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

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

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

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

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

IV. Sulṭān Rażiyyat-ud-Dunyā wa-ud-Dīn, Daughter of Sulṭān I-al-Timīsh.

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

2 Elliot: vol. ii. page 332—"He was very fond of playing with and riding upon elephants." Rather rough play.
3 Rażiyyat has a meaning, but "Rażiyya" and "Rashā" mean nothing. Sulṭān, from šān, signifies to have or possess power, to rule, &c.—a sovereign—and is therefore as equally applicable to a female as to a male, and does not appear to have had anything to do with "affectation of the superior sex," nor her assumption, subsequently, of male attire when she rode forth. Her name or title, like that of most other Muḥammādians in these pages, is pure 'Arabī, the feminine form of the by no means uncommon name of Rażi-ud-Dīn. See Thomas: Fathān Kings, page 108. The following is said to have been the inscription on the first coins of this queen regnant, in which she is styled "Unmād-al-Nawāsin—the great, or illustrious among women—

Obverse—عمة السوات ExceptionHandler، زمان طالقون، ویچ، بنی مام، عربی
Reverse—"The illustrious among women, the Queen of the Age, Sulṭān Rażiyyat, daughter of Shams-ud-Deen, I-al-Timīsh.

Obverse—"Inscribed at the city of Dīhlī, 643 H., the first of the reign."

Compare Elliot: vol. ii. page 352.
but, as she did not attain the destiny, in her creation, of being computed among men, of what advantage were all these excellent qualifications unto her?

During the lifetime of the august Sultan, her father, she exercised authority, and possessed great grandeur, on this account, that her mother, Turkân Khatûn, was the greatest [of the ladies] of the sublime harem, and her place of residence was the royal palace, the Kughîk-i-Firûzî [Firuzi Castle]. As the august Sultan Shams-ad-Din used to notice in her indications of sovereignty and high spirit, although she was a daughter, and [consequently] veiled from public gaze, when he returned after acquiring possession of Gwâlyûr, he commanded the Tâj-ul-Mulk, Mahmûd, the secretary—on whom be peace!—who was the Mughît-i-Mamâtîrî [Secretary of the State], to write out a decree, naming his daughter as his heir-apparent, and she was made his heir [accordingly].

Whilst this decree was being written out, those servants of the state, who had access to the presence of the Sultan, made representation, saying: "Inasmuch as he has grown-up sons who are eligible for the sovereignty, what scheme and what object has the Sultan of Islam in view in making a daughter sovereign and heir-apparent? Be pleased to remove this difficulty from our minds, as this deed does not seem advisable to your humble servants." The Sultan replied: "My sons are engrossed in the pleasures of youth, and none of them possesses the capability of managing the affairs of the country, and by them the government of the kingdom will not be carried out. After my death it will be seen that not one of them will be found to be more worthy of the heir-apparatus than she, my daughter." The case turned out as that august monarch had predicted.

When Sultan Râqiyyat ascended the throne of the kingdom, all things returned to their usual rules and customs; but the Wazir of the kingdom, the Niân-ul-Mulk, Muhammad, Junaîdî, did not acknowledge her; and Malik 'Alâ-ad-Din, Jâni, Malik Sai'd-ad-Din, Kîjî, Malik 'Izz-ad-Din, Kâbir Khán-i-Ayâz, Malik 'Izz-ad-Din, Muhammad, Sâlîrî, and the Niân-ul-Mulk, Muhammad, Junaîdî, assembled from different parts before the gate of the city of Dîlî, and commenced hostilities against Sultan Râqiyyat, and this opposition continued for a considerable time. At this period Malik Nuṣrat-ad-Din, Ta-yasa'î, the Mu'izzî, who was feoffee of Awadh, marched with his forces from that province, for the purpose of rendering aid to Sultan Râqiyyat, in conformity with [her] commands, towards Dîlî, the capital. After he had crossed the river Gânî, 4

1 This proves what our author meant by the word we with respect to Rukn-ad-Din, Firûz Shâh's mother, namely, that, in point of time or age, she was the oldest of Fâlî-timâsh's concubines. Râqiyyat Khatûn was his eldest child and, in all probability, her mother was KhusÂ-ad-Din, I-bâk's daughter.

Our author is about the only authority available for the events of this period—all other works, since written, merely copy from him and add from their own fertile imaginations—and there is no authority for stating [Thomas: Pâthân Kings, page 107] that Râqiyyat was "brought up under a greater degree of freedom from the seclusion enjoined for females by the more severe custom of ordering Muslim households," for our author here states, she was "veiled from public gaze," and it was only just before the end of her reign that she assumed the dress of a male, which, really, is not very different from that of a female—the addition of a head dress and tunic—and our author states. Dow, as usual, misinterpreting Firîjûtâh, who copies from the Ta'fâkât-i-Akbarî, which copies our author, incorrectly states that "on her accession, changing her apparel, she assumed the imperial robes." The "imperial robes" equally with the rest are all his own.

2 In ELLIOT, it is made "the chief royal palace in the Kughîk-château." Tâj-ul-Mulk signifies the crown of the state; "Taj-ul-Mulk" nothing. The word avvâshir signifies an examiner or authenticator of records and other writings, but not a wear certainty. na—dañir—a writer, a clerk, a scribe. sa—mu'dânîr—an administrator, director, counsellor, &c. Compare ELLIOT: vol. ii. page 333.

4 The Ta'fâkât-ad-Din Mu'llâk says "one reason why I-yâl-i-dimash named her as his successor was, that his son, Niân-ad-Din, Mahmûd Shâh—the second son of that name—was so young in years; and the Sultan remarked to his minister, at the time, that, although in the form of a woman, she was in reality a man."

5 He is styled, by some more modern writers, Chândîrî, as if he were a native of Chandîr or that that was a by-name of his, but it is incorrect. He had been I-yâl-i-dimash's wazir for a considerable time.

6 These are the same who, as stated in ELLIOT, killed "Ala Tâfîl." 7 He had been made feudatory of Awadh by Râqiyyat after Ghiyâsh-ad-Din, Muhammad Shâh's rebellion. See page 633.

8 Previous to these events, the feudatory of Khâmî, Malik Tamûr Khân-i Khân, was despatched by Sultan Râqiyyat into the Gwâlyûr territory and Mâlîwâh in command of a force, and the expedition was successful, but no particulars are given. The same Malik, when feudatory of Awadh, penetrated as far as the Tirhût territory, and compelled the Râs and Râshâh, and independent Hindî tribes in that part to pay tribute. He plundered the territory of Bhati-gîlân [saguised Bhatgong] in Nâpâl on several occasions, but neither particulars nor dates are given, but they all happened before this period.
the hostile Malik's who were before the city of Dihl unexpectedly advanced to meet him, and took him prisoner, and affliction overcame him, and he died. The stay of the hostile Maliks before the gate of Dihl was prolonged for a considerable time; but, as the good fortune of Sultân Rażīyat was at the point of ascendency, the Sultân issued from the city, and directed her sublime tent to be pitched at a place on the bank of the river Jân; and, between the Turk Amirs who served at the stirrup of sovereignty, and the hostile Maliks, conflicts took place upon several occasions. At last, an accommodation was arranged, but in a deceptive manner, and by the subtle contrivance of Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Muḥammad, Sālārī, and Malik 'Īzz-ud-Dīn, Kabīr Khân-i-Ayāz, who, secretly, went over to the Sultân's side, and, one night, met before the entrance to the royal tent, with this stipulation, that Malik Jânī, Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Kūfī, and the Niẓām- al-Mulk, Muḥammad, Junaīd, should be summoned, and be taken into custody and imprisoned, in order that the sedition might be quelled.

When these Maliks became aware that the state of affairs was on this wise, they left their camp and fled. The Sultân's horsemen followed in pursuit, and Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Kūfī, and his brother, Fakhr-ud-Dīn, fell into their hands, and, subsequently to that, they were put to death in prison. Malik 'Ala-ud-Dīn, Jânī, was killed within the limits of Pāyāl, at a village named Nakawān, and his...
Maliks began to be envious to ereat; and it so chanced to happen that Sulṭān Raṣīyyat laid aside the female dress and issued from [her] seclusion, and donned the tunic, and assumed the head-dress [of a man], and appeared among the people; and, when she rode out on an elephant, at the time of mounting it, all people used, openly, to see her.

At this period she issued commands for her troops to proceed to Gwāliyūr, and bestowed rich and valuable presents. As disobedience was out of the question, 4 this servant

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

Here is a proof of what a deal may be made out of a little. Our author is the sole authority for these statements in the Taḥākṣīr-i-Akbarī, Firāqūn and Bedā'īn, each of them, in rotation, enlarge upon, and exaggerate our author’s words—the last reverses them by saying that when she mounted an elephant or horse she least upon him, Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Yā-ḵūt, the Abyssinian. He was Amīr-i-Āqā before she came to the throne apparently, for she does not seem to have raised him to that office; and it was only in the last year of her reign that she assumed male attire, when she appeared in public. Our author does not say so, but all the Taḥākṣīr-i-Akbarī mentions is, that Jamāl-ud-Dīn, Yā-ḵūt, was treated with favour, a mere transliteration of our author’s words—"they with the same term as he uses with respect to Sulṭān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn’s favour towards his slave, Kuṭḥ-ud-Dīn, I-bak—and that the Turk Maliks and Amīrs were envious in consequence. All that that work states, in addition to our author’s words—for he does not say so—but, when she mounted to ride forth, the Master of the Horse, who had become Amīr-i-Āqā [such an office did not exist in those days, and our author never mentions such an office], used to aid her to mount by taking her under the arm—[ja]- but leaning on his arm or shoulder, in mounting, would seem to be nearer the intended meaning. Now it is very possible that it was part of the duty of the Lord of the Stable, or his privilege, to assist his sovereign to mount when he or she rode forth, and that such an act might not have been occasioned through any undue familiarity; only what was applicable to a male sovereign, according to Muslim ideas, was not so to a female. However, the Lord of the Stable being an Abyssinian, this was, with her assumption of male attire, pleasurable sufficient to the rebellious Turk Maliks—the remainder of the “Chāhil-gūr Māmūlīs,” of whom more hereafter—to rebel against a sovereign too energetic for them in their ambitious designs. The Zabūlat-i-Tawārīḥ makes no reference to the Abyssinian whatever.

I cannot conceive why our author should be styled a rebel,” because of this sentence in the text. Gwāliyūr had a governor or sennachet placed therein by Sulṭān Raṣīyyat’s father in 630 AH, and our author was Khāf there. When Raṣīyyat came to the throne, she sent a force under Malik Tāj-ud-Dīn, Sanjār [No. XIV. in the next Section], and relieved the garrison, and, as the governor—Raghiṣ-ud-Dīn, ‘All—from our author’s invocation respecting him, appears to have died there, a new feudatory was despatched, at the same time, although he is not mentioned, as, after the death of Raghiṣ-ud-Dīn, ‘All, the next official in authority was the Amīr-i-Dād, Ziyā-ud-Dīn, Junāiḏī, who being a kinsman of
of the victorious kingdom, Minhāj-i-Sarāj, in conjunction with the Malik-ul-Umrā [the chief of Amirs] Žiyya-ud-Dīn, Junaid, who was the Amir-i-Dād [chief magistrate] of Gwāliyūr, and with other persons of note, came out of the preserved fortress of Gwāliyūr on the 1st of the month Shā‘bān, 635 H., and returned to Dhīlī, the capital; and, in this same month, Sulṭān Raṭiyyat committed to the charge of this servant [the author] the Nāṣirīah College at the capital, to which was added the Kāšī-ship of Gwāliyūr.

In the year 637 H. Malik Izz-ud-Dīn, Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz, who was the feudatory of Lohor, began to show a rebellious spirit. Sulṭān Raṭiyyat led an army towards the rebel Wafir, who refused to acknowledge Sulṭān Raṭiyyat, may have been suspected of disaffection. No cause for rebellion appears, neither is any rebellion mentioned; and, on our author's arrival at Dhīlī, another office was bestowed upon him, in addition to his Kāšī-ship of Gwāliyūr, which he still held. See Thomas; Fatehī Khan, page 105.

In 631 H. some emissaries from Bālṭā Khān, son of Tūshī [Jūl], son of Chingiz Khān, arrived at the Court of Sulṭān Ilyās-ud-Dīn from Kāšī, bringing presents for him, but, as that Sulṭān had refrained from holding any intercourse whatever with the Mughal Khāns, and was wont to send their agents out of his territory when they came, he would not pass these emissaries to death, and desired to dismiss them kindly. They were sent to Gwāliyūr, however (this was one way of dismissing them kindly), and the party, being all Musūlmāns, used to present themselves in the Masjid there every Friday, and said their prayers behind the author of this book [acting as Imam], until the reign of Sulṭān Raṭiyyat, when the author, after six years' absence, returned to Dhīlī from Gwāliyūr, and was promoted, by the favour of that sovereign. At this time directions were given for these emissaries of Bālṭā Khān to be removed to Kīnānūj, and there detained; and there they were kept until they died.

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

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

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

In this year, 636 H., Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, Ḥasan, the Ḩabguḥ, hard pressed by the Mughals, had to abandon his territories, and he retired towards the territory of Multān and Sind, in hope, probably, of being more successful on this than on the former occasion. Ḥasan's eldest son, whose name has not transpired, taking advantage of Raṭiyyat's presence in the Panjāb, presented himself before her, was well received, and the fief of Barān, east of Dhīlī, was conferred upon him. Soon after, however, he left, without leave and without the cause being known, and rejoined his father, who still was able to hold Barān, and, soon after, the Karīms gained possession of Multān.

At this period Malik Mu‘ayyī-ud-Dīn, Hindū Khān, held the fief of Ḥabguḥ.

Ramaṣān, in some copies of the text.

Altīsāfī was only lately made feudatory of Tabarhindah, for, when Raṭiyyat came to the throne, she gave him his first fief, that of Barān. Briggs styles him "of the Toorki tribe of Chelguy"—a more blunder, but Dow leaves this part of the sentence out. See last para. of note 5, page 643, and the meaning of Chelguyāf in next Section.

In some copies of the text, "with the forces composing the šāhīr or centre, the signification of which has been given in note 5, page 654.

But not "on the way" thither as in Tabākāt-i-Abkârī and Firūzjâph.

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

Tabākāt-i-Abkârī and Bābīnūf have Tarhindah—mājīd—in all cases, and Firūzjâph ("revised text"), wherever this place is mentioned, under whatever reign it may be, has Pathīnūf—mājīd and Bābīnūf.
Among the events which happened in the beginning of Sulṭān Raṣīyyat's reign, the greatest was that the Kīrāmītāh and Mulāhidāh heretics of Hindūstān, invited by a person, a sort of learned man, named Nūr-ud-Dīn, a Turk, whom they used to style Nūr, the Turk, collected together at Dihlī, from different parts of the territory of Hind, such as Gujarāt, and the country of Sind, and the parts round about the capital, Dihlī, and the banks of the rivers Jum and Gang. In secret they pledged themselves to be faithful to each other, and, at the instigation of Nūr, the Turk, they conspired against Islām. This Nūr, the Turk, used to harangue, and the mob would collect around him. He used to call the 'Ulamā of the orthodox people Nāṣibī [setters-up], and to style them Murji'ī [procrastinators], and used to incite the common people to animosity against the orders of 'Ulamā of the sects of Abū-Ḥanīfah and Shāfī'ī until a day was fixed upon. The whole of the fraternities of the Mulāhidāh and Kīrāmītāh entered the Jāmī' Masjid of the city of Dihlī, on Friday, the 6th of the month of Rajab, in the year 634 H., to the number of about one thousand persons, armed with swords and shields. Having divided into two bodies, one body, from the side of the Ḥisār-i-Nau [the new Citadel], entered the gateway of the Jāmī' Masjid on the northern side, and the second body, passing through the Bāzār-i-Bāzāzān [the Bazaar of the Cloth-Merchants], entered the gateway of the Mu'izzī College under the supposition that it was the Jāmī' Masjid, and, on both sides, fell upon the Musalmāns with their swords. A great number of people, some by the swords of those heretics, and some [trodden] under people's feet, attained martyrdom.

On an outcry having arisen from the city on account of

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

That is the Sūrūn, in contradistinction to the Shī'īs and other schismatics.

Neither Taḥṣīl-i-Akbar, Būlānū, nor Fīrūzāt, refer to this "outrage," but other writers do. The fact of Fīrūzāt's being a Shī'ī may account for his eschewing the matter.

The name of one of the heretical sects among the Muḥammadians, who procrastinate, and consider good works unnecessary, and faith sufficient, and that all Musalmāns will be saved, as hell is only reserved for infidels. See Sale: Kitāb, Preliminary Discourse, for an account of these different sects of schismatics, pages 122, 130, and 131.
yâr-ud-Dîn, Aët-kin, the Amir-i-Hâjib, having been assassinated, Badr-ud-Dîn, Sunâr, the Rûmû, had become Amir-i-Hâjib. In the month of Râbl-ul-Awval, in the year 638 H., Sulṭân Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Bahram Shâh, led an army out of Dîhîf for the purpose of resisting Sulṭân Raṣîyyat and Malik Ikhtiyâr-ud-Dîn, Altûnâlah, and they were routed, and, having reached Kaithal, the troops along with them all abandoned them, and Sulṭân Raṣîyyat and Malik Altûnâlah fell captive into the hands of Hindûs, and attained martyrdom.

Their defeat took place on the 24th of the month, Râbl-ul-Awval; and the martyrdom of Sulṭân Raṣîyyat took place on Tuesday, the 25th of Râbl-ul-Awval, in the year 638 H. Her reign extended over a period of three years, six months, and six days.3

3 The author of the Tabâkh-i-Akbarî, who seems to know—without naming any authority—better than those persons who were eye-witnesses of what they relate, and other authors who preceded him, asserts that Sulṭân Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Bahram Shâh, sent an army against Raṣîyyat under Malik Izâz-ud-Dîn, Balban (in some copies Tîghân), who afterwards attained the title of Uthâr Kâshân, and Fârâbidhâh, of course, follows. The amiss part of it is that our author’s patron was neither Ethâz-ud-Dîn, at this time, nor at any other; and he had not attained such a high position at that period as to be put in the command of an army, as may be gathered from the account of him in the next Section. He was, at first, Khâshî-dîr to Sulṭân Raṣîyyat, and, afterwards, during her reign, became Amir-i-Shîkâr. The above-mentioned work also places this defeat and death of Raṣîyyat in 637 H.—a year too soon.

4 The Zobdat-ul-Tawârîkh, as well as the Tabâkh-i-Akbarî, makes two affairs of this, and says that it was the first defeat, but gives no date for it; that Raṣîyyat raised a force of Khokhars and other tribes, and that the second defeat took place near Kaithal, on the 4th of Râbl-ul-Awval, 638 H., after which the Khokhars and others abandoned her, and she and her husband fell into the hands of the Hindûs, who put them to death on the 25th of the same month. See further details of these transactions in the account of Malik Altûnâlah in the next Section.

5 In some copies, Saturday, the 29th of Râbl-ul-Akhrî, but the date cannot be correct. See also the account of Malik Altûnâlah in the next Section, where the 25th of Râbl-ul-Akhrî is given as the date.

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

Obverse—

١٥٩

Reverse—

١٥٩

which may be thus translated—Obverse—“The name of Sulṭân Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Bahram Shâh, conferred glory on Delhi and Delhi. Year 637.” Reverse—“Struck at the seat of empire, Delhi, in the first year of [the reign].”

7 He was to act as Deput or Regent for one year. See the account of this Malik in the next Section. Fârâbidhâh turns this name into “Alp-Tîghân,” but Dow leaves out the titles altogether, and makes 987â of him.

The Shamsâh Sulṭân of Hind.

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

When they imprisoned Sulṭân Raṣîyyat in the preserved city of Tabarhîndh, the Malikis and Amirs, in accord, despatched letters to the capital city of Dîhîf, and Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Bahram Shâh, on Monday, the 28th of the month Ramaḍân, in the year 637 H., they raised to the throne of sovereignty. When, on Sunday, the 11th of the month of Shawwal of that same year, the Malikis and Amirs and the rest of the forces returned to the city again, they publicly pledged their allegiance to his sovereignty within the Da’laut Khânah [Royal residence] on the stipulation of the Deputship being conferred upon Malik Ikhtiyâr-ud-Dîn, Aët-kin; and, on that day, after [pledging] allegiance, the writer of these words, by way of benediction, in order to congratulate him [on his accession], recited this strophe:

4 Well done, on thy account, the upbearing of the emblems of sovereignty! Bravo to thy good fortune, heaped up, the ensign of domonion! Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, wa ud-Dîn, Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Kâshân b'il-bâlîk, Of dignity like Sulṭân: under thy command are both jinn [genii] and mankind.

Though the sovereignty of Hind be the heritage of the Shami family, Praise be to God, a second 1-yal-timûz, of its sons art thou.

When the whole world saw thee, that, by right, thou art the kingdom’s heir,

They made thy diadem their hudaq-gath, for thou art all-powerful and wise.

Obverse—

١٥٩

Reverse—

١٥٩

which may be thus translated—Obverse—“The name of Sulṭân Mu’izz-ud-Dîn, Bahram Shâh, conferred glory on Delhi and Delhi. Year 637.” Reverse—“Struck at the seat of empire, Delhi, in the first year of [the reign].”

7 He was to act as Deput or Regent for one year. See the account of this Malik in the next Section. Fârâbidhâh turns this name into “Alp-Tîghân,” but Dow leaves out the titles altogether, and makes 987â of him.