XII

THE CHRONOLOGY AND GENEALOGY OF THE MUHAMMADAN KINGS OF KASHMIR

BY LIEUTENANT-COLONEL T. W. HAIG, C.M.G.

MR. STANLEY LANE-POOLE, on p. 311 of his most valuable work *The Mohammadan Dynasties*, has the following note after his list of the kings of Mālwa : "The list of the kings of Kashmīr should follow here ; but their chronology is so uncertain that an accurate table can hardly be constructed. See my *Catalogue of the Coins of the Muhammadan States of India*, xlvii, 68." It is evident, therefore, that the coins of this dynasty do not furnish us with sufficient materials for the construction of a complete chronological list of the kings of Kashmīr, and Mr. C. J. Rodgers, writing in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (lxv, pt. i, p. 225, 1896), says of them : "They are not of much value, as I have shown elsewhere, for the assistance they render in fixing the chronology." I have, therefore, the less reason to regret my inability, far removed as I am from museums and libraries, to consult specimens and catalogues of these coins, and I propose, with the slender materials at my disposal, to make an attempt to solve some of the difficulties of this interesting question and to construct a tentative list of the kings of Kashmīr which may at least form the basis of further investigation by those more fortunately situated than I am. My materials consist chiefly of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, Colonel Jarrett's excellent translation of the *Ā'in-i-Akbarī*, and Firīshṭah's history (Bombay text of 1830). The last-named can hardly be regarded as an independent authority, for Firīshṭah, in his account of this dynasty, is little more than a copyist of Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad, to whose *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* he has added little, but I have found his history

useful for the reconstruction of various corrupt and defective passages in the text of my copy of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, which is not one of the happiest efforts of the Newal Kishore Press of Lucknow.

The accepted date for the establishment in Kashmīr, as minister to the Rāja Sinha Deva, of Shāh Mirzā, the Muḥammadan adventurer who afterwards seized the throne under the title of Shams-al-dīn and established a Muḥammadan dynasty in that country, is A.H. 715 (A.D. 1315). The date of his seizing the throne, after defeating and capturing Rānī Kota Deva, the widow of Rāja Udyana Deva, is not expressly stated, but he died in A.H. 750 (A.D. 1349) after a reign of three years, or, according to the *Āīn-i-Akbarī*, two years eleven months and twenty-five days, so that A.H. 747 (A.D. 1346) may be accepted as the date of his establishment on the throne.

Shāh Mirzā left four sons, Jamshīd, 'Alī Shīr, Shīrāshāmāk, and Hindāl, of whom the eldest succeeded him, but retained the throne no longer than one year and two months, and was dethroned by his brother 'Alī Shīr, whose accession, under the title of 'Alā-al-dīn, may thus be placed in A.H. 751 (A.D. 1350). The period of one year and ten months given in Colonel Jarrett's translation of the *Āīn* for the duration of Jamshīd's reign is probably a misreading.

'Alā-al-dīn reigned for twelve years eight months and thirteen days, and was succeeded by his next brother, Shīrāshāmāk. This name, if it is correctly given by Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad and Firīshṭah, was a childish nickname meaning "the little milk-drinker", and the prince's real name was doubtless Shihāb-al-dīn, by which he was known after his succession to the throne. The date of his accession, if we attempt to determine it by adding the duration given for 'Alā-al-dīn's reign to the year in which the latter ascended the throne, will be A.H. 763 (A.D. 1361-2) or A.H. 764 (A.D. 1362-3), but this

date is too late by three or four years, as appears from certain events which occurred at the beginning of his reign. He is said to have defeated the Jām of Sind and to have established such a reputation as a warrior that the inhabitants of Qandahār and Ghaznī lived in dread of him; and then to have undertaken an expedition to the north—with what object is not clear—and to have penetrated the passes of the Hindū Kush, but to have been forced to return owing to the difficulties of the road. After his return he formed a cantonment on the banks of the Satlaj, and the Rāja of Nagarkoṭ (Kāngra), who was returning homewards after pillaging some of the districts of the empire of Dihlī, met him and made submission to him. This expression, in a Muḥammadan history of Kashmīr, means no more than that the two monarchs met in a friendly manner and did not fight, but the date of the meeting is important, and can, I believe, be ascertained, at least approximately. In 1361 Firūz Shāh of Dihli assembled his army for an expedition to Daulatābād, the town in which the *amīrs* of the Dakan had risen in rebellion against his cousin and predecessor, Muḥammad bin Tughlaq, and had severed from Dihli the rich provinces of the south, but for some reason unexplained in the histories of his reign Firūz suddenly abandoned his intention of marching against Daulatābād and turned his arms against Kāngra. It is certain that he would not have abandoned so important an enterprise as the expedition to Daulatābād without good reason, and there can be little doubt that he had received grave provocation from the Rāja of Nagarkoṭ, and that the provocation consisted in this impudent raid into imperial territory. The meeting between the Rāja of Nagarkoṭ and Shihāb-al-dīn may thus be placed in A.D. 1361, so that it would have been impossible for Shihāb-al-dīn, if he did not ascend the throne until A.H. 763 or 764, to carry out two distinct military enterprises and afterwards

meet the Rājā in A.D. 1361 on the banks of the Satlaj, and we must seek an earlier date for his accession. We have, fortunately, other materials, which enable us to fix a more probable date than A.H. 763 or 764 for this event. Shihāb-al-dīn reigned for twenty years and was succeeded by his brother Hindāl, who ascended the throne under the title of Qutb-al-dīn and reigned for fifteen years and five months. The date of Hindāl's death is given by Firishtah (ii, 651) and perhaps also by Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad, though it does not appear in my imperfect copy of the *Tabaqāt*, as A.H. 796. Subtracting thirty-five years and five months, the sum of the two reigns, from this date we get A.H. 760 (A.D. 1359), and perhaps this may be accepted for the present as the date of Shihāb-al-dīn's accession. In this case his death must be placed in A.H. 780 (A.D. 1378-9) and Firishtah's date (A.H. 796 = A.D. 1393-4) retained for the death of his brother and successor, Qutb-al-dīn Hindāl.

Hindāl was succeeded by his son, the bigot Sikandar, surnamed *Butshikan*, or the Iconoclast. The name by which he was known before his accession is given as Sakā, Sakār, or Sankār, probably a childish corruption of Sikandar. The events of the early years of his reign provide us with still further justification for selecting the earliest possible dates for his accession and that of his two predecessors. Sikandar was a child when he succeeded, and his succession to the throne was secured through the influence of his mother, Sūrah, an energetic lady who managed the affairs of the kingdom with a high hand, for in order to secure an undisturbed succession for her son she put to death her daughter and her daughter's husband. We know from the independent evidence of the *Zafarnāmah* of Maulānā Sharaf-al-dīn 'Alī Yazdī that Sikandar entered into relations with Taimūr-i-Lang on the occasion of the conqueror's retirement from India, after the capture of Dihli, in the early spring of A.D. 1399,

and as it is nowhere indicated that the negotiations were conducted by a regent or guardian on behalf of Sikandar, and Sikandar himself set out to meet Taimūr and was only prevented by a misunderstanding from appearing before him personally in his camp, we must conclude that Sikandar was now of full age and was himself managing the affairs of his kingdom. It is therefore more probable that he succeeded in A.H. 796 than in A.H. 798 (A.D. 1395-6), the date obtained by adding the figures for the duration of the reigns of his two predecessors to the later date for the accession of Shihāb-al-dīn.

Sikandar reigned for twenty-two years and nine months, and A.H. 819 (A.D. 1416) may be accepted as the date of his death. He was succeeded by his eldest son, 'Alī Shāh, the duration of whose reign is given as six years and nine months, which would place his deposition in A.H. 826 (A.D. 1423), but here again we have more trustworthy materials for establishing the date than the addition of the recorded duration of reigns to the date assigned for an accession. On the death of Sinha Bhat, the converted Brāhman who had, as minister of the kingdom, stimulated Sikandar's zeal against the misbelievers and had continued the same policy under his son, 'Alī Shāh resolved to perform the pilgrimage to Makkah, leaving his brother Shāhī Khān in charge of his kingdom. Whether he actually abdicated in his brother's favour or whether he merely left him in charge of the kingdom as regent is uncertain, but the Rāja of Jammū, who was 'Alī Shāh's father-in-law, induced him to forego his quixotic design of abandoning his kingdom, and, in conjunction with the Rāja of Rājāorī, provided him with a force to enable him to expel his brother. Shāhī Khān, on his brother's approach, fled from Kashmīr and took refuge with Jasrat the Khokar, a chieftain who, with his brother Shaikhā, had incurred the wrath of Taimūr by harassing his army instead of fulfilling his promise to help him, and had

accordingly been carried off into captivity in Samarqand, whence he had escaped after Taimūr's death in A.H. 807 (A.D. 1404-5). Jasrat, who had regained his power and influence in the Northern Panjāb, espoused Shāhī Khān's cause and marched with him towards Srinagar, and 'Ali Shāh marched to repel the invaders, and, in his haste to meet them, foolishly exhausted his army by a long forced march. Shāhī Khān and his ally, on learning the condition of their enemy, at once attacked him in the hills near the Tattakutī Pass and gained a complete victory. 'Ali Shāh's fate is uncertain. According to one account he escaped, but according to others, more probable, he was captured by Jasrat's troops. In either case he is no more heard of, and Shāhī Khān, with Jasrat's help, ascended the throne under the title of Zain-al-Ābidīn. According to the history of the Sayyid emperors of Dihlī, the battle between the two brothers was fought in the month of Jamādī-al-awwal, A.H. 823 (May-June, 1420), and we may confidently accept this date as that of the accession of Zain-al-Ābidīn, for immediately afterwards we find Jasrat, with his assistance, beginning a course of aggression against the dominions of Mubārak Shāh of Dihlī. Zain-al-Ābidīn, the Akbar of Kashmīr, is said to have reigned for fifty-two years, and we may assume that the duration of his reign is correctly stated and that he died in Jamādī-al-awwal, 875 (November-December, 1470), for this date agrees with that of the accession of his son and successor, Hājī Khān, as determined by legends on coins.¹ Zain-al-Ābidīn's age at the time of his death is given by Firishtah (ii, 665) as 68 (lunar) years, so that at the time when Jasrat the Khokar helped him to ascend the throne he was a youth of 16.

¹ See JASB. lxxv, pt. i, p. 225, 1896. This is one of only three instances in which I have found legends on Kashmīr coins helpful.

Hājī Khān ascended the throne three days after his father's death under the title of Haidar Shāh. He is wrongly styled in the *Āīn-i-Akbarī* (ii, 379) "Hājī" Haidar Shāh. Hājī Khān was his personal name, and should not be prefixed to the name which he bore as king as though it were the title appropriated to those who have performed the pilgrimage to the sacred cities of Islām. After a reign of one year and two months he slipped when he was drunk on the polished floor of a hall and died of the injuries which he received in Rajab, 876 (December, 1471–January, 1472). This date, obtained by adding the duration of his reign to the date ascertained as that of his succession, is corroborated by legends on the coins of his son and successor, Hasan Shāh, the duration of whose reign is unknown to Nizām-al-din Aḥmad and Firishtah, so that we are obliged to ascertain the date of the accession of his son, Muḥammad Shāh, by means other than the simple process of adding the duration of Hasan's reign to the date of his accession. The next king the date of whose accession may be satisfactorily determined by contemporary events is Ibrāhīm Shāh, who was a refugee at the court of the Lodī emperors of Dihlī, and, on the defeat of Ibrāhīm Lodī by Bābur at Pānīpat on Rajab 6, 932 (April 18, 1526), returned to Kashmīr and was immediately enthroned in the place of Muḥammad Shāh, then occupying the throne for the third time. Ibrāhīm Shāh's accession may be placed late in A.H. 932 (A.D. 1526), and the sum of the reigns which intervened between Muḥammad Shāh's first accession and the accession of Ibrāhīm Shāh is thirty-eight years. This, subtracted from A.D. 932, the date determined as that of Ibrāhīm's accession, gives A.H. 894 (A.D. 1489) as the year of Hasan Shāh's death and Muḥammad Shāh's first accession. The duration of Muḥammad Shāh's first reign is said to have been ten years and seven months

but as the date of his deposition is given in the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* as A.H. 894 (A.D. 1489) we may presume that "ten years and seven months" is a scribe's error for ten months and seven days. Muḥammad was succeeded by his father's cousin german, Fath Shāh, who was deposed after a reign of nine years, that is to say in A.H. 903 (A.D. 1497-8), when Muḥammad was restored, but reigned for only nine months and nine days, until late in A.H. 903 or early in A.H. 904 (A.D. 1498), when Fath Shāh was restored and reigned for one year and one month until A.H. 904-5 (A.D. 1499), when Muḥammad was again restored. The duration of Muḥammad Shāh's third reign is said to have been fifteen years eleven months and eleven days, or nearly sixteen years, but as he was succeeded by Ibrāhīm Shāh, the date of whose accession, as already determined, was A.H. 932 (A.D. 1526), its duration was actually between twenty-seven and twenty-eight years.

The reign of Ibrāhīm lasted only for eight months and some days when, according to Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad's and Firishṭah's chronicles of Kashmīr, he was defeated and overthrown by a force sent by Bābur, under Shaikh 'Alī Baig, Muḥammad Khān, and Maḥmūd Khān. This event is not mentioned in histories of the reign of Bābur, but from the chronicles of Kashmīr it would appear that Abdāl Mākārī, a discontented *amīr* of Kashmīr, had sought help from Bābur against Kājī Chak, who had helped to depose Muḥammad Shāh and place Ibrāhīm on the throne, and against Ibrāhīm himself, who had been a protégé of the Lodīs, and that Bābur had assisted him in the manner described. It seems highly improbable that Bābur, who required all his troops to establish himself in his newly conquered empire, should have spared a large force for the conquest of Kashmīr, but Kashmīr had been for some time past the prey of factions, and it is possible that Bābur gave permission

to some of his amīrs in the Panjāb or at Kābul to supply such a force as would suffice to destroy the balance between two contending parties and to place on the throne of Kashmīr a prince who might be regarded as a nominee of his own.

In a battle fought in A.H. 933 (A.D. 1527) in the pargana of Bānkil, Ibrāhīm Shāh's army was utterly defeated and Ibrāhīm himself either slain or forced to flee, for of his fate nothing is known and he is never heard of again. Abdāl Mākari's candidate for the throne was a prince named Nāzuk, who thus succeeded in A.H. 933, but did not long retain the throne. The duration of his first reign is given in my copy of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* as twenty years, but this is impossible, for one of the best-ascertained dates which we have in the history of Kashmīr is that of its conquest by Mirzā Haidar the Mughul, who captured Srinagar and began to reign there on Rajab 22, 947 (November 22, 1540). The Bombay text of *Firishtah* clumsily expresses the duration of Nāzuk Shāh's first reign as "twenty years and twenty months", an expression which must almost necessarily be a misreading, for no writer would describe such a period otherwise than as "twenty-one years and eight months"; but this misreading in *Firishtah* suggests the correct meaning, which will enable us to correct the *Ṭabaqāt* also. A careless copyist, one of the class well known to students of Persian MSS. and lithographed editions, might very well substitute "years" for "months", and a second representative of the same class, seeing "years" in one MS. and "months" in another, might easily solve the difficulty for himself by writing both. I believe, then, that the correct reading is "twenty months", an expression which might very well be used for the sake of brevity instead of "one year and eight months", and my reason for selecting this reading is that it enables us to arrange the reigns during

this period of confusion in such a manner thât they fit in with the few known dates at our disposal. Assuming, then, that Nāzuk Shāh occupied the throne on this occasion for a year and eight months, we arrive at the conclusion that Muḥammad Shāh, who had taken refuge in Loharkoṭ and was brought thence and restored by Abdāl Mākari, ascended the throne for the fourth time in A.H. 935 (A.D. 1529). The approximate correctness of this date is established by Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad's statement that the death of Bābur, which occurred on Jamādi-al-awwal 5, 937 (December 25, 1530), occurred shortly after Muḥammad Shāh's third restoration.

The duration of Muḥammad Shāh's fourth reign is not given, and both Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad and his plagiarist, Firis̤tah, conclude their notices of it by recording that he reigned for fifty years, a term which must necessarily be referred to the period which had elapsed since his first enthronement, placed by me in A.H. 890 (A.D. 1485), for it is certain that this much-harassed *roi fainéant*, who closed his fourth reign by a death which was possibly as welcome to him as to his chroniclers, did not reign for fifty years after his third restoration. The date of his death is not given, but it appears from the chronicle of his reign to have occurred in A.H. 941 (A.D. 1534-5), and if this date be accepted we are enabled to apply a check to the date assigned by me to his first elevation to the throne, viz. A.H. 890 (A.D. 1485). Subtracting fifty years from A.H. 941 we get A.H. 891 (A.D. 1486), which is sufficiently near to the date already given for his first accession to render it unnecessary to revise the calculation by which that date was determined.

There is yet another event which will help to fix the date of Muḥammad Shāh's death. At the close of his reign, evidently in the year before his death, the appearance of two comets is recorded. The year in which this phenomenon occurred is given by Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad as

A.H. 939 (A.D. 1532-3), and the date can thus be verified by astronomical records, to which I have at present no access.

Muhammad Shāh was succeeded by his son Shams-al-dīn, the account of whose reign is most unsatisfactory. No duration is given, and Nizām-al-dīn Ahmad, after recording a few events, remarks, "This is all that has been found in the history of Kashmīr regarding Sultān Shāms-al-dīn." We are not told whether the reign came to an end by the king's death or by his deposition, but as he never again appears on the scene it is probable that he died. Fortunately we have satisfactory data for determining the duration of the reign, for he was succeeded by Nāzuk Shāh, the king of that name who had already reigned once and who now reigned for only five or six months, at the end of which period he was expelled by Mirzā Haidar the Mughul, who, as has already been stated, occupied Srinagar on Rajab 22, 947 (November 22, 1540), so that Shams-al-dīn ceased to reign and Nāzuk succeeded him early in that year, either in Šafar or Rabī' al-awwal (June or July, 1540).

My authorities for the date of Mirzā Haidar's occupation of Kashmīr are Nizām-al-dīn Ahmad and Budā'onī, and the date could probably be verified from the *Akbar-nāmah*. Mirzā Haidar, the son of Muhammad Husain, who was the son of Bābur's maternal aunt, was a poet and the author of the well-known history, *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī*. He invaded Kashmīr, with Khwāja Kalān Baig, under the auspices of Humāyūn, who was now at Lāhor, having been expelled from Hindūstān by Shīr Khān Sūr, and Kāmran Mirzā, Humāyūn's brother, and at the invitation of a party among the amīrs of Kashmīr. The duration of Mirzā Haidar's reign in Kashmīr is always given as ten years, but as it is certain that he was slain in A.H. 958 (A.D. 1551) he actually occupied the throne for ten years and some months.

After Mirzā Haidar's death Nāzuk Shāh was again restored, and, according to my copy of the *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī*, reigned on this occasion for only two months, but the variant in *Firishtah*, ten months, is probably the correct reading. He was finally deposed in A.H. 959, before Shawwāl 1 (September 20, 1552), which date is given for an event which occurred early in the reign of his successor, Ibrāhīm Shāh, who, as we shall see hereafter, was probably his son. This Ibrāhīm must not be confounded with the former Ibrāhīm Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, who, as has been seen, disappeared entirely in A.H. 933. Ibrāhīm II is said to have reigned for only five months, but as a severe earthquake which occurred in Kashmīr in A.H. 962 (A.D. 1555) is mentioned among the events of his reign it is clear that he was not deposed until that year, when Ismā'il Shāh, described as his brother, was raised to the throne. He reigned for two years and died late in the year A.H. 964 (A.D. 1557), when he was succeeded by his son Habīb Shāh, the last of his line. The kings of the line of Shāh Mirzā had long been mere puppets in the hands of rival families in Kashmīr, and as each faction obtained power it dethroned the reigning monarch and placed its own candidate on the throne. Hitherto it had always been considered necessary that the throne should be filled by some scion of the old royal line, but by the year A.H. 968 (A.D. 1561) the Chak clan had obtained complete predominance in the state and had so consolidated their power that Ghāzī Khān Chak, the virtual ruler of the kingdom, was able to dethrone and imprison Habīb Shāh and to ascend the throne under the title of Ghāzī Shāh.

Ghāzī Shāh was a leper, and owing partly to the incapacity caused by his disease and partly to the embitterment of his temper from the same cause, which rendered him obnoxious to his people, he decided in A.H. 971 (A.D. 1563-4) that he was no longer fit to reign

and abdicated in favour of his brother Husain, who ascended the throne under the title of Naṣir-al-dīn. The date of his accession is one of the few corroborated by legends on coins. Naṣir-al-dīn Husain Shāh fell sick in A.H. 977 (A.D. 1569–70) and quarrelled with his brother 'Alī, who dethroned him, and Husain died shortly afterwards. 'Alī Shāh died in A.H. 986 (A.D. 1578–9) and was succeeded by his son Yūsuf Shāh, whose reign was disturbed both by intestine feuds and by foreign interference. Sayyid Mubārak Khān, a usurper, seized the throne in A.H. 986 (A.D. 1579) and was deposed in the following year, when another usurper, Lohar Chak, of Yūsuf's own clan, seized the throne, but was deposed by Yūsuf in the same year (A.H. 987 = A.D. 1580).

Missions were interchanged more than once between Yūsuf Shāh and Akbar, who was resolved to annex Kashmīr to his empire, and in A.D. 1584 Yūsuf sent his son Ya'qūb to Akbar's court. Late in 1585 Akbar sent an expedition under his kinsman Shāhrukh Mirzā and Rāja Bhagwān Dās to conquer Kashmīr, and Yūsuf Shāh, after preparing to oppose the invaders, abandoned his intention and agreed to pay tribute to Akbar. Leaving his son Ya'qūb, who had returned to Kashmīr, as his regent, he joined the imperial troops and was escorted to Akbar's court, where he was presented on April 7, 1586. Akbar, who had been resolved to reduce Kashmīr to the status of a province of the empire, and had had no intention of allowing it to retain even the measure of independence enjoyed by a tributary state, was much displeased with his officers for having so readily accepted Yūsuf's submission and for not having conquered the country, and refused to ratify their treaty with Yūsuf, whom he perfidiously detained as a prisoner at his court, so that Ya'qūb continued to reign in Kashmīr. In A.D. 1587 Akbar sent another expedition, under Muḥammad Qāsim Khān, Mir-i-Baḥr, into Kashmīr, and Ya'qūb, who was

prepared to defend his throne, was prevented from doing so by the wholesale desertion of his amīrs to the imperial camp, and by a rebellion which enabled Muḥammad Qāsim Khān to occupy the capital without opposition. Ya'qūb fled to the hills, and, after evading the pursuit of the imperial officers for two years, surrendered himself and was carried to Akbar, before whom he made his submission on August 8, 1589. Yūsuf, Ya'qūb's father, had already entered Akbar's service in the humble position, for one who had occupied a throne, of a commander of 500 horse with a *jāgīr* in Bihār.

The genealogy of the kings of Kashmīr is little less complicated than their chronology. The earlier kings of the first dynasty offer little difficulty, but it is not easy to trace the parentage of the puppets who were enthroned, deposed, and again enthroned in rapid succession by conflicting factions. Shāh Mirzā, Shams-al-dīn, the founder of the dynasty, had four sons, Jamshīd, 'Alī Shīr, Shīrāshāmak, and Hindāl, who followed him on the throne in the order of their birth. Of these the third son had two sons, Ḥasan Khān and 'Alī Khān, of whom nothing further is known. Hindāl, the fourth son, had two sons, Sikandar, who succeeded him and carried on the line, and Haibat Khān, who was poisoned. Sikandar had three sons, Mir Khān, who succeeded him under the title of 'Alī Shāh and died, apparently childless, Shāhī Khān, who succeeded 'Alī Shāh under the title of Zain-al-Ābidīn, and Muḥammad Khān, who had a son named Ḥaidar Khān, neither of whom figures in history. Zain-al-Ābidīn had three sons, of whom the youngest, Bahrām Khān, was blinded and died in prison and had a son, Yūsuf Khān, who was poisoned. Zain-al-Ābidīn's two elder sons were Ādam Khān and Hājī Khān, of whom the latter succeeded his father under the title of Ḥaidar Shāh. The eldest son never succeeded to the throne, but had a son, Faṭḥ Khān, who reigned twice, and had a son,

Iskandar Khān, who was blinded. It is probable, too, that Nāzuk Shāh, who reigned three times, from 1527 to 1529, in 1540, and from 1551 to 1552, was a son of Fath Shāh. He is so described in the heading to his first reign in the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* and in the *Āīn-i-Akbarī*, but his parentage is not beyond doubt. Firishtah (ii, 675) styles him the son of Ibrāhīm Shāh, the son of Muḥammad Shāh, but it was this Ibrāhīm Shāh who was defeated in 1527 by the Mughul amīrs Shaikh 'Alī Baig, Muḥammad Khān, and Maḥmūd Khān, assisting the Kashmīrī amīr Abdāl Mākārī, whose candidate for the throne was Nāzuk, and it is more probable that Nāzuk belonged to the rival branch of the royal family and was the son of Fath Shāh than that he was the son of Ibrāhīm in the camp of his father's enemies, but the question is still full of difficulty. Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad says, at the end of his account of the reign of Shams-al-dīn Shāh (A.D. 1534-40), "after him his son, Nāzuk Shāh, sat on the throne," and this statement is repeated by Firishtah (ii, 678), though he has already described Nāzuk Shāh as the son of Ibrāhīm and expressly states that Nāzuk's reign in 1540 was his second, so that we have no fewer than three fathers assigned to Nāzuk Shāh, one of whom, Ibrāhīm, may be definitely eliminated. We might surmount the difficulty by assuming that there were two Nāzuks, one the son of Fath Shāh and the other the son of Shams-al-dīn, but against this assumption we have Firishtah's headings to the reigns of A.D. 1540 and A.D. 1551-2, which he describes as the second and third reigns of Nāzuk Shāh. This difficulty is not of much importance, for Firishtah is slipshod and inaccurate; but I hesitate to assume that the uncommon name of Nāzuk was repeated in the royal family of Kashmīr, and prefer to regard Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad's statement that Shams-al-dīn was succeeded by "his son" Nāzuk either as a careless slip on the part of the author, who may have almost mechanically described

a king as the son of his predecessor, or as an interpolation by a careless scribe. In either case Firishta's repetition of the error would be of no consequence.

Zain-al-'Abidin's second son, Hājī Khān, who succeeded him under the title of Haidar Shāh, had a son named Hasan Khān, who succeeded him under the title of Hasan Shāh, and Hasan had two sons, Muḥammad, who succeeded him, and reigned no less than four times, and Husain Khān, of whom nothing more is heard. Muḥammad Shāh had two sons, Ibrāhīm, who reigned from 1526 to 1527, and Shāms-al-dīn, who reigned from 1534 to 1540. Shāms-al-dīn seems to have left no son, for the supposition that Nāzuk was his son has been rejected. Nāzuk appears to have had two sons, Ibrāhīm and Ismā'il, both of whom ascended the throne, but the question of their parentage is not free from difficulties. Both Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad and Firishta say that the Ibrāhīm who was the son of Muḥammad Shāh and who reigned from 1526 to 1527 and was then defeated by the Mughul amirs, disappeared completely and that his fate is unknown, but both afterwards contradict themselves by stating that the Ibrāhīm who reigned in 1552 was the son of Muḥammad, thereby clearly suggesting his identity with the Ibrāhīm who had disappeared. Firishta further contradicts himself by stating in a heading (ii, 685) that the reign of 1552 was Ibrāhīm's *third* reign, a manifest inaccuracy, though he immediately afterwards describes this Ibrāhīm as the son of Nāzuk Shāh. Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad, though he commits himself once to the statement that this Ibrāhīm was the son of Muḥammad Shāh, describes him elsewhere as the brother of Nāzuk Shāh and the brother of Ismā'il Shāh. There is no reason for believing that he was the brother of Nāzuk, but there is every probability that he was the brother of Ismā'il and therefore the son of Nāzuk, as stated by Firishta, who seems in this instance, to have preserved for us the correct reading. The conclusion,

therefore, at which I have arrived is that there were two Ibrāhims, one the son of Muḥammad Shāh and the other the son of Nāzuk Shāh. Ibrāhīm II, who reigned from 1552 to 1555, seems to have left no son, and was succeeded by his brother Ismā'il, who reigned from 1555 to, 1557 and was succeeded by his son Habib Shāh, with whom the dynasty came to an end in A.D. 1561.

The genealogy of the short-lived Chak dynasty presents fewer difficulties than that of the house of Shāh Mirzā, for the only question which arises is the paternity of Ghāzī Khān Chak, its founder. The founder of the fortunes of the Chak clan in Kashmīr was Kājī Chak, who was kingmaker during the reigns of some of the later kings of the older line. During the third reign of Nāzuk Shāh, and just after the downfall and death of Mirzā Haidar, Shankar Chak, son of Kājī Chak, who, in the partition of the spoil which ensued on the expulsion of the Mughuls, had received no fief, quarrelled with Ghāzī Chak, who originally owed his position in the clan largely to his being commonly accepted as a son of Kājī Chak, whereas he was not in fact his son, but the son of the wife of Hasan Chak, the brother of Kājī. Kājī married his brother's widow during her pregnancy, Ghāzī being born two or three months after the marriage, so that he was known to be the son of Hasan. Kājī's action, though a breach of the Islamic law, amounted in fact to an acknowledgment or an adoption of Ghāzī Khān as his son, and by the time when Shankar attempted to question Ghāzī's paternity the latter's predominance in the clan was so assured that the attempt failed, despite the common knowledge that Ghāzī was, in fact, the son of Hasan. Husain and 'Alī, the two brothers who ascended the throne in succession after Ghāzī, were almost certainly younger than Ghāzī, and were therefore perhaps the sons of Hasan Chak's widow by her second husband, Kājī Chak, and the half-brothers of Ghāzī Khān. 'Alī was

succeeded by his son Yūsuf, and Yūsuf by his son Ya'qūb, the last of the Chak dynasty.

In the appended tables I have followed the example of Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole in placing the *Hijrah* dates on the left and the Christian dates on the right of the columns of names.

1. FIRST MUHAMMADAN DYNASTY OF KASHMIR

A.H.		A.D.
747.	1. <u>Shāh</u> Mirzā, <u>Shams-al-dīn</u>	1346
750.	2. <u>Jamshīd</u>	1349
751.	3. 'Alī <u>Shīr</u> , 'Alā-al-dīn	1350
760.	4. <u>Shīrshāmak</u> , <u>Shihāb-al-dīn</u>	1359
780.	5. <u>Hindāl</u> , <u>Qutb-al-dīn</u>	1378
796.	6. <u>Sikandar</u> , <u>Butshikan</u>	1393-4
819.	7. <u>Mīr Khān</u> , 'Alī <u>Shāh</u>	1416
823.	8. <u>Shāhī Khān</u> , <u>Zain-al-'Ābidīn</u>	1420
Jumādī 1, 875.	9. <u>Hājī Khān</u> , <u>Haider Shāh</u>	Nov.-Dec. 1470
Rajab, 876.	10. <u>Hasan Shāh</u>	Dec. 1471 or Jan. 1472
894.	11. <u>Muhammad Shāh</u>	1489
894.	12. <u>Faṭh Shāh</u>	1489
903.	11. <u>Muhammad Shāh</u> , <i>restored</i>	1497-8
903-4.	12. <u>Faṭh Shāh</u> , <i>restored</i>	1498
904-5.	11. <u>Muhammad Shāh</u> , <i>again restored</i>	1499
932.	13. <u>Ibrāhīm Shāh</u> I	1526
933.	14. <u>Nāzuk Shāh</u>	1527
935.	11. <u>Muhammad Shāh</u> , <i>again restored</i>	1529
Safar or 941.	15. <u>Shams-al-dīn Shāh</u> II	1534-5
Rabī' 1, 947.	16. <u>Nāzuk Shāh</u> , <i>restored</i>	June-July, 1540
Rajab 22, 947.	14. <u>Mīrzā Haider</u> , <i>usurper</i>	Nov. 22, 1541
958.	14. <u>Nāzuk Shāh</u> , <i>again restored</i>	1551
959.	17. <u>Ibrāhīm Shāh</u> II	1552
962.	18. <u>Ismā'il Shāh</u>	1555
964.	19. <u>Habīb Shāh</u>	1557
-968.		-1561

2. CHAK DYNASTY

968.	1. <u>Ghāzī Shāh</u>	1561
971.	2. <u>Naṣīr-al-dīn Husain Shāh</u>	1563-4
977.	3. 'Alī <u>Shāh</u>	1569-70
986.	4. <u>Yūsuf Shāh</u>	1578-9
993.	5. <u>Ya'qūb Shāh</u>	1585
-997.		-1589

[MUGHUL EMPERORS]

FIRST MUHAMMADAN DYNASTY OF KASHMĪR

(Small Roman numerals indicate the various reigns of those kings who reigned more than once.)

CHAK DYNASTY

¹ Usurpation of Mīrzā Haidar, 1540-51.