh-or, and Jāj-nagar. No doubt Lakhān-or is meant in the copies first mentioned, and probably substituted for, by ignorant copyists.

Some writers state that Muḥammad-i-Sherān was "Hākim of Jāj-nagar" on the part of Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār, but such cannot be. Jāj-nagar was an independent Hindū territory [see note 4, page 587]; but most authors agree with ours that Muḥammad-i-Sherān was despatched against— or probably to hold in check—Jāj-nagar during Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār's absence on the expedition into Tibbat; and he was, doubtless, feudatory of Lakhān or [see note 6, page 584], which lay in the direction of the Jāj-nagar territory.
back from that quarter, and returned again to Dīw-koṭ, performed the mourning ceremonies [for Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār], and from thence [Dīw-koṭ] proceeded towards Nāran-go-e³, which was 'Alī-i-Mardān’s sief, seized 'Alī-i-Mardān, and, in retaliation for the act he had committed, imprisoned him, and made him over to the charge of the Koṭ-wāl [Seneschal] of that place, whose name was Bābā⁴, Koṭ-wāl, the Ṣafāhānī [Iṣfahānī]. He then returned to Dīw-koṭ again, and assembled the Amīrs together.

This Muḥammad-i-Sherān was a man of great intrepidity and energy, and of exemplary conduct and qualities⁶; and, at the time when Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār sacked the city of Nūdīah, and Rāe Lakhmanfah took to flight, and his followers, servants, and elephants became scattered, and the Musalmān forces proceeded in pursuit of spoil, this Muḥammad-i-Sherān, for the space of three days, was absent from the army, so that all the Amīrs became anxious on his account. After three days they brought information that Muḥammad-i-Sherān had taken eighteen elephants along with their drivers in a certain jangal [forest], and was retaining them there, and that he was alone⁶. Horsemen were told off, and the whole of these elephants were brought before Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār. In fact, Muḥammad-i-Sherān was a man of energy [combined] with sagacity⁷.

³ Other writers state that Muḥammad-i-Sherān, on hearing of the fate of their chief, Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār, returned at once from Jāj-nagar [from Jāj-nagar towards Lakhān-or] with his force, proceeded to Dīw-koṭ, and performed the funeral ceremonies; and then marched from Dīw-koṭ to Bār-sūl—Jāj-nagar—and secured the assassin, 'Alī-i-Mardān, and threw him into prison. After performing this act, he returned to Dīw-koṭ again. See note ⁷, next page. In Elliot this is turned into “they returned from their stations, and came dutifully to Deokot”; but 'Alī-i-Mardān in the printed text, does not mean “dutifully,” but “mourning ceremonies.”

⁴ Familiarly so styled perhaps.

⁵ The Jahān-Ārā, which does not mention 'Alī, son of Mardān, at all, calls Muḥammad-i-Sherān bloodthirsty, and greatly wanting in understanding, thus confounding him with 'Alī-i-Mardān.

⁶ He had managed to take these elephants and their drivers on the day of the surprise of Nūdīah, but, being quite alone, he was unable to secure them, and had to remain to guard them until such time as aid should reach him. Information of his whereabouts having reached Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, he sent out a detachment of horse to bring him in with his spoil.

⁷ Muḥammad, son of Sherān, was an intrepid, high-minded, and energetic man, and, being the chief of the Khalj Amīrs, on their return to Dīw-koṭ, the
The Khajj Mariks in LakhanaWati.

When he imprisoned 'Alī-i-Mardān, and again departed [from Dīw-kot], being the head of the Khajj Amīrs, they all paid him homage*, and each Amīr continued in his own fief. 'Alī-i-Mardān, however, adopted some means and entered into a compact with the Koṭ-wāl [before mentioned], got out of prison, and went off to the Court of Dihlī*. He preferred a petition to Sulṭān Koṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, that Kāe-māz, the Rūmī [native of Rūmiliā], should be commanded to proceed from Awadh towards the territory of LakhanaWati, and, in conformity with that command, [suitably] locate the Khajj Amīrs.

Malik Ḩusām-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, the Khajj, at the hand of Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār, was the feudatory of Gangūrī [or Kankūrī?]*, and he went forth to receive Kāe-māz the principal Amīrs were assembled in council together, and they chose Muḥammad-i-Sherān as their ruler and sovereign; and they continued to pay homage to him. It seems strange that the city of LakhanaWati is seldom mentioned, while Dīw-kot is constantly referred to by various authors; and, from what our author himself says at page 578, it would appear to have been the capital at this period.

* Some copies have "they all paid him homage," &c., and, after the word fief, insert "until."

* 'Alī-i-Mardān managed to gain over the Koṭ-wāl, and was allowed to escape. He succeeded in reaching Dihlī, and presented himself before [the then] Sulṭān Koṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, who received the ingrate and assassin with favour. Both our author and other writers, in mentioning his escape in their account of Muḥammad-i-Sherān's reign, make it appear that 'Alī, son of Mardān, at once succeeded in inciting Koṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, against Muḥammad-i-Sherān, and inducing him to despatch Kāe-māz to LakhanaWati; but this is not correct. 'Alī, son of Mardān, accompanied Koṭb-ud-Dīn to Gharnīn [where he reigned—in riot—forty days], and was taken captive by the troops of I-yal-dūz, and released or escaped again before these events happened, as will be mentioned farther on.

* The text differs here. Some copies have: "So that Kāe-māz, the Rūmī, received orders, on which he proceeded from Awadh to LakhanaWati;" but the majority are as above. The Zubdat-ut-Tawāriḵī, however, clears up the meaning of the last clause of the sentence:—"That he, Kāe-māz, should proceed into LakhanaWati, in order that each of the Khajj Amīrs, who were in that part, might be located in a suitable place, and to make certain districts their fiefs." That work, however, immediately after, states that the Khajj Amīrs, having shown hostility towards him [Kāe-māz], opposed him in battle, and were defeated, and that, in that engagement, Muḥammad, son of Sherān, was slain. Compare Elliot, too, here.

* Of the four best and oldest copies of the text, two have Gangūrī or Kankūrī—کاگری and two, Gasgūrī or Kaskūrī—but this latter appears very doubtful. Five other good copies agree with the first two, but three others have respectively کاگری and کاگری. Some other works, including the Tabākāt-i-Akbarī, state that Ḩusām-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, was the feudatory
Rūmī, and, along with him, proceeded to Dīw-kot; and, at the suggestion of Ḏae-māz, the Rūmī, he became the feoffee of Dīw-kot. Ḏae-māz, the Rūmī, set out on his return [into Awadh], and Muḥammad-i-Sherān, and other Khalj Amīrs, assembled together, and determined upon marching to Dīw-kot. Ḏae-māz, whilst on his way back [hearing of this], returned again, and an encounter took place between the Khalj Amīrs and him, and Muḥammad-i-Sherān and the Khalj Amīrs were defeated. Subsequently, disagreement arose among themselves, in the direction of Maksadah and Sanṭūs, and Muḥammad-i-Sherān was slain; and there his tomb is.

VII. MALIK 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN, 'ALĪ, SON OF MARDĀN, KHALJĪ.

'Ali-i-Mardān, the Khalj, was a man of vast energy, vehement, intrepid, and daring. Having obtained release of Kalwā-f or Galwā-f—or Kalwā-fn or Galwā-fn—the n of the latter word is probably nasal.

No sooner had Ḏae-māz turned his back upon the scene than Muḥammad, son of Sherān, and the rest of the Khalj Amīrs, determined to recover Dīw-kot out of the hands of Ḥusān-ud-Dīn, 'Iwaṣ.

These two names are most plainly and clearly written in four of the best and oldest copies of the text, with a slight variation in one of Maksidah [the Maxabad probably of the old maps and old travellers] and Makṣidah and Makṣidah, and for Surūs and Sūrūs. Of the remaining copies collated, one has and two others, and the rest and Makṣidah. The Ṭabaḵāt-i-Akbar has only.

The Gau MS. says he was killed in action after a reign of eight months, and, in this latter statement, the Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh and some other works agree; but the period seems much too short from the assassination of Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, to his death for reasons mentioned in the following note, or the country must have remained some time without a ruler before 'Ali-i-Mardān succeeded. Kauẓat-ud-Safā makes a grand mistake here. It says that Muḥammad-i-Sherān, after having ruled for a short period, became involved in hostilities with a Hindi ruler in that part, and was killed in one of the conflicts which took place between them.

'Alī-i-Mardān, that is to say, 'Ali, the son of Mardān, was energetic and impetuous; but he was not endowed with sense or judgment, and was notorious for boldness and audacity, for self-importance, haughtiness, excessive vanity and gasconade, and was cruel and sanguinary. After he escaped from confinement for assassinating his benefactor, Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yār, when lying helpless on his death-bed, he proceeded to Dihlī and presented himself before Ḫūṭb-ud-Dīn, İ-bak, who, at that time, had acquired the sovereignty of Dihlī, and was well received. He accompanied Ḫūṭb ud-Dīn to Ghaznīn at the time that he filled the throne of Ghaznīn, as our author says, “for a period of forty days,” in carousal and debauchery. There 'Alī
from imprisonment at Nāran-go-e [or Nāran-ko-e], he came to the presence of Sulṭān Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, and accompanied him towards Ghaznī; and he became a captive in the hands of the Turks of Ghaznī. A chronicler has related in this manner, that one day, when he was out hunting along with Sulṭān Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, he began saying to one of the Khālij Amirs, whom they used to style Sālār [a leader, chief] Zaffir: "What sayest thou if, with one arrow, I should slay Tāj-ud-Dīn, Yal-duz, within this shikār-gāh [chase] and make thee a sovereign?" The Sālār, Zaffir, the Khālij, was a very sagacious person, and he was shocked at this speech, and prohibited him from

fell a captive into the hands of the Turks of Ghaznī, the partizans of Sulṭān Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-duz, at the time of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn's precipitate retreat probably. Some authors, however, state, and among them the authors of the Ṭabakat-i-Akbarī, and Zubdat-ut-Tawārikh, that in one of the conflicts of that time he was taken prisoner by the Turks—Ṭabakat-i-Akbarī says, the Turk-māns—and was carried off into Kāshgār, where he remained for some time. He, at length, managed to reach Hindūstān again, and proceeded to Dihlī, and presented himself at the Court of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, who received him with great favour and distinction. The fact of his having been a captive in the hands of his rival's—I-yal-duz's—partizans was enough to insure him a favourable reception. Kuṭb-ud-Dīn conferred upon him the territory of Lakhānawatī in sīf, and he proceeded thither and assumed the government. It must have been just prior to this, and not immediately after the escape of 'Ali-i-Mardān, that Kās-māz was sent from Awadh to Lakhānawatī, or, otherwise, between the defeat of Muḥammad, son of Sherān, by the latter, and Sherān's death, and the nomination of 'Ali-i-Mardān by Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, Lakhānawatī would have been without a ruler during the time that Kuṭb-ud-Dīn took to proceed from Dihlī to Ghaznī, where he remained forty days, and back to Dihlī again, and eight months, which is said to have been the extent of Muḥammad-i Sherān's reign, seems much too short a space of time for this expedition, and 'Ali-i-Mardān's captivity in Kāshgār and his escape and return. The accounts of this period are not satisfactorily given in any work. [See page 526, and para. two of note 8 for the year in which Kuṭb-ud-Dīn had to make such a precipitous retreat from Ghaznī; and, moreover, it appears that Kuṭb-ud-Dīn did not return to Dihlī again, but continued at Lāhūr up to the time of his death.

7 Here is another specimen of difference of idiom, though not so great as in some places, occurring in different copies of the text. This sentence is thus expressed in one set of copies: 'اړل کی چینی روہت کرکد—ارل کی چینی کیفس—ارول چینی کیفس—ارول چینی کیفس—ارول چینی روہت کرکد—and, in another nalqat چینی روہت کرکد، اند کیفس، اند کیفس. 8 Compare Elliot, vol. ii. page 315. If we are to translate the name of the Sālār, Zaffir [not Zafār, which signifies victory], why not translate the name of Kuṣām-ud-Dīn, Iwāq, in fact, all the Arabic names in the book? It does not follow that this person was a "victorious general," but he was a chief whose name was Zaffir, signifying, in 'Arabic, overcoming all difficulties, successful, triumphant, victorious, &c.
[the committal of] such a deed. When 'Ali-i-Mardān returned from thence, the Sālār, Ṣaffīr, presented him with two horses and sent him away.

When 'Ali-i-Mardān came back again into Hindūstān, he presented himself before Sultan Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, and received an honorary robe, and was treated with great favour, and the territory of Lakhanawatī was assigned to him. He proceeded towards Lakhanawatī, and, when he passed the river Kons¹, Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, Iwaẓ, the Khalj, [feudatory] of Dīw-kot, went forth to receive him, and 'Ali-i-Mardān proceeded to Dīw-kot² and assumed the government, and brought the whole of the country of Lakhanawatī under his sway.

When Sultan Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, passed to the Almighty's mercy, 'Ali-i-Mardān assumed a canopy of state, and read the Khuṭbah in his own name³; and they styled him by the title of Sultan Alā-ud-Dīn. He was a blood-thirsty and sanguinary man. He sent armies in different directions, and put the greater number of the Khalj Amirs to death. The Rāes of the adjacent parts became awed of him, and sent him wealth and tribute. He began granting investitures of different parts of the realm of Hindūstān, and the [most] futile bombast began to escape his lips. Both in the assembly, and in the audience-hall, he would declaim about the country of Khurāsān, of Irāk, of Ghaznīn, and of Ghūr, and idle nonsense he began to give tongue to, to such degree, that they used [in jest] to solicit from him grants of investiture of Ghaznīn and of Khurāsān,

⁹ Another writer relates this somewhat differently. He says that 'Ali-i-Mardān, one day, accompanied the suite of Sultan, Tāj-ud-Dīn, I-yal-dūz, when he went to the chase—but this is scarcely compatible with his being a captive—on which occasion he said to the Sālār Ṣaffīr: “What sayest thou to my finishing the career of the Sultan with one thrust of a spear, and making thee a sovereign?” Ṣaffīr, however, was a man of prudence and integrity, and had no ambition of gaining a throne by assassinating his benefactor. He therefore gave him a couple of horses and dismissed him, and he returned to Hindūstān.

¹ In some copies Kons as above, and in others Kos. without the nasal n. Some other writers call this river the Konsa and Kosa.

² In some copies “from Dīw-kot.” Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, Iwaẓ, appears to have been a kind of Vicar of Bray, from what is stated previously, and here.

³ He also coined in his own name, according to the Tabakat-i-Akbarī and Burāīnī.
and he would issue commands accordingly [as though they were his own].

Trustworthy persons have narrated after this manner, that there was, in that territory [Lakhanawati], a merchant who had become indigent, and his estate was dissipated. He solicited from 'Ali-i-Mardan some favour. 'Ali-i-Mardan inquired [from those around]: “From whence is that man?” They replied: “From Safahân [Iṣfahân].” He commanded, saying: “Write out the investiture of Safahân as his fief,” and no one could dare, on account of his great ferocity and unscrupulousness, to say: “Ṣafahân is not in our possession.” Whatever investitures he conferred in this way, if they would represent: “It is not under our control,” he would reply: “I will reduce it.”

So that investiture was ordered to be given to the merchant of Safahân—that indigent wretch, who lacked even a morsel and a garment of rags. The chief personages and intelligent men, there present, in behalf of that destitute man, represented, saying: “The feudatory of Safahân is in want of resources for the expenses of the road, and for the preparation of equipage, to enable him to take possession of that city and territory;” and he ['Ali-i-Mardan] commanded a large sum of money to be given to that person for his necessary expenses. The nature of 'Ali-i-Mardan’s presumption, cruelty, and hypocrisy

---

4 Our author’s mode of relation is not over plain. “His vanity and bombast,” says another writer, “was such that he fancied Irân and Tûrân belonged to him, and he began to assign their different kingdoms and provinces amongst his Amfâr.” The fact is that he was mad; and it is somewhat remarkable that a subsequent Sulṭân of Dîhî, who was mad after the same fashion, should also have been of the Khâlî tribe. Compare Elliot, vol. ii. page 316. The author of the Gauâr MS. in his innocency, says that after his [Kûth-ud-Dîn, ʻI-bak'a’s] death, for two years and some months, the sway of this same 'Ali-ud-Dîn was acknowledged as far as Khurâśân and Iṣfahân, &c. ! ! ! Where Lakhanawât? where Khurâśân and Iṣfahân?

5 The word used in the text is mişāl [mîsâl]: such a term as “jâgîr” is not used once in the whole work, because it is a comparatively modern term.

6 Our author relates this anecdote differently from others. The destitute merchant, who wanted something that would furnish him with food and raiment, refused to accept the investiture of Iṣfahân; and the Wazîr, who out of terror of 'Alî were afraid to tell him so, represented that the Ḥâkim of Iṣfahân was in want of funds for the expenses of his journey thither, and to enable him to assemble troops in order to secure possession of his fief. This had the desired effect.
amounted to this degree; and, together with such conduct, he was [moreover] a tyrant and a homicide. The weak and indigent [people] and his own followers were reduced to a [perfect] state of misery through his oppression, tyranny, and bloodthirstiness; and they found no other means of escape save in rising against him. A party of the Khalj Amirs conspired together, and slew 'Ali-i-Mardân, and placed Malik Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, 'Iwaẓ, upon the throne.

The reign of 'Ali-i-Mardân was two years, or more or less than that.\(^7\)

---

\(^7\) Two years and some months was the extent of his reign, but most authors say two years. I do not know whether all the copies of Budā'ī's work are alike, but in two copies now before me he says plainly, that 'Ali-i-Mardân reigned two and thirty years. Perhaps he meant two or three years, but it is not usual to write three before two in such cases. The Gaur MS. states that he reigned from the beginning of the year 604 H. to 605 H., and yet says that Ḫūtb-ud-Dīn, I-bak, died in his reign!

\(^8\) Compare Thomas, "PATHĀN KINGS OF DEHLI," pages 8 and 112, and Elliot, INDIA, vol. ii., page 317. The Arabic word 'Iwaẓ [عوض] has a meaning, but "Auz" and "Auz" none whatever. One or two other authors state that he was the son of 'Iwaẓ; but this is doubtful: there is no doubt, however, of his father's name being Ḥusain. His correct title is Shītān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn. Malik Ḥusām-ud-Dīn was his name before he was raised to the sovereignty.

\(^*\) Two of the oldest copies of the text, and some of the more modern ones, are as above, and some other works confirm this reading; but one of the oldest and best copies, and the Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh, have Pusht for Pushtah. Both words are much the same in signification, however, as explained in the text itself, namely, "an ascent, a bluff, steep, eminence, hill, hummock, mound," &c.; but Pashtah [See Elliot: INDIA, vol. ii. page 317] signifying a flea, a gnat, &c., is impossible. Pusht is the name of a dependency of Bādghais, and is very probably the tract here meant. Afros is the active participle, used as an adjective, of خیس (afaus) to inflame, to set on fire, to burn, to light up, to enkindle, &c., the literal translation of which is "the burning hill, or mound," and may refer to a volcano even at that time extinguished.
to a place within the limits of Wālištān on the borders of the mountain tracts of Ghūr. Two Darweshes\(^1\), clothed in ragged cloaks, joined him; and said to him: "Hast thou any victuals with thee?" 'Iważ, the Khalj, replied: "I have." He had, along with him on the ass, a few cakes of bread, with some [little] dainty\(^2\), by way of provision for the journey, after the manner of travellers. He removed the load from the ass, spread his garments [on the ground], and set those provisions before the Darweshes. After they had eaten, he took water, which he had among his baggage, in his hand, and stood up in attendance on them. After those Darweshes had made use of the victuals and the drink, thus hastily produced, they remarked to each other, saying: "This excellent man has ministered unto us: it behoveth his act should not be thrown away." They then turned their faces towards 'Iważ, the Khalj, and said: "Ḥusām-ud-Din! go thou to Hindūstān, for that place, which is the extreme [point] of Muḥammadanism, we have given unto thee\(^3\)." In accord with the intimation of those two Darweshes, he returned again from that place [where he then was], and, placing his family\(^4\) on the ass, came towards Hindūstān. He joined Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yār, and his affairs reached such a point that the coin of the territory of Lakhaṇaẁaṭī was stamped, and the Khūṭbah thereof read, in his name, and they styled him by the title of Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-Dīn\(^5\). He made the city of Lakhaṇa-

\(\)Wālištān is evidently the same tract as is referred to at page 319, which see. The oldest and best copies of the text, and some modern copies, are as above, but some of the latter have داشان والسیان and three others, including the best Paris copy, have زاوستان.

\(^1\) They are thus styled in the original: there is not a word about "fakirs" in any copy of the text.

\(^2\) Meat, fish, vegetables, or the like, eaten with bread to give it a savour: in Elliot: INDIA, vol. ii, page 317, it is styled "traveller's bread," and the ass is turned into a mule.

\(^3\) In some copies, and in some other works, Khwājah, equivalent here to "Master," in others Sālār—head-man, leader or chief. Another author says the Darweshes said: "Go thou, O Khwājah, into Hind, for they have assigned unto thee one of the kingdoms of the region of Hind."

\(^4\) The text varies a little here. The oldest copy has "his family" as above, whilst, of the other copies, some have "his children," some "his wife," and some "his wife and children."

\(^5\) After the chief men had put the tyrant, 'Alī, son of Mardān, to death, they, with one accord, set up Ḥusām-ud-Dīn, 'Iważ, son of Ḥusain, who, originally, was one of the petty chiefs of the Khalj country on the border of
watt the seat of government, and founded the fortress of Basan-koṭ, and people from all directions turned their faces towards him.

Ghūr, a man of virtuous mind and high principles, and endowed with many excellent qualities, both of mind and body. He is said, by several authors, to have been very handsome, and they confirm all our author says about him in this respect.

* In Elliot, vol. ii. page 317, "He made the city of Lakhnaust the seat of his government, and built a fort for his residence!" The printed text has حصار بكت—fortress of Bas-koṭ.

From our author’s remark here, it would appear as though Sultan Ghīyāṣ-ud-Dīn, ’Iwāz, had been the first to make the city of Gaur or Lakhanaũwatī his capital. Aklālāh can scarcely have been built at this period or it would no doubt have been mentioned from its importance.

Abū-1-Faṣl states, in the Ā’in-i-Akbārī, that Lakhanaũwatī, which some style Gaur, is named Jannat-ābād, but this is an error from what is stated below by others, and was the name applied to the Sarkār or district, not to the city. He continues: "To the east of it is a great kol-āb [lake] in which is an island. To the north, at the distance of a kuroh, is a building and a reservoir, the monument of ancient times, which is called Sārahā-mer [سراها مير]. Criminals used to be confined in the building, and a good many died from the effects of the water which is very noxious."

The Haft-Iklīm, says Gaur, in the olden time, was the capital of Bangalāh, and that the fortress of Gaur was amongst the most reliable strongholds of Hindustān. “The river Gang lies to the west of it; and, on the N.E. W. and S. sides, it has seven [sic in MS.] ditches, and a citadel on the side of the Gang. The distance between [each] two ditches is half a kuroh, each ditch being about three fanāb [= 120 gas or ells] broad, and so deep that an elephant would be unable to cross it. JANNAT-ĀBĀD is the name of the tumān [district] in which Gaur is situated."

The Khuliṣat-ut-Tawārīḥ states that Lakhanaũwatī or Gaur is a very ancient city and the first capital of the country. To the east of it is a kol-āb [lake] of great size, and, should the dyke [confining it?] burst, the city would be overwhelmed. The emperor Humāyūn, when in that part, took a great liking to Lakhanaũwatī, and gave it the name of BAKHT-ĀBĀD.

Many fine buildings were erected and around the city by Sultan Firūz Shāh-i-Abū-i-Muẓaffar, Shāh-i-Jahān, the Ḥabasht [Abyssinian, yet he is included among the so-called "Pathāns"], one of which was the Chānd gateway of the citadel near the palace, a hāyāf [reservoir], and the famous lāt or manārak. Musalmāns do not erect "Jaya Shambas." The Chānd gateway was still standing some fifty years since, but hidden by the dense jungal, and is probably standing still. There were several masjids, one of which was founded by Sultan Yūsuf Shāh. According to the Portuguese writers who "aided Mohammed [Maḥmūd] against Sher Khan a Mogol general [I] then in rebellion," . . . the capital city Gouro extended three leagues in length along the Ganges and contained one million, two hundred thousand families [one million of people or two hundred thousand families, probably]. "Voyages and Transactions of the Portuguese: Castaneda, de Barros, de Faria y Souza, Antonio da Silva Meneses, &c."

The Tārīkh-i-Firūz-Shāhī says "Lakhanaũwatī acquired the by-name of Bulghāk-pūr—place of great sedition—from ژلد signifying much noise, tumult,
THE KHALJ MALIKS IN LAKHANAWATI

He was a man of pleasing mien, of exceeding handsome appearance, and both his exterior and interior were [adorned] by the perfection of mercy; and he was magnanimous, just, and munificent. During his reign the troops and inhabitants of that country enjoyed comfort and tranquillity; and, through his liberality and favour, all acquired great benefits and reaped numerous blessings. In that country many marks of his goodness remained. He founded jami’ [general] and other masjids, and conferred salaries and stipends upon good men among theologians, the priesthood, and descendants of the Prophet; and other people acquired, from his bounty and munificence, much riches. For example, there was an Imam-zadah of the capital city, Firuz-koh, whom they used to style Jalal-ud-Din, the son of Jamal-ud-Din, the Ghaznavi, who, to better his means, left his native country and came into the territory of Hindustan in the year 608 H. After some years, he returned again to the capital city, Firuz-koh, and brought back with him abundant wealth and riches. Inquiry was made of him respecting the means of his acquisition of wealth. He related that, after he had come into Hindustan, and determined to proceed from Dihl to Lakanawati, when he reached that capital, Almighty God predisposed things so that he [the Imam, and Imam’s son] was called upon to deliver a discourse in the audience-hall of Sultan Ghiyas-ud-Din, ‘Iważ, the Khalj1. That

sedition, &c.—because, from ancient times, from the period that Sultan Mu’izz ud-Din, Muhammad-i-Sam, of Dihl, conquered it [Ziyad-ud-Din, Baran, is rather incorrect here however], almost every Wali to whom the sovereigns of Dihl gave the government of Lakanawati, because of its distance from Dihl, its extent, and the number of passes intervening, if he had not rebelled himself, others have rebelled against him, and killed or dethroned him.”

? There is not a word about “his nobles.”

* An not “the” Imam-zadah: there were scores of Imam-zadahs probably at Firuz-koh. Imam signifies a leader in religion, a prelate, a priest.

9 Some copies have جماع—collection, amount, &c., and the more modern copies and the printed text جماع—signifying family, followers, dependents, &c., instead of جماع—seeking benefit, and the like. In Elliot, vol. ii. page 318, it is rendered a body of men—“He came with a body of men from his native country,” &c. 11 He was merely a priest, and did not travel attended by “a body of men.”

1 Compare Elliot, vol. ii. page 318; where this passage is translated: “the Almighty so favoured him that his name was mentioned in the Court of Ghiyasu-ud-din” !!
sovereign, of benevolent disposition, brought forth from his treasury a large chalice full of gold and silver tangahs, and bestowed upon him a present of about two thousand tangahs; and gave commands to his own Maliks and Amirs, Grandees and Ministers of State, so that each one presented, on his behalf, liberal presents. About three thousand gold and silver tangahs more were obtained. At the period of his return home [from Lakanawati] an additional five thousand tangahs were acquired in gifts, so that the sum of ten thousand tangahs was amassed by that Imām, and Imām's son, through the exemplary piety of that renowned monarch of benevolent disposition. When the writer of these words, in the year 641 H., reached the territory of Lakanawati, the good works of that sovereign, in different parts of that territory, were beheld [by him].

The territory of Lakanawati has two wings on either

---

3 The Haft-Iklīm states that the money of Bangālah was confined to the jital [always written with j—ج] according to the following table:

4 Jitals 1 Gandāh, 20 Gundahs 1 Ānah, 16 Ānahs 1 Rūpī.

"Whatever the rūpī might be, whether 10 tangahs or 100 tangahs, it was reckoned as 16 ānahs, and there was no change whatever in the jital and the gandāh." From what our author has stated in several places in this work, however, it is evident that the jital was current in the kingdom of Dīhlī, and Muḥammadan India, as well as in Bangālah. See page 603.

Firīstah [copying the Tārīkh-i-Firūz-Shāhī] states with respect to the tangah that "it is the name given to a tolāh of gold stamped, and that a tangah of silver was 50 pūls, each pūl [i.e. a piece of anything orbicular] of copper [bronze?] was called a jital, the weight of which is not known exactly, but I have heard that it was one tolāh and three-quarters of copper [bronze?]."

Another writer states that there were 25 jitalas to 1 dāmū.

The word tangah—with g not with k—signifies a thin plate, leaf, or slice [s], of gold or silver, and appears to be an old Persian word. See Thomas: Pathān Kings of Dehli, pages 37, 49, 115, 219, and 230.

According to some other writers, however, the following table is [also] used:

4 Jitals 1 Gandāh, 20 Gundahs 1 Pan, 16 Pan 1 Kahawān, 16 Kahawān [some call 20 a Riddha Kahawān] 1 Rūpī.

According to the same account, 20 kandis made a jital.

Price, in his "Retrospect of Mahomedan History," in reference to the revenue of Hindūstān, says the "Tungah," as far as he recollects, was considerably higher than the "Daum," and "conceives it was the fift of a rupee!"

4 Two copies have 644 H., which can scarcely be correct, and the remainder 641 H. Farther on he says he was in that part in 642 H. Our author appears to have set out from Dīhlī for Lakanawati in 640 H., reached it in 641 H., and returned to Dīhlī again in the second month of 643 H.

4 Of course Bang is not included, and our author mentions it separately.
side of the river Gang. The western side they call Rāl [Rāṛh], and the city of Lakhān-or⁶ lies on that side; and the eastern side they call Barind⁷ [Barindah], and the city

⁶ I can easily fancy a foreigner writing Rāl—राल—or Rād—राद—from hearing a Hindū pronounce the Sanskrit राल—राल—Rāṛh, containing, as it does, the letter which few but natives of the country can properly utter.

⁷ The printed text followed in ELLIOT has "Lakhnauti," but that is totally impossible, since it lay east, not west of the Ganges; its right pronunciation is, no doubt, Lakhān- or.

Most of the best copies of the text have Lakhān-or, both here and in other places where the same town or city is referred to; but two of the oldest and best copies have both Lakhān-or and Lakh-or both here as well as elsewhere. It appears evident to me that the n in the first word is nasal, and that its derivation is similar to that of Lakhana- wāţi, from the name of Dasarata's son, Lakh- mana, with the Hindī word चन्द्र—or, affixed, signifying limit, boundary, side, &c. = Lakhama's limit or frontier. In this case it is not surprising that some copyists left out the nasal n, and wrote Lakh-or, having probably the name read out to them. From the description of the dykes farther on in Section XXII., in the account of the different Maliks of the dynasty where the invasion of Jāj-nagar by the Musalmāns is mentioned, and the invasion of the Musalmān territory by the Rāe of Jāj-nagar, Lakhān-or lay in the direct route between Lakhana- wāţi and Katāsin, the nearest frontier town or post of the Jāj-nagar territory; and therefore I think Stewart was tolerably correct in his supposition, that what he called and considered "Nagor," instead of Lakhān-or, was situated in, or farther south even than Bīrbhūm. It is by no means impossible that Dr. Blochmann's supposition may be correct, that Lakarkundah [the Lacara- coonda of Rennell] is the place in question. It is in the right direction, but seems not far enough south; and, if any indication of the great dyke or cause- way can be traced in that direction, it will tend to clear up the point. Lakarkundah lies about eighty-five miles as the crow flies from Gaur or Lakhana- wāţi, "right away from the river," but this Mr. Dowson, in ELLIOT, appears to think a proof of its being the wrong way, and he probably fancies that it should follow the Ganges. "Right away from the river," too, in the opposite direction, distant about eighty miles, lay Dīw-koṭ—Dīw and Dīb are the same in Sanskrit and Hindī—f—the total length from place to place, allowing for deviations, being a very moderate "ten days' journey." There is no doubt whatever as to the correct direction of Jāj-nagar and its situation with regard to Lakhān-or and Lakhana- wāţi, as mentioned in note ⁴, page 587.

⁷ In some copies Barbind, but Barind or Barinda is correct. In one copy of the text the vowel points are given. I do not know the derivation of the Sanskrit word—रह Rāṛh, but चुद—Brind or Wrin, signifies a heap [high?], and it is possible that the former may signify low, depressed, being subject to inundation; and Brinda [the Barinda and Barind of the Musalmān writers], high, elevated, not being subject to inundation. Hamilton says the part liable to inundation is called Bang, and the other Barendra. See also the account of Malik Tamur Khān-i-Ḵīrān in Section XXII., where Lakhān-or is styled Lakhana- wāţi Lakhān-or.

Barind, under the name of "the Burin," is well known to sportsmen, I am told, in the present day, who apply it to the high tract of country N.W. of Rām-pūr, in the Rāj-Shahī district.

Terry says, alluding to the "two wings," "Bengala, a most spacious and
of Dźw-koṭ is on that side. From Lakhanawaṭī to the
gate of the city of Lakhaṇ-ṁor, on the one side, and, as far
as Dźw-koṭ, on the other side, he, Sulṭān Gḥiyāς-ud-Dīn,
'Īwaṣ, [caused] an embankment [to be] constructed, ex-
tending about ten days' journey, for this reason, that, in
the rainy season, the whole of that tract becomes inundated,
and that route is filled with mud-swamps and morass; and, if
it were not for these dykes, it would be impossible [for
people] to carry out their intentions, or reach various
structures and inhabited places except by means of boats.
From his time, through the construction of those embank-
ments, the route was opened up to the people at large.

It was heard [by the author] on this wise, that, when the
august Sulṭān, Shams-ud-Dīn [I-yal-timīsh], after the
decease of Malik Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh [his eldest
son], came into the territory of Lakhanawatī to suppress
the sedition of Malik Iḥtiyār-ud-Dīn-i-Balkā, the Khaljī, ¹
and beheld the good works of Gḥiyāς-ud-Dīn, 'Īwaṣ, the

fruitful Province, but more properly to be called a Kingdom, which hath two
very large Provinces within it, Purb [Pūrab] and Potor [Pachcham]; the one
lying on the East, the other on the West side of the River Ganges. * * *
The chief Cities are Rangamahat and Dekaka. ²

* Compare Elliot, vol. ii. page 319.

¹ These embankments, according to other writers likewise, were constructed
through the perseverance and forethought of Sulṭān Gḥiyāς-ud-Dīn, 'Īwaṣ.
Another author states that the "former ancient rulers of Bang, the present
capital of which is Dhākāh, on account of the vast quantity of water which
accumulates throughout the province in the rainy season, caused causeways to
be constructed twenty cubits wide and ten high, termed ḍāl [J], and, from the
proximity of these ḍāls, the people styled the province BANG-ĀL. Rain falls
without ceasing during one-half of the year in the rainy season, and, at this
period, these ḍāls appear above the flooded country."

² A European writer, writing on the province "as at present constituted," says:
"There are several remarkable military causeways which intersect the whole
country, and must have been constructed with great labour; but it is not known
at what period. One of these extends from Cooch Bahar [Kūch Bihār] through
Rangamatty [Rangamati] to the extreme limits of Assam [Aṣhām], and was
found when the Mahommedans first penetrated into that remote quarter." He,
of course, must mean the Muḥammadans of Aurangzib's reign.

Hamilton states that one of these causeways extended from the Dīwah to the
Brahmā-putr.

¹ In the list of Maliks at the end of Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh's reign,
farther on, he is styled Malik Iḥtiyār-ud-Dīn, Daulat Shāh-i-Balkā, and, by
some, is said to be the son of Sulṭān Gḥiyāς-ud-Dīn, 'Īwaṣ, and, by others, a
kinsman. Another author distinctly states that the son of Sulṭān Gḥiyāς-ud-
Dīn, 'Īwaṣ, was named Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn-i-'Īwaṣ, and that he reigned for a short
time. See also page 617.
Khali], whenever mention of Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz's name chanced to arise, he would style him by the title of "Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, Khali]; and from his sacred lips he would pronounce that there could be no reluctance in styling a man Sultān who had done so much good. The Almighty's mercy be upon them! In short, Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, the Khalji, was a monarch worthy, just, and benevolent. The parts around about the state of Lakhanaawaţ, such as Jāj-nagar, the countries of Bang, Kāmrūd, and

2 What extreme magnanimity! Reluctance or not, Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, had as good a title to be called Sultān as Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish, or any other who preceded or followed him; and, moreover, he had never been a slave, nor the slave of a slave. I-yal-timish was not his suzerain until he gained the upper hand. It was only 'Ail-i-Mardān who was subject to Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bak.

3 Compare Dowson's Elliot, vol. ii. page 319, where Jāj-nagar is made to appear as being part of the Lakhanaawatī territory: there is nothing even in the printed text to warrant such a statement.

4 Dr. Blochmann's surmises [Contributions to the Geography and History of Bengal, page 29] are quite correct with respect to Jāj-nagar. It appears to have been named after a town or city of that name, subsequently changed in more recent times to Jāj-pūr, the meaning of nagar and pūr being the same; and in the days when our author wrote, and for many years subsequently, it continued to be a kingdom of considerable power.

Before attempting to describe the boundaries of Jāj-nagar, and generally to elucidate the subject, it will be well to describe the territory of Kaḍhah-Katankah, or Gaḍhah-Katankah—for it is written both ways—which lay between it and the Muḥammadan provinces to the north.

The best account of it I find in the Ma'dan-i-Akhbār-i-Ahmādī, of which the following is an abstract:—"The country of Kaḍhah-Katankah they call Gondwānāh, because the Gonds, a countless race, dwell in the jangals of it. On the E., by Ratan-pūr, it reaches the territory of Chhār Kunḍ; on the W. it adjoins the fort of Rāsin of Mālwah. It is 150 kuruś in length, and 80 in breadth. On the N. it is close to the Bhāṭah territory [the Bhāṭ of the A'īn-i-Akbārī], and S. is close to the Dakhan; and this tract of country they call Kaḍhah-Katankah. It is very mountainous, and has many difficult passes and defiles, but is exceedingly fruitful, and yields a large revenue. It has forts and kaḍbaks [towns], so much so that trustworthy narrators say that it has 70,000 [the MS. has 7000 in figures and seventy thousand in words] inhabited karyaks [winter—lit. a concourse of people, a village. It does not mean a city]. Kaḍhah or Gaḍhah is a great city, and Katankah is the name of a mouṣa' [district, place, village], and by these two names this territory is known. [Katankah, however, must have been remarkable for something or other for the country to be called after it.] The seat of government of this region is Churā-gārḥ, and there are several Rājahs and Rāes in it."

Paśī, Sarhindī, in his History, calls the country Jhār-Kunḍah instead of Chhār Kunḍ; and both he and the Khulāṣat-ut-Tawārīkh say that it had 70,000 or 80,000 inhabited karyaks, and they both agree generally with the above as far as they go; but they state that Amūdah [Amūdah?] is the name of
Tirhut, all sent tribute to him; and the whole of that territory named Gaur passed under his control. He acquired

one of the principal towns of Kaḍhah Katankah, and the first of importance reached by Āṣif Khān when he invaded it in Akbar's reign. The Rānt, Dur-gāwaṭī, issued from her capital, Chūrā-gāṛḥ, to meet the Musalmāns, who had never before ventured into those parts. They halted at Damūḥ [रज्जू], Lat. 23° 50' N., Long. 79° 30' E., between the capital and Āmūdah.

From the above statements, as given in the works just quoted, the tract of country adjoining Bihār on the S. and Bangālah on the W. is Bhāṭah or Bhaṭī, which probably included Palamāo, Chhọṭah Nāg-pūṛ, and Gang-pūṛ, on the W.; and the tract adjoining Bhāṭah on the W., and immediately joining the district of Ruhtar-gāṛḥ on the N., was Chhāṛ-Kund or Jhāṛ-Kundah, lying on the right bank and upper part of the Soṇ, and stretching towards Ratan-pūṛ. Still farther W., between Ratan-pūṛ and the Narbadah, but running in a S.W. direction, and stretching from the left bank of the Soṇ, on the one side, to Rāśīn of Mālwhah, on the other, and S. to the hills, the northern boundary of Bīrūr, was Kaḍhāh-Katankah.

Terry, in his Voyage, says that the chief city of Kandoona [Gondwānah] is called Karakatenka [कारकातेका], and that the river Sarsṇī parts it [Kandoona] from Pīṭhan. More respecting the capital of Jāi-nagar will be found farther on.

Jāi-nagar appears, therefore, to have been bounded on the E. by the range of hills forming the present W. boundary of Uḍīsah-Jag-nāṭṭhī, Katāsīn, on the Mahā-nadi, being the nearest frontier town or post towards the Lakhān or portion of the Lakhāṇa-waṭī territory. Farther N. it was bounded towards the E. by the river called the Bramīnī by some English writers, and Soṅk by Rennell [I always adopt the native mode of spelling if I can find it, the fanciful transliteration of Gazetteer writers ignorant of the vernacular spelling notwithstanding], running to the W. of Gang-pūṛ. Its northern boundary is not very clearly indicated [but see Sulṭān Fīrūz Shāh's excursion farther on], but it evidently included Ratan-pūṛ and Sanbal-pūṛ. On the W. it does not seem to have extended beyond the Wana-Gangā, and its feeder the Kahan; but its southern boundary was the Gūdāwūrī, and S.W. lay Talingānah.

I am surprised to find that there is any difficulty with regard to the identification of Katāsin, also called, and more correctly, Katāsinghah. Our author, farther on, says he himself went thither along with the Musalmān forces, and distinctly states that, "at Katāsin, the frontier of the Jāi-nagar territory commences." This place is situated on the northern or left bank of the Mahānadi, which river may have altered its course in some degree during the lapse of nearly seven centuries, some thirty miles E. of Boada, in about Lat. 20° 32', Long. 84° 50'; and some extensive ruins are to be found in its neighbourhood. The capital of the Jāi-nagar state, our author distinctly states, was named Umūrdān or Umūrdan—وڀمرڈن—according to the oldest and best copies of the text; and Urmūrda or Armān—وڀڀھھر—Uzmrda or Azmrdn—زمھھر—in the more modern copies; and, in one, Uzmrda or Armrdn—زمھھر—The wilāyat-country or district—of Umūrdān or Umūrdān is mentioned, as well as the capital, town, or city of that name. There is a place named Aamar-kanta, or Aamar-kantaka—in Lat. 23° 40', Long. 81° 50', where are the remains of a famous temple of Bhawānī or Pārwat, which may be the site of our author's
It seems most strange that those who have run away with the idea that Jāj-nagar lay east of the Ganges and the Megnah, in south-eastern Bengal—in Tiparabh of all places—never considered how it was possible for Ulugh Khān, son of Sultan Ghīyāg-ud-Dīn, Tughlak—not that monarch himself—to invade Taling [Talingānāh] and Tiparabh, if the latter were Jāj-nagar, in one and the same short campaign, or that Hoṣang, Sultan of Mālwah, during a short expedition or raid rather, could have reached south-eastern Bengal in search of elephants. To have done so, he would have had to pass right through, and return again through, the extensive territory of an independent sovereign equally powerful with himself [he had only 1000 horse with him on the occasion in question], and to have crossed and recrossed two or three mighty rivers, besides many others of considerable size, or he forded the Bay of Bengal perhaps to reach the supposed Jāj-nagar.

ELPHINSTONE, too, on the authority of HAMILTON [Hindostan, vol. 1. page 178], who says that “Tiparabh,” by Mahommedan historians, is called “Jage-nagar,” has fallen into the same error; and, not content with this, even the map accompanying his History has “Jājnagur” in large letters in a part of India where no such territory ever existed! Hamilton would have had some difficulty, I think, in naming the “Mahommedan Historians” who made such assertions. The name of one would much surprise me.

The way in which Jāj-nagar is mentioned in different places, by different writers, and under different reigns, clearly indicates its situation. Ulugh Khān, son of Sultan Ghīyāg-ud-Dīn, Tughlak, on his second campaign into the Dakhan, having reached Dīw-gir [Dharāgarh], advanced into Taling [Talingānāh], took Bidr, and invested Arangul [Jāj-l], now Warangul. Having captured it, and given it the name of Sultan-pūr, before returning to Dihlī, he went for amusement or diversion [re-] into JĀJ-NAGAR. He merely crossed the frontier of Talingānāh.

Hoṣang, Sultan of Mālwah, taking with him 1000 picked horsemen disguised as horse-dealers, set out from Māndhūr or Māndhūn, and entered the JĀJ-NAGAR territory in quest of elephants. He managed to seize the Rāe of Jāj-nagar by stratagem, obtained a number of elephants, and brought him along with him, partly for his own security, on his way back to Mālwah; and, on reaching the frontier of the JĀJ-NAGAR state [on the side of Mālwah], he set the Rāe at liberty.

The Lubb-ut-Tawārīḫ-i-Hind states that Jāj-nagar is a month’s journey from Mālwah, but from what part of Mālwah is not said.

The first ruler of the Shādkī dynasty of Jūnpūr—the munsh— who is turned into a “Pathān” by the archaeologists—extended his sway as far as the territory of Kol to the south; and, on the east, as far as Bihār; and compelled the rulers of LAKHAṆAWATĪ and JĀJ-NAGAR to pay him tribute.

In 680 H. Sultan Ghīyāg-ud-Dīn, Balban, set out towards LakhāṆawatī to reduce Tughrīl, his rebellious governor of Bāngālah, who had defeated two armies sent against him. On the approach of the Sultan and his army, Tughrīl, who had been making preparations for retreat, retired towards the territory of JĀJ-NAGAR. On the Sultan’s arrival at LakhāṆawatī, no trace of the rebel could be found; but, discovering subsequently whither he had gone, he set out in pursuit in the direction of JĀJ-NAGAR, until he arrived at a place some seventy kos from that territory, when a patrol from the advanced guard of his
The august Sultan, Shams-ud-Din wa ud-Dunya [I-yal-tinigh], on several occasions, sent forces from the capital, army, having gained information of his whereabouts, surprised Tughril encamped with his forces on the banks of a river, at and around a large stone reservoir. and slew him. The next march would have brought him to the Jai-Nagar territory. The river, no doubt, was the boundary.

The Tarikh-i-Firuz-Shah of Ziyâ-ud-Din, Baranī, differs from this account, and says—according to the Calcutta printed text—that Tughril fled to Hajî-nagar—لا ـهـجـي—and, in some places, Jaij-nagar—جاي ـجاي—and, if Ziyâ-ud-Din's text is correct, it is a different place altogether.

"The Sultan, following in pursuit by successive marches, in a certain number of days, arrived on the frontier of Sunâr-gânw [or kingdom of Bang], the Râe of which—Dinwaj by name [sic]—paid homage to the Sultan, and stipulated that, in case Tughril evinced a desire to fly towards the sea [ga, also means river], he should prevent his doing so. Proceeding by successive marches, the Sultan had reached within 60 or 70 kos of Jai-Nagar, when information of Tughril's whereabouts was obtained," &c. From this statement it would seem that the place in question, whether Hajî-nagar or Jaij-nagar, was beyond Sunâr-gânw; but it is not said whether any great river was crossed, neither is it stated that the Sultan marched eastwards, and he might— and, in case Jai-Nagar is correct, as stated in the extract above, he must—have turned to the south-west on reaching the frontier of Sunâr-gânw. I am inclined, however, to think that Sangarah, mentioned in the fourth para. below, is correct, and not Sunâr-gânw. Where the Sunâr-gânw frontier commenced we know not; but it must have been a territory of some extent, as it was ruled, subsequently, by a "Sultan." A district of this name is also mentioned by Ziyâ-ud-Din as lying near Talinganah.

Be this as it may, however, the following extract, taken from the Tarikh-i-Firuz-Shah of Shams-i-Saraj, Alfi, Tabakât-i-Akbarî, and others, will, I think, tend to settle the question respecting the situation of the Jai-Nagar [بند ناغر] territory:—

In 754 H. [Alfi, 755 H.] Sultan Firuz Shah set out for Bangâlah to reduce its ruler, Ilyas, Hajî [Sultan Shams-ud-Din], to submission. On Sultan Firuz Shah's reaching the vicinity of Panjâbah, Ilyas evacuated it, and threw himself into Akdâlah [also written Akdalâ], "a mousa" near Panjâbah, on one side of which is the water [a river?], and on the other an impenetrable jungle, and considered one of the strongest fortifications of Bangâlah [Westmacott, in the Calcutta Review for July, 1874, places Akdala [Akdâlah] some forty-two miles on the Mâldah side of the river Tangan, and north of Gaur or Lakhapa-wašt—"the later city of Gour," as he styles it], and so situated that, in the rainy season, the whole country would become flooded, and not a piece of elevated ground would be left for the Sultan even to pitch his tent on. Another writer calls it an island or insular fortress. He came and encamped, according to all these works, on the bank on the other side of the water facing it; but the others state that he encamped his forces near the place on the same side. As he had to change the position of his encampment after a short time, this movement led Ilyas to imagine that the Sultan was about to retire; and he sallied forth with his troops and attacked the forces of Firuz Shah, but sustained a complete overthrow, and had to retire into his stronghold again. The rains having commenced, Firuz Shah had to abandon the investment, came to terms with Ilyas, and retired towards his own dominions by the Mânik pur ferry."
Dihlā, towards Lakhaṇaṇawatī, and acquired possession of Bihār, and installed his own Amīrs therein. In the year

On several occasions Ilyās sent presents to the Sulṭān, and others were forwarded to him in return, until, in the year 759 H., when, Ilyās having despatched his offerings, Sulṭān Fīrūz Shāh sent him presents in return; but, information having reached him from Bihār of Ilyās’s death, and of his son, Sikandar’s succession, Fīrūz Shāh ordered his presents to be stopped; and, in 760 H., he set out for Bengālīkhānī with an army of 30,000 horse and 470 elephants. The rains coming on, he passed the rainy season at Zafār-ābād, and founded the city of Jīm-pūr. Sikandar, on his approach, retired to the fortress of Akhdālah, before which Sulṭān Fīrūz Shāh sat down; but, after a few days, an accommodation was come to, and the territory of Sunār-gāṇī was given up to Sikandar, and Fīrūz Shāh retired towards Jīm-pūr. On the Sulṭān’s reaching Panḍūrā [this shows that Akhdālah was northward or eastward of it, and beyond it], seven elephants and other valuable property, sent by Sikandar as part of his tribute, reached his camp.

I notice in the Indian Atlas, sheet No. 119, in the parganah of “Debekote,” as it is styled—of course Dīw-kot or Dīb-kot is meant—between Lakhaṇaṇawatī and Dīnjūk-pūr. a place named DAMDUMA, and near it an old fort, and, to the east of it, three large tanks. The name is evidently a corruption of damūdūmā— a cavalier, a mound, &c.; and it strikes me, since the name of Akhdālah is not mentioned in history for some time after the Khalj dynasty passed away, that the name of Dīw-kot was changed to Akhdālah in after years. Dr. Blochmann, I believe, identifies Dīw-kot—probably on good grounds—with Gungūrām-pūr, which I do not find in the Atlas sheet referred to; but, I should think, from the description given of the great causeway, at the northernmost extremity of which Dīw-kot is said, at page 586, to have been situated, that Dīw-kot must have lain north instead of south of Dīnjūk-pūr.

[Since this note was written, I find the last number of the Bengal Asiatic Journal, No. III. 1874, contains an account of the site of Akhdālah and a map showing its situation, as promised by Westmacott, in a previous number; and, I believe, the situation to be very nearly identical with the “Damduma” I have referred to, but have not examined the map in question.]

On his reaching Jīm-pūr the rains again set in [760 H.], and he stayed there during the rainy season, and, in Zī-Ḥijjah of that year, set out by way of Bihār towards Jāḥ-nāgar, which was at the extremity of the territory of Gaḥḥab-Katankah [کَنْتُكَلا] When the Sulṭān reached Kārah [کْرَه]—opposite Mānik-pūr?], Malik Kūṭb-ud-Dīn, brother of Zaffīr Khān, was left behind with the troops and the heavy equipage, and he advanced with celerity through Bihār towards Jāḥ-nāgar. On his reaching Sangarā or Sankrah—[بُدَّذِن، who copies wholesale from the Ţabakāt-i-Akbarī, has, in my copy of the text, سکرک] meant probably for Fatḥah, who also copies from the former, has سکرک See BLOCHMANN, page 30. Can it be the present Sirgojāh, so called?], Rāzā Sāras [سَرَس]—Fatḥah, Rāyah of Sankrah, fled, and his daughter fell into the Sulṭān’s hands, and he called her daughter [adopted her?], and protected her. Firāṭah styles her Shākar Khātūn, an impossible name for a Hindū, unless she became a convert to Islām, and was afterwards so named. [I do not know what BRIGGS’s version may contain, but DOW has left out a great deal here.] Ahmad Khān, who had fled from Lakhaṇaṇawatī, and had reached the fort of Rantabhūr, [Ratan-pūr in Ḵẖār-kunḍah?—Lat. 32° 14’, Long. 82° 8’—is probably meant, not the celebrated stronghold of Rantabhūr] on the way, presented himself before Sulṭān.
622 H. he [I-yal-timish] resolved upon marching into Lakhanaqawi; and Sultan Ghiyās-ud-Din, 'Iwāz, moved his

Firuz Shāh. Having passed the river Mahā-nadri, Mahān-darś, or Mahān-adri [=cīc in MSS.—Budā’ūnī—Firightah—the river which falls into the Son doubtless is meant], he reached the city or town of Banāris [Shams-i-Saraj and Alī have Banārās—and Budā’ūnī Bārānī—Bārānī], which is the capital and abode of the Rāe of Jāi-nagar [Shams-i-Saraj has Rāe of Jāi-nagar-Ūdīsah]. The Rāe fled towards Taling [Talingānāh], and, the Sultan not pursuing him [Firightah says pursuing], proceeded to hunt elephants in the vicinity [Shams-i-Saraj says the Sultan remained some time at Banārās, and the Rāe took shelter in one of the islands of the, or on a, river]. [See the Asiatic Journal, vol. xiv., July to December 1822, page 438, in which is a good account of this tract of country, entitled "Notes on Birār"], during which time the Rāe despatched emissaries and sought for peace, sending at the same time three elephants, besides rarities and precious things [Shams-i-Saraj says after his return from Padmawati]. Hunting as he went along, the Sultan reached the territory of Rāe Bhānu. Dīw [Shams-i-Sarāi, Bhr-bāhun Dīw—Alī, Pfr-māhfr Dīw—perhaps Bhr-Māhl], who sent him some elephants. He then returned from this place with the object of hunting, came to Padmawati—South Bihār probably—which is a part abounding with elephants, captured thirty-three, and killed two which could not be secured.

The Tabakat-i-Akbarī, Firightah, and Budā’ūnī, quote a verse composed on the occasion by Malik Ziyā-ud-Dīn, thus showing to what extent the two latter—particularly Firightah—copied from the former; but Firightah appears somewhat confused in the latter part of his account, or has made considerable verbal alterations for some purpose; whilst Budā’ūnī [MS.] says the Sultan left Bārānī [Bārānī], and proceeded from thence to Bādawatī—Padmawati and Bhr-Māhl [Bhr-Māhl] to hunt elephants.

From Padmawati Sultan Firuz Shāh returned to Karah in Rajab, 762 H.

Jāi-nagar is mentioned on several other occasions in the history of the Dakhan, and its whereabouts distinctly indicated. Sultan Firuz, Bahmanī, entered it in 815 H., and carried off a number of elephants. In the account of Nisām Shāh, of the same dynasty, Jāi-nagar and Ūdrīsah are mentioned as totally separate territories. In the reign of Muḥammad Shāh, son of Humāyūn, a famine having arisen in his dominions, people migrated in order to obtain food into Mālwhāh, Jāi-nagar, and Gujārāt; and, shortly after, the Rāe of Ūdrīsah, aided by the Rāe of Jāi-nagar, invaded Talingānāh by way of the Jāi-mandri district.

Now, if any one will look at the map, and take what has been mentioned into consideration, where else can Jāi-nagar possibly lie than in the tract I have indicated?—Certainly not on the east side of the Bay of Bengal.

It may not be amiss here to say a few words respecting the ancient boundaries of Bangālā as described by different authors, although little remains to be said after Dr. Blochmann’s elaborate paper on the subject before referred to.

The Jami’-ut-Tawārīkh of Fakhr Muḥammad says that the territory which in after times was styled Bangālā, according to such writers as have written about it, consisted of Bihār, Gauḍā or Gauj or Lakhānawatī, Bang, and Jāi-nagar. During the campaign in Bangālā, in Aurangzeb’s time, against his brother Shāh Shuja’, the Afghān Zamindār of Bhrbhum and Jāi-nagar is said to have joined him. According to the A’in-i-Akbarī, the Subah of Bangālā from Gaḍhī to the port of Chālgānwh [Chittagong] is 400 lūruṭ in breadth; and, from the mountains bounding it on the north to the uncultivated tract [Bhānā]
vessels [war-boats?] up the river. A treaty of peace was concluded between them, and the Sultan [I-yal timish] extorted thirty-eight elephants and eighty lakes of treasure, and the Khutbah was read for him, and the coin stamped in his name. When the Sultan [I-yal timish] withdrew,

6 Another writer says he had all the boats on the river removed and secured, in order to prevent Shams-ud-Din, I-yal timish, from crossing with his forces to the Lakhanawati side of the Gang.

7 Some histories, including the Tabakat-i-Akbari, say the two Sultans did encounter each other in battle in 622 H.; but, as no details are given, it could have been but a skirmish. A peace was entered into, and Sultan Ghiaq-ud-Din, Iwas, gave, as an acknowledgment of suzerainty, for the sake of peace which he himself soon after broke, 38 elephants and 80 lakes of silver tangahs. Another writer says Ghiaq-ud-Din, Iwas, despatched forces upon several occasions to carry on war against Shams-ud-Din, I-yal timish [the latter's officers or his governors of Awadh probably]; but at length peace was concluded on the terms above stated.

The Tasqarat-ul-Muluk states that this sum was in silver tangahs; and

of sarkar Madaran [also written Madarain—مَدِارَان], 200 in breadth; but, as the country of Udiasah was annexed to it on the settlement of the province in Akbar's reign, and its formation into a Subah, its length became increased 43 kuroh, and its breadth 20. The tract of country to the W. of Bangalah is named Bhatah or Bhait, which is accounted as belonging to this country [Bangalah], and Manki is the surname of its rulers. To the north is a territory called Kui [Kuch?] and Kamrudd, also called Kanwru. At the side of this is the territory of the Rajah of Asham, and adjoining it is Tibbat, and to the left of it Khita. To the E. and S. of Bangalah is an extensive country named Arkhanak [turned into Arracan by Europeans], and the port of Chateganw belongs to it. In the sarkar of Mangir, from the river Gang to the Koh-i-Sangin [the Stony Mountains], they have drawn [کَشَمیَّہ سِنگُن] a wall, and account it the boundary of Bangalah.

The Haft-Iklim says Bangalah is 300 kuroh in length and 270 in breadth, each kuroh being one mil [1]. On the E. it is bounded by the sea, on the W. it has the pargana of Suraj-gaosh, which adjoins the Subah of Bihir, on the N. it is bounded by Kuch, and on the S. by the pargana of Jasudah [turned into Jessore by Europeans], which lies between Udiasah and Bangalah.

The Khulasaat-ut-Tawarikh agrees generally with the other two works, but states that Bangalah is 400 kuroh from E. to W.—from Chateganw to Gaush—
and 200 from N. to S.; that it has the Subah of Bihir on the W., on the S.
the high hills of sarkar Manqhudi—ماَنْقُهْدُی and the sea on the E.

The Ain says it was divided [in Akbar's reign] into 24 sarkars, and yielded a revenue of 52 kurors, 4 laks, and 59,319 dafs.

The Haft-Iklim states that it was divided [in Jahangir's reign] into 22 tumultas [or sarkars], and its revenue amounted to 5 laks, 97,570 rupis, which, at 40 dafs the rupi, are equivalent to 23 kurors, 9 laks, and 2800 dafs.

There must be a mistake somewhere, as this amount of Jahangir's revenue is not half that of Aurangzeb's time, while Akbar's revenue greatly exceeds Aurangzeb's.

According to the Khulasaat-ut-Tawarikh, it was divided [in Aurangzeb's reign] into 27 sarkars, and yielded 46 kurors and 29 laks of dafs.
he conferred Bihār upon Malik Izz-ud-Dīn, Jānī; and Sulṭān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Iwāz, marched into Bihār from Lakhānawatī, and [again] took possession of it, and treated it with severity, until, in the year 624 H., the august8 Malik, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Māhmūd Shāh, son of Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn [I-yal-timīsh], at the instigation9 of Malik Izz-ud-Dīn, Jānī, assembled the forces of Hindūstān, and marched from Awadh and proceeded into Lakhānawatī. At this time Sulṭān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Iwāz-i-Ḥusain, the Khalj, had led an army from Lakhānawatī towards the territory of Kāmrūd and Bang, and had left the city of Lakhānawatī.

further—in which the Tabakat-i-Akbarī and some others agree—that I-yal-timīsh conferred a canopy of state and a dür-bāsh [see note 8, page 607] upon his eldest son, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Māhmūd Shāh, declared him heir-apparent, bestowed Lakhānawatī upon him, and left him in Awadh with jurisdiction over those parts. Māhmūd Shāh may have been left in Awadh with charge of that part, but not of Lakhānawatī certainly; for Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Iwāz, ruled over his own territory up to the time of his death. The son of I-yal-timīsh was probably left in Awadh to watch for a favourable time for invading or seizing the Khalj dominions, which he soon found an opportunity of doing.

8 He is styled ۸ in several copies, but it cannot be correct, considering, he died a natural death, according to our author's own account, as given at page 630. The word ۸ no doubt, is an error for ۸—august, &c.


1 In the account of Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Māhmūd Shāh, page 629, and here also, in some copies of the text, and in some other works, he is styled 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī. He is, no doubt, the personage referred to in the list of relatives and chiefs at the end of Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh's reign, under the title of Shāh-zādah, or Prince of Turkistān; but he only served I-yal-timīsh: he was no relative. Soon after Sulṭān Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh, returned to Dilīlī, Sulṭān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Iwāz, marched into Bihār, and regained possession of it, compelling Malik Jānī to fly into Awadh. The Khalj ruler held possession of it for some time, until the year 624 H., when Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Māhmūd Shāh, I-yal-timīsh's eldest son, who held the government of Awadh, incited by Malik Jānī and some other chiefs, and taking advantage of Sulṭān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Iwāz's absence on an expedition against the infidels on his eastern frontier in Bang and Kāmrūd, with the greater part of his forces, suddenly and without any previous intimation, invaded his dominions with a great army, including forces sent by his father for the same purpose. As soon as Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Iwāz, received information of it, he made all haste back to defend his kingdom; but whether part of or all his army returned with him is doubtful, and no aid from without could reach him, except through Hindūstān. The enemy had already taken the capital, and, in a great battle subsequently fought between him and the invaders, Sulṭān Ghīyās-ud-Dīn, Iwāz, with most of his chiefs, were taken captive and afterwards put to death. Some state that he was slain in the battle. A son of his [by some accounts a kinsman]—Malik Khiyār-ud-Dīn, Daulat Shāh-i-Balkā—subsequently regained and held sway over the territory for a time, and Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timīsh, had to proceed in person against him with a great army.
unprotected. Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh, took possession of it; and Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz-i-Ḥusain, the Khalj, on account of that disaster, returned from that force [which he had led into Kāmrūd and Bang?], and fought an engagement with Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh. Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz-i-Ḥusain, and the whole of the Khalj Amirs, were taken prisoners, and Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, was martyred. His reign extended over a period of twelve years\(^2\).

\(^2\text{According to our author, Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, the Khalj, was the last of the Mu'izzī Sultāns of Hind; and he is the person respecting whom Elphinstone has been betrayed into such mistakes noticed in note 7, page 610. According to the Gauḍ MS. he reigned twelve years, from 606 H. to 617 H., and was succeeded by his son, Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, who reigned for a short time, and whose name has been already mentioned in note 1, page 586. See also pages 617 and 626. The events which happened after the deccase of Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-Dīn, 'Iwāz, are involved in great obscurity; but the above dates are not correct.}\)

\(^2\text{In concluding this portion of the Section on the Khalj dynasty of Lakhānawatāf, I would mention that I am not personally acquainted with Bengal; but I venture to hope that these notes, imperfect as they are, will aid in further research. The district officers will be able to follow up the inquiry with facility.}\)