REWRITING *BARANĪ*?
THE DESCRIPTION OF THE DELHI SULTANATE IN
THE *RIḤLA* OF *IBN BAṬṬŪṬA/IBN DJUZAYY* AND THE
TĀRĪKH-I FĪRŪZ SHĀHĪ OF *ḌIYĀ' AL-DĪN BARANĪ*

Tilmann Trausch, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität of Munich

Abstract

The *Riḥla* of the famous Moroccan *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* describes his travels, which led him through the whole Islamic world and beyond that to the South Seas and China, in an elaborate and rousing way: different people and their mannerisms, famous metropolises, the flora and fauna of distant territories and, last but not least, his adventures on the road. All this made the *Riḥla*, besides its being an entertaining and enthralling text, one of the main sources on the relatively poorly documented Islamic World of the 14th century. It retained this status until today. The fact that over the years more and more forgeries and plagiarisms could be proven to *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* has not principally altered the approach to regard this text as an authentic travelogue as long as no opposite is definitively proven. This article deals with the issue of what one needs to write a travelogue; this is, besides writing skill and imaginativeness, information. It focuses on the question where this information comes from or, to get to the heart of it, whether one needs to have travelled. The subject of this study is one of the most significant parts of the *Riḥla, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s description of the Delhi Sultanate. If he probably never was in India, how could he have gained his vast amount of information about this distant region? The answer to this question is, as I think, the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* of the Indian court scribe *Ḍiyā' al-Dīn Baranī*.

1. The ingredients of a travelogue[1]

The *Riḥla* of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* and *Ibn Djuzayy*[2] describes large parts of the then-known world between Morocco and China, which the former claims to have

---

2   It is not known to what extent the Andalusian scribe *Ibn Djuzayy* took part in the production of the text, so the authorship must be imputed to both. In the further course of this article, I will simply use *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, when the author-team is meant.

travelled for almost a quarter of a century. Besides these territories and their inhabitants, it is the author himself who acts as a central part of the story; the itinerary is interwoven with countless references to *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s adventures on the road and the miracles he saw. After coming to light in Europe in the 19th century, this travelogue was soon regarded as a treasure for the relatively poorly documented Islamic World of the 14th century, and beyond.

However, it has been shown that *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* copied considerable parts of his *Riḥla* from other sources. The voyage to Bulgar for example cannot have taken place;[3] his presence in Constantinople and China is at least up for discussion[4]. Thanks to the travelogue of the Moroccan *Muḥammad al-'Abdarī*, even the source for his plagiarized description of Palestine is known.[5] The text most intensively used by *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* is, as far as we know, the *Riḥla* of *Ibn Djubayr*: around 250 pages concerning Egypt, Syria, the Arabian Peninsula and Iraq are based on this travelogue.[6] A quite recent study determined *al-'Umarī* and *al-Ḳazwīnī* as sources used especially for descriptions of Anatolia and Lebanon.[7] This list could be continued.

Nevertheless, such knowledge has not altered the approach of science towards the *Riḥla* of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*. As long as plagiarism is not explicitly proven, his status as an eyewitness is not affected. This applies especially to the passages concerning India, the region *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* claims to have lived in the longest, and that he describes in most detail.[8] This approach is based on two factors: on the one hand, as Conermann says for example, there are no earlier sources on the Delhi Sultanate, from which *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* could have adopted his information. For this reason, we may take *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* at his word.[9] On the other hand he concludes: "Die Aussagen in der "*Riḥla*" werden zum größten Teil von den zeitgenössischen (und späteren) persischen Quellen bestätigt."[10]

Is all this sound? Three questions arise:

---

3   JANICSEK, 1929.

4   CONERMANN, 1993:13.

5   ELAD, 1987.

6   MATTOCK, 1918. Conermann lists more of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's* de facto and possible sources, see: CONERMANN, 1993:12–24.

7   ELGER, 2008. I would like to thank Ralf Elger, who made his still unpublished article accessible to me.

8   The events he did not witness himself, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* claims, were told him by *Kamāl al-Dīn b. al-Burhān al-Ghaznawī*, the ḳāḍī of Delhi, see: GIBB, 1971:657.

9   CONERMANN, 1993:24.

10   CONERMANN, 1993:3.

1. Are there really no earlier works *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* could have drawn upon? I think there are, and the parallels between the *Riḥla* and the works of *Rashīd al-Dīn* and *al-ʿUmarī* have been pointed out before.[11]

2. Do the later works on the Delhi Sultanate confirm *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s statements because they come from the same source as the one used by him?

3. A somewhat problematic question, and the one I will discuss here, concerns the only contemporary work, the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* of the Indian court scribe *Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn Baranī*. Could *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* have known this chronicle? Can it be regarded as a possible source?

A first version of this chronicle was finished in 1355, the same year that, according to *Ibn Djuzayy*, saw the completion of the *Riḥla*, while a second version was completed shortly before *Baranī*'s death in 1357.[12] For that reason it was hitherto excluded from the range of possible sources. However, such elaborate chronicles were not written in one go but developed over many decades, in some cases even generations. *Baranī* names his father, his grandfather and men that held important positions under sultan *Ghiyāth al-Dīn Balaban*[13] *as* his informants.[14] It can be assumed that they also produced written documents, which *Baranī* could include in his chronicle. For that reason at least the first chapters of the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* shall be considered a possible source for *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s description of India.

In the end, the question of whether *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* was able to attain a copy of the Indian chronicle cannot be answered. As he alone testifies his knowledge of the Persian language, I assume that he needed an Arabic translation or someone to translate the Persian text for him. He and *Baranī* completed their works almost simultaneously, so that the transfer of the chronicle would have had to take place very quickly. As this cannot be proved at the moment, these considerations have to remain on a hypothetic level. Of course, it cannot be excluded that a copy of the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* was available relatively soon in the western Arab lands, most likely in Cairo, and that someone was able to read

---

11   Spies for example pointed out the parallels between *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's* and *al-ʿUmarī's* Indian passages, see: IBN FAḌLALLĀH AL-ʿUMARĪ, 1943:8f.
12   CONERMANN, 1993:34. For a short biography of the Indian scribe see: HARDY, 1989.
13   While today the name of this sultan is also vocalized as *Balban* [see, for example: HARDY, 1965:268] *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* vocalized it as *Balaban* [see: GIBB, 1971:633]. I will follow him here.
14   BARANĪ, 1862:25, 127.

it. Such a copy must be searched for. This is an all the more remunerative task because the texts are very similar to one another. Additionally, one has to keep in mind that *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* copied parts of his report on India from yet other sources. Thus, the suspicion of plagiarism does not concern *Baranī* alone, or, in other words: *Baranī* would not be the sole piece of evidence that *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* probably never was in India, but one piece amongst several.

One part of the *Riḥla* especially suggests a chronicle as *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s source: the compendium of the history of the Delhi Sultanate.[15] Chapters XI to XII of Gibb's translation do not match the rest of the text; they stick out as a foreign body. They contain information typically found in chronicles, and their textual structure also reminds one of that genre. As the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* covers exactly the same period as the *Riḥla*, it is conceivable that this work is the sought-after source. There are yet more passages in *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s text with the stylistic shape of a chronicle. Thus it must be considered whether this was a mere literary model or whether the structure of the source was adopted along with its contents, that is, if, for example, in the case of the passages concerning *Čingīz Khān* a chronicle could be the source.[16]

If *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* planned to write a seemingly authentic Indian travelogue without having been there, he would have extracted the hard facts from *Baranī*'s text first of all. Later on, he would have been able to forge the accessory parts and his personal experiences or borrow them from other sources. The hard facts are, besides the historic course of events, the names of contemporary rulers and governors that *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* refers to regularly, and Persian terms and sentences that are cited in the *Riḥla*. If there appear to be a significant number of parallels in the description of the historic course of events in both texts, I shall analyze whether they run on a specific framework. Concerning *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s Arabic sources, very detailed studies have already been undertaken; even his restructuring of syntax in order to conceal plagiarism has been detected.[17] To identify such methods will be far more difficult with a Persian text. However, if *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* had extracted information from *Baranī*'s text, one can expect that he acted according to a certain model, relocating, reinterpreting and reweighing specific kinds of information, and leaving others out.

Besides the hard facts are the soft ones that make the *Riḥla* appear animated and authentic. For that reason, these were typically quoted if the aim was to

---

15   GIBB, 1971:619–734.
16   For *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's* history of *Čingīz Khān* see: GIBB, 1971:551–54.
17   Conermann lists the studies in detail, see: CONERMANN, 1993:14.

defend *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s assertions. But particularly for those kinds of narrative elements a residence in India is by no means a precondition. Unlike battles and conquests, personal experiences, miraculous stories[18] and the description of saintly men can easily be forged or copied. They are independent of time and place. They may have been extracted from an Indian source, but need not have been. Furthermore, they may occur more than once. For example, sheikh *Abū 'Abdallāh al-Murshidī*, whom *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* met in Alexandria, is quite similar to sheikh *Maḥmūd al-Kubbā* from Delhi. Both of them possess the same ability as *Sīdī Mawlā*, whose description can be found in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*:[19]

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa	*Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*	*Ḍiyā' al-Dīn Baranī*
... the pious shaikh Abū 'Abdallāh al-Murshidī, who lived a life of devotion in retirement from the world, and bestowed gifts from the divine store, for he was indeed one of the great saints who enjoy the vision of the unseen. ... He had a hermitage there in which he lived alone, with neither servant nor companion. He was sought by the amīrs and ministers of state, and parties of men in all ranks of life used to visit him every day, and he would serve them all with food. Every man of them would express his desire to eat some flesh or fruit or sweetmeat at his cell, and to everyone he would bring | what he had desired, though that was often out of season.[20]	Amongst them is the pious and learned shaikh Maḥmūd al-Kubbā; he is one of the great saints and the people assert he is able to draw on the resources of creation, because to all outward seeming he has no property of his own, yet he supplies food to all comers and makes gifts of gold and silver coins and garments. ... I saw him many times and profited from his blessed power.[21]	*Sīdī Mawlā* was a dervish... He had peculiar knowledge of the *ṣūfī*-religion (*ṭarīḥā*) and in expenditure (of food) and in feeding he was un-equaled ... he had no house-maids and servants and in-dulged no passion. He accepted nothing from no one yet spent so much that it caused astonishment to the people and a multitude of the people said that *Sīdī Mawlā* has the knowledge of magic.[22]

18 Netton describes *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's* belief in miracles, see: NETTON, 1984.
19 When citing the *Riḥla*, I use the translation by H.A.R. Gibb. The quotations of the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* are my own translation.
20 GIBB, 1958:28–29. Here *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* himself refers to the similarity of sheikh *Abū 'Abdallāh al-Murshidī* to a man named *Sīdī Muḥammad al-Mawlā*, whom he met in India. Gibb does

The compendium of the history of the Delhi Sultanate is made up of these two components: the hard and the soft facts. In this passage of his text, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* relates two to three more or less connected stories about each ruler of India. At least for all those expressing hard facts I assume I shall find counterparts in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*. In addition, I suppose I will also find some of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s soft facts in the Indian chronicle.

not accept this, saying that none of the two sheikhs from India depicted in the *Riḥla* with the name *Muḥammad* has any similarities with sheikh *al-Murshidī*, see: GIBB, 1958:32 Fn. 84. Indeed *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* does not name *Sīdī Mawlā* with a first name *Muḥammad* when describing him in Delhi, nonetheless Gibbs commentary is hard to comprehend.
21   GIBB, 1971:626.
22   BARANĪ, 1862:208.

2. The history of the rulers of Delhi
in the *Riḥla* and the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*

602/1206	Aybak, Quṭb al-Dīn , Malik of Hindūstān in Lahore for the Ghūrids	689/1290	Kayūmarth b. Muʿizz al-Dīn Kay Qubādh, Shams al-Dīn
607/1210	Ārām Shāh, protégé, dubiously the son, of Aybak, in Lahore	689/1290	Fīrūz Shāh II Khaljī b. Yughrush, Jalāl al-Dīn
607/1211	Iltutmish b. Ilam Khān , Shams al-Dīn , sultan in Delhi (Dihlī)	695/1296	Ibrāhīm Shāh I Qadïr Khān b. Fīrūz Shāh II, Rukn al-Dīn
633/1236	Fīrūz Shāh I b. Iltutmish, Rukn al-Dīn	695/1296	Muḥammad Shāh I ʿAlī Garshāsp b. Masʿūd b. Yughrush, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn
634/1236	Raḍiyya Begum b. Iltutmish, Jalālat al-Dīn	715/1316	ʿUmar Shāh b. Muḥammad Shāh I, Shihāb al-Dīn
637/1240	Bahrām Shāh b. Iltutmish, Muʿizz al-Dīn	716–20/ 1316–20	Mubārak Shāh b. Muḥammad Shāh I, Quṭb al-Dīn
639/1242	Masʿūd Shāh b. Fīrūz Shāh I, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn	720/1320	Usurpation of Khusraw Khān Barwārī, Nāṣir al-Dīn
644/1246	Maḥmūd Shāh I b. Nāṣir al-Dīn b. Iltutmish, Nāṣir al-Dīn	720/1320	Tughluq Shāh I b. ? Ghāzī, Ghiyāth al-Dīn
664/1266	Balban, Ulugh Khān , Ghiyāth al-Dīn , already viceroy *(nāʾib-i mamlakat)* in the previous reign	725/1325	Muḥammad Shāh II b. Tughluq Shāh I, Abu ʾl-Mujāhid Ulugh Khān Jawna Ghiyāth al-Dīn
686/1287	Kay Qubādh b. Bughra Khān b. Balban, Muʿizz al-Dīn		

Table 1: The Rulers of the Delhi Sultanate (from: BOSWORTH, 1996:300).

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa starts with *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn Aybak* whom he wrongly claims conquered Delhi in the islamic year 584 (1188/89), his successor *Shams al-Dīn Lalmish* and the latter's children *Rukn al-Dīn, Sulṭāna Raḍiyya* and *Nāṣir al-Dīn*.[23] Their description completely differs from those of the later sultans. Each is pictured

23   GIBB, 1971:628–32.

quite briefly, lacking the richness in detail for which *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* is normally praised.[24] Furthermore, he quotes events not mentioned in any other source and some demonstrably false[25] and naming wrong dates and personal names, as Gibb has noted.[26] Between *Sulṭāna Raḍiyya* and *Nāṣir al-Dīn*, two sultans are missing in the *Riḥla*. Gibb says that *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s informant has left out both.[27] He may be right since, except for *Nāṣir al-Dīn, Baranī* mentions none of the predecessors of *Ghiyāth al-Dīn Balaban* by name.[28] It is only when referring to the reign of this *Nāṣir al-Dīn* that he records basic data: "During the period of 20 years when sultan *Nāṣir al-Dīn* was the ruler, sultan *Balaban* was his deputy."[29] *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* mentions the length of the reign as well, stating also 20 years.[30] When describing the sultan's brothers and sister no dates are given. In addition to these hard facts, he relates an anecdote about this sultan:

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa	*Ḍiyā' al-Dīn Baranī*
He was a pious king; he used to write copies of the Holy Book with his own hand, sell them and buy his food with the proceeds.[31]	He obtained a big part of his living expenses through the transcription of the Holy Book.[32]

24   For example CONERMANN, 1993:25.

25   The anecdote of sultan *Shihāb al-Dīn* of *Ghazna* and *Kuṭb al-Dīn Aybak* making a fool of a group of conspirators is entertaining but not handed down elsewhere, as Gibb says, see GIBB, 1971:629 Fn. 46. Mentioning the execution of the sultan's son *Muʿizz al-Dīn Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* is definitely wrong. This prince was not put to death but even became sultan later on, see: GIBB, 1971:630 Fn. 51.

26   One example of false dates quoted by *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* is the year of the Muslim conquest of Delhi, which he says to have seen in the *miḥrāb* of the great mosque of the city. Gibbs explanation that *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* was not able to see the correct date because of the height of the prayer niche is a good example for the handling of false information in the *Riḥla*, see: GIBB, 1971:628 Fn. 42. He also discusses the problem of an early sultan's name having probably been handed down wrongly by *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, see: GIBB, 1971:629 Fn. 47.

27   GIBB, 1971:631 Fn. 57.

28   The names of the early rulers of Delhi are all mentioned in the passage concerning India in the encyclopedia of *Rashīd al-Dīn*, which can also be considered to be a source of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, see: JAHN, 1980:47–49.

29   BARANĪ, 1862:26.

30   GIBB, 1971:632.

31   GIBB, 1971:632. In the following tables, the citations of the *Riḥla* appear always in the left column, those of the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* in the right one.

32   BARANĪ, 1862:26.

Whereas *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* generates the impression of the ineligibility of Shams al-Dīn's children to rule in several stories, *Baranī* gets to the heart of it: they were very young and were not equal to the duties of rulership.[33]

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa begins his detailed history of the Delhi Sultanate with Ghiyāth al-Dīn Balaban, whose description is composed of three components. First, he praises the personal dedication of this ruler to justice in his realm. He had established "The House of Safety" in which debtors and murderers could take refuge until the state had paid their debt.[34] When describing sultan Shams al-Dīn, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* relates a similar anecdote.[35] The whole point of both stories is the unconventional commitment of the ruler to justice and to the welfare of his subjects. In both, I found no parallels with *Baranī*'s text.

The next anecdote broaches the issue of Ghiyāth al-Dīn's origin. When he, a smallish and ugly boy, did a favour for a ṣūfī in his hometown Bukhārā, the saintly man augured him his rule over Delhi: "We give you the kingdom of India."[36] Having mastered various obstacles, and only through God's guidance, he actually became ruler of India several years later. This story of the predestination of *Balaban*'s rule is, as Gibb has noted, completely forged. In fact, the later sultan was a favourite slave of the sultan's household from the beginning.[37] The fact that *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* reinterprets the story this way is in accordance with his affection for predestination, without which he would not even have undertaken his journey.[38]

The only hard facts in the *Riḥla* on Ghiyāth al-Dīn Balaban concern his biography. All this data can be found in *Baranī*'s text:

The Sultan Balaban had two sons, one of whom was 'The Martyr Khān', his heir; he was governor for his father in the territory of Sind, residing in the city of Multān, and was killed in warfare with the Tatars, leaving two sons Kay Qubādh and Kay Khusrū.[39]	In the year 684 the khān of Multān, who was the oldest son of sultan *Balaban*, his heir and mainstay (*pušt wa panāh*) of the state, fought at *Lawhūr* and *Diyūbālpūr* against the accursed Tamar, the bravest dog of the dogs of Čingīz Khān. By fate and preordination of the exalted God the khān of Multān, together with the

33   BARANĪ, 1862:26.
34   GIBB, 1971:633.
35   GIBB, 1971:630.
36   GIBB, 1971:633.
37   GIBB, 1971:635 Fn. 65.
38   *Imām Burhān al-Dīn*, whom *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* met in Alexandria, told him whom he would meet in China and India in case he traveled there, see: GIBB, 1958:23–24.
39   GIBB, 1971:635.

> amīrs, commanders and officers of the army,
> sustained martyrdom in this battle. … From
> this time on the khān of Multān was named
> Khān -i shahīd.[40]

The sole difference between the texts is that, according to Baranī, only
Kaykhusraw was a son of the shahīd, whereas the father of Kaykubād was
Balaban's second son Bughrā Khān.[41]

This Kaykubād became his grandfather's successor, naming himself Muʿizz
al-Dīn. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa tells us enthrallingly how only sophisticated planning by the
deceased sultan's grand wezir made this possible.[42] This story of fraud and
treason is not recorded in the Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī. Both texts agree on the
problem the enthronement of Kaykubād caused, since his father was still alive:

Now his father was still alive in the land of Bengal and Laknawtī, and when the news reached him he said 'I am heir to the kingdom; how can my son succeed to the kingdom and enjoy full sovereignty in it while I am still alive?'[43]	When sultan Muʿizz al-Dīn sat on the throne of sovereignty in Delhi, his father Bughrā Khān named himself Nāṣir al-Dīn, struck coins in Lakhnawatī and had the khuṭba read in his name.[44]

Baranī now elaborately depicts the differences between father and son. Bughrā
Khān, worried that his son was not adequately concerned with his rule, wrote
many letters to him giving advice. Muʿizz al-Dīn was insightful and glad for his
father's worry, and so a meeting was arranged.[45] The Riḥla lacks this contextual
information, but it does record the meeting between father and son:

He therefore set out with his armies on an expedition to the capital, Dihlī, and his son also set out with his armies with the object of driving him away from it. The armies came	Between son and father an agreement was made according to which sultan Muʿizz al-Dīn would come from Delhi to Awda and sultan Nāṣir al-Dīn would come from Lakhnawatī to

---

40   BARANĪ, 1862:109–10.
41   Concerning this point Baranī's statements are somewhat inconsistent. Normally he names
       Kaykhusraw a son of the shahīd [see BARANĪ, 1862:110, 122] and Kaykubād a child of
       Bughrā Khān [see: BARANĪ, 1862:139]. But one time he states both have been children of
       Bughrā Khān [see: BARANĪ, 1862:120].
42   GIBB, 1971:635–36.
43   GIBB, 1971:636.
44   BARANĪ, 1862:139.
45   BARANĪ, 1862:139–40.

face to face at the town of Karā, which is on the banks of the river Gang, the same to which the Indians go on pilgrimage. Nāṣir al-Dīn camped on the bank on which Karā lies and his son the Sultan Mu'izz al-Dīn encamped on the opposite bank, with the river between them.[46]

the bank of the *Sarū* and there would be a meeting between father and son ... When sultan *Nāṣir al-Dīn* heard that the son came with an army, he understood that (his son's adviser) *Niẓām al-Dīn* had terrified him and he also came with an army and elephants out of *Lakhnawatī* and reached the bank of the *Sarū* and encamped on one side of the river. Both armies had camped on both banks of the river in a way that the tents of one army came within sight of the other.[47]

Both texts delightedly assert that no bloodshed occurred between fellow Muslims, but differ in their estimation of the matter. According to *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* it was God who gave fatherly feelings to *Nāṣir al-Dīn* and prevented him from demanding the throne.[48] *Baranī* also believes the feelings of a father for his son are the reason why *Nāṣir al-Dīn* abstained from his claim to rule. However, it is the reason of state, rather than God, which is the crucial factor in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*. *Nāṣir al-Dīn* was sure he would stain the reputation of the throne if war broke out between father and son. Thus it was agreed that *Nāṣir al-Dīn* should meet his son and honour him as sultan. According to *Baranī* he kissed the ground in front of the throne three times.[49] *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, emphasising more clearly the claim of the father, notes that *Nāṣir al-Dīn* had given his kingdom to his son. However, the more interesting difference between the two texts is that, according to *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* this incident took place on a boat in the middle of the river,[50] whereas *Baranī* locates it on one of its banks. It is not important who is right. However, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s fascination with water has already been pointed out.[51] At the end of their stories, both portray an emotional release from *Mu'izz al-Dīn* towards his father:

The Sultan kissed his father's foot and made apologies to him, ...[52]

He (*Mu'izz al-Dīn*) laid his eyes on the foot of the father.[53]

46   GIBB, 1971:636–37.
47   BARANĪ, 1862:140–41.
48   GIBB, 1971:637.
49   BARANĪ, 1862:142.
50   GIBB, 1971:637.
51   NETTON, 1984:132.
52   GIBB, 1971:637.
53   BARANĪ, 1862:143.

Besides the difficulties during his enthronement, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* gives only one more account of *Mu'izz al-Dīn*: He was, as an Indian had told him, somewhat addicted to alcohol and women, which was why he lost his throne.[54] *Baranī* relates the austere upbringing of the sultan under the supervision of his grandfather. When *Mu'izz al-Dīn*, after the death of the designated heir apparent, came to the throne so suddenly, he forgot everything he had learnt. "A heavy desire for enjoyment of life and amusement had come into the breast of this (ruler)…"[55] The consequence of his moral conduct was an illness that made it impossible for him to hold his throne. He contracted a disease, so the *Riḥla* tells us, that physicians were not able to cure: one half of his body dried up.[56] *Baranī* reports two symptoms of the sultan's affliction: the first one was his *bāṭin-i kharāb wa bī-āb shuda-yi khʷud*, the destruction and dehydration of his internal organs[57], and the second *laḥwa*, a paralysis of his face.[58]

Under these circumstances overthrowing his master was child's play for *Djalāl al-Dīn*, one of the sultan's *amīrs*. He attacked the palace of the dying sultan, killed him and ruled after him.[59] *Baranī* reports the same story, with one minor difference: according to him, it was the sons of *Djalāl al-Dīn* who came to the palace for *Mu'izz al-Dīn*.[60] Thus concerning *Mu'izz al-Dīn* the *Riḥla* only reports hard facts. To each one of these, analogies, though somewhat differently arranged and evaluated, can be found in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*.

An eyewitness had told him of the events concerning the downfall of *Mu'izz al-Dīn*, says *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*.[61] *Baranī* states that from that moment on, he was an eyewitness to everything he reported.[62] It seems to make sense, therefore, that both describe at first the character of the new sultan:

Jalāl al-Dīn was clement and upright, and it was his clemency that led him to his death, as we shall relate.[63]	… and the second thing common to the rule of kings is force, authority and public executions (*siyāsat*), by means of which enemies are repelled and rebels subdued. Without it the

---

54   GIBB, 1971:637–38.
55   BARANĪ, 1862:128.
56   GIBB, 1971:637–38.
57   BARANĪ, 1862:166.
58   BARANĪ, 1862:171.
59   GIBB, 1971:638.
60   BARANĪ, 1862:172–73.
61   GIBB, 1971:638.
62   BARANĪ, 1862:175.
63   GIBB, 1971:638.

order of the ruler, who is the source of rule, is not carried out. And the scare of the ruler doesn't come into the hearts of the subjects. Both qualities named don't crop up at sultan *Djalāl al-Dīn*.[64]

Often they bring thieves before sultan *Djalāl al-Dīn*. He administers them an oath never to steal again and sets them free. He says to the attendees: I cannot kill a bound man, whom they bring before me...[65]

The other event the *Riḥla* reports concerning *Djalāl al-Dīn* is his murder. It took place during a meeting with his nephew in *Karra* at the Ganges. *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* and *Baranī* unanimously report that *Djalāl al-Dīn* had marched there by force.[66]

He (*Djalāl al-Dīn*) embarked on the river in order to meet his nephew, and the latter (*'Alā' al-Dīn*) also embarked on a second vessel, determined on murdering him, and said to his followers 'When I embrace him, kill him.' So when they met in the middle of the river his nephew embraced him and his nephew's attendants killed him as prearranged, and 'Alā al-Dīn took possession of his kingdom and his troops.[67]

Sultan *Djalāl al-Dīn* went with two boats and a couple of noblemen and attendants towards the other bank.[68]

At the moment, when sultan *Djalāl al-Dīn* took *'Alā' al-Dīn*'s hand and drew him to himself, the stone-hearted traitor gave the signal. *Maḥmūd Sālim*, a wretched fellow of a bad family from *Sāmāna*, hit the sultan with a sword ... *Ikhtiyār al-Dīn Hawd*, an infidel of the grace and an outlaw, followed 'The enemy subduing and the territory of the Sunni Muslims expanding' sultan and thus threw him to the ground. He cut his head off his body and brought it, dripping of blood, to sultan *'Alā' al-Dīn*.[69]

Baranī reports these events in detail, unlike *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*. The *Riḥla* only contains basic information. Where both texts agree is that it was *Djalāl al-Dīn*'s clemency that brought his death. He had stubbornly refused to heed all warnings that his nephew planned to overpower him. One of the more interesting points

64   BARANĪ, 1862:188–89.
65   BARANĪ, 1862:189.
66   GIBB, 1971:639; BARANĪ, 1862:231.
67   GIBB, 1971:640.
68   BARANĪ, 1862:232.
69   BARANĪ, 1862:234–35.

here is that, once again, according to *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, the murder of the sultan took place in the middle of the river, whereas *Baranī* locates it on one of its banks.[70]

What *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* relates first of sultan *'Alā' al-Dīn* is that he was quite interested in the pricing of the traders in his realm. Through public regulation of economy, he tried to guarantee stable prices on everyday goods for all his subjects.[71] *Baranī* also describes in detail how the sultan imposed a cap on the price of grain. However, he does not regard *'Alā' al-Dīn*'s love for his subjects as his motive. The sultan had planned to muster a huge army without emptying his treasury. His advisers suggested that the soldiers could provide for their own armament if only the price of food were not so high.[72]

Hereafter, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* gives personal information on every sultan, and by doing so also stresses his access to well informed, that is, high-ranking, circles. *'Alā' al-Dīn*, for example, had problems with his wife, who made life miserable for him. He often complained to the sultan about her. However, as she was *Djalāl al-Dīn*'s daughter, the relationship between him and the sultan suffered as a result.[73] *Baranī* also depicts these conjugal problems, and furthermore the problematic relationship between *'Alā' al-Dīn* and his mother-in-law, the wife of *Djalāl al-Dīn*. Contrary to *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, *Baranī* thinks that it was not too much conversation between the two men that caused alienation but too little. *'Alā' al-Dīn* was not able to tell his uncle about his domestic problems, and so they became estranged.[74]

Furthermore the *Riḥla* tells us that *'Alā' al-Dīn* never rode on horseback. At first, this seems to be one of the countless anecdotes of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, but the story leading to this statement can also be found in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*. *'Alā' al-Dīn* had a favourite nephew. *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* names him *Sulaymān Shāh*, while *Baranī* says his name was *Akat Khān*. When hunting with his uncle, he thought to himself:

---

70   With the description of *Djalāl al-Dīn's* murder at the orders of *'Alā' al-Dīn* the genealogy of the rulers of Delhi by *Rashīd al-Dīn* ends, see: JAHN, 1980:50.
71   GIBB, 1971:640–41.
72   BARANĪ, 1862:303–08.
73   GIBB, 1971:639.
74   BARANĪ, 1862:221.

... secretly to act with him (*'Alā' al-Dīn*) as he had acted with his uncle Jalāl al-Dīn, namely to assassinate him.[75]

As sultan *'Alā' al-Dīn* has killed his uncle and set himself on his throne, I will kill sultan *'Alā' al-Dīn* and sit myself on his throne.[76]

According to *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, when the sultan dismounted in order to lunch, his nephew shot an arrow at him and threw him to the ground. One of the sultan's slaves covered him with a shield. When *Sulaymān Shāh* approached the sultan lying on the ground to deliver his deathblow, the sultan's slaves told him that *'Alā' al-Dīn* was already dead. The traitor believed them, rode to the palace of his uncle and took possession of his private rooms. When *'Alā' al-Dīn* awoke from his faint he quickly gathered his troops. His nephew fled but was caught, brought before him and executed.[77] *Baranī* records the same story, though in far more detail, as Gibb has already noted.[78] Gibb also mentions a difference in two of the *Riḥla*'s manuscripts. In one, the sultan's slave covers him with a shield, in the other with a mantle.[79] This is of interest, because *Baranī* notes both of these items in one and the same story: It was winter, so *'Alā' al-Dīn* wore a long garment and a mantle, which provided a certain protection for him. In addition to this, he had a shield for defense. However, the slave did not wear one: he was himself the shield, "There was a slave named *Mānik* who made himself at this place the shield of the sultan, when the new Muslims shot arrows on the sultan."[80] It was not until after *'Alā' al-Dīn* was hit by several arrows that more of his slaves came to shield him. It was they who told *Akat Khān* that the sultan had already died. Aside from this, both stories differ only in details. According to *Baranī*, the usurper did not enter the palace in Delhi, but rather the sultan's tent at his camp nearby. Also, *Akat Khān* was not brought before *'Alā' al-Dīn* after his capture, but was killed immediately.[81] The fact that *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s traitor entered the palace in the capital instead of a tent, and was executed under the eyes of his uncle he himself had planned on killing makes the story more rousing than *Baranī*'s, but does not alter it substantially.

Regarding *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s two versions, several questions remain to be answered. Do they differ in more than this point? Are there even more variants

---

75   GIBB, 1971:641.
76   BARANĪ, 1862:273.
77   GIBB, 1971:641.
78   GIBB, 1971:641 Fn. 87.
79   GIBB, 1971:641 Fn. 86.
80   BARANĪ, 1862:273.
81   BARANĪ, 1862:273–75.

in the thirty known manuscripts?[82] In order to shed light on these issues, a comparison of all copies is necessary – a task that has yet to be undertaken. This is a pressing task, which could also shed new light on the matter of plagiarism.

When the death of the sultan was imminent, the struggle for succession began among his sons. Now *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* lists the names of all princes for the first time.[83] Until now he had only recorded the successor to the throne, whose brothers were of no importance to his story anyway. The names of the sultan's sons are all to be found in *Baranī*'s text, as is to be expected in a chronicle.[84] *'Alā' al-Dīn*'s wife, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* reports, tried to bring her son *Khiḍr Khān* to the throne with the help of his uncle *Sandjar*. But the grand wezir *Malik Nāyib* got wind of the plan and informed the sultan, who had *Sandjar* killed, and locked up his son at the fortress of *Gāliyūr*. Shortly after the death of *'Alā' al-Dīn, Malik Nāyib* made his youngest son, *Shihāb al-Dīn*, the new sultan.[85] *Baranī* records much the same story; the differences are of no great relevance. For example, he names the brother-in-law of the sultan *Alp Khān*. Again, he judges this event differently from *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*. He blames *Malik Nāyib* for the imprisonment of the heir apparent, whereas in the *Riḥla Sandjar* is the culprit. He names the fortress *Gawālīr*, but it is apparently the same place mentioned by *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*.[86]

Having mastered the struggle with his brothers, an event described identically by *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* and *Baranī, Mubārak Khān* became sultan, adopting the name *Kuṭb al-Dīn*.[87] His first official act was to send someone to kill his blinded brothers imprisoned at the fortress of *Gawālīr*. The differences in both stories are marginal. According to *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, only *Khiḍr Khān* panicked before the hangman, while his brothers stayed brave; reading *Baranī*, all of them were fearful:

When they came to execute Khiḍr *Khān* he was terror-stricken and aghast.[88]	*Shādī Khān* headed for *Gawālīr* and killed these intimidated blinded.[89]

---

82   For signatures and whereabouts of the known manuscripts see: OUASTI, 2006:90–91.

83   GIBB, 1971:641.

84   See BARANĪ, 1862:240. The only son named in the *Riḥla*, whom *Baranī* doesn't list, is *Abū Bakr Khān*.

85   GIBB, 1971:641–42.

86   BARANĪ, 1862:368–72.

87   GIBB, 1971:643; BARANĪ, 1862:373–77. In the course of these events *Malik Nāyib* was killed in his bed. While *Baranī* used the correct Persian word *kh^wāb-gāh, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* writes *al-khurmaqāh* or *al-kharmaqāh*.

88   GIBB, 1971:645.

89   BARANĪ, 1862:393.

In addition to the enthronement of *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn*, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* records only his death, as he had done with former sultans. This passage is a suitable example to show the parallels between the *Riḥla* and the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*. *Baranī* records these events in significantly more detail than *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* and arranges the single narrative elements in a different way; nonetheless, we read exactly the same stories.

Ḳuṭb al-Dīn had an attendant named *Khusraw Khān*, who meant the world to him and whom he allowed to do anything he wanted. Even when he was accused of an attempted coup, the sultan stood by him unquestioningly. According to *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn* addressed his distrustful advisors; according to *Baranī*, he directly addressed *Khusraw Khān* himself. The statement in both cases is the same:

Let him do as he pleases.[90]	If the whole world is upside down and all my advisers talk badly about you with one voice, I am still so in love with you that I will sacrifice all of them for one strand of your hair.[91]

Having become self-confident following this assurance, *Khusraw Khān*, who was of Indian origin, decided to establish his own power base. According to *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, he pleaded the case of a group of Indians, who came from his home province and planned to accept Islam, to the sultan.[92] In *Baranī*'s texts he articulates his desire in a straightforward manner: the sultan may allow him to bring some of his relatives from *Bahlawāl* and *Gudjarāt* to court in order to join him.[93] After *Khusraw Khān* succeeded in persuading the sultan to give him his own key to the palace gates, his followers could even enter at night without being checked by the guards. At this part of the story, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* and *Baranī* agree that this was possible only through a lie.[94] Hereafter, the narrations of both run parallel. One night the assassins entered the palace and hurried onto the roof, where *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn* used to sleep in summertime. Between them and the sultan there was only *ḳāḍī Ḍiyā' al-Dīn*, named *Ḳāḍī Khān*.

90   GIBB, 1971:647.
91   BARANĪ, 1862:406.
92   GIBB, 1971:647.
93   BARANĪ, 1862:402.
94   GIBB, 1971:647; BARANĪ, 1862:403.

But when he stopped them from entering they assaulted and killed him. All this made a clamour at the door and the Sultan called out |'What is there?'[95]

He approached *ḳāḍī Ḍiyā' al-Dīn*, drew a spear from under his *čādar*, passed *ḳāḍī Ḍiyā' al-Dīn* and killed this inexperienced, incautious and vain Muslim on the spot. Through the murder of *ḳāḍī Ḍiyā' al-Dīn* uproar arose in the *Hazār Sutūn*. ... Sultan *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn* asked *Khusraw Khān*: "What is this tumult?"[96]

In the *Riḥla*, *Khusraw Khān* claims that he wanted to bring the Indians before the sultan. As *Ḳāḍī Khān* refused to let them in, a quarrel arose between them.[97] *Baranī* also makes *Khusraw Khān* lie here: In the courtyard some horses had broken out and were now tied up again. This had caused the uproar.[98] Finally even *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn* became suspicious of the situation and tried to flee.[99] Now *Khusraw Khān* let all pretence go:

As he knocked on the door Khusrū *Khān* seized him in his arms from behind, but the Sultan was more powerful than he and bore him to the ground.[100]

He (*Khusraw Khān*) reached the sultan, grasped the sultan's hair from behind and held it tight in his hand. The sultan threw him on the ground.[101]

At this moment the assassins arrived on the roof and *Khusraw Khān* directed their attention to the sultan. *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* and *Baranī* differ in what exactly he called out to them:

Here he is on top of me; kill him, ...[102]

Look out for me![103]

At this point, the Indian conspirators killed *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn* and defiled his dead body. We find a characteristic difference here between the *Riḥla* and the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*:

95   GIBB, 1971:647.
96   BARANĪ, 1862:406–07.
97   GIBB, 1971:647.
98   BARANĪ, 1862:407.
99   The differences between the two texts are once again marginal. According to *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* the sultan tried to flee into the palace, whereas *Baranī* mentions the harem. As it lies normally inside the palace, this doesn't make any difference whatsoever.
100   GIBB, 1971:647–48.
101   BARANĪ, 1862:407.
102   GIBB, 1971:648.
103   BARANĪ, 1862:408.

... so they killed him, cut off his head and threw it down from the roof of the palace into the courtyard.[104]	He cut off the head of *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn*. They threw the body of *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn* without the head from the roof of the *Hazār Sutūn* into the courtyard of the palace.[105]

The end of *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn* is a good example of the nature of the discrepancies between the two texts: interchanged names, locations, or now and then a body part: nevertheless the course of events remains almost entirely the same.

Apart from these events, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* reports almost nothing of *Khusraw Khān*. *Baranī* does not even dedicate a chapter to him, surely due to his Indian descent which he mentions over and over again.[106] At this point, *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ Khān*, the sultan reigning when *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* claims to have been in India, appears in both texts for the first time. He was held hostage at the court of *Khusraw Khān* in order to make his father politically docile. But one day he fled and joined his father, who shortly thereafter ended the Indian interregnum on the throne of Delhi. Here, another difference between the *Riḥla* and the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* becomes tangible for the first time. Both texts record the flight of *Khusraw Khān*'s hostage, but in the *Riḥla* it is expressed in a far more enthralling way. *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* tells us that *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ Khān* used a clever trick in order to escape,[107] while according to *Baranī* he just rode away.[108]

The more their histories of India proceed, the easier it is to discern the way in which both texts resemble each other. They consist of a framework of core statements, to which *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* adds anecdotes, personal experiences and general background information. These kinds of narrative elements do not normally appear in *Baranī*'s text. But to every single one of the core statements – the hard facts of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s travelogue – analogies can be found in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*.

At first, *Khusraw Khān* sent his brother *Khān-i Khānān* against *Tughluḳ Khān*. Because the sultan's brother was quite inexperienced, he stood no chance against this skilled warrior:

---

104 GIBB, 1971:648.
105 BARANĪ, 1862:408.
106 BARANĪ, 1862:381, 390, 391. *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* records it just once, see: GIBB, 1971:647.
107 GIBB, 1971:650.
108 BARANĪ, 1862:414.

The Sultan sent his brother K̲h̲ān-i K̲h̲ānān to engage them but they inflicted on him a crushing defeat; his army passed to their side and K̲h̲ān-i K̲h̲ānān went back to his brother, his officers having been killed and his treasuries and his possessions captured.[109]

Right at the first attack *G̲h̲āzī Malik* (*Tug̲h̲luḳ K̲h̲ān*) shattered the army of the unbelievers. … The tents and standards of the brother of the renegade *Khusraw K̲h̲ān*, the elephants, horses and the treasure, which *Khusraw K̲h̲ān* had sent to his brother, all fell into the hands of *G̲h̲āzī Malik*.[110]

In the *Riḥla*, *Tug̲h̲luḳ K̲h̲ān* headed for Delhi immediately, whereas *Baranī* first records the events leading to the upcoming conflict in detail and the panic that struck *Khusraw K̲h̲ān*. When he heard of the coming of his enemy, the sultan moved out of the city to await him:

…, and Khusrū K̲h̲ān came out against him with his troops and encamped outside Dihlī at a place called | Āṣyā Ābād, …[111]

Khusraw K̲h̲ān, astonished and distraught, with his disastrous *amīrs*, *Barwārān* and Hindus, who had become his backers and fomenters, came out of *Sīrī* into the plain of *Ḥawḍ-i ʿalāʾī*, …[112]

Khusraw K̲h̲ān opened the royal treasury and distributed all the gold and money inside to his soldiers without weighing or counting it, as *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* emphasizes.[113] *Baranī* states that *Khusraw K̲h̲ān* was so afraid the money might fall into the hands of *Tug̲h̲luḳ K̲h̲ān* that he had not left a single *dāng* or *diram* in the treasury.[114] Then the fighting began. *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* praises the great bravery of the Indians in battle, due to which they succeeded in plundering *Tug̲h̲luḳ K̲h̲ān*'s camp. *Baranī* also reports this event, but one will never find praise for Indians, regardless of whether they are converts or still Hindus, in his chronicle. Many Muslim soldiers, he tells us, had taken the money and gone home, because they refused to fight against *Tug̲h̲luḳ K̲h̲ān*. When one of the sultan's Hindu *amīrs* saw that all was over, he fled. On his flight he accidentally passed *Tug̲h̲luḳ K̲h̲ān*'s camp and plundered it.[115]

Then *Tug̲h̲luḳ K̲h̲ān*, together with his last and most experienced stalwarts, attacked the centre of *Khusraw K̲h̲ān*'s army. In the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz S̲h̲āhī* this

109 GIBB, 1971:650.
110 BARANĪ, 1862:416–17.
111 GIBB, 1971:650.
112 BARANĪ, 1862:417.
113 GIBB, 1971:650.
114 BARANĪ, 1862:418.
115 BARANĪ, 1862:418–19.

looks like a tactical decision, to spare one's elite troops until the crucial part of the battle. In the *Riḥla* this story sounds more enthralling, as once again *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* uses suspense; *Tughluḳ Khān* stood at the edge of a crushing defeat when, out of total desperation, he and 300 of his oldest followers attacked *Khusraw Khān* himself and finally drove him into defeat.[116]

Khusraw Khān was separated from his men, fled from the battlefield on his own and hid away:

He took to flight, then dismounted, put off his outer garments and arms, keeping only a single shirt on, and let his hair loose upon his shoulders in the manner of the Indian faqīrs, and went into a grove of trees in that neighbourhood.[117]	He returned from *Tilpat* and came into the vicinity of the garden of *Malik Shādī-yi ʿalāʾī*, who was the old *walī* of his. There he hid and stayed in this garden the whole night.[118]

It was there he was finally caught. Once again the reader is more fascinated by *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s story of how *Tughluḳ Khān*'s men found out about *Khusraw Khān*'s hideout,[119] whereas *Baranī* just states that they did. He was treated well before execution. *Baranī* does not record his treatment in confinement but we may be sure that he would have described eventual cruelties against the Indian traitor in all detail. That *Tughluḳ Khān* had *Khusraw Khān*'s body thrown from the roof of the palace in order to avenge *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn* is not mentioned by *Baranī*.

When both texts describe how *Tughluḳ Khān* tried to restore order in the war-shaken kingdom, once again the *Riḥla* is more animated:

---

116 GIBB, 1971:651.
117 GIBB, 1971:651.
118 BARANĪ, 1862:420.
119 The story of how *Khusraw Khān* gave his ring to a trader in exchange for something to eat, has some similarities with the death of *Sulṭāna Raḍiyya* as *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* recorded it. There also it has been the fugitive's ring that blew up his cover, see: GIBB, 1971:632.

... and put the jurist 'Obaid to death. He gave orders also for the execution of malik Kāfūr the muhrdār; a stake with a sharpened end was fixed in the ground for him and was driven into his neck till its point came out of his side as he was impaled on it head downwards, ...[120]

Sultan *Ghiyāth al-Dīn* held a public audience in the plain of *Sīrī*. They staked *'Ubayd Shā'ir*, the *muhr-dār Kāfūr*, and the other insurgents alive.[121]

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa even depicts eerie details, whereas *Baranī* often only states names, dates and events.

The last sultan *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* writes about in his travelogue is *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ*. In contrast to all the preceding sultans he does not record every event under this sultan's rule in context, but instead lists a multitude of independent incidents, most of which he claims to have experienced in person. This change in narrative structure implies that the author no longer carries out a historical review. Thinking this through leads us once again to the question under discussion: should we believe *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s statements? In any case, *Baranī* changes his narrative structure at the beginning of *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ's* rule in exactly the same way.

The story of the origin of the ruling sultan, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* points out here, was told to him by sheikh *Rukn al-Dīn*. It was this man who also told him the name *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ* wore before his enthronement; the name is also recorded by *Baranī*:

..., and appointed his son, who is the present Sultan of India, as master of his horse. The latter was named Jawna and on becoming king | took the name of Muḥammad Shāh.[122]

... sultan *Muḥammad Tughluḳshāh*, whom they called *Malik Fakhr al-Dīn Djūnā* at that time, ...[123]

On the whole *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* is quite sympathetic towards *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ*, far more so than *Baranī*. One of this sultan's actions, which he criticizes, is the destruction of Delhi. The description of this event in the *Riḥla* consists of four statements. They can all be found, in a somewhat different order, in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* also. The first one addresses the resettlement of the inhabitants of Delhi into the new capital:

---

120   GIBB, 1971:653.
121   BARANĪ, 1862:449.
122   GIBB, 1971:649.
123   BARANĪ, 1862:411.

..., he commanded them to move out of the city and go to Dawlat Ābād.[124]

They sent the inhabitants together with their entourage and following, wives and children, slaves and maids on the way.

..., when they reached *Diyūgīr*, ...[125]

After all residents were expected to have left the city, *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ* gave the order to kill everyone who remained:

The Sultan ordered a search to be made for any persons who had remained in the city, and his slaves found two men in the streets, one of them a cripple and the other blind. They were brought in, and he ordered that the cripple should be flung from a mangonel and the blind man dragged from Dihlī to Dalar Ābād, a distance of forty days' journey. He fell to pieces on the road, ...[126]

(They destroyed the city) ... in such a way that in the inhabited parts of the city, in the palaces and suburbs not even a dog and a cat remained.[127]

Once again it is the same narrative imagery of the total destruction of the city that appears in both texts and, as usual, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* describes events in more detail and with more cruelty than *Baranī* does. When he had laid the city in ruins, *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ* started to regret his actions. He tried to repopulate the city with people from other provinces. This plan failed due to the dimensions of Delhi:

..., because of its extent and immensity, for it is one of the greatest cities in the world.[128]

It (Delhi) became equal to Cairo and Baghdad.[129]

But it is not only the description of the course of historic events under this sultan's rule which runs parallel in the *Riḥla* and the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*. Even for stories to which *Ibn Baṭūṭa* alludes only casually there are analogies in *Baranī*'s chronicle. An example is provided by a story about the affliction of the sultan:

---

124 GIBB, 1971:708.
125 BARANĪ, 1862:474.
126 GIBB, 1971:708.
127 BARANĪ, 1862:474.
128 GIBB, 1971:708.
129 BARANĪ, 1862:474.

When the Sultan reached | the land of Tiling on his way to engage the Sharīf in the province of Maʿbar, he halted at the city of Badrakūt, ... At that moment a pestilence broke out in his army and the greater part of them perished;[130] While on his way back to Dawlat Ābād the Sultan fell ill, the rumour of his death was bruited amongst the people ...[131]	When the sultan reached *Arangal* together with the army, the plague had broken out there ... *Sultan Muḥammad* also became affected. ... With this illness, he reached *Diyūgīr*.[132]

Having compared the biographies of the rulers of Delhi in both texts, it can be stated that nearly all of the hard facts, and also some of the soft ones, in *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s *Riḥla* could be found in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*. Assuming that he had a copy of the Indian chronicle and was able to use it, one has good reason to answer the question of whether *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* must have been in India in order to write his travelogue in the negative.

3. The person *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* in the Indian passages

While comparing both works, there are three facts which attract attention. These appear especially where the two texts seem to differ at first sight.

The most important difference is that the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* contains no self-portrayal of its author,[133] whereas in his *Riḥla Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* plays the major part. He describes his personal experiences in India again and again, which is generally seen as a proof of his presence there. But can such experiences not be forged or copied? Many of these accounts run along the same pattern. First, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* relates something general about a person he met, usually a sultan or grand wezir. Then he offers a concrete example of that person's behaviour and finally he links a personal experience to it. In *Baranī*'s text, analogies to the first two steps can be found, but understandably there is no counterpart to the third. Thus, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* allegedly witnessed the piety of sultan *Nāṣir al-Dīn*:

130   GIBB, 1971:717.
131   GIBB, 1971:717.
132   BARANĪ, 1862:481.
133   *Baranī* appears just a few times in his text and even there he plays no important part of it, see: BARANĪ, 1862:25, 48, 168, 175, 504, 507, and 517.

He was a pious king;[134]

...; he used to write copies of the Holy Book with his own hand, sell them and buy his food with the proceeds.[135]

The qāḍī Kamāl al-Dīn showed me a Qur'ān copied by him in an elegant and well-executed writing.[136]

This sultan *Nāṣir al-Dīn* ... was a gentle, gracious and pious ruler.[137]

He obtained a big part of his living expenses through the transcription of the Holy Book.[138]

Another example in which *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* arranges his personal experience in exactly the same way is his depiction of *Muḥammad b. Tughluk*'s cruelty:

..., the Sultan was far too free in shedding blood.[139]

The public punishment of Muslims and the killing of true believers became his custom and nature. So many scholars, sheikhs, sayyids, *ṣūfīs*, wandering dervishes, scribes and soldiers were executed on his order.[142]

It was but seldom that the entrance to his palace was without a corpse ...[140]

Thus no day or week passed by, in which they did not spill the blood of so many Muslims and no streams of blood ran along the entrance of the palace.[143]

... and I used often to see men being executed at his gate and [their bodies] left to lie there.[141]

134 GIBB, 1971:632.
135 GIBB, 1971:632.
136 GIBB, 1971:632.
137 BARANĪ, 1862:26.
138 BARANĪ, 1862:26.
139 GIBB, 1971:696.
140 GIBB, 1971:696.
141 GIBB, 1971:696. Not only in the Indian passages had *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* structured his personal experiences in this way. When describing Lebanon he had used the same three steps: The first statement is general, when he says: the Lebanon Mountains are among the most fertile mountains in the world. Then he gets more concrete: in it are to be found all manner of fruits and recluses. Then he records a personal experience: I myself saw there several saintly men. The first two elements of this story can be found almost parallel in *al-Ḳazwīnī's* "*Kitāb 'adjā'ib al-makhlūkāt*", the third, of course, not. For this and more examples on *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's* analogies to *al-Ḳazwīnī* see ELGER, 2008.
142 BARANĪ, 1862:465.
143 BARANĪ, 1862:466.

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa places his personal experiences in yet another way, whilst still not necessarily having had to have been present. He narrates that he was told by *ḳāḍī Zayn al-Dīn Mubārak* how *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn* sent one of his *amīrs* to the fortification of *Gāliyūr* to kill his brothers who were incarcerated there.[144] The princes' names and the fact that they reacted in panic can also be found in *Baranī*'s text.[145] In this case the personal experience that *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* claims to have had was his meeting in Mecca the mother of one of those murdered. The *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* records that *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn* ordered the mothers of the princes to be brought to Delhi. Thus *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* would know that they were not kept at the fortress anymore and pilgrimages after the death of a son would not have been unusual in the 14th century Islamic world.

A report of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* from *Multān* shall serve as a last example:

I have seen inscribed on the maqṣūra of the congregational mosque at Multān, which was built at his orders, 'I fought with the Tatars twenty-nine times and drove them in defeat, whence I gained the title of al-Malik al-Ghāzī.'[146]	... they approached that hero (*Ghāzī Malik*), who had 20 times defeated the armies of the Mongols ...[147]

Whether that sentence was in fact located on the mosque cannot be verified, since the early mosques in *Multān* did not outlast the centuries.[148] In principle, inscriptions of the benefactor in the *maḳṣūra* are not unusual, which is why *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s report might be true. But the crucial information about the battles of *Tughluḳ Shāh* against the Mongols also appears in *Baranī*'s text.

The second aspect of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s self-portrayal is of the social stratum within which he moved. His alleged access to Delhi's highest circles is striking. From sultan to grand wezir to the sultan's mother, he continuously met the dignitaries of the state. But do we need to believe that every high-ranking person allowed him access at once, or could he have derived the information about them from the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*? A good example pertaining to this is his description of a campaign of *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ* in the mountains of *Ḳarā-*

---

144   GIBB, 1971:644–45.
145   BARANĪ, 1862:393.
146   GIBB, 1971:649.
147   BARANĪ, 1862:416.
148   KHAN, 1983:177–78.

djil.[149] The stories of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* and *Baranī* resemble each other in the way already described. First, both tell how widely extended those mountains are:

This is a great range of mountains extending for a distance of three months' journey, ...[150]	... the mountains of *Farādjil*, which obstruct the way between the kingdom of India and the kingdom of China.[151]

They then portray the course of the enterprise: the army of Delhi could not cope with the environment, the more so since their adversaries cut off the routes over the passes. The greater part of the soldiers was killed or captured. The treasures they had with them were looted by the Hindus. The appraisal that this defeat limited Delhi's capacity to act with regard to foreign affairs in the long term can be found in the *Riḥla* as well as in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*.[152] The descriptions differ only where it comes to those who brought the news of the defeat to the sultan:

..., and out of the army only three of the amīrs escaped, their commander Nukbiya, Badr al-Dīn the malik Dawlat-Shāh, and a third whose name I do not recall.[153]	From such a chosen army that has become unshaken (only) ten horsemen returned.[154]

It is not possible to verify who actually succeeded in escaping from the mountains. But the fact that *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* names high-ranking *amīrs*, where *Baranī* speaks of common soldiers, matches the pattern of the *Riḥla*. The more so as *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* suggests a certain connection to them by giving their names.

Another high-ranking personality that takes a prominent place in the *Riḥla* is *Muḥammad b. Tughluk*'s mother. But *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s obtaining information about her does not require an actual meeting. First, he describes her generosity when founding and maintaining hospices. But that was not an unusual activity for sultans' mothers. The account of how she lost her eyesight seems somewhat fantastic.[155] The only hard facts in the *Riḥla* are her name, *Makhdūma Djahān*,

---

149   The printed version of *Baranī's* text, edited by *Sayyid Aḥmad Khān Ṣāḥib*, spells *Farādjil* [see: BARANĪ, 1862:477]. One of the manuscripts has the correct name.
150   GIBB, 1971:713.
151   BARANĪ, 1862:477.
152   GIBB, 1971:713–14; BARANĪ, 1862:477–78.
153   GIBB, 1971:714.
154   BARANĪ, 1862:478.
155   GIBB, 1971:736.

and the excellent relationship she had with her son. Both can be found in
Baranī's text.[156] In any case, reading this chapter gives one the impression that it
is not *Makhdūma Djahān* who is in the limelight, but her guest.

There is a third aspect in which the stories of the *Riḥla* and the *Tārīkh-i
Fīrūz Shāhī* differ even if they contain exactly the same information. This seems
to be an expression of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s personality too. In the *Riḥla* religion plays a
central role, while in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* it does not. *Baranī* limits himself
to polemics against Hindus converted to Islam; however, this seems to have
political reasons rather than religious ones. *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* on the other hand,
emphasises religion the most, as can already be seen in his many stories of holy
men and his adoration of *kāḍīs*.[157] Besides the direct references to religious
experiences one finds hints of it even where religion is not the ultimate matter;
while *Baranī* mentions the governor of a city *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* records its *kāḍī*. If one
wants to act on the assumption that he adopted his information from the *Tārīkh-i
Fīrūz Shāhī*, then he changed its basic tenor into a religious one. The often quite
subtle differences between both texts emerge only with intensive reading and
can seldom be illustrated by concrete examples. The conflict between *Mu'izz
al-Dīn* and *Nāṣir al-Dīn* for instance was, according to *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, settled by
God, whereas *Baranī* sees reason and fatherly love as responsible for the amic-
able arrangement.[158]

That this reinterpretation is not invariably without problems is shown by
Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's characterisation of *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ*. Both authors agree that
he tended towards cruelty now and then. Furthermore *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* highlights his
munificence.[159] *Baranī* does not allude to this directly but records at regular
intervals monetary presents from the sultan.[160] In one aspect of this sultan's per-
sonality they differ completely. *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* highlights *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ*'s
preoccupation with religion: "The ceremonies of religion are strictly complied
with at his court, and he is severe in the matter of attendance at prayer and in
punishing those who neglect it."[161] At this point the *Riḥla* has a breakdown in
logic. *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* is not capable of explaining reasonably why *Muḥammad b.
Tughluḳ*, though a man of faith, had Muslims and Hindus executed alike. The
Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī is more convincing here. *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ* was just

---

156   BARANĪ, 1862:482.
157   Netton analyzed the miraculous stories of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, see NETTON, 1984:134ff.
158   GIBB, 1971:636–37; BARANĪ, 1862:139–44.
159   GIBB, 1971:657–58.
160   For instance see: BARANĪ, 1862:482.
161   GIBB, 1971:657.

not a religious person but an adherent of *falsafa*, philosophy and the *ma'kūlāt*, the rational sciences.[162] For this reason it made no difference to him of which belief the executed were. Once again we may ask ourselves if both authors simply had differing views on the sultan or if one of them knowingly shook up *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ*'s beliefs. In this case especially it has to take authority that *Diyā' al-Dīn Baranī* was a court scribe of *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ* who had regular personal access to him. Unlike in the case of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, this fact is not attested only by *Baranī* himself.

4. Stories in the *Riḥla* without analogies in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*

A good deal of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s information cannot be found in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*. This may be seen as proof of the authenticity of the *Riḥla* but it is not inevitable, since they are all so-called soft facts. Furthermore, there is a certain uniformity in this kind of information as well as in its procurement. The reason is that the *Riḥla* and the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* form parts of different literary genres. A chronicle serves the purpose of archiving the historical course of events and its interpretation according to the reason of state. The consignee is a high ranking person, to whom the chronicle is dedicated; legibility and suspense are not major concerns. A travelogue on the other hand is a kind of popular fiction. Indeed, the *Riḥla* is dedicated to a high ranking person, too – the ruler of Morocco; but its real audience is not that one man but a broad spectrum of literate readers.[163]

It has already been mentioned that *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* makes regular use of a suspense curve in order to let his narrative appear more lively. In addition to that we find far more surprising, fantastical and figurative stories in his text. For instance one about *'Alā' al-Dīn*: early in his life he had the ambition of becoming king but lacked the money to achieve his goal. All he had was what he gained in his wars against the infidels. One day when he was on a campaign in the district of *Duwayḥīr*, his horse struck a stone with its hoof. *'Alā' al-Dīn* dug up the

---

162   BARANĪ, 1862:465. *Baranī* describes at length *Muḥammad b. Tughluḥ*'s affectation for Persian literature and poetry. He also delineates the extensive conversations the sultan had with his advisers about philosophy and logic, see: BARANĪ, 1862:463–65.

163   That there can be no doubt about the intention of the *Riḥla* is already shown by the foreword of *Ibn Djuzayy*: "… a narrative which gave entertainment to the mind and delight to the ears and eyes, …" [GIBB, 1958:6.]

ground around the stone and found an immense treasure, which he distributed among his soldiers.[164] There is of course no analogy to this story in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*, just the underlying hard facts are recorded by *Baranī*: *'Alā' al-Dīn* kept the enormous booty, which fell into his hands at *Diyūgīr*, for himself instead of giving it to the sultan.[165]

The execution of revolutionaries is also recorded in great and bloody detail by *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*. The Indians had elephants which were trained especially for this purpose:

> These elephants which kill men have their tusks fitted with pointed blades of iron resembling ploughshares, with edges like knives. ... If he orders him to cut the victim in pieces the elephant cuts him in pieces with those blades; if he orders him to be left alone it leaves him lying on the ground and he is then flayed. ... I saw the dogs eating their flesh, their skins having been stuffed with straw – God preserve us.[166]

Such figurative stories are not to be found in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*. *Baranī* also does not state that elephants have been trained to kill people. He regularly mentions, however, the trampling to death of rebels and criminals by elephants.[167] That these animals received some kind of training thereby seems inevitable.

Furthermore, when describing the cruelty of *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ*, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* lists several executed and banned persons, for the most part sheikhs.[168] Here he also leaves out almost no grim detail, may it be glowing iron or the *Schwedentrunk*. To these accounts there are no analogies in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*, with one exception: *Baranī* records the executed sultan's brother *Mas'ūd Khān*.[169] This fits the assumption that stories of sheikhs are to be thought of as being independent of time and place, all the more so because in this case their way of dying is the crucial point of the story, not their name. The only person that needed to be verifiable is the brother of the sultan of India.

As to the Persian words and sentences in the *Riḥla* I could find no analogies in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*. Only the verb *'imārat kardan* appears in *Baranī*'s

---

164   GIBB, 1971:639.
165   BARANĪ, 1862:222–23.
166   GIBB, 1971:715–16.
167   BARANĪ, 1862:208, 212, 320, 321, 322, 448.
168   GIBB, 1971:695–707.
169   BARANĪ, 1862:454. However, *Baranī* doesn't adore him in the way *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* does, who says *Mas'ūd Khān* is the best-looking person he has ever seen on earth. [GIBB, 1971:696.]

chronicle,[170] with a different meaning, however. What is in any case quite sur-
prising are the kind of Persian words *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* uses: whilst he records his
scholarly conversations with the sultan, wezirs and sheikhs, he solely cites sen-
tences of everyday speech like "Have it repaired!" and "Have you anything more
to say?"[171] These are the kinds of phrases one would expect to find in a book of
elementary Persian rather than in a chronicle. The task remains for academia to
search for possible sources these words could have been extracted from. In
particular in the archives of Cairo there should be a quantity of such books, from
which scholars and diplomats of the *Mamluks* learned the Persian language. As
long as such possible sources are not recovered and analyzed, the problem of the
Persian words and sentences in the *Riḥla* must remain unsolved.

5. Spicing up *Baranī*: From chronicle to travelogue

Are *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s descriptions of India based on his own personal experiences
or, as I believe, extracted from the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*? Today the question of
whether the *Riḥla* should be regarded basically as a historic or a literary source
is under debate more than ever. Criticism of his text is often regarded as criti-
cism of him, but that is exactly the opposite of what I intend to do here. It seems
to be greatly to the credit of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* that he converted the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz
Shāhī*, a lengthy chronicle in official Persian, into an enthralling, entertaining
text.

   Thus, while the final judgement on the famous Moroccan still cannot be
passed one should, because of his many verified plagiarisms and the numerous
analogies between his *Riḥla* and the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* in topic and structure,
at least have doubts about the authenticity of his Indian passages. All the more
so because their main elements have by no means such a generally different
composition from the Indian chronicle, as I had supposed. Quite to the contrary,
both texts run to a large extent in parallel. *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* could find all the hard
facts he needed for the framework of this travelogue in the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*.
To these he added the soft facts, personal experiences, stories of holy men,
itineraries and information about flora and fauna. On the other hand, *Baranī*'s
elaborations on fiscal reforms, and especially his digressions into classical Per-

---

170   BARANĪ, 1862:176, 208.
171   GIBB, 1971:759.

sia, are missing in the *Riḥla*.[172] They are not a component of a travelogue and none of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s Arabic readers would have had any understanding of them.

As was expected, the parallels between these texts break off at one point. Both authors depict, extremely negatively, the actions of the provincial governor *'Azīz Khimār*.[173] Thereafter, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* travels on to China whereas *Baranī* records the end of *Muḥammad b. Tughluk*'s rule and that of his successor. From this point on, there are no more parallels between the texts.

A very important reason to doubt *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s elaborations is the fact that *Baranī* does not mention him once. According to his own statement he, the exotic from a distant land, became *ḳāḍī* of Delhi on a portly salary,[174] was a confidant of sultan and grand wezir and was warmly welcomed by the queen-mother. Furthermore he knew a good many of the Indian sheikhs in person and was entrusted with the administration of some villages.[175] A chronicler should have heard of all this. Nevertheless, nothing of it was worth the slightest reference for *Baranī*, the ever well-informed court scribe.

But despite all parallels in potential sources, *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s presence in India is hardly in doubt until today, in academia and beyond. The great quantity of detailed accounts for some of which the *Riḥla* is the only source balances out much scepticism.[176] Nevertheless, even stories without parallels elsewhere need not inevitably be regarded as an authentification of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s statements. For example, he describes a procession in Delhi, its ceremonial and its participants.[177] It is to be assumed that the order in which religious and governmental dignitaries at processions in Morocco followed the sultan was not fundamentally different to the custom in India. The names of the high-ranking dignitaries recorded here by *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* are with a few exceptions all mentioned by *Baranī* too.[178] *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* need not have been in India in order to describe this procession.

---

172   See: BARANĪ, 1862:123–25, 165–66, 369–72 and in innumerable other passages as marginal notes in the text. *Baranī* had a special fondness for classical Persia anyway, see: HARDY, 1989:754.

173   GIBB, 1971:762; BARANĪ, 1862:501–02.

174   GIBB, 1971:747.

175   GIBB, 1971:762.

176   Dunn for example, when praising the significance of the *Riḥla* for our knowledge of the 14th century, seems not even to have taken into account the alternative why *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* is the only source of certain historic events of more or less relevance; he may have fabricated them, see: DUNN, 1986:210 Fn. 3.

177   GIBB, 1971:664–65.

178   BARANĪ, 1862:454–55.

Had *Ḍiyā' al-Dīn Baranī* written his *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* only some years earlier, it would soon have been taken into account as a possible source for *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*'s description of the history of the Delhi Sultanate. The corresponding passages of both texts in content and structure are too similar, the discrepancies too systematic. Considering the several plagiarisms already substantiated to the famous Moroccan today and the many routes along which information could be transported in the 14th century, even now we should not exclude the *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* from the body of possible sources.

References

BARANĪ, Ḍiyā' al-Dīn
1862   *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī.* Edited by Sayyid Aḥmad Khān Ṣāhib. Calcutta.

BOSWORTH, Clifford E.
1996   *The New Islamic Dynasties. A Chronological and Genealogical Manual.* Edinburgh.

CONERMANN, Stephan
1993   *Die Beschreibung Indiens in der „Riḥla" des Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. Aspekte einer herrschaftssoziologischen Einordnung des Delhi-Sultanates unter Muḥammad Ibn Tuġluq.* Berlin.

DUNN, Ross E.
1986   *The Adventures of Ibn Battuta. A Muslim Traveler of the 14th Century.* London/Sydney.

ELAD, Amikam
1987   "The Description of the Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in Palestine: Is it Original?". In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*:256–72.

ELGER, Ralf
2008   "Lying, forging, plagiarism. Some narrative techniques in Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's travelogue". In: Suraiya Faroqhi, Ralf Elger and Yavuz Köse, eds. *Custom and Innovation in Middle Eastern "Ego-Documents" (15th – 20th century: Arabic, Persian, Turkish).* Wiesbaden. (Forthcoming)

GIBB, Hamilton A.R.
1958   *The Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. A.D. 1325–1354. Vol. I.* Cambridge.
1971   *The Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. A.D. 1325–1354. Vol. III.* Cambridge.

HARDY, Peter

1965   "Dilhī Sultanate". In: *The Encyclopedia of Islam. Vol. II*:266–74.
1989   "Baranī, Żīā'-al-Dīn". In: *Encyclopedia Iranica. Vol. III*:753–54.

IBN FAḌLALLĀH al-'Umarī, Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā

1943   *Ibn Faḍlallāh al-'Umarī's Bericht über Indien in seinem Werke Masā-lik al-abṣār fī mamālik al-amṣār*. Translated and edited by Otto Spies. Leipzig.

JAHN, Karl

1980   *Die Indiengeschichte des Rašīd ad-Dīn. Einleitung, Vollständige Übersetzung, Kommentar und 80 Texttafeln*. Wien.

JANICSEK, Stephan

1929   "Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's Journey to the Bulghar: Is it a Fabrication?" In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*: 791–800.

KHAN, Ahmad Nabi

1983   *Multan. History and Architecture*. Islamabad.

MATTOCK, John N.

1918   "Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's Use of Ibn Jubayr's Riḥla". In: R. Peters, ed. *Proceedings of the Ninth Congress of the Union Européenne des Arabisants et Islamisants*. Leiden:209–18.

NETTON, Richard

1984   "Myth, Miracle and Magic in the *Riḥla* of *Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*". In: *Journal of Semitic Studies XXIX*:131–40.

OUASTI, Boussif

2006   *La Rihla d'Ibn Battûta, voyageur écrivain marocain*. Paris.