



Exclusively Distributed by

MUNSHIRAM MANOHARLAL

ORIENTAL PUBLISHERS, & BOOKSELLERS

54, RANI JHANSI ROAD, NEW DELHI-55

Sales-counter : 4416, NAI SARAK, DELHI-6

TABAQĀT-I-NĀSIRĪ :

A GENERAL HISTORY

OF THE

MUHAMMADAN DYNASTIES OF ASIA,

INCLUDING HINDUSTAN;

from A.H. 194 (810 A.D.) to A.H. 658 (1260 A.D.)

and the

Irruption of the Infidel Mughals into Islam

by

MAULĀNĀ, MINHĀJ-UD-DĪN, ABŪ-'UMAR-I-'UṢMĀN

Translated from Original Persian Manuscripts

by

MAJOR H. G. RAVERTY

VOL. I

ORIENTAL REPRINT



Oriental Books Reprint Corporation

Book Publishers, 54 Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi-55

1970

her to death. The people of the city, upon this, rose, and attacked the royal Kaṣr [Castle], and seized the mother of Rukn-ud-Dīn, Fīrūz Shāh.

When Rukn-ud-Dīn, Fīrūz Shāh, reached the city², insurrection had [already] broken out therein, and his mother had been made prisoner. The centre contingents [of the Dihlī forces] and the Turk Amīrs all entered Dihlī and joined Sulṭān Raḏiyyat, pledged their allegiance to her, and placed her on the throne. Having ascended the throne, she despatched a force consisting of the Turkish slaves and Amīrs to Gīlū-kharī, so that they made prisoner of Sulṭān Rukn-ud-Dīn, Fīrūz Shāh, and brought him into the city³. He was imprisoned and confined, and, in that prison, he was received into the Almighty's mercy. This circumstance of his seizure, imprisonment, and death⁴ occurred on Sunday, the 18th of the month Rabī-ul-Awwal, in the year 634 H.; and his reign was six months and twenty-six days⁵.

Sulṭān Rukn-ud-Dīn, Fīrūz Shāh, in munificence and liberality, was a second Hātīm, and what he did, in expending wealth, in conferring so many honorary dresses, and the superfluity of presents, no king, at any time, or in any reign, had done the like of; but his misfortune was this, that his inclinations were wholly towards buffoonery, sensuality, and diversion, and that he was entirely enslaved by dissipation and debauchery; and most of his honorary dresses and his presents were made to such people as musicians and singers, buffoons and Ganymēdes⁶. His excessive waste of money was to such degree, that, while

² Two modern copies of the text have Gīlū-kharī.

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

⁴ If all this happened in one day, it is very certain that he must have been put to death. Some copies have *نزل* instead of *د*.

⁵ Some copies have "twenty-eight days:" from the 20th of Sha'bān, 633 H., the date of I-yal-timish's decease, to the 18th of Rabī-ul-Awwal, 634 H., is exactly six months and twenty-seven days.

⁶ This is the person from whose dignity and elegance "the crown and throne acquired adornment and splendour"! One author states, that, during the short time he reigned, he and his mother managed to empty the treasury, and to spend all the wealth accumulated during the reign of Kuṭb-ud-Dīn, I-bāk, and Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish.

in a state of intoxication, seated on the back of an elephant, he would drive through the bāzār of the city, scattering *tangahs* of red gold which the people in the street used to pick up, and gain advantage by. He had a passion for frolic, and for riding elephants⁷, and the whole class of elephant drivers derived immense benefit from his riches and good-nature. It was not in his nature and disposition to injure a human being, and this fact was the cause of the wane of his dominion.

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

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

Sulṭān Raḏiyyat—may she rest in peace!—was a great sovereign, and sagacious, just, beneficent, the patron of the learned, a dispenser of justice, the cherisher of her subjects, and of warlike talent⁸, and was endowed with all the admirable attributes and qualifications necessary for kings;

⁷ ELLIOT: vol. ii, page 332—"He was very fond of *playing* with and riding upon elephants." Rather rough *play*.

⁸ Raḏiyyat has a meaning, but "*Raziya*" and "*Riziah*" mean nothing. Sulṭān, from *سلط*, signifies to have or possess power, to rule, &c.—a sovereign—and is—therefore as equally applicable to a female as a male, and does not appear to have had anything to do with "affectation of the superior sex," nor her assumption, *subsequently*, of male attire when she rode forth. Her name or title, like that of most other Muḥammadans in these pages, is pure Arabic, the feminine form of the by no means uncommon name of RAḏĪ-UD-DĪN. See Thomas: PATHĀN KINGS, page 108.

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

Obverse—عمدة النسوان ملكة زمان سلطان رضية بنت شمس الدين ايلتش

Reverse—ضربت بالدهلي سنة ١٣٣٠ جاوز احد

which may be translated:—Reverse:—"The illustrious among women, the Queen of the Age, Sulṭān Raḏiyyat, daughter of Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish." Obverse:—"Coined at the city of Dihlī, 643 H., the first of the reign."

⁹ Compare ELLIOT: vol. ii, page 332.

but, as she did not attain the destiny, in her creation, of being computed among men, of what advantage were all these excellent qualifications unto her?

During the lifetime of the august Sultān, her father, she exercised authority, and possessed great grandeur, on this account, that her mother, Turkān Khātūn, was the greatest [of the ladies] of the sublime *haram*¹, and her place of residence was the royal palace, the Kushk-i-Firūzī [Firūzī Castle]². As the august Sultān Shams-ud-Dīn used to notice in her indications of sovereignty and high spirit, although she was a daughter, and [consequently] veiled from public gaze, when he returned after acquiring possession of Gwāliyūr, he commanded the Tāj-ul-Mulk, Maḥmūd, the secretary—on whom be peace!—who was the Mushrif-i-Mamālik³ [Secretary of the State], to write out a decree, naming his daughter as his heir-apparent, and she was made his heir [accordingly].

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

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

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

² In ELLIOT, it is made "the chief royal palace in the Kushk-firozi!"

³ Tāj-ul-Mulk signifies the crown of the state: "Tāju-l-Malik" nothing. The word مشرف—*mushrif*—signifies an examiner or authenticator of records and other writings, but not a *wazir* certainly. دابر—*dabir*—a secretary, a clerk, a scribe. مدبر—*mudabbir*—an administrator, director, counsellor, &c. Compare ELLIOT: vol. ii. page 333.

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

When Sultān Rāziyyat ascended the throne of the kingdom, all things returned to their usual rules and customs; but the Wazīr of the kingdom, the Nizām-ul-Mulk, Muḥammad, Junaidī⁴, did not acknowledge her; and Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī, Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Kūjī, Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz, Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Sālārī, and the Nizām-ul-Mulk, Muḥammad, Junaidī⁵, assembled from different parts before the gate of the city of Dihlī, and commenced hostilities against Sultān Rāziyyat, and this opposition continued for a considerable time. At this period Malik Nuṣrat-ud-Dīn, Tā-yasa'ī⁷, the Mu'izzī, who was foffeee of Awadh, marched with his forces from that province, for the purpose of rendering aid to Sultān Rāziyyat, in conformity with [her] commands, towards Dihlī, the capital⁸. After he had crossed the river Gang,

⁴ The Tagkarat-ul-Mulūk says "one reason why I-yal-timish named her as his successor was, that his son, Nāsir-ud-Dīn, Maḥmūd Shāh—the second son of that name—was so young in years; and the Sultān remarked to his minister, at the time, that, although in the form of a woman, she was in reality a man."

⁵ He is styled, by some more modern writers, Chandīrī, as if he were a native of Chandīrī or that that was a by-name of his, but it is incorrect. He had been I-yal-timish's wazīr for a considerable time.

⁶ These are the same who, as stated in ELLIOT, killed "the Tāzīk."

⁷ He had been made feudatory of Awadh by Rāziyyat after Ghiyās-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad Shāh's rebellion. See page 633.

⁸ Previous to these events, the feudatory of Kinnauj, Malik Tamur Khān-i-Kīrān, was despatched by Sultān Rāziyyat into the Gwāliyūr territory and Mālwah in command of a force, and the expedition was successful, but no particulars are given. The same Malik, when feudatory of Awadh, penetrated as far as the Tirhut territory, and compelled the Rāes and Rānahs, and independent Hindū tribes in that part to pay tribute. He plundered the territory of Bhatī-ghūn [anglicised Bhatgong] in Nipāl on several occasions, but neither particulars nor dates are given, but they all happened before this period.

the hostile Maliks⁹ who were before the city of Dihli unexpectedly advanced to meet him, and took him prisoner, and affliction overcame him, and he died¹. The stay of the hostile Maliks before the gate of Dihli was prolonged for a considerable time; but, as the good fortune of Sulṭān Raḡiyyat was at the point of ascendancy, the Sulṭān issued from the city, and directed her sublime tent to be pitched at a place on the bank of the river Jūn; and, between the Turk Amīrs who served at the stirrup of sovereignty, and the hostile Maliks, conflicts took place upon several occasions. At last, an accommodation was arranged, but in a deceptive manner, and by the subtle contrivance of Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Muḡammad, Sālārī², and Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kabīr. Khān-i-Ayāz, who, secretly, went over to the Sulṭān's side, and, one night, met before the entrance to the royal tent, with this stipulation, that Malik Jānī, Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Kūjī, and the Niḡām-ul-Mulk, Muḡammad, Junaidī, should be summoned, and be taken into custody and imprisoned, in order that the sedition might be quelled.

When these Maliks became aware that the state of affairs was on this wise, they left their camp and fled. The Sulṭān's horsemen followed in pursuit, and Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Kūjī, and his brother, Fakhr-ud-Dīn, fell into their hands, and, subsequently to that, they were put to death in prison. Malik 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Jānī, was killed within the limits of Pāyal³, at a village named Nakawān⁴, and his

⁹ There is nothing about "hostile generals" in the whole passage.

¹ He appears to have been suffering from illness when Sulṭān Raḡiyyat summoned him to her aid.

Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban-i-Kashlū Khān, who was so ambitious, and, afterwards, gave so much trouble, was taken prisoner by the hostile Maliks upon this occasion, but was subsequently released by them. He was treated with great honour by Sulṭān Raḡiyyat. Compare ELLIOT here also.

² The Ṭabakāt-i-Akbarī, which copies so much from our author, asserts, however, that it was Sulṭān Raḡiyyat, who, by her able contrivance, succeeded in upsetting and confounding the disaffected Amīrs. Firishtah, of course, agrees.

³ ELLIOT, Bābul; BRIGGS, from Firishtah, Babool, FIRIṢHTAH, text, Bābal—بابال—and Dow, omitted altogether. Pāyal, or Pāyil, is the name of a very old place, giving name to the district, with a very lofty brick fort visible from a great distance—I mention it as it appeared about a century since—on one of the routes from Dihli to Lūdīānah. The ṬABAKĀT-I-AKBARĪ gives the name of the district correctly, but leaves out the name of the place. It is in Long. 76° 5', Lat. 30° 40'.

⁴ In some copies Nakāwān or Nagāwān [نکوان], but the majority of the best

head was brought to the capital; and the Niḡām-ul-Mulk, Muḡammad, Junaidī, retired to the hills of Sir-mūr Bardār⁵, and there, after some time, he died.

Now that the affairs of Sulṭān Raḡiyyat's government became arranged, she gave the office of Wazīr to the Khwājah, Muhazzab⁶, who was the deputy of the Niḡām-ul-Mulk, and he likewise received the title of Niḡām-ul-Mulk. The charge of the army, as her lieutenant, was conferred upon Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-Bihak⁷, who received the title of Ḳutluḡh Khān; and Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz, received the fief of Lohor, and the kingdom became pacified, and the power of the state widely extended. From the territory of Lakhanawaṭī to Dīwal and Damrīlah, all the Maliks and Amīrs manifested their obedience and submission⁸. Suddenly, Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, I-bak-i-Bihak, died, and the charge of the army was

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

⁵ See farther on, under the reign of Nāṣir-ud-Dīn, respecting this tract of country.

⁶ He is turned into Muhazzab, Ghaznavī, by Firishtah, and by his translators, Dow and Briggs, respectively, "Chaja Ghiznavi" and "Mihdy Ghizniv."

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

⁷ This word is written بک and بک and is doubtful.

⁸ The Ṭabakāt-i-Akbarī here copies our author nearly word for word, and Firishtah copies the former in the same way. The Taḡkarat-ul-Mulūk says, "through God's assistance she reduced the disaffected Maliks to submission and even the Malik of Lakhanawaṭī became obedient to her authority."

Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Tughril-i-Tughān Khān, on her accession, despatched emissaries to the capital, and, to testify his homage, was continually sending offerings of great value from Lakhanawaṭī. On this account Sulṭān Raḡiyyat conferred upon him a canopy of state, and standards, and great honour. At this period Malik Mu-ayyid-ud-Dīn, Hindū Khān, held the fief of Uchchah, which was conferred upon him by Sulṭān Raḡiyyat.

bestowed upon Malik Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, son of 'Alī, Ghūrī⁹, and he was appointed to [march and relieve] the fortress of Rantabhūr, because the Hindūs, after the decease of the august Sultān, Shams-ud-Dīn, I-yal-timish, had, for a considerable time, invested that preserved town and stronghold¹. Malik Ḳuṭb-ud-Dīn, Ḥusain, conducted the forces to that part, withdrew the Musalmān Amīrs [and their troops?] out of that fortification, destroyed the works, and retired, and returned to the capital again.

At this time, the Malik-i-Kabīr [Great Malik] Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Aet-kīn², became Amīr-i-Ḥājib, and Malik Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Yā-kūt, the Ḥabashī [Abyssinian or Ethiopian], who was Lord of the Stables, acquired favour³ in attendance upon the Sultān, so that the Turk Amīrs and

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

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

² Firishtah has not copied the ṬabaḲāt-i-Akbarī correctly here, and turns him into Alb-Tigīn in the "revised text," and Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Yā-kūt, is turned into a Amīr-ul-Umrā, which, although such a title did exist from Akbar's time downwards, was entirely unknown in these days.

³ I think the character of this Princess has been assailed without just cause. Thomas says [PATHĀN KINGS, page 106]:—"It was not that a virgin Queen was forbidden to love—she might have indulged herself in a submissive Prince Consort, or revelled almost unchecked in the dark recesses of the Palace Harem—but wayward fancy pointed in a wrong direction, and led her to prefer a person employed about her Court [he was Amīr-i-Aḳhur, or Lord of the Stables—Master of the Horse—a high office only conferred upon distinguished persons], an Abyssinian moreover, the favours extended to whom the Tūrkī nobles resented with one accord."

Elphinstone, who draws his inspiration from Briggs, is more correct in his estimation of her character [and both Dow and Briggs are more correct than usual in their rendering of Firishtah's words here] and says [page 324, Third ed.]:—"But her talents and virtues were insufficient to protect her from a single weakness. It was shown in the extraordinary [?] marks of favour which she showered [?] on her Master of the Horse; who, to make her partiality more degrading, was an Abyssinian slave [Who says he was a slave? If he was, he was only a slave like most of her other Maliks and Amīrs]. It does not appear that her fondness [?] was criminal, since the

Maliks began to be envious thereof; and it so chanced to happen that Sultān Raḏīyyat laid aside the female dress and issued from [her] seclusion, and donned the tunic, and assumed the head-dress [of a man], and appeared among the people; and, when she rode out on an elephant, at the time of mounting it, all people used, openly, to see her.

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

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

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

⁴ I cannot conceive why our author should be styled a *rebel*—“a forgiven rebel”—because of this sentence in the text. Gwāliyūr had a governor or seneschal placed therein by Sultān Raḏīyyat's father in 630 H., and our author was Kāzī there. When Raḏīyyat came to the throne, she sent a force under Malik Taj-ud-Dīn, Sanjar [No. XIV. in the next Section], and relieved the garrison, and, as the governor—Rashīd-ud-Dīn, 'Alī—from our author's invocation respecting him, appears to have died there, a new feudatory was despatched, at the same time probably, although he is not mentioned, as, after the death of Rashīd-ud-Dīn, 'Alī, the next official in authority was the Amīr-i-Dād, Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Junaidī, who, being a kinsman of

of the victorious kingdom, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, in conjunction with the Malik⁵-ul-Umrā [the chief of Amīrs] Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Junaidī, who was the Amīr-i-Dād [chief magistrate] of Gwāliyūr, and with other persons of note, came out of the preserved fortress of Gwāliyūr on the 1st of the month Sha'bān, 635 H., and returned to Dihlī, the capital; and, in this same month, Sulṭān Raẓiyyat committed to the charge of this servant [the author] the Nāṣiriāh College at the capital, to which was added the Kāzī-ship of Gwāliyūr⁶.

In the year 637 H. Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz, who was the feudatory of Lohor, began to show a rebellious spirit⁷. Sulṭān Raẓiyyat led an army towards

the rebel Wazīr, who refused to acknowledge Sulṭān Raẓiyyat, may have been suspected of disaffection. No cause for rebellion appears, neither is any rebellion mentioned; and, on our author's arrival at Dihlī, another office was bestowed upon him, in addition to his Kāzī-ship of Gwāliyūr, which he still held. See Thomas: PATHĀN KINGS, page 105.

"In 631 H. some emissaries from Balkā Khān, son of Tūshī [Jūjī], son of Chingiz Khān, arrived at the Court of Sulṭān I-yal-timish from Kīfchāk, bringing presents for him, but, as that Sulṭān had refrained from holding any intercourse whatever with the Mughal Khāns, and was wont to send their agents out of his territory when they came, he would not put these emissaries to death, and desired to dismiss them kindly. They were sent to Gwāliyūr, however, [this was one way of dismissing them kindly], and the party, being all Musalmāns, used to present themselves in the Masjid there every Friday, and said their prayers behind the author of this book [he acting as Imām], until the reign of Sulṭān Raẓiyyat, when the author, after six years' absence, returned to Dihlī from Gwāliyūr, and was promoted, by the favour of that sovereign. At this time directions were given for these emissaries of Balkā Khān to be removed to Kinnauj, and there detained; and there they were kept until they died."

⁵ In some copies, Majd-ul-Umrā, but the above seems the correct title. Majd signifies glory, grandeur—the glory or grandeur of Amīrs does not sound very correct. It was an honorary title merely.

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

⁷ In the account of this Malik our author states that Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz began to act contumaciously in 636 H., in which year Sulṭān Raẓiyyat advanced at the head of her troops into the Panjāb against him. He retired before her towards the Indus, until he reached the neighbourhood of the Sūḍharah [he could not go much farther, for immediately to the west he would have fallen into hostile hands]. When the royal troops crossed the Rāwī, Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz made his submission, but he was removed from the fief of Lāhor, and Multān was placed in his charge, and the feudatory of the latter—Malik Karā-Ḳush Khān—sent to Lāhor.

In this year, 636 H., Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Ḥasan, the Ḳarluḡh, hard pressed by the Mughals, had to abandon his territories, and he retired towards the territory of Multān and Sind, in hope, probably, of being more successful on

that part from Dihlī, and followed in pursuit of him. At last an accommodation took place, and he presented himself; and the province of Multān, which Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Karā-Ḳush Khān-i-Aet-kin, held, was made over to the charge of Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz. Sulṭān Raẓiyyat returned again to the capital on Thursday, the 19th of the month of Sha'bān⁸, 637 H.

Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūniāh, who held the fief of Tabarhindah⁹, broke out into rebellion, and, secretly, some of the Amīrs of the Court abetted him in this treason. Sulṭān Raẓiyyat, on Wednesday, the 9th of the sacred month Ramaẓān of this same year [637 H.], set out from the capital, with numerous forces¹, for the purpose of putting down Malik Altūniāh's rebellion. When she reached that place [Tabarhindah]², through circumstances which supervened, the Turk Amīrs rose against her, and put to death³ Amīr Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Yā-ḳūt, the Ḥabashī, seized Sulṭān Raẓiyyat and put her in durance, and sent her to the fortress of Tabarhindah⁴.

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

⁸ Ramaẓān, in some copies of the text.

⁹ Altūniāh was only lately made feudatory of Tabarhindah, for, when Raẓiyyat came to the throne, she gave him his first fief, that of Baran. Briggs styles him "of the Toorky tribe of Chelgany"—a nice blunder, but Dow leaves this part of the sentence out. See last para. of note², page 643, and the meaning of Chihil-gānī in next Section.

¹ In some copies of the text, "with the forces composing the *ḳalb*" or centre, the signification of which has been given in note², page 634.

² But not "on the way" thither as in Tabakāt-i-Akbarī and Firishtah.

³ Our author says "martyred," here equivalent to his being put to death unjustly. Rauzat-uṣ-Ṣafā says, Yā-ḳūt commanded her troops, a very unlikely thing, when the Turk Maliks and Amīrs hated him so greatly. He may have commanded Raẓiyyat's own personal followers. Rauzat-uṣ-Ṣafā, indeed, says so. For the detail of these events see the account of Malik Altūniāh in the next Section.

⁴ Tabakāt-i-Akbarī and Budā'ūnī have Tarhindah—تارهند—in all cases, and Firishtah ["revised text"], wherever this place is mentioned, under whatever reign it may be, has Pathindah—پاتندہ; Pathadah—پاتادہ; and Bathindah—باتندہ.

Among the events which happened in the beginning of Sulṭān Raziyyat's reign, the greatest was that the Ḳirāmiṭah and Mulāhidah heretics of Hindūstān, incited by a person, a sort of learned man, named Nūr-ud-Dīn, a Turk⁵, whom they used to style Nūr, the Turk, collected together at Dihlī, from different parts of the territory of Hind, such as Gujarāt, and the country of Sind, and the parts round about the capital, Dihlī, and the banks of the rivers Jūn and Gang. In secret they pledged themselves to be faithful to each other, and, at the instigation of Nūr, the Turk, they conspired against Islām. This Nūr, the Turk, used to harangue, and the mob would collect around him. He used to call the 'Ulamā of the orthodox people⁶ *Nāsibī* [setters-up], and to style them *Murjī*⁷ [procrastinators], and used to incite the common people to animosity against the orders of 'Ulamā of the sects of Abū-Ḥanīfah and Shāf'ī until a day was fixed upon. The whole of the fraternities of the Mulāhidah and Ḳirāmiṭah entered the *Fāmi' Masjid* of the city of Dihlī, on Friday, the 6th of the month of Rajab, in the year 634 H., to the number of about one thousand persons, armed with swords and shields. Having divided into two bodies, one body, from the side of the Ḥiṣār-i-Nau [the new Citadel], entered the gateway of the *Fāmi' Masjid* on the northern side, and the second body, passing through the Bāzār-i-Bazāzān [the Bāzār of the Cloth-Merchants], entered the gateway of the Mu'izzī College under the supposition that it was the *Fāmi' Masjid*, and, on both sides, fell upon the Musalmāns with [their] swords. A great number of people, some by the swords of those heretics, and some [trodden] under people's feet, attained martyrdom.

On an outcry having arisen from the city on account of

⁵ He was not called "Nūr Turk," but he was a Turk, and his name was Nūr-ud-Dīn.

⁶ That is the *Sunnīs*, in contradistinction to the *Shī'as* and other schismatics. Neither Ṭabaḳāt-i-Akbarī, Budā'ūnī, nor Firishṭah, refer to this "outbreak," but other writers do. The fact of Firishṭah's being a Shī'a may account for his eschewing the matter.

⁷ The name of one of the heretical sects among the Muḥammadans, who procrastinate, and consider good works unnecessary, and faith sufficient, and that all Musalmāns will be saved, as hell is only reserved for infidels. See Sale: ḲUR'AN, Preliminary Discourse, for an account of these different sects of schismatics, pages 122, 130, and 131.

this outbreak, the warriors of the city, such as Naṣīr-ud-Dīn, Ai-yitim, the Balārāmī, and Amīr, Imām-i-Nāsirī, the Poet, and other armed men, from different directions, rode fully equipped [as they were] with cuirass, and other defensive armour, steel cap, spear, and shield, into the *Fāmi' Masjid*, by the *minārah* entrance⁸, and plied their swords upon the Mulāhidah and Ḳirāmiṭah heretics; and the Musalmāns, who were on the roof of the *Fāmi' Masjid*, poured down stones and bricks upon them, and sent the whole of the Mulāhidahs and Ḳirāmiṭahs to hell, and quelled that outbreak. Thanks be to God for the blessing of safety and the honour of religion!

When they imprisoned Sulṭān Raziyyat within the stronghold of Tabarhindah, Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūniāh, entered into a matrimonial contract with her, and espoused her⁹, and marched an army towards Dihlī, in order to take possession of the kingdom a second time. Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Sālārī, and Malik Ḳarā-Ḳuṣh rebelled and quitted the capital, Dihlī, and went and joined them.

Sulṭān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh [Raziyyat's brother¹], was [at this time] seated on the throne; and Ikhtiyār-

⁸ Compare ELLIOT, vol. ii, page 336.

⁹ The Ṭazkarat-ul-Mulūk and some other works state that Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūniāh, contracted marriage with Sulṭān Raziyyat, *volens volens*. He then took up her cause. He was no longer a rebel, because he imagined he would get the upper hand of his brother rebels; and Raziyyat now managed to raise a considerable force consisting of Khokhars [this large tribe appear to have extended, at that period, a considerable distance east of the Bīāh, and the good horses to be obtained in the Talwandhīs of the Khokhars are often mentioned], Jaṭs, and others of the tribes about Tabarhindah, and some Amīrs likewise, from the adjoining fiefs, went over to her. The Ṭabaḳāt-i-Akbarī, and Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh, also mention Khokhars, but Firishṭah, here, as well as elsewhere, not knowing the difference between *Khokhars* and *Khaksars* turns the former into Ghakars, a people, in his time, in some repute, and when a chief or two of the tribe were serving the Mughal emperors.

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

¹ Half-brother apparently.

yār-ud-Dīn, Aet-kīn, the Amīr-i-Ḥājib, having been assassinated, Badr-ud-Dīn, Sunḡar, the Rūmī, had become Amīr-i-Ḥājib. In the month of Rabī'ul-Awwal, in the year 638 H., Sulṭān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, led² an army out of Dihlī for the purpose of resisting Sulṭān Raḡiyyat and Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Altūniāh, and they were routed, and, having reached Kaithal, the troops along with them all abandoned them³, and Sulṭān Raḡiyyat and Malik Altūniāh fell captive into the hands of Hindūs, and attained martyrdom.

Their defeat took place on the 24th of the month, Rabī'ul-Awwal; and the martyrdom of Sulṭān Raḡiyyat took place on Tuesday, the 25th of Rabī'ul-Awwal⁴, in the year 638 H. Her reign extended over a period of three years, six months, and six days⁵.

² The author of the Ṭabaḡāt-i-Akbarī, who seems to know—without naming any authority—better than those persons who were eye-witnesses of what they relate, and other authors who preceded him, asserts that Sulṭān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, sent an army against Raḡiyyat under Malik 'Izz-ud-Dīn, Balban [in some copies Tigīn], who afterwards attained the title of Ulugh Khān, and Firīshṭah, of course, follows. The amusing part of it is that our author's patron was neither styled 'Izz-ud-Dīn, at this time, nor at any other; and he had not attained such a high position at that period as to be put in the command of an army, as may be gathered from the account of him in the next Section. He was, at first, Khāsāh-dār to Sulṭān Raḡiyyat, and, afterwards, during her reign, became Amīr-i-Shikār. The above-mentioned work also places this defeat and death of Raḡiyyat in 637 H.—a year too soon.

³ The Zubdat-ut-Tawārikh, as well as the Ṭabaḡāt-i-Akbarī, makes two affairs of this, and says that it was after the first defeat, but gives no date for it; that Raḡiyyat raised a force of Khokhars and other tribes, and that the second defeat took place near Kaithal, on the 4th of Rabī'ul-Awwal, 638 H., after which the Khokhars and others abandoned her, and she and her husband fell into the hands of the Hindūs, who put them to death on the 25th of the same month. See further details of these transactions in the account of Malik Altūniāh in the next Section.

⁴ In some copies, Saturday, the 29th of Rabī'ul-Ākhir, but the date cannot be correct. See also the account of Malik Altūniāh in the next Section, where the 25th of Rabī'ul-Ākhir is given as the date.

⁵ IBN-BAṬŪṬAH, who is sometimes quoted as an authority on Indian history, says [Lee's translation] that Raḡiyyat's brother, having "polluted his reign by killing his brothers, was, therefore, killed himself. Upon this, the army agreed to place his sister, El Malīka Razīa, upon the throne, who reigned four years. This woman usually rode about among the army, just as men do. She, however, gave up the government, on account of some circumstances that presented themselves. After this, her younger brother, Nāsir Oddin, became possessed of the government, which he held for twenty years"!! So much for Ibn-Baṭūṭah's authority on Indian history.

V. SULTĀN MU'IZZ-UD-DUNYĀ WA UD-DĪN, BAHRĀM SHĀH⁶,
SON OF THE SULTĀN [I-YAL-TIMISH].

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

When they imprisoned Sulṭān Raḡiyyat in the preserved city of Tabarhindah, the Maliks and Amīrs, in accord, despatched letters to the capital city of Dihlī, and Mu'izz-ud-Dīn, Bahrām Shāh, on Monday, the 28th of the month Ramaḡān, in the year 637 H., they raised to the throne of sovereignty. When, on Sunday, the 11th of the month of Shawwāl of that same year, the Maliks and Amīrs and the rest of the forces returned to the city again, they publicly pledged their allegiance to his sovereignty within the Daulat Khānah [Royal residence] on the stipulation of the Deputyship being conferred upon Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn, Aet-kīn⁷; and, on that day, after [pledging] allegiance, the writer of these words, by way of benediction, in order to congratulate him [on his accession], recited this strophe:—

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

Though the sovereignty of Hind be the heritage of the Shamsī family,
Praise be to God, a second I-yal-timish, of its sons art thou.
When the whole world saw thee, that, by right, thou art the kingdom's
heir,
They made thy diadem their *ḡiblah-gāh*, for thou art all-powerful and
wise.

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

Overse—*نصر الدرهم و الدينار باسم سلطان محمد بن بهرام شاه في سنة سبع و ثمانين و ستماية*
Reverse—*قرب دار الخلافة دلهي جاوس*

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

⁷ He was to act as Deputy or Regent for one year. See the account of this Malik in the next Section. Firīshṭah turns this name into "Alp-Tigīn," but Dow leaves out the titles altogether, and makes *Tiggi* of him.