

VERNACULAR SOURCES ON QUEEN PADMINI: HISTORY AND MYTH

Dr Madhav Hada*

Abstract

'Myth' is time and again gazed at as an assurance or an idea, or popular belief that is made-up and baseless. It is prevalently known that King Rattan Singh of Chittor married Padmini, the princess of Sinhala Island and Allaudin Khilji, the Sultan of Delhi, attacked Chittor to betroth her. Although this belief is widely held and convincing too, it is inappropriate because, in history, nothing of that sort happened; in fact, the mere conjecture of 'myth' is incorrect. It is a different matter that one should not have expectations from myth vis-à-vis modern history. The present paper discusses the initial historicity of the event and its characteristics in the fabled episode. An attempt is to establish that Padmini-Rattan Singh episode is interwoven with history in mythical and semi-mythical narratives.

Keywords: Myth, historicity, vernacular, semi-mythical, episode, fabled, ballads, storytellers, non-sequitur, indecorous, inference

It is a general belief that the vernacular and historical sources like narratives and poems regarding the life and times of Padmini are myths. 'Myth' is often regarded as a belief or idea, or popular opinion that is false or *non-sequitur*. Speculation is that King Rattan Singh of Chittor married Padmini, the princess of Sinhala Island, and Allaudin Khilji, the Sultan of Delhi attacked Chittor to betroth her. Although this belief is popular and persuasive too, but it is indecorous because in history nothing of that sort happened; actually 'myth' is used here for such notions or beliefs which are false, but it is not the only connotation. Nevertheless, popular and popularised opinions for centuries transform into a 'myth' but to use the 'myth' in the restricted sense that it is false or imaginary would be erroneous; it

* Fellow, IAS, Shimla

would be impossible to reach the truth. As a matter of fact, 'myth' is the reflection of the mundane and the cosmic. It is not timeless and cannot be confined to a 'place' or 'time' or even 'meaning'.

I

Tracing the etymology of the term, 'myth' is derived from the French *mythe* (1818) during the 19th century and was popularised which comes from Latin, '*mythus*' and it from Greek '*mythos*'. Usually, it has two interpretations, one is related to the early history of man in a natural and social context; secondly, to propagate and validate wrong belief or intention. During the 19th and the 20th centuries, with rise of the urge for modernism, the disciplines like art, literature, history, sociology and several others there was growth in logic and empiricism which turned 'myth' as a synonym to 'falsehood' and 'imaginary'. As a result of which a tendency to dismiss mythological events related to the past and mythical characters increased rapidly. To comprehend the concept of the 'myth,' it becomes necessary to understand its etymology of the word and its meaning in the early steps of development, but it did not happen due to the human urge for modernity. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, a renowned thinker on art and culture, in his book, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, made the first move to describe and elaborate on the notion of 'myth' from a more inclusive perspective since the inception of the term. In essence, he considered myth as an implicit synonym of history. He referred to 'history' next to 'myth'. His belief caught the attention of fewer people in the era of modernism when the urge for logic and rationale became paramount in examining and evaluating tradition. He remarked:

Like the Revelation (*Sruti*) itself, we must begin with the Myth (*Itihas*) the penultimate truth, of which all experience is the temporal reflection. The mythical narrative is of timeless and placeless validity, true nowhere and everywhere: just as in Christianity, "In the beginning God created" and "Through him all things were made", regardless of the millennia that come between the dateable words, amount to saying that the creation took place at Christ's "eternal birth". "In the beginning" (*agre*), or rather "at the summit", means "in the first cause": just as in our still told myths, "once upon a time" does not mean "once" alone but "once for all". The Myth is not a "poetic invention" In the sense, these words now bear: on the other hand, and just because of its universality, it can be told, and with equal authority, from many different points of view¹.

Coomaraswamy's notion regarding 'myth' is different and

divergent, but it is more appropriate than the prevailing one and the most bona fide. His interpretation of 'myth' proves that the general notion is altogether fictitious and false. Coomaraswamy believes that 'myth' is neither conceded nor perpetual — it is a reflection of the mundane experiences. He considers myth as a reflection of reality and not the truth itself. Consideration of 'reality' does not need to be like 'reality'. Often the form of temporal or mundane 'reality' transforms in its reflection; however, this does not mean that it is fake or untruthful. Coomaraswamy also believes that due to time-honoured practices the truth of myth is not confined to one place or time, it becomes universal and ubiquitous, but it does not mean that it disengages from its source. Coomaraswamy has inferred that in the mythical narrations it is often used 'once upon a time' which means that it is valid for all times or forever. He also believes that 'myth' cannot be confined to one interpretation, meaning or perception. The truth regarding the myth becomes enigmatic due to its perpetual and diverse behaviour. In Indian tradition, the best examples are texts such as the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*. Both have transcended the limits of time and space and are also the reflections of the everyday world.

II

In modern times, the concepts regarding 'history' have developed in such a way that the urge for the unequivocal, evidence and empirical has taken paramount importance. Often ignored is the fact that history is also basically a reflection of reality or temporal like a myth. A review of the truth will be different and will mutate in every situation, despite being dependent on the fact. Perhaps, that is the reason 'myth', and 'history' for Coomaraswamy are not incongruent. According to him, history is also a myth, and myth history. It is a different matter that one should not have expectations from myth *vis-à-vis* modern history; based on this criterion, nothing is consequential, but on closely scrutinising a myth some traces of history are there. A tale is a fictional extension of reality.

The Padmini episode, often regarded as a myth and not history, the very perception is unjustifiable. Vernacular poets and storytellers have refurbished the historical episode in their creative writings; the acclaimed characters of history Rattan Singh, Padmini, Raghavchetan and Allaudin. Ballads composed around their lives and times have a tinge of imagination according to times and intentions and interests of the poets and the storytellers in folk literature. It is the inimitability

of folk literature to merge history and creativity. The basis of creating myth stems from history and then evolves through the mind's eye. In fact, after a time-lapse, history also develops through imagination. Perhaps the reason that an event or an incident freezes in memory the process of myth formation begins, and even history is reconstructed from it. Padmini-Rattan Singh incident mutated from the past into a myth in the span of hundred or two hundred years. Though Alauddin Khilji in folk memory has mythical dimension, undisputed he remains regarding his historicity. In fact, fine shreds of evidence to this effect are available in the Islamic historical sources. Most of the myths attribute to the characters of Padmini-Rattan Singh, and there is considerable controversy over their historicity. Raghavchetan's historicity, to a great extent, is underestimated. There are some new literary accessible pieces of evidence about his historical presence, but historians have not yet considered them.

III

There are diverse explanations regarding Allauddin Khilji's campaign to Chittor in history, narratives and folk memory. More or less all the then Persian historians of the period have referred to the episode, but none has mentioned Padmini, Gora-Badal, etc². Later, Persian historians have noted Padmini or the Rani, but based on indigenous vernacular narratives have mutated and metamorphosed the episode differently. All vernacular, indigenous and folk poetic narrations, including that of Malik Mohammad Jayasi, include twisted and transformed incidents as well as the historical ones. Allauddin invaded Chittor in 1303 AD and after the victory handed over the fort to his son, (Khijra Khan) and returned to Delhi.

Rattan Singh, the King of Chittor, was captured and thirty thousand soldiers lost their lives during this campaign. With some incongruity in dates, almost all the Islamic sources acknowledge the incident. Kakksuri, a Jain Acharya, Allauddin's contemporary, also mentions and confirms the event. Kakksuri was the mentor of Dhandhya Samarasah, the then ruler of Patan. During this period, Patan was a prosperous city of Gujarat and was a centre of political activities. Ulugh Khan attacked and destroyed Patan, Samarasah also came in close contact with Allauddin and Ulugh Khan. Kakksuri, being the guru of Samarasah, was well under control with the political upsurge of the times. In his treatise, *Nabhinandaninodhana*, composed in 1336 AD (1393 *Vikram Samvat*), in Kajarkot, Rajasthan, writes about Allauddin's war campaigns and also mentions the invasion of Chittor. In this regard, he says:

*Shri chitrakoot Durgesham Bdhavalatvachtaddhanam
Kanthbandhamkapimivabrahmyata purae*³

In essence, it means that ‘Allaudin robbed and captivated the King of Chitrakoot and like a monkey dragged him from one village to another’. Many, following Islamic sources, have the mention of Padmini and Gora-Badal. Abdul Fazal acknowledges Raja Rattan Singh’s stunning woman whom Allaudin asked for⁴. On the other hand, Farishta’s admittance of a woman of mystical beauty and virtue as the daughter of King Rattan Singh is evasive⁵. Traditional historical sources narrate about Gora-Badal, but they have no mention in the above-cited sources. *Munhta Nainsiri Khyat* (1610-1670 AD), a later indigenous source, confirms: “*Padmini*” *remamley Lakhmsiney Allaudin lad kaam aya*⁶.

The *khyat* also mentions about *jauhar* (an ancient Hindu ritual of self-immolation performed by women anticipating defeat of the men in battle). It is on record — ‘*termey din Jauhar kar rano lakhamsi ratansi kaam ayaa*⁷’ (on the thirteenth day of the fight, after the ceremony of *jauhar*, Rattan Singh died in the battlefield). In almost all traditional sources, the portrayal of the incident is more or less the same. In the majority of the vernacular texts, there are references to Rattan Singh’s marriage to Padmini, Raghavchetan’s displeasure for the King and his departure for Delhi, his praise of Padmini’s beauty to Allaudin, assault on Chittor, the tactical rescue of Rattan Singh by Gora-Badal and many other such incidents. A unique feature of these narratives is that there is no mention of *jauhar* and the outcome of the battle is different in most of them. In some available sources, Rattan Singh is victorious; while in many of them there is a defeat of both. There are others in which there is no conclusive statement regarding the war. It is a fact that in contemporary (the then) sources the incidents are not fully described, but in folk memory it is, and it is because of this that based on folk memory it has been recorded in Islamic sources of the later period such as that of Abul Fazal and Farishta which became the textual source for Jayasi’s *Padmavat* which transformed it into a narrative poem. It is a wrong notion that Jayasi was the first one to conceive it imaginatively because Jayasi’s departure from the subject does not reckon with the later Islamic sources.

IV

The evidence of Rattan Singh as a historical figure corroborates based on stone inscription, vernacular sources and folk memory,

but modern Indian historians are sceptical about his historicity with Padmini. The basis of their scepticism is that there is no mention of Rattan Singh and Padmini as the King of Chittor in some Islamic sources as well as in the traditional inscriptions of Allaudin's period. The then Islamic sources of contemporary Persian historians such as Amir Khusrau and Abdul Malik Isami have used the term 'Rai' for the ruler of Chittor. Similarly, Ziauddin Barni's account of Chittor invasion is just in two lines and does not even make any references to 'Rai' or king'. Barni in his *Tarikh-e-Ferozshahi* only testified: 'Sultan Allaudin again attacked Chittor. He took the army from the city of Delhi to Chittor and laid the siege to the fort, and after the victory, he returned to Delhi'⁸; Abdul Malik Isami has also described the incident briefly, according to him: 'Hence[the]Sultan attacked Chittor. Rai continued to fight for eight months, but after that, he apologised, and the Sultan pardoned him and also gave him the robe of honour'⁹; Amir Khusrau's account of the incident is relatively detailed, but there is no mention of Rattan Singh as the ruler of Chittor¹⁰. In long-established genealogical sources of the reign of Allaudin, there is a mention of Rattan Singh while in others there is no mention at all. In Mewar, most of the genealogical sources belong to the period of Maharana Kumbha and have been prepared centuries later based on traditional stories and folk memory, so they have several discrepancies. Kumbha was the descendant of Hammir, and he (Hammir) belonged to the Rana branch of Gohil dynasty. The Rawal branch of the Gohil dynasty terminated with Rattan Singh. Most of the inscriptions and legends related to the hereditary of Mewar date back to the time of Kumbha, therefore they consist of the names of the Rana branch of Hammir, but none of them had ever been a ruler. All were the feudatories of Sisoda, a *jagir* of Mewar. Hammir and all his descendants belonged to the Rana branch of Sisoda, hence known as Sisodias.

Thus, in the inscriptions of Ranakpur (1493 AD), Jagdish Temple (1651 AD) and Eklingji (1652 AD) and also in the texts like *Rajprashasti Mahakavya* there is no mention of Rattan Singh (1675 AD). It is a fact that Islamic sources as well as genealogical vernacular sources and inscriptions have no reference of Rattan Singh. However, the historicity of Rattan Singh remains undoubted. There is no uniform tradition among Persian historians to record the names in their histories. Also, they have ignored very notable and prominent personalities and even at times have included insignificant and unimportant ones. Abdul Fazal mentions 'Rai Ratansi'¹¹ and Mohammad Kasim Farishta has mentions 'Rai RatanSen'¹² for

Rattan Singh. In some of the inscriptions and genealogical sources, it is evident that the Rawal branch to which Rattan Singh belonged terminates. After which Hammir, who belongs to the Sisoda Rana branch of Gohil dynasty, takes control over Chittor; therefore, there is no mention of Rattan Singh in Hammir's genealogical records. Rattan Singh was the son of Samar Singh of Rawal branch of Gohil dynasty and was the ruler of Chittor at the time of Allaudin's invasion as mentioned in several sources. An inscription in a temple near Dariba has a mention of Rattan Singh thus: 'Dated *Vikram Samvat* 1869 *Magh Sudi* 5 *Budhwar* (Saturday 24 January 1303 AD)'. It states bestowed with rare royal qualities, 'Maharaj' 'Kul' that is Maharawal Shri Rattan Singh Dev ruled over a welfare state. The state was lo0ked after by Chief Mahan (Mahtam Mehta) Mohan Singh ('*Samvat* 1359 *varsh magh sudi panchami budhwar diney adhey shri medpaat mandley samas trajavali samalankrit maharajkul shri Rattan Singh Dev kalian vijay rajey taniyukt mahn, shri mahansi samast mudra vayapuram paripanthiyati*')¹³.

Four days later, that is, on 28 January 1303 AD, Allaudin Khilji departed from Delhi to invade Chittor and on 26 August 1303 AD he gained victory over the fort. Amir Khusrau confirms the description of the invasion in his document¹⁴. With incisive research and diligence, the inscription of Kumbhalgarh prepared during the reign of Rana Kumbha in *Vikram Samvat* 1517. (1460 AD) has an explicit mention of Rattan Singh becoming the ruler of Chittor after Samar Singh (Verse 176). Lakshman Singh (verse 180) of a junior Rana branch of Mewar was the ruler of *jagir* Sisoda, during the reign of Rattan Singh in 1303 AD¹⁵. The same commendation is there in *Ekling Mahtamya*¹⁶. Thus, it is crystal clear that during Allaudin's invasion of Chittor, Rattan Singh, son of Samar Singh of Rawal Branch of Gohil dynasty, was the ruler of Chittor. The reason that there is no mention of Rattan Singh in the inscriptions and genealogical sources is because, after the defeat of Rawal Rattan Singh, Chittor fell into the hands of a Rana branch of Sisoda and *Bhats* and *Charans* mention the names of Hammir's ancestors in the dynastic literature and sources, even though none of them had ever ruled Chittor.

V

In folk memory and vernacular sources, Padmini is the central character, but in works of most historians, no such name ever appeared in history. Persian historians, the then contemporaries of Allaudin Khilji, have mentioned the invasion of Chittor, but there is

no reference of its Queen or Padmini. Amir Khusrau, Abdul Malik Isami and Ziauddin Barani, all three have not mentioned the Rani or Padmini. However, some historians have accepted the suggestive or symbolic mention of Padmini or Queen of Rattan Singh in Amir Khusrau's account. An interesting fact is that Amir Khusrau was with Allaudin Khilji during the invasion of Chittor; therefore, most of the historians consider his version factual and empirical. Another unique feature of Khusrau's description is that it is hyperbolic and exaggerated in aesthetic terms; thus, Persian historians have refurbished several other implications which do not match with one another. H.M. Elliott in his *The History of India as Told by its Own Historians* has regarded *Khazine-ul-Fatuh* as more of poetic composition and not history and has only summarised it¹⁷. Syed Athar Abbas Rizvi in *Khilji Kaaleen Itihaas (History of Khilji Dynasty)* has also retained the summary of *Khazine-ul-Fatuh*. For the first time, it was translated into English by Prof. Mohammad Habib, a scholar of history and Persian. In Rizvi and Elliott's account, there is no mention of Padmini during Allaudin Khilji's assault on Chittor, but some historians have taken a cue from Prof. Habib's literal English translation and adaptation and linked Padmini to 'Hud-hud' episode. It goes like this:

On this day 11 *Muharram Hijri* year 703, Monday, *Suleiman* (Allaudin) of the era, sitting on a high throne, entered the fort, bird's flight could not even match its height. Amir Khusrau accompanied Allaydin with his humble bird (Amir Khusrau. *Suleiman*, was shouting, 'Hudhuda' *Hudhuda*' but I (Amir Khusrau) did not come forward, because I was afraid that *Suleiman* in 'his annoyance might not inquire, 'why is it that *Hudhuda* has not shown up? Is he also among the absentees?' Moreover, if inquired about the details or the reason for my absence, then what excuse will I give? If in anger, the King says 'I will punish you' then how shall this poor bird embolden him to bear it?¹⁸

The *Quran* describes 'hudhud' as a bird that brings news of Bilakis, the queen of Sheba to Solomon. Some historians and scholars regard that in this episode Amir Khusrau considers himself as 'hudhud' and Allaudin Khilji as Solomon. According to Khusrau, Allaudin Khilji, after entering the Chittor fort could not find Padmini, considering Amir Khusrau 'hudhud', his messenger, Khilji inquires about the whereabouts of Padmini. According to Ashirvadilal Srivastava, a historian, 'Amir Khusrau implies to convey through the incident and compares Allaudin to Solomon searching for the queen of Sheba at Chittor Fort, he reveals within and uses the metaphor of 'hudhud', the bird to himself who had informed the King Solomon of Ethiopia about the ravishing beauty of Queen Bilakis¹⁹. Prof. Mohammad

Habib, the one who translated *Khazine-ul-Fatuh*, also favours the argument that 'hudhud' refers to Amir Khusrau: '...he intended for himself because he had to bring the news of the beautiful Padmini to Allaudin (and it is evident that it is related to the queen of Sheba)'²⁰.

Muni Jinvijay, a noted archaeologist, too has the same belief. He regards the above mention is associated with Padmini, and the above statement of Amir Khusrau cannot have any other implication other than this, nor does the recognition of the bird 'hudhud' a simile for bird and its relation to Suleiman and Bilakis, the queen of Sheba²¹. Padmini is present among all traditional narrative poems and ballads. In some, she is Padmini- Padmavati, while in others, she is a woman of high standards of 'Padmini' having her origin from Sinhala island. A *Chittor-Udaipur Paatnamah*, another vernacular source has mentioned her name as Madan Kunwar.

It would be wrong to consider Padmini as ahistorical (not concerned with or related to history) or a fictitious character only based on the then Islamic sources in which there is no mention of her. Padmini is present in several traditional and vernacular sources like poetic narrations and folk memory and also has a symbolic presence in Amir Khusrau's *Khazine-ul-Fatuh*. Several circumstantial shreds of evidence also reveal that to claim Padmini, Allaudin might have invaded Chittor. Persian sources attributed her absence entirely, which is in total contrast to the point of view of narrative historians. Khilji's servant Amir Khusrau 'exaggerated and admirably praised Allaudin Khilji in *Khazine-ul-Fatuh*, he regarded him as Suleiman'²². Khusrau even avoids mentioning negative aspects of Allaudin's character. It would be wrong to expect Allaudin Khilji's failure to get Padmini as a factual statement. In almost all traditional and vernacular sources like narrative poems and ballads, centre of focus is on Padmini. According to the *Chittor-Udaipur Paathnamah*, 'Madan Kunwar, the daughter of Raja Samar Singh Panwar of Manohargarh in Sinhala, belonged to Padmini caste and was married to Rattan Singh.'²³

Circumstantial evidence also suggests Allaudin Khilji as lecherous and covetous. Persian sources acknowledge the same. Abdullah Muhammad Bin Omar-al-Maqqi- al- Asafi Ullugh Khani (1605 AD), the author of Arabic history of Gujarat comprehensively analysed Allaudin's character. Due to his extramarital affairs, his wife was often upset and angry with him²⁴. Traditional sources prove that he carried out military campaigns to capture women. He invaded Gujarat for Kamla, Ranthambore for Devaldevi and Devgiri for Chittai. Surprisingly, in vernacular narratives, his desire for women

is prominent in his military campaigns, but the then Persian historians have not said anything in this regard. There is no mention of women even in Amir Khusrau's accounts on Ranthambore, Chittor and Devgiri campaigns, whereas the desire for women has been the dominant cause for Allaudin Khilji according to the vernacular narratives. He (Khusrau) also abstains from mentioning the *jauhar* of women in Chittor. However, there is a mention that during the Khilji's ascent on Ranthambore, Rai set the fort on fire, and his women were burned²⁵. Amir Khusrau did not mention Chittor or Devgiri campaign, but says that after the attack Sultan ordered special arrangements to protect Rai and his family is cited.²⁶

VI

Like Rattan Singh and Padmini, there is a doubt regarding Raghavchetan's historicity, but in large numbers of vernacular literary sources long before Jayasi's *Padmavat*, Raghavchetan had earned enough fame as a 'learned and devious brahmin'²⁷. In some of the native sources and traditional historical legends, Raghavchetan is described not as one but two individuals — Raghav and Chetan. There is an instance in Hemratan's *Gora Badal Parmani Chaupai* that says '*Raghav Chetan behi Jana*'²⁸ that is Raghav and Chetan are two people. In Labadhodya's *Padmini Charitra Chaupai* Raghav and Chetan are two storytellers of Vyas. It states that '*Raghavchetan daur vasey, chitrakoot mein Vyas/raati divas vidya tano, adhikobachhe abhyas*'²⁹. In *Chittor-Udaipur Paatnamah*, it is clear that they are two and they are regarded as *Bahibancha Bhat (charan)* of Rattan Singh, the King³⁰. Even in *Jain Sidhant Bhaskar* Raghav and Chetan are described as two Brahmins³¹. In majority, popular mythical narratives and Jayasi's *Padmavat* describes Raghavchetan as a single entity. According to Agarchand Nahata, a scholar of ancient literature, Raghavchetan is one individual, and it is not Jayasi's imagination³². A mention of Raghavchetan is there in several vernacular narratives written much before Jayasi's "*Jinsuri Prabandh*" anthologised in *Vridhacharya Prabhandhavalii*(1569 AD) has a reference of Raghavchetan. According to it, Jinprabh Suri had an impact on Muhammad Tughlaq which Raghavchetan disliked, therefore conspicuously he stole the King's ring and placed it in Jinprabh Suri's treasury. Later, the truth comes into view. Some of the treatises and inscriptions have also mentioned Raghavchetan.³³

A valid and popular narrative of Padmini-Rattan Singh does have historical significance as much as a myth has to history. A myth is not history, but a tale does not have record is a wrong assumption;

some of the modern historians believe that Padmini-Rattan Singh story is not factually a history, but it is also not entirely imaginary and concocted. The process of transformation of history into myth is long drawn and complex and remains perennial for centuries. For centuries, people retain a record in their way that is according to their socio-cultural needs and requirements and the process goes on at times with or without ingenuity; it is the very nature of masses or communities. This process continues for centuries seamlessly, and it is difficult to identify when how, where and what happened. The same happened in the Padmini-Rattan Singh episode. The journey between its early historical allusions and prevailing myth today extends over seven to eight centuries. There is no rational answer as to when, how, what and why it happened. There is no cause and effect relationship regarding the incidents. It would be futile to argue or validate it based on *raison d'être* and logic. The earliest historical insinuations of the episode are extensive, continuous and varied so much so that its facts are long lost. Conversion into a myth is often the destiny of history.

Consequently, history becomes a myth; in its inception, it appears to be history, but gradually turns into a legend. The past or the incidents of the past assert to be so for some time. As Malik Mohammad Jayasi also claims that none survives for long, as much as a narrative or story remains in this world' *koi na raha, jag rahi kahani*'. Usually, a description or a myth begins with the history; therefore, it flourishes around and at times within its narration or mythical rendering. At times the narrative or myth remains intact, and at times it even transforms; thus, it sustains the tests of time. The Padmini-Rattan Singh episode is interwoven with history in mythical and semi-mythical narratives. These narratives have flourished through history, which we call myth.

Notes

1. Anand K Coomarswamy, *Hinduism and Buddhism* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 2015), p. 6.
2. See *Khilji Kaleen Bharat*, trans. & ed. Syed Athar Abbas (New Delhi: Rajkamal Prakashan, 4th edn. 2015, 1st. edn. 1995).
3. Kakksuri, *Nabhinandan Jinoddhar Prabandh*, ed. Bhagwan Harkhchand (Palitana: Somchand D Shah, 1925), p. 104.
4. Abdul Fazal Ellami, *Ain-e-Akbari*, Vol. I, trans. & ed. H.S. Jarrett (Delhi: Low Price Edition, 2011, 1st. edn. 1927), p. 274.
5. Muhammad Kasim Farishta, *The History of Mohammeden Power in India till the Year 1612 AD*, Vol. I, trans. & ed. John Briggs (Calcutta: R. Cambre and Company, 1909), p. 206.

6. Mohta Nainsi, *Mohta Nainsi r iKhyat*, Vol. I, ed. Badri Prasad Sakaria (Jodhpur: Rajasthan Oriental Studies Institute), 3rd. edn. 2006, p. 14.
7. *Ibid*, p. 14.
8. Barni, "Tarikh-e-Ferozshahi" in *Khilji Kaleen Bharat*, p. 76.
9. Isami, "Futuhamhsateen" in *Khilji Kaleen Bharat*, p. 201.
10. Khusrau, "Khazine-ul-Futuh" in *Khilji Kaleen Bharat*, p. 160.
11. Ellami, *Ain-e-Akbari* Vol. I, p. 274.
12. Farishta, *The History of the Rise of Mohammedan Power in India till the year 1612 AD*, Vol. I. p. 206.
13. Gauri Shankar Hirachand Ojha, *Udaipur Rajya ka Itihasa* (Jodhpur: Rajasthani Granthagaar, 1996-97), p. 192
14. Khusrau "Khazine-ul-Futuh" in *Khilji Kaleen Bharat*, p. 160
15. *Epigraphia Indica and Record of Archaeological Survey of India*, Vol. XXI, 1931-1932, eds. Hirendra Shastri & K. N. Dixit (Delhi: The Manger, Publications, Archeological Survey of India), p. 279
16. Kanha Vyas, *Ekling Mahatamya*, ed. Premlata Sharama (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1976) , p. 133
17. *History of India as Told by Its Own Historians*, Vol. I, ed. & trans. H.M Elliott (Allahabad: Kitab Mahal Pvt. Ltd, 1996, 1st. edn., 1866) p. 76-77
18. Khusrau, "Khazine-ul-Fuatuh," p. 37.
19. Sirivastava, *Delhi Sultanate*, p. 161. (*Epigraphia Indica and Record of Archaeological Survey of India*, Vol. XXI, 1931-1932, eds. Hirendra Shastri & K.N. Dixit (Delhi: The Manger, Publications, Archaeological Survey of India), p. 279
20. Mohammad Habib, trans. & ed. "Khazine-ul-Fuatuh," *Journal of India History*, Issue – VIII, Vol. I, No. 22 (April 1929) p. 371.
21. Muni Jinvijay, ed., *Introduction (Ratan Singh ki Samsya) to Gora Badal Charitra*(Jodhpur: Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, 3rd edn., 2000), p. 63.
22. Khusrau, "Khazine-ul-Futuh," p. 371.
23. Manohar Singh Ranawat, ed., *Chittor-Udaipur Paatnama*, Vol.I (Sitamau: Natnagar Research Institute, 2003), p. 311.
24. Abdullah Muhammad-Bin-Umar-al Makki-al-Asafi Ulugh Khani, "Zafrul Vallah be Muzzafar Valah," *Khilji Kaleen Bharat*, p. 230.
25. Khusrau, "Khazine-ul-Fuatuh," *Khilji Kaleen Bharat*, p. 159.
26. *Ibid*, p. 161.
27. Agar Chand Nahata, "Raghavchetan ki Atihasikta," *Nagri Pracharini Patrika*, Vol. I (1964), p. 64.
28. Hemratan, *Gora Badal Padmini Chaupai*, ed. Uday Singh Bhatnagar (Jodhpur: Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, 2nd. edn., 1997, p. 19.
29. Labdhodhaya, *Padmini Charitra Chaupai*, ed. Bhanwarlal Nahata (Bikaner: Sadul Rajasthan Research Institute, 1960), p. 24.
30. Ranawat, ed., *Chittor-Udaipur Paatnama*, Vol. I, p. 349.
31. Nahata, "Raghav Chetan ki Aitihastikta," p. 65.
32. *Ibid*. p. 65.
33. *Ibid*. p. 66.