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PREFACE

The task of making available to the world of scholars the benefits of study and research on Indian inscriptions would have remained incomplete without the reprinting of volumes of Epigraphia Indica (Arabic & Persian Supplement). This series, under the title Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, published from 1907 to 1940, was revived in 1949 and since 1951 in its present form. This valuable material is being published in 13 volumes. The present one is 13th in the series and will be followed in quick succession by subsequent ones.

I wish to record my thanks to Shri N.M. Ganam, Superintending Epigraphist, for the planning of the series. Shri J.C. Gupta, Production Officer, Archaeological Survey of India, has the credit for its speedy execution and production.

K.V. RAMESH
DIRECTOR (EPIGRAPHY)
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A UNIQUE INSCRIPTION OF SULTAN AHMAD OF MALWA FROM PIRANPUR NEAR CHANDERI

BY PROFESSOR S. A. Rahim

LECTURER, NAGPUR MAHAVIDYALAYA, NAGPUR

Despite the fact that there exists a number of historical works dealing with the history of the Māłwā Sultanate, written both at its capital Māndū and a little later elsewhere, there are considerable gaps in our knowledge of this dynasty. While none of the contemporary records in the former category has seen the light of the day, with the exception of an abridged edition of the Ma'āhir-i-Mahmūd Shāhī of 'Ali Kirmānī, also known as Shihāb-i-Hakim, almost all the important works in the other category are available in print as well as in translation. A few years back, however, in 1965 to be exact, a political and cultural history of Māłwā by Dr. U. N. Day of the Delhi University, originally being the subject for his Degree of the Doctor of Philosophy, was published. But unfortunately Dr. Day, while utilising the historical works on the subject, failed to consult the latest epigraphical material which, as the readers of this series are aware, contains a large number of the inscriptions of the Māłwā Sultāns which have come to light, and which furnish in some cases, new information about, and in other, supplement our knowledge of, the history of the period. We shall restrict ourself to give only one instance here. A Jain record of 1424 at Deogarh in Jhānsi District of Uttar Pradesh, gives the name of the reigning king as 'Shah Alambhāk' of Māndū, which according to Dr. Day stands for 'Shah Alap Khan'. But this is not correct. The title Shāh 'Alam can be easily recognised in the phrase 'Shah Alambhāk,' and is not the corruption or variant of Shāh Alp Khan, but it was the title which the latter alias Hoshang Shāh Ghori appears to have adopted. This is also clear from the title 'Alam Sāhī' used for Hoshang Shāh in the Kārīga Mavohar of Maheshwar Kāvi as is noted by Dr. Day himself. Dr. Day would have immediately recognised this fact, if he were aware of

---
1 This abridgement made by Dr. Nāru'ī-Hasan of the Delhi University was published in 1968 by the Indo-Persian Society, Delhi.
2 U. N. Day, Medieval Mālwa (Delhi, 1965).
3 He did consult the epigraphs noticed in the Annual Reports of the Archaeological Department of Gwalior State (AIA) and also those published in the Epigraphia Indica Medemica (EIM), up to its 1939-40 issue.
6 Ibid., p. 424, f.n.1.
the fact that his Mānju inscription clearly mentions Alī Khan as having been entitled Shāh-i Almān. Incidentally, the same king finds mention as ‘Shāh Alm’ in a Sanskrit record dated V. S. 1485 (1428 A.D.), from Naderi in Cuna district, also noted by Dr. Day, who could not still connect him with Hūshang Shāh, probably because he accepted the wrong identifications of Shāh Alm with the ‘Sayyid king of Delhi’ given in the source, despite the clear date.

The inscription under study is one more such instance which, being as it is a unique record of a royal king in the Mālū family during the last days of the Sultānate, underscores the need for extensive search of epigraphs on one hand and proper utilization of their evidence, on the other. The present inscription may be termed as an outstanding discovery in recent times, as it represents the unique inscription of a sultan of the ruling Khalji family of Mālū, who had, as will be seen presently, succeeded his father in wielding independent authority at Chandeli, which is hardly a couple of kilometers from the finds pot of this record. The narrative in most of the historical records generally referred to by scholars of history about the father’s having declared his independent rule at Chandeli under the name Sultān Muhammad Shāh and about his son Sultān Almān Shāh is not very clear, particularly in regard to dates as also the extent of his rule. It is surprising that some of our historians, particularly Dr. Day, should have totally ignored the sultan, though the earliest authority does mention the fact as we shall soon see. Our inscription also, giving as it does a specific date, can be said to fill a lacuna in the history of Mālū of the first quarter of the sixteenth century.

The tablet bearing this interesting inscription is fixed into the left side of a step-well locally called Gachsh-Bāqi, situated to the north-west of the village of Prānpur, situated about four kilometers east of Chandeli. An impression thereof was taken along with those of other epigraphs from the place when I visited it in January 1962, but the impression being unsatisfactory, sufficient details could not be made out at that time. In a subsequent visit in November 1966, a fresh impression was prepared and effort were also made to read it on the stone. But due to loss to the somewhat indistinct and unusual way of execution than to the damaged nature of the epigraph, the text has not come out in the impression as well as it should. Nevertheless, it is definitely far better than the earlier one and as a result, the epigraph could be deciphered. I am happy to say, almost completely and correctly. I must, however, admit that in a couple of places, particularly in the last line, I am not certain about the reading of a couple of words.

The square tablet, measuring 60 cm. a side, contains a text of twelve lines, which but for the first and the last two lines, are in verse. The first line comprises, instead of the Basmalah, another religious formulae, offering praise to Allah and salutation to His Prophet, and the last two give particulars of the sponsor, the mosque, etc.

1 Epigraphia Indiae Arabicae et Persicae Supplementa (EIAPS), 1964, p. 51. Dr. Day perhaps was misled by the incomplete and faulty reading of this epigraph which was first published in EIM, 1909-10, p. 24; its revised reading in ibid., 1911-12, p. 10, was even more confusing, though the portion indicating Shāh-i Almān as the title of the king was correctly read. The correctness and date of the king were clearly indicated in ARIE, 1962-63 No. D, 60.

2 Dr. Day, op. cit., p. 457.

3 ABRAH, for V.S. 1961, No. 24.

4 It must be noted that even a modern writer as the compiler of the Gwalior State Gazetteer, has noted the fact that Bābur after conquering Chandeli made over the fort to its legitimate sovereign Ahmad Khān, son of Sāhīb Khān. But his statement that the latter’s alias was Makhmūl III and that he was a son of Makhmūl II is not correct (C. E. Luard, and other. Central India State Gazetteer Series, Vol. 1, part 1, Lucknow, 1906, p. 211).


6 For another epigraph from Prānpur, belonging to Ghurid-Din Khalji’s time, see ibid., 1961-62, No. D, 63. It was published in EIAPS, 1964, p. 75, pl. XVII b.
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The tablet having been exposed to inclemencies of weather, the writing is considerably damaged; the calligraphy too, though not poor, is not fine either, and the engraving is indifferent. And though, the text has even then been almost fully deciphered, the poor quality of verse and the faulty syntax and grammar have rendered the meaning in a couple of places not perfectly clear.

The first three couplets of the metrical text which is contained in lines 2-9 refer to the construction of the step-well and eulogise, in poetical strain, the fine quality of its water. The fourth couplet contains in the first hemistich, the name of the reigning ‘Sultān of the land, Ahmad son of Muḥammad’ and in the second refers to the Khalji kings at the Manḍū fort, but the connection between these two parts is not easy to establish due to the mediocre text and manner of engraving. What is probably meant is that the king belonged to the stock of the Khalji kings who ruled at Manḍū. The next verse mentions Bhārati Chand(ra), the official Majmū‘dār at the village and Maliku’sh-Sharq Fadīlā. The sixth verse quotes the date to the exact day, viz. 1st Dhū‘l-Qa‘dā 926 (13th October 1520). In the seventh verse occurs the poetic name Mashriqi, who is stated to have composed the metrical text comprising seven verses, ‘each verse of which is an ocean full of lustrous pearls’—an utterly absurd claim, for the quality of the verse as stated earlier is just mediocre. The next verse, composed in a separate metre, is imprecatory.

The first of the last two lines of the epigraph which are in prose, records the name of the scribe Muḥammad Sha‘lān Afghānī, who was, we are told, an old retainer of Khān-i-A‘gam Afḍal Khānī. The last line could not be satisfactorily deciphered. According to my reading, it states that this well meant for public use was constructed at the instance of B(P?)ayāg Dās unbeliever, by the mason attached to him, namely Rāmdās, son of Lakhmān.

The style of writing of the epigraph is Nasīḥī which is basically of a tolerably good quality. But it is the way in which the letters have been executed that imparts a somewhat untidy appearance to the writing. It seems that the letters were originally intended to be brought out in relief, as is indicated by their outlines marked out on the stone, but for some reason or the other, the portion of the slab surrounding these was not chiselled off. In some parts, particularly in lines 9, 10 and 11, some of the letters look as if they have been incised on stone.

The text of the epigraph has been deciphered as under:

### TEXT

Plate I(b)

1 (١) نحاس و نصل
2 (٢) باب و شکر بی منت خدای فضل سبعانی
3 (٣) مرتب گشت این باتین نکرم نام وندانی
4 (٤) بعیس چشمہ کوثر بیاپس سلبسلب آبیس
5 (٥) مزاجی نیر وز شکر صفی شهد هم دانی
6 (٦) اگوشد گرگ کسی آپی بخوانند وصف صد بابی
7 (٧) پگوید نیست این آپی مکر در چشمہ کنعانی

---

¹ There is at least one more similarly engraved record at Chandeli, which was set up four years later, in the time of Ibrahim Lodhi (EIAPS, 1956 and 1956, pl. XXXI c).
(1) We praise Him and send salutations (on His Prophet).

(2) Thanks and gratefulness are due for the bounty of God and Divine excellence (that) this step-well was constructed through the grace (lit. generosity) of the name of God.

(3) In its well is the fountain of Kauthar, at its steps, its water is like the Salsabil, its composition is milk and sugar...you may even know it to be pure honey.

(4) If anybody drinks its water, he would recite hundred chapters in its praise (lit. description) and would say, 'This (sort of) water is not to be found anywhere except perhaps in the fountain of Canaan.'

(5) This took place in the reign of His Majesty the king of the land, Ahmad son of Muhammad, who is (descended from) Khaliji emperors reigning at Mandu Fort.

(6) At this place (?) Bhurati Chand is the Majmu'dar from this court, (who) is attached to (?) Maliku'ah-Sharq Faqâlû, the world-conquerer.

(7) The month was Dhu'l-Qa'da, on the first day, (and) the year was twenty and six above nine hundred, on the day which was Monday (1 Dhu'l-Qa'da 926=13 October 1520).

---

1 Name of a stream in Paradise.
2 Name of another stream in Paradise.
3 'Uwâd according to F. Stephans, A comprehensive Persian English Dictionary (London, 1967), p. 864, is 'prefacing or writing a title page to a book'.
SÜR RECORD FROM BIHAR

(a) Inscription of Muhammad Sûr, dated A.H. 962, from Bihârsharif (p. 10)

SCALE: 23

MÁLWA SULTANATE RECORD FROM MADHYA PRADESH

(b) Epigraph of Sultan Ahmad from Pîrânpur (p. 3)

SCALE: 23
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(8) Mašriqi composed seven complete couplets in its praise, in each of which there is an ocean full of the Oman pearls.

(9) Whoever casts an evil eye on this step-well, may his eye be blind and his stomach ache.

(10) The writer of these words is the poor and insignificant creature Muḥammad Sha’bān Afghānī, an old retainer of Khān-i-A’zam Afḍal Khān.

(11) At the instance of Bayāḍās (i.e. Prayāg Dās) unbeliever, the construction of this step-well endowed for public (at the hand of ?) Rāmdās (son of) Lakhman (attached to ?) Bayāḍās (Prayāg Dās) unbeliever, in the month of Dhul-Qa’da, year (?) . . . .

It may not be without significance that this epigraph is also one of the many records of the time of the Mālāwā kings found in Gujā district particularly at Chanderī and its neighbourhood, which commemorate the setting up of step-wells. It also supplies new information about the local history of Chanderī as obtained in and about A.H. 926. It happens to be the only source to have preserved the name of a Hindu official of the revenue collection department, namely Bhārati Chand, who was the Majmūdār at the place. The record also provides, for the first time, the name of a new Mālāwā noble, whose name even would have passed into oblivion but for our record. The Maliku’-sh-Sharq’s designation or his connection with Chanderī or the court is not specified in the text, but it can be safely assumed that he held a high post at the court, presumably that of a minister, or he may have held his jagir in the region. It is therefore surprising that he should be untraceable in historical works. The epigraph also gives the name of the scribe-designer of the text, a piece of information not always met with in epigraphs. He is Muḥammad (son of) Sha’bān who describes himself as an Afḍān and also as an old retainer of Khān-i-A’zam Afḍal Khān. The latter is evidently identical with a nobleman of Mālāwā, Maulānā ‘Imādū’d-Dīn entitled Afḍal Khān who was concerned in the fratricidal wars between Sultān Maḥmūd and his brother Sultān Muḥammad. He changed sides a couple of times receiving once the highest title of Majlis-i-Karim from, and was ultimately beheaded by, the former at the instigation of Medini Rāsi in about A.H. 918.1 The similarity of the names of Afḍal Khān and Faḍlā which are derived from the same root, may suggest the possibility of their being the father and the son. The text is stated to have been composed by the pseudo-poet Mašriqi, to trace whom in the historical or other works would be futile. Lastly, the names of the person at whose request the step-well was constructed and of the mason, very probably, attached to him, are also given. If the reading is correct, the former in particular is mentioned with the sobriquet ‘unbeliever’ generally used for a Hindu, while, it will have been noted that no such sobriquet is used for Bhārati Chand.

But the major importance of this epigraph is that it not only confirms but throws new light on the existence of a sovereign principality, however nominal or short-lived, which was set up by the brother of ‘Alаū’d-Dīn Maḥmūd II of Mālāwā (1511-1531), son of Nāṣir Shāh Khaljī. The latter had, before he died in December 1510, appointed his son Maḥmūd as his successor, his eldest son and heir-apparent Shihābu’d-Dīn having rebelled. The death of Nāṣir Shāh was a signal for further trouble which Maḥmūd Shāh had to face. He had not yet settled down on the throne when news came in about July 1511 that some of the nobles had decided to raise to the throne another brother of his, Sāhib Khān by name. The latter helped by these nobles succeeded a few days later, in besieging the palace of Maḥmūd Shāh who was compelled to escape from the fort and flee towards Ujjain, or Srangpur, according to some. The nobles raised Sāhib Khān to the

1 Nīgāmūd-Dīn Āḥmad, Tabaqāt-i-Ābārī (Lucknow, 1873), pp. 575-79; Day. op. cit., pp. 240, 268, 272, 274, 276, 278.
The events of about this period are almost identically described except for slight difference in dates by Nāẓūm-ud-Dīn Ahmad, Fīrūzī, Sikandar, Ḥājī Dābir and others. For a resume of this, see Day, op. cit., pp. 271-279, 281-284.

Sikandar, Miṣʿāḥi- Sīkandarī (Baroda, 1962), pp. 174, 175, 176, 179; Ḥājī Dābir, Zafar-ul-Walīh bi-Masāʾīl wa-Ahāk (London, 1910), pp. 97, 98, 100, 212, 213, etc.

Dr. Day follows Nāẓūm-ud-Dīn Ahmad, when he says that Șāhib Khān 'went to the army of Sikandar Lodī on the other side of the border of Mālūwā' (op. cit., p. 284).

For details, see Day, op. cit., pp. 290-297.

Ibid., p. 303.

Ibid., p. 312. In the Glamour State Gazetteer too, Rānā Sāngā is stated to have seized it in 1520 and made it over to Medini Rāī who held it until Bābur captured it on 27 September 1527 (Luard, op. cit., pp. 210-11). Apart from the interpolation under study, the Lodī record of A.H. 930 (1524 A.D.) from Chandīri (EIAS, 1906 and 1956 pp. 122-23) also shows that Rānā Sāngā could not have taken it before 1524.
In short, one looks in vain in Dr. Day’s otherwise laudable work, for any worthwhile information about Chandiari’s political status by the end of the first quarter of the sixteenth century. Naturally Dr. Day could not be expected to be aware of the evidence furnished by the inscription under study, which was brought to light after his work was published. But there are at least two references in historical works that have escaped Dr. Day’s notice, which could have been utilised to present a somewhat clear picture on the subject. One of these is to be found in Nizāmu’d-Din Ahmad’s work itself which has been the main source for Dr. Day’s narration of the later Mālāw Sultāns, but it seems to have escaped Dr. Day’s notice, as the particular statement occurs in the account of Ibrāhīm Lodī. The other reference, which gives more details, is from about a contemporary source, viz., the Memoirs of the Mughal emperor Bābur whose statement throws fresh light on the history of Chandiari, and as such, deserves to be quoted below first in full:—

Formerly Chandari will have belonged to the Sultāns of Mandū (Mandū). When Sl. Nāṣiru’d-Din passed away, one of his sons Sl. Māljamād who is now holding Mandū, took possession of it and its neighbouring parts, and another son called Muhammad Shāh laid hands on Chandari and put it under Sl. Sīkatār (Lūdī)’s protection, who, in his turn took Muhammad Shāh’s side and sent him large forces. Muhammad Shāh survived Sl. Sīkatār and died in Sl. Ibrāhīm’s time, leaving a very young son called Ahmad Shāh whom Sl. Ibrāhīm drove out and replaced by a man of his own. At the time Rānā Sāgā led out an army against Sl. Ibrāhīm and Ibrāhīm’s begs turned against him at Dūlpūr, Chandari fell into the Rānā’s hands and by him was given to Medimī [Mandū] Rāo the greatly-trusted pagan who was now in it with 4 or 5,000 other pagans.1

Bābur took Chandari from Medimī Rāī in A. H. 9352 and gave it, again, to Ahmad Shāh, according to his own statement.3 Abu’l-Faḍl and Firīghta also have referred to the restoration of Chandari to Ahmad Shāh by Bābur.4

The above account of Bābur clears up the picture to a large extent, and the exact chronology which it lacks can be supplied from epigraphical and historical works. Firstly, the epigraph under study indicates that the history of Chandari as given by Bābur is fairly correct. Ahmad Shāh was at least ruler of Chandari in A. H. 926, the date of the record. From the other reference in Nizāmu’d-Din Ahmad’s work to which attention has been drawn, Bābur’s statement regarding Muhammad Shāh having survived Sīkatār Lodī stands corroborated. According to this, immediately after his accession, Ibrāhīm Lodī lost no time in strengthening various parts of the kingdom and he sent Shaikhzāda Manjhū to guard the Chandari fort and act as a Peshā (Chief Minister) of Muhammad Shāh.5

From the above, it would transpire that Muhammad Shāh was succeeded by his son Ahmad Shāh some time between A. H. 924 and A. H. 926. The latter seems to have been supplanted,

---

1 Annette Susannah Beveridge, Bābur-Nāma (Memoirs of Bābur), New Delhi, 1970, p. 593.
2 Medimī Rāī was killed in this battle (ibid., p. 596, f.n. 1).
3 Ibid., p. 598.
5 Nizāmu’d-Din Ahmad, op. cit., p. 175; Firīghta, op. cit., p. 190. Both call Muhammad Shāh a grandson of Nīṣāru’d-Din, which is not correct.
6 Incidentally, this statement of Nizāmu’d-Din Ahmad has been wrongly translated by S. A. A. Faww (Imām Taṣūrī’s-Shāhāt, Aligarh, 1968, p. 236) as indicating that Ibrāhīm Lodī appointed Muhammad Shāh as the Peshā. See also Firīghta, op. cit., p. 189, where he explicitly refers to Shaikhzāda Manjhū’s assignment as that of Vakil.
not very long after, by Miyan Husain Farmull, who was given the siege of Chanderti by Ibrahím Lodi. But exactly at what date this deposition took place, and how long Miyan Husain enjoyed his new siege, is nowhere mentioned, though the latter's extermination by the akhqudas of Chanderti, at the instigation and instance of the Lodi monarch has been described in details by some historians. As Miyan Husain's death is reported to have taken place a little before the death of the Bihār governor Dāryā Khān Nūsānī, this event must have taken place some time in A.H. 927 or 928 (1521-22 A.D.).

In what year did Raṇā Sāngā take Chanderti from Ibrahīm Lodi is also nowhere mentioned, nor has the fixing of the date been attempted by any scholar including Prof. A. B. Pānde, who has worked on the history of the Lodis. That it could not have been before 930 (11 July 1524) is clear from an epigraph of Ibrahīm Lodi from Chanderti which names Sharaḍūl-Mulk as the Muqta' of the Chanderti gharī. This Sharaḍūl-Mulk must have succeeded to part, if not whole, of the Chanderti jagir of Miyan Husain Farmull in whose clandestine removal, he had taken an active part at the instigation of Ibrahīm Lodi himself.

It follows, therefore, that Mādīnī Rāī must have been set up as Raja of Chanderti only after July 1524 and Ahmād Shāh was again made king of Chanderti by Bābur in A.H. 934 (1527-28 A.D.) as stated above. We are totally in dark about what happened to Sultan Ahmad Shāh thereafter.

In any ease, the inscription under study is extremely valuable as a historical document and due notice should be taken thereof.

Before I close, I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Z. A. Desai, editor of this journal, who not only asked me to select this epigraph for study but also helped me in various ways in the preparation of the article.

---

3 The Geographer State Caresette places the event in 1520 which is manifestly wrong as has been shown above (p. 6, supra, fn. 7).
4 EIAP, 1935 and 1936, pp. 122-23. The inscription was noticed as early as in about 1928 in the ARADO, for the year V.S. 1986, no. 13, where its date is wrongly read as A.H. 902, though it is stated to have been set up in the time of Ibrahīm Lodi (who came to throne in A.H. 923).
5 Mūḥtaqr, op. cit., pp. 164-69.
A UNIQUE INSCRIPTION OF MUHAMMAD SHAH SUR OF BIHAR

BY DR. Z. A. DESAI

This interesting inscription was first identified and brought to light by my esteemed friend Professor S. H. ‘Askari of Patnā, the great historian and scholar, who is known to have virtually dedicated himself to historical studies. It is no exaggeration to say that almost all the new Arabic and Persian inscriptions of the province of Bihar have been published in recent times including those that have been published in this series, owe their discovery entirely due to the indefatigable energy and unquenchable zeal of the learned professor. It has indeed been a privilege to have been accompanied by him, more than once, in the course of my visits to the province to collect Arabic and Persian inscriptions. These epigrapha have shed considerable new light on the history of Bihar, particularly of the pre-Mughal period and it is no exaggeration to say that epigraphical evidence alone has been forthcoming to give a list of succession of the Tughluqian governors of the province, about which our information was almost nil. Professor ‘Askari had published three learned articles, based on the evidence of inscriptions and literary works like the biographies of saints and their Malfuz (Daily Talk), one each dealing with the Turko-Afghan Period, Lodi Period and Early Mughal period.

The inscription under study was noticed by Professor ‘Askari in the above-mentioned first article, where the Roman transcript of its text as deciphered by him was also given. Initially, its impression was prepared for my office in 1954, but the writing being somewhat damaged and the letters having been executed in a somewhat cursive hand and also placed one upon another, the text could not be satisfactorily read. As a result, the king’s titles were stated to be Shamsu’d-Din. In January 1956, when I visited Bihar Sharif in the company of Professor ‘Askari, I took the opportunity to examine it on stone, and had a somewhat better impression thereof obtained. It is from this impression that the epigraph is being edited here.

The tablet bearing the inscription is fixed above the mihrab in the western wall of a building called Imambara situated in the Mahalla Aziz Ghat of Bihar Sharif, a sub-divisional headquarters in Patna district. The building was used at that time and, may be, is used even now, to run a small restaurant called Munshi Hotel.

1 Some idea of this can be had from the studies on the inscriptions of the Tagluq and of the Lodi s of Bengal, from Bihar, which appeared in the various issues of the Epigrapha India Arabic and Persian Supplement (EIAPS), as detailed in the foot note 4, below.
2 The first and the third of these articles were published in the 1954 and 1957 issues of the Curia of Studies Magazine of the Patna College, Patna, where Professor ‘Askari headed the Department of History with great distinction. The second was published in the Journal of the Bihar Research Society, Patna, vol. XL, part 3 (1955). It is unfortunate that these articles, published as they were in a college magazine having a limited circulation and that too among students of various subjects and calibres, did not attract sufficient notice.
4 Ibid, Bihar Sharif is famous in Indo-Muslim history as the provincial capital in the pre-Mughal period.

A number of inscriptions of the Mamluk, Tughluq, Sherd and Lodi kings have been found here. These have been listed in the ARIE and almost all of them also published in the various issues of the Epigrapha Indo-Kasemica and EIAPS. For references to these, see EIAPS, 1961, p. 25, f.n. 2. Independent articles on the inscriptions of the Tughluq and of the Sultanate of Bengal from Bihar have appeared in ibid., pp. 25-44 (where more references will be found) and ibid., 1969, pp. 11-16. Some Sherd, Lodi and Sur epigraphs were published in ibid., 1962, pp. 41-44, 60-52; ibid., 1967, pp. 25-32; and ibid., 1968, pp. 25-27. A few Mugal epigraphs were published in ibid., 1966, pp. 36-42 and ibid., 1969, pp. 1-14.
The epigraph is a three-line text, of which the first line is devoted to Basmala and the remaining two contain the historical record in Persian, which refers itself to the reign of Nasru’d-Dunya wa’d-Din Abul’-Muzaaffer Muhammad Shâh Sultan and assigns the construction of a mosque to Ahmad (son of) Tahir, son of Diya in 1554-55.

The epigraphical tablet measures 30 by 25 cms., and the style of writing is Nasikh of quite an ordinary type which is somewhat on a crude side in certain parts. However, an attempt seems to have been made to achieve a certain impressiveness by the parallel arrangement of vertical strokes of some letters and the slanting strokes of parts of other letters particularly in the first line, and the effect could have been quite picturesque if the calligraphy were of a high order.

The reading of a few words in the middle of the second line of the text which could not be deciphered satisfactorily is tentative. These words except one, are not indistinct, but their correct reading could not be established, as they are quite unfamiliar. It would not be surprising if they have been wrongly inscribed in place of some other words.

TEXT

Plate 1(a)

(1) لا اله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(2) أنصر(؟) الدنيا و انوار المحضر محمد شاه سلطان

(3) بناي مسجد بهذا دركو فكري خرکنها احد(؟) بن طاهر بن ضياء في اثنين سبیل و سعماية

TRANSLATION

(1) There is no god but Allâh, Muhammad is the Prophet of Allah.

(2) (In the reign of) Nasru’d-Dunya wa’d-Din Abul’-Muzaaffer Muhammad Shâh Sultan,

(3) the builder of the mosque is the servant of the court.

Professor 'Askari's eye-reading of this epigraph, despite the fact that it was made under unfavourable conditions, is correct to a fairly good extent. The above reading differs from that of his in two or three places: He reads in line 2 Zafaru’d-Dunya (which looks more like Nasru’d-Dunya) and Mirnagar Harkhâ and Bunyâ instead of Fakir Kh(or H)arkhâ and Diya respectively in line 3. It will be seen from the illustration that the words are almost quite clear in the

---

1 According to the tentative reading given in the text, this phrase reads like Fakir Kh(or H)arkhâ. It could have been originally intended for some inventory phrase.

A UNIQUE INSCRIPTION OF MUHAMMAD SHĀH SŪR OF BIHĀR

impression. But it is difficult to explain what they stand for. Likewise, the reading of the name of the builder is also not certain. It has been tentatively read as Ahmad, son of Tahir, son of Diyā. The name of Tahir son of Diyā is quite clear. About the builder, nothing is known from available historical records, but the text mentions him as the servant of the court, that is an official.

But the main importance of the record lies in that it is a unique record of the king mentioned therein. There were, as Professor 'Askari has rightly pointed out, two sovereign rulers bearing this name, to wit, Sultan Muhammad Shāh Sur surnamed 'Adil who ruled first at Delhi and later at Chunar (1553-57) and the other, Muhammad Khan Sur, governor of Bengal including North Bihar (1553-55). The latter who is mentioned in some historical works as Gauriya,' was the viceroy of Bengal which then included parts of North Bihar also, and having refused to acknowledge the former, independently ruled as king of Bengal from 1553. He was ultimately killed at the hands of Humā of December 1555 in a battle fought at Chhappargāh, near Kāpi.1 His death was avenged by his son and successor to the throne Chīyāthu'd-Dīn Bahādur Shāh, who killed Muhammad 'Adil in the battle fought in the vicinity of Surajgarh, near Monghyr, in about April 1557.2

Now, as Professor 'Askari has rightly observed, the title of both of them are different from that found in our inscription.4 As to the titles of Muhammad 'Adil, his coins have Mushārin'd-Dūnyā wa'd-Dīn,4 while none of his three inscriptions found so far, contains any title.* On the other hand, no inscription of Muhammad Shāh Sur of Gauḍa was known so far. But his coins issued from Arakān mint in A.H. 962 have clearly Shamsu'd-Dūnyā wa'd-Dīn.5 The inscription in the study bears the date A.H. 962 and also contains the name Muhammad Shāh, and in addition its inscription, Bihār Sharif is more likely to be at this date under the Afghan ruler of Gauḍa than Muhammad 'Adil, who being deprived of the Delhi throne had come down to Chunar. But in that case the title used in the inscription, to wit, Naṣru'd-Dūnyā would be different from the title used in his coins. There is also a possibility namely that the word Naṣr in the title may have been so engraved instead of Shams. The style of writing being somewhat confusing, this would not be wholly impossible.

1 'Abd al-Qādir Badayūnī, Muntakhab-Tawāriḥ, vol. I (Calcutta, 1868), p. 432 Firehā. Tārīkh-i-Runī, (Nawalkishore, 1864), vol. I, p. 235; Ngāmu'd-Dīn Ahmad, Tabaqāt-i-'Askari (Lucknow, 1873), p. 241. It is rather surprising that Dr. S.M. Imām u'd-Dīn in his introduction to Tārīkh-i-Khānedān-i-Manṣūr-i-Afgānī, vol. I (Daeca, 1900), p. 402, should write the sobriquet as Kūrah. The correct sobriquet Gauriya is used by these historians to distinguish him from other nobles bearing his name, as he was ruler of Gauḍa in Bengal.

2 R. G. Mujumdar, ed. History of Bengal, vol. II (Daeca, 1948), p. 179. None of the Persian historians give the exact date of the battle, but from the statement of Firzhā, op. cit., p. 235, it would appear that the battle was fought after the reoccupation of Delhi and Agra by Humayūn, which took place in Rajab 962 (May-June 1556) and just before the death of the latter which took place in Rabi' 1563 (January-February 1556). The date of the battle, therefore, given in Mujumdar, op. cit., appears to be correct. In R. R. Dīwākar, ed. Bihār Through the Ages (Calcutta, 1939), p. 494, the date given is 1564.


4 'Askari, op. cit.


6 Two of these are from Jathārī (EIAPS, 1953 and 1954, pp. 37-38). The third is from Kaishmā (ARIE, 1953-54, No. D, 265). Generally speaking, historical works do not give his regal title and wherever it is given, it is incorrectly given. For example, Badayunī, op. cit., gives Jalān’u’d-Dīn.

7 Wright, op. cit.
A glance at the illustration will show that the word \textit{Nagar cordu} has been originally intended to be \textit{Shams}.$^1$ And even otherwise, the cases where the titles on coins and inscriptions differ are not entirely unknown. Therefore, I am inclined to assign this epigraph to \textit{Muhammad Shāh Sūr} who governed Bengal for about two years after declaring his independence in A.H. 960.

\footnote{In any case, there is no doubt that the word is not \textit{Jafar} as taken by Professor \textit{Askary}.}
AN EARLY FOURTEENTH CENTURY EPIGRAPH FROM GUJARAT

BY DR. Z. A. DESAI

The town of Pātān in Mhānsā district in North Gujarat is well-known, under the name of Anhilwārā or Nahrwāla, to students of Indian history as the capital of Gujarat ever since its foundation till its place was taken by Ahmadābād in 1412. Now shorn alike of its historical importance, antiquarian character and former splendour, it is reduced to the position of a taluka headquarters. It is approachable both by rail and road from Ahmadābād, which is about one hundred kilometres on the south-east.

Very few Islamic monuments have survived at Pātān, which was the capital of the Muslim governors for about a century. Whatever few have come down to us probably date from the Sultanate and post-Sultanate periods, and these too comprise in almost all cases the mausolea of celebrated saints like Shaikh Fārid, Makhḍūm Husāmuddin Multānī and the like, situated on the outskirts of the present town. Fortunately, however, a large number of Muslim epigraphs ranging from the Raipūt period down to the present times, have been preserved in various monuments, comprising mostly mosques, in which the town abounds. There epigraphs have been listed in the Annual Reports on Indian Epigraphy from time to time, and some of them have been edited in the previous issues of this series as well. The Khalji and the early Tughluq records of the place—the available Tughluq records do not date prior to the reign of Firūz Tughluq—have totally disappeared, except two fragmentary epigraphs, which have been proved to have formed part of a record of the time of ‘Alā‘uddin Khalji, who conquered Gujarat in 1298. It may be recalled that this record also mentions Alp Khān that is to say, Malik Sanjar, a brother-in-law of that monarch, who was the governor of the province for about a decade. In one of my subsequent visits to Pātān, to be exact in January 1965, I discovered one more inscription of the time of the Khalji monarch, which seems to have been caused to be set up by a man of official status, but surprisingly enough it omits to mention the name of the king. It is proposed to study this inscription in this short article.

This is quite an elegant inscription carved in relief on a slab of white marble which is built up into the inner face of the city-wall to the immediate west of the Moti Shāh Darwāza. This part of the city-wall forms the southern wall of a shop, which belongs to the adjacent mosque on the west. The mosque in question is a modern structure. The text of the epigraph comprises one line of writing in Persian recording the construction of a mosque in 1315 by Malik‘ul-Umara Khiyyār ‘ud-Daulat wa‘d-Dīn ‘Alī son of Muḥammad (son of) Khānīkhān. Whether the epigraph

1 For reference to the history and description of the town, see Epigraphia Indica Arabic and Persian Supplement (EIAPS), 1961, p. 15, fn. 4.
3 Epigraphia Indo-Muslimica (ELM), 1939-40, pp. 34 (pl. I b); EIAPS, 1961, p. 16 (pl. III a); ibid., 1962, pp. 3 (pl. I b), 7 (pl. II c), 8 (pl. III a), 15 (pl. IV b); ibid., 1963, pp. 13 (pl. I a), 12 (pl. III b), 14 (pl. IV a), 15 (pl. IV b), 23 (pl. VII b), 54 (pl. IX a), 35 (pl. X a). A few Mughal records from Pātān are included in this issue (pp. 66-68, 68, 76, 78, 82, 87, infra).
4 Recently a fragmentary inscription of Ghīyāshuddin Tughluq Shāh has been discovered (ARIE, 1972-74, No. D, 77).
5 Here only those inscriptions are taken into account which specifically refer to the ruling monarch.
6 For the detailed notice of this epigraph, please see EIAPS, 1962, pp. 1-3.
has anything to do with the present mosque cannot be said for certain, but the possibility that there might have been an old mosque on the same site and the epigraph might have belonged to it cannot be ruled out.

The style of writing is Naskh of no distinctive merit in itself, but the letters which are engraved in relief have been symmetrically and neatly placed and the effect produced on the whole thereby is extremely pleasing to the eye.

The text is engraved on the entire surface of the slab which measures 1.67 m. by 20 cms. and has been deciphered as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate II(a)*

إِنَّ رَبِّي هَذَا الْمَسْجِد مَلك الامْرَاء ملِجَاء الْفَقْراء اخْتِبَارُ الدِّوَلَة وَالْإِنْدِي عَلَى عِبَادِه

إِذْ أَمَانَ اللّهُ مَعَالَهُ مِنْ غَرَّهُ مِنْ جَمَادَة الْأَوْلى سَتِينَ عَشَر وَسَبْعَاٰتِ وَرَبِّي

**TRANSLATION**

This mosque was ordered to be built by Maliku'l-Umarā (lit. prince among the nobles), the refuge of the needy, Ḳẖṭṭiyya'r-Daulat wa'd-Dīn 'Ali (son of) Muhammad (son of) Khāmūsh, may Allāh perpetuate his glories, on the first of Jumādā'ī-ulā (of the) year (A. H.) fifteen and seven hundred (1 Jumādā'ī I 715-3 August 1315).

The importance of the epigraph lies, apart from being one of the very few records of the Khaljī period that have survived in Gujarāt, in preserving the name of a noble of first rank, Maliku'l-Umarā 'Ali. Though the latter is not designated by any official authority in the text, the title Maliku'l-Umarā Ḳẖṭṭiyya'r-Daulat wa'd-Dīn used along with his name and his description as helper of the needy, can be safely taken to indicate that he enjoyed high official status. As such, the epigraph is quite valuable as a source of regional history.

At the same time, the Maliku'l-Umarā does not appear to have been in the lime-light of political activity. Otherwise, his name at least would have found mention in contemporary records. For want of any information whatsoever, it is difficult to establish his full identity beyond what is known from the present record, namely that he was an official of high status stationed at least having a temporary or permanent domicile at Panān at the time of the date of the record. No doubt we do come across a short account of Sayyid Khāmūsh, an uncle of the author of the celebrated hagiographical work *Ṣiyar al-'Auliya*.

But as he is stated to have died in A.H. 732, at a comparatively young age, he would be too late a person to be a grandfather of Maliku'l-Umarā 'Ali. However, there is the possibility of the former's having belonged to this family if not being the son of the latter—the naming of grandchildren after the name of grandpatents has been a common practice.

It has been alluded to above that the name of the ruling monarch has been omitted in the text. This is by no means a solitary instance, as students of Indo-Islamic inscriptions know, and as such it may not have any particular significance. On the other hand, one may be tempted to take into account the situation obtaining at Delhi at about this time when, according to histories! works, 'Alā'uD-Dīn's last days were marked by the influence wielded over him by Malik.

---

1 Amir Khurā, *Ṣiyar al-'Auliya* (Delhi, 1876), pp. 219-20.
Nāgaur, who was instrumental in having Alp Khān the governor of Gujarāt to be recalled to Delhi by the king, to be put to death a little later in the beginning of 1316.¹ Seen against this background, the absence of the king's name may have been due to the fact that the state of affairs at the capital was not clear, and the authorities at various levels in Gujarāt could not make up their mind, and hence took recourse to the safer way of keeping quiet on this point. It would not be unlikely that this course was adopted by the Malikul-Umarā of the record under study, who, it may be remembered, did not stand to lose anything by doing so, as this epigraph did not constitute, strictly speaking, an official document.

The need for preservation of this important historical document of the early fourteenth century is imperative, and it is hoped that it will not be allowed to be destroyed or lost in the course of the demolition of the city-wall by the Municipality of the town, which was in various stages of completion, at the time of my visit.

INSCRIPTIONS OF THE KHANZADAS OF NAGAUR

BY DR. Z. A. DRAI

Very little attention has been paid by our historians to the history of the small but powerful dynasty of the Khánzadas of Nágaur, which ruled over part of central Rájásthán from Nágaur for a period of slightly less than a century and half. It is a measure of its greatness that it retained its sovereignty against heavy odds—the kingdom was surrounded on all sides by powerful neighbours who were all the while ready to attack and if possible annex it to their own territories. For example, there were the Rájput chiefs of Mewâr and Márwâr on one side and on the other, there were the Súltâns of Mâlûwâ. There were also the Súltâns of Gujârat, who, however, in the beginning at least as it would seem, acted more in times of need like protectors than otherwise, which is not surprising since the founders of the principality of Nágaur and the kingdom of Gujârat were scions of the same family.

The reason for this lack of interest may be partly, if not wholly, due to paucity of material. None of the well-known historical works, contemporary or otherwise, dealing with the history of the period, contain any information about, leave alone devote a separate chapter to, the history of the dynasty. The historians of Gujârat also do not supply any detailed information about this house whose founder was a brother of the founder of the Gujârat Sulítanate. As it is, even a full list of the rulers, not to speak of the dates of their rule, is not to be found. Secondly, until very recently, very few epigraphs of the Khánzâda chiefs were found; these, too, to be exact, numbering seven in all, were found at Dîdwâna in Nágaur district and Nâipâ in Jaipur district of Rájásthán, but none of them at Nágaur itself. At the same time, the apathy of scholars to the regional history or to that of minor dynasties must also share some responsibility for this, as no systematic search for the sources (including epigraphical) for the history of the Nágaur principality seems to have been made. Only during the past decade, the Archaeological Survey of India has discovered some more lithic records of these rulers.

This is not to say that the matter did not receive any attention at all. As a matter of fact, the first to make a somewhat systematic effort in this direction more than thirty-five years ago, was Dr. M. 'Abdu'llâh Chághtáí.¹ His fairly detailed article on the history of Nágaur from its earliest conquest by the Muslims also included the history of the Khánzâdas. This account, though not very exhaustive, was based on the available material in historical works and a few known epigraphs referred to above, some of which—those from Dîdwâna—were found by him. Even then, to him must go the credit of providing for the first time, a compact though brief account of the dynasty, having fortunately been able to lay his hands on a Persian manuscript entitled Atrâd-i-Qâdirîyya, preserved in the sanctuary of Haḍrat Hamîdud-Dîn Suîlî, popularly called Sulţânî-Târikhân and Sufî Sâhib. It was mainly on the basis of the information contained in this manuscript that he was able to reconstruct a fairly complete genealogy of the Khánzâdas. In 1958-59, Dr. K. C. Jain attempted a brief history of Nágaur town from the earliest times to Akbar's period, as a part of his project of the history of important towns of Rájásthán.²


(16)
Inscriptions of the Khánzásas of Nágaur

Dr. Jain who does not seem to have consulted Dr. Chaghşái's article, provides some interesting information gleaned from the colophons of a few Jain manuscripts stated therein to have been written in the time of Khánzás chief. A few years later, in 1965 to be exact, Dr. B. S. Mátur of the Udaipur University read a paper on the history of Nágaur at the Mynore Session of the Indian History Congress. As the paper is not readily available to me, it is difficult to say for certain if Dr. Mátur has been able to throw fresh light on the subject since Dr. Chaghşái and Dr. Jain wrote. But a passing reference may be made to the fact that as would appear from the published summary of his paper, he also subscribes to the generally accepted view that Nágaur remained part of the Delhi Sultanate till the fall of the Tughluq dynasty, after which a triangular contest arose between the states of Gujarát, Mewár and Márwár for its possession, that it had often to change hands, that it was only during the reign of Sultán Sikandar Lodi that Nágaur became once again a part of the Delhi Sultanate. This does not appear to be a true statement of facts, as Nágaur had at no time become part of any of the three kingdoms mentioned above, nor did it become a part of the Delhi Sultanate under Sikandar Lodi.

For this reason, we greatly feel, at times, the lack of zeal on the part of research scholars and historians to look for new material, epigraphical as well as written. In one of my visits to Nágaur, for example, I was told about some old documents and papers that were in possession of the descendants of the Khánzásas, the last of whom is reported to have migrated to Pakistan in 1948 or so.

While for obvious reasons, the scope of the present study does not permit us to explore any new, or interpret the available material pertaining to this dynasty, it will be our endeavour here to place before the scholars and historians alike, with necessary comments, the new epigraphical material that has come to light in recent years through the Archaeological Survey of India. It is genuinely felt that the detailed examination of this material attempted in the following lines will add to our knowledge of the history of the period, particularly of Rájahsháh.

The most important aspect of this study is that as many as twelve of the sixteen inscriptions studied therein are from Nágaur itself. Three decades earlier, Dr. Chaghşái had bemoaned the fact that no inscription of the Khánzás dynasty had come to light from Nágaur itself. No wonder, therefore, that his study of Nágaur epigraphs does not contain a single epigraph of this dynasty. But these twelve epigraphs show that not all such remnants had been completely destroyed by Ráná Kumbhá when he came there to dismantle the bastions of the Nágaur Fort.

1 Jain, op. cit., p. 135.
3 Among others, Dr. A. B. Pandé (The First Afghan Empire in India, Calcutta, 1956, pp. 147-149) also subscribes to this erroneous view. The basis of this assertion is the account of the historians of the Mughal period (Nágámú'd-Din Ahmad, Tákhbí'í-Ákbért, Lucknow, 1875, p. 168) that in about A. H. 915, the Nágaur chief Muhammed Khán, being threatened by an attack by Sikandar Lodi, agreed to pay tribute and have the latter's name introduced on the coinage and in the sermon. This statement even if factual, cannot be interpreted to mean annexation as Dr. Pandé and others state. Also, apart from the Aurd-i-Qádäríqá (Chaghşái, op. cit., p. 176), an epigraph set up as late as in A. H. 933 mentions Pirz Khán as the reigning chief (Inscription No. 16, infra).
4 It is worthwhile to point out that these may not be the only extant Khánzás records of the town. An exhaustive survey of the inner and outer faces of both the citadel walls (or what may now have remained of it) and the lower and upper wall of the citadel is bound to produce a few more records. Myself, in one of my visits, was shown an epigraphical tablet, which was built up in the outer wall at a great height; from its calligraphy, definitely seems to be a Khánzás record. All my efforts to secure its impression failed due to its inaccessibility and for want of a ladder of sufficient height.
5 Epigraphia Indo-Scitica (EIS), 1940-50, pp. 35-53; Chaghşái, op. cit., p. 179.
But it is a great pity too, that, as in the case of the Khalif inscriptions of Chitorgarh, of which we had the occasion to speak in a previous issue,¹ at least as many as nine of these twelve epitaphs are not in situ: in other words, the buildings on which they were fixed to commemorate their erection, have ironically enough, disappeared. Then again, the epigraphical tablets are fragmentary, and in most cases, badly damaged and are used as stone masonry in the walls of the citadel as well as the city-wall of the town. The buildings on which they were originally set up comprised, as is clear from their texts, a few tombs, which in all probability enshrined the remains of the members of the Khânzâda family, a few mosques and a step-well, and these are reported to have been demolished by Maharâja Bakht of Jodhpur — there are a number of carved mîhrâbs, blind niches, etc., found built up in these walls. Mr. H. B. W. Garrick, the Assistant Archaeological Surveyor, has noted in about 1883-84, the accounts refer to Nâgaur that "Aurangzeb himself never destroyed more temples than did Bakht Singh mosques, and this nay—indeed does account for the numerous Arabic and Persian inscriptions which I found built tosey-turvy into the main circumvallation of the city—some upside down, some diagonally and others so that the lines of writing stand up vertically".² As this aspect has been referred to by me in some details on an earlier occasion, when some of the epigraphs found in the city-wall and the citadel have also been mentioned,³ it need not detain us here any further.

This wanton damage has deprived the posterity of the most authentic source for the local history, on one hand, and of the specimens of architecture that some of these buildings can be reasonably taken to have comprised, on the other. And this is all the more regrettable in view of the fact, that, as pointed out earlier, historical works contain little information on both these aspects. It was therefore a matter of some satisfaction to have come across these epigraphs which even in their present fragmentary and damaged state, furnish important and new historical information, particularly in regard to the chronology of this dynasty.

As stated above, so far only seven epigraphs of these chiefs have come to light; three each from Dîdwânâ in Nâgaur district and Narâinâ in Jaipur district and one from Bâp Khân in Nâgaur district. Of these seven, again, four—one from Dîdwânâ and three from Narâinâ—belong to the reign of Mujâhid Khân and bear the dates A.H. 840 and A.H. 848,⁴ and the remaining three are dated A.H. 886, A.H. 889 and A.H. 896 in the reign of Frûz Khân, a grandson of Mujâhid Khân.⁵

The present group represents at least three new rulers. It contains three early epigraphs, dated A.H. 821, A.H. 822 and A.H. 838. Two of these are unfortunately fragmentary, one of them being beyond any doubt the unique record of Frûz Khân, son of Shams Khân Dandân the founder of the dynasty; from their surviving text, I am inclined to think that they were in all probability meant for the Tomb of Shams Khân Dandân. The third record was caused to be set up by a royal, but not ruling personage, namely Hátim Khâtûn, spouse of the last-mentioned. This is quite interesting considering the fact that even in the whole range of Indo-Islamic history, particulars about, and in many cases, even the names of, most of the intimate members of the royal family are un-known.

The next king to be represented in these records is Mujâhid Khân. His two epigraphs are dated A.H. 844 and 865. The later of the two inscriptions is extremely important not only in that

¹ Epigraphia Indica Arabic and Persian Supplement (EIAPS), 1899 and 1900, p. 70.
³ EIAPS, 1897, pp. 3-4. A few more inscriptions, since found, have been included in the present article
⁵ Íbd., 1949-50, pp. 21, 22; Chegatâl, op. cit., p. 172.
it provides epigraphic evidence of a later date for his reign, but also in having a bearing on the question of the place from where he had ruled, as will be discussed in its proper place. Mujahid Khan's grandson Firuz Khan II claims as many as five epigraphs, three from Nāgaūr and two from Bāri Khāṭu, which range in their dates between A.H. 880 and A.H. 900. His three known epigraphs, as has been seen above, being dated A.H. 886, A.H. 889 and A.H. 896, these new epigraphs studied here provide earlier and later dates. Again, the epigraph, dated A.H. 900, shows that Firuz Khan was reigning in that year, thus extending his reign by at least one year, from A.H. 899 mentioned in Dr. Chaghtai's Genealogy to A.H. 900. Then again, the Bari Khāṭu inscriptions of this king, both pertaining to one and the same monument, furnish the name of two high local officials.

The two other new kings to be represented for the first time in epigraphs are Muhammad Khan and Firuz Khan III. To the reign of the former belong five records and to that of the latter one. Of these, the inscription of Firuz Khan is extremely important, besides being unique. For, while dates of inscriptions of Muhammad Khan fall within the dates of his reign as given in Dr. Chaghtai's Genealogy, the inscription of Firuz Khan, dated A.H. 933, throws new light on the dates of the later rulers. According to Dr. Chaghtai's Genealogy, Muhammad Khan was succeeded by his son Firuz Khan who ruled from A.H. 915 to A.H. 922 and he by his son Muhammad Khan II who reigned from A.H. 922 till his death in A.H. 933. Now according to our inscription, Firuz Khan was reigning in A.H. 933. This would mean, firstly, that Firuz Khan of our record, who would be Firuz Khan IV, had succeeded the last-mentioned Muhammad Khan II in A.H. 933 and may have ruled beyond that date, at the most up to the time of Bābur who claims Nāgaūr as part of his kingdom. Unfortunately, in the case of the later inscriptions—those of Muhammad Khan and Firuz Khan III—the genealogy is not given, and therefore, their parentage cannot be authenticated. And while it has been found that the information from the Aṣūrād-i-Qādirīyya, which formed the basis of Dr. Chaghtai's Genealogy, appears to be in the main correct as far as the names of the rulers of this house are concerned, the same, however, cannot be said of their dates. On the other hand, the evidence of inscriptions as far as the names and dates are concerned is unimpeachable, but then the difficulty is that we do not have at present all epigraphs of all the rulers, or even those bearing all the dates of the represented rulers. After a careful consideration of the said Genealogy and the available dates of the inscriptions, I am inclined to feel that while the line of rulers as given in the Genealogy is correct, the dates of the rulers are not—we have seen above in the case of Firuz Khan II that his date can be extended at least by one year. In other words, there is no Firuz Khan IV and the inscription of A.H. 933 should be taken to refer to Firuz Khan III, son of Muhammad Khan I, only. In other words, Firuz Khan, son of Muhammad Khan I who ruled until or at least in A.H. 933, was succeeded by his son Muhammad Khan II, in that or in one of the following years. This is fortunately corroborated by the statement of the colophon of a Jaina manuscript which refers to Muhammad Khan as ruling over Nāgaūr in V.S. 1585, Falgun Vadi 6 (12th March 1528). This would be Muhammad Khan II who may have succeeded (his father) Firuz Khan III in or after A.H. 933 and before 20th Jumādā II 934, the date of the transcript of the Jaina manuscript and ruled until the extinction of the dynasty at the hands of Bābur or so.

If the above presumption is correct, the dates given in the said Genealogy will have to be revised. But, this can only be done when some new material comes to light. However, a word

1 That is to say it provides a later authentic date. According to the Genealogy reconstructed by Dr. Chaghtai, Mujahid Khan had a long rule from A.H. 829 to A.H. 872.


3 Bābur's claim over Nāgaūr has been referred to above.
or two may be said about fixing of A.H. 915 as the date of the end of Muḥammad Khān I’s reign in the Genealogy. This has perhaps been done on the basis of the statement of the Mughal and Afghan historians that in that year Muḥammad Khān offered to acknowledge the sovereignty of Sikandar Lodī. In view of lack of any definite evidence on the death or dismissal of the said chief, it is equally possible that he continued to govern his principality beyond that date.

Then, at least five of these epigraphs furnish for the first time the names of persons of note, including members of the ruling family: Hātim Khātūn, spouse of the founder of the dynasty, who has been already referred to; a wife of Miyān ‘Ali brother of Muḥammad Khān; Malikzāda Fathullāh son of Khānṣāda Ahmad Khān (the latter may have been a brother of one of the chieftains); Khānṣāda Hasan son of Fīrūz Khān II; Malik ʿUmār Lālī Khālīs, the Senior and the Junior; Dadā (son of) Khānṣāda Salāḥ Khānī; and one whose name reads something like Adā Jānūhī. One inscription, dated A.H. 880, mentions a ‘son of ‘Alā son of Sherdil Khānī’, who may be identical either with Malik Hisibr, son of ‘Alā, son of Sherdil Khānī mentioned as the agent of Diḍwānī in a later epigraph, dated A.H. 896 or with a brother of his.

Six of these epigraphs record the construction of mosques, three of tombs-cum-mosques, two of tombs, and one each of a step-well and a Khānąqāh. The remaining one epigraph being badly damaged, its exact purpose cannot be made out. Majority of these epigraphs are not in situ. The buildings—tombs and mosques—on which they must have originally appeared do not exist; these might have possessed some architectural character.

A word or two may also be said about the calligraphy of these records. This is usually of a fairly high order particularly in the case of the inscriptions caused to be set up by the Khānṣāda chieftains or members of their family, at Nāgar. The style of writing is Nasḥī or Thulth of a pleasing variety, recalling to mind the calligraphy, in varying degrees of quality, of the epigraphs of Bihār, Bengāl and Gujarāt. The writing is particularly remarkable for its bold and pleasing execution and the arrangement of the elongated shafts and rounded curves of its letters is also quite happy. In some cases, the execution of letters has a pronounced angular flourish and the calligraphy of a few letters, such as ‘on and the final ḥ as in Allāh) is quite artistic recalling to mind similar features in the late Tughluq and very early Sultanate inscriptions of Gujarāt.

Last but not the least, coming to the area covered by these epigraphs, twelve of the total sixteen records studied here are, as stated above, from Nāgar, while of the rest, two come from Barī Khāṭūt and one each from Narāīnī in Jaipur district, and Kamārī, which is about twenty-five kilometres to the south-west of Nāgar. These and one more findspot of the Khānṣāda records, viz., Diḍwānī, may be reasonably taken to indicate the extent of the authority of this dynasty. Narāīnī in Jaipur district, situated to the south of Sāmānī, may well indicate the easternmost borders of this kingdom.

With these introductory remarks, we may commence the study of these inscriptions in chronological order.

**Fīrūz Khān I**

Fīrūz Khān I was the son of Shams Khān, the founder of the line. Very little is known about the life and exploits of Shams Khān except that he was a brother of Zaiśar Khān, later on Muṣṭafār Shāh I of Gujarāt, who had granted him the governorship of Nāgar vice Jalāl Khokhar. He seems to have become independent soon after his brother’s death, for we are told that he finds mention as the ruling chief in V.S. 1468 (1411 A.D./A.H. 814) in a Jain work.¹ The date of Fīrūz’s

¹ Jain, op. cit. p. 135.
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acccession to the throne is not mentioned in any historical work. According to Dr. Chaghäti's Genealogy, he succeeded his father on his death in A.H. 829 and reigned until A.H. 857. But his father had died in about A.H. 822 if not earlier, as is clearly shown by a recently discovered unique epigraph mentioning him, which is included in this study (Inscription No. II). He only finds mention in historical works in the events of confrontation between the Sultans of Gujarat and Malwa. He is stated to have died in A.H. 857, after reigning for about three decades and a half.

I. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 821, FROM NÄGAUR

The fragmentary tablet bearing this inscription is built up into the outer-face of that part of the southern outer wall of the citadel, which is nearer to the Gandhi Chowk of the town and has in front a row of shops, facing the Station Road. Measuring in its present state 75 by 33 cm., it contains a one-line record, from whose surviving text, one can easily see that considerable part thereof is lost. It records the construction of a masjed in 1418, but by whom, is not clear from the extant text. The record also furnishes important information about the martyrdom attained by somebody whose name is lost but who is referred to as 'the chosen one or God'. It ends with a request to the visitor of the Tomb for a prayer for the deceased. The language of the epigraph is Persian and the style of writing is Tughra, having a slight tendency towards Tughrä. The vertical shafts of the letters have been elongated and effort has been made to ensure visual artistic effect.

Its text has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate II(b)

[Translation not provided due to the nature of the text]

TRANSLATION

[Translation not provided due to the nature of the text]

1 Chaghäti, op. cit., p. 176.
2 Sikandar, op. cit., p. 82; Nişāmu’d-Din Ahmād, op. cit., p. 453; Firāshṭā, op. cit., p. 192. Of all the historians, only Hājī Dabīr Zafar’i Wālih bi-Muṣaffar wa Aīth, vol I (London, 1910), p. 11, gives the actual date.
4 *Fāṭiḥa* is the opening chapter of the Qur’an which is recited to invoke blessings.
Though fragmentary, the epigraph is extremely important. That it is not in situ is quite obvious. It is also clear that it was originally meant for a mausoleum—maqbara of the text. From the fact that the mausoleum is called auspicious, it can be reasonably inferred that it was erected over the remains of an eminent person, very probably a royal personage. The epigraph also furnishes an important piece of information that the person for whom it was built died a martyr's death, evidently—as is clear from the context—in a battle.

It is a pity that the record being fragmentary, the identity of the martyr cannot be determined beyond doubt. Could it be that, the person referred to as having fallen a martyr is none other than Shams Khan Dandani himself? Unfortunately, the historical works do not help us in this regard. Nāgaur finds mention in historical works in the account of the events of A.H. 819 when Sultān Aḥmad I of Gujarāt is supposed to have marched to Nāgaur and ravaged the country, but according to some, he retreated on learning of the intention of Khizr Khān, the Sayyid king of Delhi, to come to its rescue. If so, it should mean that something serious had taken place at Nāgaur about this time, and it was probably to rectify matters that Aḥmad Shāh had gone there. Or it may be that Aḥmad Shāh's Nāgaur expedition was accentuated by his desire to take revenge on Shams Khan, his grand-uncle who had not only, allegedly, administered poison to Aḥmad Shāh's father, but had also given refuge to the Gujarāt Sultān's uncle and his own nephew Fīrūz Khān. It is also possible that Khizr Khān's proposed march to Nāgaur was not in the nature of intervention against the Gujarāt Sultān but otherwise; the latter might have moved to thwart the designs of Khizr Khān over Nāgaur at this crucial period, when Shams Khan had died. And it was probably at this time that Shams Khan's son and successor Fīrūz Khān ascended the throne with the help of his nephew, the Gujarāt Sultān.

The above surmise that the person referred to in our inscription may be Shams Khan is also indirectly indicated by another epigraph to be studied next, in which he is mentioned as already dead in A.H. 822 (1419 A.D.). Then again, the Nāgaur chief whom Sultān Hoghang of Mālwa tried to woo against his Gujarāt rival and who warned the latter about it in about A.H. 821 was Fīrūz Khān son of Shams Khan Dandani, showing that the last-mentioned had died in or before A.H. 821.

If the above surmise is correct, the epigraph must have been set up on the mausoleum of Shams Khan, and would thus be an extremely valuable record, deserving preservation.

In any case, the date of the death of Shams Khan Dandani given in the Genealogy referred to above as A.H. 829 is thus manifestly proved wrong, both by the epigraphical and the historical evidence.

---

1 Tūrtīk (or Tobuṅk)-i-Māhmuḍ Shāhī (Ms.), f. 111.
2 Yahya Saḥhāni, Ṭūrtīk-i-Mubārak Shāhī (Calcutta, 1931), p. 185. Frightha, op. cit., p. 185 and Nigāmu'd-Din Ahmad. op. cit., p. 461, have apparently derived their information from the Delhi historian Yahya. The retreat of the powerful Sultān Ahmad of Gujarāt against Khizr Khān is rather hard to believe. Significantly, the Gujarāt historian Sikandar does not mention Nāgaur expedition at all.
3 Sikandar, Mir'āt-i-Sikandar (Baroda, 1962) p. 91.
4 According to Sikandar (ibid., p. 46), he was Shams Khan, but there seems to have been copyist's error in transcribing the name. Both Nīgāmu'd-Din Ahmad, op. cit., p. 461 and Frightha, op. cit., p. 185, have Fīrūz Khan son of Shams Khan. Dr. S. C. Misra, The Rise of Muslim Power in Gujarāt (Bombay, 1963), pp. 172, 178 also takes him to be Shams Khan, but he quotes all the three authorities for this, which is inexplicable.
II. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 822, FROM THE SAME PLACE

This is another fragmentary record, which seems to have originally belonged to a Khānāzāda monument. The tablet on which it is engraved in one line is built up into the northern upper wall of the Nāgaur Fort.¹ This part of the wall contains at least half a dozen inscribed slabs, of varying sizes, most of which are fragmentary. Some of them bear Quranic texts while at least two, including the one under study, are historical records.²

Unfortunately, the epigraphical tablet is badly damaged. Apart from the lost portion towards the right, it has broken or cracked in the middle and the two parts have been cemented together. The writing is considerably damaged, but except for the places where letters have peeled off, the text has been more or less completely read. Luckily, enough text has survived to furnish valuable information. The extant text records the construction of an 'illuminated mausoleum' in 1419 and contains the name of Khān-i-Aʿẓam, Fīrūz Khān Ghāzī.

The language of the inscription is Persian and its style of writing is bold Naskh which is quite akin to that in the previous record except that the curves of the letters here are somewhat flattish. The epigraphical tablet measures 110 by 45 cms.

The text has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate II (c)*

الخان الأخومن نوروز خان ابن شمس خان غازى طاب الله ثراه بنى عمارة هذه المبارة [النوروة (؟) برحمة الله مورخا في التاريخ الثالث من ربيع الأول سنة ثمانية [و]]

**TRANSLATION**

Khān ‘l-Aʿẓam, Fīrūz Khān son of Shāh’s Khān Ghāzī, may Allāh render his grave pleasant, constructed was the edifice of this illuminated mausoleum into the mercy of Allāh. Dated the third of Rabīʿ ‘l-Awwal, year (A.H.) twenty two and eight hundred (3 Rabīʿ 1 822-30 March 1419).

The importance of this epigraph cannot be overstressed. It clearly shows that by the year A.H. 822 (1419 A.D.), Shāh’s Khān Dandān was already dead. He could, therefore, not have ruled until A.H. 829 as worked out by Dr. čahētāi. Also, it may be taken to corroborate indirectly some of the surmises recorded above, about a few events connected with Nāgaur at about this period.

² The other historical record, also fragmentary, belongs to the reign of Muhammad bin Sām and is dated A.H. 594 (1196 A.D.). It has been published in *EIAPS*. 1668, p. 3 (pl. I c).
³ The religious records also appear to be early. While one of them containing only the phrase wa ajāla executed against floral background in Thulūḥ of the same type as in the epigraphs on the Qub Minār at Delhi, can be safely dated to the early thirteenth century, the rest also are assignable on palaeographic grounds to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It is a matter of regret that due to certain inevitable circumstances, their rubbings could not be prepared.

⁴ čahētāi, op. cit., p. 176.
It is not clear from the incomplete text as to in what capacity Firuz Khān has been mentioned here. But very likely the inscription refers to his reign, and the missing text must have contained words to that effect.

It is a pity that this inscription and the one just studied above have come down to us in fragments. Their complete texts would have shed further light on the history of this kingdom which still awaits the painstaking research of a diligent plooder.

Before we pass on to the next epigraph, mention may be made of a building at Nāgaur, which popular belief marks as the last resting-place of Shan's Khān. The Kāla-Gumbād, as it is locally known, is situated inside the Dargah of Bare Pir Sāhib, situated to the immediate north of the Shān al Mosque, which also is attributed to this Shan's Khān. The Shamsī Tank on the western bank of which the said mosque is situated is also known after him. The Kāla-Gumbad is perhaps the only architectural relic of the time of the Khānsādās to have survived.

III. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 838, FROM NĀGAUR

This well-preserved epigraph is perhaps the only complete record among those occurring on the various parts of the upper and lower walls of the Nāgaur Fort, which have come to our notice. The epigraphical tablet measuring 55 by 50 cms is built up into that part of the outer face of the southern upper wall, which is situated to the west of the Water-Tower. The text runs into two lines of Persian and purports that a well was constructed in 1430 by Ḥātim Khātūn, wife of Shan's Khān the deceased, for obtaining the pleasure of God. It further expresses a hope that the Muslims might derive benefit from it and remember the builder with a prayer for her Faith.

The epigraph is also remarkable for its beautiful calligraphy, which recalls to mind similarly executed Tughluqian epigraphs of Bihār and Gujarāt inscriptions of Zafar Khān, but its style of writing is not that excellent and flawless.

The text has been read as under:

TEXT

Plate III (b)

(1) باکری این چا را پتویق انت اعمال اعظم محاسباتون فوم شمسخان طاب

قناره برای رضاء

(2) خدای عز و جل تا مسلمانان نفع گیرند و بدعا ایمان یادآورند فی الغرمه من رمضان

سنة ثمان و ثلاثین و ثامنیاهم

TRANSLATION

(1) This well was constructed with the grace of Allāh, may He be exalted, by the weakest of creatures, Ḥātim Khātūn, wife of Shan's Khān, may his grave be rendered pleasant, for the pleasure of

1Chaghtai, op. cit., p. 172, has rightly held erroneous the statement of Mr. Garrick (op. cit., p. 84), that shams Khān, the founder of the Khanate, was an official of Ilutmish.

(a) Epigraph, dated A. H. 844, from Narain (p. 27)

(b) Inscription, mentioning Hātim Khātūn, from Nagaur (p. 24)
(2) God, may He be honoured and glorified, so that the Muslims derive benefit and remember (the builder) with a prayer for (her) Faith. On the first of Ramadān, year (A.H.) eight and thirty and eight hundred (1 Ramadān 538-31 March 1435).

The importance of the inscription lies in the fact that it has preserved the name of an important member of the Khānzādas family, namely the wife of the founder of the line. This is all the more important when we remember that this type of information is not commonly available even from historical works. Also interesting is the statement in the text that the well was constructed for the benefit of the Muslims. It is difficult to say if the well is the same as the Water-Tower referred to above. If so, the tablet may be in situ, which would indicate that the Fort may represent in the main the original citadel forming the residence of Khānzādas. But if the tablet is not in situ, it must have been brought from some step-well in or around the town. The reference in the text to the Muslims being the intended beneficiaries, may perhaps be correctly interpreted as the restriction of its use to Muslims only. If so, we would have an indirect corroboration of the strong caste and community prejudices for which Rājasthān in particular is quite well-known. It may be pointed out that we have a Makrān in the same district an inscription of the time of the Mughal emperor Shāh Jahān, which prohibits people of low caste from drawing water from a well in the Bāwā of Māhalla.1 In this context, the fact that the land around Nāgaur district is a waterless and sandy tract, should not be lost sight of.

It may also be noted here that the name of the ruling chief is omitted in the text. Whether this could be taken to signify beyond doubt any political reason, it is difficult to say since this practice is not so uncommon in the Muslim records of India.2

Mujahid Khān

Firūz Khān, as seen above, died in A.H. 857 (1453 A.D.), after having ruled for three decades and a half. We have not come across any epigraph of his between A.H. 822 and A.H. 857. On the other hand, as pointed out earlier, in epigraphs dated A.H. 840, A.H. 844, A.H. 848 and A.H. 865, his brother Mujahid Khān is mentioned as the reigning chief. Of these, the first three dates which fall in the reign of Firūz Khān occur in his records from Dūwarahā and Naraainā, which fact has been reasonably interpreted to indicate that Mujahid Khān had already carved out a separate principality for himself, during his brother’s life-time, probably with his capital at Dūwarahā, and had occupied Nāgaur on the latter’s death in or immediately after A.H. 857.

A little digression here in attempting to guess the probable time by which Mujahid Khān established his authority independently of his brother, it is hoped, will not be out of place. What perhaps is a clue to this may be found in one of the Naraainā inscriptions which says that Mujahid Khān occupied and became master of Dūwarahā, Sambhār and Naraainā after the tumult and turmoil caused by Rānā Mokal. Now in some Sanskrit epigraphs, Rānā Mokal is eulogised as the van quisher of Firūz Khān (and not Shams Khān)3 which would place his defeat after the death of Shams Khān Dandānī which took place some time before 30th March 1419, if not in A.H. 819 (1416-17) or so as has been suggested in the preceding lines. But since Mokal did not ascend the throne until 1421, this event must have taken place thereafter. Dr. Chhajā’s Genealogy gives A.H. 829 (1425-26 A.D.) as Shams Khān’s date of death (which is manifestly wrong) and as both

2 See, for example, the Gujarāt inscription included in this number (p. 14, infra).
3 According to Dr. Chhajā, op. cit., p. 175, Shams Khān fought a battle with Rānā Mokal in A.H. 814 (1411 A. D.), but this is not incorrect, as Rānā Mokal did not come to the throne till 1421.
Firuz Khān I’s and Mujāhid Khān’s initial years of reign. Unfortunately, nowhere, not even in the Rāpūr annals or epigraphs, the exact date of Mōkal’s victory over Firuz Khān is given. As the first mention of this victory appears to have been made in the Chitorgarh inscription dated V.S. 1485 (1429 A.D.) and Strüng Rishi inscription dated a few months later, the victory must have been obtained before that date, in which case, it is doubtful if Mujāhid Khān had already established his authority in 1425–26 as worked out by Dr. Chaghtāi.

It occurs to me that the opportunity to set up his independent authority must have been availed of by Mujāhid Khān on the death of the Rānā in 1433. It may be recalled that sometime during that year, Sūltān Ahmad I of Gujarāt had marched towards Nāgaur, but returned without reaching there but after plundering the Rānā’s country. It is very likely that Ahmad Shāh went to Nāgaur to the Khānūzāda chief’s help against the Rānā but returned on hearing of the murder of the latter.

When on Firuz Khān’s death, Mujāhid Khān occupied Nāgaur, the former’s son Shams Khān sought at first the help of Rānā Kumbhā of Mewār and subsequently of Sūltān Qubā’-Dīn Ahmad II of Gujarāt to secure his father’s kingdom, but he ultimately failed to do so and Mujāhid Khān became the undisputed master of the kingdom.

According to Dr. Chaghtāi, who quotes local information, Mujāhid Khān ruled upto A.H. 872 (1467–68 A.D.). This may well be correct or at least nearer to truth as in a Sanskrit inscription of Dīdwān dated V.S. 1520 (A.H. 868/1463 A.D.)—i.e. about three years after the Nāgaur record of A.H. 865 (Inscription No. V, infra), Mujāhid Khān is mentioned as the ruler.

IV. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 844, FROM NARĀINĀ

This inscription pertaining to the reign of Mujāhid Khān is from Nārāinā situated in the Sambhar talūd of Jaipur district. Along with Sambhar, it seems to have fallen within the jurisdiction of the Nāgaur kingdom. It was one of the three places, the other two being Dīdwān and Sambhar, that were, after probably being lost to Rānā Mōkal of Mewār, reconquered by Mujāhid Khān, as mentioned in one of the inscriptions to be found there.

The present epigraph is engraved on a squarish tablet measuring 60 by 55 cms. which is fixed into the south wall of the courtyard, near the main entrance of the Jāmī Mosque of the town. There are at least three inscriptions on the mosque proper, and these were published in a previous issue of this series from impressions prepared by Mr. B. L. Dhāmā, an officer of the Archaeological Survey of India. It is surprising how the present record escaped Mr. Dhāmā’s notice, unless it

1 This date as in the case of practically all other dates in the Genealogy seems to have been taken from the Aurād-4-Qudiriyyas.
2 Epigraphia Indica, vol. II. p. 410. It may be noted that the dates of this record are stated to be irregular.
4 Sikandar, op. cit., p. 40; Niẓām’-Dīn Ahmad, op. cit., p. 484; Firekha, op. cit., p. 190.
5 For details, see Sikandar, op. cit.; Niẓām’-Dīn Ahmad, op. cit.; Firekha, op. cit. Also Chaghtāi, op. cit., pp. 177–78.
6 ARIK, 1968–69. No. B. 147. Dīwān Kumbhā’s occupation of Nāgaur, even if proved historically, would appear to be only temporary. In any case, the passage mentioning the Rānā’s exploits in this region, for details of which see H. B. Sevdlī, Madhaṇa Kusūdā (Ahmēr, 1917), pp. 53–56, 65, etc., appear to be highly exaggerating in their contents.
7 JM, 1923–24. p. 15.
be that it was brought to its present place afterwards. There is one more tablet fixed into the platform of a grave in the courtyard of the mosque; it is a fragmentary epitaph.1

Since the epigraphical tablet has been adversely affected by inclemencies of weather and neglect, the writing is badly damaged. The letters have completely disappeared towards the end, and even in other parts, the writing is somewhat illegible in a few places, particularly in lines 1 and 2, with the result that the object of construction which it seems to mention, cannot be determined except that it was situated somewhere outside the fort (bišär). It refers itself to the reign of Mujāhid Khān, who is described as the best of kings. The date is given in words, and can more or less be clearly deciphered to be A.H. 844 (1440-41 A.D.). It may be pointed out that the two groups of the records of Mujāhid Khān from Narāinā—the one on the Gauri Shankar Tank and the other on the Jāmi’ Mosque—are dated A.H. 840 and 848.2

The style of writing of the record is Naskh of a fairly good type. Its calligraphy is superior to the one in the Tank inscriptions under reference, dated A.H. 840, but not as artistic and well designed as the three Jāmi’ Mosque epigraphs.3

The record comprises five couplets in Persian. The inscriptions of the Khānzādas are as a rule in prose and this is perhaps their third metrical record which is known to us.4

The text has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate III(a)

(1) بناء شه درين زمان
(2) خارج حصار
(3) خارج ز خوف غمگين كشتاه بهر طرف
(4) خير الرون قرى فرمود مصطفى
(5) حضرت جهل جهار

TRANSLATION

(1) was constructed at this time............. security.

(2) outside the fort...... in the time of Mujāhid Khān on of Shams Khān.

(3) The infidels, on all sides, have become depressed, due to fear (of the Khān), and the heart of the believers have gladdened (lit. blossomed forth) due to prosperity.

(4) The chosen one (i.e. Prophet Muhammad) has said, “My age is the best of ages”. This age, verily, is better than that of the other kings.

(5) (It was the year A.H.) eight Hundred (and) fourtyfour (A.H. 844=1440-41 A.D.).

This epigraph, as seen above, provides one more date of the reign of Mujāhid Khān.

2. SIM, 1923-24, pp. 15, 16, 19.
3. See ibid., plate VII and Dr. G. Yazdani’s remarks in ibid., p. 18.
4. The other two are: one of the two tank records mentioned above, and the epigraph of Firuz Khān II’s time at Nāgaur (Inscription No. VI, infra).
V. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 865, FROM NĀGAUR

The fifth inscription of this group and the second of Mujāhid Khān, is from Nāgaur. The tablet, measuring 75 by 30 cm., on which it is inscribed, is fragmentary, but fortunately, as far as it can be judged from its text, not much of its text is missing. The tablet which must have originally belonged to a mosque, as is evident from its purport, is now built up into the western upper wall of the Nāgaur Fort, by the side of two more inscribed tablets, dated in the years of the fourteenth century. The record under study mentions the construction of a mosque in 1461 during the time of Mujāhid Khān. The name of the builder which was contained in the second line is lost. The epigraph comprising two lines of Persian is executed in Nāshk of a fairly good type, which indicates a mature and experienced hand.

The text has been read as under:

TEXT

Plate IV (a)

(1) ...... [زما؟] إن مجلس علي مجاهذ خان يدیم الله معاویه بن ابرکرد این عمادت مسجد بتوافق الله
(2) ... و یاک از ابرای رضاء خدا [؟] الله من شهر ومضان سنة خمسة و ستسن و ثمانیاء

TRANSLATION

(1) ................ time of (?) Majlis-i-All Mujāhid Khān, may Allāh perpetuate his glories, the edifice of this mosque was built by the grace of Allāh.

(2) ................ Pure, for the sake of the pleasure of God. On the second of the month of Ramadān, year (A.H.) five and sixty and eight hundred (2 Ramadān 865-11 June 1461).

This, as stated above, is a new and the latest Persian inscription of Mujāhid Khān. Also, it is the only record of his to be found at Nāgaur itself.

It has been stated above that Mujāhid Khān's records from Diğwānā and Narainā, respectively in the north-eastern and south-eastern parts of the Nāgaur kingdom, set up when his brother Firūz Khān was alive and ruling at Nāgaur, indicate that the former ruled over this part of the kingdom independently, while Firūz Khān ruled over the remaining part from the capital Nāgaur. Dr. Chaghtāi has also followed this reasoning in the reconstruction of the Genealogy. In the absence of Firūz Khān's inscriptions, after the one of A.H. 822, it may be argued that Mujāhid Khān had succeeded him as exclusive chief of the whole principality some time before A.H. 840, his earliest inscription from Narainā. But this argument, based on the negative evidence of inscriptions, does not hold good before the clear statement in historical works that Firūz Khān ruled over Nāgaur till he died in A.H. 857. Therefore, until fresh material comes to light, we have to accept that Firūz Khān had succeeded his father and Mujāhid Khān either being

2 Ibid., Nos. D, 337-338.
3 Reference has already been made in the preceding lines to his Sanskrit inscription dated two or three years later (p. 26, supra).
4 It would not be quite correct to say that this fact is known from history as stated in E.I.M. 1940-50, p. 21, the fact is based on epigraphs only.
5 Chaghtāi, op. cit., pp. 176-177.
6 A systematic search in the region may yet bring to light new epigraphs of the early Khānsādas.
dissatisfied or for some other reason managed to set up his authority in the eastern part of the kingdom, as vouchsafed by his epigraphs, and became master of the whole kingdom on the death of his brother in A.H. 857 as seen above. The presence of his inscription dated A.H. 865—the one under study—would also point to that fact. There is little chance of the tablet not belonging to Nâgaûr or its neighbourhood—its present position, along with other epigraphical tablets, shows that it formed part of a mosque at Nâgaûr itself.

Fîrûz Khân II

According to Dr. Châghtâi’s Genealogy, Mujâhid Khân died in A.H. 872 and his son SalâhKhân—erroneously called Salâhat Khân by Dr. Châghtâi—came to power and ruled for three years. His existence is known only from the inscriptions of his son Fîrûz Khân II, which quote his full genealogy; Dr. Châghtâi’s information about the duration of his reign seems to have been derived from the Aurâd-i-Qâdiriya.

Fîrûz Khân II also does not find mention in historical works. But he is already known to the readers of this series from his two inscriptions found at Dîwânâ. The present study contains five more records of his, of which three are from Nâgaûr and two from Bâr Khâtu. Dr. Châghtâi makes him rule from A.H. 875 to A.H. 899, but one of the inscriptions in our study (p. 36, infra) extends his reign at least by one year. Fîrûz Khân II is also referred to in a Jain work as reigning in 1484 A.D.

VI. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 880, FROM NÂGAûR

This epigraph is to be found on the mosque locally called Akhâdewâli-Masjid, situated in Mabuah Churigarân, at the back of the Shâme Mosque. The mosque is of modest dimensions and has no architectural pretensions: its building appears to be old but has undergone extensive repairs. It comprises a single prayer-hall divided into three aisles, each two bays deep, having an opening of broad and slightly pointed arches. Its roof is flat. There is only one mihrâb in the west wall, above which the tablet bearing the inscription under study is fixed.

This is another of the very few metrical epigraphs of the Khânzâdas—the second in the present group—that have come down to us. It comprises six Persian couplets, running into as many lines, on an area measuring 30 by 75 cms. The epigraph purports that the mosque was constructed by a son of Allâ and grandson of Sheru’dhâni in 1475, during the time of Fîrûz Khân, son of Salâh Khân. It further states that the text was inscribed by Samâ’, son of Hasan, who hailed from the town of Sarasati. The name of the composer is not given, but that does not matter either, as he does not appear to be a man of any poetical talent or training. The quality of the verses is mediocre, and the composer has flouted the rules of the grammar, prosody and syntax, obscuring the meaning of the record. For example, the sense intended to be conveyed in the last couplet cannot be exactly made out.

An interesting aspect of the inscription is that it is incised on stone instead of being cut into relief as is the case with all the other records of the Khânzâdas. The only other record executed in this style at Nâgaûr is the record of the Ghorîmonarch Muhammâd bin Sâm. The style of writing of our record is Nasîkh of no particular merit.

1 Châghtâi, op. cit. pp. 176, 179.
3 Châghtâi, op. cit., pp. 176, 179.
4 Jaina, op. cit.
The text has been read as under:

Text

Plate IV (b)

1.  در زمان سرور نیاز خان
   بن صالح خان اعظم کرمان
2.  کردر این مسجد بنا از عون حق
   بن علاء شیر دول خانیست کان
3.  از برای حبیب الله برکرد
   مسجدی را تا باند جاودان
4.  هنده از ماه شعبان بود آن
   بود از خطه سرتسی بدان
5.  بنده کتاب سلام بن حسن
   سر بین بیشین مسجد بهوان
6.  روز یکشنبه بنا عالم بیست

Translation

(1) In the time of the chief, FirūzKhān, son of ŠalābKhān, the greatest successful Khān,

(2) one who is the son of 'Alā (son of?) SherdīKhānī constructed this mosque with the

help of God.

(3) He built a mosque for the sake of God so that he may be immortal.

(4) The date was year (A.H.) eight hundred and eighty, and it was seventeenth of the

month of Shābān (17 Shalaḥbān 880-16 December 1475).

(5) Know that the humble creature, the scribe Šamā' son of Šaraf, is from the town (khūta)

of Sarastū.

(6) On Sunday, the construction took place (in the) world and such a mosque was completed.

Read ye.

It will be noted that the name of FirūzKhān I's father is clearly inscribed as ŠalābKhān. It

has been hitherto read as Šalābat Khān, also by Dr. Chaghtāi who had before him the manuscript of the

Aurāḏī-Qādiriyya and had also published the Dīvānā and Barī Khātu inscriptions of this

chief. But there is no doubt that the reading of this name in this epigraph as also in a few more

included in the present study is clearly Šalāb Khān. 6

It is somewhat unusual that the builder's name is not specified in the epigraph. He is simply
called ' bin ' Alā'i- SherdīKhānī which would mean— if we treat the kasta after 'Alā as being

governed by the igīfat-i-abī (the kasta denoting the son-and-father relationship) as it almost

certainly is—son of Alā son of SherdīKhānī. Now we know from one epigraph that one son of

this 'Alā, named Malik Husīr, was the Commissary (Gumāšt) of the same Firūz Khān in

Dīvānā in A.H. 896 (1491 A.D.). 7 If both are identical, the epigraph would provide an earlier

1 This is perhaps 'Alā-i-SherdīKhānī which means 'Alā son of SherdīKhānī.
2 In the plates of the two Dīvānā inscriptions (E.I.M. 1949-50, pls. XI and XII a), the name can be clearly
read as Šalāb Khān. But Dr. Chaghtāi may perhaps have been misled by the manuscript of the Aurāḏ.
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date, by about 16 years, for Malik Hizibr. But in that case, whether Hizibr had held any office at Nāgaūr, the findspot of the epigraph under study, is not indicated in the record, though it can be presumed so without much fear of contradiction. The other alternative is that he may be another son of ‘Ali. Thirdly, if the  idadefat between ‘Ali and Sherdilkhanī is not an idadefat-i-ibnī (as it almost certainly appears to be), the name of the son would be Sherdilkhanī, in which case the name borne by the grand-son and the grand-father would be common. This is not unusual. But nothing definite can be said about this in view of the hopeless quality of the verses. As it is, I am inclined to take it as a case of idadefat-i-ibnī. In any case, nothing is known about the personages from the available historical records.

Likewise, nothing is known about Samā‘ the scribe. Sarasatl, to which he is stated in the text to belong, is modern Sirsā, a district headquarters in Haryāna State. As in the text, there is nothing in the calligraphy of the record that might do credit to the scribe.¹

VII. Inscription, Dated A.H. 885, From Nāgaūr

The credit of discovering this epigraph goes to Shri N. M. Ghanam, Technical Assistant, Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, Baroda, who had come across it in the course of his exploration work in Jodhpur district. It is engraved on a tablet, measuring 70 by 30 cms., which is lying loose in the building locally called Kālā Gumbad, situated within the premises of the Bārī Pir Sāhib-i-Dargāh.² This Gumbad which has been referred to above (p. 24, supra) is separated from the Sharīi Tank on the south south-east by the compound wall and is popularly attributed to Shams Khān Da‘dānī, the founder of the line.

The impression of this record, prepared by Shri Ghanam was received along with those of a few more epigraphs from the Nāgaūr district in October, 1960.¹ But partly because the writing is damaged and the calligraphy is quite intricate, and partly because the inked rubbing was not quite satisfactory, the epigraph could not be completely and correctly deciphered. As a result, the date and the name of the Khānzaḍa chiefs were left unread and the object of construction was tentatively deciphered to be a mosque.³ Subsequently, Shri W. H. Siddiq, then Senior Epigraphical Assistant in our office who was deputed to tour Rājasthān in about October 1962 was specifically asked to have a fresh rubbing prepared, but though the rubbing was better, the text still defied decipherment. Then, when I visited Nāgaūr in December 1966, not only did I have its fresh rubbings prepared very carefully, but I also spent considerable time in deciphering the text on the stone and was, fortunately, able, after sustained and concentrated efforts, to decipher the whole of the text.⁴

The epigraph consists of a single line of Persian prose and records the construction of a Khānqāh in 1480-81 during the reign of Fīrūz Khān son of Salāḥ Khān. The script employed is Nasīḥī which is remarkable for the sharp and pointed outline of its letters, whose elongated strokes have been so designed as to form a row of arches, creating a highly artistic effect.

¹ It is just possible—the language of the record being much below standard—that by the term kāhī which literally means ‘one who writes’ is intended the writer i.e. the composer.
³ All the epigraphs were listed in ibid., 1961-62, Nos. D, 239-263.
⁵ Ibid., 1966-67, No. D, 221.
The text has been read as follows: --

TEXT

Plate V (a)

با شد این خانواده در عهد دولت بنگی خان اعظم و خاکان معظم مجلس عالی فوروز خان

بن صالح خان یادیم الله معاونه البته (؟) سنته خمین و سه‌مین سال و نهایتاً

TRANSLATION

This Khānqāh was constructed in the reign of His Highness the great Khān and magnificent Khāqān Majlis-i-ʿAli Frūzā Khān son of ʿAlā Khān, may Allāh perpetuate his glories, in the year (A.H.) five and eighty and eight hundred (A.H. 885–1480-81 A.D.).

A reference has already been made in the preceding lines about the correct name of Frūzā Khān’s father (p. 30 supra). In this as well as the following three inscriptions, his name is clearly inscribed as ʿAlā Khān.

The text is silent regarding the builder of the Khānqāh, who would on the face of it appear to be some one else than the chief. Nor does it provide any clue to its identity—to what saint or saintly establishment it was attached. And there is unfortunately no authentic history of the original provenance of the epigraphical tablet. If it happens to have originated in the same premises where it is found i.e. the Bārī Pir Ṣāḥib-ki-Dargāh—the Dargāh built in memory of the famous divine Shāikh ʿAbdul-Qādir Jeelānī, the founder of the Qādiri order—it would mean that the Khānqāh was built for the use of the followers of the Qādiri order. One thing is certain that the epigraph has nothing to do with the Kālā Gumbad or the mausoleum of Shams Khān Dandānī.

VIII-IX. INSCRIPTIONS, DATED A.H. 886, FROM BARI KHĀTU

These two extremely interesting records are found inscribed on two tablets fixed into two different parts of a mosque called Khānzdān-ki-Masjid situated in the Fort on the top of the hill at Bārī Khātu in the Jāiel Tahsil of Nāgar district. The credit of noticing them for the first time goes to Dr. M. A. Chaghtāi. He published, however, only one of these and his reading comprising only the name and genealogy of the chief, the year and the portion referring to the Muqta of the Muwānula of Khattā is incomplete. They were also noticed in 1958 by Mr. K. V. Saundarya Rājan of the Archaeological Survey of India, Buroda, on receipt of their photographs from whom, I deputed Mr. I. A. Oneri, then Epigraphical Assistant, to prepare their inked rubbings. It is from those impressions that both the epigraphs are edited here.

On plan, the mosque consists of a single prayer-hall, built entirely in tuffa style, overlooking a court-yard. The main miḥrāb, unlike in other cases, is cut open into the western wall. The building is simple in execution and does not contain any decorative features of importance. Nevertheless, as a building of the fifteenth century in Rājasthān, it is not without antiquarian interest.

1 I am not very sure about the reading of this word. The sign below the letter pktm 63 on the stone has been taken to indicate this word.
3 Chaghtāi, op. cit., p. 173.
(a) Inscription, dated A.H. 885, from Nāgaūr (p. 32)

(b) Record, dated A.H. 886, from Baṛī Khāṭū (p. 33)
One of the two epigraphs appears above the central mihrab and slightly to its left. The epigraphical tablet measures 10 by 45 cms. and is inscribed with a six-line text in Persian prose. The text purports that the mosque was constructed in 1482 during the reign of Majlis-i-ʿAli Firuz Khan, son of Salah Khan, during the deputyship of Malikuʿl-Umarā ʿIkhtiyārūd-Daulat waʿd-Din Lâdla Khalâs, the former chief of the Royal Stables and the Muqtaʾ of the district of Khattâb by Malikuʿl-Umarâ Tâjuʿd-Daulat waʿd-Din Malik Lâdla Khalâs, the Muqtaʾ of the Fort of the said district.

The text is executed in ordinary Naskh with a slight tendency to cursiveness and has been deciphered as under:—

TEXT

Plate V(b)

(1) Prior to this, a mosque was built in the reign of the Khan of the Khans, the signet on the surface of the earth.


(3) The mosque was constructed in 1482 during the period of Malikuʿl-Umarâ ʿIkhtiyārūd-Daulat waʿd-Din, the champion of the time, Lâdla Khalâs.

(4) And it was built, by the bounty of Allah and (His) best grace, during the period of Malikuʿl-Umarâ ʿIkhtiyārūd-Daulat waʿd-Din, the champion of the time, Lâdla Khalâs.

TRANSLATION

(1) This mosque was constructed in the reign of His Highness the Khan of the Khans, the signet on the surface of the earth.

(2) One who is decorated (with chiefship) by the Nourisher of the worlds, the cherisher of the men of Faith, the overthrower of men of Infidelity and rebellion, the lion of the arena (of manliness).


(4) And it was built, by the bounty of Allah and (His) best grace, during the period of Malikuʿl-Umarâ ʿIkhtiyārūd-Daulat waʿd-Din, the champion of the time, Lâdla Khalâs.

2 In fact both these epigraphs happen to be the longest Khânzâda records that have come down to us.
3 An ṣalāf-i-ṭabâ has to be read between these two names.
The former keeper of the Royal Stables and the (present) Muqta' of the district (Mu'amala) of Khatū, may Allah perpetuate his grandeur. The work was carried out by Malik al-Unari Tājūl-Daulat wa'd-Dīn.

(6) Malik Lāla Khulāṣ, Muqta' of the Fort of the said district (Mu'amala), may his prowess endure forever. On the date the 22nd of the month of Dhu'l-Hijja, year (A.H.) six and eighty and eight hundred (22 Dhu'l-Hijja 886-11 February 1482).

The tablet bearing the second inscription of the same mosque, measures 62 by 35 cms. and is fixed on the facade of the prayer-hall, above and to the right of the entrance. The record is identical in purport, and, to a great extent, even in words, with the previous one except for the omission of the name of the Muqta' of the district and of the titles of the Muqta' of the Fort. In this epigraph, it may be particularly noted, the latter has been much bigniously mentioned as the builder of the mosque.

The epigraph consists of four lines of writing in Persian prose. The style of writing is Nuskh of a quality which is inferior to that in the other record. It has greater cursiveness also, no particular regard having been shown for notches of letters or ligatures.

The text has been read as under:

**TEXT**

Plate VI(c)

(1) بنا أَيْنَكَ اِبْنِ مسْجِدِّ رَأَيْتَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ وَحْسَنَ تَوْبَتَهُ مَلكَ لَدِينِهِ خَلاَصَ مَقطَعَ قَلْعَهُ

(6) كَهْفُ نَصْرَهُ اللَّهَ عَنِ الْآفَاتِ

(9) دِرَ عَيْدَهُ نَجَالَ خَانَ خَوْلَانِ لَكِنَّهُ رَوَىَ زَهْبَرَتَهُ رِبَّ إِلَامِينَ وُضِيُّرَ: اِبْحَيْنَاءَ

(8) وَاذْبَزُرَتُهُ اَيُّهُ كِفرُ وَطَلُبَانَ شِيَامُ سُبُعَ اَبَنِ وَأَمَانَ بَنِيَ مَجِنَ مُحِيُّ عَالِ

(7) فَرُوُزَ خَانَ

(10) [كِنَّ سَلِبَخُنِّ بنِ مَجِاهِدِ خَانَ نَزَ نَمِسَخَانَ وَجَسِيدُ المحلَّلَ في النَّابِيِّينَ الْأَوَّلِينَ وَالْعَشَرَوْنَ مِنْ شَهِرِ ذِي الْحَجِّ سِنَةَ سِتَّ وَنَمَائِنَ وَثَمَانِينَ]

**TRANSLATION**

(1) This mosque was built, by the bounty of Allāh and His grace by Malik Lāla Khulāṣ, Muqta' of the Fort of Khatū, may Allāh avert him against calamities.

(2) during the reign of His Highness the Khān of the Khāns, the signet on the surface of the earth, one who is decorated (with chieftship) by the Nourisher of the worlds, the cherisher of the men of Faith,

(3) the over thrower of the men of Inidelity and rebellion, the lion of the arena (of manliness), the patrons of peace and security. His Highness, Majlis-i-All Fīrūz Khān,

---

1. This is the place-name as spelt by Muslim historians also. Its local pronunciation is Khāna.
2. The word in the text is bār kār which literally means the work was done by. If kāra is taken as a single word it would mean 'worker or agency of'. But as the second inscription makes him the builder, the word bār kār has been taken here as a verb.
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(4) son of Šalâb Khân son of Mujâhid Khân son of Shams Khân (son of) Wajihul-Mulk, on the 22nd of the month of Dhu'l-Hijja, year (A.H.) six and eighty and eight hundred (22 Dhu'l-Hijja 886-11 February 1482).

From the above, it is quite clear that it was Malikul-Unnâ Tâjul-Hukumat wâd-Din Malik Lâdîa Khalâq, the Muqta̱ of the Fort of the district who built the mosque.

These epigraphs are, thus, quite important. But for these, the names of two nobles of first rank of the Khânzâdas would have remained unknown. As a matter of fact, we know precious little about the history of this dynasty and are absolutely in the dark about its officials. Therefore, the importance of the epigraphs from which for the first time we have come to know of these two officials cannot be overstressed. From the appendage of titles and the high rank the two nobles enjoyed, as stated in the epigraphs, they appear to have held prominent position in the government, and it is a reasonable surmise that they might have belonged to the ruling family.

Attention may be drawn to the peculiarity in the names of these two grandees, both of whom are mentioned as Malik Lâdîa Khalâq. I fail to grasp the exact connotation of the name Lâdîa, except perhaps that it be the Hindi word Lâdî meaning 'the fondled or darling'. But it is almost certain that the term Lâdîa Khalâq does not appear to be a case of having the idafat-i-ibnî. That is to say, it cannot be taken to mean 'Malik Lâdîa son of Khalâq', for the persons each mentioned as Malik Lâdîa Khalâq are definitely two different persons, as the titles and the posts held by them show. The only plausible explanation of this would be that these were either two entirely different persons, or that Lâdîa Khalâq was the family name by which the persons were known and they were distinguished from each other by their titles. The second alternative appears to me to be more likely.

But these epigraphs are also important from another point of view. They happen to be the only Khânzâda records found so far at Bâri Khâtu—a place about sixty kilometres to the east of Nâgaur—where, as the readers of this series are aware, the epigraphs of the successive dynasties of the Mamlûks, the Khâljis and the Tughluqs have been found. It has been noted that out of the forty-three epigraphs found so far in the town, there is not a single record, other than the two under study, set up after A.H. 902 and before A.H. 968. Could this be interpreted to mean that Bâri Khâtu was added to the Nâgaur territories in the reign of Fârûz Khân II or a little earlier, in the reign of his grand-father Mujâhid Khân, as has been noted by Dr. Châfûtâi? On the other hand, Bâri Khâtu being situated hardly at a distance of about 40 kilometres to the south-west of Dîwarâ and about 60 kilometres to the east of Nâgaur, it appears unlikely that it should have come into the Khânzâda possession so late. The only plausible explanation may be that under the early Khânzâdas, Khâtu had lost its importance, which it regained under Fârûz Khân II.

In any case, the records clearly indicate that under this chief, Bâri Khâtu was the headquarters of a separate district with a Fort, whose importance can be judged by the fact that it was governed by two officials of high standing.

It may also be recalled that these are the only Khânzâda records which have such an array of high-sounding titles used for the chief. Also, as in the case of the Narâîn record of his grand-father Mujâhid Khân, referred to above, the records under study quote the full genealogy of the chief right up to the progenitor of the ruling families of Gujarât and Nâgaur, namely Wajihul-Mulk, a Tughluqian grandee.

1 Sec. 3, on p. 33, supra.
3 Châfûtâi, op. cit., p. 179.
This is another interesting epigraph of the time of Firuz Khān II. It is engraved in one line on a tablet, measuring 86 by 34 cms., which is fixed above the central mihrāb of the small unpretentious mosque situated in the compound of the Bān-i Pīr Shāhīb-kī Dargāh referred to above. The rubbing of this inscription also was prepared in 1959 by Shri N. M. Ghanam, of the Western Circle of the Archaeological Survey of India, Baroda. But the epigraph seems to have been noticed and its impression prepared by Dr. Chaqtaī, much earlier; he had sent the photograph of its rubbing along with those of a few more to the Director General of Archaeology in India, New Delhi, to be included perhaps as an addenda to his article on the inscriptions from the Jodhpur State. While in the available records, the note on these inscriptions, if it was sent, is not available, it did not find place in the said article, nor does it appear to have been published by him elsewhere.

Both the rubbings of Dr. Chaos and Mr. Ghanam were not as distinct as one would like to have. Also, a few unfamiliar words could not be deciphered at the time of listing the epigraph in our annual report for 1961-62. Consequently I took opportunity of my visit to Nāgar in 1969 to devote some time to decipher the writing on the stone itself and also have its fresh impression made. It is from this impression that the epigraph is being published here.

It will be seen from the plate that the writing is almost perfectly well preserved, the letters are clearly engraved and the style of writing is quite bold. Nevertheless, due to the crowded writing in the typical style of the Khānāzāda inscriptions, in which one letter is written upon another and a word or a letter thereof is at times interposed between those of the other word, the decipherment has been rendered difficult. Added to this was the somewhat unfamiliar name of the builder. And though it is a matter of satisfaction that practically the whole of the epigraph has been, it is hoped, correctly, read, there is one word written cursively which has still remained unintelligible.

The epigraph consists of one line in Persian prose and purports that the mosque was built in 1495, during the reign of the chief Firuz Khān, by one Duda, son of Kāl Salāḥ Khān.

The calligraphy of the record is quite remarkable. The style of writing is Nāshk of the same type as in the early fifteenth century inscriptions of Zafar Khān of Gujarāt, so much so as to make one feel that the inspiration, if not the calligrapher himself, must have come from there. The well-shaped letters have been placed below the artistic arrangement of tall arch-shaped railings formed by their elongated shafts, the whole producing quite a pleasing effect.

The text of the epigraph has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

Plate VI (b)

بنوشته این مسجد اثر دو خان دو مهربان اعظم و خاندان معظم در عهده سلطان فیروز خان تتوافق رحمانی دادا کیلیا سلاجمانی ابراهیم اثنان و الشیری من شهر الرجب رجب قدرت ست ستمعا"
INScriptions of the Khánzadas of Nágar

TRANSLATION

This illuminated mosque was built in the reign of the great Khán and magnificent Khaqán, Firúz Khán, through the grace of the Merciful (i.e. God), (by) Dadá (son of) Kílá Saláh Khán, for the king (?), on the 12th of the month of Rajab, may its dignity increase, year (A.H.) nine hundred (12 Rajab 900 = 8 April 1495).

The primary importance of this epigraph lies as pointed out in the introductory lines, in extending the reign of Firúz Khán II by one year from the last known date of his reign A.H. 899, as recorded in Dr. Chaghtái's Genealogy. It is also quite important in another respect. Like the Barí Khán record studied above, this epigraph also furnishes the name of a person of some note who flourished at this time. Though the name of the person is quite unfamiliar and to establish his or her identity is difficult, a look at the reproduction of the epigraph will show that there should be little doubt about Dadá Kílá Saláh Khán being the correct reading of the name of the builder. But whether this constitutes the son and the father's name or is the name of one person is a debatable point. Dadá means also a wet-nurse, and if that be the meaning intended here, it would mean that the builder was Kílá, the Dadá, attached to Saláh Khán, father of Firúz Khán. Now, when in Nágar, I was informed by Mr. Rahmanatullah Raumaq Uthnain of the Pirzada family of the town, who is much interested in the history of the town and possesses valuable information on the subject, that he had quite some time back seen a document of the time of Aurangzib, then in possession of the descendants of the Khánzadas, in which mention is made of a Dáí's Tomb along with the Tomb of Shams Khán (i.e. Kílá Gumbad, which is to the immediate east of the mosque containing the inscription under study). Mr. Uthnain being unaware of the mention of Dadá in the epigraph under study, his account as to the mention of the Dáí's Tomb in the document cannot be dismissed as an after-thought. There is also one more Tomb in the vicinity of the said Kílá Gumbad, which could be the Dáí's Tomb in question. The proximity of the mosque to these buildings lends weight to the identification of Kílá as the nurse of Saláh Khán.

In the alternative, Dadá may be the name of the builder, and Kílá that of his father. From the appellation Saláh Khán attached to his name, it appears to have been a favourite noble or servant of Saláh Khán.

In any case, the epigraph has preserved unto us the name of a leading person of the period, and as such its importance is considerable.

Muhammad Khán

In the Genealogy of Dr. Chaghtái, Muhammad Khán is shown as having succeeded his father Firúz Khán II in A.H. 899 and ruled up to A.H. 915. That he did not succeed Firúz Khán until A.H. 900 is evident from the record just studied. We have been able to discover so far five records of Muhammad Khán, the earliest of which is dated A.H. 909 and the latest A.H. 913. In the colophon of Jain works, Muhammad Khán is also spoken of ruling in V.S. 1561 (1504 A.D./A.H. 910) and V.S. 1576 (1519 A.D./A.H. 925-26).  

1 Chaghtái, op. cit., p. 176.
2 According to Mr. Uthnain, the officials mentioned in these documents were Qadí Dost Muhammad and Haji Suliman, the Muhawwib. The descendants of the Khánzadas mentioned therein were Pólát Khán, Rahmat Khán and Jhujhar Khán.
3 According to Mr. Uthnain, the last of the Khánzada family of Nágar was Ramdan Khán whose sons were Fayyad Khán and 'Abdu'l-Ghaffar, who migrated to Pakistan in 1948. There is no member of this family, according to him, now living at Nágar.

Jain, op. cit.
The year A.H. 915 is shown in the Genealogy as the final year of his reign. In this year, Muḥammad Khān is stated to have offered allegiance to Sikandar Lodī, as has been referred to above (p. 17, supra). Dr. Chaghtái’s information may have been based on the Awād whose dates, are however, not always correct. Until, therefore, some fresh information comes forth, the question of the terminal year of his reign should be considered open.

XI. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 909, FROM NĀGAUR

This is again quite an interesting epigraph in which one more member of the ruling family finds mention. It was brought to my notice by Mr. Raunaq Uthmani, who has been instrumental in saving quite a few epigraphical tablets built up in the city-wall, then under demolition by the Nāgaur Municipal authorities, from being lost or damaged. He got some tablets removed to the Kanhepo Juhon-kt-Majid, situated near the Dargah of Aḥmad ‘Ali Bāpjī, within the Delhi Gate, towards its north-west.¹

The one bearing the inscription under study is one of them.² It measures 50 by 38 cms. and contains a one-line text, which assigns the construction of a cathedral mosque to the wife of Khāنزāda Miyān ‘Ali in 1503-4, during the reign of Muḥammad Khān.

The language of the record is Persian. The style of writing is Nasḵh of the same variety as in the previous epigraph. The letters are remarkable for their well-shaped outline and bold execution. But here, the elongated shafts of the letters have been arranged in a somewhat novel way. Raised to the same level, they have been decreased in size in the descending order from right to left, and the artistic effect produced by this is accentuated by the motif of banner-heads that marks the tips of these shafts.

The text of the record is quoted below:

TEXT

Plate VII(a)

بنا این مسجد کلان منکوسه خانزاده میان علی بتوافق رقمان در عهد خان اعظم محمد خان سنه تسع و تسویت

TRANSLATION

This large (i.e. cathedral) mosque (was) built (by) the wife of Khāنزāda Miyān ‘Ali through the grace of the Compassionate (Allāh) during the reign of the great Khān Muḥammad Khān (in the year A.H.) nine and nine hundred (A.H. 909-1503-04 A.D.).

This is the second inscription from Nāgaur in which a female member of the ruling family is mentioned. But unlike in the case of the other record (p. 24, supra), her name is not given. She is merely introduced as the wife of Khāنزāda Miyān ‘Ali Khān. Fortunately, the identity of the latter is known from historical works. According to these, he was a brother of Muḥammad Khān and had entered into a conspiracy in about A.H. 915, with another brother of his, Abā Bakr, to kill their royal brother. But ultimately, both were compelled to seek asylum at the court of Sikandar Lodī, then camping at Dhoulpur, and Muḥammad Khān, anticipating a reprisal by the latter, appealed him by sending letters of allegiance and presents to him and showing his readiness to have his name read in sermons and minted on coins. ‘Ali Khān was appointed by the

¹ For these see AJE, 1965-66, Nos. D, 332-55.
² Ibid., No. D, 332.
INSRIPTIONS OF THE KHĀNZĀDĀS OF NĀGAUR

Lodi king to the sardār of Sui Saber,¹ which was later on taken from him by way of punishment² and given to his brother Abū Bakr. Beyond this, nothing is known about him. This event may have occurred in about A.H. 916 or so.

The inscription under study belongs to a period when Miyan ‘Ali was still at Nāgaur. The mosque built by his wife must have been destroyed along with other monuments of the town by Rāja Bāhīt Singh, as referred to in the introductory lines, if not even earlier by Rāna Kumbhā.

XI. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 911, FROM THE SAME PLACE

The tablet bearing this epigraph was found built upside down in the outer face of the lower part of the city-wall when I had its rubbing prepared in 1966.³ It was also shown to me by Mr. Raunaq Uthmānī. This portion of the city-wall stood to the west of the opening therein, off the Nīyārisān-kā-Mahalla, and facing the famous Dargāh of Sūfī Saihīb towards north-west. It is not known if the city-wall still stands or has since been pulled down.

The epigraphical tablet having been exposed to varied climatic conditions for centuries, the writing which was originally in the same bold relief as is characteristic of the Khāنزāda records of Nāgaur, is badly damaged, particularly in the bottom portion which lay exposed; the writing in the top portion of the tablet which was buried in the ground is in a slightly better state of preservation. Fortunately, however, the text could be read almost completely after a few concentrated efforts.

The epigraph consists of one line of writing in Persian occupying a space of about 80 by 40 cms. The tablet seems to have originally belonged to a tomb, as the inscription records the construction of the mausoleum of Manikzāda Fathullāh son of Khāنزāda Ahmad Khān, and of the mosque, which was evidently attached to it, in 1505-06, during the reign of Muhammed Khān. The text, as in the case of other Khāنزāda records, is incomplete in that there is no verb in the sentence, but the purport is more or less understood. The name of the builder is not given.

Fortunately, we are in a position to identify with some amount of certainty the tomb on which the slab might have been originally set up. Mr. Raunaq Uthmānī who was, it may be remembered, in the dark about the purport of the record, had earlier pointed out to me a ruined tomb locally attributed to Fathullāh Shāh, situated not far from the location of the tablet, a little to the north of the city-wall and east of the Dargāh of Sūfī Saihīb. Only the traces of the plinth and a marble sarcophagus now remain of what appears to have originally been a tomb of some architectural merit. From these, it appears to have been an octagonal tomb like the one at Kumārī, about twenty-five kilometres to the south-west of Nāgaur, which has fortunately survived the hand of the vandal.

The style of writing is Nasḵa of the same high quality which characterises the Khāنزāda records. Apart from the finely chiselled outline of its letters, the elongated shafts have been arranged to form arch-heads, the apex of each of which is marked by a small cross or trifoil, investing it with a picturesque effect. The highly artistic arrangement in which the four curves representing the letter mān have been placed across these shafts on the left side, and the two distinguishing marks of the letter kāf on their right side, must have invested the whole with a picturesque effect when in original condition; this is somewhat marred by the disfiguring of the letters caused by neglect and weather.

¹ The name of this place is transcribed in different manuscripts in different ways. See S.A.A. Rizwān, Uttar Taimūrkhān Shāhrukh (Aligarh, 1958), p. 224, f.n. 1.
The text of the record has been deciphered as under:

Plate VII(b)

This mosque and the tomb of Fathullah Malikzada son of Khanzada Ahmad Khan (was) built in the time of the great Khân Muhammad Khan through the grace of the Compassionate (Allah in the) year (A.H.) eleven and nine hundred (A.H. 911-1505-06 A.D.).

From this epigraph, the names of two more members of the Khanzada family are known. Also, the epigraph indirectly confirms the local tradition pertaining to the tomb of Fathullah Shah who appears to be none other than the Malikzada.

XIII. ANOTHER INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 911, FROM NAGAUR

One of the few old buildings to survive at Nagaur is the small and somewhat dilapidated mosque called Ek Minâr-ki-Masjid, situated in the Pathanom-ka-Mahalla. The mosque is so called because one of its two minarets has fallen. Built of stone, it is a structure of modest dimensions built in trabeate system. On plan it consists of a single prayer-hall, overlooking an enclosed court, which is divided into five aisles and two bays by pillars supporting a flat roof. The prayer-hall is decorated with a prominent parapet, mounted with arch-shaped arches, which seems to have been carved with simple geometrical designs. An equally prominent cornice shaded the open facade, but most of its tiles have fallen. The lone small but shapely minar rises above the roof at the southern end of the facade, and its tapering design, octagonal and round in sections, and rounded up at the top, is quite pleasing. It recalls to mind its slightly earlier late Tughluqian counterpart at Delhi, but is more remarkable for its symmetry and shape. The mosque when fresh from construction and its second minar and other parts intact must have presented a fairly impressive appearance. It is an interesting specimen, after the Shamsi Mosque and the surviving towers of the Idgah, of the mosque architecture of the Khanzadas or rather of Nagaur.

The tablet bearing the epigraph measures 65 by 34 cms. and is fixed above the central mihrab between it and the roof. It has been considerably affected by weather and wear and tear of time, with the result that the letters, engraved in fine relief, have flaked off, particularly towards the end, but this has not proved a handicap in its decipherment, except for a word, which ironically enough is perfectly well preserved and otherwise clear. The text comprises, as in the case of the majority of the Khanzada records, a single line of writing in Persian, and records the construction of a mosque in 1505-06 during the reign of Muhammad Khan. The name of the builder of the mosque was perhaps contained in the word which has defied persistent attempts at decipherment; having tentatively read it as Philkali, I take it to be the name of the builder.

The calligraphy of this epigraph is also of a high order. The style of writing is Naskh of the same type as in the other records and the letters, cut into bold relief, are particularly remarkable for their sharp outline. Another innovation made in its design, if one may so, is the arrange-

MUHAMMAD KHAN

PLATE VII

(a) Inscription, dated A.H. 909, from Nâgaur (p. 38)

(b) Record, dated A.H. 911, same place (p. 40)
INSCRIPTIONS OF THE KHÂNZÂDAS OF NÄGÂUR

Next of the elongated shafts, which do not cover the whole slab as is the case in similar records studied before, but have been placed a little apart from one another in groups of five, four and three, commencing from right. But this does not produce the desired artistic effect.

The text of the record has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate VIII (a)

نا ان مسجد پہلوکلا(؟) در عهد خاناعظم محمد خان برفیق رحمان سنه احدی عشر و تسمایه

TRANSLATION

This mosque (was) built by (?) Phûlkala (?) in the reign of the great Khân Muhammad Khân, by the grace of the Compassionate (in) the year (A.H.) eleven and nine hundred (A.H. 911-1505-06 A.D.).

XIV. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 912, FROM KUMÂRÍ

Kumârî is a small village situated in the Nâgâur district at a distance of about twenty-five kilometres to the south-west of the district headquarters. On the outskirts of the village, there are a few tombs including that of Bâlâ Pir consisting of an ordinary platform with two graves. To the west north-west of this, at a distance of about 150 to 200 metres lies a square platform, about 2.25 metres high, in the middle of which stands an octagonal tomb, locally called Hasan Shahid’s Tomb, which is roofed by a single dome decorated with stripes and crowned by a lotus finial as in the Mughal domes. Perforated stone-screens fill the arched sides of the Tomb which is not devoid of architectural merit. Traces of blue enamel tile-work may still be seen at places. The Tomb is also interesting as being one of the few monuments of the Khânzâda period that have come down to us.

This platform is extended on its left by a platform slightly raised by about 15 cm., which is bound on the west by a single wall to serve, evidently, as the Qanâtî Mosque for the Tomb. In the middle of this wall is a stone mîhrâb above which is placed the tablet bearing the epigraph under study.

This epigraph was also first found by Mr. N. M. Ghanam in 1959. It was noticed in our annual report on the basis of the impression taken by him. But the impression being unsatisfactory, the writing being somewhat crowded and the letters being small and also executed in a slightly cursive hand, the text could not be read correctly then, and consequently, it was stated to seem to record the construction of a mosque and the Tomb of Firûz Khân and the raising of a garden; its date was doubtfully read as A.H. 902 (1496-97 A.D.).

The reference to Firûz Khân’s Tomb was extremely interesting, and if the reading of the inscriptions was correct, it would indeed have been a great discovery in itself. As such, it was necessary to be certain about the reading of the record beyond any reasonable doubt. Consequently, while in Nâgâur in 1966, I visited Kumârî in the company of Mr. Ghanam and Mr. Raunaq Uthmâni. Apart from having its fresh estampe prepared, I also finalised the reading of the epigraph, according to which it was definitely proved that the tomb did not contain the remains of Firûz Khân. At the same time, this fact did not detract from the importance of the record, as the Tomb, according to the final reading, was erected over the remains of a member of the Khânzâda family, or to be exact a daughter-in-law of Firûz Khân II as will be presently seen.

The epigraph which as usual consists of one line of writing in Persian states that the construction of the Tomb of the wife of the late Khānzaḍa Miyan Ḥasan son of Fīrūz Khān and the mosque attached thereto took place in 1506-07, during the time of Muhammad Khān.

The style of writing is Naskh but unlike in the case of the other Khānzaḍa records, the letters are somewhat small and cursive and the writing appears a little crowded. But for this, the epigraph conforms to the general calligraphical style. The artistic device of elongated shafts of letters and the curves of the letters wa and the marks of the letters kāf placed across these, has been resorted to here also.

The epigraphical tablet measures 60 by 24 cm., and the text has been deciphered as follows:—

TEXT

Plate VIII (b)

بناء ابن مسجد و بنيت اتباع خان مرحوم بن فيروز خان بن مأمون خام سباعان در عهد خان أعظم محمد خان في [سنة] إثنين عشر و تسعماه

TRANSLATION

The construction of this mosque and the Tomb of the wife of the late Khān, son of Fīrūz Khān, whose name is Khānzaḍa Miyan Ḥasan (took place) by the grace of the Compassionate, during the reign of the great Khān Muhammad Khān in the year (A.H.) twelve and nine hundred (A.H. 912-1506-07 A.D.).

Needless to say, nothing is known from historical works about Khānzaḍa Miyan Ḥasan or his wife, and but for this epigraph, they would have remained totally unknown. The record also supplies the information that Miyan Ḥasan was the son of Fīrūz Khān by whom evidently Fīrūz Khān II is meant. That is to say, he was the brother of the reigning chief Muhammad Khān. He had probably predeceased his wife; according to the epigraph, he was no mere when her tomb was constructed.

XV. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 913, FROM NĀGAUR

The tablet containing the last record of Muhammad Khān, a badly damaged one, is built up into the inner face of the part of the perkoš (upper wall) of the Nāgaur Fort, which overlooks the Horse-Stables and Rangwās (Ladies' Quarters). It being directly exposed to the inclemencies of weather, the writing thereon has been adversely affected, and the letters cut out in alto relievo have been almost completely leaved out, as can be better visualised from the illustration (pl. No. IX b).

A complete reading of the epigraph, therefore, is out of question. However, it is no mean satisfaction that a sizable portion of the record sufficient to yield the purport including the date has been deciphered to a fairly correct extent.

The inscription comprises, as usual, one line of writing in Persian, recording the construction of a mosque in 1507 during the reign of Muhammad Khān. The name of the builder does not appear to be there; he could be the chief himself.

1 ARIS, 1905-06, No. D, 334.
(a) Epigraph, dated A. H. 911, from Nâgaur (p. 41)

(b) Inscription, dated A. H. 912, from Kumâri (p. 42)
PLATE IX
(a) Epigraph of Muḥammad Khān, dated A. H. 913, same place (p. 43)

Scale: .23

FĪRČZ KHĀN III
(b) Record, dated A. H. 933, from Nāgar (p. 44)

Scale: .21
The style of writing is Naskh. Whatever of the calligraphy has survived, is sufficient to proclaim its fine quality. Though small, the letters appear to have had the same sharpness of outline and artistic flourishes as their other counterparts at Nāgaur. The smallness of the letters, of the size of hardly one fourth of the total height of the slab, has been pleasantly contrasted with their elongated shafts raised right to the top.

The epigraphical tablet measures 60 by 33 cms. The text has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

**Plate IX (b)**

بناهذ كرد ابن مسجد بنو تقي رحمان در عهد دولت بنطور خان اعظم و خاقان(؟) معظم [محمد خان]...في التاريخ ثلاث عشر و تسعين(؟) من سنة ثلاث عشر و تسعين

**TRANSLATION**

This mosque was built by the grace of the Compassionate, in the reign of His Highness the great Khān and the magnificent Ḥaqāqān (Muḥammad Khān)........On the third of the victorious (month of) Ṣafar of the year (A.H.) thirteen and nine hundred (3 Ṣafar 913–14 June 1507).

A point that may easily strike to the discerning scholars is that this is the only of Muḥammad Khān's five records studied here which uses the set of two titles that are almost invariably used in Firūz Khān II's epigraphs. On the other hand, four of his epigraphs merely use the title 'great Khān'. Since the name of Muḥammad Khān is not legible in the damaged record, a doubt may arise if it belongs to his reign. But there should not be any such doubt on this score, as the date A.H. 913 is quite clearly legible on the stone as well as in the rubbing.

**Firūz Khān III**

The existence of this ruler was first made known by Dr. Chaqṭāi in the Genealogy, where he is shown as having ruled from A.H. 915 to A.H. 922 in which year he is stated to have been succeeded by his son Muḥammad Khān. The latter is shown therein to have ruled till A.H. 933. Presumably this information was obtained from the Aurād-i-Qādirīyya. But from this solitary record of his, it appears that Firūz Khān was ruling in A.H. 933. The implications of this evidence as also the probable date of accession of his successor Muḥammad Khān II have been discussed in some detail in the introductory lines (p. 19, supra) and need not be repeated here.

**XVI. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 933, FROM NĀGAUR**

The last of the sixteen epigraphs of this study comes from Nāgaur. It pertains to the reign of Firūz Khān III. The loose tablet, measuring 65 by 31 cm., on which it is inscribed, is now preserved into the Dargāh of Ḥaḍrat Sayyid Imām Nūr, is situated outside the town to the south-east of the Delhi Gate.1 The tablet, according to Mr. Raunta Uṭhmānī, who brought it to my notice, was recovered from the demolished part of the city-wall. From the text it appears that the epigraph originally belonged to a tomb.

The inscription consists of a single line of writing in Persian. The tablet is slightly fragmentary, having lost a little portion on the right, but this has not affected materially the text except for a letter or two. It records the construction of a tomb and a mosque, evidently attached thereto, by a certain person, whose name is not clearly decipherable but reads something like Adā Jānbū or Adā Chānbū. The construction took place in 1527 during the reign of Firūz Khān.

---

1 ARIE, 1966-66, No. D, 357.
The style of writing of this epigraph is *naqṣ* of the usual variety with elongated shafts of letters. The writing is quite crowded and words have been placed one upon the other in horizontal as well as somewhat diagonal positions. Attention in particular may be drawn to the way in which the letters *m* and have been designed almost flattish like َā and placed across the elongated shafts of letters.

The text of the record has been deciphered as follows:

**TEXT**

Plate IX (a)

"نَبَيَّ كَرْد اِن مسجد و حضیره (sic) اداجانیو (اداجانیو) در عهد خان اعظم قیروز خان
سلمه الله تعالی بتوفیق و حماس بنایی نام ماد ذی المعمدم سنہ تلخین و تسعائیہ)

**TRANSLATION**

This mosque and the tomb were built by Adā Jānbū (or Adā Chānbū) in the reign of the great Khan Firuz Khān, may Allah preserve him, by the grace of the Compassionate, on the date, ninth of the month of Dhul-Qa'da (of the) year (A.H.) three and thirty and nine hundred (9 Dhul-Qa'da 933-10 August 1527).

The importance of the record is evident. Incidentally, this is the only one-line Khānāzīda record in which the sentence is complete in all respects. Thus, Adā Jānbū or Adā Chānbū, is shown in the text as the builder of the Tomb-cum-mosque complex. But the question would arise, whose tomb was constructed by him (or her)? In the few Tomb-records studied in the preceding lines, the names of the persons whose tombs were built have been mentioned. Could it be that it was Adā Jānbū or Adā Chānbū who was buried in the tomb? If the verb *bindā bard* was used without an object, this would have been the interpretation. It may also be that the said person may have built the tomb for himself (or herself) while alive. But no definite conclusion can be reached on this point.

Likewise, I am not sure if I have correctly read the name of that person. The writing is quite clear, and there is absolutely no confusion in that regard. All the letters of the word are clear and legible, but due perhaps to the unusualness of the name, I am unable to decipher it correctly. It is possible that some of the readers may be able to hit upon the correct form of this name.

Before conclusion, I would like to mention once again the assistance and help I received in copying some of these inscriptions from the staff of H. H. the Maharāja of Jodhpur who owns the Nāgaur Fort, and who has kindly permitted me to publish these records. I must also mention with admiration the indefatigable energy and interminable interest which Mr. Ramañj Uthmānī has for the history of the Nāgaur region; he was kind enough to accompany me in both of my visits to various places bearing inscriptions, and some of the records studied here might have escaped our notice but for his untiring zeal. Shri N. M. Ghanam also deserves our thanks for having traced some new inscriptions either on his own or through the information supplied by Mr. Ramañj Uthmānī and also for having accompanied me in one of my visits to Nāgaur.

Lastly, I genuinely regret that a couple of spotted epigraphs from the Nāgaur Fort could not be copied for want of proper equipment. I have a feeling that an extensive search may still uncover new epigraphs from the Fort or the remaining portion of the city-wall, if it is still intact.

*Bb* could be taken as a suffix used as a term of respect for ladies, like Bibi.
SOME MORE DIRECTION-STONES OF THE NIZHĀM SHĀHI DYNASTY

BY DR. A. A. KĀDIĪ
Senior Epigraphical Assistant

I propose to study in this article a few interesting inscriptions of the Nizām Shāhī kings of Ahmadnagar, dealing with a single but an unusual aspect of history, namely that of communications. As is well known, contemporary chronicles contain scanty information about the administrative and public welfare institutions. Other sources of such important information in which at the most we can get stray references are literature, epigraphs, deeds and endowments, royal orders and the like.

In the whole domain of Indo-Muslim epigraphy, so far, no records have been found which served the purpose of direction-stones or direction-signs of our days, except those set up in the Ahmadnagar kingdom. As the readers of this series are aware, a few such bilingual direction notices in the official language (Persian) and the local language (Marāṭhī) were found some time back at Antra and Kālamī. Unfortunately, no systematic efforts to locate more such epigraphs was made since then. In the past decade, however, some eight more records of similar nature have been found at various places, some of which are situated on the borders of the Nizām Shāhī dominions, to wit, Betul district in Central India and Kōlābā district on the Western coast. These valuable records indicate the direction of roads leading to various places from the places of their installation.

Communication is the most vital link in the life of any nation or kingdom. No state could afford to neglect this important means of keeping its trade and commerce, functioning of its various departments, both civil and military, and administration of the kingdom, in order. It is but natural that the Muslim kings also must have taken adequate steps—as in the case of Sher Shāh Sūr—to ensure proper maintenance of the roads and their safety. But no details thereof have come down to us, except that in Deccan, we are told that measures to ensure the safety of roads were taken first by Muḥammad Shāh I Bāhu nān (1388-75). Similar information in respect of other kings is not forthcoming from historical works. But fortunately, from a fragmentary record found at Cenāl in Kōlābā district, which incidentally appears to be the earliest of such direction records (and is included in this study), it is known for the first time that Burhān Nizām Shāh II (1591-95) immediately after his accession, issued a farman directing that at every place in his dominions, where there was a confluence of roads, a sign post should be set up to avoid confusion and inconvenience to the travelling public. This farman affords a concrete proof of the said king’s zeal for the welfare of the travelling public. As these epigraphs were intended for the benefit and use of the general public at large, it is but natural that their texts were also ordered to be inscribed in the official language Persian and the local language Marāṭhī.

1 Epigraphia Indo-Muslemica (EIM), 1919-20, p. 15, pl. (IX a).
2 Epigraphia Indica Arabic & Persian Supplement (EIAPS), 1955 and 1956, p. 115 (pl. XXIX e); Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission (PIHRC), vol. XI (1929), p. 92, where its gist was published. The record is now in the Central Museum, Nagpur.

(45)
As referred to above, so far only two such records, one each in the vicinity of the Antur Fort in Aurangabad district and from Kalam in Yeotmal district of Maharashtra, have been published. Both were set up in the time of Burhan II. According to the Persian version of the Antur record whose Marathi counterpart is not published, the road leads on the east towards Nagapur and Jharnapur, on the south towards Daulatabad and Ahmadnagar, on the west towards Mahun and Chalisgaon and on the north towards Antur and Burhanpur. The Persian writing on the Kalam pillar seems to have been scrapped up and is hence almost illegible. Its Marathi version states that the road to right leads to Salewa and that on the left to Nacangoon.

Of the eight records studied in the following lines, seven are of Burhan II and one of Burhan III (1610-50). The earliest of these is from Cheull in Kolaba district of Maharashtra. Apart from alluding to the firman regarding setting up direction-stones as referred to above, it refers to the confluence of roads to Ashwar, Nagpahan, Pen and Ruvandha. The next is found at Bur, a district headquarters of Maharashtra. It points out to the road leading from the town of Bir to the city of Ahmadnagar. The third record is from Nimbait in the Nasik district of Maharashtra. It is inscribed on four sides of a pillar and points out to the roads on each direction—from Nimgan to Daulatabad on the south and Gahna on the east; the stone having considerably weathered, the names of places on the north and west sides are illegible.

The fourth record is from Somaripe in Betul district of Madhya Pradesh. It also refers to the firman and indicates the directions towards Ellichi pur and Chand. The fifth record was found in the same neighbourhood, at Rawanbahiri. It points to Jiwapura on one side, to Bhanwar along the other, to Asir on the third, to Pratagpur on the fourth and to Sali on the fifth. The sixth record is from Mehkar in Buldana district of Maharashtra. As in the Kalam record referred to above, the Persian version is lost and the Marathi text only contains the name of the king and the date. The seventh record is from Paunari, in Wardha district of Maharashtra. It is fragmentary and contains only the Marathi text, the surviving portion of which is almost similar to that of the Mehkar record, but seems to have contained some additional information.

The eighth record, the only one to be set up in the time of Burhan Nizam Shah III, was found near Dina-Agra, to the right of the road towards Borli Pancharat (about 2 kilometers away) in Kolaba district. It marks pargana Borli on the east, the sea on the west, pargana Shwarghan on the south and the district of Danag on the north. The Marathi version also refers to a ferry at Dighi on way to Danag.

It will be noted that in these records, as in the case of two other records of similar nature referred to above, the date is given in words preceeded by the words Shuhur-i-Sana. Now this term was commonly used in Islamic countries and also in India, when only the year is given but not the exact month and date. At the same time, in India, particularly in the Deccan, the term was also used to denote the Solar variation of the Hijra year which was commenced from A.H. 744 or 745, and was called Shuhur San, corrupted into Suro San of Maharashtra.

Now in the text of the six inscriptions studied here (Inscription Nos. 2-7), the year 1000 is preceded by the term Shuhur-i-Sana, but in the seventh (Inscription No. 1), the same year is clearly specified as of Hijra era. If in these six epigraphs which were set up in the reign of Burhan Nizam Shah, the Shuhur era were meant, their dates—Shuhur 1000 or A.H. 1008—would not fit in with the dates of the reign of either Burhan II (A.H. 999-1003) or Burhan III (A.H. 1018-40). necessarily therefore, the date has to be taken in the Hijra era i.e. A.H. 1000, which

1 PIHRC, p. 92, has Deoli instead of Salewa.
2 For details, see M. Nigam, Bijapur Inscriptions, Archaeological Survey of India Memoirs, No. 49 (Delhi, 1936), pp. 96-102.
3 For this, see p. 68-69, infra.
it may be noted, is the date of the seventh record of the same king (Inscription No. 1). Moreover, as these epigraphs were set up in pursuance of the royal order issued immediately after the accession of Bahlain Niẓām Shāh, both according to Inscription No. 1 where the Hijra year 1000 is clearly given and also according to Inscription Nos. 2-7, where the year 1000 preceded by the term Shuhūr-i-Sanā is given, and since of the three Bahlains, the accession of Bahlain II took place a few months before A.H. 1000, it is also indicated that Bahlain II is meant. In other words, the term Shuhūr has to be taken to mean 'in the months of' and the date has to be taken to belong to the Hijra era.

But the date in the eighth epigraph (Inscription No. VIII) presents some difficulty. There the year is 1010, preceded by the word Shuhūr-i-Sanā, and the king's name is Bahlain. Here Bahlain II cannot be meant, since the date of the epigraph whether taken as A.H. 1010 or Shuhūr 1010 (A.H. 1018) would not fit in with the dates of his reign. Therefore, the king has to be Bahlain III, and the date will have to be taken as Shuhūr 1010 (A.H. 1018) and not as A.H. 1010, when Muťarag II was ruling and Bahlain II was dead for six or seven years. It may appear somewhat confusing, that in the case of the six epigraphs, the term Shuhūr has to be taken in the ordinary sense and in the case of the seventh, as denoting the Shuhūr era, but this has to be so in view of the explicit mention of the king and the year 1010 clearly given in the text.

The historical importance of these epigraphs is considerable. They provide through their findspots an idea of the boundaries of the Niẓām Shāhī kingdom even in the days when it was threatened by Mughal expansionist designs. That the Niẓām Shāhī sovereigns were acknowledged on the western coast of India is clearly shown by the Cheul and Dive-Agar records, and therefore, there is no truth in the statement of the local records that the governors of Dāndā-Rājpur, which lies between Cheul and Dive-Agar, were Mughal officers.1

Secondly, Somāripeś and Kherpā-Rāwanbāū near Betul are also proved to have been included in the Ahmadnagar kingdom, thus corroborating the statement of the Ahmadnagar historian, Sayyid Alī Tabātabā that during Mirzā 'Arif Koka's governorship of Mālwā (c. 1593-95), Ḥāndūr, situated to the north-west of these places, was the border between Mālwā and Niẓām Shāhī kingdom.2 Towards Bider, the town of Bir, and on the east north-east, Mehkar, Kalamūb and Pāunār were under the authority of these kings.3

But still greater importance of these records lies in their providing an idea of the network of roads in the various parts of the kingdom and the towns of some consequence at that time. The towns where these records were put up must have been famous for something or the other. Some of them are now reduced to small unimportant villages, but in the old days, they commanded sufficient importance. It would be interesting to reconstruct, on the basis of the information contained in these epigraphs and casual references to the army's marches in the area, the important routes that were commonly taken by the travellers.

The epigraphs are also important in another respect: they have faithfully recorded how these place-names were spelt in those days. For example, Ellippur—which has been now changed to Adalpur—must have been pronounced as Ellippur as recorded in the text of the Somāripū inscription.

1 Maharashtra State Gazetteers, Kolaba Districts (MSG, Kolaba), Bombay, 1964, p. 80.
2 Alī Tabātabā, Bahlain-i-M. 'Arif (Hyderabad, 1930), p. 549; Dr. Rāhū Shāhān, The Kingdom of Ahmadnagar (Delhi, 1968), pp. 179-80, 240, 270 (where Ḥāndūr is misspelt a Ḥudūyā).
The earliest inscription of the set is reported to have been found almost eight decades ago in the field belonging to one Vishnu Joshi, at Cheul in Ailbag Tahuka of Kolaba district. It's inked rubbing seems to have been taken by an officer of the Archaeological Survey, Western Circle, Poona, in about 1893-94, but was very probably transferred in 1953 to the Office of the Government Epigraphist for India, Ootacamund (now Chief Epigraphist, Mysore) and thence transferred to the office of the Superintending Epigraphist for Persian and Arabic Inscriptions, Nagpur, in 1958. The impression being quite worn out, it was intended to have its fresh impressions prepared when we visited Cheul in 1959, but attempts to locate the tablet proved unsuccessful. It is therefore from the old impression that the record had to be edited here.

Cheul, now reduced to a village of little importance, was the most important port-town in the Nizam Shahi kingdom and was also the headquarters of the province of that name. It was through it that the foreign trade of the kingdom was transacted. Therefore, it is but natural that the order directing sign-posts on stone to be put up in various parts of the kingdom, immediately after the accession of Burlan II, was first implemented here.

The inscriptive slab seems to have been considerably damaged due to inclemencies of weather at the time when its rubbing was taken: letters have peeled off in quite a few places. The text occupying a space of about 55 by 80 cm.s. consists of ten lines of writing in Persian carved in relief in Natashaq characters. It is unfortunate that the damage to the slab as also the worn out condition of the impression has rendered part of the text illegible. The readable portion of its text imparts the information that in the year when Burlan Nizam Shahi ascended the throne, a farman was issued to the effect that at every place in the dominions where many routes met, a sign-post indicating the directions should be set up so that the travellers may not experience any difficulty. It then lays down the directions to the towns of Ashtam, Nagothana, Pen and two more places which could not be deciphered. It also mentions a mountain temple, the route to which lay to the south. The epigraph was set up in 1591-92.

The text has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

Plate X(b)

(1) بعث ابن علامت آن أست كه در سال جلوس لواب كليب (؟)
(2) جمجمة سليمان سياء برهم لاقلماش وجد ملكه وسلطانه فرمان واجب
(3) الأذعاق صاده الله شده دك كه هر ملك كه مالك مجوسره كه اختلاف تركع
(4) ياند علماني نصب نماينده تا متبرد دين را اسکلی نماهند لهذا
(5)مسافراً كه از درواز كرله (؟) توند بداهنده كه اگر متوجه

3. For the strategic and commercial importance of Cheul, see *MSG, Kolaba*, pp. 720-25; Rādhē Shyām, *op. cit.*, pp. 332-56.
NIZĀM SHĀHĪ INSCRIPTIONS

BURHÂN NIZĀM SHĀH II

(a) Record, dated A. H. 1000, from Bīr (p. 50)

(b) Epigraph of the same date, from Cheul (p. 48)
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(1) The reason (for setting up) of this sign (post) is that in the year of accession of the successful Nawwāb,

(2) the possessor of Jamshid’s dignity (and) having Solomon’s army, Burhān Nizām Shāh, may his kingdom and sovereignty be perpetuated, a royal decree (farmān) commanding

(3) obedience was issued that at every place in the royal (lit. guarded) dominions where there is diversity of roads,

(4) a sign-post should be set up so that the travellers may not encounter any difficulty. Therefore,

(5) the travellers who . . . . from the Kori (?) Gate, should go . . . . . . . , and if they intend to

(6) go to Ashtam, they should turn their face towards the sun and proceed; and if they want to go to . . . . . . .

(7) they ought to turn their face towards north-east and take up the familiar (lit. famous) route;

(8) and if they proceed towards south, the route (leads to) the mountain temple; and if [they wish] to go to Nāgota (modern Nāgothānā) . . . . . . .

(9) and if the intention is to go to the town (qal'eh) of Pen . . . . . . .

(10) . . . . . . . is Regdāna (modern Revdānā). And this was (inscribed) in (the year) one thousand of the Hijra era (A.H. 1000-1591-92 A.D.).

INSRIPTION NO. 2

The second direction-notice of Burhān II’s reign was found inscribed on a pillar locally called Rānkhaibn, which is fixed in the ground by the side of the road near the Collector’s office at Bir, a district headquarter in Mahārāṣṭra. Occupying a total space of 73 by 60 cms., the text is bilingual comprising one line in Persian and three lines in Marāṭhī. Bir has a number of inscriptions and old monuments. Dr. G. Yazdānī who had made an extensive survey of these, had published their texts also. It is surprising how the epigraph under study, the only Nizām Shāh record to be found at Bir, escaped his notice.

---

1 For the antiquities and inscriptions of Bir, see Annual Report of the Archaeological Department of H. E. H. Nizām’s Dominions for the year 1920-21, pp. 4-14.
The record is dated 1591-92 in the reign of Burhan Nizam Shah II and indicates that the road leads from the town (qasba) of Bir to the city of Ahmadnagar. Both the Persian portion and the Marathi versions are carved in relief. The style of writing of the former is somewhat cursive Nasīḥ, which is partly responsible for the difficulty in the decipherment of the text. It will be noted that the Nāgarī version is almost the same as the Persian version except for two Marathi words used in place of their Persian equivalents in line 4.

Though the contents of the record were known, albeit not completely, the exact object of the pillar has been a matter of conjecture so far. Traditionally, it is believed to be a Rankhamb and was described as such recently in a Marathi journal by Shri N. S. Pohanker. Dr. V. B. Kolte, former Vice-Chancellor of the Nagpur University, who referred to it in one of his articles and quoted its contents almost completely, except the city-name Ahmadnagar (to which the road led), endorsed the view expressed by Mr. Pohanker. But there is no basis for such assumption or assertion. From the text, it is quite clear that it has nothing to do with a Rankhamb but was set up as a direction-stone like many others.

The text has been read as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate X (a)*

(i) **Persian version.**

(1) در زمان حضرت برهان نظام شاه شهر سنه اف سب نصبه، پی راه احمدانگر

(ii) **Marathi version.**

दर जमावे हजरत बुरहान निवास
म स्वातुर सन अतिव कसवा बी
ढ माग्य स्वाहर अहमदानगर

**TRANSLATION**

(i) (1) In the reign of His Majesty Burhan Nizam Shah (in the) months of the year one thousand (A.H. 1000-1591-92 A.D.), the route from the town (qasba) of Bir to the city of Ahmadnagar.

(ii) (2-4) As in line No. 1.

It will be noted that the name of the city Ahmadnagar has been inscribed as Ahmādānāgar. This is not an uncommon spelling being found in inscriptions as well as on coins.2

**INSCRIPTION NO. 3**

The third sign-post of Burhan II, a stone-pillar, was found buried in the local graveyard at Nimbāt, in Nāsik district. Its inked rubbings prepared by an officer of the Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, Poona, some time in 1936-37, were preserved in the old records.

---

1 *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay, dated the 29th November 1970.
2 *SAI*, 1962, p. 74, f.n. 3.
(a) Inscription, dated A. H. 1000, from Nimbit (p. 51)

(b) Another record of the same date, same place (p. 51)
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These being somewhat worn out, I had fresh ones prepared when I visited the place in 1961, and it is from these that the epigraph is being edited here. It is not known if the record is published or noticed anywhere. It is inscribed on all the four sides with bilingual text on each side. But the writing on two sides is badly damaged, rendering its decipherment uncertain as well as incomplete.

The readable portion of the text yields the information that the road towards south leads to Daulatābād from Nimām and that towards the east side to Gālnā, also through Nimāon. The places to which the roads going towards north and west led are not clearly legible. The pillar is stated to have been set up in 1591-92.

The text occupies a total space of about 40 by 50 cms., 40 by 55 cms., 37 by 50 cms. and 40 by 35 cms., respectively on the south, east, north and west sides. The style of writing of the Persian text is Nasḵh of somewhat crudish type, which coupled with the fact that the writing is badly affected has rendered its complete decipherment difficult. The language of the record is mediocre—containing words from the local dialect and the spellings are also wrong in a number of places.

The epigraph has been read as under:

(a) South side.

Plate XI (b)

(i) Persian version:

(1) الله محمد عل
(2) ..................................................
(3) دز زمن حضرت بهران نظامتی
(4) سورس حنفا واهی بالای موزی رگاوی
(5) مارک دهلنیا ب١

(ii) Marāṭhi version:

(1) मार्ग नीवावां वहन दील
(2) तावादेस जाती

(b) East side.

Plate XI (a)

(i) Persian version:

(1) الله محمد عل
(3) دز زمن حضرت
(2) بهران نظام شاه
(4) سورس حنفا در جانبین قنوت
(5) از پای موزی نم گم راهی فلاهي کننا

(ii) Marāṭhi version:

(1) मार्ग नीवावां वहन गाढ़निया
(2) स जाती
(a) North side.  

(i) Persian version:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \text{ اَللَّهُ مُحَمَّدُ عَلَی} \\
(2) & \hspace{2cm} \\
(3) & \text{ دَارُ ....} \\
(4) & \text{ دَارُ حَمَذَتُ بَرَهَانَ نَفَاطِشَةٍ} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(ii) Marathi version:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \text{ मार्ग नीवावः बहुः बेलः} \\
(2) & \text{ गावः हालः} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(b) West side.  

(i) Persian version:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \text{ رَسُولُ اَللَّهُ مُحَمَّدُ عَلَی} \\
(2) & \text{ لاَ اَللَّهُ الاَََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََََ∗}
\end{align*}
\]

(ii) Marathi version:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1-2) & \text{ Obliterated.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

TRANSLATION

(a) (i)  

(1) Allāh, Muḥammad, 'Ali.

(2) .................................................................

(3) In the reign of His Majesty Burhān Nizām Shāh

(4) [in the] months of the year one thousand (A.H. 1000–1591-92 A.D.). The road above the village Regāvī........ is the route to Daulatābād.

(ii)  

(1-2) The route from Nivagāon (i.e. Nimgaon) goes to Daulatābād.

(b) (i)  

(1) Allāh, Muḥammad, 'Ali.

(2-3) In the reign of His Majesty Burhān Nizām Shāh

(4-5) [in the] months of the year one thousand (A.H. 1000–1591-92 A.D.) in the direction of Q [K]jīmawat, from the foot of the village Nimgān the route leads to Gālnā hill.

(ii)  

(1-2) The route from Nivagāon leads to Gālnā.
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(e) (i)
(1) Allâh, Muḥammad, ‘Alt.
(2-3) ........................................ road (leads to) ................................
(4) In the reign of His Majesty Burhân Niğâm Shâh
(5) ........................................ [leads to] .................. gâm(?)
(ii)
(1-2) The route from Nîvâgâon leads to Belegâun (?).

(d) (i)
(1-2) There is no God but Allâh, [Muḥammad] is the prophet of Allâh. Allâh, Muḥammad, ‘Alî.

(3) ........................................ road .................. Nîmbâîli
(4) in the reign of his Majesty Burhân Niğâm Shâh.
(ii)
(1-2) ........................................ 1

INSCRIPTION NO. 4

This direction-stone was found at Somâripeś, a village close to Kherlâ, towards its southwest, in Betul district of Madhya Pradesh.2 The slab measuring 80 by 140 cms. is fixed up into the ground in the village and contains ten lines of writing of which six are in Persian and four in Marâṭhî.3 The Persian text refers to the reign of Burhân Niğâm Shâh (II), bears the date 1591-92 and states that the road on one side goes to Ellichpûr and that on the other side leads to Chândâ. In the text reference is also made to the royal order in pursuance of which the sign-post was set up. The Marâṭhî portion only mentions the name of the king, the date and the route to Ellichpûr.

The epigraph was first noticed in the District Gazetteer, but due to its incomplete and incorrect reading the name of the Ahmadnagar monarch was taken to be that of a Muhammadan governor under the king of Mâlvâ.4 From the readings quoted below, the epigraph is proved beyond any doubt to contain a Niğâm Şhâhî record.

The Persian and Marâṭhî texts are carved in relief in Nastaʿliq and Nâgârî characters, whose only merit is their boldness. This is an extremely important record. Like the Kherlâ-Râwanbârî record to be studied next, it was found not only in what can be reasonably called the northeasternmost limit of the Niğâm Şhâhî kingdom but in the heart of the Kherlâ kingdom, which figures prominently in the events of the Bahmani rule, and fills up a gap in its history intervening the Mâlvâ and the Mughal rules. It also corroborates as stated in the introductory lines, the statement of the Niğâm Şhâhî historian ʿAli Ṭabarâbâ, that during Mirzâ ‘Azîz Koka’s governorship of Mâlvâ (c. 1593-95), Hânjiâ, now in Hoshangâbâd district, formed the border between the province of Mâlovâ and the kingdom of Deccan.5 It is also proved from these two epigraphs from Betul district (which borders on Berâr) that the Niğâm Şhâhî occupation of Berâr had also included the region up to Betul and possibly Hânjiâ.

---

2 The writing in this part has totally pecked off.
4 Apparently the fourth line of the Marâṭhî text is buried in the ground.
6 Ṭabarâbâ, op. cit., p. 349; Râđhe Shyân, op. cit., pp. 179-80, 209, 270.
The text has been read as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XII (b)*

(i) *Persian version:*

(1) در زمانه حضرت
(2) بر همان نظام شاه
(3) شهر سنه الف
(4) بر حكم فرمان سلطان
(5) صادر شد که یک جانب
(6) راه ایلچ پور دیگر راه جانده

(ii) *Marathi version:*

(1) दर जमाने हुजरती बु
(2) राज्य नित्यान स्याहा सु|| श्र
(3) ढफ येक वाट अठाठपुर
(4) .........................

**TRANSLATION**

(ii)

(1) In the reign of His Majesty
(2) Burhān Niẓām Shāh
(3) [in] the months of the year one thousand
(4-5) in pursuance of the royal *farmān* which was issued (it is notified that) on one side, the
(6) road leads to Ilīchpūr (i.e. Ellichpūr) (and) the other road is to ChāNDā.

(ii)

(1-2) In the reign of Hajrātī Burhān Niẓām Syā (i.e. Shāh), months of the year one thousand
(3) One route leads to Alachhpūr (i.e. Ellichpūr).
(4) ..........................................................

The towns mentioned in the record viz. Ellichpūr and ChāNDā are well-known. The epigraph shows that this part of the country was connected even in those days to Ellichpur, the capital of Berār (now in Amrāoti district of Mahārāṣṭra) on the south-west and to far off ChāNDā, now a district headquarters in Mahārāṣṭra, beyond Nāgpur on the south-east, on the trunk line to Madras,
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INSCRIPTION NO. 5

The next epigraph of Būrghūn Nizām Shāh II in this group is also bilingual and appears on a slab fixed in Rāwanbāri situated very close to Kheşā in Betul district. The tablet is lying loose by the side of a cart track at a distance of about a kilometre from Rāwanbāri, and measures 80 cms. by 140 m. It contains a text of seven lines in Persian followed by three in Marāṭhī carved in relief. The Persian text, as in the case of the Somāripeṭ record, is engraved in bold Nastā’īq letters, otherwise of no distinctive merit, and while referring to its being set up in the reign of Būrghūn Nizām Shāh II in the months of the year (A.H.) 1000 (1591-92 A.D.), purports to indicate the road in one direction to Jiwāpūr, in another to Bhawārgāh, in the third to Asīr, in the fourth to Pratāpgaṛh and in the fifth to Sāliyā. The Marāṭhī portion as in the case of the Somāripeṭ record merely refers to the reign of the king and quotes the date.

In the Betul District Gazetteer, reference has been made to 'two stone pillars on which the distances are marked, which are signed by Būrghūn Shāh, Gond Rājā of Deogarh, and are of comparatively recent origin'. It is difficult to say for certain if the two inscriptions under study are intended, but the purport given including the name of the king strongly points to that being the case. If so, the present study will make it clear that these records have nothing to do with the Gond king but were set up by Būrghūn Nizām Shāh II of Ahmadnagar.

The text has been read as under:

TEXT

Plate XIII(a)

(i) Persian version.

(1) در نیان حضرت برھه
(2) ایام شاه شهر منه
(3) انفاک جانب راه
(4) جبوا (؟) پور و دیگرا راه شهر کر
(5) سیموم راه ایمیر
(6) جهارم راه پرتاپ
(7) کوره پنجم راه سالیا

(ii) Marāṭhī version.

(1) दर जमाने हजरती
(2) बुर्खान निवास स्था
(3) सू ॥ अलफ
TRANSLATION

(i)

(1) In the reign of His Majesty Burlān
(2) Nizām Shāh (in the) months of the year
(3) one thousand (A. H. 1000–1591–92 A. D.). On one side is the road to
(4) Jiwāpur and on the other is the road to Bha(n)wargār.
(5) On the third (side) is the road to Asīr.
(6) On the fourth (side) is the road to Pratāp-
(7) gaṛgh and on the fifth (side) is the road to Sāliyā.

(ii)

(1) In the reign of His Majesty
(2) Burlān Nizām Shāh (i. e. Shāh)
(3) (in the) months of (the year) one thousand (A. H. 1000–1591–92 A. D.).

Both the Somārpe and Rāwanārī records are situated within a couple of kilometres from each other and also within a radius of about a kilometre from Kherlā which was conquered by Firūz Bahmanī but was restored to its ruler. Afterwards it was taken by Hoghāng Shāh of Mālwā. It is believed to have continued as part of that kingdom till 1560, when Mālwā was taken by Akbar. But that this is not correct, is shown by this as well as the previous record. These records clearly show that sometime before 1591, the date when these were set up, the region had been occupied by the Nizām Shāhī kings of Ahmadnagar and formed part of their kingdom. In other words, as stated above, these records fill a gap in our knowledge of the history of the region.

One of the places mentioned in the text is Asīr. The celebrated Asirgarh is situated at a distance of about 160 kilometres to the west south-west. There is one more Asirgarh in Betul district itself which is situated about 65 kilometres to the north-east of the district headquarters. This is perhaps likely to be the place mentioned in the epigraph. Of the rest, Bhawargār is very probably the Bhawargār of the maps: situated at a distance of about eleven kilometres due west of the Barbatpur Railway Station, on the Betul-Iṣārī section of the Central Railway, it lies north north-west of Rāwanārī. Sāliyā of the record is perhaps Sāliyā of the maps. There are three places bearing this name. Of these Saliyā situated in 22° 05' and 76° 05' at a distance of about thirty kilometres north-west of Bordah Khās Railway Station on the Amīna-Parasia section of the Central Railway, is likely to be the one mentioned in the record. The other two places bearing the name are further up, at a distance of more than 80 kilometres towards north and north-east respectively, of this Saliyā, which is nearer to and to the north north-east of the findspot of the record. Saliyā is a market place also. As to Pratāpgarh, two places bearing the name could be traced on the maps: one is situated in 22° 26', 79° 35' (about 160 kilometres to the north-east of Betul) and another 23° 15', 78° 35' (about 155 kilometres to the north north-east of Betul). One of these places has to be identical with Pratāpgarh of our record. The remaining place Jiwāpur could not be located on the maps available to me.

1 Sherwānī, op. cit., pp. 156–57. For a somewhat coherent history of the region, see CPDG, Betul District, pp. 25–38.
2 CPDG, Betul District, p. 233.
3 It is shown in Half Inch Sheet No. 55 J/SW of the Survey of India Maps.
This epigraph is also bilingual. It is from Mehkar in the Buldana district of Mahārāṣṭra.¹ The slab is reported to have been found by Mr. R. A. Thengade, Lecturer in History, Arts and Commerce College, Mehkar, who sent its inked rubbing, prepared perhaps by him, to Dr. V. B. Kolte, then Vice-Chancellor of the Nagpur University. The latter, who referred to it in his article referred to above,² was kind enough to give it to me at my request, for which I am extremely grateful. It is not known if the record is published anywhere else.

Mehkar, the headquarters of a Tāluka, is a place of some antiquity.³ It was the headquarters of a sarkār in the time of Akbar.⁴

Unfortunately, the portion containing the Persian text has broken off and only the Marāṭhī version has survived. The latter consists of five lines of writing carved in relief in Nāgarī characters occupying a space of about 30 by 50 cm³. As in the other records, this version mentions only the name of the king and the date A. H. 1000 (1591-92 A. D.), and the information on directions which was evidently contained in the Persian version is not available.

The Marāṭhī text reads as under:—

**TEXT**

Plate XIV(b)

(1) दर जमाने
(2) [हृ]जरती वु
(3) रहन निजाम
(4) स्या मुहर स
(5) न बढ़फ

**TRANSLATION**

(1-3) In the reign of His Majesty Burhān Niṣān
(4-5) Sūa (i. e. Shāh), in the months of the year one thousand (A. H. 1000-1591-92 A. D.).

The epigraph shows that Mehkar was a town of sufficient importance in Barār during the Niṣām Shāh period.

**INSCRIPTION NO. 7**

The seventh direction-stone of the time of Burhān II was found at Pāunār in Wardhā district of Mahārāṣṭra.⁵ Pāunār situated at a distance of about 8 kilometres to the north-east of the district headquarters, is the first station on the railway line towards Nāgpur. It is an old village

---

² Maharashtra Times, Bombay, dated 29th November 1970.
³ For the history and description of the town, see CPDG, Buldana District (Calcutta, 1910), pp. 448-60.
and has a history behind it. ¹ Now, shorn of its earlier importance, it has the traces of the old fort, one of the gateways of which, a large imposing structure of stone, was standing at least in the closing years of the last century.² Upon the gateway was an inscription in Nāgarī characters according to H. Cousens, and following him the District Gazetteer, but its contents were left undescribed.³

The gateway is now no more, but the epigraphical tablet is the same as one now fixed into the compound-wall of the house of Mr. Vithal Chinnaji Bangre—as was gathered by Mr. S. A. Rahim, then Epigraphical Assistant, who had visited the place to copy the record.⁴

As in the case of the Mehkar record, here too the Persian text is cut off and lost, with the result that the places to which the roads from Paunār led cannot be determined. The text in Nāgarī characters has survived the hand of neglect or vandalism, but it merely states that the slab was set up in 1591-92, during the reign of Sultan Burhan Nizām Shāh. The Persian text, now lost, evidently contained the purport proper of the epigraph. It is a pity that the Persian texts of all the three Nizām Shāh direction-stones found so far in the Berar region, including the one from Kalsem referred to above, are either damaged beyond recognition, as in the case of the last mentioned or lost as in the case of this and the previous epigraph. It may be more than a coincidence. While it is difficult to say if these have been purposely destroyed, the fact remains that the information sought to be conveyed has been lost to us for ever.

It may be noted that the language of the Nāgarī record is Persian. It reads as under:-

**TEXT**

*Plate XIV(a)*

1. दर जमाने
2. हजरती सुनूँ
3. तान बुरशान नि
4. जाम स्मा सु
5. हूर सन अज
6. फ कारम सु [४]
7. मांगं...सु....

**TRANSLATION**

(1-7) In the reign of Hajrati Sultan Burhan Nizām Syā (i.e., Shāh), in the months of the year one thousand (A. H. 1000-1591-92 A. D.), this was set up. The road....................

¹ For the history and description of Paunār, see CPDO, Wardha District (Allahabad), 1867, pp. 252-53.
³ CPDO, Wardha District, p. 253; Cousens, op. cit., p. 10.
⁴ ARIE, 1966-67, No. 3, 201. There is only one Arabic-Persian record at 1 Paunār. It contains only religious text and is assignable to 16th-17th century on palaeographical grounds (ibid., No. 1, 182).
⁵ This phrase was commonly used in Marathi records.
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Burhān Nizām Shāh III

INSCRIPTION NO. 8

This is the only epigraph of Burhān III in the present group and also its last. On enquiry I had informed Dr. V. B. Kolte about the Marāṭhī version of this epigraph, the impression of which was prepared at his instance by an officer of the Department of Archaeology, Government of Mahārāṣṭra, Bombay. The slab is fixed on the side of a road to Borlai Panchāyat, from Dive Agar, in Shrīvardhan Tāluka of Kolābā district of Mahārāṣṭra, at a distance of about a kilometre from either place. Dr. Kolte who published a reading of its Marāṭhī portion in his article referred to above, was kind enough to make its rubbing available to me. It is from that impression that the Persian text of the epigraph is being published here for the first time.

This is also a bilingual inscription occupying a total writing space of 40 cms. by 1.20 m. and runs into twenty-four lines of which the first eight are in Persian and the remaining sixteen in Marāṭhī, all carved in relief. The Persian text is engraved in NaṣkĀr characters of a fairly good type but the letters have lost their prominence of relief and have pecked off at a few places due to weathering of the slab.

The Persian part of the epigraph records that in the reign of the just king Burhān Nizām Shāh in the Shuhr year 1010 (A. H. 1018-1609 A. D.), this road-direction stone was set up at pargana Div and that the road to the east leads to pargana Borlai; on west to the sea, on the south to pargana Shrīvardhan and on the north to mālamal Ąṇḍā. The Marāṭhī text supplies an additional piece of information, namely that there is a ferry at Dighi on the route to Ąṇḍā.

This epigraph is a very valuable document not only because it adds one more to the seven records known so far, of Burhān Nizām Shāh III, whose very existence in the Nizām Shāḥi dynasty is primarily established on the basis of his inscriptions, but also because according to me, it is the earliest of his epigraphs hitherto discovered. As explained in the introductory lines, the date of the record is to be taken as Shuhrū 1010, i.e. A. H. 1018 (1609 A. D.), while his earliest known record is dated A. H. 1019. Dr. Yazdānī who was the first to establish his identity fixed the year of his accession as A. H. 1019 (1610 A. D.) on the authority of an inscription from the Antur Fort and also on the basis that the Bāsātnā’s-Salātīn—a 19th century work—continues to mention Murtadā Nizām Shāh II till the year A. H. 1020 (1611 A. D.). But this does not appear to be a very sound basis. The events of the last days of Murtadā II may perhaps be recounted here. From the time that Murtadā II had intrigued with some nobles to dispose off Malik Āmbar in A. H. 1016 (1607 A. D.), the latter wanted to depose Murtadā II, but desisted on the intervention of Ādil Shāh, and marched, with the king, to Jummār. According to the Bāsātnā, in Shuhrū 1009 (A. H. 1017-1608 A. D.), Murtadā II shifted his capital from Jummār to Daulatbād. In 1609, when Malik Āmbar became free from all troubles, he turned his atten-

1 In Dr. Kolte’s reading, the 23rd line is not given. Since listed in J.R.E., 1970-71. No. D 116 and No B 103.
2 D.I.M. 1919-20, p. 12 (pl. VIII), p. 14 (pl. VII a and b); ibid., 1933-34 (Supplement). p. 22 (pl. XII and XIIIa); ibid., 1949-50, p. 6 (pl. IIIa); ETAPs. 1937, pp. 58-59 (pl. XV).
3 D.I.M. 1919-20, p. 12.
6 Zubairi, op. cit., p. 270. According to Dr. Rādhē Shyām, loc. cit., p. 82, Malik Āmbar brought him from Jummar to Daulatabad to keep him nearer to himself.
tion towards Murtazâ II, to settle the score. Now according to our record, dated Shukrur 1010 (A.H. 1608-1609 A.D.), Burhân III was the king, which shows that ‘Ambar must have ultimately succeeded in doing away with Murtazâ II in 1609 itself.

This assumption is corroborated by other contemporary evidence too: The Mughal emperor Jahângrî dispatches Prince Parwiz on the Deccan assignment on the 14th Rajab 1018 (October 1609); but before the latter reached Burhânâpur, Jahângrî received the news that ‘Ambar had killed Murtazâ II. Assuming that the journey from Agrâ to Burhânâpur took one or even two months, Murtazâ II must have been dead by the end of December 1609, if not earlier.

In view of the above, as well as of the epigraph under study, it would appear that Burhân III had ascended the throne in A.H. 1018 and not in A.H. 1019 as assumed by Dr. Yazdânî and others.

Apart from this, the record under study helps us in dispelling the doubts about the Nizâm Shâhi sovereignty over the Konkan region. It has been asserted that though Malik ‘Ambar is stated to have recovered most of the territory from the Mughals soon after the fall of Ahmadnagar in 1600, local records seem to show that till 1618, the governors of Dandâ-Rajpuri were Mughal officers. But from the present record, it is clear that at least until 1609, this area was under the Nizâm Shâhi rule.

The text of the epigraph has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate XV

(i) Persian version.

(1) در زمان بادشاہ عدالت پناہ خلافت
(2) دستگاه پرہان، نظم شام خند احمد
(3) ملک و سلطان و راز عدل و
(4) [محسان شیواز] سنه ا-fire عشر در پرگن
(5) دیو نیشان راحا ثبت کردہ شد
(6) راه مشترک پرگنہ پور لیہ و جانب مغرب
(7) دریاء شور و جانب جنوب(؟) ب [یزگانشیروی]
(8) دهن جانب [شاپل] معاملہ دندا

1 Râdhe Shyâm, loc. cit.
2 Tahâk-i-Jahângrî (Aligarh, 1864), p. 75.
5 M307, Kolaba District, op. cit., p. 80.
6 This should have been جنوب to correspond with the Marâṭhi text.
BURHAN NIZĀM SHĀH III
Epigraph, dated Shuhūr 1010,
from Borlai Panchāyatana (p. 90)

Plate XV

Scale: 1:16
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(ii) Mūrāthi version.

(1) दर जमाने पातस्या ज
(2) म ज्या आदाल्त[व]
(3) पत्रा बिलासित दस्त
(4) गाह दुर्भान निजा
(5) म स्वा बुकिल्ता मु
(6) छोट्य व सुन्दरातातुध
(7) जाध अदल्तु व अहु
(8) स्वान्तु महः सन अति
(9) माई आधार परगणे
(10) दिवा निशान वाटा भर्व
(11) दिस्ते परगणे बोरल्याए दक्षे
(12) यो चिन्हक विज्ञ
(13) मे सरोला उतररे परग
(14) यो दुधा वाटन विद्वीस
(15) तरो आहे मार्गे
(16) [११] छे [१२] ना

TRANSLATION

(i) (1-2) In the reign of the king, the asylum of justice, the possessor of the dignity of caliphate, Burhān Nizām Shāh, may Allāh perpetuate his kingdom and sovereignty and increase his justice and benevolence! (in) the Shuhūr year one thousand and ten (Shuhūr 1010-1609 A.D.), in the pargana of Div, the sign-post of roads was set up.

(3) The road to the east (leads to) pargana Borlai and on the west (7) is the sea and on the south is the pargana Shiwar-
(8) dhan (and) on the north is the district (mutāmala) Dāuli.

(ii) (1-13) As in lines 1-8 above.¹

¹ Lines 9-21 constitute the Nāpuri transcript of the Persian version.
(14-15) There is a ferry on the route to Ḍandā at Dighi Road.

(16) .........................

Dive-Āgar—Āgar Panchātan of the Survey maps is now reduced to a small village, situated about two kilometres to the west of Borlai, which is mentioned in the text as a pargana. Shriwardhan is a Tāluka headquarters situated towards south, while Ḍandā, mentioned as a district towards north, known as Dāndā-Rāipuri in earlier times, is now reduced to a small village situated on the other side of the Rāipuri Creek. Ḍandā was approached as stated in the Marāṭhi text by the ferry at Dighi which can also be seen on the maps.

1 Sheet No. 47 B & F.
SOME MUGHAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM GUJARĀT

By Dr. Z. A. Desai

A considerable number of Arabic and Persian inscriptions from Gujarāt belonging to different periods of its history have been brought to light in recent years by the Archaeological Survey of India, and quite a few of them have been studied in the past numbers of this Series, such as for example, seventeen epigraphs of the Pre-Muslim or Rajput period, twenty four of the Pre-Sultanate or Khalji and Tughluq period and fifty of the Sultanate period. Here it is proposed to study fifteen records, belonging to the time of Akbar and Jahāngīr, out of a total of about sixty records of the post-Sultanate or the Mughal period. A few of these do not make an explicit mention of the reigning monarch, but being important in one way or the other, they have also been included.

The findspots of these inscriptions make an interesting study in itself. They belong to places situated almost in all the parts of the present boundaries of Gujarāt—Kadi and Pātan in northern, Māngrol in western, Baroda, Cambay and Sarkhej in central, and Vsrāvi in southern Gujarāt. Again, Pātan has the largest number, totalling 7, Cambay and Māngrol coming next with 2 each and the remaining places having 1 each. This is not without interest, corroborating as it does the statement of Professor M. S. Commissariat that under the Sultanate, also during the Mughal imperial rule, the towns to the north and northeast of Ahmadābād, in the region represented by the newly created districts of Mehsānā, Banās Kānṭhā and Sābar Kānṭhā, play a part in the Gujarāt history not less prominent than the perhaps better known towns to the south of the capital.

That these epigraphs constitute an important source for the history of Gujarāt under the early Mughals is too obvious to be emphasised here; they supply, as will be clear from their study in the following lines, important information even in the political field. They indicate, on the other hand, a somewhat larger area of building activities than is generally known. The largest number of these, or to be exact, seven, pertain to the construction or repairs of mosques (along with a tomb in one case). Among other non-secular buildings, the erection of tombs is mentioned in two, while one fragmentary record, now set up at a place other than to which perhaps it originally belonged, is an epitaph. On the secular side, two epigraphs refer to the foundation of a suburb, and one each to the construction of a market-place, a step-well and a fort-gate.

Also, these epigraphs provide new names in the list of local officials and noblemen, supply some new information about their personal and political career, particularly in the matter of dates and contain interesting information about some of the saints, their associates or descendants and the like, which is not to be had from available sources. For example, two of the inscriptions under study name trustees of two famous saintly establishments of Gujarāt—one at Pātan and the other at Sarkhej. The inscription set up to commemorate the construction of a market-place

1 These are listed, as and when found, in the Annual Report on Indus Epigraphy (ARIE).
3 Ibid., 1962, pp. 1-40.
5 A study of eight inscriptions of Shāh Jāhān, originally included in this article had to be omitted for want of space. Ultimately, of the post-Shāh Jāhān epigraphs, those of Aurangzeb form the largest number.
—corresponding perhaps to the agricultural marketing yard of the present days—indicates the efforts on the part of the administration to ensure an equitable dealing to the producer;¹ this incidentally must have also ensured the proper and correct payment of the sales or purchase-levies to the state.

The language of these inscriptions in most cases is Persian. Arabic is employed only in five of them, which pertain to the reign of Akbar. The rest, including five more epigraphs of the time of that monarch are in Persian, mostly in verse. Palaeographically, there is nothing very remarkable about these inscriptions, except that among the scripts represented here, viz. Naskh, Thuluth and Nasta’liq, we have some specimens of calligraphy of a fairly high order.

The impressions of these epigraphs were obtained, except otherwise stated, in the course of my official tours as well as that of some of my colleagues, to various parts of Gujarāt.

Akbar

I. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 982, FROM PĀṬAN (N. G.)

The inked rubbing of this inscription was received in 1961-62 from the then Superintendent, Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, Barodā. It seems to have been originally prepared by an officer of the Archaeological Department of the erstwhile Barodā State of which the region (roughly comprising the present Mhasānā district) in which Pāṭan, the findspot of the inscription is now situated, formed part.²

The loose slab bearing this epigraph was some time back reported to have been lying in the mosque attached to the Tomb of Maulānā Ya’qūb, situated about four hundred metres to the north-west of the famous Sahastralings Tank outside the town.³ My efforts to trace it in 1969 proved futile, and on inquiry, I was told that the epigraphical tablet did lie for some time in the mosque but had disappeared a few years back.

Occupying a writing space of about 65 by 24 cms., the three-line Arabic text is executed in Naskh style which is somewhat akin to the style of writing employed in the late Tughluq and early Sulṭanate records of Gujarāt. The writing is affected by weather, and as a result, the letters having lost their prominence of relief, the text is not clearly intelligible in one or two places; particularly the word indicating the nisbat of the person mentioned therein does not admit of correct decipherment.

The epigraph, apart from quoting the famous Quranic verse occurring in mosque inscriptions records the construction of a mosque and a mausoleum ‘for its master or occupant Sulṭān Dost Muḥammad Sulṭān a’n-Najrāvīintestinal’ in 1574, during the reign of emperor Akbar. The text being somewhat ambiguous, it is not possible to say for certain whose mausoleum was constructed, particularly since the tablet was not in situ and it is not known to what building it originally belonged. But very likely, the text seems to indicate that the mausoleum belonged to Dost Muḥammad Sulṭān who, it may be pointed out, is mentioned as deceased. The text could also

¹ That it was so explicitly stated in an inscription of Shah Jahān’s time omitted from the present study, recording the construction of a ganj, i.e. a market (ARIE, 1964-65, No. D, 66).
³ ARIE, 1961-62, No. D, 38. The inscription on the mosque itself is studied in the following lines.
be interpreted to mean that Dost Muḥammad Sulṭān constructed the mosque and the mausoleum of his master or the master of the mosque, but in that case the omission of the name of the latter cannot be explained satisfactorily.

The importance of the record lies in the fact that it is the earliest record of Akbar found so far in Gujarāt, which was first conquered by that emperor in 1573. Also, from the tenor of the text, the occupant of the tomb, Dost Muḥammad Sulṭān, who could not be traced in available records, appears to have been a man of consequence, or perhaps a local official.

The text has been deciphered as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XVI (a)*

(1) ﷺ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ 

(2) ﷺ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ 

(3) ﷺ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ ﷲ 

**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the name of Allāh the Beneficient, the Merciful. ‘And verily, the mosques are for Allāh only; hence invoke not any one else with Allāh’.

(2) This mosque and this dome (i.e. mausoleum) for its occupant (lit. master) Dost Muḥammad Sulṭān an-Najrānī (?), may Allāh cover him with His Forgiveness, were built.

(3) In the reign of the greatest king, the victorious, Jalālu’d-Dīn Muḥammad Akbar Badshāh Ghāzī. Its date is second of Rabī’u’l-Awwal year (A. H.) 982 (2 Rabī’ 1 982-22 June 1574).

II. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 985, FROM THE SAME PLACE

This neatly executed record also comes from Pātān. The tablet on which it is inscribed, measuring about 125 by 65 cm., was found on the central miḥrāb of the Baḍr or Jāmī’ Mosque of Mahalla Mukhātwādā, by Dr. A. A. Kādiri, Senior Epigraphical Assistant. More than one third part of the slab is carved with three ornamental ogive-shaped pointed arches, the middle of which is inscribed with the First Creed. The text proper runs into five lines and is composed in Arabic of a somewhat florid and literary style, unlike in the case of most of the epigraphs. The style of writing is Naskh of quite a pleasant type. Even as the letters are written quite closely and are moreover slightly weather-beaten, the calligraphical effect is picturesque which speaks of the skill of its designer, whose name is unfortunately not mentioned. Incidentally, there appears to have crept in a couple of orthographical mistakes in the execution of the text.

The inscription records the construction of a mosque in 1577, by Ṣāliha Bānū, wife of Khwāja Khalīlullāh. The latter is stated in the text to have descended from Ḥaḍrat ‘Abdu’llāh bin Jarīr

---

1 Qr’sūn, Chapter LXXII, verse 18.
2 ARIE, 1960-61, No. D, 64.
3 In view of the fact that a large number of Pātān inscriptions are not in situ, it is difficult to say if it is the same mosque on which the epigraph now occurs that was constructed.
a'li-Lishī al-Bajālī, who is described as one of the closest Companions of the Holy Prophet. The Khwāja is further mentioned in the text to have been, at the time of the construction of the mosque, the governor of Pātān. The array of titles used for emperor Akbar is worth notice. Such titles, which occur in the early Delhi Sultanate inscriptions, are found in quite a few epigraphs of Akbar pertaining to the early part of his reign.⁴

The epigraph has been read as under:—

TEXT

Plate XVI (b)

(a) Under the middle arch.

لا إنه الله محمد رسول الله

(b) Below the above.

(1) تسمع الله الرحمن الرحيم وربنا نقلت من أنك أعنت السميع العلم فوالذي صلى الله عليه وسلم من بني مسجدنا بنى الله له بنى في الجنة قد بنيت هذه البلاطة المذكورة في عصر السلطان العظمى والشاه الأزكرم ملك رقاب إما (المملكة)؟

(2) سلطان الهند و العجم صاحب الناج و العلم كل الله تعالى على العالم الذي قيل في خلقه نخل ساحة منه يعمل القليل يآوى جلال الدين محمد أكبر بإنشاء الغازى خلد الله ملكه العبادة الصالحة الكريمة المخلصة فاضي النور ذي (ق) طاعة رزاً إله مريم الزمان في وفواه الله الممتنع ببناء هذا البلاط إلى نواب الله الجل

والراجبة إلى عفو الله الملك العلي صالحه ياثر مثابة خواجه خليل الله و هو من أولاد من هو أحد الصحابة على رسول الله عبادة بن جربير الناشن الباجي

(3) في الخامس عشر من شهر بيع الأول سنة خمس و ثماني و تسعين و سبعين من الهجرية و كان خواجه خليل الله المختار إليه حاكماً و عماراً من الأخوة العلياء في هذه البلدة المشهورة به بن حمزة الله تعالى

(4) عن الفنان في السنة المذكورة الحمد لله بكهن شم البلاطات (؟) و ينعنه جمل هذا العمل من البلاطات الصالحة كما قال الله عزوجل و البلاطات الصالحة خير عند ربكم تواباً و خير إملاً

TRANSLATION

(a) First Cron.

⁴ Cf. INDIA, I, pp. 54, 56, 67, 68, etc.
MUGHAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM GUJARAT

AKHAR

(a) Inscription, dated A. H. 932, from Pātan (p. 47)

Scale: 22

(b) Record, dated A. H. 985, same place (p. 46)

Scale: 14
(b) (1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful. 'O Our Lord, accept (this) of us; verily, Thou art the Hearer, the Knower.' The Prophet, may Allāh's salutations and blessings be upon him, has said, 'He who builds a mosque for Allāh, Allāh builds for him a house in Paradise'. This auspicious edifice was built in the reign of the greatest Sūltān and the most noble king, lord of the necks of nations.

(2) the monarch of Arabia and 'Ajam, master of the crown and the banner, the shadow of the Exalted Allāh on the earth, in respect of whom it has been said that justice done (by such a king) for a short while is equivalent to (the good) action of both the worlds (namely) Jalālū'd-Dīn Mūhammad Akbar Būdžhāh al-Ḡāzī, may Allāh perpetuate his kingdom, by the chaste, the pious, the noble and the benevolent lady, the Fāṭima2 among the women (of the world) who is in the servitude of

(3) Allāh, the Mary of the age aspiring for the pleasure of Allāh, one who intends to seek, by the construction of this edifice, merit from the Manifest Allāh, and the hopeful of the pardon of the Great Allāh, Sāliha Bānū, wife of Khwāja Khabilu'llāh who is descended from one of the most beloved Companions of the Arabian Prophet, 'Abdu'llāh son of Ja'ir a'I-Lahir a'I-Bajāli.

(4) on the 15th of the month of Rabī' 'uI-Awsa, of the year five and eighty and nine hundred from the Migration (15 Rabī' I 985-2 June 1577). And the aforementioned Khwāja Khabilu'llāh was the governor and the 'Āmil (i. e. Agent) appointed from the exalted court for this town, better known as Pātan, may the Exalted Allāh protect it

(5) from mischief, in the said year. Praise be to Allāh that through His grace this merit (?) was achieved and with His bounty this action became one of the enduring charitable deeds, as the Exalted and Glorified Allāh has said, 'And the ever-abiding, the good works, are better with your Lord in reward and better in expectation.'

This epigraph is one of the very few records pertaining to women. Also, it furnishes an interesting piece of information about the pedigree of the builder's husband, and supplies material for local history, disclosing as it does, one important link in the chain of local officials. The name of Khwāja Khabilu'llāh is not met with in the annals of the period, not even in the Mil'r-i-Ahmodī, which is somewhat surprising, for Pātan even after it ceased to be the capital of Gujarāt in the Sultanate period, continued to be an important place, to which generally, men of sufficient prominence were appointed. Khwāja Khabilu'llāh who thus appears to have been one of the notable men of his time, held Pātan at least in 1577, the date of the record.

According to the text, the Khwāja's ancestor 'Abdu'llāh bin Ja'ir al-Lahīr al-Bajāli had the distinction of being a companion of the Holy Prophet. Now the doyen of Traditionists Imām Abū Ismā'īl Mūhammad Bukhārī (d. A.H. 256) mentions Ja'ir son of 'Abdu'llāh al-Bajāli among the Companions of the Prophet and devotes a small section to him.5 Subsequent writers, like 'Abdu'l-Karīm Sam'ānī (d. A.H. 562), and Hāfiz Saifū'd-Dīn al-Anqārī (tenth century A.H.),6 also call him Ja'ir bin 'Abdu'llāh. But our epigraph calls him 'Abdu'llāh son of Ja'ir. It is

---

1 Qur'ān, Chapter II, verse 127.
2 Daughter of Prophet Mūhammad.
3 Qur'ān, Chapter XVII, part of verse 46.
6 Hāfiz Saifū'd-Dīn al-Anqārī, Tahātī' Taḥātī' Kamāšfī Asma'ir-Bajālī (Cairo, A.H. 1361), p. 61. I was able to consult these works through the kindness of Mājadda Suyyid Mūhammad of the Madrasa Mājadda'ī, Ummān, Nagpur, to whom I am extremely grateful.
III. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 1006, FROM THE SAME PLACE

This inscription is from the tomb of one of the most celebrated exponents of the science of Tradition - Hadith literature - that India has produced, namely Shaikh Muhammad son of Tahir of Patan. It is engraved horizontally in four lines on a tablet measuring 85 by 25 cms. The tablet is fixed over the doorway of the Shaikh's Tomb situated in a large enclosure, on the outskirts of Patan, just without the Khān-Sarwar Gāt. The record which is in Persian verse is incomplete, and it appears that some part of the tablet, on the left side, which contained the remaining portion of the text, is now missing.

The metrical record is composed by Rāfi and states that the construction of the tomb of Shaikh Muhammad Tahir who rendered yeomen services to the cause of the Hadith literature took place in 1597-98 and that the Shaikh had expired on the 6th December 1578. As part of the text is missing, the person who constructed the mausoleum cannot be made out. The style of writing is Nasīh of a fairly good type, but the overall effect is not equally pleasing as the alignment and arrangement are not quite perfect. The quality of verse is mediocre.

Shaikh Jumâl-din Muhammad, entitled Malik-ul-Mahaddithi (lit. Prince among the Traditionists), was celebrated throughout the Islamic world as an eminent Traditionist. Originally born of Bohra parents, he was a great zealot for orthodoxy in religion. Born in A.H. 911 (1508 A.D.), he went to Hijâz at the age of thirty, after completing his education in India, and pursued higher studies particularly in the science of Tradition under great savants like Shaikh Ali Mustaqi and others. On his return to India, he zealously took up the cause of introducing religious reforms in his community and was killed on his way to Delhi to see emperor Akbar to seek his promised intervention and help in the matter. He also made great efforts for the spread of education, and being a man of substantial means, even helped deserving students with board, lodge and incidental expenses. He compiled a number of books on the science of Tradition, the most important of which, the voluminous Majma'u Bihârî'Anwâr, purporting to be an exhaustive dictionary of both the Hadith and the Qur'ān, has been judged by competent critics to have almost eclipsed all the previous works of its kind.

The text of the inscription runs as follows:

**TEXT**

Plate XVII (c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>روضه وراثی</td>
<td>خیر خبر</td>
<td>ناکش اسماء</td>
<td>طغیان تلیب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روایت حیدر</td>
<td>حدث هند</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Samânî, op. cit.
3 As far as it can be judged, about one third of the slab is missing.
4 M. G. Rizvi, Ayagand, The Contribution of India to Arabic Literature (Allahabad, about 1946), pp. 43-44. 52, 152, 254, 403, where a complete list of the Shaikh's works as well as references to books containing his account will be found. To the latter may be added, Hakim 'Abdul-Hayy, Tâdî- Ayûm in Urdu (Lucknow, 1926), pp. 73-76 and A. Yazdani, Memôrîzî in Arabic, part IV (Hyderabad, 1954), pp. 298-301. His biograpy entitled Todkh kow—Jâmîa Shaikh Muhammad bin Tahir by 'Abdul-Wahhab has been published by 'udwatu'-Musannifa (Delhi, 1946), but I have not seen it.
(a) Record, dated A. H. 991, from Kadi (p. 73)

(b) Epigraph, dated A. H. 994, from Cambay (p. 74)

(c) Inscription, dated A. H. 1006, from Patan (p. 68)
(1) The good and divine mausoleum of the learned, the revealer of the secrets of the Bringer of good news and the Warner (i.e. Prophet Muhammad),

the upholder of the standards of the Tradition of the Guide, the humbler of the banners of the mischievous rebels,

he whom Divine Decree

(2) with pleasure be drank the cup (of death) (and) left for the sightseeing of the great (i.e. the other world).

On the sixth of Shawwāl he was honoured with rank and position in the kingdom of eternity like the resplendent full moon.

He is Shaikh Muhammad, son of Tāhir, the name

(3) 'And he is a Martyr, a Martyr, a Martyr'—(A.H.) 986 (6 Shawwāl 986-6 December 1578)—in this regard there is no denying the fact.

For the auspicious date of (construction of) this mausoleum, take (the words) 'the gate of Divine pleasure'—(A.H.) 1006 (1397-8) from the garden of Paradise.
(4) O Rādī, if you sincerely pay attention (i.e. desire), the obliging Munificent (Allāh) will certainly help.

The dates for the two events as described above are given both in figures as well as in chronograms.

IV. FRAGMENTARY EPIGRAPH, DATED A.H. 991, FROM BAROḌĀ

The arch-shaped tablet measuring 53 cms. from apex to bottom and 35 cms. in width, on both sides of which this fragmentary but interesting epitaph is engraved in relief, was found by me in 1969 at the head of a grave in the courtyard of the Jāmā’ī Mosque of the famous city of Baroḍā.¹ The chief importance of the record lies in the fact that it has now been proved to be the epitaph of the famous Mughal nobleman and official Nawāb Qutb-ud-Din Muhammad Khān, youngest brother of emperor Akbar’s foster-father Shamsu’d-Dīn Ataqa Khān, who was governor of Baroḍā and Broach and was murdered by the orders of Sultan Muṣṭafā III of Gujarāt in 1583.² There should be little doubt that the tablet is not in situ, for it must have been originally set up at the head of the grave of the Nawāb who lies buried at Baroḍā itself in a grandiose mausoleum, situated at Danteshwar on the road leading to the Makarpurā palace of the Muhārīj of Baroḍā. The mausoleum, locally called Hajira—corruption of Ḥafīrā—is a massive brick structure octagonal on plan, built on an elevated platform, and is perhaps the only impressive extant Muslim monument of the city.³ It would be interesting to know when and why was the tablet detached from the Nawāb’s grave and how did it come to be fixed at the present place.

As the tablet is built up into the ground, it is difficult to ascertain if there was some inscribed portion thereof at the bottom, and if so it is missing or is underground. It is possible that the slab had already broken when it was brought and fixed up in the ground in the Jāmā’ī Mosque. In its present state, at least one fourth of the tablet is missing.

As stated above, the record is inscribed on both the sides, the text on each side comprising a Quranic verse between the bordered arch and a two-verse Persian Fragment in the two vertical borders. Like the Quranic texts, the two Fragments are incomplete, but their meaning is quite clear: each purports to give a chronogram for the martyrdom of the Nawāb. In one of them, the full name Qutb-ud-Dīn Muhammad has survived, while in the other, the title Nawwāb and the word Qutb (lit pivot) are extant. These as well as the date of martyrdom, which according to the two chronograms, was A.H. 991 (1583 A.D.) leaves no room whatsoever for doubt that the epitaph relates to none other than Nawwāb Qutb-ud-Dīn Muhammad Khān. It will be noted that it was this very year in which the last Gujarāt Sultan Muṣṭafā III was able to regain, albeit temporarily, his throne.⁴

The calligraphy of the record is of a very high order, the text having been written in different scripts. The religious text is inscribed partly in plain Naṣīḥ and partly in plain Tughrā and Tughrā-š-Mu‘lās, while the versified historical text is executed in pleasing Naṣīḥiyy.

³ Commisariat, op. cit., pp. 21-22 and plate facing page 36.
⁴ Ibid., p. 19.
The text on the obverse of the slab reads as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate XVIII* (b)

(a) **In the border.**

(i) **At the apex:**

阿拉伯

(ii) **Right and left sides:**

..............................................................

القَاضِي فِي طَبِيبِ دِينِ مُحَمَّدٍ خَان

يشاهد و سيدم كرد وقم


[Note]

(b) **In the middle.**

(i) **Within the arch:**

لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(ii) **Below it:**

(١) اسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
(۲) شهد الله انه لا إله إلا هو و المملكة و اولوا

{٣} العلم قاببا بالقسط لا إله إلا هو العزيز الحكيم

..............................................................

**TRANSLATION**

(a) **i. Allâh.**

ii. By the Divine decree, Quṭb-i-Dīn (i.e. Quṭbu’d-Dīn) Muḥammad Khān, that................................. for his date, wrote, 'he attained martyrdom' (A.H. 991=1583 A.D.).

(b) **i. There is no god except Allâh. Muḥammad is the Prophet of Allâh.**

ii. (1) In the name of Allâh, the Beneficient, the Merciful.

(2) 'Allâh bears witness that there is no god but He, and (so do) the angels and those possessed of knowledge, being maintainer of justice; there is no god, but He, the Mighty, the Wise.

(3) [Surely, the true religion with Allâh is Islam and those to whom the book had been given did not show opposition but after knowledge had come to them out of envy among themselves].

\[^1\] It appears that one more inscribed panel after this which probably contained the remaining Qur’anic text (supplied in the translation) is missing.

\[^2\] Qur’ān, Chapter III verses 17 and part of 18.
The text on the reverse reads as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate XVIII(c)*

(a) In the border.

(i) At the apex:

(ii) Right and left sides:

(b) In the middle.

(i) Within the arch:

(ii) Below it:

**TRANSLATION**

(a) i. Allāh.

ii. When Sodition encompassed everything (like an ocean), the Nawwāb became immersed in

"Call me 'the Qayb (pole-star) of the sphere of martyrdom'."

(b) i. And He is the Witness and the Witnessed.

ii. (1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

(2) He is Allāh besides whom there is no god, the Knower of

(3) [the Unseen and the Seen. He is the Beneficent, the Merciful].

V. INSCRIPTION, ALSO DATED A.H. 991, FROM KĀḌI

This epigraph, which pertains to the time of another famous Mughal official who was viceroy of Gujarāt for some time, namely Shihāb Khān, surprisingly omits any reference to the Mughal

---

1 One more inscribed panel after this which must have contained the remaining part of the Qurʾānic text (supplied in the translation) is missing.

2 Qurʾān, Chapter LIX, verse 22.
emperor. The inscriptional tablet is of white marble and measures 85 by 45 cms. It was originally set up on the Jāmī Mosque of the town of Kadi in Mhānsā district, but seems to have been detached when the mosque was rebuilt in 1957; it was still lying loose when I had its impression taken in 1964.¹

Kadi now divested of any importance seems to have been an important strategic place in old days, particularly during the Mughal period. Unfortunately, all its early monuments have since disappeared, except the small but imposing citadel built by Nawāb Murtadā Khān Bakhārī in A.H. 1018, that is, in the time of emperor Jahāngīr according to its inscription.² The earliest Muslim epigraphical record in the town noted so far is of the time of Firuz Tughluq.³

The epigraph, which consists of four Persian verses, states that a mosque was built in the khitras¹ of Kārī (i.e. Kadi) in 583-84,² in the time of the great Khān Shihāb Khān. The year of construction is given both in figure as well as in a chronogram. There is no indication in the text about the name of the builder. As to Shihāb Khān, he is none other than Shihābūd-Dīn Ahmad Khān, a noble of great abilities and reputation who replaced Wazir Khān as the viceroy of the province towards the end of 1577 and continued in the post till 1583. The month of the year not being specified, it is not known what part of that year the construction took place, but it may be of interest to know that it was to Kadi, the final spot of the inscription under study, where Shihāb Khān had repaired, on his recall as viceroy and en route to the royal court, towards the end of A.H. 991 and it was at this place that he was prevailed upon by the new viceroy Iftimāl Khān to assist him against Sultan Muṣṭafā III who had already entered Ahmadābād. Shihāb Khān, a capable administrator and a revenue expert, has gone down in the history of Gujarāt as one of its best Mughal viceroys. He is stated to have constructed or repaired and strengthened in all about eighty forts at different strategic places in the province. He died at Ujjain in 1590.⁴

The text is executed in fair Nastaʿlīq and reads as under:—

**TEXT**

Plate XVII (a)

(1) در عہد خان مکومت آئین شہابخان کور ہو اور مہد دین انظام تھد
(2) تعمیر نافذ مسجدی از شہابخان مائید کبیر معبد عاقب و عام شد
(3) کردم جہ جہ تکر از میں ناول مال و کے کلام باین کلام مین مشکام شد
(4) ز احاد اور آگر نشماری بجز یک گوید خرہ کہ سمج جام تمام ہد
(5) سنه 1991

**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the time of the munificent Khān, Shihāb Khān, by whom the affairs of the community and the religion were properly conducted,

---

² Ibid., No. D, 33. It was published in G. Yazdani and R. G. Gujer, Muslim Inscriptions in Baroda State (Bombay, 1944), pp. 8-10. Also see Commisariat, op. cit., pp. 46-47.
⁴ For the corroboration of this text please see ELAP 1968, p. 10.
⁵ Only first three days of the year 1584 fell in A.H. 991 which ended on 3rd January, 1584.
EPIGRAPHIA INDICA—ARABIC AND PERSIAN SUPPLEMENT

(3) a mosque was constructed in the Miṣṣa of Karī (which), like Ka‘ba, has become the place of prostration for the high and the low.

(3) When I pondered to find out the date of its construction, my pen became musk-coloured by (writing) this firm text:

(4) 'If your do not take into account its first digits except 1, Wisdom says (that the words) the Jāmi‘ Mosque was completed (will afford the date).

(5) Year (A.H.) 991 (1583-84 A.D.).¹

The date, as will be seen above, is afforded by the chronogram contained in the last couplet, yielding A.H. 991, which is also inscribed in figure. The ingenuity of the chronogram, whose composer has chosen to remain anonymous, lies in the fact that the date will be worked out only if its letters having the numerical values represented by the first digits other than 1, i.e. 2 to 9, are omitted in reckoning.

VI. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 994, FROM CAMBAY

Cambay, the findspot of the inscription under study, was the capital of the erstwhile State of the same name and is, now, a Taluka headquarters in the Kairā district. It was a flourishing commercial emporium and a world-mart in the 14th century and also the Sultanate and the post-Sultanate periods.²

The inscription tablet measuring 122 by 35 cms. is reported to have been fixed on the Three Gates of the town, which is the most famous counterpart in Ahmadābād, opens out into the business thoroughfare. The record is quite interesting in that it refers to the construction of a 'beautiful and wonderfully planned' market-place (sūq) which was completed in 1585-86 in the reign of Emperor Akbar. It is difficult to say if the original market exists or not. Very probably, it does not.³ From its brief description contained in the text it seems to have comprised a number of shops. Also of interest is the reference, by implication, in the text, to the custom of decorating the market with silk and brocade evidently to attract the customers. Though not specifically mentioned so in the text, the market seems to have been constructed by the government. The year of construction is given both in the figure as well as by a chronogram.

The text of the epigraph comprises three Persian verses of a fairly high order which are inscribed vertically on the slab in Nasta’liq characters of a fairly pleasing type and read as under:

TEXT

Plate XVII (b)

(a) Right vertical panels.

¹ See foot-note 5, on p. 73.
³ ARIO, 1954-55, No. C, 43. Its inked rubbing was received from the office of the Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, Bomb".
SOME MUGHAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM GUJRAT

(6) Middle vertical panels.

چه مرغوب قلوب آمد چه حاجت
کر استیرق یا واپش و دیبا

(c) Left vertical panels.

خرد تاريخ اتمام رتم زد عمارتها عجب و سوق زیبا

TRANSLATION

(c) (1) In the time of the king Akbar, was completed

(2) a heart-ravishing market of marvellous plan.

(b) (1) Since it has (already) captivated (the) heart (of everybody), what is the need

(2) of adorning it with silk and brocade?

(e) (1) Wisdom wrote down the date of its completion (in the words):

(2) Wonderful buildings and a beautiful market (A.H.) 994 (1588-86 A.D.).

VII. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 996, FROM PÂTAN

This is one of the few inscriptions which give some more detailed purport than is generally met with in the Arabic and Persian inscriptions of India. The epigraphical tablet measuring 85 by 40 cms. is fixed over the central mihrab of the mosque situated in the compound of the saint Makhluum Husam-u'd-Din Multani (d. A.H. 736), one of the eminent disciples of the celebrated Haqrat Nizam-u'd-Din Auliya of Delhi, and contains eight lines of closely written text in Arabic which furnishes the information that the renovation of the mosque—for that is evidently intoned by the words 'this place' in the text, which begins with the famous religious formulae usually occurring in mosque inscriptions—inside the enclosure of the Dargah of the pious Shaikh and holy Imaum, namely Husam-u'd-Din, who expired in A.H. 736 (1336 A.D.)—as yielded by the chronogrammatic phrase describing him as 'Master of inspiration Husam-u'Din'—was carried out in 1588 by the orders of the noble and brave Sayyid and the magnificent chief, Sayyid Qasim son of Sayyid Mahmud, under the spervision of Manjula, son of Jalal Bahlaum. The last-mentioned is spoken of in the text as an old retainer or attendant of the Sayyid. Reference is also made in the text to the fact that the saint was a spiritual successor of the celebrated Haqrat Nizam-u'd-Din Qasim of Delhi. It further states that the work was undertaken at the suggestion of Haji Shaikh Khabur Muhammad son of Ishiq, the hereditary trustee of the place, the latter having been advised (in a dream) by the Makhluum (i.e. the saint) to have it renovated. The Arabic text is stated to have been composed by 'Abdur-Latif son of 'Abdul-Qasim ‘an-Nagauri (i.e. of Nagaur) al-Ansari, and inscribed by 'Abdur-Qadir son of 'Abdur-Latif. That the scribe and the composer are not son and father, as may otherwise be suggested

1 ARIE, 1934-55, No. C, 92.
2 The mosque was originally built, according to the inscription now appearing over its left mihrab, in 1485 during the reign of Sultan Mahmud I of Gujurat (ibid., No. C, 91 and ETAPS, 1903, p. 36, pl. Xa).
4 The epitaph of Sayyid Mahmud may still be seen at Mehera in Muzaffarnagar district of Uttar Pradesh (see ARIE, 1952-53, No. D, 302).
by the name ‘Abdul-Latif, is clear from another inscription from Pahan studied in the following lines (p. 82, infra), where his full name is given as ‘Abdul’-Qadir son of ‘Abdul’-Latif al-Yamani.

The inscription thus provides quite useful information, particularly in regard to the hereditary trustee and attendant of the shrine of the saint; this is all the more important as this type of information is not generally available from any source other than the Pedigree-Trees (majara) which are generally frowned upon as unreliable by historians. That these Pedigree-Trees are not unreliable is proved by the present epigraph also.1 In the Family-Tree supplied by the present Sajjada of the saint, Mr. Shujâ’u’d-Din Fârüqi, M.A., B.T., who is seventeenth in line from the saint, the names of Muhammad Ishaq and Kabiru’d-Din occur as the fifth and sixth descendants. Our epigraph, while corroborating the Tree, however, gives the correct names as Kabir Muhammad and Ishaq respectively.

As to Sayyid Qasim, who belonged to the Bahr family, that came into greater prominence some time later, he took a leading part in the conquest of Gujarat by Akbar and also during the early critical years of Mughal rule in the province.2 Our record also speaks of an old retainer of his, Major son of Jalal, whose clan-name was Balbin. Nothing is known about him as also about the composer of the text and the one who inscribed it. The composer appears to have been well-versed in Arabic language, but the same cannot be said about the calligraphical skill of the scribe. The calligraphy is of no particular merit, the style of writing being Yashk.

The text has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate XIX (b)

(1) يسْمَى انتَ الصَّاحِبُ مَسْجَدِي الْإِنْفِرَاقِ إِذَا يَعْمِرُ مَسْجَدِي انتَ الصَّاحِبُ مَسْجَدِي الْإِنْفِرَاقِ
(2) قَدْ جَدِدَ بَنِي [هُ] هذَهِ الْبَقْعَةِ بَيْنَيْنِ إِنَّهُ مَسْجَدُي انتَ الصَّاحِبُ مَسْجَدِي الْإِنْفِرَاقِ
(3) الْحَلِّيَةُ وَ الْفَالِقَةُ تُقَدِّرُ إِنَّهُ مَسْجَدُي انتَ الصَّاحِبُ مَسْجَدِي الْإِنْفِرَاقِ
(4) الْمَلَكَةُ مَسْجَدُي انتَ الصَّاحِبُ مَسْجَدِي الْإِنْفِرَاقِ
(5) مَسْجَدُي انتَ الصَّاحِبُ مَسْجَدِي الْإِنْفِرَاقِ
(6) مَسْجَدُي انتَ الصَّاحِبُ مَسْجَدِي الْإِنْفِرَاقِ

1 It will be recalled that in a similar case, the correctness of two steps in the Pedigree-Tree of the present Sajjada of Qâdî Hamidu’d-Din Nâgaur, as established by a couple of epigraphs at Nâgaur (cf. Elaps, 1961, p. 35 and f.n.1).
2 For details of his career, see Shah Nawaz Khân, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 377-78, 409-10; ‘Ali Muhammad Khân, op. cit., part I (Baroda, 1928), pp. 154, 175, 176; Blochmann, op. cit., p. 461, No. 105, etc.
(a) Inscription, dated A. H. 1009, from Cambay (p. 84)

Scale: 3

(b) Epigraph, dated A. H. 996, from Pāṭan (p. 75)

Scale: 4
(5) and who enjoys manifest traces of kindness and favours from him, (namely) the Shaikh who is Hāfī (i.e. one who knows the Qur'ān by heart), the hereditary attendant of this Shrine by his own exertion and right, the unique Shaikh Kabīr Muhammad son of Ishāq, and under the superintendence

(6) of one who is the most trustworthy and moderate among men, and old retainer of the generous Sayyid, namely Manjiha son of Jalāl Bahlim, may Allāh accept (this good deed) from all of them. The author of this

(7) text is the one who is dependant upon the Protecting and Omnipotent (Allāh), ‘Abdu'l-Laṭīf, son of Abīl-Qāsim son of ‘Abdu'l-Laṭīf an-Nāṣir, al-‘Anṣārī, may Allāh forgive him and his forefathers, all of them. On the second of the auspicious month of Ramadān, year (A.H.) six and ninety and nine hundred (2 Ramadān 996-15 July 1538).

(8) This was written by the weak creature ‘Abdu'l-Qādir son of ‘Abdu'l-Laṭīf.

---

1. The name of the father is written in very minute hand below these words.
2. Qur'ān, Chapter IX. verse 18. Incidentally, it is somewhat unusual that the Qur'anic verse has not been fully inscribed but it has been indicated to be taken as granted through the words al-dyn, i.e. (ill the end of) the verse—an equivalent of etc., etc.
VIII. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 996, FROM THE SAME PLACE

This epigraph, recording the construction of a mosque by the same Sayyid Qasim Barha, is from the mosque situated in the enclosure of the Dargah of Maulana Ya'qub, popularly known as Maulana Mahbub, referred to above. The tablet on which it is inscribed measures 1.30 m. by 30 cms. and is fixed above the central mihrab.

The record consists of five lines of writing in Arabic executed in fairly good Na`ikh characters, the calligraphy resembling, to quite some extent, that of the inscription dated A.H. 982 studied above (No. 1). It states that the blessed mosque in the Dargah of the great saint and pole-star, namely Ya'qub, was built in 1500, by Sayyid Qasim son of Sayyid Mahmud al-Husaini, a resident of Barha. The inscription also furnishes this information about the saint that he was an attendant (Khalil) i.e. a disciple of Shaikh Zainu'd-Din, a spiritual successor of Shaikh Burhanu'd-Din who was in his turn the spiritual successor of Hazrat Nizamu'd-Din Chishti.

TEXT

Plate XX (b)

(1) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم قال الله تعالى إنا نبشر مساجد الله من آن بالله و اليوم الآخر
(2) عليه السلام من بني الله مسجدان بين الله لهما في الجنة قد عمره عدد المسجد المبين
(3) في المرقد المصعب
(4) للكتب العالم الرباني و الغوث العارف العماداني الذي خرج تاريخ و وصلته لقبه
(5) المعطيي مل الله عليه و سلم و البرية في معاملة حضرة الشيخ حكاك الشيخ حرم المدينة
(6) على ساكناها البجية فقس سه طيز وي و هو "ب" بتقول هو مجري و مصوفي، و كان
(7) نفس سه طيز خادم الشيخ زين الحق و الدمن و هو حلبة
(8) الشيطان ينه و الذري و هو خليفة سلطان المشايخ مجموع الله الشيخ نظام
(9) العلماء و الدين الديانIndices the crude آكرم
(10) السير الاوثر الاعظم باستعمال و الأثمان و بالغ البذول والباستثناء الطالب بأعمال
(11) برج محض ذات إبه و وسادة العام السالم أبو الكلاك السيد قاسم إبن السيد المودود الودود السيد محمود
(12) الحسيني مالك يعده على تحاف الخطب المعبور ليلة سنة تسعين و سبعين و تسعية لي شهر
(13) المحرم الله تعلم (؟)

1 For an account of the saint, see Fadl Ahmad, op. cit., pp. 121-22; 'Ali Muhammad Khair, op. cit., Supple-}

2 ARCE, 1954-55, No. C, 102. The mosque has on its northern mihrab another epigraph which comprises religious text: Qur'an, Chapter LXXII, verse 18), executed in beautiful Na`ikh characters (ibid., No. C, 113).
SOME MUGHAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM GUJARĀT

TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful. The Exalted Allah has said, 'Only he shall visit the mosques of Allah who believes in Allah and in the Final Day (i.e. the Day of Judgment) - (to the end of) the verse'. And (the Prophet), may peace be upon him, has said, 'He who builds for Allah, a mosque, Allah builds for him a house in Paradise'. Verily, this auspicious mosque in the enclosed (lit. guarded) resting place

(2) of the Qiblah (lit. pole-star), who is learned in divinity, the Ghauth (lit. rescuer) and the divine gnostic, the date of whose death can be extracted from what the Chosen (Prophet), may Allah's salutations and peace and also those of the Creation be on him, entitled him in the incident of His Holiness Shaikh Hakkaê, the Shaikh (chief of) the Prophet: Sanctuary at Madina-

(3) may on its residents be (Allah's) blessings - may his honoured secret be sanctified (by saying), 'What! Are you asking about Ya'qûb! He is liked and loved by me', and who (i.e. Ya'qûb), may his honoured secret be sanctified, was the servant (Khâdîm) of Shaikh Zainul-Haqq wa'd-Din, the spiritual successor (Khâlifa)

(4) of Shaikh Burhânul-Haqq wa'd-Din, the spiritual successor of Sultanul-Mahbûbîk, the beloved of Allah, Shaikh Nizâmul-Millah wa'd-Din al-Chishta, was built by the most munificent and brave Sayyid

(5) and the most magnificent and pious Sayyid, spreader of justice and bounty, provider of munificence and gift, the seeker, through his good actions, of the Essence of his Nourisher and his Protecting Creator, Abul-Malâkîn (lit. Father of virtues) Sayyid Qâsim, son of the loving and the lovable Sayyid Ma'hûdî al-Husaini, inhabitant of Bârôh, may the favours of the Truth (i.e. God), worthy of worship, be showered upon him in the year (A.H.) nine and ninety and nine hundred, in the month of Muharram (Muharram 999-October-November 1590 A.D.).

(6) Allah, accept (this).

The importance of this epigraph is considerable. It furnishes some new and also supplementary information about the saint as well as the builder, who are otherwise quite well-known. For example, about Sayyid Qasim, it provides an important piece of information that he was a Husaini Sayyid; it also calls him Abul-Malâkmîn, which must have been his kunya, and it specifically states that he was an inhabitant or resident (tâkin) of Bârah. The etymology of this word which has more or less come to signify the clean-name is uncertain and a satisfactory meaning or connotation of the term has yet to be found. Though unfortunately our epigraph does not provide any explicit answer to this controversial question, it does provide valuable indication which restricts the sphere of etymological derivations to only one, viz. that the term Bârah has nothing to do with bîhir meaning outside or bârah imân i.e. the twelve Imâms of the Shi'as, or abâr meaning pious, but it has a geographical connotation. Of course, whether

---

1 Qur'ûn, Chapter IX, verse 18. Also see foot-note on page 77, supra.
2 In the ghaib, a Qiblah occupies the first place and a sâth the second.
3 This phrase - a slight variation of the hemistich from an Arabic Qasida - purporting to be the words used by the Prophet about Maulâ Ya'qûb as well be explained presently, constitutes the chronogram for the date of his death.
4 The claim of Sayyid Mahmûd to be a Sayyid-e.-descendant of the Holy Prophet was not accepted beyond any doubt in his own life-time, as is evident from the incident related by emperor Jahângîr (Jahangir, Turuk-i-Jahangîr, Algâs, 1564, p. 386). Cf. Blochmann, op. cit., p. 425.
5 An exhaustive note on Bârah and the Sayyids of Bârah, will be found in Blochmann, op. cit., pp. 425-32.
6 Also see Shah Nawz Khân, op. cit., vol. II, p. 377.
7 Blochmann, op. cit., pp. 425, 429, where the etymology has been discussed at some length.
the term represents a village or a region, it is not clear beyond doubt, but very likely the term as used in the epigraph might be taken to indicate a village rather than region.¹

 Secondly, the inscription helps to clear up some confusion that seems to prevail about the identity of Maulānā Yaʿqūb. Perhaps, the earliest account of the saint is contained in the Tadhkira-i-Husāmīyya composed in Persian in A.H. 855, hardly fifty-five years after his death by one Ḥusām son of ʿṢiddiq whose main object was to make available to the Indian admirers and disciples of the saint a Persian translation of the Qasida-i-Hakkīkiyya which Shaikh Hakkāk of Madīna had composed in Arabic, describing the extent of Prophet’s love for Mālānā Yaʿqūb as communicated to him by the Prophet himself—as will be elucidated presently.

 Among the hagiological works available to me, the earliest reference to him and a somewhat detailed account of his to be found is in Muhammad Ghauṭi’s hitherto unpublished Gulkār-i-Abrār composed about two decades after the date of the epigraph under study. According to this account, the saint entitled Tāju’d-Dīn died in A.H. 789,² which is evidently wrong as our epigraph and other sources place his death in A.H. 800. His brief account in the Miʿrāj-i-Aḥmadī seems to have been taken from an earlier work on the subject.³ But unfortunately, in the Barōdī edition of that work, there is confusion about the year of the saint’s death, stated to be A.H. 890 in words, while the chronogram quoted yields A.H. 800.⁴ A somewhat fuller account of the saint is contained in a modern work on the saints of Deccan, where the details including the date of the death (given in figure as well as by quoting the same chronogram as given in the Miʿrāj-i-Aḥmadī) are factually correct.⁵ Our epigraph, which quotes an altogether different chronogram, now establishes beyond doubt that the saint had expired in A.H. 800, which fits in with the fact, mentioned in the inscription as well as the last mentioned two works, that he was a disciple of the fourteenth century saint, Shaikh Zain’ud-Dīn of Daulatābād.

 It will be observed that while seeking to give the chronogrammatic phrase for the saint’s death, the text makes a reference to what the Prophet himself conveyed to Shaikh Hakkāk, a constant attendant of the shrine at Madīna, about his feeling for Maulānā Yaʿqūb; this communication—"Yaʿqūb, hura maḥlātī wa maʿṣūmī (i.e. What? Are you asking about Yaʿqūb? He is liked and loved by me)—forms the chronogram, yielding A.H. 800. This episode in the life of the saint wherein he was recommended to Shaikh Hakkāk by the Prophet himself, forms the subject of an Arabic Qasida composed by the said Shaikh and may be briefly described here: Maulānā Yaʿqūb in the course of his travel to the holy cities met at Zabīd, Shaikh Ismāʿīl al-Jaburī,

¹ Blochmann’s following comments are still true to day: A more exhaustive History of the Sādāt-i-Fāhsh, based upon the Muhammadan Historians of India—now so accessible—and complete from inscriptions and any other documents now in possession of the clan, would be a most welcome contribution to Indian History. —(Blochmann, op. cit., p. 431, f. n. 2).
² Ḍāqī Ahmad, op. cit., p. 121. In another place, Ghauṭi mentions Sayyid Tāju’d-Lin Qaṣī who expired in A.H. 1007 when Fāṭān was held in ḥujjār by Syyid Qāsim (ibid., p. 442). He is evidently a different person. It is apparent that Ghauṭi who was almost a contemporary of Syyid Qasim did not take pains to trace particulars and his account of the saint’s life, may have been inspired by the epigraph under study.
³ All Muhammad Khān, op. cit., Supplement, p. 114.
⁴ The Bombay lithographed edition has A.H. 800 in words also.
⁵ ʿAbdul-Jabbār Khan, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 119-20. A more recent account of the saint gleaned from the above as well as two more works including one manuscript (Munāqib-i-Auliya) is contained in Sayyid Fāṭān Ṣāḥib, Tadhkira-i-Daudījī Ḫalālī-ī-ʿAuliya-i-kirām (Fāṭān, N.G., 1928), part 2, pp. 23-26. A Gujarāti pamphlet containing the biography of the saint and description of his tomb (etc., compiled by Mr. ʿAbdul-Ḥaqq Muhammad Wali Šadīgūr of Fāṭān, has been published in 1969 by the Sīrat Committee of Fāṭān. It contains an illustration of the epigraph under study and its purport in Gujarāti, but unfortunately the rendering, particularly of the chronogram referred to above is incorrect.
who having been impressed by the former's sanctity, gave a recommendatory note to Shaikh Hakkâk who was his disciple. Now the latter was so much steepea in the love for the Prophet that he would never do anything that was not approved by the Prophet, and so when Maulânâ Yâ 'iqâb reached Madina and met him, Shaikh Hakkâk without immediately responding to his greetings went into contemplation and received the call of the Prophet that if he were asking his opinion about Ya'qûb, he should know that he was his beloved. As a result of this mention of endearment by the Prophet, the saint was popularly known as Maulânâ Mâjbûb.

Before passing on to the study of the next epigraph, I feel it necessary to state that the contents of the inscription in certain parts—lines 2-3—containing a reference to Shaikh Hakkâk of Madina and to the Prophet were not wholly intelligible to me despite the complete decipherment of the text. I had occasion to mention the difficulty in the course of my visit to Pâtan in July 1969 to my esteemed friends Sayyid Fayyâz Husain Qâdiri, Mr. Shujâ'-ud-Din Fârûqi and Sayyid Ruknâ-ud-Din. It was then that not only this episode in the life of the saint was related to me, but a manuscript of the *Tughdîra-i-Husâmîyya* in possession of one Mr. Barkatâ'ullâh was also made available to me for a cursory perusal. Subsequently, Mr. Fârûqi also sent to me a copy made by him of the Persian translation, by Husâm, of the *Qasida-i-Hakkâkîyya*. I am thankful to all these gentlemen for their help and their interest in the matter.

IX. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 1008, ALSO FROM PÂTAN

This is another important inscription which furnishes new information about a member of the family of Sayyid Qâsim—a son—who is not mentioned in historical works and who seems to have been associated with Pâtan in official capacity, most probably as governor or holder of a jâgîr. The epigraphical tablet measuring 85 by 30 cms. is fixed above the central mihrâb of the mosque situated in the enclosure of the Dargâh of another celebrated saint of Pâtan, Sayyid Husain, popularly called Khing-sawâr (lit. horse-rider), which is situated at a little distance to the west of the above-mentioned Sakastra linga Tank.

The six-line text in Arabic records the fact that the reconstruction of the mosque as well as the Tomb—though not so specifically stated, these evidently refer to the Tomb of Sayyid Husain and the mosque attached to it—was carried out by the great and brave Sayyid and just and bountiful Amir, Sayyid 'Ali son of Sayyid Qâsim and grandson of Sayyid Mahmu'd in 1599-1600. The date for the work has been given both in words as well as in a chronogram stated to have been composed by a scholar whose name has not been disclosed. At the end of the text occurs the name 'Abdu'l-Qâdir son of 'Abdu'l-Łâfî Yamanî, preceded by the phrase 'I am entirely dependent upon His covert favours'. This is evidently that of the scribe, and he must be identical with the scribe of the inscription in the mosque of Mahmu'd Husâmu'd-Din Multânî (No. VII, supra); in view of his *nisha* Yamanî, he must be different from the father of the composer of the epigraph under reference, namely 'Abdu'l-Łâfî Nâgaurî, as pointed out above (p. 75, supra). The calligraphy is Naskh of no particular merit. From the *nisha* he appears to have been of Arabian descent, which would not be surprising, as the town of Pâtan has been the home of many Arab settlers, mostly traders, and there are still a few families there which have business relations with Arabia.

---

1 The actual hemistic of from the Qasîda is: *a Ta'qûbû, âwâq mahbûbûn*.  
3 *ARBE*, 1954-55, No. C, 97. Over the left mihrâb of the mosque occurs another inscription comprising a Quranic text (Chapter LXXXII, verse 18), executed in Kâfî and Thulût of a very high order (*ibid.*, No. C, 88).
The language of the epigraph is, as in the case of the other inscriptions from Patan, of sufficient literary merit, and as compared to majority of the Arabic inscriptions of India, flawless; the benedictory phrases used for the renovator may be noted in particular.

The text reads as follows:—

Plate XX (a)

(1) Ism Allah al-rhaman al-rohyim wa na takbil ma al-kh iin as-samih al-ulim qad aqbil lu tajdid

(2) wa al-qub al-munifaa abnaa la mizara wa al-kh rim taila thawab and amarr al-ulim as-sid al-arif

(3) al-ar-kum al-ansuq wa al-amhir al-afl al-fazl

(4) muwied ban al-wad as-sidd wa al-qasim abn as-said mukkod lazil

(5) farlaa as-sidd wa al-afl la awwada baawad al-qawwad wa abn anf sahir fawad

(6) muwofuada an as-aihama wa al-aihama

(7) awzak al-aswaa bil-mashnaw ba安保 min al-kh r la san was wa laf min al-hare

(8) al-arab al-mubadd wa akh r fay na suq min al-aihama wa al-qasim abn as-said mukkod

(9) wa aswaa bil-mashnaw wa abn anf sahir fay na suq min al-aihama wa abn anf sahir fay na suq min al-aihama

TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful. 'Our Lord! accept from us; surely, Thou art the Hastening, the Knowing.' Undertaken was the renovation of this noble place

(2) and he eminent dome, (the renovator) being desirous of the pleasure of his Generous Lord and intending to seek His all-embracing merit and bounty, the greatest, the noblest and the bravest, Sayyid, and the most just and excellent Amir,

(3) one who is supported by the help of Allah, the Loving and the Master, (namely) Sayyid Ali son of Sayyid Qasim son of Sayyid Mahmud, may the shadows of his chieftship remain spread

(4) till the Promised Day (i.e. Day of Judgement), may the ropes of the tent of his government be tied with the pegs of eternity, may the palace of his high station remain secure from demolition and damage;

1 Qur'an, Chapter II, part of verse 127.
2 Reference to his being a Sayyid.
SOME MUGHAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM GUJARAT

(a) and may the pillars of the hall of his grandeur remain safe from the striking of the malignant eye (lit. Eye of Perfection), in the year eight and one thousand from the Migration of the Chosen (Prophet) (A.H. 1008-1600 A.D.), may Allâh’s blessings be upon him and his progeny and his pious Companions.

(6) And praise be to Allâh, the First and the Last. As to its date, one of the accomplished men has said, ‘One who entraps it becomes safe and honoured’. And, I am utterly dependent upon His covert favours. ‘Abdu’l-Qâdirson of ‘Abdu’l-Laâfî al-Yamani, may his sins be pardoned.

H. Blochmann, in his extremely exhaustive and also very valuable notes on the A’în-i-Akbarî could trace, from historical works, only two sons of the Sayyid viz. Sayyid Âdam and Sayyid Sulaimân. And now the epigraph under study discloses for the first time the existence of at least one more son, named Sayyid ‘Ali. With the help of the epigraph it is now possible to identify almost with certainty Sayyid ‘Ali Bârha mentioned by emperor Jahângîr in his Memoirs. The emperor speaks of having granted an increase in rank to Sayyid ‘Ali Bârha on or about the 30th March 1615 and again an elephant on or about the 8th June 1615. Unfortunately, Jahângîr does not give any details about him or the post he held.

Equally important is the information contained in the record about ‘Ali’s implied official status. The high-sounding titles used for him and the long array of eloquently worded phrases invoking perpetuity for his life, authority and grandeur, leave little doubt that he held some post of considerable authority; very likely, he had succeeded his father in the thânâdârî of Pâtan, when the latter died in A.H. 1007.

X. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 1009, FROM CAMBAY

The tablet bearing this inscription, when its rubbing was taken in 1959, was lying in the Stores office of the Public Works Department—and presumably it still lies there—at Cambay. Measuring 38 by 25 cms., it contains a six-line text in Persian prose and verse, executed in what may be basically described as Nasîkh, but having flourishes traceable to Tajîq variety of the Arabic alphabet. The letters are small and very closely written, and the tablet seems to have been exposed to inclemencies of nature and neglect for considerable time. As a result, the writing has been affected, and the task of decipherment was rendered somewhat difficult. Fortunately, however, the text has been completely deciphered, except for one or two words purporting perhaps to be the honorific titles of the builder.

The exact findspot of the epigraph is not known, but as it refers to the construction of a step-well, it must have originally belonged to one in or around Cambay, at the most within the jurisdiction of the Public Works Department, Cambay Sub-division. The record states that Mirzâ Khan, son of Nawwâb Mirzâ Abu’l-Qâsim, constructed a large step-well as an act of merit and endowed it for the use of the general public in 1601, during the reign of Jalâlu’d-Din Abu’l-Fath Akbar.

---

1 The original Arabic comprising the chronogram for the date of reconstruction is a variation of a famous Quranic text (Chapter III, part of verse 96).
2 Blochmann, op. cit., p. 427.
5 ARBE, 1959-60, No. D, 104. It has been removed, it is now ascertained, to the local College Museum.
The epigraph has been deciphered to read as follows:

TEXT

Plate XIX (a)

(1) در زمان سلطان السلاطین سلطانة و الدین و الدينین ابو الفتح جلال الدين

(2) ..این سیلابا مخالما لوجه الله

(3) تأمیداری خورشید اشتباه میرزا ابو القاسم این سیلاب را خالصا مخالما لوجه الله

(4) تمام‌داری خورشید اشتباه میرزا ابو القاسم این سیلاب را خالصا مخالما لوجه الله

(5) تعلیم و وتنف کردارا برای کاش ایام از خوش و عوامی قدری شهید

(6) شرکت، خضر گشت فارغ امت

In the time of the sovereignty of the Sultan of the Sultans, Jalâl-ul-Millat wa’l-Dunya wa’d-Din Jalâl-ul-Din Akbar Badghâli-i-

(2-3) Ghâzi (and) through the Divine guidance and heavenly support.............Mirzâ Khân, son of the illustrious Nawwâb of sun-like reputation, Mirzâ Abu’l-Qâsim, laid the foundation and constructed this step-well (subîf), purely and solely for the sake of the Exalted and the Generous Allâh and for seeking His pleasures

(4) (which are) all-embracing, and he endowed it for the use of the general public, whether high or low, on the first day of the month of the Holy Dhu’l-Hijja in the year nine.

(5) and one thousand from the Migration of the Prophet, may thousand-thousand salutations of Allâh and thousand-thousand blessings be upon him (1 Dhu’l-Hijja 1009-24 May 1601).

Verse: This reservoir whose water is from (the Fountain of) the Water of life—

(6) a thing which is apparent, where the need of describing it—

whoever drank a mouthful of water therefrom, became immune to death like the Prophet Khîdr.

1 In ARIE, 1959-60, No. D. 104, the date was inadvertently printed as 11 Dhu’l-Hijja 1009 (3 June 1601).
JAHANGIR

(a) Inscription, dated A.H. 1020, from Sarkhej (p. 85)

(b) Epigraph, dated A.H. 1033, from Māngrol (p. 90)
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It is difficult to identify the builder. While no person of the name of Mirzā Khān who flourished at about this time—excepting of course Mirzā Khān, the famous Khān-i-Khānān who is altogether a different person—is met with in well-known historical works, we come across a number of noblemen with the name of Abūl-Qāsim, who enjoyed high status and authority under Akbar and Jahāngīr. These are Abūl-Qāsim Tābrīzī who held the office of the Diwān of Gujarāt in A. H. 991; Nauwāb Abūl-Qāsim Nakhṣūr, who expired in A. H. 1057; Mirzā Abūl-Qāsim Nāsīkī, about whom no much is known; Abūl-Qāsim, brother of Āṣaf Khān, etc. But the available details of the career of these gentlemen are too meagre to provide a clue for the satisfactory identification of the builder. The only reasonable guess is that Nauwāb Abūl-Qāsim, father of the builder, is very likely identical with Abūl-Qāsim Tābrīzī who was the Diwān of Gujarāt for some time under Akbar.

Jahāngīr

XI. INSRIPTION. DATED A.H. 1020. FROM SARKHEJ

The loose tablet bearing this inscription is reported to have existed some years back in the premises of the Dargāh of the celebrated saint Ḥaḍrat Shaikh Ahmad Khāṭrī (d. A.H. 849) at Sarkhej, a small village, situated just on the outskirts of the city of Ahmadābād.1 The tablet is not traceable and inquiries made by me on the spot regarding its present whereabouts and original findspot have met with no result.2 Fortunately, an inked rubbing of the epigraph was taken in May 1941 by the Western Circle of the Archaeological Survey of India, then situated at Poona, and it is from that rubbing that the inscription is edited here for the first time. There is no doubt that the epigraph originally belonged to a mosque at or near Sarkhej, since it is clearly so stated in the text.

The record consists of three Persian couplets, arranged in only many lines and states that Mir Abūl-Qāsim of noble lineage who discharged the duties of the trusteeship (of the Dargāh) most satisfactorily, built a wonderful mosque on the road to Sarkhej in 1611-12. The date is contained in an ingenious chronogram which, as in the case of the one contained in the Kadi inscription studied above (p. 73, note), requires the deduction of the first digits from the values yielded by each letter of the chronogrammatic phrase.

The chief importance of this inscription, apart from its beautiful calligraphy, lies in the fact that it furnishes an important piece of information about the trusteeship of the Dargāh and its incumbent; this is particularly valuable since in written records, we do not usually come across this type of information. As to Mir Abūl-Qāsim who held the trusteeship, it is not possible to make any satisfactory identification; it is difficult to say if he is identical with any of the persons so named, mentioned in the study of the previous epigraph though it is not unlikely.

The text occupies a writing space of 45 by 25 cm. The style of writing is Naṣīḥī of quite a pleasing type, but curiously enough there are two mistakes in the written text as will be observed from the reading quoted below:—

TEXT

Plate XXI (a)

(1) میر ایب النامہ بزرد تزارد کہ بحق بورد تولیت را داد


2 However, I understand from other sources that the tablet is kept in one of the rooms in the enclosure.
(2) مسجد(ي) ساخت در ره سرکچک یک جهان مثل یا ندارد یاد
(3) سال تاریخش از خرد جسم کفت بیت العنق یی احاد

TRANSLATION

(1) Mir Abu'l-Qāsim of noble lineage who, to tell the truth, added lustre to trusteeship,

(2) constructed a mosque on the road to Sarkej (Sarkhej), the like of which the world does not remember.

(3) I sought the year of its date from Wisdom (who) said, “It is to be found from the phrase ‘the Ancient House’ without the first digits”.

The Arabic equivalent of the phrase ‘the Ancient House’ has two letters, the numerical value of each of which according to the Abjad system is represented by first digits. These are 2 and 1, the total of which is to be deducted from the total numerical value 1023 of the said phrase to obtain the date A.H. 1020 (1611-12 A.D.).

XII. INSCRIPTION. DATED A. H. 1026, FROM PĀTAN

This epigraph is from the Tomb of Qādi‘Ahmad Jūdha (or Jodh) situated on the outskirts of the town of Pātān, just without the city-wall between the Moti Šāh and Khān Satwar Gates. The marble slab on which it is engraved measures 22 by 34 cms. and is built up into the eastern wall of the Tomb, which is a modern structure.

The credit of bringing this epigraph to light—apart from a mere reference to it in the Mir‘ât-‘i-Ahārūdi—goes to the late Professor M.S. Commissariat who published a translation thereof in his valuable work. His rendering is substantially correct except for the name of the builder as will be pointed out at the proper place.

Qādi‘Ahmad was greatly respected in his time for piety. He is much better remembered in connection with the foundation of the city of ‘Ahmadābād—to which reference is also made in the text; as is well known, he is stated to have been one of the four Ahmads who laid the actual foundation of the city, each representing one direction. Qādi‘Ahmad is stated to have died in 1437, almost two centuries before the inscription under study.

The epigraph is in Persian verse, but the quality of verse is mediocre. On the other hand, the Nestāliq style of its calligraphy is fairly good. The text which runs into five couples assigns the construction of the Mausoleum of Qādi‘Ahmad Jūdha (or Jodh) which ‘provided Pātān with the light of sanctity’ to one of his grandsons, Farid (and not Hūmaid as given by Professor Commissariat) son of Faqīh, the work having commenced in August-September 1616 and completed in June-July 1617. It also furnishes the information that the saint was a spiritual successor of

---

1 This usually denotes Karba.
2 In ARIE, 1963-64. No. D. 84, through oversight, the year A.H. 1029 (1619-20 A.D.) was given.
3 ARIE. 1954-55. No. C. 84.
4 For details, see Sikandar, Mir‘ât-i-Sikandar (Baroda. 1901), p. 34; ‘Ali Muhammad Khān, op. cit., Supplement, p. 2.
6 For an account of the saint, see ‘Ali Muhammad Khān, op. cit., p 118; Pyarī Shāhīb, op. cit., part 1, P. 34.
Shaikh Ahmad Khattā who lies buried at Sarkhej and who was also one of the four Ahmadā at whose hands the foundation of the city of Ahmadābād was laid.

The letters of the text, even originally inscribed in bas-relief, have further flattened, but the text is quite legible, as will be seen from the reading that follows:—

TEXT

Plate XXII (b)

�(1) جو شیخ احمد کھاتی خلافته

(2) مخدوم قاضی احمد جوہید مرتنام

(3) ز چار احمد بن ند احمدآباد

(4) یک ایشان یوحنم صاحب هدایت

(5) کے کر کر مرچو از سر بدیات

(6) یہ شیعان نو س ان آغاز وی دان

سنہ 1617

TRANSLATION

(1) When Shaikh Ahmad Khattā bestowed, through kindness and favour, the Robe of Succession

(2) upon His Holiness (Makhdum) the pious (lit. ascetic) Qādi Ahmad Juddha (at Jodhpur), see there is in his resting-place, light of saintliness.

(3) The city of Ahmadābād was founded with (the help of) four Ahmadās: he, the master of guidance, was one.

(4) His grandson is Farid son of Faqih, who started afresh the construction of this mausoleum.

(5) Know it to have started (in) the month of Sha'bān, year (A.H.) 1025 (Sha'bān 1025 = August-September 1616). What a tomb!Wonderful! Its completion was in Rajab, year (A.H.) 1026 (Rajab 1026 = June-July 1617).

The epigraph is thus quite important. The information about Qādi Ahmad’s participation in the foundation of Ahmadābād may have been borrowed from the Mir’āt-i-Sikandari which was composed a few years before the date of this epigraph.1 In any case, it must have been the current belief, though it may be of interest to recall that in the verses of the contemporary Ḥulwi Shīrāzi, describing the foundation of the city, which have been quoted in the Mir’āt, no mention to this fact occurs.2 Then, the inscription has at least preserved the name of a descendant of the saint who flourished about two centuries after his death. But even far more important to my mind is the light the inscription throws on the correct sobriquet or surname of the saint which is commonly believed to have been Judd (جود) meaning ‘generosity’.3 There is no unanimity in historical works about the correct spelling of this name. It should be noted that of the two earliest available historical works on Gujarāt history in print, the Mir’āt-i-Sikandari merely gives the

---

1 Mir’āt-i-Sikandari is generally believed to have been composed in A.H. 1020.
2 Sikandar, op. cit., pp. 31-36.
name as Shaikh Ahmad; 1 it does not call him Qâdî Ahmad nor does it say anything about his being buried at Pâtân or Nahrwâlâ as it was called in those days. In the other, the Tarîkh-i-Salâtîn-i-Gujarat, composed at about the same time or a little earlier, the name Qâdî Ahmad occurs, though it also does not make any mention of Pâtân or Nahrwâlâ. 2 In none of these two works, the sobriquet of the saint occurs. The only historical work in which the sobriquet occurs is the Mirât-i-Abândâ, a late eighteenth century work, the two editions of which transcribe the name variously as Jâyîd, 'Jahâd, 'laîjîh' and 'bijîh'. 3 In our epigraph, the surname is transcribed clearly as Jâdha (or 'Jodh') which must represent the correct spelling, as the epigraph was caused to be set up by a descendant of the saint. The saint thus was called Jâdha or 'Jodh', a surname (Yodh) which has to-date survived in Gujarât, and therefore, the popular epithet 'Jâd' by which he is generally called should be taken as a misnomer. The famous Qâdîrî Sayyid families of Pâtân as well as of Kâhâlaq in Almâwâbâd claim descent from the Qâdî. 5

XIII. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 1029, FROM VASRAVI

Vasrâvi is now a small and out of the way agricultural village in the Mûnârâl of Surât district, situated at a distance of about five kilometres to the south south-east of the Taluka headquarters. That it was a place of importance in the past is established beyond doubt from the epigraph under study, and also from two earlier Nâgâr inscriptions, found there, which are unfortunately fragmentary: One of these is dateable on paleographic grounds to the thirteenth century, and the other, dated 1198, refers itself to the reign of Sultan Mahmûd of Gujarât.4

The present epigraphical tablet, measuring 21 by 55 cms., is built up into the facade to the right of the door of the Dargâh of a saint locally known as Haḍrat Gañj-Abândâ, and is evidently not in situ. It contains a brief text running into nine lines of writing in Persian, recording the construction of the gate of the fort of Bâstwâli (modern Vasrâvi) in 1629. The epigraph also provides important information that the work was completed when the jâyîr was held by Shâh Jahân and the governor was Shâh Baig. The epigraph thus shows that Vasrâvi had already a fort in Jahân-gir's time, which also establishes its strategic importance.

It will be recalled that Shâh Jahân held the viceregency of Gujarât during 1618-22. But what is perhaps intended to be conveyed by the epigraph is that Vasrâvi (and perhaps the region around—which is quite fertile) was included in the personal fief of prince Shâh Jahân. As to Shâh Baig, in all probability he is identical with Shâh Baig Uzbek, who received the title of Khân in Shâh Jahân's first reignal year and rose to occupy high posts including the governorship of provinces like Bûstân and Aurangâbâd: he had held the rank of 1000 men, 400 horse in Jahân-gr's time. 6 We also know of one Shâh Baig Khân whose mention occurs in the account of those of Shâh Jahân's nobles and retainers who laid down their lives before Shâh Jahân's accession; he is stated to have been killed while fighting bravely on the day of the attack on the Bûthânâpur fort. 7

---

1 Sikandar, op. cit., p. 34.
4 Pyâra Shabb, op. cit., part I, p. 34.
5 Commission, op. cit., p. 93.
7 Ibid., No. 14, 47. In copying the inscriptions, I received much help from Shri Usmân I. Desai, Police Sub-Inspector, Mûnârâl of and Shri Yashwant Sarpanch, of Vasrâvi, to both of whom I am grateful.
But he is already mentioned as Khān when he died while Shāh Baig Uzbeck was not yet made a Khān until the accession of Shāh Jahān which should make his identification with the governor of the Vasrāvi area more probable.

The style of writing is ordinary Nasta'lijī and the text has been read as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XXII(a)*

(1)  الله أكبر
(2)  دروائه
(3)  قلخه پسراهی
(4)  در چاگیر شاه
(5)  جہان و در
(6)  عمل بنده درگیه
(7)  شاه نیکپ رامت
(8)  شد پتاریخ ۷  جمادی الآخر
(9)  سنة ۱۲۲۹

**TRANSLATION**

(1) Allah is great.
(2) The gateway
(3) of the fort of Basrāhi (modern Vasrāvi),
(4) situated in the jāgīr of Shāh
(5) Jahān and in the
(6) governorship of the servant of the court
(7) Shāh Baig, was constructed
(8) on 2 Jamādāl-ʿAkhār,
(9) year (A.H.) 1029 (2 Jumāda II 1029–25 April 1620).

**XIV-XV. INSCRIPTIONS, DATED A.H. 1033. FROM MĀNGROL**

These two interesting inscriptions pertaining to the time of prince Dāwar Bākhtār’s viceroyalty under Jāhāngīr, bear on an identical subject relating to the population of a suburb, called La’īpurā in Māngrol.¹

Māngrol, now a sub-divisional headquarters in the Junāgadh district, was a town of great importance. It was, in the pre-Sultanate period, the seat of the Sūrāh province and in recent times, the seat of a small principality, whose chiefs were called Shāhs of Māngrol. A number of inscriptions of the imperial Tughluqus, the Sultāns and the Mughals are to be found there.²

One of the two inscriptions under study was fixed into the outer face of the wall of a private house situated opposite the mosque in the Lālpurā quarter of the town, when its rubbing was taken in 1954. It was found lying loose by me in the same house when I visited the place in July 1969 in the company of Mr. A. R. Khushtr, a prominent citizen and scholar of the town, who is greatly interested in the history of Māngrol and the neighbourhood. When the epigraph was first noticed in or before 1889, the house belonged to one Șadr Miyan. It now belongs to Sayyid Qāsim ʿAli son of Ibrāhīm who has at the suggestion of Mr. Khushtr kindly agreed to its removal to the mosque for preservation. The other epigraphical tablet which was then lying loose in the same house, had already found its way to the mosque.

The tablet bearing the following record measures 22 by 42 cms., and contains an eight-line text mostly in Persian verse, which is executed in a somewhat crudish Nastaʿlīq style. The quality of verse too is rather on the mediocrem side. The epigraph records the populating of a suburb proposed to be called Lālpur evidently after the name of Laʿl Baig by whose order it was done in 1624. In the text the suburb is described as ‘the mine of gems’ but what is meant thereby is not clear. Very probably, this description is nothing more than poetic and may have suggested to the composer on account of the name Lāl pur, laʿl meaning a precious stone, ruby. The tablet having considerably weathered, the date of writing cannot be deciphered beyond doubt.

The reading of the epigraph is quoted below:

**TEXT**

*Plate XXII(b)*

(1) الله أكبر

(2) تا جهان را مدار برگرد است

(3) این بنای را قرار معهبر است

(4) لعل نپک امر دران قرومود

(5) لعل پور را که معدنی گهر است

(6) لعل غالب چه یافته تازیخش

(7) سرمتی زین حساب جنگ و کرام است

(8) روز یکه نیا والتی بیست و سوم ماه رجب نوشته شد

**TRANSLATION**

(1) Allāh is great.
(2) As long as the pivot of the world rests on motion.
(3) the stability of this edifice is assured.
(4) Laʿl Baig, the noble, issued order
(5) (to populate) Lālpūr which is the mine of gems.
(a) Record, dated A.H. 1029, from Vasrāwi (p. 89)

(b) Inscription, dated A.H. 1026, from Pāian (p. 87)
Epigraph, dated A. H. 1033, from Māngrol (p. 91)

Scale: 4
(6) Since La'l (Baig?) found ghâlbî (lit. dominant) (A.H.) 1033 (1624 A.D.) as its date,

(7) Sarmâdi is dumbfounded by this calculation.

(8) (This) was written on Saturday, the 23rd of the month of Rajab (23 Rajab 1033=1 May 1624).

The tablet bearing the other record which is bilingual, measures 35 by 40 cms., and was lying loose as already stated in the above-mentioned house in 1954 when its rubbing was taken; it is now lying in the mosque. Its six-line text, inscribed in three panels, is badly damaged, and most of the letters have pealed off. It contains the same purport, but it further seeks the cooperation of all and sundry including the officials who might be posted at the place in future to strive for the prosperity of the newly founded suburb and look after it. It also provides the useful information that La'l Baig was the servant of prince Dâwar Bakhsh, whose name is inscribed in the top corner on the right, in the manner of farrâns and like official records, though it grammatically belongs to the second line of the text. Incidentally, the Corpus reads the portion containing the name of the prince as 'Prince Hasan Jahângir Akbar'. The date is given in figures, but these have completely flaked off. The reading quoted in the Corpus has A.H. 1933, which is perhaps derived from the previous record. It, however, appears to be correct, tallying with the date in the Nâgâri version and moreover, Prince Dâwar Bakhsh whose retainer La'l Baig professes to be, was viceroy of Gujarât for slightly more than a year from Rajab 1032.

The six-line text in Persian is inscribed in three panels in ordinary or rather crudest Nasta'îq style similar to that in the other epigraph and has been read as under:—

**TEXT**

**Plate XXIII**

(1) ۱۰۰۰ داور بخش

پهلوی بیستم نه جمادی الاول

(2) لعل بیگ غلام شا[ه]۲

(3) دژدو شنیه از عینایت الی لعل بیه آباد شد

(4) آنجه بیوه نو آبادانی این بیه پادشاه دران کوسه

(5) دریغ نازارند و جهاد متقناد آفرط میرا بانش خدای خدا

(6) مبانست هر حاکم که بیاید خبرداره مپورده بانش برای خدا

**TRANSLATION**

(1) God is Great. **Shâh Dâwar Bakhsh**

(2) La'l Baig, the servant of shâh.

---

1. *ARIE*, 1954-55, No. C, 156. It was listed in the *Bhânavigiri Frâhâla* Shâhângârâla at p. 25 (No. 90 of the Catalogue of Inscriptions given at the end), where only the date (V.S. 1647) and the name of the king are quoted.

2. *CIB*, p. 42.

3. As in royal documents, this name should be read along with the text in the second line to which it properly belongs.

4. **Shâh Dâwar Bakhsh** in the first line should be read after this.
(3) in the year (A.H.) [1033] (1624 A.D.) on Monday, through Divine favour, Lālpūrā was populated.

(4) For whatever is needed for the betterment and prosperity of this pūra (suburb), no effort should be spared and no undue expectations should be entertained (by anybody). If anybody entertains any (undue) expectations, God will intervene (lit. is in between). Every official who comes (to this place) should look after this for the sake of God.

These two inscriptions are thus quite important. If the present locality, now known as Lālpūrā, in one of the houses of which the two slabs were originally found, was also known by the same name, before their texts were made known in about 1889, it would mean that the suburb was located there. It was originally perhaps populated on the outskirts of the town in Jahāngīr’s time, but in course of time became part of the expanding town itself. In any case, the epigraph has preserved, in the form of a contemporary document, the history of this quarter. Also, it is only these epigraphs which have preserved the name of Lāl Baig, who is otherwise totally unknown. He calls himself a slave of Prince Dāwar Bukhsh and therefore, it is a reasonable guess that his association with Māngrol must have been in official capacity.

The Persian version does not contain the name of the ruling emperor, Jahāngīr. But the Sanskrit version refers to his reign, quoting his name Salīm Shāh, which is generally found used in such inscriptions. This version consists of 5 lines of closely written letters in a minute hand, and seems to be a little more detailed. But unfortunately, it is too badly damaged to admit of complete decipherment. According to the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, Mysore, who was requested to examine it, ‘the record appears to belong to the time of Pātasāh Salīm Saḥī, and to contain the details of date such as Vikrama 1681 and Śaka 1546, Vaiśākhā su. 12, Monday (=1624 A.D.), April 19’. The other details are not possible to make out.

The Nāgarī version was earlier published by the late Mr. D. B. Diskalkar in 1940. His comments on the epigraph are as follows: ‘It opens with the date, Monday (?), the 15th day of the bright half of Vaiśākhā in V.S. 1687 or Śaka 1552 and refers to the reign of the emperor Salīm Shāh. It then mentions the name of the viceroy appointed over Saurashtra, but unfortunately his name is missing. In the last line are preserved some letters of an imperemptory verse which shows that a grant was made by this inscription.’

He further remarks that the ‘Emperor of Delhi at this time was Shah Jahan and not Salīm Shāh which is the other name of Jahāngīr. Such a mistake is excusable in this distant part of the country’. Needless to say, this explanation, even otherwise not warranted by facts, is quite contrary to the usual practice. A mistake about the name of the ruling monarch, particularly under the Muslim rulers, the mention of whose names in public was his exclusive prerogative, was considered inexcusable. But as pointed out earlier, Mr. Diskalkar was misled by the wrong reading of the date due to the damaged nature of the writing. Similarly, the purport of the record as determined by him is also incorrect. The imperemptory verse was intended in this case to ensure protection and proper upkeep of the newly founded suburb and not observance of any grant made therein.

---

1 *New Indian Antiquity*, vol. III, No. 9 (December 1940), p. 339. A number of inscriptions from Saurashtra were published by him in the series of articles entitled ‘Inscriptions of Kathiawad’ in the first three volumes of the same journal. These were separately made available under the title *Inscriptions of Kathiawad*.

2 Ibid.
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Abū Bakr, brother of Khānṣāda Muḥammad  38, 39
Abūl-Qāsim, of the Khānṣāda family of Nāgar  37 (f.n. 3)
Abūl-Qāsim al-Lahji al-Bajāli, Ṣaḥrat, Companion  66-68
Abūl-Qāsim Chaghāti, Dr. M., see Chaghāti  75, 77
Abūl-Qāsim al-Nāgarī, father of Abūl-Qāsim  75, 77
Abūl-Qaḍīr, the scribe  75, 77, 81, 83
Abūl-Qādir, son of Abūl-Qaḍīr  75, 77, 81, 83
Abūl-Qāsim, sīnib of Abūl-Qaḍīr  75, 77
Abū Ismā'īl Muḥammad  Bhārā, Traditionist  67
Abāl-Faḍl, a historian  7 (f.n. 5)
Abūl-Makārim, sīnib of Sayyid Qāsim  79
Abūl-Muṣaffar, ṣawānia of Sultan Muḥammad  10
Abūl-Qāsim, son of Abūl-Muṣaffar  85
Abūl-Qāsim Tābīrī, the Dīvān of Gujarāt  47
Achelpur, modern name of Ellipchur  45, 44
Aḍa  Ḣanbūlī, variant reading of Aḍa  Ḣanbūlī  45, 44
Aḍa  Ḣanbūlī, a builder  20, 43, 44
Aḍa  Ḣanbūlī, see Khān-i-Arjam, a Mālāvā nobleman  5
Aḍa  Ḣanbūlī, title of Maulānā Imāmuddin, a noble of Mālāvā  5
Aḍa  Ḣanbūlī, a clan  5, 11, 29
Agar Panchāyatan, see Divāg-Agar  11 (f.n. 2)  60, 75
Agāra, in Uttar Pradesh  60, 75
Ahmad, son of Muhammad, Sultan of Mālāvā  5
Ahmad, son of Tāhir, a builder  10, 11
Ahmadbād, in Gujarāt  13, 63, 73, 74, 83-88
Ahmad, 'Alī Bāgji, Dārghā of, at Nāgar  38
Ahmad Jūdha, Qādī, see Qādī Ahmad Jūdha  2
Ahmad Khān, son of Sāhib Khān, Sultan  2
Ahmad Khātū, Shāikh, see Shāikh Ahmad Khātū  2

Ahmadnagar, in Mahārāṣṭra  45-47, 50, 53, 55, 56, 60
Ahmadnagar, Ahmadnagar so spelt  50
Ahmade, four builders of Ahmadbād  86
Ahmad Shāh, Sultan of Mālāvā, see Ahmad, son of Muḥammad  56, 85
Ahmad Shāh, Sultan of Gujarāt  22
Abubkar, Mughal emperor  16, 56, 57, 63-66, 68, 70, 74-76, 83-85
Aṭā, son of Sherdīkānī  20, 20, 30 (f.n. 1), 31
Alachhpūr, variant for Ellipchur  54
Alam Sāhī, Sanskritic form of Alam Shāh  13, 14
'Alīshāh Wali, Delhi Sultan  5
Allahbād, in Uttar Pradesh  53 (f.n. 1), 58 (f.n. 4)
Allahbād, in Uttar Pradesh  53 (f.n. 1)
Alīshāh, son of Abūl-Lahif, a builder  55, 66
Alp Khān, entitled Shāh-i- 'Alam  2
Alp Khān, title of Malik Sanjar, governor of Gujarāt  13, 15
Amarman, see Malik Ambar  37
Amarshāh, a post  67
Amīr, in Mahārāṣṭra  64
Amīnshāh, a post  13
Aurangābād, in Gujarāt  46, 45, 59
Aurangābād, a country  67, 81
Aurangābād, in Māhārāṣṭra  46, 88
Aurangzeb, Mughal emperor  18, 37, 63 (f.n. 5)

B

Bābur, Mughal emperor  2, 66, 9, 19 (f.n. 2)
Bahlūl, clan name  76
Bahmani, a dynasty of Deccan  53
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhanwargār, mentioned in a record</td>
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<td>Bohrā, a community</td>
<td>68</td>
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<td>Blochmann, H., scholar and author</td>
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<td>Bombay</td>
<td>59</td>
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<td>59, 61, 62</td>
</tr>
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<td>Borlai Vanehāyatan, in Kolghā district</td>
<td>46, 59, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broach, in Gujarāt</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Būlāghānā, in Mahārāshtra</td>
<td>46, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Būnā, wrong reading of Dīyā</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Būrhan U, Nīgānā Shāh</td>
<td>45-50, 52-58</td>
</tr>
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<td>Būrhan U, Nīgānā Shāh</td>
<td>46, 47, 59-61</td>
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<td>Būrhanpur, in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>46, 60, 88</td>
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<td>Būrhan Shāh, Gond Raja</td>
<td>55</td>
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<td>Būrḥān’ud-Dīn, Shāh, see Shāh Shāh Būrḥān’ud-Dīn</td>
<td>45-50, 52-58</td>
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| \( \text{Cambay, in Gujarāt, inscriptions from} \) | 63, 74 |
| \( \text{Canaan, fountain of, mentioned in text} \) | 4 |
| \( \text{Chaghtā, Dr. M. Abdullah, author} \) | 16 (f. n. 1), 17 (f. n. 3), 19 (f. n. 1), 21, 23, 24 (f. n. 7), 25 (f. n. 3), 26, 28, 29, 30 (f. n. 2), 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 43 |
| \( \text{Chāishingān, in Mahārāshtra} \) | 46, 53, 54 |
| \( \text{Chandā, in Mahārāshtra} \) | 11 |
| \( \text{Chānderī, in Madhya Pradesh} \) | 1 (f. n. 1), 5, 6 (f. n. 7), 7, 8 |
| \( \text{Chhappargāh, site of battle} \) | 11 |
| \( \text{Cheul, in Mahārāshtra} \) | 45-47, 48 (f. n. 1), 53 |
| \( \text{Chitorgarh, in Rājasthān} \) | 18, 26 |
| \( \text{Chunār, in Uttar Pradesh} \) | 11 |
| \( \text{Commissary, a post} \) | 30 |
| \( \text{Commissariat, Prof. M. S., author} \) | 63, 66 |
| \( \text{Couzens, H., author} \) | 58 |

**D**

| \( \text{Dādā, son of Kīlā Sālah Khānī, builder} \) | 20, 36, 37 |
| \( \text{Dādā, wet-nurse} \) | 36 |
| \( \text{Dālī, Tomb of, at Nāgaur} \) | 37 |
| \( \text{Dāndā, in Mahārāshtra} \) | 46, 59, 61, 62 |
| \( \text{Dāndā-Bājpur, in Mahārāshtra} \) | 47, 60, 62 |
| \( \text{Dārgāh of Bāre Pīr Sāhib, at Nāgaur, inscription from, also see Bāre Pīr Sāhib-Ki-Dārgāh} \) | 47, 59, 61, 62 |
| \( \text{Dārgāh of Maulānā Ya’qūb, at Yātān, inscription from, also see Maulānā Ya’qūb} \) | 73 |
| \( \text{Dārgāh of Sayyid Husain, at Yātān, inscription from, also see Sayyid Husain} \) | 71 |
| \( \text{Dārgāh of Shāhī Shāh-Abad Khāṭī, at Sarkhej, inscription from, also see Shāhī Shāh-Abad Khāṭī} \) | 85 |
| \( \text{Dāryā Khān Nīhānī, governor of Bihār} \) | 8 (f. n. 2), 9 (f. n. 6) |
| \( \text{Daulatābād, in Mahārāshtra} \) | 46, 51, 52, 59 |
| \( \text{Dāsaw Bakhtā, Mughal prince} \) | 89, 91, 92 |
| \( \text{Day, Dr. U. N., author} \) | 1 (f. n. 5), 2 (f. n. 1), 6 (f. n. 1, 3, 4), 7 |
| \( \text{Deccan, region} \) | 45, 46, 53, 60, 80 |
| \( \text{Delhi} \) | 2, 6, 8 (f. n. 2), 11 (f. n. 2), 14, 15, 17, 22 (f. n. 2), 23 (f. n. 2), 40, 66, 68 (f. n. 4), 75 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delhi gate, of Nāgaur</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deogarh, in Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>38, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deogarh, in Mahārāṣṭra</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deol, road leading to</td>
<td>46 (f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diāmū, B. L, officer</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dholpur, in Rajasthan</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didwānā, in Nāgaur, inscriptions from 16,18,20</td>
<td>26, 26, 28, 29, 30 (f.n. 2), 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīghī, in Mahārāṣṭra</td>
<td>46, 59, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīkhalkar, D. B, author</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div, person of, see also Divā-āgār</td>
<td>59, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divā-āgār, in Kolhā district</td>
<td>46, 47, 59, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīva, post</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yā, father of Tāhir, a builder</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēst Muhammad, Sultan, an-Naṣirjāvi, epitaph of, at Dīmān, see also Sultan Dēst Muhammad</td>
<td>64, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīlpur, near Chandī</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R**

Ellīchpūr, in Mahārāṣṭra, road to | 46, 47, 53, 54 |

**F**

Paīlā, Mahārāṣṭra, father of Afdal Khān, a Mālāw nobleman | 5 |
| Fāqīh, father of Farsi (s.v.) | 86, 87 |
| Fārsī, son of Fāqīh and descendant of Gādī | 86, 87 |
| Ahmad Jūha, a saint | 86, 87 |
| Farnān, issued | 45, 46, 48, 49, 54 |
| Fachāḥihdā, in Mahārāṣṭra, inscription from | 47 (f.n. 3) |
| Fatūlī Shāh, tomb of, at Nāgaur | 39, 40 |
| Futūlī Māhāzāda, son of Khānṣādā | 40 |
| Ahmad Khan, of Nāgaur | 40 |
| Fāqīha, daughter of the Prophet | 67 |
| Fāysāl Khan, son of Rāsīlā Khan Khānṣādā | 37 (f.n. 3) |
| Firaq, historian | 6 (f.n. 1), 7 & |
| Fīrūz Shah, king of Delhi | 5, 6, 7 |
| Fīrūz Khan I, son of Shams Khan Khānṣādā | 38, 43, 44 |
| of Nāgaur | 19, 20, 22, 26, 28 |
| Fīrūz Khan II, Khānṣādā, son of Selāḥ Khan | 19, 20, 22, 26, 28 |
| 19, 20, 22, 26, 28 |
| Fīrūz Khan III, son of Muhammad Khān Khānṣādā | 19, 20, 22, 26, 28 |
| Fīrūz Khan IV, Khānṣādā, son of Muhammad Khān Khānṣādā | 19, 20, 22, 26, 28 |
| Fīrūz Tughlaq, king of Delhi | 13, 73 |

### G

Gachaw-Bāzī, at Chandī, inscription from | 2 |
| Gāhāṇa, in Nāgaur district of Mahārāṣṭra | 46, 51, 52 |
| Gānj-i-Ahd, Hādżrat, saint | 88 |
| Gaur, in Bengal | 11 (f.n. 1) |
| Gāzipāya, sobriquet of Muhammad Khān of Gaur | 11 (f.n. 1) |
| Gāwilghar, in Mahārāṣṭra | 47 (f.n. 3) |
| Ghazan, N. M, official | 31, 36, 41, 44 |
| Ghauh, a sūfī term | 79 |
| Ghauh, author of Ghalib-i-Ahīd | 80 (f.n. 2) |
| Ghyāl-ud-Dīn Bahādur Shāh, king of Bengal | 11 |
| Ghyāl-ud-Dīn Khāsh, king of Māluwā | 28 |
| Ghyāl-ud-Dīn Bahādur Shāh, king of Bengal | 28 |
| Ghyāl-ud-Dīn Khāsh, king of Māluwā | 28 |
| Ghori, a dynasty | 28 |
| Gondā Bās, of Deogarh | 28 |
| Gujrat, region | 6, 13-17, 20, 22, 24, 25 (f.n. 2), 26 |
| 35, 36, 63-65, 67 |
| 76, 72-73, 76, 86, 87, 88, 91 |

### H

Hādżrat 'Abdul-lāh bin Jafir, see 'Abdul-lāh bin Jafir | 37 (f.n. 2) |
| Hādżrat Gānj-i-Ahd, see Gānj-i-Ahīd | 37 (f.n. 2) |
| Hādżrat Hāmīdū-d-Dīn Su‘ālī, see Hāmīdū-d-Dīn Su‘ālī | 16 |
| Hādżrat Nāsīr-ud-Dīn Aḥmad, see Nāsīr-ud-Dīn Aḥmad | 16 |
| Hādżrat Sayyid Imām Nūr, see Sayyid Imām Nūr | 16 |
| Hāzī Shāh, Kabīr Muhammad, see Shāh Shāh Kabīr Muhammad | 16 |
| Hājī Sultan, Muḥʃīd official | 37 (f.n. 2) |
| Ḥakīm, Shāhī, see Shāhī Ḥakīm | 16 |
| Ḥamīdū-d-Dīn Su‘ālī, Hādżrat, Sultan ‘Umar- ‘Arshīd, Nāgaur sai it | 16 |
| Ḥāndūn, in Madhya Pradesh | 47 (f.n. 1) |
| Ḥāndūn, Ḥāndūn wrongly read as | 10 |
| Ḥāṛṣaṇī, a state | 28 |
| Ḥasan, of the Sabū'ī, the scribal | 28, 30 |
| Ḥasan Ḥaḍīṣīr Akbār, Prince ‘Awār | 28 |
| Ḥāẓir wrongly read as | 91 |
| Ḥasan Shāhīd, tomb of, at Kunārī, in Rajasthan | 18, 20, 24 |
| Ḥupī, i.e. Sandī Arabia | 28 |
| Ḥimū, famous general | 11 |
| Ḥidāya, variant for Ḥājī (s.v.) | 47 (f.n. 2) |
| Ḥusainī thrā, a district in Madhya Pradesh | 53 |
| Ḥusain Shāh Ghori, Sultan of Mālūwā 1, 2, 22, 26 |
EPIGRAPHIA INDICA—ARABIC AND PERSIAN SUPPLEMENT

I

Ibrāhīm, father of Sāyid Qāsim ‘Ali, loose slab in the house of, at Māngrol

Ibrāhīm ‘Adīl Shāh II, of Bijāpur

Ibrāhīm Lodh, king of Delhi

‘Adāb, at Nāgaur

Kahitiyār d-Dawlat wa’d-Dīn, title of ‘Ali son of Muhammad son of Khāmūsh

Kahitiyār d-Dawlat wa’d-Dīn, title of Lāllā Khāṣī, Malikul-‘Umar, nobleman, of Bār Khāṣū

Khutmish, Marālik king

Īsmā’īl d-Dīn, Ma‘allān, entitled ‘Afsāl

Khān, of Mālwā

Imām, Abu ‘Abd Allāh Muhammad Bukhārī, a Traditionist

Imām Bāba, a building at Bihārgarif, inscription from

Imām Nūr, Ḥāṣrāt Sayyid, Dargāh of, at Nāgaur

Iṣfāhān, in Iran

Ishāq, Shāhī, father of Ḥāṣrāt Shāhī Kabir Muhammad

I’timād Khān, a viceroy

J

Jālāl, in Nāgaur district

Jāgīr, i.e. fief

Jahāngīr, Mughal emperor

Jain, Dr. K.C., historian

Jaipur, district in Rājasthān

Jālāl Bahām, father of Manjha

Jālāl Khokhar, governor of Nāgaur

Jālāl d-Dīn, so called title of Muhammad ‘Adīl

Jālāl d-Dīn Abūl Fath, title and name of Akbar

Jālāl d-Dīn, Jālāl ‘ullā, ‘ulā, wa’d-Dīn, titles of Akbar

Jāmā, old name of Jānā, in Mahārāṣṭra

Jāmālū’d-Dīn Muhammad, Shāhī, a Traditio

Jamālū’d-Dīn Muhammad, Shāhī, a Traditionalist

Jamālū’d-Dīn Muhammad, Shāhī, a Traditionalist

Jarīr, father of Ḥāṣrāt ‘Abdullāh, a Companion of the Prophet

Jathārā, in Madhya Pradesh

Jhāstā, in Uttar Pradesh

Juḥās, in Uttar Pradesh

Juḥās, in Uttar Pradesh

Juḥās, in Uttar Pradesh

K

Kabīr Muhammad, Ḥāṣrāt Shāhī, son of Ibrāq

Ibrāq d-Dīn

Ibrāq d-Dīn, in Gujarāt, inscription from, 63, 73, 73, 85

Kairā, in Gujarāt

Kairānā, in Uttar Pradesh

Kālī Gumbad, Tomb of Shams Khān, at Nāgaur, known as

Kalsamb, in Mahārāṣṭra

Kālpī, a district, in Uttar Pradesh

Kālīwād, region in Gujarāt

Kārīwā, variant for Kājī

Kāṭhīāwīd, in Gujarāt

Kaurīyā, variant for Gaurīyā (s.v.)

Kautār, stream, in Paradise

Khdām, an attenuant

Khalīfat, a spiritual successor

Khalilu’llāh, Khwāja, see Khwāja Khalilu’llāh (s.v.)

Khalīj, a dynasty of Delhi

Khalīj, a dynasty of Mālwā

Khāmūsh, grandfather of ‘Ali, an official

Khān-i-A’ṣam, title

Khān-i-Khānān, title of Mirza Khān

Khānštā, construction of

Khānštā, chief of Nāgaur

Khānsādā, chief of Nāgaur

Khānsādā, chief of Nāgaur

Khānsādān, title of Mirza Khān

Khānsādā, construction of

Khānsādā, chief of Nāgaur

Khānsādā, chief of Nāgaur

Khānsādā, chief of Nāgaur

Khānsādā, chief of Nāgaur

Khānsādā, chief of Nāgaur

Khānsādā, chief of Nāgaur
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maulānā Mahbūb, <em>alias</em> of Maulānā Ya‘qūb</td>
<td>Muhammad Khān Sūr, governor of Bengāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78, 81</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulānā Muḥammad Wāli</td>
<td>Muhammad Shāh, Sha‘bān Afghān, a scribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Sa‘dīgār</td>
<td>5, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulānā Ya‘qūb, Tomb of, at Pāta</td>
<td>Muhammad Shāh, of Gaur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 (f.n. 6)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n. 3), 80, 81</td>
<td>Muhammad Shāh, father of Ahmad Shāh, of Mālāw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (f.n. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medīnī Rāj, ruler of Chanderī</td>
<td>Muhammad Shāh, son of Sultan Nāsīr-ud-Dīn, of Mālāw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6 (f.n. 7)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muhammad Shāh I, Bahūman king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muhammad Shāh, Sūlāhā, Sūr king of Bihar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (f.n. 2), 8</td>
<td>9, 10, 11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehkar, in Māhārāṣṭra</td>
<td>Mujāhid Khān, chief of Nāgaur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46, 47, 57, 58</td>
<td>18, 19 (f.n. 1),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehānā, a dīstrict in Gujarāt</td>
<td>25, 26, 27, 28,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 64, 73</td>
<td>29, 30, 31, 32, 33,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mewār, Rājput chiefs of</td>
<td>34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 17, 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīndāu, variant for Medīnī</td>
<td>Muhammad Khān Bakhshā, Nawāb, Mughal official and builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīrāgār, Fākhr, wrongly read as</td>
<td>Muzaffar Shāh I, of Gujarāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīr Abū‘l-Qāsim, a builder and trustee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84, 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīrzā Abū‘l-Qāsim, father of Mirzā Khān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84, 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirzā ‘Arīz Koka, governor of Mālāw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47, 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirzā Khān, Shāhu‘d Dīn, son of Nawāb Abū‘l-Qāsim, builder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83, 84, 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīyān ‘Ali, see Khān ‘zāda Mīyān ‘Ali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīyān Ḥasan, see Khān ‘zāda Mīyān Ḥasan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīyān Ḥasan Fārmū, a Lodi nobleman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokhār, Rāhā, of Mewār</td>
<td>25, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monghīr, in Bihār</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulūnāla i.e. a dīstrict</td>
<td>32, 34, 39, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu‘āmunāla Dāndā, see Dāndā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu‘ārrāz-ud-Dīn, title of Muhammad ‘Adī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mughal, a dūnasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 9 (f.n. 4), 13 (f.n. 3), 25, 41, 47, 53, 60, 63, 89</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, the Holy Prophet</td>
<td>16 (f.n. 20),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, 52, 53, 71</td>
<td>17 (f.n. 2), 3, 18, 19 (f.n. 3),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, father of Ahmad, Sultan of Mālāw</td>
<td>29, 31, 32, 33,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, son of Shībān</td>
<td>25, 26 (f.n. 6),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27 (f.n. 4), 28,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, father of ‘Ali (c.v.)</td>
<td>29, 31, 32, 33,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td>34,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, ‘Adī, Sūr king</td>
<td>38, 39, 40-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad bin Sām, Ghurid king</td>
<td>46, 48, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 (f.n. 2), 29</td>
<td>51, 52, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Ghānghī, author</td>
<td>16, 18, 20, 25,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>26, 27, 28, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Ilhām</td>
<td>13, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu‘ārrāz-ud-Dīn, a Lodi nobleman</td>
<td>Nāgāpur, road to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Khān, chief of Nāgaur</td>
<td>Nagaon, variant for Nagathānā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (f.n. 3)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Khān I, father of Firūz Khān III</td>
<td>Nāgathānā, road to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 20, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43</td>
<td>48, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Khān II, son of Firūz Khān III</td>
<td>Nādīgnāon, road from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, 41, 43</td>
<td>51, 52, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Khār Gaurīā, see Muhammad Khān Sūr</td>
<td>Nārānā, in Rājasthān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16, 18, 20, 25,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26, 27, 28, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nagās, in Mahārāṣṭra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāzīr Shāh, Khilīf Sultān of Mālāw</td>
<td>Nāgu‘d-Dīn Wa‘d-Dīn Abūl-Mughal, title and knyvage of Muhammad Shāh Sūr, of Bihār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāwāb, Būrhiān Nīgān Shāh II so called</td>
<td>Nāwāb Abūl-Qāsim Nāmānī, Mughal nobleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāwāb Abūl-Qāsim Nāmānī, see Mirzā Abūl-Qāsim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nawwāb Murtaḍā Khan Bukhāri, see Murtaḍā Khan</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nawwāb Qutb'u'd-Dīn Muhammad Khan, see Qutb'u'd-Dīn Muhammad</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimbātī, in Mahārāṣṭra</td>
<td>40, 50-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimicōn, in Mahārāṣṭra</td>
<td>46, 51, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nūrān Shāhī, a dynasty</td>
<td>45, 47 (f.n. 3), 48, 49, 53, 56-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nūrānūd-Dīn Ahmad, a historian</td>
<td>6 (f.n. 1, 3), 7 (f.n. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nūrānūd-Dīn Auliya, Ḥaḍrat, a saint</td>
<td>75, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nūḥānī, Daryā Khan</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omeri, I.A., official</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistān, a country</td>
<td>37 (f.n. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fānde, Prof. A.B., author</td>
<td>8, 17 (f.n. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergana, a revenue division</td>
<td>46, 59, 61, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pargana Borli, mentioned in an inscription</td>
<td>46, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pargana Div, mentioned in an inscription</td>
<td>46, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pargana Shriwardhan, mentioned in an inscription</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parviz, Mughal prince</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pātān, in Gujarāt</td>
<td>13 (f.n. 3), 14, 63, 64 (f.n. 2, 3), 65 (f.n. 3), 36-68, 75, 80 (f.n. 2), 81-83, 86-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paunār, in Mahārāṣṭra</td>
<td>46, 47, 57, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen, in Mahārāṣṭra</td>
<td>46, 48, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pehtās, i.e. Chief Minister, a post</td>
<td>7 (f.n. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phulkalā, a builder</td>
<td>40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piśāner, near Chauder in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>2 (f.n. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirzāda, family, of Nāgaur</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pohnerkar, N.S., a scholar</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratapgarh, mentioned in an inscription</td>
<td>46, 55, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratāgāla, mentioned as Bāyāgāla (e.v.), a builder</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulāl Khān, Khānāzāda, mentioned in a document</td>
<td>37 (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qāḍī Ahmad Jūdha, a saint</td>
<td>86-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qāḍī Dost Muhammad, Mughal official</td>
<td>37 (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qāḍī Ḥamīdūd-Dīn Nāgaur, a saint</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qāḍī, a Gūf order</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qutb, a Šāfī grade</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qutb'u'd-Dīn Muhammad Khan, Nawwāb, Mughal official</td>
<td>70, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāḍī, a composer</td>
<td>68, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahmat Khān Khānāzāda, mentioned in a document</td>
<td>37 (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahmatu'llāh. Raunq 'Uqūmānī, of Nāgaur</td>
<td>37 (f.n. 2, 3), 38, 39, 41, 43, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāja Bakht Singh, of Mārwār, see Bakht Singh</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bājaesthan, a state</td>
<td>16, 17, 25, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bājpuri, creek in Mahārāṣṭra</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bājpur, a clan</td>
<td>13, 16, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmadān Khān, Khānāzāda</td>
<td>37 (f.n. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmūsā, a mason</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānā, see Mokal</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānā Kumbhā, see Kumbhā</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānā Mokal, chief of Mewār, see Mokal</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānā Sāngā, chief of Mewār, see Sāngā</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raokhamb, at Bīt. in Mahārāṣṭra</td>
<td>49, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāwanbārī, in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>46, 47, 53, 55, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reṣārī, road from</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regaḍānḍā, variant for Revdānḍā (a.v.)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revdānḍā, in Mahārāṣṭra</td>
<td>46, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohamkhed, in Buldāna district</td>
<td>47 (f.n. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sābar Kāṁthā, district in Gujarāt</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šadr Mīyān, epigraphical tablet in the house of</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šaf'u'd-Dīn Mirzá Khān, see Mirzá Khān</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šāhīb Khān, father of Ahmad Khān, of Mālwā</td>
<td>2 (f.n. 4), 5, 6 (f.n. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šalābat Khān, wrong reading for galāb Khān (e.v.)</td>
<td>29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šalāb Khān, son of Muṣhīd Khān, Khānāzāda</td>
<td>29-33, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīkewāl, road to</td>
<td>46 (f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saliba Banu, wife of Khwaja Khalilullah, official and builder</td>
<td>65, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salim Shah i.e. Mughal emperor</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saliya, road to</td>
<td>46, 55, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saliya, probably same as Saliya</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salusih, a stream in paradise</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam, father of Muhammad</td>
<td>23 (f.n. 2), 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam, son of Hasan, a scribe</td>
<td>29, 30, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambhar, in Rajasthan</td>
<td>30, 35, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangh, Rana, chief of Mowar</td>
<td>6 (f.n.7), 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargapur, in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasati, modern Sisai in Haryana</td>
<td>29, 30, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarkar, a revenue division</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarkhej, in Gujarat</td>
<td>63, 85-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarmadi, a composer</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saurashtra, in Gujarat</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid, a dynasty</td>
<td>2, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyida of Bahr</td>
<td>79 (f.n. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Adam, son of Sayyid Qasim</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Ahmad Maulana, a scholar</td>
<td>67 (f.n. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid 'Ali, a builder</td>
<td>81, 82, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid 'Ali Tabassabah, a historian (s.v.)</td>
<td>17 (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Fayyaz Hasan Qadir, of Patan</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Imam Nair, Hajcat, Dargah of, at Nasrur</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Khamsheh, uncle of the author of Sargul-ul-Auliya</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Mahmud, father of Sayyid Qasim (s.v.)</td>
<td>75, 76, 79 (f.n. 4), 81, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Qasim, son of Sayyid Mahmud al-Hussaini</td>
<td>75, 76, 77, 80 (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Qasim 'Ali, son of Ibrahim, epigraphical tablet in the house of</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Ruknuddin, of Patan</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Sulaiman, son of Sayyid Qasim</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Tujuddin Qadir</td>
<td>80 (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah 'Abdullah, son of Muhammad, of</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah 'Ali, Alum, title of Alp Khazan</td>
<td>1, 2 (f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah Alambak, Sanscritic form of 'Ali</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah Alap Khazan, same as Alp Khazan (s.v.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah Baig Uzbeg, a governor and builder</td>
<td>88, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah Dawa Barakah, Prince Dawa Barakah (s.v.) so called</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah Jahang, Mughal emperor</td>
<td>25, 63 (f.n. 5), 64, 88, 89, 92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh 'Abdul-Qadir Jilani, the famous divine</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh Ahmad Kahtwall, saint of Sirkhej</td>
<td>87, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh 'Ali Muttaqi, Tradtivist</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh Burhanuddin, a saint</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh Burhanuddin, al-Haq wa'd-Din, same as Shaikh Burhanuddin (s.v.)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh Farid, a saint</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh Hakkak, the custodian of Prophet's Shrine and Mosque</td>
<td>79, 80, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh Husainuddin, renovation of the tomb of</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh Isma'il Jabrat</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh Jamaluddin Muhammad, of Patan, Tradtivist</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh Kadir Muhammad son of Ishaq (s.v.)</td>
<td>76, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh Muhammad, son of Tahir</td>
<td>68 (f.n. 4), 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh Nigamuddin Millat wa'd-Din al Chughti</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh Zaimuddin, a saint</td>
<td>78, 79, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh zada Manjhi, a Lodhi nobleman</td>
<td>7 (f.n. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaikh zada, of Chanderi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shams Khan, father of Firuz</td>
<td>18, 22 (f.n. 3), 23, 24 (f.n. 1), 25-27, 31, 33, 35, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamsuddin, a title</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamsuddin Atiga Khan, foster-father of Akbar</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamsuddin Duniya wa'd-Din, title of Muhammad Khan Suri</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharuj, a dynasty</td>
<td>9 (f.n. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharafuddin Mulk, Mawlwi official</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherdilkhani, father of 'Ali</td>
<td>20, 29, 30 (f.n. 1), 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sher Shah Suri, a king</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shihab-i-Hakim, see 'Ali Kirmangi</td>
<td>72, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shihab Khan, Mughal official</td>
<td>72, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shihabuddin, son of Najar Shah Khalji</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shihabuddin Ahmad, a nobleman</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiq, a revenue division</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiuwardhan, in Maharastra</td>
<td>46, 59, 61, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shujauddin Firozi, of Patan</td>
<td>76, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddiq, father of Hasan</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikandar Lodi, a king</td>
<td>6 (f.n. 3), 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sira, in Haryana</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon, the Prophet and king</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soumîriyot, in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>46, 47, 53, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sora, in Gujarât</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sriâgâ Rishâ, inscription from</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şür Şâhi, popular name of</td>
<td>16, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamdûn-d-Dîn Su'âli (s.v.)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sîn Sâber, serek of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Ahmad Shâh, son of Sultan Muhammed Shâh of Mâlûwâ</td>
<td>2, 6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Ahmad Shâh I, of Gujarât</td>
<td>22 (&amp; f.n. 1.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Burhan Nizâm Shâh II, also see Burhan Nizâm II</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Hoşang Shâh of Mâlûwâ (s.v.)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Mahmûd, of Mâlûwâ</td>
<td>5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Mahmûd I, of Gujarât</td>
<td>75 (f.n. 2), 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Muhammed son of Sultan Mahmûd of Mâlûwâ</td>
<td>2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Muhammed, regal name of Şâhîb Kân</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Muhammed Shâh Sur, surnamed 'Adîl</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Muazzam III, of Gujarât</td>
<td>70 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Nâsirud-Dîn, father of Sultan Mahmûd</td>
<td>7 (&amp; f.n. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Qucbîd-Dîn Ahmad II, of Gujarât</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Sikandar Lodî, see Sikandar Lodî</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultân of Bengâl</td>
<td>9 (f.n. 1, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultân of Gujarât</td>
<td>16, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultân of Mâlûwâ</td>
<td>16, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulânâlu'-Masahâ'îkh, popular title of Haçrat Nizâm ud-Dîn (s.v.)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulânâlu'-Ta'âhilî, see Hamdûn-d-Dîn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sûr, a dynasty</td>
<td>9 (f.n. 4), 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surajgarh, near Monghyr</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surat, a district in Gujarât</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tâbâtabâ, Sayyid 'Alî, a historian (s.v.)</td>
<td>47 (&amp; f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tâhir, father of Ahmad, a builder</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tâhir, father of Shaikh Muhammed, a Traditionist</td>
<td>68 (f.n. 4), 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tâjû'd-Daînâl wa'd-Dîn, title of Malik Lâdîa Khâlaq (s.v.)</td>
<td>33, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tâjû'd-Dîn, a saint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tâlâm, a revenue division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehrân, in Iran</td>
<td>74 (f.n. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thânedâr, a post</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thengade, R.A., a scholar</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tughluq, a dynasty</td>
<td>9 (f.n. 1, 4), 13, 17, 20, 24, 35, 63, 64, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uljain, a district in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>5, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usmân I. Desâi, official</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vakîl, a post</td>
<td>7 (f.n. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsâvî, in Gujarât</td>
<td>63, 68 (f.n. 7), 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnî Joshi, inscriptional slab in the field of, at Cheul</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viñhâl Chinnâjî Bangre, inscription in the compound of</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wajîhu'-Mulk, father of Shâms Khân (s.v.)</td>
<td>33, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardhâ, a district in Mahârâshtrâ</td>
<td>46, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Tower, at Nâgaur</td>
<td>24, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WazÎr Khân, a viceroy.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamani, niea, of 'Abdu'l-Latîf (s.v.)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya'qûb, Moulânâ, see Moulânâ Ya'qûb</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazdânî, Dr. G., scholar and epigraphist</td>
<td>49, 59, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeotmîl, a district in Mahârâshtrâ</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yüsuf Paçîl, Sarpanch of Varsâvî</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zafar Khân, of Gujarât</td>
<td>20, 24, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zafarud-Dunyâ, Nâgrûd-Dunyâ wrongly read as</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zainûd-Dîn Shaikh, see Shaikh</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zainûd-Dîn</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabîd, in southern Arabia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SOME FOURTEENTH CENTURY EPITAPHS FROM CAMBAY IN GUJARĀT

By Dr. Z. A. Desai

India’s relations with countries of the Middle East are believed to have existed not only from pre-Islamic times but even from times inmemorial, but we do not have much in the form of written records or similar evidence for this. Anyway, the advent of the Arabs as a trading community and the growing world-consciousness (not in the material but geographical and one-world concept) which they brought with them must have naturally given further impetus to this traffic, which was and remained for centuries to come, as it is so even now, in the main commercial or exploratory, for in the very early years of Islam, even sporadic efforts to establish political authority on the Indian soil were firmly discouraged by the second caliph Hādrat ‘Umar who has gone down in history, as is wellknown, as having severely reprimanded his general for his expedition to the place on western coast identified as Thānā.

No doubt, as distant lands of Africa, Central Asia, Persia, etc., gradually came within the fold of Islam, the eastward political penetration resulted in the Arab occupation of Sind in the early part of the 8th century. But the real political association of the Muslims with India came only three centuries later, through the invasions, from time to time, first of the rulers of the House of Subuktigin of Ghazna and subsequently of their Ghori overlords, culminating in the establishment of the Muslim rule after the victory of Muḥammad bin Sām at the battle of Tarain in 1193.

But even in this interregnum—between the conquest of Sind in 712 and the foundation of Muslim rule in northern India in 1193, the country particularly through its extensive coast-line did have relations with its neighbours in the Middle or Near East, as is amply born out by the accounts of a number of Arab authors in their geographical works or travelogues. But these works immensely valuable as they are—as a matter of fact, they contain authentic and eye-witness description of the various aspects of Indian life—they cannot fully satisfy the curiosity to know the nature of these relations in their details, because by their very nature, these works suffer from a limitation in that the information furnished by them was bound to be of a particular type. It is not unlikely that apart from the works of the geographers, there might be some unexplored material in Arabic and other foreign languages which might contain some information on the subject. Regrettably, no sustained efforts to trace these, if any, have been made nor does there appear any intention or likelihood to do so.

In any case, the material relating to these from the thirteenth century onwards, being available in somewhat greater degree, the pattern of relations becomes a little clearer. Here too, it may be pointed out, the available material is non-Indian and is mostly in the form of

(1)
biographical works in Arabic. But in this case, again the difficulty is that unfortunately, even published Arabic works, let alone manuscripts, pertaining to this branch of history, are not easily available in India.¹

There is one more source, unfortunately not so detailed, but more important in a sense, which has a bearing on this aspect. I refer to the epitaphs or rather such of those as have survived not so much the ruthless ravages of time as the thoughtless hand of the vandal and are found at different places of historical importance. In this article, it is proposed to study thirty such epitaphs of the fourteenth century, from an important seaport and commercial centre of the period in Western India, namely Cambay, in Kairā district of Gujarāt State.²

There are a considerable number of epitaphs to be found in this one-time port, majority of which is not in situ. They were set up from the first half of the thirteenth century onwards—when Gujarāt was still ruled over by the Chaulukyas and the Vaghelās, and refer to men in different walks of life—officials, scholars, merchants, sailors, craftsmen, etc.³ The group under study is fairly representative in this regard: Of the thirty persons and odd mentioned therein, four were officials or men in authority—one of them was a (royal) Secretary and Minister; two (and perhaps one more) can be distinctly recognised as men of vast learning and erudition; at least three belonged to the community of merchants and business-men, including those belonging to, what appear to be, prominent, local families; three were 'freed-slaves', that is to say, they started their career with bondage but were later freed by their masters whose names are also given in each case; and lastly, at least three of the deceased were ladies who, it can be easily assumed, came from families of status—as a matter of fact, one of them is clearly mentioned as having been the spouse of a great merchant and official, as will be presently noted. In the case of the remaining twelve persons or so, it is difficult to ascertain their vocations for want of any specific mention in the text, but it is a reasonable supposition that most of these also belonged to the mercantile community.⁴

On the other hand, there is little doubt about the foreign origin of these persons. Almost all of them, with the possible exception of one or two, were settlers from Persia and adjoining territories, as the appellations to their names as al-Banū, al-Giliānī, al-Hānānī, al-Kātarīnī, al-Ardastānī, al-Tīlīn, al-Baṣrī, al-Isfahānī, etc., tend to suggest. These persons, usually belonging to the mercantile class, had settled down, may be, from more than one generation for carrying on trade and business at Cambay which, being a flourishing port and wealthy town, was extremely suited for the purpose. This and the information about the places from which they originally hailed should provide some material for the nature of relations between different countries and pattern of the foreign settlers on the Indian soil, who must have subsequently merged in the local population.

¹ The importance of these works can be judged by a couple of articles published by me incorporating the information gleaned from a few works available to me: 'India and the Near East during 13th-15th centuries', Mālik Rām Felicitation Volume (Delhi, 1972), pp. 209-27; 'Relations of India with Middle Eastern countries during the 16th-18th centuries', in Professor H. K. Sherwani Felicitation Volume, Hyderabad, 1975.

² References to works containing an account of Cambay and its monuments and inscriptions will be found in Epigraphia Indica, Arabic and Persian Supplement, EI, AF3S, 1961, pp. 3 (f.n. 7), 4 (f.n. 1-5); ibid., 1962, p. 3 (f.n. 2), 6, 10, 19, 20, 27; ibid., 1963, pp. 10 (f.n. 2), 18, 21, 22, 36, 39, 42, 49; ibid., 1970, pp. 74 (f.n. 2), 83.

³ As many as five thirteenth century epitaphs from Cambay, dated 1222, 1249, 1264, 1287 and 1291 were published in ibid., 1961, pp. 7, 9, 17, 19, and 22 respectively.

⁴ Some of the epitaphs mention more than one person (apart from his or her father and fore-fathers), as for example, the masters of the freed slaves. Of course, in the absence of any information about the early careers of these freed slaves, their masters cannot be necessarily deemed to have lived in Cambay, but the specific mention of the relationship in the death-record should indicate that in all probability it was so.

⁵ The surname Khwāja in the case of a few of them, may perhaps be taken to indicate this.
SOME FOURTEENTH CENTURY EPITAPHS FROM CAMBAY IN GUJARAT

The epitaphs of freed-slaves throw interesting sidelight on the life of this particular class, and the institution of slavery. Apart from the indication contained in these and some other records about their social status (and indirectly financial too), the very fact that no attempt was made to conceal their antecedents shows that there was no stigma attached to, or any thing ignominious about, this state; it was evidently a case of economic condition. These records prove that these people must have enjoyed sufficient rights and could easily avail of the opportunities for showing their talents in different fields including state service.

The families known from these epitaphs to which a reference has been made above are Bammi, Irbili and ‘Alamgar. The first has only one representative in the present group but two earlier members of the family were noticed in a previous number of the series. The Irbilis are represented by two members in this group; one member of this house also lies buried at Cambay. Incidentally, in the later of the two Irbili epitaphs here, the sobriquet Fatolia occurs, as was the case with the third Irbili record under reference. Likewise, ‘Alamgar too has two representatives in the present group; a third member of this family had died, if not lived, at Rander, an old habitation near Surat, where his tombstone may still be seen. If the family-name ‘Alamgar meaning a lance- or banner-maker is any indication, its members might have been engaged in the manufacture of lances or banners.

About the officials and the learned men too, the present group supplies new and hence welcome though unfortunately scanty, information except in the case of one, Maliku’sh Abaq ‘Imar al-Kazarini, who is mentioned only by the celebrated Moroccan traveller Ibn Batuta, as will be pointed out in the proper place.

Calligraphically too, these inscriptions provide a rich feast to the eyes. In general design they follow more or less the same pattern. I had occasion to dwell upon it at some length on a previous occasion but it may perhaps bear some repetition here. These epitaphs except in the case of one are engraved on arch-shaped tablets, usually of white marble, which are again divided into rectangular panels and arches of different shapes and decorative designs, and the texts comprising, almost as a rule, Quranic verses and the obituary proper are inscribed respectively in the arched portion, in the running borders of the stone as also in some of the horizontal lines of the vertical rectangular portion and in the remaining lines of the last mentioned. The style of writing, broadly speaking, is varied— it is basically Naskh or ‘uth or rather Rigla in the main text and Kufi or Thuluth in the headings or Basnala.

This pattern of tablets and their style of writing is found to have been more or less standardised in epitaphs to which it is exclusively found employed, more or less for two centuries, without any modification. Since many such epitaphs are found in Gujarāt, mostly at Cambay and also at other far-fung places like Akbarabad, Rander, Verāval (in the western part of the province), Pātan, etc., I was first led to describe the style as typical of Gujarāt, at least in India, but since those lines were written some more material has come to my notice which shows that this pattern was also in fashion in southern Arabia. I was also told, almost a decade and a half back, by an Indonesian delegate to the International Conference on Asian Archaeology held at New Delhi in

---

1 EIAPS, 1961, p. 9.
2 ibid., p. 22.
3 Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica (EIM), 1933-34, Supplement, p. 37, plate XXI b. Rander is now part of Surat city.
4 EIAPS, 1961, pp. 2-3.
5 ibid., p. 3.
6 For a similarly executed epitaph from Zafar in Orān, see Islamic Culture, Hyderabad-Dn., Vol. IX (1925), pp. 402-10, pls. A-1, B-1, A-2, B-2, and C.
1961 that in his country too, this type of tombstones was in vogue. But I have not been able to procure any further information in this regard.

A striking aspect of the epitaphs studied below is that as any as twenty-six out of the total thirty belong to persons who died in the first half of the century, the latter half only claim ing four. Representing as they do a fair sample-survey of epitaphs from Cambay, this fact may not be without significance and may perhaps be taken to reflect the fluctuations in the social and economic life of Cambay. Could the diminishing number in the latter half of the fourteenth century have been due in some measure at least, to the fact that it was not as peaceful as the earlier half, politically speaking, both for the province and the town, or to any change in the status of Cambay consequent upon the concentration of political power in the north of the province, to wit, at Pātān (Nahrwālā of Muslim historians)?

As has been stated earlier,\(^1\) most of these epigraphs, twenty-one to be exact, had been noticed and listed by the Archaeological Surveyor of the Western Circle more than half a century back,\(^2\) but unfortunately, their notices are usually incomplete and incorrect.

It may be noted that all but three of these epitaphs are not in situ. The tablets of most of them are built up into the walls of the Tomb of a local saint popularly known as Parvāz Shāh, Parvār Shāh or Parvāz Shahīd, which is situated on the north-western outskirts of the town.\(^3\) The entire area around the tomb particularly on its west and south sides is strown with tombs and graves. While most of their tombstones have either disappeared or lie buried in the ground, one can still see a few lying about here and there. It is from this burial ground that the headstones now preserved in the Tomb of Parvāz Shāh most have been removed. They were lying loose in the Tomb premises at the time of the survey referred to above (for they are not mentioned in the Report as Tombs collected in the Tomb) and must have been built up into walls, as of now, in 1946 when its present building was constructed.\(^4\) A few more headstones from this burial ground seem to have been removed to the Tomb of Pīr Tāju'd-Dīn, also situated in the same graveyard half way to the Tomb of Parvāz Shahīd, while a few seem to have found their way to some Tombs and mosques of the town.

Of the epitaphs studied here, nineteen are from the Tomb of Parvāz Shāh (with two more from outside it) and two each from the Tomb of Pīr Tāju'd-Dīn, Tomb of Buhārī Shahīd and Faraspūr Kāj-Masjid. The remaining three are the only ones in situ—two fixed at the head of graves.

---

\(^1\) EIAFS, 1961, pp. 3-4.


\(^3\) The tomb, a modern structure constructed about three decades back, comprises a large rectangular hall, with the grave of the saint under a wooden canopy. Nothing is known about the saint or his times except that his name was Shaikh 'Ali Jawālīq, according to a framed short notice in Arabic, which runs as follows: ‘Praise be to Allah and obligation too. And salvation and peace be on Muhammad the best of mankind and his progeny and companions. This edifice of the (tomb-) garden (which is) from among the gardens of Paradise, (containing the remains of) His Holiness the martyr, Shaikh 'Ali Jawālīq, known as Pīr Parvār, may his secret be sanctified, was raised from its very foundation a second time and completed on the 28th of the month of Dhu’l-Qa’dā of the year five and sixty and three hundred after one thousand, from the Migration of the Prophet (29 Dhu’l-Qa’dā 1305-25 October 1946).’

\(^4\) There are in all twenty-six headstones thus preserved in this Tomb, out of which eleven occur in the east, six in the west, four in the south, and two in the north wall. These have been listed in our annual reports, but through oversight, the walls have been wrongly specified in the provenance of fifteen of these, viz. Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy (ARIE), 1956-57, Nos. D, 69-83. The correct provenance is: Nos. 69, 70, 72 and 81, in the south wall. Nos. 71, 77 and 80, in the east wall, Nos. 73, 74, 75, 76, 78 and 82, in the west wall, and Nos. 79, and 83, in the north wall.
in the mausoleum forming the southern annexe of the Jami' Mosque and one at the grave of Bhitī Bānī at Nagarā, a village five kilometres to the north of Cambay.

I. EPITAPH DATED A.H. 699 (1200 A.D.)

The first epigraph is engraved on an arch-shaped tablet of white marble, measuring 68 cm. from apex to bottom and 36 cm. at the base, which is fixed at the head of a grave on a low platform, situated to the left of the passage just outside the entrance of the Tomb of Parvāz Shāh. A narrow margin inscribed with Quranic verses runs all along the tablet, except at the bottom; its arched portion is decorated with a trifoil arch resting on jambs with foliated patterns at their sides, and above the arch is inscribed the formulae vesting the proprietorship of the entire worldly kingdom in Allah. The rectangular portion under the arch is divided into seven horizontal panels, the first containing the First Creed, the second a Quranic verse and the rest, the obituary proper, according to which the grave was that of Kamālūd-Dīn Sulaimān son of Ahmad son of Hussain son of Abū (i.e. Abū) Sharaf al-Banrı who had died on Monday, 30th Jumādā II 699 (22nd February 1300). The text designates the deceased as al-Ghārib meaning 'the stranger in the land' that is to say a foreigner or emigrant, which may be taken to indicate that he had not yet finally settled down in Cambay when death overtook him. He seems to have been one of the merchants from foreign countries carrying on trade here. His nisba al-Banı suggests that Kamālūd-Dīn Sulaimān belonged either by birth or origin, to Banı, a famous fortress-town between Kūnān and Zāhīdān in the Kūnān province of Iran.

The deceased appears to have been a member of what appears to be the Banı family residing at Cambay. Two persons with the nisba who find mention in epigraphs from Cambay are Sā'id son of Abū Sharaf; son of 'Ali son of Shāpur al-Banı (alive in 1218) and Sharafu'd-Dīn Abū Sharaf son of Abū Shāmī son of Abū Sharaf al-Banı (died in 1249).2 Taking their names and their dates into account, all the three appear to have been the offspring of one fore-father as per the following genealogical table:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shāpur</th>
<th>'Ali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abū Sharaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussain</td>
<td>Abū Shama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sā'id (alive, A.H. 615/1218 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharafu'd-Dīn Abū Sharaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamālūd-Dīn Sulaimān (d. A.H. 699/1300 A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

---

3 He built a mosque at Cambay in this year (EIAPS, 1961, pp. 5-6, pl. I a).
4 For his epitaph, see ibid., pp. 9-10, pl. II a.
The text is executed in the Rigā'-mixed Naskh style of writing of a fairly good quality and reads as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate I(a)*

(a) *Margin.*

شهد الله إنه لا إله إلا هو و الملاكتمة و إلوّنا العالم قابئا بالقسط لا إله إلا هو العزى

الحكم أن الدين عند الله الإسلام و ما اختلف الذين أوتوا الكتاب إلا من بعد ما جاءه هم العلم

بغي بينهم و من يكره بآيات الله فإن الله سريع الحساب

(b) *Above the arch.*

الملك تتم الواحد القهار

(c) *Horizontal panels.*

(1) لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(2) كل من عليها فان و يبقى وجه ربك ذوالجلال و الازكرام

(3) هذا قبر العبد الضعيف الغريب المرحوم المغفور

(4) المذنب المجتاج إلى وحة الله تعالى كمال الدين

(5) سليمان ابن أحمد ابن حسان ابن أيوب شرف البني تقدمه الله

(6) بالرحمة و الرضوان و سكنه في دار الجنان توفي يوم

(7) الاثنين سلغ جمادي الأول سنة ثيجة و نسيم و سماحة

**TRANSLATION**

(a) 'Allah bears witness that there is no god but He, and (so do) the angels and those possessed of knowledge, being maintainer of justice; there is no god but He, the Mighty, the Wise. Surely, the true religion with Allah is Islam, and those to whom the Book had been given did not show opposition but after knowledge had come to them, out of envy among themselves; and whoever disbelieves in the communication of Allah——then surely Allah is quick in reckoning.'

(b) The kingdom belongs to Allah the One, the Subduer (of all).

(c) (1) (First Creed:) 'There is no god but Allah, Muḥammad is the apostle of Allah'.

(2) 'Every one on it must pass away. And there will endure for ever the person of Your Lord, the Lord of glory and honour.'

---

1 Qur'an, Chapter III, verses 17-18.
2 Cf. ibid., Chapter XL, verse 16.
3 Ibid., Chapter XL, verses 26-27.
(a) Epitaph dated A.H. 699 (p. 6)

(b) Epitaph dated A.H. 700 (p. 7)

Scale: 2
(3) This is the grave of the weak creature, the stranger (or emigrant), the one who is called unto Allah's mercy and pardoned,

(4) the sinful, the dependent on the mercy of Allah the Exalted, Kārālū'd-Dīn
(5) Sulaimān son of As'ad son of Husain son of Abī Sharaf al-Banmī (lit. of Banūmī), may Allah cover him
(6) with (His) mercy and pleasure and settle him in the abode of Paradise. He died on Mon-
(7) day, last day of (the month of) Junādā the First (of the ) year (A.H.) nine and ninety and six hundred (last day i.e. 30 Junādā I 169=22 February 1500).

II. EPIGRAPH, DATED A.H. 700 (1301 A.D.)

This epigraph is from the Tomb of Pir Tājū'd-Dīn, a small modern open four-walled enclosure, referred to above, which must have originally formed part of the main burial ground of the town but fenced off not very long ago. There are three graves in this enclosure, and the epigraph studied below is the one from the middle grave.

The marble-tablet is as usual arch-shaped and comparatively plain. Measuring 52 cm. from apex to bottom and 35 cm. in width at the base, it has a margin all around except at the bottom, which contains one of the two Quranic texts usually found in epitaphs from Cambay. In the arched portion is inscribed the First Creed, and below it, the first and the second of the six horizontal panels contain Bismillah and a famous Quranic verse on the mortality of human beings. The epitaph proper contained in the remaining four lines marks the grave of Tājū'd-Dīn Muḥammad son of Muḥammad a'z-Zakariyyā' al-Qazwīnī who is stated to have expired on Monday, the 9th Junādā II 700 (19th February 1301).

The nisba al-Qazwīnī makes the deceased Tājū'd-Dīn an Iranian settler or emigrant. Though locally venerated as a saint, there is nothing in the text to invest him with any saintly status or spiritual powers. Very probably, he was one of the innumerable merchants, traders, craftsmen or artisans who are usually found at such busy ports as Cambay was in those days.

The text which is executed in Rūqā'-mixed Thulūth style of a fairly high quality has been deciphered as follows:—

TEXT

Plate I(b)

(a) Margin.

شهد الله أنه لا إله إلا هو وملائكة وروى العلم قابا بالنفاذ لا إله إلا هو إن شاء الحكيم أن الدين عند الله الإسلام وما اختلف الذين أوتوا الكتاب إلا من بعد ما جاءه هم العلم بنيا بيهم و من يكرر بيات الله فإن الله سريع الحساب

1. ARIE, 1959-60, No. D, 117. It was first noticed in PRWC, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 32.
2. Here on a small platform at the back may be seen the epitaph dated A.H. 630 or 1232 A.D. (EIAPS, 1961, p. 7, pl. I b).
3. There are four more headstones embedded into the north and east walls (ARIE, 1959-60, Nos. D, 118-121). These tablets must have been brought to this place from the graveyard after the visit of the Archaeological Surveyor in 1919-20, since they are not mentioned in his report but the one under study is (PRWC, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 32).
(b) Within the arch.

لا الله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(c) Horizontal panels,

(1) Bismillah الرحمن الرحيم
(2) كل نفس ذائقة الموت
(3) هذا قبر العبد الضعيف الراجح إلى رحمة الله
(4) تعالى تاج الذين محمد ابن محمد الزركرة القزويني
(5) تغمد الله بالرحمة والرضوان واسمه في دار الجنات
(6) وقد تو في يوم الأثنين التالى من شهر جمادى الآخر سنة سبعاية

TRANSLATION

(a) Qur’an, Chapter III, verses 17-18.¹
(b) First Creed.²
(c) (1) Basmala : In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.
(2) ¹ Every soul shall taste of death .³
(3) This is the grave of the weak creature, hopeful of the mercy of Allah.
(4) the Exiled, Tājū’dīn Mūhammad ad son of Mūhammad a’z-Zakariyyā al-Qazwīnī (mir. of Qazwin).⁴
(5) nay Allah cover him with (His) mercy and pleasure and settle him in the abode of Paradise.
(6) And he died on Monday, the ninth of the month of Junādā the Second (of the year) A.H. 700 (9 Ju.; idā 11 700-19 February 1301).

III. EPIGRAPH, DATED A.H. 707 (1307 A.D.)

The arch-shaped tablet bearing this extremely interesting epitaph is of considerable size measuring 1.12 metre from apex to bottom and 55 cm. in width and is built up into the north wall of the Tomb of Īrāq Shāhīd.⁵

The record comprises religious text and the epitaph proper, as in the case of the two preceding epitaphs, but in this instance, there is more Quranic text and the arrangement of the whole record is also somewhat more elaborate. In addition to the three-sided margin, there are two inner vertical panels, the arch-base is converted into a separate horizontal panel and the arched area on the tablet is garnished with a trifoil arch. The central or main portion consists of ten inscribed panels of uniform size except the first one which is wider.

¹ For translation, see p. 6.
² For translation, see p. 6.
³ Qur’ān, Chapter III, verse 184.
⁴ Qazwīn is a famous town in Iran.
⁵ ARIE, 1956-57, No. D, 79.
(a) Epitaph dated A.H. 707 (p. 9)

Scale: ×12

(b) Epitaph dated A.H. 709 (p. 11)

Scale: ×17
The outer and inner margins contain two different sets of Quranic verses, the arch-base is inscribed with the Basmala, the first two horizontal panels are taken up with the First Creed and a Quranic verse, the third, fourth and part of the fifth record a Tradition of the Prophet on the fleet character of human life, and the rest contain the obituary stating that the grave belonged to Shamsud-Din Muhammed son of Ali son of Ya'fly son of Ya'fly son of al-Jauzi al-Jaziri who expired on Tuesday, the 17th Rabi' II 707 (16th October 1307).

The epigraph was briefly noticed in the Progress Report referred to above, where the year of death was wrongly quoted as A.H. 709 and the name of the deceased and those of his father and grandfather were given as 'Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Suraihi ibn ali jawzi al-Jaziri'.

While nothing is known about the deceased, the epithets used for him in the text show him to be a leading personality of his times, at least in the field of religious knowledge and learning. He is described as 'the savant well-versed in the subtleties of knowledge, the leading teacher and pursuer of Truth and the Mufti (i.e. giver of Fatwa or religious decisions) of sections and groups.'

It has not been possible to identify the deceased or to get hold of any particulars of his life. The epigraph calls him a martyr which means that he had met his death in one of the ways laid down in the religious law for martyrdom, such as killing, drowning, snake-bite, etc. Also, he is mentioned as al-Qarib i.e. a stranger or one from another land, indicating that he was an enigmatical or a new-comer to Cambay.

The text is executed in the same Riqa'-like Naskh which marks the calligraphy of the thirteenth century epitaphs of this type and reads as under:

**TEXT**

**Plate II(a)**

(a) Outer margin.

الله لا هو الا هو الذي تقيم لا تأخذه [ ] سنة و لا نوم له ما في السموات وما في الأرض من ذي الذي يشع عينه الا بذاته يعلم ما بين أيديهم وما خلفهم و لا ينفعون بشيء من علمه إلا بما شاء ومع كسرية السموات والأرض و لا يؤد حفظهما و هو العلم العظيم لا أكره في الدين قد تكون الرشد من الدين فن يكثر بالغاظوت و يؤمن بالله فقد استمسك بالعروة الوثقى لا انفصال لها و لله سمع عليكم

(b) Vertical panels, right and left.

شهد الله إنه لا هو الا هو الملاويه و اولوا [ ] العلم قايمين بالقطط لا الله الا هو العزيز الحكيم إن الدين عند الله الإسلام و ما اختلف الذين اتوا الكتاب إلا من بعد ما جاءه [ ] هم العلم بتنا بينهم و من يكثر بابيات الله فان الله سريع الحساب

---

1 *PRWC*, 1919-20, p. 49, Appendix Q. No. 3.
2 *It is difficult to say if Muhammad bin Muhammad al-Jaziri (d.A.H. 833), the celebrated author of the famous work *al-Hidżrār* was among his descendants,
3 DGA/74
(b) Vertical panels, right and left.

(c) Bismi Allah al-Rahman al-Rahim

(2) La ilaha illa Allah, wa salallahu 'alayhi wa salamu

(3) 'Allahumma fa idnu man kafaru 'an kulli shahada

(5) Xalidin ina ibada an 'Allah wa amru fi quwwam

(6) Hadzaf bin 'Abdullad bin Durayd ibn 'Abdullad

(8) Ulam ad-Daharid bi-nab 'Allah bi-nab ujar bi-muna dibin 'Adalid

(9) Turayn ina muna bi-nab ijar bi-nab ujar bi-muna dibin 'Adalid

TRANSLATION

(a) Qur'ān, Chapter II, verses 255-56.¹

(b) Ibid., Chapter III, verses 17-18.²

(c) (1) Basmala.³

(2) First Creed.⁴

(3) Qur'ān, Chapter III, part of verse 184.⁴

(4) 'Their Lord gives them good news of mercy from Himself and (His) good pleasure and gardens, wherein lasting blessings shall be theirs;

(5) abiding therein for ever; surely Allāh has a Mighty reward with Him.⁶

¹ For translation, see p. 10.
² For translation, see p. 6.
³ For translation, see p. 8.
⁴ For translation, see p. 6.
⁵ For translation, see p. 10.
⁶ Qur'ān, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.
(6) This is the grave of the creature, the stranger (who is) received into (Allāh's) mercy (and is) hopeful of
(7) the mercy of Allāh the Exalted, Miṣbāḥ, the freed slave of the Lord, Zainu'd-Dīn
(8) 'Ali son of Muẓaffar al-Malāḏhari, may Allāh illuminate his grave with His ample pardon.
(9) He died on the twentieth (of the month) of Jumāḍā the Second (of the) year (A.H.) nine and seven hundred (20 Jumāḍā II 709-25 November 1309).

V. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 710 (1310 A.D.)

This arch-shaped headstone also comes from the Tomb of Parvāz Shahād, where it is built up, fourth from right, in the eastern wall. It is smaller in size being only 55 cm. in height and 25 cm. in width and has a single marginal border inscribed with Quranic text and horizontal panels within, containing religious texts followed by the epitaph proper.

This tombstone was originally set up on the grave of Ḥāji Abū Bakr son of 'Ali son of Abū Bakr Irbilī, who died on the 25th Muharram 710 (24th June 1310). In the Progress Report where the tombstone is noticed, the deceased's nisba is given as Adhālī. As in the case of the other persons mentioned in the preceding epitaphs, nothing is known about Abū Bakr Irbilī. But there are found at Cambay at least three epitaphs bearing this nisba Irbilī i.e. of Irbil, a town near Mosul in modern Iraq, and from this it can be safely surmised that he belonged to the same family, which guess is further corroborated by the names of the three persons—Ḥāji Ibrāhīm son of Muḥammad son of 'Ali al-Irbilī known as Fatolīa (d. A.H. 690), Ḥāji Abū Bakr son of 'Ali son of Abū Bakr al-Irbilī, mentioned in the epitaph under study (d. A.H. 710) and Shamsu’d-Dīn Muḥammad son of Abū Bakr son of 'Ali Irbilī (d. A.H. 736), whose epitaph has also survived (No. XXIII, infra). We would not perhaps be much wrong, on the basis of this information to draw up a genealogy of these persons as under:

```
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Bakr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥāji Abū Bakr</td>
<td>Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. A.H. 710)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamsu’d-Dīn Muḥammad</td>
<td>Ḥāji Ibrāhīm Fatolīa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. A.H. 736)</td>
<td>(d. A.H. 690)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Very probably, thus, the deceased belonged to the Irbilī family of Cambay, which appears to have been a leading business-house of the town. Ḥāji Ibrāhīm has been described in his epitaph as 'the magnificent chief, the great and glorious master, king of merchants and prince of shipmasters', etc., while the epitaph under study calls Ḥāji Abū Bakr 'the respected chief'. In

---

1 The text has Maulū, an equivalent of Khwāja in Arabic-speaking countries
2 *ARIE*, 1959-60, No. D, 123.
3 *PBWC*, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 20.
the case of the other two members, the *alīs* ‘Fatolia’ is used, but the present epitaph omits it. As has been stated elsewhere, Fatolia appears to have been a sobriquet for the family rather than for the individual.¹

The calligraphy of this record is similar to that in the previous records, the script being ṫiqṣʿ-mixed Naṣḥ. Its text is quoted below:

TEXT

Plate III(b)

(a) Border.

(1) لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله
(2) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
(3) يبشرهم برحمته منه و رضوان و جنت لهم فيها نعيم مقيم
(4) هذا قبر الصدر المعترم المرحوم المغفور الراجه
(5) إلى رحمته ربي حاجي أبو بكر بن علي بن أبي بكر
(6) ارثى نور الله قبره بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم يوم الاربعاء
(7) الخامس والعشرون من المحرم سنة عشرة و سبعمينه

TRANSLATION

(a) Qurʾān, Chapter III, verses 17-18.²

(b) (1) First Creed.³

(2) Basmala.⁴

(3) Qurʾān, Chapter IX, verse 21.⁵

(4) This is the grave of the respected chief, one who is taken into (Allāh’s) mercy (and) pardoned, hopeful

(5) of the mercy of his Nourisher, Ḥājī Abū Bakr son of `Ali son of Abū Bakr

¹ HIAPS, 1961, p. 23, where the word Fatolia has been explained.
² For translation, see p. 6.
³ For translation, see p. 6.
⁴ For translation, see p. 8.
⁵ For translation, see p. 10.
⁶ One who has performed the Ḥaji, i.e. made a pilgrimage to the Kaʿba at Mecca.
SOME FOURTEENTH CENTURY EPITAPHS FROM CAMBAY IN GUJARAT

(6) Irbilî (i.e. of Irbil, near Mosul), may Allah illumine his grave with His ample pardon. He died on Wednesday,

(7) the twentieth of (the month of) Muḥarram (of the) year (A.H.) ten and seven hundred (25 Muḥarram 710–24 June 1310).

VI. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 713 (1314 A.D.)

This is the epitaph of another person who has been described in the text as a freed slave. It is inscribed on an arch-shaped headstone fixed, second from right, into the north wall of the Tomb of Ḥāvāz Shāhīd1 and conforms, more or less, to the ornate two-margins type of the tombstones in the present group. There is, however, a slight variation in the Quranic text.

According to the epigraph, the grave belonged to one Aminu’d-Din Kāfūr, a freed slave of the merchant Sharafu’d-Din Mahdī son of Muḥammad al-Hamadānī, who had died on 1st Dhu’l-Qa’dā A.H. 713 (17th February 1314). No further information is contained in the text about Aminu’d-Din, except that his former master was a merchant by profession and had hailed from Hamadān, the famous city in western Iran.

The notice of this epitaph by the Archaeological Surveyor in his Progress Report is misleading and confusing: the deceased is stated to be ‘Astruddin Kāfūr Atīq (ibn) Sharauddin Mahdī ibn-i-Muḥammad al-bāqir-ül-Ḥamādānī’. Both the one-time slave and master have been mistaken as son and father due to the ignorance about the term ‘Atīq, and the Arabic term for merchant, (a’t-Tājir), due to lack of diacritical marks and peculiar style of writing, was erroneously read as ‘al-bāqir’.

The style of writing is again typical Rūqā-like Naskh and the calligraphy is of a fairly high order. The tablet measures about 102 cm. from apex to bottom and is 38 cm. in width.

The text has been deciphered as follows:—

TEXT

Plate III(a)

(a) Outer margin.

هو النذير لا إلا هو عالم الغيب و الشهادة هو الرحمن الرحيم هو الله الذئ لا إله
[الآ] إله الملك القدوس السلام العالم المعين المهيمن المنيز

(b) i. Corners at the arch-base.

الملك لله

ii. Vertical panels and top (arch-base) panel.

شهد الله إنه لا إله إلا هو و الملاكتة و أولوا العلم قايا باقسط لا إلا هو العزيز
الحكيم إن الذين عند الله الإسلام و ما اختلف الذين أوتوا الكتاب إلا من بعد ما جاءهم العالم
بغي فيهم و من يكره بيات الله فان الله سربع الحساب مدق العلم

1 ARK, 1956-57, No. D, 88, where it is wrongly stated to be in the eastern wall.
2 PRWC, 1919-20, p. 49, Appendix Q, No. 4.
(a) He is Allāh besides whom there is no God: The knower of the unseen and the seen; He is the Beneficient, the Merciful. He is Allāh, besides whom there is no god; the King, the Holy, the Author of peace, the Granter of security, Guardian over all, the Mighty. \footnote{1 Qur’ān, Chapter LIX, verse 22 and part of verse 23.}

(b) Kingdom belongs to Allāh.

(c) Qur’ān, Chapter III, verses 17-18,\footnote{2 For translation, see p. 6.} followed by the phrase ‘Rightly says Allāh’.

(d) (1) Basmala.\footnote{3 For translation, see p. 8.}

(2) First Creed.\footnote{4 For translation, see p. 6.}

(3-4) Qur’ān, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.\footnote{5 For translation, see p. 12.}

(5) This is the grave of the creature, received in (Allāh’s) mercy and pardoned, Aminu’d-Din Kāfur,

(6) the freed slave of the one who is taken into (Allāh’s) mercy, Sharafu’d-Din Mahdi son of Muḥammad, the merchant, al-Hamadānī (i.e. of Hamadān),

(7) may Allāh cover him with His mercy and pleasure and grant him abode in the centre of His Paradise. He died on Wednesday,

(8) the first (of the month) of Dhu’l-Qa’da (of the) year (A.H.) thirteen and seven hundred (1 Dhu’l-Qa’da 713-17 February 1314). And Allāh’s salutation be on Muḥammad (the Prophet).

VII. EPIGRAPHIA INDICA—ARABIC AND PERSIAN SUPPLEMENT

One more family or professional name has come to light through this epitaph, which is inscribed on an arch-shaped tablet of white marble, now fixed, seventh from right into the eastern wall of
(a) Epitaph dated A.H. 713 (p. 15)

(b) Epitaph dated A.H. 710 (p. 14)
TRANSLATION

(a) Qur‘ān, Chapter III; verses 17-18.¹
(b) (1) First Creed.²
(2) Baismala.³
(3) This is the grave of the weak creature taken into (Allāh’s) mercy (and) pardoned,
(4) Ḥāji son of Muḥammad son of Aḥmad, popularly known as ‘Ala‘īgar (i.e. lance- or banner-maker),
(5) may Allāh render his sleeping-place cool. He died on Monday, the eighth
(6) of the month of Ramaḍān (of the) year (A.H.) fifteen and seven hundred (8 Ramaḍān 715=6 December 1315).

The sixth day of December of the year 1315, according to Ephemeris, was not Monday, but Saturday. This may perhaps be due to the calculations based on the actual sighting of the moon or the reckonings of the Calendar followed in the Arab countries.

VIII. EPIGRAPH, DATED A.H. 716 (1316 A.D.)

This is quite an interesting epitaph. It furnishes some important, though meagre, historical information, not found elsewhere. It mentions two persons, one-time master and slave who, judging from the titles and epithets appended to their names, held position of authority during their life-time.

The epitaph is engraved on an arch-shaped tablet of marble, measuring 102 cm. from apex to bottom and 38 cm. at the base, which is fixed into the eastern wall of the Tūn b of Parvāz Shabīd, ninth from right.⁴ The text is executed in a slightly more elaborate and artistic way, but the somewhat crowded writing fails to produce the desired effect. The calligraphical style is the usual Naṣīḥ with strong Riqa’ tendency.

The epitaph was intended for the grave of the great, the just and the learned Malīk Ṣāliḥu’d-Daulat wa’d-Dīn who is reported to have met a martyr’s death on Tuesday, the 17th Jumādā II 716 (6th September 1316). The deceased’s name and title are indicative of the high official status held by him in life. That he had risen to the postion of a great Malīk from that of a slave is clear from the fact that the text describes him as a freed slave of Mukhlīṣ a’s-Sulṭānī, who too, from his appellation a’s-Sulṭānī appears to have been an official of high rank. It may be particularly noted that the deceased is stated to have been a man of great learning.

But it is unfortunate that we do not have more details about either the Malīk or his one-time master or about their duties, piece of postings, etc. For want of any such possible information it is not possible to say if the deceased had served his master in Gujarāt or elsewhere. Even then, its importance as a historical document of note is apparent, having preserved the name of an official of position who flourished during the early years of the consolidation of the Muslim rule in Gujarāt—having died hardly within two decades of the conquest of the province by ‘Alā‘u’d-Dīn

¹ For translation, see p. 6.
² For translation, see p. 6.
³ For translation, see p. 8.
⁴ ARIE, 1959-60, No. D, 128.
⁵ Ibid., has 18th which is a misprint.
Some Fourteenth Century Epitaphs from Cambay in Gujarat

Khalji in 1297-98. This information is all the more valuable since contemporary, let alone later, historians give practically no information about the officials posted in the province. As it is, apart from one epigraph, dated 1314, mentioning the Gujarat governor and two other officials, from Peštâd, not far from Cambay, it is only at Cambay that records preserving the names of officials who flourished within the first quarter of the Khalji conquest of Gujarat are found. It may be recalled here that in this town lies buried a governor (hûkim) of Cambay (d. 1299), probably its first.\(^1\)

As usual the brief notice of the inscription as given in the Progress Report is confusing and incorrect: according to it, the tombstone belonged to Sâlihid-din ʿÂtiq who died on the 17th Jamâdi-ul-Âkhar, 716 A.H. and was most probably an officer who had served Sultan ʿAla'uddin Muhammad Khalji of Delhi in person.\(^2\) This notice suffers from a number of inaccuracies, which can be corrected with the help of the text and translation quoted below:—

**Text**

*Plate IV(a)*

(a) Arch-margin.

هو الله الذي لا إله إلا هو عالم الغيب و الشهادة هو الرحمن [الرحيم] هو الله الذي لا إله إلا هو الملك القدوس السلام الدومن الجهيم العزيز

(b) Outer margin, under (a).

اللهم لا إله إلا هو الحي القوم لا تأخذ سنة ولا نوم له ما في السماوات وما في الأرض من ذى الذي يشع عنه إلا هو يعلم ما بين أيديهم وما خلفهم ولا يحيطون بهم من علمه إلا دم شاه وسمع كربه السماوات والأرض ولا يؤده حفظهما وهو على العظيم لا أكره في إنذين قد تبين الرشد من الفن فن يكفر بالطاغوت ويرى من الله قد استمسك بالعروة الولى لا انفصال لها وله سمعة علم

(c) Vertical panels, right and left.

شهد الله أنه لا إله ولا الملائكة ولا أولو[ا] العلم قابلا باقسط لا إله [الله] هو العلي الحكيم إن الدين عند الله الإسلام وما اختلف الذين أو توا الكتاب إلا من بعد ما جاهم[هم] علم يغيب بينهم و من يكفر بايات الله فإن الله سريع الحساب يد إله العظيم

(d) Horizontal panels.

(1) لا إله إلا الله عمد رسول الله

(2) يبشرهم وبهم برحمه منه ورضوان

---

\(^1\) *E.I.M.*, 1917-18, p. 33, pl. XI b.

\(^2\) *E.I.A.P.S.*, 1962, pp. 3-4, pl. I a.

\(^3\) *PRWC*, 1919-20, pp. 49, No. 1.

(3) و جنات لهم فيها نعيم مقيم
(4) هذا قبر الملك الكبير العالم
(5) العدل المنحؤن المنعم
(6) الشهيد صلاح الدولة و الدين
(7) عتق مخاص السلطان الابد لله
(8) مضIKE قد توى ليلة اللثما سابع
(9) عشر من شهر جمادى الآخر سنة
(10) السادس عشر و سبعه

TRANSLATION

(a) 'He is Allâh besides whom there is no god: the Knower of the unseen and the seen; He is the Beneficent, the Merciful. He is Allâh, besides whom there is no god; the King, the Holy, the Author of Peace, the Granter of security, Guardian over all, the Mighty.'

(b) Qur'âน, Chapter II, verses 255-56.

(c) Ibid., Chapter III, verses 17-18, followed by the phrase 'Rightly says Allâh the Magnificent'.

(d) (1) First Creed.

(2-3) Qur'âن, Chapter IX, verse 21.

(4) This is the grave of the great and learned Malik,

(5) the just, the one taken into (Allâh's) mercy and pardoned, the fortunate,

(6) the martyr, Ṣalâhu'd-Daulat wa'd-Din (lit. welfare of the State and Religion),

(7) the freed slave of Mukhliṣ a's-Sultânî, may Allâh render cool

(8) his resting-place. He died on the night of Tuesday, the seventh of the month of Jumâdâ al-Ákhiar (of the) year (A.H.)

(9) sixteen and seven hundred (17 Jumâdâ II 716=6 September 1316).

IX. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 721 (1321 AD.)

In general design as well as arrangement and execution of text, this epitaph resembles the preceding one to a fairly large extent. It also contains the same Quranic text with small additions in two three places. These facts may perhaps be indicative of a similar status of the deceased for whose grave this tombstone was intended.

1 Qur'ân, Chapter LIX, verse 22 and part of verse 23.
2 For translation, see p. 10.
3 For translation, see p. 6.
4 For translation, see p. 6.
5 For translation, see p. 10.
SOME FOURTEENTH CENTURY EPITAPHS FROM CAMBAY IN GUJARAT

The tablet is as usual arch-shaped and measures 85 cm. from apex to bottom and 50 cm. in width. It is now preserved in the Tomb of Fārūz Shāh where it is built up, sixth from right, into the southern wall, but it was originally meant to mark the grave of one Fakhr al-Dīn Aḥmad son of Ḥusain son of Abū Bakr, popularly known as al-Qādi`u l-Īsfahānī i.e. the Isfahānī Qādi, who is stated to have died a martyr on Sunday, the 25th Rabī' II 721 (24th May 1321).

The cognomen recorded in the text by which he was popularly known shows that the deceased discharged the duties of the local judge and might have headed the judicial department as it existed then. It also proclaims him not only to be of Iranian extraction but probably a fresh immigrant. Needless to say, whatever position he might have held in his time, he is not known from any other source.

The style of writing is Riqāʾ-like Naskh and the text reads as under:

TEXT

Plate V(b)

(a) Arched margin.

هو الله الذي لا إله إلا هو عالم الغيب و الشهادة هو الرحمن [الرحيم هو] الله الذي لا

الله إلا هو الملك القدوس السلام المؤمن المهيمن العزيز

(b) Outer margin.

الله لا إله إلا هو الحي القيوم لا تخاذل سنة و لا نوم له ما في السماوات وما في الأرض

من فی الی الذي يشفع عنه إلا بذاته يعلم ما بين يديهم و ما خلفهم و لا يحيطون بهم من عله

الا بسُبُرهم وسع كرسيه السماوات والأرض و لا يوده حفظهما و هو العلي العظيم لا أكره له

الذين قد تنبى القدر من الأمل في كفرا بالطاغوت و وُمّن باتبه قد استمك بالعورة الوثني لا

انفصام لها و الله سميع عليم صداق الله

(c) Vertical panels, right and left.

شهيد الله إنه لا إله إلا هو و الملائكة و أولوا العلم قائما بالقسط لا الله إلا هو العزيز

الحكيم ان الذين عند الله الإسلام وما اختلف الذين أتىوا الكتاب الا من بعد ما جاءهم العلم

بغي بينهم و من يكفر بآيات الله فإن الله سريع الحساب و ما عمد إلا رسول

(d) Horizontal panels.

لا إلا الله لا إله إلا يequals رسول الله

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

يا بشرهم و بشرهم برحمة منه و رضوان و ذنات لهم فيها نعيم

منهم خالدين فيها ابدا إن الله عنده اجر عظيم

1 ARIE, 1959-60, No. 125; PRWC, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 19.
(5) This is the grave of the creature taken into (Allāh’s) mercy and pardoned, the fortunate, the martyr, Fakhrū’d-Din

(6) Aḥmad son of Ḥusain son of Abū Bakr common known as al-Qādir‘I-Isfahānī (i.e. the Isfahānī Qādir or Qādirī, originally from Isfahān).4

(7) May Allāh cover him with His mercy and pleasure and grant him abode in the centre of his Paradise. He died on Sun-

(8) day, twenty-fifth of the month of Rabī‘ul-Ākhar (of the) year (A.H.) one and twenty and seven hundred (25 Rabī‘ II 721 = 24 May 1321).

X. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 728 (1327 A.D.)

This is yet another tombstone preserved in the Tomb of Pir Parvāz Shahid. It is arch-shaped, measuring 86 cm. from apex to bottom and 42 cm. in width and is embedded, first from right, into the eastern wall. It more or less conforms, in general design and execution, to the other tombstones in this group.

The epitaph was originally set up on the grave of Khwāja Fakhrū’d-Din Muḥammad son of Maḥsūr al-Kuhrāmī, i.e. of Kuhrām, who died, according to the text, on Friday, 5th Muharram 728 (20 November 1327). The text contains nothing which could throw light on the life of the Khwāja; only his niṣba al-Kuhrāmī can be taken to indicate that he hailed from Kuhrām, probably an important fort of that name (Kohrām) in the Panjab in the medieval period. If so,
(a) Epitaph dated A.H. 728 (p. 23)

(b) Epitaph dated A.H. 721 (p. 21)
it would mean that though not a foreigner in the strict sense, he was a new comer to Cambay. Whether he came there in the capacity of an official, a mere visitor, or a trader, it is difficult to say. Nevertheless, the distinct reference to a North-Indian resident of Cambay, is not without historical interest.

The epitaph was briefly and correctly noticed in the Progress Report except that the niha of the deceased is omitted there and the day of the month is stated to be 6th instead of 5th Muḥarrar.\(^1\)

The text is inscribed in the usual Riqā'-like Naskh style and has been read as under:

**TEXT**

**Plate V(a)**

(a) *Arched margin.*

هو الله الدوّار لا الله إلا هو عالم الغيب و الشهادة هو الرحمن [الرحيم هو] الله إنّه لا الله إلا هو الملك القدوس السلام المومن المعين العزيز الجبار [الشكر...]

(b) *Vertical panels, right and left.*

أنه لا الله إلا هو الحي القيوم لا يأخذ سنا ولا نوم له ما في السماوات وما في الأرض من ذي الذي يشغع عنه إلا بما يحبن ما يريه السماوات وما يبخلن ويضرون بشيء من عمه إلا [بما شاء] وسع كرمته السماوات والأرض ولا يؤده حفظهما وهو على العظيم صدق الله

(c) *Horizontal panels.*

i. Arch-base:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم قال هو الله أحد [الله] الصمد لم يلد ولم يولد ولم يكن له كنوا أحد

ii. Below i:

(1) لا الله إلا الله محمد رسول الله
(2) يبشرهم دينهم برحمته منه و رضوان و جنات لهم فيها نعم مقيم
(3) خالدين فيها إبدا ان الله عينه [[ Bundir عظيم
(4) هذا قبر العبد الاحرار المغفور الراجح إلى رحمة و ره خواجه كبير الدين
(5) محمد منصور الكحراي نغمه الله برحمته و غفرانه و إباحه بحبوحة جنانه قد ترى
(6) يوم الجمعة السادس من شهر المحرم سنة ثمان و عشرون و سبع

**TRANSLATION**

(a) *Qur'an, Chapter LXIX, verse 22 and part of verse 23.\(^2\)

---

1 PRWC, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 16.
2 For translation, see p. 20.
EPIGRAPHIA INDICA—ARABIC AND PERSIAN SUPPLEMENT

(b) Qur’ān, Chapter II., verse 255, followed by the phrase ‘Rightly says Allah’.  

(c) i. ‘In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful. Say: He, Allah, is One. Allah is He on whom all depend. He begets not, nor is He Begotten. And none is like Him.’

ii. (1) First Creed.

(2-3) Qur’ān, Chapter IX. verses 21-22.

(4) This is the grave of the creature taken into (Allah’s) mercy and pardoned, the hopeful of the mercy of his Nourisher, Khwaja Kabiru’d-Din

(5) Muḥammad (son of) Mansūr al-Kuhrāmī i.e. of Kuhrān, may Allah cover him with His mercy and pleasure and habitate him in the centre of His Paradise. He died

(6) on Friday, the fifth of the month of Muḥarram (of the) year (A.H.) eight and twenty and seven hundred (5 Muḥarram 729-20 November 1327).

XI. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 730 (1329 A.D.)

The arch-shaped tablet on which this epitaph is inscribed measures 75 cm. in height and 35 cm. at the base and is built up in the southern wall of the Toab of Parvūz Shahid. It contains, as usual, religious text, comprising in this case, in addition to the Quranic texts a saying of the Prophet on the transitoriness of the world. According to the epitaph, the grave belonged to Abu Bakr son of Ahmad al-Nakañi a’r-Rāneri, i.e. of Rāner (Rānder), who died on the 13th Muḥarram 730 (16th November 1329).

The deceased belonged, according to his nisba, to Rāner, which is the name used by the Arab writers for Rānder near Surat, across the River Tapti. No other information about him or his vocation, etc., is furnished by the record or any other source. But the epitaph furnishes an important piece of information that the deceased was popularly known as Lekhari which is a Gujarati word meaning associated with or related to wood. This al-Sa may perhaps signify his profession—dealers in timber or so, or some trait or distinguishing character of his.

The style of writing is the Rigged Inscribed Naskh of more or less the same type as is found in Caubay epitaphs of the period.

The text reads as under :

TEXT

Plate VI(b)

(a) Arched margin.

هو الله اللّه لا إله إلا هو عالم الغيب و الشهادة هو الرحمن الرحيم هو الله الذي لا إله إلا هو الملك القدوس السلام النجات المعين العزيز الجبار

1 For translation, see p. 10.
2 Qur’ān, Chapter CXII.
3 For translation, see p. 6.
4 For translation, see p. 12.
5 ARIE, 1956-57, No. D, 74, where it was stated to be in the northern wall.
6 In Īṣīd, the al-Sa is given as Zakariyyā.
7 In PHWC, 1919-20, p. 49, No. 11. an incomplete gist is given.
(a) Epitaph dated A.H. 730 (p. 26)

(b) Another epitaph of the same date (p. 24)
(b) *Outer margin and arch-base.*

و سبب الذين انتوا وبينهم إلى الجنة زمرة حتى إذا جاؤها وفتحت أبوابها وقال [لهم]

خُزِّن بها سلام علىكم طيبم فادخلوها] خالدين و قائلوا الحمد لله الذي صدقت ونعم و اورثنا الأرض

نُثْبِو من [الجنة حيث نشاء ننفم اجر العاملين و ترَى الملائكة حافين من حول العرش يسبعون

بحمد ربيهم و قضى بينهم بالحق و قبل الحمد لله رب العالمين

(c) *Inner margin.*

شهد الله انه لا إله إلا هو و الملائكة و اولو العلم قابا بالقسط لا إله إلا هو العزيز

الحكيم ان الذين عند الله إلا سلام و ما اختلف الذين اوتوا الكتاب إلا من بعد ما جاوه[ه]هم العلم

بغير بينهم و من يكفر بآيات الله فان الله سريع الحساب صدق الله العظيم

(d) *Horizontal panels.*

(1) لا الله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(2) نبضهم وبينهما برحمته منه و رضوان و جاثتهم فيها نعيم

(3) مقيم خالدين فيها ان الله عندهم اجر عظيم

(4) قال النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم كن في الدنيا

(5) كانت غريب اوكعبا bilip و عد نفسك من اصحاب القبور

(6) هذا قبر العبد المرحوم أبو يكير بن أحمد عرف لنوراً răngية

(7) نور الله قبه قد انقل من دار الفنا يوم السبت الثالث عشر من

(8) شهر المحرم سنة ثلاثون و بمعايدة وصلى الله على محمد

TRANSLATION

(a) Qur′an, Chapter LIIX, verse 22 and part of verse 23.1

(b) 'And those who are careful of (their duty to) their Lord shall be conveyed to the garden in companies; until they come to it, and its doors shall be opened and the keepers of it shall say to them: Peace be on you, you shall be happy; therefore enter it to abide. And they shall say: (All) praise is due to Allah, who has made good to us His promise, and He has made us inherit the land; we may abide in the garden where we please; so goodly is the reward of the workers. And you shall see the angels going round about the throne glorifying the praise of their Lord; and judgment shall be given between them with justice, and it shall be said: All praise is due to Allah, the Lord of the worlds.'2

(c) Qur′an, Chapter III, verses 17-18,3 followed by the phrase 'Rightly says Allah the Magnificent'.

---

1 For translation, see p. 20.
2 Qur′an, Chapter XXXIX, verses 73-75.
3 For translation, see p. 6.
(d) (1) First Creed.1
(2-3) Qur'ān, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.2
(4-5) Tradition of the Prophet.3
(6) This is the grave of the creature received into (Allah's) mercy, Abū Bakr son of Aḥmad alīs Lakaṭīyā aʿr-Rā'inī i.e. of Rā'īn,
(7) may Allah illumine his grave. He passed away from the house of mortality on Saturday, the thirteenth of
(8) the month of Muḥarram (of the year A.H.) thirty and seven hundred (13 Muḥarram 730=16 November 1329).

13th Muḥarram of the Hijra year 730 fell on Monday and not on Saturday as stated in the text. This could be due to calculations as pointed out in a similar case in the previous lines.

XII. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 730 (1329 A.D.)

This damaged epigraph, noticed here for the first time, is engraved on a fragmentary arch-shaped tablet: its upper part is missing. Since in other respects, it conforms to the general type of tombstones from Cambay, the missing portion must have contained religious text.

The tablet is built up into the north wall of the Tōmb of Buhīlāl Shahīd, situated in the Tin Līndji or Chīpūḏ locality of the town.4 The Tōmb itself is a modern structure, being nothing more than a rectangular room, approximately 9 by 2.5 metres, and is situated just across the road, at the back of the mosque of the said locality. There is a loose tombstone lying in the Tōmb which is also included in the present study (No. XXIX, infra).

The headstone originally belonged to the grave of one Tājuʿdīn Iwāḏ son of 'Abdūl-'Āsīs Qazwīnī i.e. of Qazwīn, a famous town in Iran, who died on 7th Muḥarram 730 (31st December 1329). The deceased's name proper is written without any diacritical mark and was earlier read as Ghawdā meaning a 'diver' (the alif of the word ibn preceding it was taken to belong to that name). But since the names vogue at this period as a rule were double, comprising both the title and the name proper (e.g. K̄anā'udīn Salāṭīnān, Tājuʿudīn Muḥarrīmād, etc.), and also since the alif is written across the word ibn and after the word in question, the reading Iwāḏ is preferable. The deceased was an Iranian immigrant to or settler in Cambay.

The epitaph is calligraphed in the same Nashī style bearing a greater resemblance to Riqa'. It reads as under:

TEXT

Plate VI(a)

(a) Margin.

اَللّٰهُ لاَّ اللّٰهُ الاَّ هوَ الْحَيُّ الْقَيُومُ لاَ تَأْخُذُهُ شَيْئٌ وَ لاَ تَنْصَبُهُ شَيْئٌ مِّنَ الْأَرْضِ وَ لاَ يَمْنُونَهُ فِي الْزَّمْنِ مِّنَ الْعَيْنِ الْكِبْرِ ۚ يَمْتَسَّكُ بِالْأَرْضِ الْأَعْظَمَ [صَدِيقُ الْأَلْلٰهِ العَظِيمِ]

---

1 For translation, see p. 6.
2 For translation, see p. 10.
3 For translation, see pp. 10-11.
4 ARIE, 1959-60, No. 1, p. 107. It measures 37 cm. by 47 cm.
5 Ibid.
(b) *Horizontal panels.*

(1) [لا إله إلا الله إسحاق ورسول الله]

(2) يبشرهم برحمته منه وغفرانه وجنات لهم فيها نعيم قيم

(3) خالدين فيها إبداً إن الله عنده اجبر عظيم

(4) هذا قبر عبد العزيز طهري تغمده الله برحمته وغفرانه واباحه بجيوحة

(5) عبد العزيز طهري تغمده الله برحمته وغفرانه واباحه بجيوحة

(6) جناته توزع يوم الاثنين السابع شعبان سنة ثمانين وسبع مئة

**Translation**

(a) Qur’an, Chapter II, verses 255-56 (middle portion lost); this was probably followed by the phrase ‘Rightly says Allâh the Magnificent’.

(b) (1) First Creed.

(2-3) Qur’an, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.

(4) This is the grave of the creature taken into (Allâh’s) mercy and pardoned, Tâju’d-Dîn ‘Iwâq son of

(5) ‘Abdu’l-‘Azîz Qarwînî (i.e. of Qarwînî), may Allâh cover him with His mercy and pardon and settle him in the centre

(6) of His Paradise. He died on Monday, the seventh (of the) month of Muḥarram (of the) year (A.H.) thirty and seven hundred (7 Muḥarram 730–31 December 1329).

XIII. **EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 730 (1330 A.D.)**

This is also one of the epitaphs preserved in the Tomb of Parvâz Shahid, where its arch-shaped tablet, measuring 100 cm. from apex to bottom and 45 cm. in width is built up into the eastern wall, eighth from the right side.

In general design and arrangement this epitaph conforms to the ornate variety of the group dealt with in this article. From the text, it appears that it was originally set up on the grave of one Sirâju’d-Dîn ‘Umar son of Sa’dat-Tîfisi (in Georgia), who had died on Wednesday the 11th Sha‘bân 730 (30th May 1330). The deceased, thus, originally belonged to Tîfisi, that is to say modern Tbilisi—the capital of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic. It would be perfectly safe to presume that he was one of the foreign merchants stationed at Cambay.

---

1 For translation, see p. 10.
2 For translation, see p. 6.
3 For translation, see p. 12.
4 A.R.E., 1959-60, No. D, 127. It is the same as F.W.C., 1919-20, p. 50, No. 22, where it was stated to pertain to ‘Tajuddin ‘Umar bin Saiyad Assafînî (1)’, and the year of demise was quoted as A.H. 720.
The style of writing is Riqa'-like Nashī of the same variety as in other epitaphs under study, and the text has been read as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate VII(b)*

(a) *Arched margin.*

هو الله الذي لا إله إلا هو عالِم الغيب وشهادت هو الرحمن الرحيم هو الله الذي لا إله إلا هو الملك المقدِّس السلام العالم الهمين العزيز الجبار المتكلم

(b) *Outer margin, including arch-base.*

إٌن الله الذي لا إله إلا هو الحَي الْقَيْوم لا تأخذ سنة ولا نوم له ما في السماوات وما في الأرض من ذِئب الذي ينفخ عنده لا باذنه يعلَم ما بين أيديهم وما خلفهم ولا يحيطون بهُم من علمه إلا بما شاء] وَسَوِّى كُرْسِيَّهُ الْسَمَاتَ وَالْأَرْضَ وَلَا يُؤْفِكَ هَيَبَتُهُمْ وَهُوَ الْعَلِيمُ الْعَظِيمُ [Nachs. فِي الْقَيْمَةِ قَدْ تَبَينَ الرَّسُولُ مِن الْأَوْصَابِ وَكُلَّ مَا حَسِبْتُمْ وَهُوَ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ خَبِيرٌ

(c) *Vertical panels.*

و سبق الذين اتقوا ربهم إلى الجنة زمرا حتى إذا جاوها وفتحت أبوابها وقال لهم خواتمهم سلام عليهم طلَّبُوا فادخلوا خالدين وقلوا الحمد لله الذي صدقتنا وعدده وورثنا الأرض نتقبها من الجنة حيث نشأتم فنعم إجر العاملين وترْسِل الملاكاء هالبين من حول العرش يسبعون بعده دارهم وقضى بينهم بالحق وقيل الحمد لله رب العالمين

(d) *Horizontal panels.*

(١) لا إله إلا الله محمّد رسول الله
(٢) يسمِّي الرحمن الرحيم
(٣) يبشرهم برحمة منه ورضوان و
(٤) جنات لهم فيها نعيم مقيم خالدين فيها
(٥) ابداً أن الله علِمهم إجر عظيم
(٦) هذا قبر المعبد المرحوم المغرور سراج الدين
(٧) عمر ابن سعد التلفيسي تغمد الله برحمته وغفرانه واباحه بحبيعة
(٨) جالانه توني يوم الآريعا الحادي عشر من شهر شعبان سنة
(٩) ثلاثون وسبعاء وثمانية ومائتا وإمّا عمد وله أهمٍّين
SOME FOURTEENTH CENTURY EPITAPHS FROM CAMBAY IN GUJARĀT

TRANSLATION

(a) Qur'ān, Chapter LXI, verse 22 and part of verse 23.¹

(b) Ibid., Chapter II, verses 255-56.²

(c) Ibid., Chapter XXXIX, verses 73-75.³

(d) (1) First Creed.⁴

(2) Basmala.⁵

(3-5) Qur'ān, Chapter IX, verses 31-22.⁶

(6) This is the grave of the creature, taken into (Allāh's) mercy and pardon, ʿSirāj ud-Dīn

(7) ʿUmar son of Saʿd aʿl-Tīfīsī i.e. of Tīfīsī (modern Tbilisi), may Allāh cover him with His mercy and pardon and settle him in the centre of

(8) His Paradise. He died on Wednesday the eleventh of the month of Shābān (of the) year (A.H.)

(9) thirty and seven hundred (11 Shābān 731-30 May 1330). And Allāh's salutations be on Muhammad and his progeny, all of them.

XIV. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 731 (1330 A.D.)

This is a fragmentary tombstone built into the west wall of the mosque in the quarter of the town called Faraspur or Piraspur,⁷ which is locally believed to have been a corrupt form of Pirāzpūr or Pirāzpūr as called after either Pirāz Shāh of the Tughlaq dynasty, or after some local official or man of note. The mosque itself is a modern structure, and this as well as another epitaph, included in the present study (No. XXVII, infra) which is also built up into the same place, were apparently brought to this mosque to save them from disappearance or damage.

The arched portion of the tablet is lost. The writing is also badly affected by prolonged exposure to elements of nature, neglect over centuries and perhaps hand of vandal too. The result is that the letters are damaged in many places, particularly in the horizontal panels where the epitaph proper occurs. It is on this account that the name, the title and the nisba of the deceased as also the name of his father, etc., which are usually met with in such epitaphs are illegible. However, the name has been tentatively read as al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm while that of his grandfather as Mūsīlī. The deceased is stated to have departed from this world on the 5th Rabiʿ I 731 (17th December 1330).

This epigraph also does not seem to have come to the notice of the officers of the Archaeological Survey of India or any other agency earlier.

¹ For translation, see p. 20; the Qur'ānic verse is continued to two words further, meaning 'the Supreme, the Possessor of every greatness'.
² For translation, see p. 10.
³ For translation, see p. 20.
⁴ For translation, see p. 6.
⁵ For translation, see p. 8.
⁶ For translation, see p. 8.
⁷ For translation, see p. 12.
Its style of writing is Riqā’-like Naskh. Its text is quoted below:

**TEXT**

Plate VII(a)

(a) *Outer margin.*

لا اله الا هو الحي القيوم لا تأخذه سنة ولا نوم له ما في السمات وما في الأرض من ذى الثق..، بالطاغوت وجميع ما جاء بهن فقد استمك بالعواء الوطئي

لا انفاسم لها ولا سبب عليهم صدق الله

(8) *Vertical panels, right and left.*

شهد الله ان لا اله الا هو والملاكوت وولوا العلم قابلا بالقسط لا اله الا هو

المن بعد ما جاءهم العلم بنينهم و من يكثر بيازات الله فان الله سريع الحساب و ما محمد الا رسول الله

(c) *Horizontal panels.*

(1) لا اله الا هو محمد رسول الله

(2) بشرهم ربهم برحمة منه و رضوان و جنات لهم فيها

(3) نعيم مقيم خالدين فيها ابدا ان الله علمنه اجر عظيم

(4) هذا قبر العبد المرحوم المغفور الحاج ابراهيم(؟) بن

(5) صلح

(6) فجر منه يوم الاريحا خاص من ربيع الأول سنة احد ثلاثين و سبعميا

**TRANSLATION**

(a) Qur˒ân, Chapter II, verses 255-56 (middle portion lost), followed by the phrase ‘Rightly says Allah’.

(b) Qur˒ân, Chapter III, verses 17-18 (middle portion lost). ‘And Muḥammad is no more than a prophet’.

(c) (1) First Creed.

(2-3) Qur˒ân, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.

(4) This is the grave of the creature, taken into (Allah’s) mercy and pardoned al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm(?) son of

---

1 For translation, see p. 10.
2 For translation, see p. 6.
3 Qur˒ân, Chapter III, part of verse 143.
4 For translation, see p. 6.
5 For translation, see p. 12.
(a) Another epitaph dated A.H. 731 ( p. 31 )

(b) Third epitaph dated A.H. 731 ( p. 33 )

Scale: 0.22

Scale: 0.3
(5) Mustālīh .......... may Allāh cover him with His mercy

(6) and pardon. He died on Wednesday, the fifth of Rābī‘ul-Awwal (of the year) 1330 (A.H.) one and thirty and seven hundred (5 Rābī‘ I 731-17 December 1330).

XV. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 731 (1331 A.D.)

This tombstone is built up, fiftieth from left, into the west wall of the Tomb of Parvāz Shāhidī and measures 25 by 47 cm. The writing at the top in the arched margin is slightly damaged.

The epitaph was originally placed on the grave of a man well-versed in Islamic lore, for, the text calls him the greatest Imām Maulānā Muhammad son of Aḥmad al-Jauhar al-Fārsī (i.e. of Fārs or Iran proper), who died on Saturday, the 24th Rajab 731 (3rd May 1331). From the epithets used with his name, it would appear that the Maulānā was considered to be a man of learning and erudition and was respected as a great savant. His nisba indicates his Iranian origin if not birth. It would be futile, as usual, to expect any details about the Maulānā from any other source. As it is, the epigraph under study is the only document which has preserved even his name for posterity.

This epigraph was noticed in the Progress Report where the Maulānā’s name has been correctly read, but the date is stated to have been lost. This is rather inexplicable as the date is very much there and quite distinct too. The tablet is small and the design is also simple reflecting very probably, one is tempted to feel, the simplicity of the deceased’s life. The script is Riqā’-like Nashī and the text has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate VIII(a)

(a) Margin.

............................. جال[ه]هم العلم بغيا بينهم و من يكثر بآيات الله فان الله سريع الحساب [صدق الله]

(b) Horizontal panels.

(1) لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(2) بشرهم وبهم برحمه منه و رضوان و جنت لهم فيها

(3) تعبد مقيم هذ[ه] قبر العبد المرحوم العفاف الفقير الى الله

(4) تعالى مولانا امام الأعظم محمد ابن أحمد الجوهر الفارس تعمد الله برحمته و

(5) مغترانه توفي يوم السبت رابع و عشرين من شهر رجب سنة احد و ثلاثين و سبعماية

1 ARIE, 1955–57, No. D. 82, where it is wrongly stated to be in the west wall.
2 The present Fārs province of Iran with Shirāz as its capital.
3 PRWC, 1919-20, p. 49, No. 6.
TRANSLATION

(a) Qur‘ān, Chapter III, verses 17-18 (middle portion lost), followed by the phrase ‘Rightly says Allāh’.

(b) (1) First Creed. (2) Qur‘ān, Chapter IX, verse 21. This is the grave of the creature taken into (Allāh’s) mercy and pardoned, one who is supplicant of Allāh

(4) the Exalted, Maulānā (lit. our master), the greatest Imām Muḥammad son of Ahmad al-Jauhar (lit. related to or associated with Jauhar i.e. essence) al-Fārāi (lit. of Fāra i.e. Irān proper), may Allāh cover him with His mercy and

(5) pardon. He died on Saturday the twenty-fourth of the month of Rajab (of the) year (A.H.) one and thirty and seven hundred (24 Rajab 731=3 May1331).

XVI. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 731 (1331 A.D.)

This epitaph is almost of the same design as the preceding one, but is larger in size. It is also preserved in the Tomb of Parvāz Shāhīd where it may be seen built up, second from left, in the southern wall. The tablet, slightly damaged at the top, is arch-shaped, measuring 60 cm. in height and 36 cm. in width.

The epitaph states that the grave—for which it was obviously meant—contained the remains of one Zainu’d-Din ‘Ali son of Najib son of Ḥanīd al-Hanjūrī, who is stated to have expired on the 8th Dhu’l-Qa‘da 731 (14th August 1331). The nisba is indicative of the deceased’s foreign origin, but due to lack of reference books here at Nāgpur, it is not possible to locate the place to which he originally belonged. Zainu’d-Din ‘Ali was evidently one of the fraternity of foreign settlers in the town carrying on trade or following some similar vocation.

The epigraph was also noticed in the Progress Report where, the name of the deceased’s father and his nisba were wrongly read. According to this notice, the epitaph records the death of one ‘Zainudin ‘Ali bin Mujib bin Jahān-ul-Hanjawi’. The similarity between the place-name Hanjawiwin indicated by this wrongly read nisba and the name of the town Hanjwama or Hanjwama mentioned in two Sanskrit copper-plate grants of the Silhārā dynasty of Konkan gave rise to the speculation that the name mentioned in the Arabic inscription may be the same as Hamjwama. It was also suggested in the same notice that it may be from this Hanjawar or Hanjamān that Zainu’d-Din ‘Ali’s father may have migrated to Cawbāry.

In view of the fact that the place-name mentioned in the epigraph is clearly Hanjūr or Hanjwar, this identification loses whatever validity it might have had. I take the town to be positively non-Indian, though at the moment, for the reason stated above, I am unable to indicate its geographical position.

---

2 For translation, see p. 6.
3 For translation, see p. 6.
4 For translation, see p. 10.
5 ARIE, 1956-57, No. D, 73, where it is stated to be in the west wall.
7 This has been wrongly identified with modern Sanjār or the basis of the Pārisi legends (Epigraphia Indica, vol. XII, pp. 258 ff).
8 PrWC (1919-20), pp. 57-58.
9 For want of critical marks, its exact pronunciation cannot be determined. It could also be Hanjuar, Hanjwar, Hanjūr and Hanjawar, but it is obvious that it has nothing to do with Hanjawin or Hanjumān.
The style of writing is the usual Riqâ’-type Naskh. The text reads as under:

**TEXT**

Plate VIII(b)

(a) Margin.

(1) لا اله الا الله الا هو الحي القيوم لا تأخذ سنة ولا نوم له ما في السماوات وما في الأرض
(2) من ذي القدر يشع عنده الا باذنه يعلم ما بين أيدينهم [و ما] خلفهم و لا يحيطون بها من علمه
(3) الا بما شاءه وسع كرسي السماوات والأرض ولا يؤده حفظهما وهو العلي العظيم لا إكراه في
(4) الدين قد تبين الرشد من الظلم فمن يكفر بالطاعوت ويومن بإله فقد استمسك بالعروة الوثقى لا
(5) انفصام لها و الله سميع عليم

(b) Horizontal panels.

(1) لا اله الا الله الا هو الحي القيوم لا تأخذ سنة ولا نوم له ما في السماوات وما في الأرض
(2) [بسم] الله الرحمن الرحيم
(3) كل نفس ذائقة الموت ثم اينا ترجعون
(4) هذا القبر (كذا) العبد الضعيف المرحوم الحسن بن الدين علي
(5) بن نجيب بن حمدي الهنجوري فقر الله و لوالديه و لجميع
(6) المومنين والمؤمنات يوم القيامة نجاة في شهر
(7) 16 ذالقعد للإباده و ثمانية و سبع ماهيه

**TRANSLATION**

(a) Qur’â, Chapter II, verses 255-56.

(b) (1) First Creed.

(2) Basmala.

(3) 'Every soul must taste of death, then to Us you shall be brought back.'

(4) This is the grave of the weak creature, taken into (Allâh’s) mercy and pardoned, Zainu’d-Din ‘Ali

(5) son of Najib son of Ḥamid al-Hanjûrî, may Allâh forgive him, his parents and all the

---

1 For translation, see p. 10.
2 For translation, see p. 6.
3 For translation, see p. 8.
4 Qur’â, Chapter XXIX, verse 57.
(6) faithful men and women. (He died) on Wednesday, the eighth of the month of
(7) Dhūl-Qādā (of the) year (A.H.) one and thirty and seven hundred (8 Dhūl-Qādā 731 =
14 August 1331).

XVII. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 731 (1331 A.D.)

This arch-shaped tombstone, also from the Tomb of Parvâz Shahid, is built up, tenth from
right into the eastern wall and measures 1 metre from apex to bottom and 47 cm. in width.
It was intended for the grave of one Khwâja Shihâbu’d-Dîn Ahmad son of ‘Umar al-Humâni who
died on Sunday the 19th of Dhūl-Qâdâ 731 (24 August 1331).

From the text, it is difficult to say anything definite about the social or professional status
of the late Khwâja, but if the fact that in general design and execution, the epitaph belongs to
the ornate type, is any indication, the deceased was a man of standing. The sura ‘Khâja’
prefixed to his name may also be reasonably taken to indicate that Shihâbu’d-Dîn belonged to
the respectable class of traders. That he was also a foreigner is clear from his nisba, though for
want of reference books, its exact connotation cannot be determined.

The epigraph was also noticed in the Progress Report, where the nisba is doubtfully read
as Hašâni and the day as Saturday. 1

The script employed is the same stylish Kif’s-like Naḵḵ which while conforming in general
to the characteristics of most of the epitaphs of the town, is in particular akin to that of the previous
epitaph. The text has been deciphered as under:—

TEXT

Plate IX(1)  

(a) Arched margin.

هو الله الدّّلّ لا إله إلا هو عالم الغيب و الشهادة هو الرحمن الرحيم الملك الملک الدوّس

السلام علىهم

(b) Outer margin and arch-base.

وسيق الذين اتقو واذنهم إلى الجنة وزروا حتى أنّها جاها و فتحت أبوابها و قال لهم خزنتها

سلام عليكم طلبت فادخلوها خالدين و قلنا الحمد لله الذي صدقنا و إله وأورونا الأرض نفيما[1] من

الجنة حيث نشاء و نسرى العاملين و ترى الإملاءة حافين من حول العرش يسبحون بحمد ربهم

و قضى بينهم بالحق و في الحمد لله رب العالمين

(c) Vertical panels, left and right.

شهد الله إنه لا إله إلا هو و الملائكة و أولو[1] العلم قابلا بالطّلب لا إنه إلا هو العزيز

الحكيم ان الذين عند الله الإسلام و ما اختالف الذين أتوا الكتب الآن و ما دخلين و هم العلم

بنية بينهم و حاملي بآيات الله فإنه سريع الحساب

1 ARIE, 1939-40, No. D 129.
2 PBWC, 1919-20, p. 49, No. 2.
(d) Horizontal panels.

(1) لا الله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(2) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

(3) يبنههم زبنهم إبرحة منه و رضوان و جنت لهم فيها نعيم مقيم

(4) خالدين فيها ابدا ان الله عنده اجر عظيم

(5) هذا قبر العبد المرحوم المغفور النقيف إلى الله تعالى

(6) خواجه شهاب الدين احمد ابن عمر الهمامي تغده

(7) الله برحمته و غفرانه و إباحه بحبة جنانه فقد تتوفر

(8) يوم الآخر النافع عشر من ذي التموم سنة

(9) امتداد و ثلاثين و سبعماثان و صلى على محمد و الله

TRANSLATION

(a) Qur'an, Chapter LIX, verse 22 and part of verse 23.

(b) Qur'an, Chapter XXXIX, verses 73-75.

(c) Qur'an, Chapter III, verses 17-18.

(d) (1) First Creed.

(2) Basmala.

(3-4) Qur'an, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.

(5) This is the grave of the creature, taken into Allâh's mercy and pardoned, one who is dependent of Allâh,

(6) Khwâja Shhâbu'd-Din Aâhmad son of 'Umar al-Hurnâmi, may Allâh cover him

(7) with His mercy and pardon and settle him in the centre of His Paradise. He died

(8) on Sunday, the nineteenth of (the month of) Dhu'l-Qa'da (of the) year (A.H.)

(9) one and thirty and seven hundred (19 Dhu'l-Qa'da 731-24 August 1331). And may

(Allâh's) salutation be on Muhammâd and his progeny !

XVIII. EPITAPH DATED A.H. 732 (1331A.D.)

This is an historically important record which was set up to mark the last resting-place of a high official, about whom nothing is known from any other source. That the importance of

\[1\] For translation, see p. 20 (upto 'Granter of security' with some portion missing).

\[2\] For translation, see p. 25.

\[3\] For translation, see p. 6.

\[4\] For translation, see p. 6.

\[5\] For translation, see p. 6.

\[6\] For translation, see p. 6.
the record was not realised so far is not due to lack of the knowledge of its existence. As a matter of fact, it happens to be one of the tombstones listed in the Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey, but due perhaps to the incorrect decipherment of its text, the true identity of the deceased remained unestablished. The tombstone was described in the said report as that of Shamsuddin Mahmoud son of Jamal-ud-din Ahmd bin 'Umar al-maruf (?) ad-din. According to our reading, the text states that the grave contained the remains of the 'Prince among ministers and accomplished men' Shamsu'd-Din Mahmūd son of Jamāl-ud-Din Ahmād son of 'Umar, commonly known as the 'Dahir' i.e. Secretary. He is stated to have died on Friday, the 8th of Muharram 732 (11th October 1331).

The deceased thus held a fairly high official position in his lifetime. He worked, as the sobriquet 'Dahir' implies, in the epistolary department with the rank of minister. Whether he acted as Secretary at the Imperial court or in the provincial administration, it is neither clear from the text, nor is it possible to ascertain, but from the title 'prince of ministers' used for him, it may be inferred that he was an imperial officer. Again, it is difficult to say if he was posted at Cambay, the place of his burial and presumably that of his death too, or he had been here on a short visit. In any case, the inscription furnishes the information, not to be found elsewhere, about a Tughluqian official: that he is called prince among the ministers and accomplished men and a Secretary shows that he was not only adept in the art of belles lettres, but was also celebrated for learning. The text unfortunately offers no clue as to his nationality or place of origin. The absence of any nida should perhaps be reasonably taken to indicate his Indian stock.

The arch-shaped headstone bearing the record, which is built up, fifth from right, into the eastern wall of the Tomb of Parviz Shahid, is fragmentary: measuring in its present state 55 cm. by 65 cm., almost whole of the arched portion of the original tablet at the top is gone, and consequently, the texts contained in the arched margin and within the arch, if any, and greater portion of the Basmalah are lost. It is difficult to determine the cause of the damage, natural or otherwise, but it is almost perfectly arch-shaped even now. As was pointed out in the case of another tombstone from the same premises, published earlier, it is normally observed that when a tablet is broken by accident or through natural causes, it does not take arch shape, though the broken tablet may be so refashioned at the time of its letting up into the wall. But we have quite a few fragmentary tombstones which have not been so treated. Another possibility is that the reverse was used at one stage or the other for a fresh epitaph, for which the new arch-shape was given, but this cannot be ascertained unless the tablet is dislodged.

From the artistic point of view, the tablet is a little more ornate resembling somewhat in visual effect and design to the tombstone of another official of the time of Muhammad bin Tughluq Shih, namely Malik Parviz al-Kazari (pl. XI, infra). A thick panel of arabesque contrasts the horizontal panels with the margin enclosing them, and the text also has some variety—it contains a totally different set of Quranic text. The obituary also is differently worded: instead of the usual commencing phrase indicating the grave, it starts with a prayer invoking mercy and pardon for the deceased.

In the style of writing, too, there is a slight variety. While the bulk of the text is inscribed in the usual Riq' type Nasha, the Basmalah has been executed in artistic Kufi of the florid variety.

---

1 *PRWC*, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 17.
3 *ELAPS*, 1961, p. 23, l.n.4.
The text has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate IX (b)*

(a) *Vertical panels, right and left.*

قل اعوذ برب الناس ملك الناس آله الناس من شر الوسواس الخناس الذي يواسي في صدور الناس من الجنة و والناس - قل اعوذ برب الفلك من شر ما خلق و من شر غاصق إذا وتم و من شر الرفات في العقد و من شر حامد إذا حسد

(b) *Arch-base.*

(1) [اسم الله [ الرحمن الرحيم]]

(c) *Horizontal panels.*

الذين يؤمنون بالغيب و يقيمون الصلاة و ما رزقنهم ينفقون و الذين يؤمنون بما انزل الله و ما انزل من قبل و بالغيرة هم ينفقون (3) اولئك على هدى من رحم و اولئك هم الفائدون (4) الله يرحم بركة القران و اغفر بالرحمة و الرضوان (5) صاحب هذا الفير المرحوم المنفور هك الوزرا (6) و الفضلا شمس الدين عمود ابن جمال الدين احمد (7) ابن عمر المعروف بالديب توق يوم الجمعة (8) الثامن من شهر المحرم سنة اليث و ثلاثين و سبعاً

**TRANSLATION**

(a) ‘Say, I seek refuge in the Lord of men, the king of men, the God of men, from the evil of the whisperings of the slinking (devil), who whispers into the hearts of men, from among the jinn and the men.’"

‘Say : I seek refuge in the Lord of the dawn, from the evil of what He has created, and from the evil of the utterly dark night when it comes, and from the evil of those who cast (evil suggestions) in firm resolutions and from the evil of the envious when he envies.'

(b) *Basmala.*

1 Qur'an, Chapter CXIV.
2 Ibid., Chapter CXIII.
3 For translation, see p. 8.
(c) (1-4) “I am Allâh, the best Knower: This book, there is no doubt in it, is a guide to those who guard (against evil), those who believe in the unseen and keep up prayer and spend out of what we have given them; and who believe in that which has been revealed to you and that which was revealed before you, and they are sure of the hereafter. These are on the right course from their Lord, and these it is that shall be successful.”

(5) O Lord, have mercy through the blessings of the Qur’an on, and give pardon through (Thy) mercy and pleasure, to

(6) the occupant of this grave, the one taken into (Thy) mercy, the pardoned, Maliku’l-Wuzarâ

(7) wa’l-Fu’âlî (lit. prince among the ministers and accomplished men) Shamsu’d-Din Ma’hmûd son of Janâlû’d-Din Ahmad

(8) son of ‘Umar, commonly known as the Dabir (lit. Secretary). He died on Friday,

(9) the eighth of the month of Mu’harram, year (A.H.) two and thirty and seven hundred (8 Mu’harram 732-11 October 1331).

XIX. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 732 (1331 A.D.)

This headstone, fixed into the left mihrâb of the one-wall open mosque situated just outside the Tomb of Parvâz Shahid and to its south-east, is quite different in design from the preceding ones. Its small rectangular tablet, which is 25 cm. in width and 32 cm. in height, appears at first sight to be in tact, but the text in the margins comprising First Creed and a Quranic verse is incomplete and therefore, it is very likely that originally there was a little more portion at the top, which is now lost.

The epitaph suffers badly in comparison with its class, in visual effect. The penning is not bad, but the style of writing is plain or rather quite inartistic Naskh. Likewise, the composition of the Arabic text too is not happy.

The epitaph records the death of one Qâsim son of Isâ who died on one of the Fridays of the month of Mu’harram of the year 732—day of the month is not given (Mu’harram 732=October 1331).

The text reads as under:

TEXT

Plate X (a)

(a) Margin.

i. Right:

إشهد ان لا إله إلا الله

ii. Left:

الوجهه ثم علينا ترجعون

1 Qur’ân, Chapter II, verses 1-5.
2 ARIE, 1959-60, No. D, 133.
(b) *Horizontal panels.*

(1) بسم اللہ الرحمن الرحيم  
(2) كل نفس ذائقة الموت  
(3) ثم إلينا ترجعون  
(4) ذلك في التاريخ من شهر  
(5) المحرم يوم الجمعة سنة  
(6) سبعمائة و لثمن و الثا  
(7) قاسم ابن عيسى نور الله قبره

**TRANSLATION**

(a) i. 'I bear witness that there is no god but Allâh. .................. yak

ii. ' ...................... except His Face. Then to Us you shall be brought back. ' 6

(b) (1) *Basmâla.* 6

(2-3) 'Every soul must taste of death, then to Us you shall be brought back. ' 6

(4) This (was) on the date in the month of

(5) Muḥarram., Friday, year (A.H.)

(6) seven hundred and thirty and two (Muḥarram; 732-October 1331).

(7) Qâsin son of 'Īsâ, may Allâh illuminate his grave, (died).

**XX. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 734 (1333 A.D.)**

This is perhaps the most pleasing epitaphic headstone of the whole lot to look at. It is remarkable for its overall symmetry, pleasing shape of the arch, expressive penelling and artistic borders all round in geometric design. Also, it is one of the few epitaphs, if not the only one, of the present group that is *in situ.* The beautiful grave of nâng to which the headstone of the same material is attached is remarkable for its execution of artistic mouldings and penellings and lies in the centre of an imposing tomb jutting out from the middle of the southern wall of the stately Jâmi' Mosque of the town. The area in which the Tomb is situated stretches along the south side of the mosque and has an imposing entrance in the centre of the south face. The entire area measures about 62 by 55 metres. At the west is the mosque belonging to the tomb and as it stands to-day may be considered as a continuation of the Jâmi' Mosque through the parti-

---

1 This word is engraved in the left bottom corner panel of the margin.
2 Second Creed. The remaining part in its English translation would read: Who is one and has no partner and I bear witness that Muhammad is His creature and apostle.
3 Qur'ān, Chapter XXVIII, part of verse 88. The rendering phrase of this verse is: Everything will perish.
4 Ibid., Chapter XXIX, part of verse 57.
5 See translation, see p. 8.
6 Qur'ān, Chapter XXIX verse 87.
tion wall; the mosque and the Tomb were roofed but the rest of this court is open. Unfortunately, the large and striking dome with a diameter of 11.8 metres which was originally carried on tall pillars to cover the Tomb has fallen. Nevertheless, the Tomb is, like the Mosque, architecturally important in so much as it has preserved one of the few specimens of early tomb architecture in Gujarát, which provides a useful and instructive link for the proper study of the origin and development of pre-Mughal architecture of Gujarát. There is inside the enclosure another similarly executed fine, but smaller grave which also has an inscribed headstone of marble (No. XXVIII, infra).

This epitaph is inscribed on the headstone attached to the larger grave, which as stated earlier, belongs to the ornate variety of the tombstones and is characterised, apart from some distinguishing features referred to above, by some variety of religious text also. But in the style of writing, it more or less conforms to the prevalent design at Cambay except that, as in the case of the fragmentary epitaph of another state official, Shamsu’d-Din Muhammad the Secretary, studied above (No. XVIII, supra), the Basnala here is executed in florid Kufi script.

The record states that the grave belongs to the fortunate martyr, prince among the princes of the East and ministers, one who was wellknown in India as well as Arab countries, Zakiu’d-Daulat wad’-Din Umar son of Ahmad al-Kázárini entitled Parviz Malik, who expired on Wednesday, 9th Safar 734 (22nd October 1333).

The published text of the inscription prepared by the late E. Rehatsek from the facsimile supplied by James Burgess, on which subsequent notices of the epitaph are based, contains two serious errors: the word Sharq in the title Malik-i-Muluki’-sh-Sharq and the title Parviz Malik of the deceased have been wrongly read as Sarwar (translated as ‘prince’) and Zauru’-Malik.

It may be recalled here that until this epigraph was discussed by us, the identity of the Malik had not been established. Indian chronicles have totally ignored him like many others of his ilk. But fortunately, he has been mentioned by the celebrated fourteenth century Moroccan traveller Ibn Battûta who was in Cambay within a decade of Maliku’-sh-Sharq’s death. As usual Ibn Battûta furnishes information about him, which stands corroborated by the present record.

According to this, he was called Maliku’t-Tujjâr al-Kázáruni and was surnamed Parviz, Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq Shih had assigned to him the city of Cambay as an iqti and had promised him a charge of a vazirate; about this time, at the instance of the Maliku’t-Tujjâr, his friend and fellow-countryman Shihiu’d-Din al-Kázáruni came from Iran, equipped with presents for the Sultan (of which the details are given). When he arrived at Cambay, he found the Maliku’t-Tujjâr preparing to leave for Delhi with all the revenue collected from the territories under his charge together with presents. But on his way, he was killed by some mischievous persons at

---

1 For a detailed description, plan, illustration, etc., of the Tomb, see J. Burgess, On the Muhammadan Architecture of Bharat, Cambay, Deccan, Champaner, and Mahudabad in Gujarat (London, 1896), pp. 27-28, plates XVIII and XXI-XXIV. A detailed description of the Jam’i’ Mosque is also given there.
3 J. Burgess and H. Cousins, Revised List of Antiquarian Remains in the Bombay Presidency, etc. (Bombay, 1897), p. 320.
5 Dr. Mahdi Husain, The Rule of Ibn Battûta (Bordia, 1953), pp. 67-68, 173.
6 According to Ibn Battûta, ‘majority of its inhabitants (i.e. of Cambay) are foreign merchants, who continually build there beautiful houses and wonderful mosques—an achievement in which they endeavour to surpass each other’ (ibid., p. 172).
(a) Another epitaph dated A.H. 732 (p. 38)

(b) Epitaph dated A.H. 734 (p. 41)
the instigation of the prime-minister Khwāja Jahān who had great influence there, having administered the province including Cambay for quite some time and therefore having become jealous and worried because of the Sultan’s promise to raise the Malikū’-Tujjār to the vizierate.\footnote{For details, see Mahdi Husain, op. cit., pp. 67-68.}

Ibn Battūţa’s account thus authenticates the high sounding title Malik-i-Mulākī sh-Sharq wa’l-Wuzará and his title-name Malik Parviz employed in the text and also the manner of his death, that is, martyrdom. On the other hand, the epigraph furnishes some new information: for example it gives his full name and personal title, Zakiu’d-Din ‘Umar, his father’s name Aḥmad and quotes the exact day, date, month and year of his death. But neither Ibn Battūţa nor our record specifies the place of death, which was at some distance from Cambay. The house of the Malikū’-Tujjār, reckoned among the grand buildings of Cambay by Ibn Battūţa was, according to the same authority, adjacent to his mosque.\footnote{Ibid., p. 173.} This mosque must definitely be other than the Jami’ Mosque which was built, according to its inscription, about a decade earlier by (Malik) Daulatshah Muḥammad Būtaḥārī,\footnote{ELAPS, 1957 and 1958, pp. 29-30, pl. IX a.} but it could have been in the immediate neighbourhood, as the practice of selecting one’s own house or mosque for the last resting-place has been not so uncommon.

Incidentally, there are two more epigraphs at Cambay which mention al-Kāzarūnī; one is the epitaph of his wife Fāṭima who lies buried in the smaller grave in the tomb-enclosure (No. XXVIII, infra) and the other furnishes the information that a former slave of his, Khālis by name, had set up a marble prayer-niche of a mosque at Cambay itself in A.H. 726 (1326 A.D.).\footnote{ART, 1938-37, No. D, 52. Also PRCG, p. 57, where it was stated to purport the carving of the mihrāb by ‘Zaqindīn Ahmad Qazarnūnī’ himself, who is further described as ‘the greatest architect of Cambay’. Al-Kāzarūnī is also stated there to have built the Jami’ Mosque (cf. Burgess and Cousens, op. cit., p. 96) and been buried under the great dome of the principal gateway. All this is incorrect.}

The headstone is arch-shaped, measuring 145 cm. from apex to bottom and 70 cm. at the base. The letters are slightly affected by weather, but the text is perfectly legible.

TEXT

\textit{Plate X (b)}

(a) \textit{Margin.}

يس و القرآن الحكم إنك لمن المرسلين على طري مقيم تنزيل العزيز الرحمن لتنذر فوما
ما إنذر آباؤهم لهم غافلون ندن حق القول على أكثرهم فهم لا يؤمنون اننا جعلنا في أعقاهم
إغلالاً فسقى الي الأذان فهم متحون و جعلنا من بين إلزيمهم سداً و من خفيفهم مدا عظينهم
فهم لا يبعرون و سواء علىهم [ه] أذنتهم ثم لم تذروهم لا يؤمنون اننا جعلنا من اتبع الذكر و
خشى الرحمن بالغيب فيشر بنفقرة و اجر كريم انا نحن نحي الموتى و نكتب ما قدمو و
أنارهم و كل شي اصطنده في امام مبين و اضرب لهم مثل أصابا القرية اذ جاءه [ه] المرسلون
[إ]م رسلنا الذين فذبوهما منزنا بثالث
(b) In the arched portion.

(1) اشهد ان لا اله الا الله وحده لا شريك له و اشهد ان ع składa and رسله

(2) i. Inner margin, around (a).

(ii) الله ألا هو الاحي يقوم لا تأخذه سنة و لا نوم له ما في السموت و ما في

الارض من ذي الدي يشع عندنا يباعذه يعلم ما بين ادبيهم و ما خالفهم و لا يحيطون بشئ من

عمله الا بما نشاء ماعظم السمات و الأرض و لا يوجد حظهما و هو العل العظيم

ii. Arch-base.

(3) هذا ما وعد الرحمن و صدق العلمن و اننا الله و اننا الله و اجعون

(d) Vertical panels, right and left.

(4) شهد الله انه لا اله الا هو و الملائكة و اوالوا العالم قاببا بالشفط لا اله الا هو العزيز

الحكيم ان الدين عند الله الاسلام و ما اختلف الذين اوتوا الكتاب الا من بعد ما جاءهم

علم بيهم و من يبكر بقات الله فان الله سرع الحساب

(5) Horizontal panels.

(6) يسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

(7) ولا يحسبن الذين قتلوا في سبيل الله وانها لن انهايهم

(8) يرزقون فرحين بما آتتهم الله من فضله و يستبشرون بالذين لم يلعنوا

(9) بهم من خلفهم الا خوف عليهم و لاهم يحزنون يستبشرون

(10) بنعمة الله و فضل الله ان الله لا يضيع اجر المومنين

(11) هذا قبر العبد الشهيد الشيخ المرحوم المفتي

(12) ملوك الشرق و الوزروا مشهور العرب و العجم زكي الدولة

(13) و الذين عمر ابن أحمد الكازرون المحاطب رويز ملك تعمده الله تعالى

(14) بالرحمة والسغور وسكنه في دار الجنة المثوى الراحمة

(15) الله تعالى في يوم الاربعاء التاسع من صفر سنة اربع و ثلاثين و سبعماية

TRANSLATION

(a) 'O man! Consider the Qur'an full of Wisdom; Most surely you are one of the apostles,
on a right way. A revelation of the Mighty, the Merciful. That you may warn a people whose
fathers were not warned, so they are heedless. Certainly the word has proved true of most of them,
so they do not believe. Surely We have placed chains on their necks, and these reach upto their
chains, so they have their heads raised aloft. And We have made before them a barrier and a barrier behind them, then We have covered them over so that they do not see. And it is alike to them whether you warn them or warn them not; they do not believe. You can only warn him who follows the reminder and fears the Beneficent God in secret; so announce to him forgiveness and an honorable reward. Surely We give life to the dead, and We write down that they have sent before and their footprints, and We have recorded everything in a clear writing. And set out to them a parable of the people of the town, when the messengers came to it. When We sent to them two, they rejected both of them, then We strengthened (them) with a third.  

(b) Second Creed.

(c) i. Qurʾān, Chapt. II, verse 255.

ii. 'This is what the Beneficent God promised and the apostles told the truth.'  
      'Surely we are Allah's and to Him, we shall surely return.'

(d) Qurʾān, Chapter III, verses 17-18.

(e) (1) Basmala.

(2-5) 'And reckon not those who are killed in Allah's way as dead; nay, they are alive (and) are provided sustenance from their Lord; rejoicing in what Allah has given them out of His grace, and they rejoice for the sake of those who (being left) behind them, have not yet joined them, that they shall have no fear, nor shall they grieve. They rejoice on account of favour from Allah and (His) grace, and that Allah will not waste the reward of the believers.'

(6) This is the grave of the weak creature, the fortunate, the martyr, the one taken into Allah's mercy, the pardoned, Malik-i-

(7) Mulḵiʿī Shārqi waʿl-Wuzarā (lit. the prince among the princes of the East) and ministers) one who is celebrated in Arabia and other Islamic countries, Zakī'ul-Daulat

(8) waʿd-Din (lit. one who is just in the matters of State and Religion), ʿUmar son of ʿAbd ʿAl-Rahman al-Kāzarūnī entitled Parviz Malik, may the Exalted Allah cover him

(9) with (His) mercy and pardon and settle him in the abode of Paradise, one who returned to the mercy

(10) of the Exalted Allah, on Wednesday, the ninth of (the month of) Ẓafar (of the year (A.H.) four and thirty and seven hundred (9 Ẓafar 734=22 October 1333).

XXI. ANOTHER EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 734 (1333 A.D.)

This fragmentary headstone is preserved in the Tomb of Parviz Shahid, where it is built up, third from left, in the west wall.  

10 Its top portion which was presumably arch-shaped, is gone. In its present state, it measures 40 by 50 cm.
The epitaph was originally set up on the grave of another member of the 'Alamgar family already referred to above (No. VII, supra). He is Hasan son of Abū Bakr 'Alamgar (lit. lance or standard-maker), who is stated to have expired on Friday, 19th Rabi' I 734 (5th December 1333).\(^1\) Except for this, no other information is available about him.

The style of writing is the Rqä’-type Ṭabākh characteristic of Cambay epitaphs, and so is the general design, but of the less ornate variety. The text reads as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XI (a)*

(a) *Margin.*

لا الله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

يهم بروحمة منه و رضوان و جنت لهم فيها نعيم

مقيم خالدين فيها إبدا أن الله علّه إجر عظيم

هذا قبر العبده المرحوم المغفور الفجر إلى الله تعالى

حسن بن أبي بكر علمبير تغعم الله برحمته و غفرانه و إياه

سبحها جناته تؤوي يوم الجهيم السالم و عشرين من شهر ربيع الأول سنة أو

بعة و ثلثون و سبعاء و صلى الله عليه و عليه آله

**TRANSLATION**

(a) *Qur'ān,* Chapter II, verse 255 (middle portion lost).\(^2\) 'And Muhammad is no more than an apostle'.\(^3\) 'This day; Allah may forgive you, and He is the most merciful of the merciful'.\(^4\)

(b) (1) *First Creed.*

(2-3) *Qur'ān,* Chapter IX, verses 21-23.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) According to epheemeries, this day was Wednesday.

\(^2\) For translation, see p. 10.

\(^3\) *Qur'ān,* Chapter III, part of verse 143.

\(^4\) *Ibid.,* Chapter XII, part of verse 92.

\(^5\) For translation, see p. 6.

\(^6\) For translation, see p. 12.
SOME FOURTEENTH CENTURY EPITAPHS FROM CAMBAY IN GUJRAT

(4) This is the grave of the creature taken into (Allah's) mercy (and) pardoned, the dependent on the Exalted Allah,

(5) Hassan son of Abū Bakr 'Alamgar (lit. Lance- or Banner-maker), may Allah cover him with His mercy and pardon and settle him

(6) in the centre of His Paradise. He died on Friday, the twentyninth of the month of Rabī'ul-Awwal, four

(7) and thirty and seven hundred (29 Rabī' I 734=8 December 1333). And Allah's salutations be upon Muhammad and his progeny.

XXII. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 736 (1335 A.D.)

This headstone too is fixed up next to the previous one, that is fourth from left, into the west wall of the Tomb of Parviz Shahid, and is, like it, fragmentary. But its top has been shaped to a flattish arch design almost in the same way as another fragmentary epitaph in the east wall published some time back. In view of this and a couple of other fragmentary epitaphs in the present group (Nos. XVIII, XIX, etc.), it would appear that the slabs were so shaped at the time of letting them up into the wall and there may not have been any subsequent epitaph engraved on the reverse as was suggested earlier.

The slab measures, in its present state, 45 cm. from apex to bottom and 29 cm. in width and was meant to serve as the headstone for the grave of Kamāl al-Dīn Kamāl son of Ḥusain al-Bāṣrī (i.e. of Bāstā) who died on Thursday, 2nd Safar 736 (21st September 1333). The deceased seems to have died quite young, as apart from the size of the tablet, the text calls him 'the dear son', which could be further taken to indicate that the text of the epitaph was dictated by his bereaved father. From his nisba, the father of the deceased, Ḥusain, appears to be an Iraqi merchant settled or at least carrying on some business at Cambay.

The writing is executed in the usual Risā type Naskh. The tablet having been exposed to elements of nature before its removal to the present place, the writing is slightly damaged in the margin, but the extant text is quite legible.

The text has been read as follows:

TEXT

Plate XI (b)

(a) Margin, right and left.

شهد الله انه لا لله إلا هو والملائكة وأولوا العلم فانيا بالفسط لا لله إلا هو العزيز

الحكيم ان الذين عند الله الإسلام وما اختلف الذين اوتوا الكتاب إلا من بعد ما جاءتهم العلم...

................................

1 ARIE, 1956-57, No. D, 78, where it is stated to be in the southern wall.
2 ELAPS, 1962, p. 23.
3 Ibid., f.n.4.
4 A famous port-town in Iraq.
5 This epitaph also was noticed in PRWC, 1919-20, p. 49, No. 7, where his name proper was omitted.
(b) **Horizontal panels.**

(1) لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله
(2) يبشرهم برحمته منه و رضوان
(3) و جنات لهم فيها نعيم مقيم
(4) هذا قبر الولد العزيز
(5) كمال الدين كمال بن حسن البصري
(6) توفي يوم الخميس الثاني من شهر
(7) صفر سنه ستة وت ثمانين و سبع عشية

**TRANSLATION**

(a) Qur'ān, Chapter III, verse 17 and part of verse 18 (upto knowledge).  
(b) (1) First Creed.  

(2) Qur'ān, Chapter IX, verse 21.  
(3) This is the grave of the dear son
(4) Kamāłu’d-Dīn Kamāl son of Ḥusain al-Baṣrī (i.e. of Baṣrā).
(5) He died on Thursday the 2nd of the month of
(6) 8 Safar (of the) months of the year (A.H.) six and thirty and seven hundred (2 8 Safar 736=21 September 1335).

**XXIII. ANOTHER EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 736 (1336 A.D.)**

The man on whose grave this epitaph was originally set up has been mentioned above as a member of the Irbilī family (p. 13, supra). The epitaphic tablet is also preserved in the Tomb of Parvāz Shahid, where it may be seen, second from right, into the eastern wall.

The design of the epitaph is of the simple variety, but the calligraphy is of a high order. The style of writing is the usual Riqā'-like Nasḵ. The writing is damaged due to adverse effects of weather to which the tablet seems to have remained exposed before its removal to the present premises; the writing in the bottom of the left marginal panel is almost obliterated.

According to the text, the tombstone marked the grave of Shamsu’d-Dīn Muḥammad son of Abū Bakr Irbilī (i.e. Irbilī), alias Fatūliya who died on the 25th Dhū’l-Qa’da 736 (5th July 1336). In the Progress Report where it was first noticed, the nisba has been recorded as Aḍbaḥ instead of Irbilī and the unit of the year of death is not given.
(a) Another epitaph dated A.H. 734 (p. 44)

(b) Epitaph dated A.H. 736 (p. 45)
(a) Another epitaph dated A.H. 736 (p. 47)

(b) Epitaph dated A.H. 738 (p. 48)

Scale: 0.17

Scale: 0.22
It has been pointed out elsewhere, on the basis of another epitaph from Cambay, that the *alīa Fatoliya* does not appear to have been the nickname of the deceased or of any other individual but was very probably the cognomen by which the family was known. This nickname is clear in the present epigraph and, as has been suggested earlier, appears to be a Gujarātī word, derived from *Fatool* meaning 'soft', etc. in relation to betelnuts. That the deceased, another foreigner settled at Cambay, was a merchant can be safely presumed.

The arch-shaped tablet measuring 60 cm. from apex to bottom and 28 cm. in height contains the following text. It is somewhat unusual that there is a grammatical mistake in the text—in the very beginning of the epitaph proper after the Quranic verse in the fourth horizontal panel.

**TEXT**

*Plate XII (a)*

(a) *Margin.*

اللهُ لاَ إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ لاَ تَعَالَى الْيَوْمُ وَلاَ تَمْوتُ نَقُولُ لَهُ مَا فِى السَّمَوَاتِ وَمَا فِى الْأَرْضِ

من ذَٰلِكَ يَنْفَعُ شَيْءًا إِلَّا بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَنَا وَإِنَّ عِلْمَنَا هُوَ الْعَلِيمُ

(b) *Horizontal panels.*

(۱) لاَ إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ نَصَادِقُ

(۲) بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

(۳) كَلِّٰٓ نَفْسٍ ذَا ذِيَ لَهُ الْمَوتُ

(۴) الأَيِّانَ تُرْجِعُونَ هَذَا الْقُرْآنَ

(۵) شَهِمُ الْقَلْبِ مَعَ الْمَوْتِ

(۶) اَّمَّا اَلْيَوْمَ فَلَنْ نَأْفَكُ إِلَّا هُنَّ

(۷) نَازِعُ الْخَيْبَةَ وَالْعَشْرِينَ ذَٰلِكَ الْعَلِيمُ الْحَكِيمُ

**TRANSLATION**

(a) Qurʾān, Chapter II, verses 255.
(b) (1) First Creed.
(2) Basmala.

(3-4) 'Every soul must taste of death, then to us you shall be brought back.' This is the grave of the [creature ?]

---

1 EIAFS, 1961, pp. 22-23.
2 Ibid., p. 23.
3 For translation, see p. 9.
4 For translation, see p. 6.
5 For translation, see p. 8.
6 Qurʾān, Chapter XXIX, verse 97.
(5) Shamsu'd-Din Muḥammad son of the one who is received into (Allāh's) mercy namely Abū Bakr.

(6) Irbīlī (i.e. of Irbit), alias Fārolīya, may Allāh pardon him. (He died) on

(7) the date twentyfifth (of the month of) Dhu‘l-Qa‘da (of the) year (A.H.) six and thirty
and seven hundred (25 Dhu‘l-Qa‘da 736–5 July 1336).

XXIV. EPIGRAPHIA DATED A.H. 738 (1337 A.D.)

The headstone bearing this epitaph is attached to the grave of a lady, locally called Bibi Rānī at Nagārā, a small village situated at a distance of about 5 kilometres to the north of Cambay, representing the site of ancient Cambay. The Tomb of Bibi Rānī, which I visited in 1959 is an ordinary hut-like modern structure, but the finely carved marble sarcophagus is original and resembles those of Malik u’sh-Sharq ‘Umar al-Kāzarūnī and his wife, mentioned above. The design of the epitaph, however, though pleasing, is devoid of artistic decorations.

According to the text, the grave belongs to a lady named Fāţima daughter of the late Sayyid Tājū‘d-Dīn Ḥusain al-‘Alavī, who died on Monday, 4th Ṣafar 738 (1st September 1337). Nothing is known about the lady or her father from any source. That she hailed from a respectable family of ‘Alavī Sayyids is clear from the honorific ‘Sayyid’ and niṣba ‘Alavī appended to the name of the father. The text is silent on the married status of the deceased which is unusual: Could the absence of the husband’s name be taken to mean that she died a virgin or was a divorcee at the time of death?

There is some variation in the religious text. The epitaph is engraved on an arch-shaped tablet measuring 82 cm. from apex to bottom and 45 cm. in width. The reverse of the upper part of the tablet is inscribed with Quranic text, and so is the eastern side of the sarcophagus itself. The style of writing is in the main the usually fine Riqa’-like Naskh, while the Basmala is executed in ornamental Kufi.

The text has been read as follows:—

TEXT

Plate XII(b)

(a) Margin.

آمن الرسول بما أنزل من ربه و المومنون كل آمن بعثت و ملاكك و كنبه و رسله
لا تفرق بين أحد من رسول و قالوا سمعنا و طعنا غفرانك ربنا و إليك المصير لا يكلف الله نفسا
الو سمعها لها ما كسبت و عليها ما أكتسبت ربنا لا تواخذنا أن نسنا أو أخطأنا ونا و لا

1 ARIE, 1959-60, No. D, 136. It was first noticed in PBWC, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 35.
2 For a brief account of Nagara and its remains, please see Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. VI (Bombay, 1880), and Basnani Rao Jofa op. cit., pp. 148-50. However, no mention of the Tomb or the epitaph is found in either of these or Burgess, op. cit. or Burgess and Consens, op. cit.
3 The term Sayyid seems to have been used here in the Indian sense of the term indicating descent from Prophet Muḥammad through his daughter Fāţima, wife of ‘Ali. Incidentally, the term ‘Alavī is also usually applied to ‘Ali’s progeny from wives other than Fāţima.
4 ARIE, 1959-60, No. D, 137.
5 Ibid., No. D, 133.
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(a) The apostle believes in what has been revealed to him from his Lord, and (so do) the believers; they all believe in Allāh and His angels and His books and His apostles: We make no difference between any of His apostles and they say: We hear and obey, our Lord. Thy forgiveness (do we crave), and to Thee is the eventual course.

Allāh does not impose upon any soul a duty but to the extent of its ability; for it is (the benefit of) what it has earned, and upon it (the evil of) what it has wrought: our Lord! Do not punish us if we forget or make a mistake; our Lord! Do not lay on us a burden as thou didst lay on those before us; our Lord! Do not impose upon us that which we have not the strength to
bear; and pardon us and grant us protection and have mercy on us; Thou art our Patron, so help us against the unbelieving people.'

(b) Qur'ān, Chapter II, verses 255-56.

c (1) First Creed.

d (1) Basmala.

(2) 'Every soul shall taste of death, and you shall only be paid fully your reward on the resurrection day; then whoever is removed far away from the fire and is made to enter the garden,

(4) he indeed has attained the object, and the life of this world is nothing but a provision of vanities.'

(5) This is the grave of the lady received into (Allāh's) mercy (and) the pardoned one Fatīma daughter of the one who is taken into (Allāh's) mercy (and) the pardoned one Sayyid Tāju'd-Din (lit. the crown of Faith) Ḥusain al-'Alavi (i.e. descended from 'Ali the fourth caliph), may Allāh cover her with His mercy and pleasure

(7) and may Allāh pardon her and her parents and all the Faithful men and women.

(8) She died on Monday the fourth of (the month of) Ṣafar, may Allāh end (it)

(9) with goodness and victory, (of the) year (A.H.) eight and thirty and seven hundred (4 Ṣafar 738=1 September 1337).

XXV. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 741 (1340)

This otherwise finely executed epitaph, noticed here for the first time, is fragmentary though at first glance it looks complete. The slab seems to have broken in such a way that its middle portion was lost, and its upper and lower portions were properly edged and put together at the time of their being built up into the wall in such a way that the tablet appears to be whole, but the lack of continuity of the religious texts and the absence of the usual initial phrases of the obituary notice clearly shows that the middle portion is missing.

The arch-shaped tablet is built up at the northern end of the eastern wall of the Tomb of Parwān Shahid. Apart from being fragmentary, the writing is considerably damaged, rendering the decipherment of the epitaph proper extremely difficult. As a result of all these, it could only be deciphered tentatively and the details about the deceased could not be made out except the date of death. According to this tentative reading, the deceased was a lady and her father was a big merchant named Sa'd, who from his name appears to be a foreign immigrant. Beyond this nothing can be made out.

The off-quote Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey does not mention this record, which is perhaps due to the damaged nature of the epigraph.

---

1 Qur'ān, Chapter II, verses 255-86.
2 For translation, see p. 10.
3 For translation, see p. 8.
4 For translation, see p. 8.
5 Qur'ān, Chapter III, verse 184.
6 ARIE, 1936-37, No. D, 80, where it is stated to be in the southern wall
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The style of writing is the same Riq'ī-like Naskh and the tablet measures 45 cm at the base and 50 cm from apex to bottom.

The text has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate XIII(a)

(a) Outer margin. ¹

(2) He who sees You when He is not 
with him, he never sees You again.

(b) Within the arch.

لا لله إلا الله

(c) In the border, below (a), right and left sides.

الملك الله

(d) Vertical panels.

شهد الله انه لا لله الا هو و الملائكة[ة]...العلم بينهم و من

بكرى بيات الله فان الله سريع الحساب

(e) Horizontal panels.

(1) ...Bint Amer Eljaar Sade (؟) تقدمها الله بالرحمة و الرضوان
(2) و اسكنها في دار الجنة تكون ليلة الأربعة السابع
(3) عشرين من المحرم سنة احدى و اربعين و سبع مه و سلم تسلمها

TRANSLATION

(a) Qur'ān, Chapter II, verse 255 (middle portion lost).²

(b) 'There is no god but Allāh'.

(c) The kingdom belongs only to Allāh. The glory belongs only to Allāh.

(d) Qur'ān, Chapter III, verses 17 and 18 (middle portion lost).³

(e) (1) ...daughter of the prince among merchants Sa'd(؟), may Allāh cover her with (Him) mercy and pleasure

(2) and settle her in the abode of Paradise. She died on the night of Wednesday, the seventh

¹ Only the writing in the margin of the arched portion has survived.
² For translation, see p. 16.
³ For translation, see p. 6.
This tombstone built up, first from left, into the west wall of the Tomb of Parvaz Shahid,¹ is one of the few records noticed earlier in the above-mentioned Progress Report with contents.² It belongs, in general design and execution, to the simple one-border type of Cambridge tombstones and must have been originally fixed at the grave of a lady (Sitti) named Sharaf, daughter of Kamalu’d-Din Muhammad son of 'Abdu’l-Baqi son of 'Amir son of Tarhan Anshari, who expired on the 13th Jumada II 746 (11 October 1345). The notice in the said Progress Report, quoting the genealogy of the deceased, a lady, viz. ‘Musammat Sharaf Sati (?), daughter of Najmu’d-Din Muhammad son of ‘Abdu’l-Jabbar son of Amir son of Tarkhan’, is incorrect and confusing. Particularly, the wrong reading of the name Tarkhan gave rise to the following misleading comment: The record contains the earliest reference to the class of Tarkhan clan of Khurasan who later on founded a kingdom for themselves in Sindh, after the decline of the Musalman-Rajput Sarnas in the 16th century A.D.³ But this is not true. The name in question is Tarhan, which and the name of his son ‘Amir and the nisba Anshari⁴ are sufficient indications of their Arab descent. Therefore, it would be wrong to see any earliest reference in this record to the Tarkhan clan.

The epitaph thus belonged to a foreign settler, but it unfortunately does not give any details about the deceased or her husband, if any.⁵ The record speaks of her as a devout and respected lady.

The headstone is as usual arch-shaped and measures 55 cm. from apex to bottom and 35 cm. in width. The text is inscribed in Riq’i-type Naskh but has sharp pointed final bā, which makes it more artistic.

TEXT

Plate XIII(b)

(a) Margin.

الله لا اله الا هو الحي القيوم لا تأخذ سنة ولا نوم له ما في السموات وما في الأرض
من ذي الذي يشفع عنه إلا باذنه يعلم ما بين ايديهم وما خلقهم ولا يحيطون بشيء من علمه
لابعاشاء ومع كرسيه السموات والأرض ولا يوجد حفظه وهو العلي العظيم

¹ ARRI, 1956-57, No. D. 74.
² PRWC, 1919-20, p. 49, No. 9.
³ Ibid., p. 58.
⁴ The Ansārīs are descendants of Ansārīs (lit. helpers)—those residents of Medina, who, after embracing Islam played host to and helped Prophet Muhammad and his companions when the latter migrated there in 622.
⁵ In this context, see p. 48.
(b) Horizontal panels.

(2) Walna la ilaha illa illa Allah. Wala bi'dina wa'bta lam na'lata rukhda.
(3) Ak8 at-tawabah - hasa qabir ar-rumohum al-motumah
(4) Al-mostur al-mahfazat al-salatina al-hakima min a'zab riba [kada] ar-rajai
(5) Al-humaymah al-taymah mina shirha bi'dina [al-dini] taba
(6) Abu al-baqi al-unlu bi'dina ta'zir al-jama', taba Allah Thara'a wa gham al-janna
(7) Mu'awwa ta'lilat fi layla al-shithan al-thalathn ash-sha'raa min jumada 'l-akhir wa ra'een wa sibmaa.

TRANSLATION

(a) Qur'an, Chapter II, verse 255.1

(b) (1) 'Kingdom belongs to Allah.' Basmala.2 'And to Him is due Praise.'
(2) 'Our Lord! make not our hearts to deviate after Thou hast guided us aright, and grant us from Thee mercy;
(3) surely, Thou are the most liberal Giver.' 3 This is the grave of the one who is taken into (Allah's) mercy, the respected,
(4) the veiled, the fasting, the pious, the one who always feared the punishment of her Lord, the hopeful
(5) of the mercy of the exalted Allah, named Sitti4 Sharaf daughter of Kamal(u'd-) Din Muhammad son of
(6) Abdul-Baqi son of 'Amir son of Tarafan Ansari, may Allah render her earthly abode (lit. earth) pleasant and make Paradise
(7) her abode. She died on the night of Monday, the thirteenth of (the month of) Jumada al-Akbar (of the) year (A.H.) six and forty and seven hundred, (13th Jumada II 746 = 11 October 1315).

XXVII. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 778 (1376 A.D.)

The next epitaph, interesting in its own way, is dated A.H. 778, that is after a gap of more than four lunar decades. The tombstone is built up into the west wall of the Farspur or Piraspur-ki-Masjid,2 whence also came the epitaph noticed above (No. XIV, supra), and like it, the present epigraph is noticed here for the first time.

---

1 For translation, see p. 10.
2 For translation, see p. 8.
3 Qur'an, Chapter III, verse 7.
4 The Arabic term Sitti is a term of respect and is roughly equivalent to 'Lady' in English.
5 AIF, 1959-60, No. D, 100.
The first thing that strikes the onlooker about the record is its shape and design, which are entirely different. It is neither arch-shaped nor arranged in elaborate panelled design like most of its counterparts in the present group. Likewise, the style of writing is also somewhat different, being Thulth with strong Riqâ’ flourishing.

As to the contents, it is more or less on the same pattern——Qur’anic text, though limited, and the obituary proper.

The epitaph was set up to mark the grave of Jamîlû’d-Dîn Hâji Muhammad son of ‘Abdu’llâh, popularly known as Kûkband, who is stated to have expired on Friday, 3rd Jumâdâ al-‘Âkhar 778 (18th October 1376). The text calls him ‘the great Shaikh, the devout, the righteous and the religious’, which indicates that he was a saintly person. The exact connotation of his alias ‘Kûkband’ which appears to be a Persian term is not clear, but that may have been either his popular epithet or professional name. The appendage Hâji shows that he had performed the prescribed visit to the Holy Ka’ba at Mecca and presumably Medina too. The text offers no clue as to the country of his origin.

The style of writing of this epigraph may be described as Thulth with very strong Riqâ’ features. The tablet is squarish measuring 40 by 50 cm. and contains the following text:—

TEXT

Plate XIV(a)

(1) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
(2) شهد الله إنه لا إله إلا هو و الامبرهة و اولوا العلم
(3) قابتا بالقسط لا إله إلا هو العزيز الحكيم إن الدين عند
(4) الله الإسلام كل من عليها فانو يبتين وجهة ربك ذو
(5) الجلال و الإكرام من ترية الشيخ الأجل العاد العبد المتقين المتدين
(6) جمال الدين حاجي محمد بن عبد الله عرف كوكبند رحمه الله ورحمة
(7) وامام و غفروه منغفرة جامعة توق إلى وحة الله الفخور في يوم الجمعه ناث
(8) من شهر جمادى الآخرة سنة ثمان و سبعين و سبعما من الهجرة النبوية عليه السلام

TRANSLATION

(1) Basmala.

(2-5) Qur’ân, Chapter III, verses 17-18. Chapter XL, verses 26-27. This is the grave of the great Shaikh, the devout, the righteous, the religious.

---

1 This term literally meaning ‘old’ or ‘aged’ is also applied to persons of great eminence, particularly in the field of learning or sahih.
2 It may be pointed out that not in all cases, particularly of Nasâ’î and Thulth, the epigraphical specimens conform to the laid down rules.
3 For translation, see p. 8.
4 For translation, see p. 6.
5 For translation, see p. 6.
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(6) Jamālū’d-Dīn Ḥājjī Muḥammad son of 'Abdāl’llāh popularly known as Kākband, may Allāh be merciful to him with (His) mercy.

(7) unbounded and pardon him with His overwhelming pardon. He was taken into the mercy of the Pardoning Allāh on Friday, the third.

(8) of the month of Jumādā al-Ākhār (of the ) year eight and seventy and seven hundred from the Migration of the Prophet, may (Allāh’s) peace be upon him (3 Jumādā II 773-18 October 1376).

XXVIII. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 783 (1382 A.D.)

This epitaph stands at the head of the smaller grave in the Tomb of Malikūsh Shārīq ‘Umar al-Kāzarūnī, already referred to above (p. 40). The grave enshrines the remains of al-Kāzarūnī’s wife and is of the same ornateness as that of the husband.

The tablet was originally arch-shaped, but the top portion having been lost through damage, it has been restored with cement-plaster. Roughly rectangular, it measures 42 cm. by 74 cm. and though simple and not so highly ornate in design as the other headstones, it is quite pleasing; particularly its horizontal panels are made more artistic by dividing every alternate panel into three parts, the side ones having been filled with geometrical and floral designs and the middle ones with text which states that the grave belongs to Bibi Fūṭima daughter of the late Khwāja Husain of Gilān and wife of Zakiū’d-Dīn ‘Umar al-Kāzarūnī, who died on the 20th Shawwāl 783 (7th January 1382).

The chief importance of the epigraph lies in the fact that it provides the name of the wife of a prominent person of his age and that of her father and her land of origin, a piece of information not available from any source. Her father too would appear, like her husband, to be a merchant of Iranian origin, hailing from Gilān.

The calligraphy of the record is quite good, but not as good as that of the epitaph of her husband. The script is Rā’s-dark Naskh except for the Basmala which is executed in ornamental Kufi of quite a pleasing type. There is also in the text a minor grammatical error which is rather unusual.

An incomplete and incorrect reading of this epigraph too, made by Professor E. Rehatsek was published by Burgess and Cousens in their List. The deceased, for example, is stated therein to have been ‘crown of treasures’ and one ‘who had performed the pilgrimage to Karbala’.

The epitaph reads as under:

TEXT

Plate XIV(b)

(a) Margin.

Innā lillāh wa innā ilaihi rā'imūn. dāʿiham inna wāli ma fī al-sawāt wa-μī qā al-adrīr

wa la yūdū hàjin-ha wa-μī al-li’al adīri.Wā arīh ni’āma wa la yūdū ṣalāhā wa-μī al-li’al adīri.

(b) Within the arch.

[Innā lillāh wa innā ilaihi rā'imūn. la lillāh wa lillah] محمد ر[سلام الله]

1 ARIE, 1956-57, No. D, 46.

2 Burgess & Cousens, op cit., p. 320, No. 16. Karbala is the place where the Prophet’s grandson Husain, attained martyrdom and where he lies buried.
(c) Horizontal panels.

(1) Bism al-rahman al-rheem
(2) Kull min alil la fann wabik
(3) Wahe
(4) Rakeh du-jalal u al-akram
(5) Song (mukh)

(6) Urmulat al-mawjudat far xamata taaj al-intibar
(7) Bibi Fatima, daughter of

(8) Urmulat al-mawjudat hasin al-kalila, wajza al-muluk al-umrul
(9) Zakii'd-Din 'Unar al-Kazaruni' entitled Malik Parviz, may illuminated
(10) By Allah be her grave. She died on the twentieth of (the month of) Shawwál (of the year A.H.) three and eighty and seven hundred (20 Shawwál 783-7 January 1382).

XXIX. EPIGRAPHIA INDIKA—ARABIC AND PERSIAN SUPPLEMENT

(a) Qur'an, Chapter II, verses 255.¹
(b) First Creed.²
(c) 1) Basmala.³
   (2-4) Qur'an, Chapter XI, verses 26-27.⁴
(5) This is the grave
(6) of the lady taken into Allah's mercy and pardoned, the pride among women, the crown of free women (i.e. women of noble lineage),
(7) Bibi Fatima, daughter of
(8) the Khwaja who is taken into (Allah's) mercy, Husain al-Gilani (i.e. of Gilan, a province in Iran) (and) wife of the Malik (who is) taken into Allah's mercy (viz.)
(9) Zakii'd-Din 'Unar al-Kazaruni' entitled Malik Parviz, may illuminated
(10) by Allah be her grave. She died on the twentieth of (the month of) Shawwál (of the year A.H.) three and eighty and seven hundred (20 Shawwál 783-7 January 1382).

This short epitaph, noticed here for the first time, seems to have escaped the notice of the officer when the epigraphical survey of Cambay was made in 1919-20, for it is not included in his list. The tablet is lying loose in the Tomb of Pir Buhul Shahid in Tin-Limdi or Chipwaid,³ where one more epitaph, noticed above (No. XII, supra), is preserved.

The squarish slab measuring 22 cm. is 27 cm. is fragmentary in that a little bit from its top left corner has disappeared. Whether it was originally arch-shaped or not, it is difficult to say for certain, but perhaps it was not.

¹ For translation, see p. 10.
² For translation, see p. 6.
³ For translation, see p. 8.
⁴ For translation, see p. 6.
⁵ ARIF. 1939-40, No. 1, 108.
(c) Epigraph dated A.H. 768 (p. 54)

(d) Epigraph dated A.H. 763 (p. 55)
The brief obituary note, too, is not fully clear. The text calls the deceased as Aḥmad ʿĀli, but such compound names not being in vogue in those days, very probably the idjāfati-binā is intended in this case, making it Aḥmad-i-ʿĀli i.e. Aḥmad son of ʿĀli. This is, of course, usually not done in Arabic texts, which is the case here, but as stated above, the text is faulty and the composer not very conversant with Arabic language. Unfortunately, again, an important word indicating his nisba which could have disclosed his origin or profession or like information cannot be deciphered satisfactorily. This is so despite the usually fine, distinct and clear-cut script, which is Riqʿi-like Naṣīḥ, but the lack of diacritical marks coupled with calligraphical flourishes has prevented its definite decipherment: it reads like Kirātīst or Kirātīst.

So, according to our tentative reading, the epitaph was intended to mark the grave of one Aḥmad (son of) ʿĀli Kirātīst (?). The given date, viz. Saturday, the 16th of Jumādā al-ʿĀkhār 786 (5th August 1384) is evidently the date of his death.

The text has been deciphered as under:—

Text

Plate XV(a)

(1) لا إنه الا الله ع师 رسول الله
(2) كل من عليها فان ولي ومه
(3) ربك ذو اللواء و الاكرام هذا الامير (كذا) الاعز
(4) احمد على كرايتست (كرانتست) في ذلك الزيج يوم السمت
(5) السادس عشرة من جمادي الآخر سنة سبعمائة و سبعمائة

Translation

(1) First Creed. 1
(2-3) Qurʾān, Chapter XL, verses 26-27. 2 This is the grave of the most beloved (?)  
(4) Ahmad (son of?) ʿAli Kirātīst or Kirātīst (?). And this was on the dat. Saturday, 
(5) sixteenth of (the month of) Jumādā al-ʿĀkhār (of the) year (A.H.) six and eighty and seven hundred (16 Jumādā II 786=5 August 1384).

XXX. EPIGRAPH, DATED A.H. 798 (1395 A.D.)

The last epitaph of the group is from the Tomb of Pīr Tajūʾī-Dīn refer-er-i to above (p. 7 ), where it is built up into the eastern wall, 3 and is noticed here for the first time. The arch-shaped tombstone conforms to the ornate type, with the arch being trifolied with a vase hanging from its apex on chain, and decorated with floral designs here and there.

The tablet measuring 78 cm. from apex to bottom and 40 cm. in width seems to have weathered considerably, for the writing is quite damaged. But the text is more or less legible except the nisba of the deceased which has defied several attempts at decipherment. According to the text, the epitaph belonged to the grave of Khwāja Asīl 4 son of ʿUmar son of Saʿduʾ-Dīn, who expired on Sunday the 8th of Muharram 798 (23rd October 1395). The deceased is spoken of in the text as the chief of merchants, pride among the great and the free-born, which shows that he was a prominent member of the mercantile community. His native place cannot be determined as the nisba could not be deciphered.

---

1 For translation, see p. 6.
2 For translation, see p. 6.
3 ARIE, 1939-40, No. D, 121.
4 In ibid., the name is read as Saʿīdān.
The style of writing is the usual ṭiqā'-type Nashī of excellent quality. The text is quoted below:

**TEXT**

*Plate XV(b)*

(a) *Within the arch.*

لا الله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(b) *Margin.*

[الله لا عز الله هو الحب المقبول لا تأخذ سنة ولا نوم له ما في السماوات وما في الأرض من ذي الذي يشع عندنا إلا باذنه يعلم ما بين أيديهم وما خلفهم ولا يخطرون بشيء من علمه إلا بما شاء ومع كبرياء السماوات والأرض ولا يوحده فحولهما و[هو العلي العظيم] *

(c) *Horizontal panels.*

(1) مسمى الله الرحمن الرحيم

(2) يبشرهم دبّهم برحمة منه وذوال وجنات لهم فيها نعيم

(3) متعم خالدين فيها إبداً أن الله علمه إجر عفّف

(4) هذا قبر عبد الضعيف النجيف الرافي إلى راحة الله تعالى

(5) صرر التجار مفخر الأكابر والاحرار خواجه اصيل ابن عمر ابن سعد الدين

(6) [[[أ]]] تغمده الله بالرحمة واسكنه في دار الجنان توفي يوم

(7) الواحد الثامن من المحرم سنة ثمان وتسعم وسباعية

(8) حامداً الله وصلاً عليه ورسوله محمد وصلواته السلام

**TRANSLATION**

(a) (1) First Creed.¹

(b) *Qurʾān,* Chapter II, verse 255.²

(c) (1) Basmala.³

(2-3) *Qurʾān,* Chapter IX, verses 21-22.⁴

(4) This is the grave of the weak and infirm creature, hopeful of the mercy of the Exalted Allāh,

(5) the chief of the merchants, pride of the great and the free-born, Khwāja Aṣīl son of 'Umar son of Sa'du'd-Dīn

(6) al........I., may Allāh cover him with (His) mercy and settle him in the abode of Paradise. He died on Sun-

(7) day, the eighth of (the month of) Muḥarrā: (of the year (A.H.) eight and ninety and seven hundred (8 Muḥarrā 798=23 October 1395).

(8) Praise to Allāh and salutations on His apostle Muḥa μad. And salutation and peace.

¹ For translation, see p. 6.
² For translation, see p. 10.
³ For translation, see p. 8.
⁴ For translation, see p. 12.
TWO MUGHAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM SAMANA, PANJAB

BY S. S. HUSAIN, EPIGRAPHICAL ASSISTANT

I propose to publish here two Mughal inscriptions from Sāmānā.¹ The town, a Tahsil headquarters in the Pašīlā district of Panjāb, is situated in 30°9′ north latitude and 76°15′ east longitude, about 27 kilometres south-west of Pašīlā town, with which it is connected by a fine metalled road. Sāmānā now a modern town containing well-built houses and fields along the borders of the town, finds frequent mention in historical works and enjoyed considerable importance during the Muslim period, as is attested to by numerous mosques and tombs some of which are unfortunately either in a ruinous condition or occupied by displaced persons from Pakistan for residential purposes, while others which were in good shape are turned into schools, Temples or Gurdwāras.

The original name of the town is said to have been Niranjan Kherā. Later on, from time to time it was known as Ratanār, Dhobi Kherā and Sāmānā.² During the Sultanate period, Sāmānā was an important stronghold. It was first surrendered along with Saruṣti (Sirāz), Ghurām (Kuhārān of historical works) and Hānsī to Muḥammad Ghori by Prithvī Rāj after his defeat in 1192.³ During the Mughal period, when the Mongols were plundering the upper Panjāb and Delhi, Ghiyāthu’d-Din Balban (1265-87) established military cantonments to prevent their inroads into the north-west frontiers, and appointed his son Bughrā Khān to the charge of Sāmānā to reinforce and guard the Beis line. Under the Khaljīs too, for the same reason, its importance as a military cantonment was realised and Sāmānā was made the headquarters of the most experienced commanders with well-equipped troops to check the Mongols. But under the Tughlaq dynasty, Sāmānā and other sub-divisions namely Sunām, Hānsī, Saruṣti (Sirāz), Kalānāur, Jullundhar and Sūrīhind remained under chaos due to rebellions of the governors and internal as well as external conditions. It was only under the just rule of Fīríz Shāh (1351-88) that this region heaved a sigh of relief and obtained prosperity. But with his passing away, the closing years of the fourteenth century brought havoc and plunder to Sāmānā and nearby territories in the wake of the invasion of Delhi by Timūr.⁴ But under the Sayyid and Lodī dynasties, no important event seems to have taken place at Sāmānā except perhaps that it was here that Sultan Buhlāl Lodī (1451-89) who had gone there in his early career, along with two of his friends to see his uncle Iṣām Khān Lodī, is said to have met a Darwīsh, Sayyid Abīn or Sāhid by name, who offered and sold the kingdom of Delhi to him.⁵

During the Mughal rule, Sāmānā again finds occasional mention. Humāyūn had halted here after defeating Sikandar Sūr and was enchanted with its climate.⁶ It was saved from plunder

⁴ Divyān’-d-Din Barānī, Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī (Calcutta, 1862), p. 86.
⁵ For an eye account of the advance of Timūr’s army in the region, see Elliot & Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. III (London, 1871), pp. 431, 483, etc.
and loot by the timely action of Akbar when Sher Muhammad Divāna a servant of Bairam Khān, when the latter fell out with the emperor, created disturbance there and killed one Mir Dost Muhammad who was sent to Sāmānā to manage its affairs by Mullā Nūrūd-Dīn Muḥammad Turkhan.1

Under Jalāṅgīr’s reign, Sāmānā was famous for its fine cloth and was mostly inhabited by the weaver community, who supplied silk and other types of textiles to the royal harem. The fine textiles produced here seem to have been known by the name Samianos or Samyanaos.2 In 1621, the East India Company is reported to have bought it at the rate of Rs. 2-1/2 to Rs. 4-1/2 per piece.3 After this Sāmānā appears to have passed into oblivion.

Sāmānā seems to have had quite a few mosques and tombs, which, though ‘magnificent’ or ‘restored’ had several inscriptions on them; but it is a pity that no systematic effort was made to copy these inscriptions, almost all of which have now disappeared or are untraceable. Fortunately, the Survey report made by Charles Rodgers mentions about half a dozen epigraphs (including one included in the present study), of which I could only trace one in the course of my tour in October 1971. According to him, the earliest available record was of the time of Sīkandar Lodi (1484-1517), one of Jalāṅgīr (included in this article) and two of the time of Shāh Jahan.4 It is surprising that Rodgers was not aware of one more inscription of Shāh Jahan which I discovered during my visit to the town. This epigraph belonged to the Inā bārā in the Sayyidān-Khān Mahalla (now called Mahalla Chakī) which is now converted into a Gurduwārā. It is an interesting record purporting the construction of a chansān, as we shall presently see. The inscription of Jalāṅgīr was noticed by Rodgers, but he has read its date as A.H. 1014 instead of 1024, a difference of one decade.

Taking this inscription first, it is carved on a marble slab, measuring 50 by 37 cm., which is fixed on the central outer arch of the three-storeyed Jamā’ mosque, which is situated in the north-west part of the town.5 The right half portion of the central dome has fallen inside the central hall. Except for this, the general condition of the rest of the mosque is good. Architecturally, the mosque is in the tradition of the Lodi-Sūr monuments and not in the style of the Mughal buildings initiated by Akbar.

The epigraph consists of three couplets in Persian and written in relief in ordinary Nastā’īq letters. It records the construction of a mosque by Mirzā Mūrūn in A.H. 1024 (1614-15 A.D.) during the reign of the Mughāl emperor Nūrūd-Dīn Jalāṅgīr. The date is given in a chronogram contained in the second hemistich of the third couplet. Rodgers who was the first to notice this inscription and publish it reading three-quarters of a century back had, due to the misreading of the chronogrammatic phrase, calculated the date as A.H. 1014 (1605-06 A.D.). He had mistaken the word ʿaznāl for ʿajnāl and hence the difference of 10 in the date.6

I have not been able to identify the builder viz. Mirzā Mūrūn from contemporary chronicles. Possibly, he was an official which would mean that but for this record, he would have remained unknown. Even otherwise, he appears to have been a man of local importance and hence the record under study is an important source at least for the local history.

2 According to Jh. p. 25 emperor Jalāṅgīr used to wear this cloth made by the weavers of Sāmānā whose descendants had in their possession marks from the emperor.
3 Jh. p. 2, fn.1.
5 For details, see Jh. pp. 21-32.
6 ABRE, 1971-72, No. 11, 133.
7 Rodgers, op. cit., p. 22.
The text has been read as follows:---

TEXT

Plate XVI (a)

(1) بدور نور الدين جهانگير که حکم صحیفہ روی زین است
(2) بناء خیر میرزا مون ساخت کہ سعی دادما در راه دین است
(3) تاریخی عطارد خوش رتم زاد لمسجد مون مسلمین است

TRANSLATION

(1) In the reign of Shāh Nūru'd-Dīn Jahāngīr, whose rule is (established) on the whole surface of the earth,

(2) Mīrzā Momin, who always strives in the path of Faith, erected (this) beautiful edifice.

(3) For its date, ('the Scribe of the Heaven') Mercury beautifully wrote, 'it is: Verily the mosque of Momin (lit. a believer) is for the Muslims.'

The chronogram yields A.H. 1024 (1614-15 A.D.).

The other inscription is published here for the first time. It was discovered by us while searching for the inscriptions of Sāmānā listed by Rodgers, who surprisingly on its to mention it. The tablet bearing this inscription is fixed on the right enclosure wall of the passage of the gate of the Gardwānā Singh Śāhī Gilā in Mahalla Chaklā in the heart of the town. This building is reported to have been used as an Imāmbāra called Bāzā in the pre-partition days, which after the migration of the Muslim population was converted into the Gardwānā. There is a modern mosque in the premises just within the entrance gate. The inscription slab, measuring 14 by 47 cm., is fixed at a height of about a metre and a half from the ground and it is doubtful if it is in situ. It appears to have been brought from some other place for it records the construction of an 'abode of joy', as will be seen presently.

The inscription is in Persian verse, comprising five verses written in raised letters in finely executed artistic sets of horizontal panels, vertically separated from each other by geometrical figures, which coupled with its Nastā'īq of a fairly high quality, has made it an elegant epigraph. The text records the construction of a lofty palatial building designated in the text as 'an abode of happiness', and likened to a 'palace from Paradise'. The name of the builder is not explicitly given but from the manner he is spoken of viz. the Khān who is worthy of the sphere of Daulat (lit. good fortune), it is certain that it is Daulat Khān. The construction took place, the inscription further states, in A.H. 1044 (1634-35 A.D.) under the superintendence of one Gopāl Bhatt and the work was executed by one Ishāq. The text also gives along with the Hijra year, the 6th regnal year which must pertain to Shāh Jahān whose name is surprisingly omitted in the text, but the 8th regnal year officially ended on the last day of Jumādā I 1045 (2nd December 1633). Therefore, either there is some inadvertent mistake on the part of the sculptor in engraving.

1 There is a fine pun on the word Momin, which is the name of the builder and which also means a true believer.
2 Rodgers, op. cit., pp. 21-23.
3 ARIS, 1971-72, No. 2, 134.
(1) The foundation of this everlasting abode of happiness was laid at an auspicious and blessed moment.

(2) This happy mansion appears as if a palace has been removed from Paradise (to the earth) A.H. 1044 (1634-35 A.D.).

(3) Or this lofty palace is an auspicious heavenly abode which has become the exalted residence (of one) whose standards are (as high as) the high heavens. Regnal year 6.

(4) One who is worthy of the sphere of fortune, (namely) that Khān by whose reflected image, the eyes of the sky are opened wide (i.e. the sky is astonished). Work done by Ishāq.

(5) When I sought the year of its date, Widsom replied, 'It is: a wonderful, auspicious and airy building'. Superintended by Gopāl Bhatt.

The chronogram is contained in the last hemistich. The date given in the figure is A.H. 1044, and the chronogram would yield it only if the word binā'ī in the chronogrammatic phrase is taken to consist of two yā and a hamza, though it is normally taken to be one yā and one hamza. As the date is explicitly given in figure as 1044 and the word binā'ī is so written as to indicate that the spelling with two yā and one hamza was intended by the composer for the reckoning, there is no doubt that the date is A.H. 1044 (1634-35 A.D.).
ADIL SHAHI INSCRIPTIONS FROM PANHALA

BY DR. A. A. KÂDIRI, SENIOR EPIGRAPHERICAL ASSISTANT

I propose to study in this article twelve 'Ādil Shāhī inscriptions from Panhālā, a place of historical interest in the Kolhpur district of Mahārāshtra. These range in their dates from A.H. 918 (1512-13 A.D.) to A.H. 1020 (1611-12 A.D.) and represent the reigns of four rulers of the 'Ādil Shāhī dynasty, viz., Ismā'īl (1516-34), Ibrāhīm I (1535-57), 'Alī I (1558-80) and Ibrāhīm II (1580-1636).

The earliest extant inscription from Panhālā was published in an earlier issue of this series,1 where a brief résumé of its history upto A.H. 917 (1511-12 A.D.) was given. It would therefore be better to carry forward this local history to A.H. 1022 (1611-12 A.D.), the date of the latest inscription of the present group, which will incidentally show the importance of these epigraphs for the local history of the fort.

From the earliest record dated A.H. 918 (1512-13 A.D.) studied below, it is clear that Malik Sikandar Ḥaidarī who was, according to an earlier epigraph, the Thānadār of Panhālā in A.H. 917 (1511-12 A.D.),2 continued to hold that post at least till A.H. 918 (1512-13 A.D.). After this date nothing is known about Panhālā or its Thānadār till A.H. 946 (1539-40 A.D.), when according to inscription No. II, set up in the reign of Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh I, one Yūsuf held the charge of the Panhālā fort. After this date, again, nothing is heard about the place till about A.H. 954 (1547-48 A.D.), when Ibrāhīm I visited Panhālā on a pleasure-trip, according to Firīghta.3 This is in a way corroborated by inscription No. III in which, Panhālā is referred to as the seat of government in the mid year, when Dāʾud Ḍāqā was in charge of the place. The latter seems to have continued to govern Panhālā till the following year when, according to inscription No. IV, he constructed a tank. It was at this time that Burhān Nizām Shāh I of Ahmadnagar and Jaḥānlī Qutb Shāh of Golconda who followed the Shiite tenets tried to exploit their sectarian affinity with Asad Khān Lārī, an ‘Ādil Shāhī official of great status, urging him to hand over the fort of Belgāum of which he was custodian to Nizām Shāh for monetary consideration. According to Firīghta, Asad Khān spurned the overtures, imprisoned the persons involved in the offer, and in view of his illness, requested his master to visit Belgāum.4 But the Ahmadnagar historian ‘Alī Taḥāṭabā would have us believe that Asad Khān fell a victim to treachery and invited Burhān, then besieging Bijāpur, to come in person to Belgāum, to receive the charge of this strategic fort from him, but Ibrāhīm having son show got an inkling of this, marched to Belgāum a couple of days before the appointed rendezvous of the Ahmadnagar king with Asad Khān there.5 Firīghta states at another place that being hard pressed by the manoeuvres of the allied forces of the Vijayanagara king Rām Rāj and Burhān, Ibrāhīm left Bijāpur which was later besieged by Burhān and went to Panhālā.6 On his way, he appears to have paid a visit to Belgāum on the request of his ailing general Asad Khān who ultimately breathed his last in the beginning

---

1 *Epigraphia Indica Arabic & Persian Supplement (EIAPS)*, 1964, p. 43.
2 Ibid., pp. 43-44.
4 Ibid., p. 31.
6 Firīghta, *op. cit.,* p. 120.
(64)
of A.H. 956 (1549 A.D.). It is possible that having arranged the affairs at Belgaum, Ibrahim might have left for Panhalá, which was more formidable and hence more secure than Belgaum. This inference is corroborated by Tabatába, according to whom, Burhan, having on his way to Belgaum got news that Ibrahim had reached Belgaum and fortified it with men and provision, changed his route, marched on to Panhalá and laid siege to the fort. But finding the task impossible, Nizám Sháh concentrated on lower fortifications which were reduced after a fight lasting for a day and a half only, and after having destroyed them completely, he left for Satara. Firidshá did not know the details, according to his own confession, of the three battles fought between Burhan and Ibrahim, but he refers to the expedition of the allied forces of Rám Ráj and Burhan against Bijapur, as a result of which Ibrahim, finding himself unequal to the task of containing them, went to Panhalá. Burhan invested Bijapur but fell ill and had to be removed to Ahmadnagar where he died in the same year.

It is a fact that neither the contemporary chronicler like Raﬁ'u’d-Din, nor the later historian Zubairi, mentions these events pertaining to Panhalá. Nor are they taken note of in dealing with the events of this period. For example, the Imperial Gazetteer merely gives this information that ‘on the establishment of the Adil Sháhi dynasty of Bijapur in 1489, Panhalá was fortified with great care’, and ‘in 1659 immediately after the murder of Afzal Khan, Shivaji took Panhalá from Bijapur ’, while the State Gazetteer enlightens us that ‘Ibrahim I and II took a lot of interest in Panhalá and its fortifications. This is shown not only by the numerous Persian inscriptions left by them but also by the architectural style of the monuments at the place’. But far more surprising is that Dr. Rádhey Shyám in his history of the Ahmadnagar kingdom should have chosen to ignore Panhalá and events about it, so connected with Ahmadnagar history, completely. Moreover, the fort of Panhalá contains inscriptions of the time of the Bijapur king ‘Ali I, which evidently do not seem to have been known to all these authorities.

Resuming the narration of the events of Panhalá fort, we next find (vide inscription No. V) that in A.H. 964 (1556-57 A.D.), Malik Khidr, the Sar Khawáza, was very probably incharge of the fort. For the next two decades, nothing is known about its history. But from an epigraph (No. VI, infra), it would appear that in A.H. 985 (1577-78 A.D.), one Shamsu’d-Din, the Ná’ib-i Ghilábat of ‘Ali I was incharge there. He seems to have been succeeded, two years later, by one Ahamd ‘Ali son of Raam ‘Ali, entitled Shamsi’l-Mulk (vide inscription No. VII). Some time between this and A.H. 988 (1580 A.D.), a little after the murder of ‘Ali I, Mir Kamál’u’d-Din Husain Injá, entitled Murtadá Khan, seems to have been imprisoned at Panhalá, for we are told by the contemporary chronicler Raﬁ'u’d-Din Shirází that Kishwar Khán Lári tried to do away with Murtadá Khan Injá and his brother Sháh Qasim; as he did in the case of Mu’áfa Khán Ardastáni at Bankápur, but the letter of ‘Abdu’l-Mu’min addressed to Kishwar Khán having

---

1 Firidshá, op. cit., p. 31; Zubairi, Basháir-e-Suleáfa (Hyderabad), p. 64.
3 Firidshá, op. cit., p. 116.
4 Ibid., p. 120.
5 Raﬁ'u’d-Din Shirází, Todkristu’l-Malúk (MS).
6 Zubairi, op. cit., pp. 48-64.
7 Such as, for example, Imperial Gazetteer of India (IG), Vol. XIX (Oxford, 1908), p. 396; Gazetteer of India, Maharashtra State, Kolhapur District (Kolhapur Di. Gz.), Bombay, 1960, p. 67; Dr. Rádhey Shyám, The Kingdom of Ahmadnagar (Delhi, 1966), pp. 57-94.
8 IG, p. 396.
9 Kolhapur Di. Gz., p. 67.
10 Rádhey Shyám, op. cit., pp. 57-94.
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fallen in the hands of Ikhlas Khan, the plan misfired and orders were issued to release the two brothers who left Panhala and came to Bijapur.  

A little earlier, Kishwar Khan had sent a contingent under the command of Afjal Khan Shirazi to relieve the garrison at Bidar which was besieged by the allied forces of Ibrhim: of Golconda and Murad of Ahmednagar. The faction fights at Bijapur which ultimately resulted in the death of Kishwar Khan, having lowered the morale of the 'Adil Shahi forces, Afjal Khan had to retreat to Bijapur.  

At this stage, Ikhlas Khan, the new prime minister who had succeeded Kishwar Khan, despatched Rafiu'd-Din Shirazi to Panhala to bring the treasure accumulated there to the capital.  

After this, we do not hear about Panhala till A.H. 1016 (1607-08 A.D.), when according to inscription No. IX, one Aqa Maq苏d constructed a palace on the terrace of the fort in the reign of Ibrhim II. This Aqa Maq苏d appears to have been in charge of Panhala at least till A.H. 1020 (1611-12 A.D.), when according to inscription No. X, he constructed a mosque at Ibrhimpur, situated outside the upper fortification. Most probably this outer portion of the fortification was destroyed during the Nizam Shahi siege mentioned above.  

From the above, it will be seen that much of the history of Panhala owes its reconstruction to the epigraphic records. These records, as will be seen presently, mention a number of officials of rank, most of them unknown from other sources, apart from scribes. The former include such names as Malik Sikandar Haidari (the Thindar), Malik Yousuf the Abdar, Malik Da'd Aqa the Naib'i-Ghaibat, Shamsu'd-Din the Naib'i-Ghaibat, Malik Khoji the Sar Khawass, Ahmad Ali entitled Shamsul-Mulk and Aqa Maq苏d. Some of these held high ranks and the rest were also officials of note.  

From the calligraphical point of view too, these epigraphs are not without interest. Four of the twelve epigraphs are inscribed in Nasta'liq character—the earliest of these, the second of the group, is dated A.H. 916 (1539-40 A.D.)—of no particular merit in itself, but their designers have sought to impart an artistic touch through floral or decorative motifs, but the effect on the whole is not very pleasing. The remaining eight are in Naifikasi or Thuluth style which is uniformly good with the exception of one inscription (No. VII) where too it is partly quite good. The style of writing in these seven epigraphs would have made these very attractive specimens of calligraphy were it not for the fact that the designing of the text particularly the placing of the letters and words leaves much to be desired. Fortunately, four of these epigraphs also contain the names of their designers, viz. Maulana Rajab who wrote three epigraphs and Muharram son of Faridu'd-Din, both of whom appear to be talented calligraphers. It is a pity that in the case of the rest, particularly Inscription Nos. I and II, the names of the calligraphers are not known.  

Almost all of these records are metrical but the quality of verse presented by them is mediocre except in the case of Inscription No. II. With these introductory remarks, we now proceed with the study of the epigraphs themselves.  

I. INSCRIPTION DATED A.H. 918  

The first inscription is carved on the left of the three slabs measuring 68 by 34 cm. which are fixed on the platform of the Dargah of Sa'du'd-Din.  

The Dargah, the most important of
ADIL SHAHII INSCRIPTIONS FROM PANHALA MAHARASHTRA

(a) Inscription of Ibrāhīm I dated A.H. 955 (p. 71)

(b) Inscription dated A.H. 918 (p. 67)
'ADIL SHĀHĪ INSCRIPTIONS FROM PANHĀLĀ

The Muslim buildings at the place, is about 9 metres square and 15 metres high including the dome.

Evidently the slab is not in situ as it records the construction of a bastion by Sikandar, in A.H. 918 (1512-13 A.D.). The text comprising two Persian verses is inscribed in two lines in relief in Thulūdī characters of a high order, but the name of the calligrapher is not mentioned. The date is contained in a chronogram.

The builder is none other than Malik Sikandar Ḥsaidīr, the Thānādār of Panhālā, who had, according to another inscription studied in a past issue of this series, excavated a tank and constructed its gate a year earlier.¹

The text has been deciphered by me as under:

**TEXT**

Plate XVII(b)

1. زمینِ بستری کے مرد باریکہ بین
2. زبانِ خبرِ میں ہم گوش دار

**Translation**

1. Listen to me, O connoisseur: Its date is (contained in the phrase) Fārābī-Bihātī (i.e. the bastions of Paradise).

2. Hark! I am informing you about the builder. (He is) Sikandar (i.e. Alexander) in name and (also) Sikandar in quality.

The following English rendering of the epigraph was given in the old series of the Bombay Gazetteer of the Kolhāpur district, but it is unintelligible: 'Oh friend listen to the voice of the assembly. The able man Sikandar converted the hill into a road, and named the Sikandar bastion with this date. It informs one of 806 with a golden call'.²

II. INSCRIPTION OF IBRĀḤĪM I, DATED A.H. 946

The second inscription of the group and first of Ibrāhīm I occupying a total space of about 1.55 m. by 42 cm. appears on the facade of the structure over the step-well called Andhār-Rāoli in the Fort.³ Its text consists of seven couplets in Persian which are of a fairly good quality and are carved in relief in ordinary Nastaʿlīq characters. The haphazard placing of letters has rendered its decipherment a difficult task. The epigraph states that Yūsuf the royal Ḥādīr (i.e. Water-bearer), constructed at Panhālā, a bastion and a tank with a structure above the latter in the year A.H. 946 (1539-40 A.D.), in the reign of 'Adil Shāh (i.e. Ibrāhīm I).

This record was also noticed in the Bombay Gazetteer, where its following English translation is given: 'In Panhala at the commencement of his rule, may God increase his prosperity, good fortune and rank. This will remain as a glorious memorial for him. Now A.H. 909 Abu Yusuf is the official entrusted with the construction of this work. The cause of this building being the best of its day is this, that this lofty building was completed in the reign of the king of the age,

¹ EIAPS, 1964, p. 44, pl. XIV c. It is now preserved in the Kolhapur Museum.
³ ARIBE, 1963-64, No. D, 204.
Adil Shah. A bastion, a reservoir, and this building were constructed (as it were) on the heads of the black-eyed damsels of Paradise. A life-giving spring flows from its reservoir and they placed it on the shelf (as it were) of a palace, by the order of a man of high and excellent rank. With victory, with happiness and excellence, this was brought into sight.¹

The above rendering, apart from the wrong reading of the date, the name of buider etc., is hopelessly corrupt and misleading. The name of the builder is Yūsuf, the ʿĀbdār and not Abū Yūsuf. Unfortunately nothing could be gleaned about this Yūsuf from the Persian chronicles available to me. But he appears to have been an official of note and held the honorary rank of the ʿĀbdār, i.e. person in charge of the drinks for the king. The epigraph is thus an important document which has perpetuated the name of the ʿĀdil Shāhī official and has also preserved a small bit of information about the posts connected with the royal person like ʿĀbdār.

I have read the text as follows:—

TEXT

Plate XVIII(b)

شند تمام این عمارت عالی
در پناله بدولت والی
نهم یار زمانه غاداشان
زانده اه بخت دولت جام
یادگار از خوشن و خبیر
برج حوض و عمارت بر سر
آب حوضش ز جمعة حیاوان
طاق ایوان کشیده بروکیوان
یوسف ابدار نیک نهاد
بانی این عمارت از بنیاد
نیست دیگر نزای بی علت
شند مربی بسید و فیروزی
این عمارت به پهترین روزی

TRANSLATION

(1) At Pan(h)āla, this lofty edifice was constructed during the government of the Lord,

(2) the king of the age ʿĀdil Shāh, may Allāh increase his fortune, reign and dignity.

(3) (This) bastion, tank and the structure above it, reminds one of Khwaranq² and Khaibar.³

(4) The arch of its portico raised its head to the seventh heaven; the water of its tank is from the Spring of Life.

(5) The builder of this edifice, from its foundation (i.e. anew) is Yūsuf the ʿĀbdār, of good disposition.

¹ BG, p. 422, No. 2.
² A palace in Babylonia.
³ A fort near Medina.
(a) Inscription of Ibrahim I dated A.H. 954 (p. 69)

(b) Inscription of the same king dated A.H. 946 (p. 68)
(6) Nine hundred and forty years had passed after the Migration; add (for the date) to it six for no reason (A.H. 945-1538-49 A.D.),

(7) when this edifice was completed on the best of the days, with happiness and victory.

III. INSCRIPTION OF THE SAME KING, DATED A.H. 954

The slab bearing the second inscription of Ibrāhīm I and the third record of the group, is fixed on the facade of the middle gate of the Tin-Darwāza gate of the Fort. The text is inscribed within a large panel and the all round margin enclosing it. The panel contains two lines of Persian prose commencing with the famous opening verse from the celebrated Persian poem Makhzan-i-Aṣrūr. The margin has on the right, top, left and bottom, respectively, a line in Persian prose, five hemistiches in Persian verse, one hemistich in Persian verse and a Quatrain of the celebrated Persian poet 'Umar Khayyām, all carved in relief in Nasta'īlīq characters of a fairly good type. The writing in the panel is set against floral background.

The epigraph states that in the reign of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh the buildings at Panhālā, which is spoken of as the seat of government were either repaired or built anew in A.H. 954 (1547-48 A.D.) during the regime of Malik Dā'ūd Aqā, the Nā'īb-i-Shaibat, that is to say, king's Deputy. It further states that Dā'ūd Aqā constructed a reservoir of sweet drinking water. The text is stated therein to have been written by one Sālār son of Aḥmud, the Dabīr (Secretary).

This epigraph was also noticed in the Bombay Gazetteer; its rendering there, though not without mistakes, is fairly accurate in stating the purport. Nothing could be gleaned about Malik Dā'ūd Aqā, from the contemporary sources, but he continued to be at Panhālā at least for one more year according to the next inscription. These two records are therefore quite important. The one under study is also important as it corroborates the statement of Firūghta that at about this time, Ibrāhīm I had left Bījāpur and took shelter at Panhālā, for which reason, evidently, the appellation 'Dāūn's-Saltanāt (i.e. the seat of the government) Panhālā Fort' has been used in the text. The inscription has also preserved the name of a calligrapher of some merit. This man, Sālār, was also a secretary, as can be easily surmised from his surname Dabīr.

The text has been read by me as follows:—

TEXT

Plate XVIII(a)

(a) Main panel.

1

(1) بسم الله (کذّا) الرحمن الرحیم - هس کلید در گنج حکیم

(2) تجدید و تحیدی عماوات دار السلطنت قلبه پناه در ایام دواست خسروم (کذّا)

(3) جهان باز سلطنت پناه اراهام عادتا خلد ملکه در تاریخ سنه اربع خمسین تسعمایه

دوجک کر [د] ملک داود آتا نابی خوبت کابینه صالح بن احمد دیبر

1 *ARIE*, 1963-64, No. D, 203. It measures 1'78 m. by 46 cm.

2 This Makhzan poem is by Nāshīr Ganjavi, a twelfth century Persian poet of great eminence.

3 *Bihājūt-i-'Umar-i-Khayām* (Lucknow, 1956), p. 36, No. 279, where the order of the hemistichs is different.

4 *BG*, p. 423, No. 7. The translation of the text in the margin is also faulty.

5 Firūghta, op. cit., p. 120.
(b) Margins.

i Right:

باب بنای خبر این آب داود آفاکند

ii Top:

(١) بنای نین در همه روي [زنیم] نیست

آ هم که دروست کم ازمه معین نیست

(٢) عز کس که پنفرشید هم گفت که رحمت

بر بای او باد که خبری به ازین نیست

(٣) یکرست که نوشت نخاست

iii Left:

دنیا نکن وفا تو خوش فاک

iv Bottom:

در دل شوار کتاب عرمی باید خواند

همواره کتاب عرمی باید خواند

پیداست که ار جهان چند خواهی ماند

TRANSLATION

(a) (1) The formula In the name of the Beneficent, the Merciful is the key to the treasure-house of the judicious Lord.

The renovation and (new) construction of the buildings at the seat of the government, Panhālā Fort, (took place) in the reign of the king

(2) having sovereignty over the world, the asylum of the kingdom, Ibrāhīm ʻĀdil Shāh, may his kingdom be perpetuated, in the year four (and) fifty (and) nine hundred (A.H. 964-1557 A.D.), during the time of Malik Dā’ūd Aqā, the Nā‘ib-i-Ghaibat (lit. Deputy in Absence). Its writer is Sālār son of Aḥmad, the Dābir (i.e. Secretary).

(b) i. This tank (lit. bountiful edifice of water) was excavated by Dā’ūd Aqā.

ii. (1) Such an edifice is not to be found on the whole surface of the earth; the water which it contains is not inferior to the limpid water (of Paradise).

(2) Whosoever drank from it exclaimed, 'May the mercy (of God) be upon its builder, for there is no bounty better than this'.

(3) The stone-carver engraved on the stone thus:

iii. The world is not faithful (i.e. will not last), so be merry.

iv. (1) The shrub of sorrow cannot be planted in the heart; the book of enjoyment must be read at all times.

١ This should have been چند در چهاران.
ADIL SHAHI INSCRIPTIONS FROM PANHALA

[2] Wine ought to be drunk and the desires of the heart ought to be fulfilled; (for), it is obvious, how long can one live in this world?

IV. INSCRIPTION OF THE SAME RULER, DATED A.H. 955

The third record of Ibrahim I which is also in Persian prose and verse may be seen on the western wall of the Nāg Jharī in the Fort.1 Carved on a slab measuring 66 by 52 cm., it runs into three lines in Persian, two of which contain two couplets and one a line in prose. The text is executed in relief in Nastaliq characters which resemble that of the inscription just noticed. A floral border runs all around the text.

The epigraph records that the top of the mountain had been flattened as a result of which a hundred springs of water were released. It also states that though many persons have come and gone, the spring and the mountain had withstood the test of time. The particular spring on which it now occurs, was constructed, according to the text, during the time of Ibrahim 'Adil Shahi in A.H. 955 (1548-49 A.D.) by Dā'ūd Aqā. The builder is the same as the builder of the reservoir mentioned in the previous epigraph.

This epigraph was also noticed in the Bombay Gazetteer, the rendering in which is fairly correct.1

The text as read by me is as under:

TEXT

Plate XVII(a)

(1) کوه و کمری بهم نهاده صد جمجمه آب از و کشاده
(2) هر چند آن بیامدن و وانتند این جمجمه و کوه بجا ستاده
(3) در دور ابراهیم عادلشاه خمس تسوائبه داوود پیدا ساخته

TRANSLATION

(1) The mountain and its middle having been put together, a hundred springs of water were brought forth.

(2) However much people have come and gone, this spring and the mountain have stood in their place.

(3) In the reign of Ibrahim 'Adil Shahi (in the year) five (and) fifty (and) nine hundred (A.H. 955-1548-49 A.D.), Dā'ūd Aqā constructed (this).

V. ANOTHER RECORD OF IBRAHIM I, DATED A.H. 964

The fifth record of the group and fourth of Ibrahim I, occurs on the western wall of the tank near the Dargah of Sa'du'd-Din mentioned above2 and is carved on a slab measuring 120 m. by 50 cm. It consists of three lines of writing comprising five Persian couplets, which

2 ibid, p. 123, No. 8.
3 ARJA 1963-64, No. D, 200.
is executed in relief in Nasta‘liq characters; the style of writing is the same as in the previous record, and it is not unlikely that the two epigraphs were inscribed by one and the same person. The metrical text is of poor quality.

The epigraph assigns the construction of a tank designated Chashma-i-Khidr to Malik Khidr the Sar Khawās in A.H. 964 (1566-57 A.D.), during the reign of Ibrāhīm I.

This epigraph was also published in the Bombay Gazetteer.1 Available contemporary Persian chronicles fail to identify Malik Khidr, whom the text designates as Sar Khawās and who must, therefore, have been an official of note. There is a village Khidarpur in Kolhāpur district which may have been founded by or have had some association with him. The epigraph is thus a valuable document both for the local history of Panhalā and for having preserved to posterity the name of an official and post held by him. The exact duties of the post are difficult to be defined.

My reading of the text is as under:—

**TEXT**

Plate IX(b)

(1) ننام م (کذا) خدا صانع دادرگر
(2) نام م (کذاآ) خدا صانع دادرگر
(3) نام م (کذاآ) خدا صانع دادرگر

**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the name of God, the Just Maker, who brings forth sweet water from the rock.

In the reign of the glorious and victorious emperor, Ibrāhīm Shāh the chosen one,

(2) such a special reservoir which you see was constructed by Malik Khidr, the Sar Khawās.

As to the year, it was nine hundred and sixty and four (A.H. 964-1566-57 A.D.), when this Spring of Khidr,3 became a memento (of his).

(3) O God! Preserve it till the day of Resurrection, for the sake of the Prophet and ‘Ali. Peace (be on them).

VI. INSCRIPTION OF ‘ALI I, DATED A.H. 986

This epigraph, sixth of the lot and first of ‘Ali I, is now preserved in the Kolhāpur Museum.4 The inscriptive tablet measuring 92 by 75 cm. contains four lines of Persian verse carved in relief in Naskh characters, of a fairly good type, which state that in the reign of emperor ‘Ali I,

---

1 *RG*, p. 429, No. 9.
3 There is a pur intended here. The spring of the water of Life is associated with Prophet Khidr.
4 *AIE*, 1903-04, No. D, 190.
(a) Epigraph of 'Aṭā' I dated A.H. 985 (p. 73)

(b) Record of 'Abd al-Azīz dated A.H. 984 (p. 72)
A DIL SHĀHĪ INSCRIPTIONS FROM PANHĀLĀ

A bastion called the Burj-i-Qadrat (lit. Bastion of Might) was constructed by Shamsu’d-Din, the king’s Deputy, out of the treasuries of Panhālā, in A.H. 985 (1577-78 A.D.).

The notice of this record also occurs in the Bombay Gazetteer, and it is fairly correct. The only error of some consequence is that the builder and the governor is called ‘chief of cavalry’ and ‘deputy governor’ which is not correct.

The epigraph furnishes the valuable information that Shamsu’d-Din was the king’s Deputy and incharge of the fort of Panhālā. Persian chronicles appear to be silent about him.

The quality of the verse is quite good and the style of writing is also fine Naqš. The pleasing calligraphical effect is accentuated by a vertical floral border occurring at each of the right and left ends of the text which has been read as under:

TEXT

Plate XIX (a)

(1) نَامَ خَدَائِی کَه در هَیَج چَای
بَرود و نَبَاش بِجَز وَی خَدَائِی
(2) بَرَه* شَوشَه عَلِی بَادَشَاء
یِشَتَرْتُ پَنُسَل الَّه
(3) باَکَرْدَه شَمَس الَّدین شَسْوَار
کَه بِرَوْسَت او نَسُب کَامَگَر
(4) بَقْعَمُ یِکی بَرَج بِسَت او زَْکَنِج
زِ نِمَسُد نَزُون بُود هِشَاد و بِنِج

TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of God, except Whom, there was no and there will never be any other God anywhere.

(2) In the reign of the emperor ‘Alī, the king, the Burj-i-Qadrat (i.e. Bastion of Might) was constructed through the bounty of God.

(3) It was built by Shamsu’d-Din, an expert rider, who was the victorious deputy (i.e. governor).

(4) He constructed a bastion in the fort out of the treasuries (at Panhālā); it was eighty and five above nine hundred (A.H. 985-1577-78 A.D.).

VII. ANOTHER RECORD OF ‘ALĪ I, DATED A.H. 987

The slab bearing the second record of ‘Ali I and seventh of the group is also preserved in the Kolhapur Museum and measures 1.25 m. by 72 cm. At the time the inscription was noticed in the Gazetteer, the tablet was lying near the Ambā Bāī’s temple at Panhālā and was believed

---

1 He does not appear to have done anything with a contemporary official of similar rank Faulāb Khān, the King’s Deputy at Shillāpur, whose name was Shamsu’d-Din (C. H. Khare, Persian Sources of Indian History, Vol. V, pt. 1, Poona, 1961, p. 121). For he already held the title Faulāb Khān in Shhār 964 i.e. A.H. 971 (1563-64 A.D.), while the present record fourteen years later mentions no title.

2 Could Gatū here be intended for Gaqti, the local corruption of gadd, that is mortar?—Ed.

3 It is perhaps not correct to translate Shāherwar as the ‘Chief of the Cavalry’ as done in BG, loc. cit.

4 Please see footnote above.

to have originally belonged to the Tiger Gate. A portrait engraved in relief, of a lion facing left with a raised right paw and tail occupies slightly less than three-fourths of the entire tablet on the right side, while the remaining portion on the left is inscribed by the Persian text running into six lines executed in bold Thuluth characters. A Persian couplet, or rather what is intended as such, for its composition is mediocre, executed in Nasikh characters, is inscribed below the raised paw of the animal. The Nasikh writing is superior to the Thuluth one, but though of fine quality, it loses its impressiveness due to the crowded arrangement of its letters.

The inscription records that Ahmad 'Ali, son of Rau'm 'Ali, devoted servant of 'Ali (I) constructed a bastion in A.H. 987 (1579-80 A.D.). The rendering of this record in the Bombay Gazetteer reads: 'The Lion of God, the victorious one, 'Ali, son of Abi Talib Ahmad Ali, who hath the title of Shamehir-ul-Mulk, is in heart and soul, the slave of that Ali. The date of the building of this bastion was A.H. 987."

It will be noted that in the Gazetteer, the letters between and have not been taken notice of or have been intentionally overlooked. These letters could either be read as or . In either case, the builder Ahmad 'Ali's father's name is mentioned in the epigraph. It cannot be asserted with certainty whether the title Shamehir-ul-Mulk occurring after the father's name belongs to the father or the son, though it is reasonable to hold that the son must have been so entitled. Contemporary chronicles do not help us in identifying either of the two, but a record dated A.H. 943 (1538-39 A.D.) from Mugal in Ràichur district of Mysore and another dated Shubhr year 950 i.e. A.H. 956 (1550 A.D.), mention one Shamehir-ul-Mulk as an officer of Bakhsh 'Adil Shàh. At least Shamehir-ul-Mulk of the Ràichur record is an adherent of the Shi'ite Creed, like Ahmad 'Ali of our record and hence could have been the father of the latter. In that case, the title would have to refer to the father and not the son or that the son had, as usual, inherited the father's title. Again, as the name of 'Ali, the fourth Caliph, has already been mentioned in the opening lines, 'Ali in the fourth line of the text should most probably refer to the reigning king 'Ali I, who was also a devout Shi'a, which fact seems to have been overlooked in its notice in the Bombay Gazetteer.

My reading of the text is as under:

**Text**

**Plate XX (a)**

(a) Left side.

1. اسم الله الغالب
2. على ابن أبي طالب
3. از دل و جان
4. عسم علی احمد
5. على بن (؟) و رونعلو المخا
6. بمشير الملك

---

1 *BG*, p. 424, No. 11.
2 The name Rau'm 'Ali is quite uncommon.
3 *BG*, p. 424, No. 11.
5 *EIAPS*, 1963, pp. 63-64, pl. XX (b).
6 *BG*, loc. cit.
(a) Inscription of 'Alī I dated A.H. 987 (p. 74)

(b) Epigraph of Ibrahim II dated A.H. 994 (p. 75)
(b) Under the lion’s paw.¹


(b) For the date of the construction of the bastion of this edifice, (know) that it was nine hundred and eighty and seven from the Migration (A.H. 987-1579-80 A.D.).

VIII. INSCRIPTION OF IBRĀHĪM II, DATED A.H. 994

The eighth record of the group and first of Ibrahim II is inscribed on the central slab fixed on the platform in the compound of the Darqūṭ of Saʿdūʿ Din, mentioned above,² which is obviously not in situ. The slab measuring 1.50 m. by 52 cm. contains two lines of writing of which, the first contains Nād-i-ʿAli and the second, which is in Persian prose, the historical text, stating that the gate of the fort was built by Māqsūd Khān, an official, in the reign of Abu’l-Muqaffa' Ibrahim 'Aṣḥāb in A.H. 994 (1586 A.D.). The style of writing is refreshingly beautiful in style. The calligrapher is Mullā Ῥaḍā, who has also inscribed two more epigraphs (Nos. IX and X).

The Bombay Gazetteer has noticed only the historical part of this epigraph but its rendering which follows, is faulty and misleading: 'In the reign of the victorious Ibrahim Aḥṣāb. His servant was Māqsūd Akā, and he built a gate of the Panhāla fortress, in the year Shalur 994. The inscription of this was Mālaq Ghufrān'.³

In the above rendering, there is no mention of the Nād-i-ʿAli, the name of the builder is given as Māqsūd Akā instead of Māqsūd Khān, the year is stated to be in Shuḥūr Shān, while it is not so in the text and lastly, the name of the scribe Mullā Ῥaḍā is deciphered as Mālaq Ghufrān.

The text has been deciphered by me as under:

TEXT

Plate XX(b)

(1) Nād-i-ʿAli Muḥṣir al-ʿAṣḥāb

(2) Mullā Ῥaḍā, son

(3) of the sayings written by the ancients

TRANSLATION

(1) Invoke ‘Ali the manifestation of wonders. You will find him succour in miseries.

All grief and sorrow will soon disappear, by thy friendship (with God), O ‘Ali O ‘Ali O ‘Ali!

¹ In BG, loc. cit. it is stated to be on a separate stone.
³ BG, p. 424.
(2) In the reign of Abu'l-Muzaffar Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh, (this) gate of the fort was constructed by the servant Maqṣūd, may his sins be pardoned, in the year four and nine hundred (A.H. 994-1586 A.D.). Written by Mulla Rājāb.

The builder Maqṣūd, for once, may be identified satisfactorily. We are told of one Maqṣūd Khān who was in the employ of the king when in A.H. 988 (1580 A.D.), taking advantage of confusion consequent upon the death of 'Ali I, 'Ainu'l-Mulk imprisoned the Abyssinian nobles Ikhlaš Khān, Ḥamīd Khān and Dīlawār Khān and was taking them out of Bījāpur in chains, Maqṣūd Khān along with his companions and others followed them and intercepting 'Ainu'l-Mulk at the Allāhpūr Gate, freed them and brought them to the new king. But the Abyssinians trio too, on their part, nurtured apprehension from the royal slaves as well as other Deccani nobles and tried to disperse them by appointing them to distant forts and places. It was as a result of this strategy perhaps that Maqṣūd Khān was sent to Panhālā as its commandant, at about this time i.e. some time after A.H. 988. He is likely to have continued in that capacity till after A.H. 994 (1586 A.D.), the date of the record under study. Some time before Dhu'l-Hijja 1003 (August 1596), as Superintendent of the royal elephants, he is reported to have taken part in the battle against Ibrāhīm Nizām Shāh. That he was a foreigner Turk from Georgi, is stated by Firigha; and that is why in the next two records (Nos. IX, X), which are written by the same scribe Maulānā Rājāb, he is called Maqṣūd Aqū. These records are the only source which indicate Maqṣūd Khān's association with Panhālā.

IX. ANOTHER RECORD OF IBRĀHĪM II, DATED SHUḤŪR 1008

The ninth epigraph of the group and the second of Ibrāhīm II, occurs on the western wall of the dining hall of the Inspection Bungalow in the Fort, which is known as Sajjā Khānī. The slab on which it is engraved in relief measures 85 by 50 cm., and contains three lines of writing in Persian verses, executed in fairly good Thulūdī characters, but the quality of the verse is mediocre.

The epigraph states that Maqṣūd Aqū constructed on the terrace of the fort a pleasant palace, one Nauras yard in width and two Nauras yards in height, in Shuḥūr 1008 i.e. A.H. 1016 (1607-08 A.D.). It was written by Maulānā Rājāb, the scribe of the previous record.

This epigraph was also noticed in the Gazetteer where its English rendering is not without mistakes but it does convey the purport fairly accurately except that it takes Rajāb, the name of the calligrapher, as the month in which the construction took place and that it does not mention Nauras Gaz but only Nauras which by itself is not a term indicating measure of length. The term only indicates nine times, for we commonly come across terms such as Nauras-Hon i.e. nine Hons, etc., in the royal orders of Ibrāhīm II and his successors.

---

1 Firigha, op. cit., p. 52; Zubairi, op. cit., p. 175.
2 Zubairi, op. cit., p. 179.
3 Ibid., p. 180.
5 Ibid.
6 ARIE, 1903-04, No. D, 206.
7 This palace, on the terrace of the Panhālā hill, is popularly known by this name, as it was here that Shivāji had imprisoned his son Sambhāji.
8 BQ, p. 424, No. 13.
9 His infatuation for the term Nauras is well-known.
10 For a note on Nauras, see Islamic Culture, vol. XXVIII (1964), pp. 335-38; Zubairi, op. cit., p. 249.
The text has been read by me as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate XXI(a)*

(1) During the reign of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh of auspicious countenance, an attractive palace was built on the terrace of the fort.

(2) It was one *nauras* (i.e. nine) yards in width and two *nauras* (i.e. eighteen yards) in height. This building of a pleasing view was erected by Maqṣūd Āqā.

(3) In the Shuhūr year one thousand and eight (Shuhūr 1008 i.e. A.H. 1016-1017 A.D.), this excellent edifice was constructed. O Lord! May this pure edifice last for ever! Written by Maulānā Rajab.

X. **THIRD RECORD OF IBRĀHĪM II, DATED A.H. 1020**

The third record of Ibrāhīm II and tenth of the present lot is fixed above the central *mihrāb* of the Jami' Mosque in the Ibrāhimpurā locality. The inscripational slab measuring 68 by 41 cm. contains three lines of writing, of which the first one is in Arabic prose, while the remaining two contain a Persian verse each carved in relief in fairly good *Taulāh* characters. It is stated to have been penned by the same Maulānā Rajab who had designed the two previous records. As it is, it is the best of the three, calligraphically. But as in the case of the other two, the text is a fine specimen of mediocrity poetry.

The inscription states that Maqṣūd Āqā constructed a mosque with a clean tank in Shuhūr 1011 i.e. A.H. 1020 (1611-12 A.D.) and that the text was written by Mullā Rajab.

This epigraph was also noticed in the Bombay Gazetteer, and the translation quoted there is as usual faulty, but the purport is correctly stated except for two mistakes of consequence: The first is that the date given is Shuhūr 1021, which is wrong, as the text has 1011 in words which, though not so specified must refer to the Shuhur era, as this year is equivalent to the Year 1020 given in figure, which is intended as Hijra era. Secondly, here again, the name of the scribe Mullā Rajab is mistaken for the month of Rajab and the word Mullā has been wrongly read as Maḷāz.*

---

I have deciphered the text as follows:—

TEXT

Plate XXI(b)

(1) قوله تعالى و ان المساجد ن لا تدعو[1] مع الله إحدا
(2) در زمان إبراهيم عادله صندار بناشد مسجد ز مع حوض مطهر سنة 1021
(3) بنا كرد مقصود آقا نيك رايس در سنة احدى عشر و ألف شتند تما مترب كتبه ملارجب

TRANSLATION

(1) The Exalted (Allah) has said, 'And verily, the mosques are for Allah only; hence, invoke not any one else with Allah.'

(2) In the reign of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh, the valiant (lit. breaker of ranks), the mosque with a pure tank (for ablution) was constructed. Year (A.H.) 1020 (1611-12 A.D.).

(3) It was built by Maqṣūd Āqā of good judgment and was completed in the (Shuhūr) year one thousand (and) eleven. Written by Mullā Rajab.

XI. FRAGMENTARY RECORD

The eleventh epigraph is carved on the right slab fixed in the platform in the compound of the Dargāh of Sa’du’d-Din. The slab measuring 1 m. by 30 cm. is fragmentary and contains one line of writing in Persian verse, carved in relief in Thulūḥ characters of a fairly good type.

The fragmentary slab seems to have lost its portion in the beginning, and hence the earlier part of the text is lost. As a result, it is difficult to determine the purport of the record with certainty. The extant text only refers to the assistance of one Khalaf Khān through which some edifice was constructed. Since the text also exhorts the visitor to show great deference to the place, it is pretty certain that the edifice was the Tomb of a saint. As the composition is faulty it cannot be asserted but the edifice could also be the 'Qadamsag of Prophet Khidr', i.e. the building containing the foot-print of Khidr. It may be, however, pointed out that while the foot-prints of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and even of 'Ali are known, we do not usually come across any such relic of Prophet Khidr who is immortal and also hidden from the eyes of mankind. The text is inscribed in Thulūḥ characters of fairly good quality, the calligrapher being one Muḥammad son of Farīḍu’d-Din.

But, the rendering of this epigraph given in the Bombay Gazetteer, which quotes a date, as also assigns it to a gate, gives an impression that the earlier part was extant when it was then noticed, but that does not appear to be the case, as the rendering and the present extant text are more or less of the same length. Therefore, the confusion is due to nothing else but the wrong reading of the epigraph which resulted in its misleading rendering in English. There is no date in the extant text but from the calligraphy it may be assigned to the first part of the seventeenth century.

1 Qur‘ān, Chapter LXXII, verse 18.
3 HJG, p. 424, No. 15.
(a) Another record of Ibrahim II dated Shuhur 1008 (p. 77)

(b) Third record of the same monarch dated A.H. 1020 (p. 78)
‘ADIL SHĀHĪ INSCRIPTIONS FROM PANHĀLĀ

The composition of the metrical text, in contrast with its calligraphy, is quite hopeless.

It has been deciphered by me as follows:

**TEXT**

*Plate XXII(a)*

پامداد خان [خان] تامدار بی سال از زو نادر
پی از پامدخی اینجاش که عجیب درگاه است که پدما خضر منزل شاهنامه‌ست

*Left margin.*

کاتب این عبد اباد ابن فردالحین

**TRANSLATION**

Through the help of the celebrated Khalaf Khan. May it remain as his memento for many years.

Do not step in here irreverently, for it is a wonderful threshold, for the building of the foot-
point of (Prophet) Khādīr is (like the) abode of an emperor.¹

*Left margin.*

Written by the humble creature Muhammad son of Fariduddin.

The calligrapher Muhammad son of Fariduddin appears to be a talented calligrapher, but
he does not find mention in chronicles. The record is therefore important for the history of
calligraphy and also for preserving the name of an artist of note in this field.

**XII. ANOTHER FRAGMENTARY EPIGRAPH**

The last record of the group is fix'd on the eastern wall of the Darzah of Bāra Inām in
the Fort.² Its one-line text comprising three hemistiches of Persian verse is inscribed
on a fragmentary tablet which measures 1.10 m. by 30 cm. The style of writing is
excellent Thulūd characters executed in relief against floral background. The extant portion of
the text seems to refer to the construction of some matchless edifice and to the reign of the
king during which it took place.

In the notice of this epigraph in the Bombay Gazetteer,³ it is stated to contain the remaining
three lines of a Quatrain, but a look at the text will show that the verses are in a metre different
from that employed in Quatrains. Also the translation in the Gazetteer names the king as ‘Ali,
which again is wrong and nothing more than a result of faulty reading.

¹ This line may also simply mean: 'threshold which is the place where Prophet Khādīr visits and where the
emperors come and sit.'
² *Ars*, 1883-84, No. D, 205.
³ *BG* p. 434, No. 17.
I have read the text as follows:

**TEXT**

*Plate XXII(b)*

...نديدم که مثل این بود در جهان بعده به سفر گردیده دین شمس تاجود شاه عالی[ی] گزین

**TRANSLATION**

............. I have not seen that its like is there in the world.

In the reign of the emperor, of pure religion,

the king, the lord of crown, the lofty and the chosen...........
THE SHUHUR SAN: DATE EQUIVALENCIES, ORIGINS AND SPECIAL PROBLEMS

BY MARIE H. MARTIN, AHMEDNAGAR

I. INTRODUCTION

Scholars working with Deccani materials from the fourteenth century onwards are familiar with the dating era called the Shuhūr San variously called Sur San Shahur San, Arabi San, etc. Tables and/or discussions of the era are found in both Marathi works and English works. But there are discrepancies in the treatment of the era—for example, Tables do not agree, there is confusion concerning what is actually the first day of each year, and quick calculations (such as subtracting 599 from the Christian year) are not necessarily accurate. By combining English Marathi sources (M. Nizim, G. H. Khare, and B. F. Modak), tables are available from the last quarter of the fifteenth century through the nineteenth century; and L. D. Swamikannu Pillai offers tables covering the entire period although not immediately relating to the Shuhūr San. The Tables are inconsistent, unfortunately, and there is no single source which gives an lucid explanation of the intricacies involved in calculating date equivalencies; therefore, there is no way to judge which tables can be used with the greatest degree of accuracy and confidence.

This essay will attempt to resolve the problems of the Shuhūr era; first, there will be a brief introduction to the era; then, an explanation of the reasons for the discrepancies in existing source for setting the initial day of each Shuhūr year; thirdly, a method for calculating Shuhūr date equivalencies will be presented; and, finally, there will be a detailed analysis of various specific problems of calendar equivalencies relevant to understanding the calendar systems involved.

This essay has been written because of the interest and help of a number of scholars, professional persons, and institutions. Dr. Z. A. Desai, Superintending Epigraphist for Arabic and Persian Inscriptions of the Archaeological Survey of India, Nagpur, and Dr. A. A. Kadiiri, Senior Epigraphical Assistant in the same office, drew my attention to some of the problems involved in the Shuhūr San and suggested bibliography. Dr. G. N. Morje, Head of the Marathi Department, Ahmednagar College, very kindly helped locate Marathi sources and translated the relevant passages for me. And Faculty members, professional persons and staff connected with Deccan College, Poož, the Archaeological Survey of India, South-Western Circle, Aurangabad, and Ahmednagar College, Ahmednagar, have assisted me in various phases of the research. I hope that this article will not only contribute to the study of South Asian History, but also serve as a demonstration of my thanks for their help and confidence.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SHUHUR SAN

One of the earliest descriptions in English of the Shuhūr San was given by James Grant Duff in 1826:

The Miry or cultivator’s year, always commences in the beginning of our month of June, corresponding with the end of the Hindu month, Vēsāh, or beginning of Jēsth.

(81)
By calculation, it appears that the Soorsun, (generally written Shuhoorsun by the Mussulmans), was introduced on the Migr, in Hejrzee 745, which corresponds with A.D. 1344-45; and hence it would appear, that it must have originated with Mohummud Tughluq Shah. It was much more like his character, than that of the emperor Akber, to introduce so useless an innovation; but it was in the reign of Akber that the Fusslee era commenced to the north of the Nerbudda, and it was introduced into the Deccan by his grandson, Shah Jahan, in the year of the Hejrez 1047, or A.D. 1637-38. The Soorsun and Fusslee eras are merely solar years, setting out with the date of the Hejrez when they commenced, but without making allowance in future reckoning, for the difference between the solar and lunar years; but which means they differ rather more than three years every century. Both the Soorsun and Fusslee are called Migr, or the husbandman's year, from their commencing at the season when the fields begin to be sown. 1

Grant Duff's comments can begin summarized in three categories. The first of these is the information about the era which is agreed upon by other authorities: the Shuhur San is a solar era; the first day of any single Shuhur year corresponds with the ‘Migr’——i.e., the day when the sun enters the Nakshatra Mrigasira; and, since the Shuhur year is calculated on a solar basis, it diverges from the Hijri year because each Shuhur year contains more days than each Hijri year. Additional information from other authorities confirmed by records using Shuhur dates, indicates that the Shuhur year is 599 to 600 years behind the Christian year (from about June through December it is 599 years behind, and from January to about June it is 600 years behind); and, that although the Shuhur and Hijri years begin on different dates, any particular day in Shuhur era is identified by the Hijri nomenclature for that day.

The second category of Grant Duff's comments is his opinion that it was a “useless innovation”. The continued use for several centuries of the Shuhur San by different dynasties and different rulers suggests exactly the opposite. G. H. Khare points out that except for military documents it was used for most official records, particularly those which had to do with land and land revenue. 2 Upon reflection, its suitability for record-keeping seems obvious: by embracing a complete agricultural year, records concerning land and land revenue could be immediately understood without adjustment. And since the year began with the sowing season and, therefore, near the onset of the monsoon, not only was organized material relevant for tax computation immediately available, but so was also information necessary for budgetary projections and estimations. In terms of an economy based heavily on agriculture, this was a more efficient time-period than a calendar year which changed at about the time of the spring harvest, as by early June some intimation of the potential of the monsoon was available for anticipating the yields of the coming year, and for planning broader budgetary considerations. Thus, for record-keeping purposes in the Deccan, it was an extremely logical calendar period.

The final category of comments has to do with calculations. Grant Duff says that the year begins in early June corresponding with the Hindu luni-solar months of Vaisakha or Jyestha; however, according to other authors, the year begins as early as 23 May and as late as 7 June. Furthermore, he suggests that calculations indicate that the year apparently was introduced in A.H. 745 (1344-45 A.D.). To verify these statements, a systematic method for finding date

---
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equivalencies must first be established, and in order to do this, certain idiosyncrasies of the
Christian calendar vis-a-vis the Hindu luni-solar calendar must be examined.

III. CHRISTIAN CALENDAR PROBLEMS

Long before the period of the Shuhr San, the Julian calendar was in effect in the Christian
countries of Europe. By the end of the sixteenth century, the Vernal Equinox which had
originally fallen on the 21st of March came regularly on the 11th of March. In 1582 Pope Gregory
declared that, in all Roman Catholic countries, ten days were to be omitted—the fifth of October
was to be the fifteenth of October—in order to correct this shift and to bring the Vernal Equinox
back to the 21st of March. In addition, all years evenly divisible by four were to have one extra
day (i.e., the 29th of February) except in the case of the beginning of a century when only the
first two digits had to be evenly divisible by four. That is to say, the years 1500 and 2000 were
to be leap years, while the years 1700, 1800, and 1900 would not be, as the first two digits cannot
be evenly divided by four.

The Gregorian reforms, however, were not instituted immediately in the Protestant and
Orthodox sections of the Christian world. Of particular importance for South Asianists, they
were not accepted in England. The result was that the English Old style calendar was out of
step with the Gregorian calendar. From 5 October 1582 until 28 February 1700, the English
calendar was ten days behind; and, because the English calendar continued to have a leap year
in all years divisible by four, from that date until the English calendar reform in 1752, the English
calendar was eleven days out of phase. The English reform took place when 2 September 1752
was followed by 14 September 1752, omitting the eleven day disparity between the calendars
and establishing the Gregorian calendar in England.

For those scholars working with materials from the sixteenth century onwards, this raises
the problems of reconciling Christian dates with one another. From October 1582 to the end
of February 1700 sources which are Roman Catholic (e.g., French, Portuguese, etc) have a ten
day discrepancy; from 1700 until 1752 the discrepancy is eleven days. Furthermore, reforms
in Orthodox countries (e.g., Russia, Greece, etc.) did not occur at the same time as the English
reform, and in some cases this discrepancy continued into the twentieth century, becoming greater
in 1800 and 1900 where the old style Julian calendar prevailed.

In regard to Indian materials, the eleven days omitted by the 1752 reform had the effect
of moving all days backward—e.g., any date which before the reform had fallen regularly on
8 May, since the reform omitted eleven days, then fell on 20 May. And any occasion falling
with regularity near the end of May, then shifted into early June. So the major reason for the
May/June discrepancy in references to the Shuhr San is due to the English calendar reform.

This does not explain the discrepancy completely, as different authorities say that the variation
in days between the two calendars was from 23 May to 25 May and from 5 June to 7 June
(plus two days, plus seven days, plus two days, or four days more than the calendar changes
explain). This additional disparity is due to the different methods used to calculate the length
of the Hindu solar year and the Christian solar year.

Technically, the Christian year is calculated on the basis of the time interval between one
Vernal Equinox and the next, a period of a little less than 365 days and six hours. The Hindu
solar year is calculated on the basis of the time required for the earth to complete one revolution around the sun measured in relation to the (apparently) fixed stars, a period of a little more than 365 days and six hours. This time difference means that over a long period of time, the Christian calendar will gain slightly on the Hindu calendar; if a Hindu solar date is equal to 23 May for many years, it will then shift to 24 May, and after many more years it will shift to 25 May.1

This is the same relationship which is seen between the Hijri lunar calendar and the Christian solar calendar, but in this instance the discrepancy is about eleven days per year and the gain is very rapid. As the disparity between the Christian calendar and the Hindu solar calendar is only a few minutes per year, it takes many years for even a one day discrepancy to appear. But, whenever tables embracing a long period of time are presented in which the opening day of the Shuhur year always corresponds with the same Christian date (with—as in Nāṣīm—or without—as in Khāte—allowance for leap year additions), the tables are obviously fallacious and have not taken into account this shift.

IV. THE CALCULATION OF SHUHUR SAN EQUIVALENCIES

One source which gives the scholar enough information with which to accurately calculate Shuhur San equivalencies is Pillai’s An Indian Ephemeris.2 Pillai explains the era briefly, saying that its current year is 599 years behind the Christian year, and that each year begins when the sun enters the Nakshatra Mrigasiras. In a footnote, he gives an example of how to calculate the first day of any particular year, but without explanation: (1) the sun enters the Nakshatra Mrigasiras when his (the sun’s) longitude is 53 degrees 20 minutes (3) the number of days which correspond to this longitudinal figure equals 56; and (3) when the solar year begins as in 1911 on 13 April, the sun’s entry into the Nakshatra Mrigasiras would be 56 plus 13, or 69 days from 1 April, i.e., on 8 June.3

This example in Pillai’s footnote, although it is not particularly clear, describes the procedure for calculating the first day of the Shuhur year. What Pillai does not explain is that the entrance of the sun into the Nakshatra Mrigasiras, because it is a solar phenomenon, takes place every year the same number of days after the beginning of the solar year—i.e. 56 days after the solar new year. Since the first month of the solar year is Mēsha in Sanskrit and Chittirai in Tamil, the first day of the solar year will be found in Pillai’s tables as 1 Mēsha-Chittirai in the column labelled “Solar Reckoning”, under the heading “Cyclic Sidereal year, month, and day”. In bold type, corresponding either to the month of March or April, 1 Mēsha-Chittirai will be seen, and reading across the line the equivalent Christian and Hijri dates will be given. For reasons which will be explained in the section on “The Indian Civil Day”, the information must be read from the tables and not taken from the top of the page which gives the moment of Mēsha Sankrānti. Because the entrance of the sun into the Nakshatra Mrigasiras occurs 56 days later, 56 must be added to the March/April date of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai in the tables. To facilitate these calculations, Pillai has included information in all the volumes in the form of an end paper or a book marker entitled “Table III: Days of the English Calendar Year, reckoned cumulatively from March 1 and April 1 respectively”, as well as in the Eye Tables, section 9, found in Volume 1 Part 1 on pp. 156-57, 162-63, and 168-69 at the top of the page.

---

1 Actually a simple shift from 23 to 24 to 25 May is not immediately apparent because of the interpolation of a leap year day every four years. This phenomenon and the resultant pattern will be carefully examined in the section “Mēsha Sankrānti Equivalences: An Unusual Pattern”.

2 L. D. Śwámikānu Pillai, An Indian Ephemeris, 7 volumes (Madras, 1922 and 1925).

3 Ibid., Vol. I, part I, p. 56 and f.n.
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In order to calculate the first day of the Shuhur year equivalent to 1413, for example, the tables indicate that 1 Mesha-Chittirai fell on the equivalent Christian date of 27 March (even though the actual moment of Sankranti was 26-28 March in the Sarya Siddhanta and 26-79 in the Arya Siddhanta). To find the date corresponding to 56 days later, Table III is used, the column referring to cumulative days from the first of March. To the 27th day of March, 56 is added, giving a total of 83. The first of May is 62 days from the first of March; and 83 minus 62 will be 21 days after the first of May, or 22 May.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 March</td>
<td>equals 1 Mesha-Chittirai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+56 days more until sun enters the Nakshatra Mrigasiras.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 days from 1 March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62 days between 1 March and 1 May.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 days after 1 May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As another example of this procedure, to find the beginning of the Shuhur year which occured in 1783, the Pillai tables show that 1 Mesha-Chittirai corresponded with 10 April. Since the date is being calculated from 1 April, 10 is added to the 56 days necessary for the sun to enter the Nakshatra Mrigasiras, totalling 66. The first of June was 62 days after 1 April, and 66 minus 62 gives a difference of 4 days after 1 June, or 5 June 1783. According to this procedure, since Table III gives the number of days corresponding to the first of the month, a date equivalency will always be X number of days after the first of the month, and so it is necessary to add 1: the day 6 days after 1 June is 7 June; the days 25 days after 1 May is 26 May, and so forth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 April</td>
<td>equals 1 Mesha-Chittirai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+56 days more until sun enters the Nakshatra Mrigasiras.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 days from 1 April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62 days between 1 April and 1 June.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days after 1 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For those who find no confusion in numbers, there is a slight modification of Pillai's method which simplifies the calculations. During the period of the use of the Shuhur San, all the days 1 Mesha-Chittirai fell either in March or April, and all the corresponding first days of each Shuhur San year fell respectively in May and June. The time from 1 March to 1 May is 62 days, and the time from 1 April to 1 June is 62 days. Since 1 needs to be subtracted with Pillai's method, the actual difference is 61. So to calculate an exact answer, one need only to subtract 61 from the total of the days of 1 Mesha-Chittirai PLUS 66, remembering that a March date corresponds with a May date, and an April date corresponds with a June date.)

For most scholars, however, calculating the first day of any particular Shuhur year corresponding with a Christian year is not of itself of interest. What is wanted is a method to find a Christian date equivalent to a particular Shuhur date. If the only information given is a particular year—say Shuhur 823—then the addition of 599/600 gives the equivalent Christian years, i.e. 1422/23. Checking Pillai's tables for those two years, Mesha-Chittirai began on 26 March both years, and 26 plus 56 totals 82. Referring to Table III, 1 May was 62 days from 1 March, so that the first day of the Shuhur San in both 1422 and 1423 fell on 82 minus 62 plus 1 May, or 21 May. The Shuhur year 823 began on 21 May 1422 and ended the day before the next year began, that is on 20 May 1423.

In a case in which both a Shuhur year and a Hijri year are given but with no additional information, an even more precise calculation can be made. For example if the Shuhur year 823 and the Hijri year 826 are given, since Shuhur year 823 embraced 21 May 1422 through 20 May 1423, then the time shared by these two years was from 15 December 1422 (when Hijri 826 began) to 20 May 1423.
Finally, there is the case in which a complete Shuhur date is cited, as 1 Shawwāl Shuhur 965. Adding 599/600 to 965 gives 1564/65 as the equivalent Christian years. Pillai's Hijri tables indicate that there was only one 1 Shawwāl which fell into that period, occurring on 2 May 1565.

Since the solar Shuhur year is longer than the lunar Hijri year, some part of the Hijri calendar will be repeated in each Shuhur year—e.g., if 1 Muḥarram in a normal 354 day Hijri year should happen to fall on the first day of the Shuhur year, then the Hijri year would expire after 334 days while the Shuhur year continues to run, and a second 1 Muḥarram would fall in that Shuhur year. The eleven days which are repeated would then be distinguished as awwal (first) and akhir (last) days. Or if 10 Ṣafar should happen to correspond with the first day of a Shuhur year, then 355 days later 10 Ṣafar would again be the Hijri date in the next Hijri year, but the 365 day Shuhur year would still be running; in this case the dates 10 through 21 Ṣafar would be identified as awwal and akhir.

V. THE ORIGIN OF THE SHUHUR SAN

Although finding date equivalencies of Shuhur San dates is of primary importance to most scholars, the introduction of the era is of historical interest. Several epenmists have tentatively assigned the date of the era's introduction, but the evidence available does not justify their specificity. Since V. S. Bendery's discussion includes material not found elsewhere, his comments are given in full:

It is believed that the Arabic era originated from the ascension of Mustak to the throne of his father Abraha in 589 A.D. The first year of the era, however, coincided with 600 A.D., and its commencement occurred in the latter half of May 600 A.D. Another version of the origin of this era is that the era may have been an offshoot of the Hijrī reckoning probably originated in or closely about the year 745 A.H. (i.e. May 15th, 1344 to 3rd May 1345 A.D.), and it may have been introduced in the southern part of Mahārāṣṭra by Muḥammad Tughluq during his regime. This view finds support in the circumstance that a new era was introduced by the Jawhar Chief in commemoration of his investiture with "Shah"-ship by Muḥammad Tughluq. Whatever be the origin of the era, it is definitely ascertained from the records now available that its initial point must be taken as 600 A.D. for our calculation of this era.

The reasons for Bendery's conclusions concerning the Arab San are not clear. Firstly, Abraha and his son were Ethiopian rulers of Yemen during the period of Ethiopian ascendency (A.D. 529 to 606) in that area. If the title originated with either of them, since they were not Arabs, they must have been identifying an already extant era; but Bendery gives no evidence that such an era was in effect in Yemen. And had either of these rulers originated the era himself, one would expect to find the title reflecting their Ethiopian heritage or carrying some reference to their own names. Secondly, there is no indication of which records "now available" demonstrate "that its initial date must be taken as 600 A.D.". Has Bendery simply subtracted the 599/600 discrepancy between the Christian era to arrive at this figure; and if so, then the correct answer would be from the latter half of May 599, not 600. Also, if the era was instituted in 589, why were the years not numbered until 600? And finally, since the calculation of the beginning of each Shuhur year is based on a Hindu solar calculation, and since the period of the year is so well suited to Deccani conditions, it suggests most strongly that the era was not imported but was native to the area.

Bendery, Study of Muslim Inscriptions (Bombay, 1946), p. 33.
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This last statement is highly suggestive, in that it implies that the official introduction of the era for record-keeping purposes was simply a recognition of the suitability of an extant way of dividing the year. It is common knowledge that amongst different communities in the sub-continent the actual beginning of the year for calendar purposes does not necessarily correspond with the beginning of the year for other purposes. For example, the Mārwarī book-keeping year begins officially with Lakṣmī Pūjā, not with either the calendar year or the tax year. In the Deccan, tā: "Mirg" was the beginning of the cultivators' year, and at some point some one in officialdom seems to have recognised the suitability of this year for land and land revenue records. So that actually what is being discussed in terms of fixing the "origin" of this era is, when did the suitability of the agricultural year for record-keeping purposes become apparent, and when was the agricultural year first used as an official record-keeping year?

Returning to Bendrey's analysis, it is suggested as it was in Grant Duff that the origins of the Shuhr San lie in the period of Muḥammad Tughlīq's domination of the Deccan. Other ephemerists comment on this point, but their explanations lack detail. C. S. Patell, for example, says:

According to Jervis, it was introduced on the 5th of June, 1342 A.D., in 743 of the Hegira; others place it a year sooner. He states that the computation of its agreement with the Hegira year shows it to have begun when the 745th Hegira (A.C. 1344) corresponded with the 745th Shuhr San.¹

And R. Sewell and S. B. Dikshit say:

It only diverged from the Hijri in A.D. 1344, according to the best computation, since when it has been a solar year as described above. On May 15th A.D. 1344, the Hijri year 745 began. But since then the Shuhur reckoning was carried on by itself as a solar year.²

The basic assumption underlying the two statements above, Bendrey's comments, and Grant Duff's description, is that when the Shuhr era was introduced, it bore the same number as the Hijri year current, just as the various Faglī eras did; but, given the solar nature of the era, each year was longer than each Hijri year, so that throughout the numbering of the years diverged, the Hijri system moving ahead by about three years per century.

A common factor in all four descriptions is the reference to the year A.H. 745, but the commentaries are speculative and contradictory. The Patell statement is internally inconsistent—the era was introduced on 6 June 1342 (which was 1 Muḥarram 743) or a year earlier, but it began in 745. Bendrey hedge's by saying that it originated "in or closely around" 745. Grant Duff says, "By calculation, it appears" to have been introduced in 745. And Sewell and Dikshit say that it "diverged" from the Hijri year in 745. These contradictions are the result of various fallacious assumptions. Jervis, for example, was aware that in the nineteenth century the "Mirg" fell in early June, so he apparently searched for an early June date when 1 Muḥarram might have corresponded with the "Mirg"—as in 1277, 1342, and 1375. The year 1342 seemed most suitable given the 599 year discrepancy between the Shuhr and Christian eras. Unfortunatly, he neglected to take into account the calendar reform of 1752 before which the "Mirg" would have taken place in May, not in June. The Sewell and Dikshit statement suggests that, since A.H. 745 began on 15 May and the Shuhr year began later, the dates diverged at that time. This assumes, incorrectly, one of two things: either (1) that the Shuhr year and the Hijri year were identified by the same number before 745; or (2) that since the Hijri year began before the Shuhr—

year, the Shuhûr year would have had a different number—but this is when the Shuhûr year would have had the same number.

In order to resolve the problem above, Table 1 has been constructed showing when it was possible for the Shuhûr and the Hijri year to be identified with the same number. Column 1 gives the number of the Hijri year; column 2, the equivalent Christian date of the first day of that Hijri year, of 1 Muharram; column 3, the last day of that Hijri year; column 4, the first day of the Shuhûr year; column 5, the Shuhûr year; and column 6 the Hijri year current when the Shuhûr year began. The asterisks identify years when the Hijri year and Shuhûr year were not the same.

A.H. 741 began on 27 June 1340. The Shuhûr year and the first day of that year can be calculated with the method explained previously in this essay. 1340 minus 599 gives the Shuhûr year 741. In 1340, the first day of Mêsha-Chittira was 26 March. 26 plus 56 equals 82, and 82 minus 62 equals 20. 1 May plus 20 equals 21 May. So the first day of Shuhûr 741 was 21 May 1340. The Hijri year 741, however, did not begin until the end of June—in other words, the Hijri year current when 1 Shuhûr San 741 would have taken place was 740. Therefore, if the assumption that when the Shuhûr year was introduced it was identified with the number of the Hijri year current is correct, it could not have been introduced in A.H. 741 (1340 A.D.). Following this procedure, all the Hijri dates from 741 through 781 have been given along with the Shuhûr dates.

Examining the table, one can see that it was possible for the Hijri and Shuhûr years to be identified with the same number only from A.H. 745 through 775 (A.D. 21 May 1344 through 1 June 1375). The Shuhûr year, therefore, could not have been introduced before A.H. 745, nor after A.H. 776. And the two eras “diverged” in A.H. 777 (1375 A.D.), not in the period of the 740’s.

The numerical evidence alone does not establish the exact year in which the era was first used for book-keeping purposes. It does make highly dubious the assertion that it was introduced by Muhammad Tughluq since from 21 May 1344—the earliest date the era could have been introduced as seen above—he was absent from the Deccan and returned only in 1345 for the siege of Daulatabad. Conditions in the Deccan were extremely unsettled in 1344-45, and political hegemony was not restored until after the establishment of the Bahmaní dynasty in 1347. It seems far more likely that the era was first used officially by the Bahmanís between 1347 and 1375 while creating and consolidating their own political and revenue structures, rather than during the confusion of the political collapse of the Tughluqs.

There now remains Bendrey’s statement about the “Jawhar Chief”. This may be a reference to an officer named Malik Jawhar, but the Persian source—which Bendrey does not give—must be studied closely. The statement as given is clearly ambiguous—most political leaders take great pride in introducing a “new era”. Usually this is a figurative statement; and when it is literal, it means enumerating years from the time of the ruler’s accession rather than introducing a new system.

VI. HINDU LUNI-SOLAR TERMS RELEVANT TO UNDERSTANDING SHUHUR SAN CALCULATIONS

The section describing the method for calculating Shuhûr San date equivalencies was presented without explanation because of the complexities of Hindu calendar calculations. In  

1 By “Jawhar Chief” is intended the Cheîr or Raja of the erstwhile Jawâr State situated within the geographical limits of Thana District, near Bombay. Prof. Bendrey has perhaps derived his information from the Imperial Gazetteer of India. Vol. XIV (London, 1908), p. 88, which too, unfortunately, does not quote any source. Thus any reference to an officer Malik Jawhar is out of question; Miss Martin was misled by the similarity of names. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that this particular piece of information needs further scrutiny and study as stated by Miss Martin.—Ed.
order to understand why the method presented is accurate and also to indicate under what circumstances there may be discrepancies in Pillai's tables affecting the Shuhur San, it is necessary to examine certain aspects of the Hindu luni-solar calendar, and also to consider certain assumptions made by Pillai when compiling his tables.

i. The Luni-Solar Year, Siddhântas and Ankrântis

Indian calendar systems generally follow the same procedural rules for calculations; however, the constants used to define the length of certain astronomical periods may differ slightly. These constants define systems which are called siddhântas; and there are two major siddhântas in use in the sub-continent. One of these systems, the Surya Siddhânta, is found throughout the sub-continent; the other, the Arya Siddhânta, is used in the South. The only difference between the two systems occurs in the fixing of the time of the exact moment of Sankrânti—the beginning of each solar month; and, for the centuries with which this essay is concerned, this involves a difference of -06 to -11 of a day.

The luni-solar year used in India is calculated on the basis of both lunar and solar phenomena. The solar calculations involve the sidereal year—a year measured in terms of the time required for the earth to move around the sun and return to a particular position determined in relation to the (apparently) fixed stars. Each of the twelve months of the solar year begins when the sun enters a different râśi—Sign of the Zodiac—and the exact moment of its entrance is called a sankrânti. Pillai suggests that it is helpful to think of these solar months as "hinges" and to consider the lunar months as "doors" which swing on the hinges.†

The moment of Mēsha Sankrânti—the phenomenon which determines the beginning of the solar year and the first day of the first solar month—is a "hinge", and the new moon which precedes this sankrânti starts the lunar month associated with that sankrânti—it is the door hanging on the Mēsha Sankrânti hinge. On the second sankrânti of the year, the next lunar month is hung, beginning on the new moon which precedes that sankrânti. Usually (but not always) the solar months have a regular number of days, varying from 29 to 31, depending on the month. The actual length of the lunar month, however, is 29 53 days. It is possible, then, for a month of 30 or 31 days to have two new moons; and that solar month will then have two lunar months commencing within it. Much more rarely, there is no new moon in a 29 day solar month, and so a lunar month is dropped from the calendar in that year.

As stated above, the length of the regular solar months ranges from 29 to 31 days. Occasionally, however, the regular month may contain an extra day. This happens in the Tamilnâdu system when the moment of Sankrânti occurs after sunset.‡ Instead of beginning the new month immediately, it is not extended by one day. It is for this reason that a particular date in a single solar month cannot be identified as always occurring 56 days after Mēsha Sankrânti. And, therefore, in every year the calculation of the day the sun enters the Nakshatra Mrigasiras must be calculated by the addition of the 56 day difference.

ii. The Luni-Solar Day, Nakshatras and Tithis

There are two ways of defining daily time in the Hindu luni-solar system. One of these is in terms of nakshatras. In non-technical terms, a nakshatra corresponds to a lunar mansion, and

† Pillai, op. cit., p. 25.
‡ For a more detailed explanation, see sub-section iii. The Indian Civil Day.
there are 27 lunar mansions in the Hindu calendar system. From the point of view of an observer on the earth, this nakshatra cycle is complete when the moon has travelled around the earth until it has regained its position in regard to a fixed group of stars identified as a particular nakshatra—a period of a little over 27.32 days. Since there are 27 nakshatras, the time unit of one nakshatra is equal to a little more than one day, say about 1 day 18 minutes.

The other method of defining daily time is based upon the time required for the moon to move from one new moon to the next. This period is about 29.53 days long, during which the moon not only travels around the earth but also travels with the earth in its orbit. In so doing, it moves to a point further in the earth’s orbit, and in order for the sun’s rays to be blocked out sufficiently for another new moon to occur, it must move further around the earth as well. There are 30 tithis in this lunar period, so that one tithi is slightly less than the western day, say about 0.98 of a day.

As daily time-keeping units, nakshatras and tithis have no effect on the Suhur San. The term nakshatra, however, is used in regard to fixing the first day of the Suhur year which occurs when the sun enters the Nakshatra Mrigasiras. A more technical definition of a nakshatra is the portion of the ecliptic occupied by the moon on successive days. Since the ecliptic is the apparent path of the sun through the stars over a period of a year, the sun also moves through the 27 nakshatras. And just as the sun moves around and appears to re-enter the constellation Mēsha once a year, it will also pass through each nakshatra at a particular time each year. In his footnote referred to above, Pillai calculates this time by measuring the distance between the point of Mēsha Sankrānti and the point which indicates the entrance of the sun into Mrigasiras in degrees of longitude and then converts this measurement into days. Since the stars involved are so distant as to seem to be fixed, this distance is a constant, and the time required to traverse it is also a constant. Thus the sun’s entrance into the Nakshatra Mrigasiras always occurs 56 days after Mēsha Sankrānti.

iii. The Indian Civil Day

On a day-to-day basis, time is kept according to the divisions of the Indian Civil Day. This day begins at sunrise, not at midnight, and is split into 60 units called ghatikas. Pillai has used the civil day as the basis for his calculations, and when he cites the moment of Mēsha Sankrānti at the top of the page of his Ephemeris dealing with each year, he has expressed that moment in decimal places of the civil day. For example, in 1400 A.D., Mēsha Sankrānti took place on 26.24 March according to the Surya Siddhānta. Checking either the book-marker or end-sheet, the decimal .24 of a day equals 14 and \( \frac{1}{2} \) ghatikas, or 5 hours 45 minutes. This time is reckoned from sunrise; if sunrise were at 6:00 A.M., then the time indicated would be 5 hours 45 minutes later, or 15 minutes before noon. Assuming that the mean sunrise time for India is 6:00 A.M., then any fraction over .75 of a day, or over 45 ghatikas, would take place after midnight; and in western terms that would put it into the following day.

In different parts of India there are different calculations for the commencement of the civil day. In Orissa, irrespective of the moment of Sankrānti, the first day of the solar month begins on the actual day (i.e. civil day, calculated from sunrise to sunrise) of the sankrānti. In areas of Malabār, if sankrānti occurs before 18 ghatikas have expired, then that civil day is the civil sankrānti day; if sankrānti occurs after 18 ghatikas have expired, then the next civil day is identified as the sankrānti day. In Tamilnadu, the cut-off point is 30 ghatikas; if sankrānti occurs when 30 ghatikas have expired, then the next civil day is identified as the sankrānti day. And in Bengāl, when sankrānti occurs during the first 45 ghatikas of a day, the next
day is the civil sankrānti day; if it takes place after 45 chaṭikās, the following day is the civil day.1

Examining Pillai's tables once again, two things should be noted about the relationship between the moment of Mēsha Sankrānti and the first day of the first solar month, 1 Mēsha-Chittirai. Pillai gives two calculations for the moment of Mēsha Sankrānti, one in the Surya Siddhānta, one in the Ārya Siddhānta. In his tables he gives date equivalencies of Mēsha-Chittirai and the Christian date. Whenever the moment of Mēsa Sankrānti according to the Ārya Siddhānta corresponds to .50 of a day or more, 1 Mēsha Chittirai corresponds to the next Christian day. For example, in 1436, Mēsha-Chittirai took place at 26.56 March according to the Ārya Siddhānta. Pillai gives the day of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai as 26 March. In 1440 however, Mēsa Sankrānti took place at 26.69 March in the Surya Siddhānta and at 26.52 according to the Ārya Siddhānta. In this case Pillai gives the date equivalency of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai as 27 March. Pillai has used the Tamilnādu system for calculating the civil day in his tables, as well as the Ārya Siddhānta, and both of these are southern systems. Nowhere is it made explicit, however, that the various rulers of the Deccan from the fourteenth through the nineteenth centuries used these two southern systems exclusively for their astronomical calculations.

The effect on the calculation of Shuhūr San dates, if other systems were used, would only occur when certain time periods were involved. Had the Surya Siddhānta been used rather than the Ārya Siddhānta, since the difference is .06 of a day in the fourteenth century and .11 of a day by the end of the nineteenth century, very few dates would have been affected, and only those dates where Mēsha Sankrānti took place at a crucial moment of the civil day. If one of the other three systems of computing the civil day had been used, then only during certain portions of a day would there have been an effect on establishing 1 Mēsha-Chittirai from the moment of Mēsha Sankrānti. In the Malābār system, times from .30 to .50 of a day would not convert to the next day as the Tamilnādu system does; and in the Bengāl system, times from .50 to .75 of a day would be the same as the Tamil system; all other times would be one day advanced.

The circumstances under which a discrepancy might be discovered are limited. When there is an accompanying Hijri date, since the method presented uses Hijri tables for finding the equivalent Christian date, there will be no discrepancy. In cases when only a Shuhūr date is available for establishing the first or last day of the Shuhūr year, there is a possibility of error. The only way this error can be detected and rectified is if a document clearly states that particular serial day of the Shuhūr year fell on a Hijri date (or Hindu date, for that matter) of such-and-such, and it can then be demonstrated that the moment of Mēsha Sankrānti which began that Shuhūr year fell into one of the vital time periods listed in the preceding paragraph.

Recalling what was said earlier in the essay about the introduction of the Shuhūr San suggests that it is more probable that these two southern systems have been used rather than the other systems. To begin with, the Shuhūr San was first introduced in the South, not in the North. It was not until some two centuries later that it appeared in the North as the Fasī era. Furthermore, it seems to have been introduced by the Bahmanīs, a southern dynasty despite their northern origins, the strength of whose kingdom was dependent upon the agricultural conditions of the South. As the Shuhūr San was applied to Deccani conditions and used Hindu dating calculations for setting its initial day, it is logical to anticipate that local personnel would be used to establish important moments in that local system. Since the Tamilnādu system of calculations was the most widespread in the Bahmani areas—the Bengāl system being far removed, and the Orissi

1 See Pillai, op. cit., p. 8.
and Malabar systems being confined to relatively small regions removed from the areas of Bahrain dominance—it is the most likely system to have been employed.

VII. 1 Mēsha-Chittirai Equivalences: An Unusual Pattern

An examination of Pillai’s calculations for the date of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai indicates an unusual pattern of date-changes which repeats itself over a period of a little more than a century (see Table 2, infra). The reason for this strange looking pattern has to do with the discrepancy in the Christian calendar calculations between the real length of the year and the length used for calendar calculations. The real length of the year is 365 days 3 hours 48 minutes and 45 seconds, or slightly less than 365 and ¼ days. Every four years an extra day is added to correct the calendar, but since the real calculation is a little less than 1¼ of a day per year, this extra day slightly overcompensates for the real discrepancy. In order to demonstrate exactly what happens, Table 3 has been prepared. For convenience in reckoning, the length of the year has been rounded off to 365 days 5 hours and 48 minutes. In terms of a fraction of a day, 5 hours and 48 minutes equal 348 minutes over 1440 minutes or 87,360ths. The years are imaginary, beginning with XX01 and each year evenly divisible by 4 (e.g., XX01, XX08, XX48) is a leap year.

Following the table, the year XX01 expires after 365 days, but there are 87,360ths of a day left in the real year, so the calendar is missing that fraction of a day, it is minus 87,360ths of a day. The year XX02 will also be a 365 day year, losing another 87,360ths, so that the total time discrepancy will be minus 174,720ths. The same situation applies to the third year, the total time lag at the end of XX03 being minus 261,840ths. The year XX04, being divisible by 4, will be a leap year of 366 days and plus 360,360ths of a day are added; however, the real addition of time is (minus 87,360) (times 4), or minus 348,360ths. The calendar has added plus 360,360ths, so that the calendar has moved ahead of the real time by plus 12,360ths. In next year, XX05, 87,360ths are lost again, and the calendar is once more behind real time, the sum of a positive 12,360ths and a negative 87,360ths being minus 75,360ths. Expanding the table to cover 120 years (because a fairly small and regular fraction has been used), the table comes around to the beginning again as far as the fractions are concerned, and one whole day has been added.

Analysing the contents of the table, it begins with a pattern of three minus signs and one plus sign: then it moves to a pattern of two minus signs and two pluses; the next shift is to a pattern of one minus and three pluses: the fourth change is to a pattern of four pluses; finally the pattern is one day extra along with the original pattern of three minus signs and one plus sign.

Comparing this pattern with the dates of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai from 1348 to 1479, the same pattern is seen (the years do not correspond exactly because the fraction used to compute Table 3 was rounded off rather than a precise fraction). Beginning in 1348, there are three minus years in a row—that is 26 March—and in 1351 a plus year, or 27 March. This pattern repeats for some years. Then in 1379 the pattern changes to two minus and two plus days—i.e., 26, 26, 27, 27 March. In 1406 there is a shift to one minus and three plus days—i.e., 26, 27, 27, 27 March. In 1437 the pattern of all pluses reverses—i.e., 27, 27, 27, 27 March. And in 1467 an entire new day is added, the 28th of March, and the original pattern of three minus and one plus day begins again—i.e., 27, 27, 27, 28 March.

VIII. Another Table for Conversion

Many scholars working with South Asian materials may not have continuous access to Pillai’s *An Indian Ephemeris*, and moreover, it is difficult to carry when on tour. A small, fairly inex-
Pensive volume which is available (originally priced at Sh. 10/50, now perhaps slightly more) is G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville's *The Muslim and Christian Calendars*, London, Oxford University Press, 1963. One drawback to the volume is that the user has to calculate date equivalencies; however, the method is quite simple and can be learned very easily by anyone who is not petrified when faced with normal addition and subtraction. Furthermore, dates in this volume covering the centuries when the Shuhur San was in use agree with the dates in the *Ephemeris* with two exceptions: the Freeman-Grenville volume follows the Gregorian reform of 1582, and there is an error in assigning the week day corresponding with 1 January from 1582 through 1878.

For adapting dates up to the calendar reform of 1582 and after the calendar reform of 1752, the following method can be used:—

1. On a separate sheet of paper, convert the 1 Mēsha-Chittirai dates of 25, 26, 27 March, etc., and 9, 10, 11 April, etc., to their appropriate dates corresponding with the sun’s entry into the Nakshatra Māgāstrās 56 days later.

2. Using Pillai’s tables for 1 Mēsha-Chittirai, along with the list of equivalencies prepared in 1 above, 25 March will be immediately understood as 20 May, 26 March as 21 May, etc.

3. In the Freeman-Grenville volume in the column labelled “Christian date to Muharram 1”, on the right side, enter the correct date of the entrance of the sun into the Nakshatra Māgāstrās corresponding with each Christian year. The column will then read: 15 May 1344-21/5; 4 May 1345-21/5; 21 April 1346-21/5; etc. It is easiest to make the entry after the Christian year (rather than before the Hijri year) because every 33 years or so two Hijri years will begin in the same Christian year (1356, 1388, 1421, etc.).

4. Then treat the date which has been entered with the same method with which all dates in the Freeman-Grenville volume are treated.

Dates in the *Ephemeris* were not reformed until 1752, while the Freeman-Grenville dates are reformed from 1582. So that the tables may be internally consistent, it is necessary to correct the Pillai figures when entering them into the Freeman-Grenville tables. Since 4 October became 14 October in 1582, Pillai dates such as 28 and 29 May will be converted to 7 and 8 June. In 1700 with the leap year day, the discrepancy becomes one day more. By keeping the table in the Freeman-Grenville volume consistent, all dates in the volume can be used the same way. And any figure which is the result of a series of calculations can then be converted at the end to correspond with the English calendar.

The error in assigning the week day corresponding with 1 January is a systematic error from the year 1552 through 1878. Each 365 day Christian year consists of 52 weeks and 1 day, so that if a year begins on a Sunday it also ends on a Sunday, and the next year begins on Monday. In leap years, because of the addition of an extra day, if a year begins on Sunday, then the following year begins on Tuesday. In 1551 the year began on Thursday; in 1552, then, it began on Friday. Freeman-Grenville has put back the day to Wednesday instead of advancing it to Friday, so that from 1552 onward, until 1871, all days are two days out of phase. During this period, whenever Thursday is given as the first day of the year, it must be corrected to read Saturday; when Monday is given, it must be corrected to read Wednesday, etc. In addition there is a typographical error in the year 1703; Saturday is given, but Sunday would be correct in terms of the systematic error. From 1872 through 5 January 1878 the error is reduced to only one day, and those eight years must be corrected by the addition of one day—Wednesday should be corrected to read Thursday, etc.
### Table 1
YEARS WHEN THE HIJRI AND SHUHŪR YEARS COULD HAVE BORNE THE SAME NUMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hijri Year</th>
<th>First Day of Hijri Year</th>
<th>Last Day of Hijri Year</th>
<th>First Day of Shuhūr Year</th>
<th>Shuhūr Year</th>
<th>Hijri Year Current on First Day of Shuhūr Year</th>
<th>Asterisks indicate years when Hijri &amp; Shuhūr Numbers Differed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>741</td>
<td>27/6/1340</td>
<td>16/6/1341</td>
<td>21/5/1340</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td>17/6/1341</td>
<td>5/6/1342</td>
<td>21/5/1341</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>6/6/1342</td>
<td>25/5/1343</td>
<td>21/5/1342</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>26/5/1343</td>
<td>14/5/1344</td>
<td>21/5/1343</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745</td>
<td>15/5/1344</td>
<td>3/5/1345</td>
<td>21/5/1344</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746</td>
<td>4/5/1345</td>
<td>23/4/1346</td>
<td>21/5/1345</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>24/4/1346</td>
<td>12/4/1347</td>
<td>21/5/1346</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748</td>
<td>13/4/1347</td>
<td>31/3/1348</td>
<td>21/5/1347</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>748</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>1/4/1348</td>
<td>21/3/1349</td>
<td>21/5/1348</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>22/3/1349</td>
<td>10/3/1350</td>
<td>21/5/1349</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>11/3/1350</td>
<td>27/2/1351</td>
<td>21/5/1350</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752</td>
<td>28/2/1351</td>
<td>17/2/1352</td>
<td>22/5/1351</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>753</td>
<td>18/2/1352</td>
<td>5/2/1353</td>
<td>21/5/1352</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754</td>
<td>6/2/1353</td>
<td>23/1/1354</td>
<td>21/5/1353</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>24/1/1354</td>
<td>15/1/1355</td>
<td>21/5/1354</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>16/1/1355</td>
<td>4/1/1356</td>
<td>22/5/1355</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>25/1/1356</td>
<td>24/12/1355</td>
<td>21/5/1356</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>25/12/1356</td>
<td>14/12/1357</td>
<td>21/5/1357</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759</td>
<td>15/12/1357</td>
<td>2/12/1358</td>
<td>21/5/1358</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>3/12/1358</td>
<td>22/11/1359</td>
<td>22/5/1359</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>23/11/1359</td>
<td>10/11/1360</td>
<td>21/5/1360</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762</td>
<td>11/11/1360</td>
<td>30/10/1361</td>
<td>21/5/1361</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijri Year</td>
<td>First Day of Hijri Year</td>
<td>Last Day of Hijri Year</td>
<td>First Day of Shuhur Year</td>
<td>Shuhur Year</td>
<td>Hijri Year Current on First Day of Shuhur Year</td>
<td>Asterisks indicate years when Hijri &amp; Shuhur Numbers Differed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763</td>
<td>31/10/1361</td>
<td>20/10/1362</td>
<td>21/5/1362</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>21/10/1362</td>
<td>9/10/1363</td>
<td>22/5/1363</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>10/10/1363</td>
<td>27/9/1364</td>
<td>21/5/1364</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>28/5/1364</td>
<td>17/9/1365</td>
<td>21/5/1365</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>18/9/1365</td>
<td>6/9/1366</td>
<td>21/5/1366</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768</td>
<td>7/9/1366</td>
<td>27/8/1367</td>
<td>22/5/1367</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>769</td>
<td>28/8/1367</td>
<td>15/8/1368</td>
<td>21/5/1368</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>16/8/1368</td>
<td>4/8/1369</td>
<td>21/5/1369</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771</td>
<td>5/8/1369</td>
<td>25/7/1370</td>
<td>21/5/1370</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772</td>
<td>26/7/1370</td>
<td>14/7/1371</td>
<td>22/5/1371</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>15/7/1371</td>
<td>2/7/1372</td>
<td>21/5/1372</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>3/7/1372</td>
<td>22/6/1373</td>
<td>21/5/1373</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>23/6/1373</td>
<td>11/6/1374</td>
<td>21/5/1374</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>12/6/1374</td>
<td>1/6/1375</td>
<td>22/5/1375</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>2/6/1375</td>
<td>20/5/1376</td>
<td>21/5/1376</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778</td>
<td>21/5/1376</td>
<td>9/5/1377</td>
<td>21/5/1377</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>779</td>
<td>10/5/1377</td>
<td>29/4/1378</td>
<td>21/5/1378</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>30/4/1378</td>
<td>18/4/1379</td>
<td>22/5/1379</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
THE PATTERN OF 1 MĒSHA-CHITTIRAI EQUIVALENCIES, 1348-1479

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>March Date of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai</th>
<th>One Plus Sign Indicates One Day's Advance From 26 March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1357</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>March Date of 1 Meha-Chittrai</td>
<td>One Plus Sign Indicates One Day's Advance From 26 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1388</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1390</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1391</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1392</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1393</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1395</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1396</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1397</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1398</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 DGA/74
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>March Date of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai</th>
<th>One Plus Sign Indicates One Day's Advance From 26 March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1402</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1404</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1406</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1407</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1408</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1409</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1413</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1414</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1417</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1418</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1421</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1422</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1423</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1426</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>March Date of 1 Mēša-Chittirai</td>
<td>One Plus Sign Indicates One Day's Advance From 26 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1427</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1428</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1429</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1431</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1432</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1433</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1434</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1435</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1436</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1437</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1438</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1439</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1440</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1441</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1442</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1443</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1444</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1446</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1447</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1448</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1449</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1452</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1453</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>March Date of 1 Mēsha-CHittirai</td>
<td>One Plus Sign Indicates One Day's Advance From 26 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1455</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1456</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1457</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1458</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1460</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1462</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1463</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1465</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1468</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1471</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1472</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1474</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1478</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

**The Pattern of Calendar Year and Real Year Time Discrepancies**

(See Section VII. 1 Mesha-Chittirai Equivalencies: An Unusual Pattern, For Explanation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Year</th>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX01</td>
<td>- 87,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX02</td>
<td>- 174,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX03</td>
<td>- 261,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX04</td>
<td>+ 12,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX05</td>
<td>- 75,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX06</td>
<td>- 162,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX07</td>
<td>- 249,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX08</td>
<td>+ 21,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX09</td>
<td>- 63,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX10</td>
<td>- 150,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX11</td>
<td>- 237,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX12</td>
<td>+ 36,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX13</td>
<td>- 51,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX14</td>
<td>- 138,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX15</td>
<td>- 225,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX16</td>
<td>+ 18,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX17</td>
<td>- 39,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX18</td>
<td>- 126,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX19</td>
<td>- 213,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX20</td>
<td>+ 60,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX21</td>
<td>- 27,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX22</td>
<td>- 114,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX23</td>
<td>- 201,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX24</td>
<td>+ 72,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Year</td>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX25</td>
<td>- 15/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX26</td>
<td>- 102/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX27</td>
<td>- 189/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX28</td>
<td>+ 84/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX29</td>
<td>- 3/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX30</td>
<td>- 90/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX31</td>
<td>- 177/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX32</td>
<td>+ 96/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX33</td>
<td>+ 9/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX34</td>
<td>- 78/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX35</td>
<td>- 165/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX36</td>
<td>+ 108/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX37</td>
<td>+ 21/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX38</td>
<td>- 66/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX39</td>
<td>- 153/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX40</td>
<td>+ 120/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX41</td>
<td>+ 33/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX42</td>
<td>- 54/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX43</td>
<td>- 141/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX44</td>
<td>+ 132/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX45</td>
<td>+ 45/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX46</td>
<td>- 42/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX47</td>
<td>- 129/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX48</td>
<td>+ 144/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX49</td>
<td>+ 57/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX50</td>
<td>- 30/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX51</td>
<td>- 117/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Year</td>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX52</td>
<td>+ 156/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX53</td>
<td>+ 69/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX54</td>
<td>- 18/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX55</td>
<td>- 105/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX56</td>
<td>+ 168/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX57</td>
<td>+ 81/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX58</td>
<td>- 6/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX59</td>
<td>- 93/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX60</td>
<td>+ 180/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX61</td>
<td>+ 93/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX62</td>
<td>+ 6/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX63</td>
<td>- 81/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX64</td>
<td>+ 192/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX65</td>
<td>+ 105/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX66</td>
<td>+ 18/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX67</td>
<td>- 69/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX68</td>
<td>+ 204/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX69</td>
<td>+ 117/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX70</td>
<td>+ 30/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX71</td>
<td>- 57/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX72</td>
<td>+ 216/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX73</td>
<td>+ 129/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX74</td>
<td>+ 42/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Year</td>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX75</td>
<td>- 45/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX76</td>
<td>+ 228/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX77</td>
<td>+ 141/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX78</td>
<td>+ 54/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX79</td>
<td>- 33/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX80</td>
<td>+ 240/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX81</td>
<td>+ 153/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX82</td>
<td>+ 66/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX83</td>
<td>- 21/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX84</td>
<td>+ 252/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX85</td>
<td>- 165/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX86</td>
<td>+ 78/390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX87</td>
<td>- 9/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX88</td>
<td>+ 264/390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX89</td>
<td>+ 177/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX90</td>
<td>+ 90/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX91</td>
<td>+ 3/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX92</td>
<td>+ 276/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX93</td>
<td>+ 189/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX94</td>
<td>+ 102/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX95</td>
<td>+ 15/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX96</td>
<td>+ 288/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX97</td>
<td>+ 201/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Year</td>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX98</td>
<td>+ 114/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX99</td>
<td>+ 27/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI00</td>
<td>+ 300/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI01</td>
<td>+ 213/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI02</td>
<td>+ 126/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI03</td>
<td>+ 39/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI04</td>
<td>+ 312/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI05</td>
<td>+ 225/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI06</td>
<td>+ 138/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI07</td>
<td>+ 51/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI08</td>
<td>+ 324/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI09</td>
<td>+ 237/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI10</td>
<td>+ 150/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI11</td>
<td>+ 63/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI12</td>
<td>+ 336/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI13</td>
<td>+ 249/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI14</td>
<td>+ 162/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI15</td>
<td>+ 75/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI16</td>
<td>+ 348/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI17</td>
<td>+ 241/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI18</td>
<td>+ 174/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI19</td>
<td>+ 87/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI20</td>
<td>+ 1000/360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>Ahmad, father of 'Ali, entitled Shamsud-Dīn Mulk, a builder</td>
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<td>Ahmad bad, in Gujarāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadnagar, in Māhrārāthra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Alīn-ilmu, 'Adil Shāhī minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akoor, Moghul emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Adhaṭānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Bāmmū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Bākhūrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Cijānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Hājī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Hamadānī</td>
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<tr>
<td>al-Humānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Jafā'ānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Jauzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Jauzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Kāzarūnī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Kuhrānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Malā'īhānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Qāzwīnī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Alamgar, profession and family known as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n. 1, 3), 18, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Alamgar, Hājī known as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Alamgar, writing for 'Alamgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allah d-Dīn Khalījī, Delhi Sultan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Alavi, a <em>nisba</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alī Khan, Moghul mānṣūbdār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'All, the fourth Caliph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'All (f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'All, son of Abū Bakr Irbīlī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'All, son of Shāhāpur al-Bāmmū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'All, son of Yahyā and father of Shamsud-Dīn Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'All, father of Abū Sharaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'All, father of Hājī Abū Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'All, 'Abdul 'Ali an-Naṣir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'All, father of Abū Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'All, son of Abū Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'All, 'Ali wrongly read as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali Jawālīqī, Shāhī see Shāhī 'Ali Jawālīqī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali Tabā'āb, a historian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali Kuršī or Kuršīt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amlā'ud-Dīn Kāfūr, a freed slave of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharaqā d-Dīn Mihili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Āmir, son of Tārahān Anğârī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Āmir, father of 'Abdu'l-Baqi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Āmir, father of 'Adu'l-Jahālār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anğârī, a nībe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āqī Maqṣūd, in charge of Panhālī fort, see Maqṣūd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar-Rūmī, i.e. of Rūmī (modern Rûnder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab, a country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabo, a country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabo era, origin of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araba, as a trading community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbalī, a nībe, see al-Īrābī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-Sūltānī, a title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asad Khān Lūz, 'Ādī Shāhī Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aslī, Khwāja, see Khwāja 'Aslī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astūd Dīn wrongly read title of Kāfūr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a't-Ṭifārī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Atiq, a term meaning 'freed slave'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylonia, in Irāq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badgdegān, in U.S.S.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahmanī, a dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balūchistan (Shāhān)'ud-Dīn of Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahlūl, in Afghānistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banūr, in Irān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banūnī, family known as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankīpur, in Karnātaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bārā Ḫām, Dārgāh of, at Panhālī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bārār, in Irāq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bēka, a river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgārm, in Karnātaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihī, a term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihī Fatāma, daughter of Khwāja Ḥusain and wife of Malik 'Umar al-Kazārūnī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihī Rānī, Fatāma so called</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihī Rānī, Tomb of, at Nagarā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidar, in Karnātaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijāpur, in Karnātaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bughrā Khān, son of Balbān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bublī Lodī, Sulṭān, Delhi King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bublī Shahīd, Tomb of, at Cambay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Būrān, Nizām Shāhī ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaukhty, a dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Calendar, problems of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dārā Shikoh, son of emperor Shah Jahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dā'ud Āqī, Nālīk, official and builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69, 70, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daulatabād, in Mahārāṣṭra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daulatshāh, Nāwāb of Shāhīwāstī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daulatshāh Bistārī, Nālīk, Tughluqian grandee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deccan, Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhobi Khera, Sāmānā known as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilawar Khān, 'Ādī Shāhī official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dost Muhammad. Mir. see Mir Dost Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East India Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia, rulers of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fakhr'ud-Dīn Ahmad, son of Husain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faridu'd-Dīn, father of Muhammad the Calligrapher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fars, Iran and now a province of Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathpur Shāhīwāstī, in Rājasthān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatimah, daughter of Holy Prophet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatimah, a term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatimah, a sobriquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 46, 47, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatwa, a term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulād Khān, an official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firgītā, a historian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firuz Shah, Delhi Sultan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaz, a measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia, in U.S.S.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghawgās, a term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghaznī, in Afghānistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghiyāsh'ud-Dīn Balban, see Balban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghori, a dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghuram, variant for Khurām in Panjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cilān, in Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golconda, in Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopal Bhaṭṭa, supervisor of construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregorian Calendar, reforms in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarat, state and region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijī, a term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijī, son of Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijī Abū Bakr, son of 'Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijī Ibrahim, son of Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamadan, in Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanāl al-Hanjūrī, father of Najīb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanāl Khan, 'Adil Shāhī official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haraymann, variant of Hanjawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanjawan, variant of Jamān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanjawan, in Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanjūrī, probably a place-name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hīnā, in Haryāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan, son of Abū Bakr Al-Angar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hōn, a coin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hujayyūn, Muḥāḍhi emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husain, father of Ahmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husain, father of Fakhrūd-Dīn Abūmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husain, father of Kamāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husain, son of Abū Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husain, son of Abū Sharaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husain, Khwāja, see Khwāja Husain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim I, 'Adil Shāhī ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim II, 'Adil Shāhī ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim, son of Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62, 73, 77, 77, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim, al-Hijī, son of Muḥāḍhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim, Hijī, son of Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim, Nūrān Shāhī ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahimpur, near Pānālā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Battūta, the famous Moroccan traveller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikhlās Khan, 'Adil Shāhī official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imāmshāh, at Sāmānā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inasm, a term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqāt, a term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, a country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irāq, a country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irbil, in Irāq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irbil, family known as, of Cambay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**J**

Jahān, wrong reading for Hamid | 32 |
Jahān, Khwāja, see Khwāja Jahān | 32 |
Jahāngīr, Muḥāḍhi emperor | 60, 62 |
Jamālud-Dīn Abūmad, son of Umar | 36, 38 |
Jamālud-Dīn Hijī Muhammad, son of 'Abdullah | 54, 55 |
James Burgess, author and archaeologist | 40 |
Janggīd Qubī Shāh, Golconda King | 64 |
Jauher, Malik, so-called official | 88 |
(āf.n.1)

Jawalāhar, erstwhile State in Mahārāstra | 83 |
(Jawāhar, variant of Jawāhar, Shulūr San originated by the Chief of | 86, 88 |
Julius Calendar | 83 |
Julusulbar, in Punjab | 39 |

**K**

Kabba, at Mecca | 54 |
Kabiru-d-Dīn Muhammad, Khwāja, see Khwāja Kabiru-d-Dīn Muhammad | 2 |
Kairān, in Gujārāt | 2 |
Kānān, in Panjāb | 50 |
Kamālud-Dīn Husain Injū, Mir, see Mir Kamālud-Dīn | |
Kamālud-Dīn Kamāl | 42, 44 |
Kamālud-Dīn Muḥāḍhi | 52, 53 |
Kamālud-Dīn Sulaimān | 5, 7, 26 |
Kānghā, in Himāchal Pradesh | 62 |
Karīṭtī, a nīsha | 57 |
Karbalā, in Irāq | 55 (f.n.2) |
Khait-ar, in Saūdi Arabia | 66 |
KHALAF KHĀN, a builder | 78, 79 |
Khālis, a freed slave | 41 |
Khālij, a dynasty | 19, 50 |
Khīdīr, Prophet | 78, 79 (f.n.1) |
Khīdīr, Malik, 'Adil Shāhī official | 63, 66, 72 |
Khīdarpur, in Kolhapur district | 72 (s. f. n. 2) |
Khawāraṇa, the palace, in Bahbīnyās | 68 |
Khwāja, a surname | 2 (s. f. n. 5) |
Khwāja Asīl, son of Umar | 57, 58 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khwaja Husain, father of Bibi Fatima</td>
<td>55, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwaja Ja'far, Tughluqian Prime Minister</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwaja Khabiruddin Muhammad</td>
<td>22, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwaja Shihabuddin Ahmad</td>
<td>34, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimai, variant of Karat</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirmān, in Iran</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwaja Khan, 'Adil Shahi official</td>
<td>65, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kollapur, in Maharashtra</td>
<td>64, 72, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koukhan, a region in Maharashtra</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhār, in Panjab</td>
<td>22, 24, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kukhband, a sobriquet</td>
<td>54, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laka'iya, a sobriquet</td>
<td>24, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lod, a dynasty</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodh-Sūr, dynasty</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahārāshtra, a state</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makand Aka, variant of Nāqūd Aqā</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malabar, a region in Kerala</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaz Ghrān, wrong reading for Mullā Rajā</td>
<td>70, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Dā'ūd Aqā, see Dā'ud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Da'ilah Bakhšārī, see Da'ilah Bakhsh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Ja'far, see Ja'far</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Khādīr, see Khādīr, Malik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Parvaiz, title of 'Umar Akbarshāni</td>
<td>36, 41, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Salāḥuddin wa'd-Dīn, epitaph of</td>
<td>18, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Sakhād Šadārī, 'Adil Shāhī official</td>
<td>64, 66, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Šahfak, 'Adil Shāhī official</td>
<td>64, 66, 67, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik-i-Mulkāsh-Sharq wa-l-wuzūr, a title</td>
<td>41, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik-i-Tujjar, a title</td>
<td>40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzik, a dynasty</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzil-i-Kuhārnī</td>
<td>22, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāqūd Aqā, 'Adil Shāhī official</td>
<td>66, 70, 76, 77, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naukulla Rajāb, a calligrapher</td>
<td>66, 76, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neccka, in Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>14, 17(f.n.3) 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nēzīna, in Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>68(f.n.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mewāt, a region near Delhi</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mir Dost Muhammad, official</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mir Kamāluddin Husain Injū, official</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirzā Nūrān, builder</td>
<td>60, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miẓāb, a freed slave</td>
<td>11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongola, a tribe</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moqul, in Iraq</td>
<td>13, 15, 46(f.n.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgadal, in Karnātaka</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumīn, a title</td>
<td>9, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musul, a dynasty</td>
<td>40, 59, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, the Holy Prophet</td>
<td>4(f.n.3), 6, 18, 22, 29, 30, 35, 44, 45, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f.n.3), 52(f.n.4), 58, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, son of Ahmad</td>
<td>17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, son of 'Ali al-Isbīli</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, son of Fārududdin, a calligrapher</td>
<td>66, 78, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, son of Muhammad al-Jazīrī, an author</td>
<td>9(f.n.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, son of Šām, the Gūrūd ruler</td>
<td>1, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, son of Tughluq Shāh, Delhi Sultan</td>
<td>36, 40, 82, 86, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, father of Hājī</td>
<td>17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, father of Hājī Ibrahim</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, father of Ṣirajuddin</td>
<td>13, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, father of Tājuddin</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musammār al-ʿAlī, son of Mozaffar</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥib, wrong reading for Najib</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukhīšī al-ʿUṣūrī, an official</td>
<td>18, 19, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullā Nūrān d-Dīn Muhammad Tārkhān, Nūrānī official</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullā Rajāb, a calligrapher (same as Mauمكان Rajāb)</td>
<td>75, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murād Bakhtīr, son of emperor Shāh Jahan</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustaqīm, Nūrān Shāhī ruler</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustaqīm Khan, title of Mīr Kamāluddin Husain Injū</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musti bi, grand father of Ibrahim</td>
<td>29, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mujzak, son of Aḥmad, Ebrāhīm Khan</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustafa Khān Arsalānī, Dervān grandee</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzaffar, father of Musammār al-ʿAlī</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzaffar, al-Malzāhari, father of Zain</td>
<td>13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāy, a state, now called Karnātaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāzī al-ʿAlī, religious text</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagarā, near Cambay in Gujarāt</td>
<td>5, 48(f.n.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgūr, in Rājasthān</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāhrwāl, old name of Pātān in north Gujarāt</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naḥīb-i-Gūlākār, a post</td>
<td>65, 66, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najīb, son of Hāmid</td>
<td>32, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najībuddin Muhammad</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauras, a technical term</td>
<td>76, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerbuddah, river</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīrman Kherū, original name of Sāman ā</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīzām Shāhī, Ahmadnagar ruler</td>
<td>64, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīzām Shāhī, a dynasty</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nūrān d-Dīn Jahāngīr, see Jahāngīr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nūrān d-Dīn Muhammad Tārkhān, Mullā see Mullā Nūrān d-Dīn Tārkhān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panhāla, in Malārāshtra</td>
<td>64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 75, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjāb, a state</td>
<td>22, 59, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārvāz Shāh, tomb of, at Cambay</td>
<td>4, 5, 8, 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 24, 27, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 43, 45, 46, 50, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārvāz Malik, title of Maliku’-Tujjār al-Kāzarūnī, see also Malik Pārvāz</td>
<td>40, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārvāz Malik, see Malik Pārvāz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāta, in north Gujarāt</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paṭišālā, in Panjāb</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perās, a country</td>
<td>1, 7, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peṭlid, in Gujarāt</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pīr Pārvāz, also known as Pīrāb Shāhīd</td>
<td>4 (fn.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pīr Tājū-’Dīn, Tomb of, at Cambay</td>
<td>4, 5, 7, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prithvi Rāj, a ruler</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q     |      |
| Qadasmāsh, of Prophet Khīḍr  | 78 |
| Qādir, a post  | 21 |
| Qāla dār, a post  | 62 |
| Qandahār, in Afghanistan  | 39, 62 |
| Qasim, son of Iśā  | 38 |
| Qaswin, in Irān  | 8 (fn.4), 26, 27 |

| R     |      |
| Rāfī’u-’Dīn Shāhīzī, a historian  | 65, 66 |
| Rāchur, in Karṇātaka  | 74 |
| Rājāb, Mulla, see Mulla Rājāb  |      |
| Rājasthān, a state  | 62 |
| Rām Rāj, Vijayansara king  | 64, 65 |
| Rānār, now part of Surat city in Gujarāt  | 3, 17, 24, 26 |
| Rāner, variant of Rānār  | 24, 26 |
| Ratangarh, Sāmān known as  | 59 |
| Ruṣn ‘Ali, son of Ahmad ‘Ali  | 65, 74 |
| Rehasteck, E., an author & scholar  | 40 |

| S     |      |
| Sa’d, a merchant of Cambay  | 50 |
| Sa’d father of Służu’-Dīn ‘Umar  | 27, 29 |
| Sa’d-’Dīn, Tomb of, at Panhāla  | 66, 71, 75, 78 |
| Sa’dū-’Dīn, father of ‘Umar  | 57, 58 |
| Sa’d, son of Abū Sharaf  | 5 |
| Sa’d, Ambīn-’Tujjār  | 51 |
| Sa’dī, alias of Sayyid Abīnān  | 59 |

Saidān, the name of to read  | 37 (fn.4) |
Sālihu’-Dīn Daudat wa’-Dīn, Malik, see Malik Sālihu’-Dīn Daudat wa’-Dīn  |      |
Sīr, scribe and official  | 69, 70 |
Sulhūd Dīn ‘Abī, a wrong reading  | 19 |
Sūmānī, in Panjāb  | 59, 60, 61, 62 |
Sūmbhājī, son of Sīrājī  | 76 (fn.7) |
Samyanee, name of textile produced at Sīmānī  |      |
Sanjūn, in South Gujarāt  | 32 (fn.6) |
Sar Khwāvī, a post  | 66, 72 |
Sarastī, old name of Sīrāj, in Haryānā  | 59 |
Sarwar, wrong reading for Pārvāz  | 40 |
Sātārā, in Mahārāshtra  | 65 |
Sāyīd, a dynasty  | 59 |
Sāyīd Abīnān, a Darvīsh  | 59 |
Sāyīd Tājū-’Dīn Hūsain  | 48, 60 |
Semunee, variant of Sāmīnān  | 50 |
Shāhī Khān, an official  | 62 |
Shāh Jahān, Ugojī emperor  | 60, 61, 62, 62 |
Shāhpur al-Barmat, father of ‘Abī  | 5 |
Shāh Qasim, ‘Ādī Shāhī official  | 65 |
Shāhī, term explained  | 54 |
Shāhījī, ‘Abī Jawālījī, a saint of Cambay  | 4 (fn.3) |
Shamsīrū-’Dīn, title of Ahmad ‘Abī 63, 66, 74, 75 |
Shamsu’-Dīn Mahmūd, an official  | 36, 38, 40 |
Shamsu’-Dīn, ‘Ādī Shāhī official and builder  | 65, 66, 72 |
Shamsu’-Dīn, another ‘Ādī Shāhī official 73 (fn.1) |
Shamsu’-Dīn Muhammad, son of Abū Bakr  | 13, 46, 48 |
Shamsu’-Dīn Muhammad, son of ‘Abī  | 9, 11 |
Sharaf, daughter of Kamaliu-’Dīn  |      |
Shamsu’-Dīn Muhammad  | 52 |
Shamsu’-Dīn Abū Shams, son of ‘Abī  | 5 |
Shamsu’-Dīn Mahmūd, a merchant  | 15, 16 |
Shamsu’-Dīn Muhammad Dīwānī, a servant of Bairam Khān  |      |
Shāhābī’-Dīn Ahmad, Khwājā, see Khwājā Shāhībī’-Dīn Ahmad  |      |
Shāhībī’-Dīn Ahmad al-Kāzarūnī, a merchant  | 40 |
Shīrāz, in Irān  | 31 (fn.2) |
Shīvājī, the Maharāthī chief  | 65, 76 (fn.7) |
Shōlpur, in Mahārāshtra  | 73 (fn.1) |
Shāhīn, solar adaptation of Hīrā era  | 81 |
Sikandar, a builder  | 67 |
Sikandar ‘Haidarī, Malik, see Malik Sikandar ‘Haidarī  |      |
Sikandar Lodi, Delhi king  | 60 |
Sikandar Sūr, Delhi king  | 59 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silāhārā, a dynasty</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sind, a country</td>
<td>1, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirju d-Dīn 'Umar, son of Sa'd</td>
<td>27, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirhind, in Panjāb</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirāj, in Haryānā</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittī, a term of address</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subuktīgin, Ghaznavid king</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulṭān Buhāl Lodi, see Buhāl Lodi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulṭān Muhammad Tughluq Shāh, see Muhammad, son of Tughluq Shāh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surānī, in Panjāb</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur Khwās, variant of Sar Khwās</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suraj Nhi, a name wrongly read</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surat, in Gujarāt</td>
<td>3, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabāštābā, see 'Ali Tabāštābā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāhir Khān, son of Daulat Khān</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tājū d-Dīn Jwaḏ, son of 'Abdūl-'Azīz Qawwāl</td>
<td>26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tājū d-Dīn Muhammad, son of Muhammad aʿz-Zakariyyā</td>
<td>7, 8, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tājū d-Dīn 'Umar</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāptī, a river</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarkhān, battle of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarshān Anšārī, father of Amir</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarkhān, Tarbān wrongly read as</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarkhān, a clan-name</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thānā, in 'Umrān Khān</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thānīār, a poet</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūfīa, modern Tehsil in U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>27, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūmūr, the famous Mongol king</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tughluq, a dynasty</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tughluq Shāh, Delhi Sultān</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkoy, a country</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umar, 'Abd-Allāh, see 'Abd-Allāh Ramdān</td>
<td>1, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umar, son of Sa'd</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umar, father of Jomālū d-Dīn Ahmad</td>
<td>62, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umar, father of Khwāja Asīr</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umar al-Humānī, father of Khwāja Shihādu d-Dīn Ahmad</td>
<td>34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umar Khayyām, famous Persian poet</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Urmī, Al-aṣ̂antar, father of Abū Bakr</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiḥelān, a dynasty of Gujarāt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīrāval, in Gujarāt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijayānagral, kingdom of</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā, son of al-Jauzī al-Jazīrī</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen, a country</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yūsuf, Malik, see Malik Yūsuf</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zāhidiān, in Irān</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakariyyā, Zakariyyā so read</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zainu d-Dīn 'Alī, master of Nībābā</td>
<td>11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zainu d-Dīn 'Alī, son of Najīb</td>
<td>32, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakhu d-Dulat wa'd-Dīn, title of 'Umar al-Kāzārūnī</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakhru d-Dīn, 'Umar al-Kāzārūnī</td>
<td>41, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaqqu d-Dīn, variant of Zakhru d-Dīn</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Za'uṣ̂alī Malik, Parviz Malik wrongly read as</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaḥair, a historian</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zufār, in Oman</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>