BOOK V

The Southern Powers

CHAPTER 1

The Bahmani dynasty of the Deccan, 1347–1526

Bahmani dynasty; Sultan ‘Alā-ud-dīn I. A series of rebellions between the years 1343 and 1351, caused by the tyranny of Muhammad bin Tughluq, left to the sovereign of Delhi only a small portion of the extensive empire which he had controlled for a few years.

Hasan, entitled Zafar Khān, an Afghan or Turki officer of the Delhi sultan, occupied Daulatabad in the Deccan in 1347, and proclaimed his independence before the end of the year. He is known to history as Sultan ‘Alā-ud-dīn I, the founder of the Bahmani dynasty of the Deccan, which played an important part in India for nearly two centuries, from 1347 to 1526. He assumed the name or title of Bahman, because he claimed descent from the early Persian king so-called, better known as Artaxerxes.

Gulbarga, the capital. The new sultan established his capital at Gulbarga, now in the Nizam’s former dominions, to which he gave the Muslim name of Ahsanābād.1 After the death of Muhammad bin Tughluq in 1351 ‘Alā-ud-dīn undertook the conquest of a large part of the Deccan, and when he passed away in 1358 was master of an extensive dominion, reaching to the sea on the west and including the ports of Goa and Dabhol. The latter place, now a small town in the Ratnagiri District, Bombay, was the principal port of the Konkan from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century. The eastern frontier of the Bahmani sultanate was marked by Bhōnagir or Bhōngir (17° 31′ N.; 78° 53′ E.), now a considerable town in the Nizam’s former dominions. The Pen Ganga river formed the northern, and the Krishna the southern boundary. For administrative convenience these territories were divided into four provinces or tarafs.

1 Ahsanābād, or Hasanābād, with reference to the Sultan’s name Hasan (see E. & D., vol. viii, p. 16 n.). The Hyderabad officials use the erroneous form Gulbarga. The name may be correctly written as Kalburgā (कल्लुर्बुर्गा), or Kulburgā (कुल्लुर्बुर्गा), or Kulburgā (कुल्लुर्बुर्गा). See King, p. 1 n.
Muhammad Shāh I; wars with Hindus. The reign of the second sultan, Muhammad Shāh I (1358–73), was chiefly occupied by savage wars waged against the Hindu rulers of Vijayanagar and Talingana or Warangal. The ferocious struggle continued until the sultan was reputed to have slain half a million Hindus. At last the butchery was stayed and the parties agreed to spare the lives of prisoners and non-combatants. Muhammad Shāh was as ruthless when dealing with brigandage in his own dominions as he was against his external Hindu foes. Like the Mughul emperors later he sought to suppress robbery by massacres, and in the course of six or seven months sent nearly 8,000 heads of supposed robbers to be piled up near the city gates. He accumulated immense treasures and possessed 3,000 elephants. It was Muhammad Shāh who set the pattern of administration for the Bahmanī kingdom and its successor states. He controlled the provinces by yearly royal tours, reorganized the household guards, and had a group of eight ministers at the centre.

Firūz, eighth sultan, 1397–1422. Passing over intermediate revolutions and short reigns, we come to the reign of Firūz, the eighth sultan, who was a son of the youngest brother of Muhammad Shāh I.

After a year devoted to the reorganization of the administration—in which increasing numbers of Brahmans were employed—Firūz was faced with an invasion by the Vijayanagar ruler Harihara II. The unwieldy Hindu host was surprised during the rains, 1399, Harihara’s son was slain, and the army driven in confusion to Vijayanagar. An alliance between Malwa, Gujarat, and Vijayanagar checked the sultan’s designs of expansion to the north, but in 1406 he defeated the Hindus, securing a Vijayanagar princess for his harem, and the Tungabhadra for his southern boundary. The Raichur Doab was made a separate province.

He so far violated the principles of his religion as to drink hard and enjoy music. He kept an enormous number of women from many countries, including Europe, and was reputed to be able to talk with each lady in her own tongue. He had facilities for importing European curiosities through Goa and Dabhol. Firūz loved building, and constructed a fortified palace at Firozābād on the Bhima to the south of the capital. He adorned Gulbarga with many edifices, the most notable being the principal mosque, alleged to have been planned in imitation of the mosque at Cordova in Spain. It is the only large mosque in India which is completely roofed.¹

Firūz went on one expedition too many. About 1420, towards the close of his reign, he suffered a severe defeat at Pāngal, to the north of the Krishna, and came home a broken-down old man. He spent the rest of his days in works of piety according to his lights and left affairs

¹ Gulbarga decayed after the death of Firūz, when it ceased to be the capital, and then lay neglected for centuries. It has revived lately, being now a prosperous town of about 30,000 inhabitants with extensive trade. Haig denies that the mosque is copied from that at Cordova (Historic Landmarks, p. 94).
of state in the hands of two Turki slaves. Although he gratified his curiosity by reading the Old and New Testament, it is not correct to affirm, as Meadows Taylor does, that 'in religion he was perfectly tolerant of all sects and creeds'.

Firishta was of opinion that the house of Bahman attained its greatest splendour in the days of Firuz.

Ahmad Shāh, 1422–35. The administration of the Turki slaves being displeasing to the sultan's brother Ahmad, that prince, with the aid of a foreign merchant named Khalaf Hasan Basri, deposed Firuz and murdered him with his son. Such tragedies were common in Bahmanī history and do not seem to have offended public opinion. The murderer ascended the throne without opposition, and resumed the war with the Hindus, burning to revenge the losses suffered by the army of Islam in his brother's time. He attacked the Vijayanagar territory, with savagery even greater than that shown by his predecessors.

Ahmad Shāh, without waiting to besiege the Hindu capital, overran the open country; and wherever he went, put to death men, women, and children without mercy, contrary to the compact made by his uncle and predecessor, Muhammad Shāh, and the raya of Vijayanagar. Whenever the number of slain amounted to twenty thousand, he halted three days, and made a festival in celebration of the bloody event. He broke down also the idolatrous temples and destroyed the colleges of the Brahmans.

Ultimately peace was concluded with Vijayanagar. The operations against Warangal in 1424–5 had finally destroyed the independence of that Hindu kingdom, and extended the Bahmanī frontiers to the sea. About the year 1423 the Deccan again suffered from a severe famine.

Ahmad Shāh also engaged in wars with the sultans of Malwa and Gujarat and with the Hindu chiefs of the Konkan. The war with Gujarat was ended by a treaty of alliance offensive and defensive, which subsisted for many years. Nizām Shāh benefited by it in 1462.

Change of capital to Bidar. Ahmad Shāh, who had suffered from illness at Gulbarga, and regarded the place as unlucky, shifted his capital to Bidar (Ahmadabad or Muhammadabad), distant about sixty miles to the north-east. The wisdom of the transfer is fully justified by the description of the new capital recorded by Meadows Taylor:

There is no more healthy or beautiful site for a city in the Deccan than Bidar. The fort had been already erected on the north-east angle of a table-land composed of laterite, at a point where the elevation, which is considerable, or about 2,500 feet above the level of the sea, trends southward and westward, and declines abruptly about 500 feet to the wide plain of the valley of the Manjera, which it overlooks. The fortifications, still perfect, are truly noble; built of blocks of laterite dug out of the ditch, which is very broad. . . . The city adjoined the fort, space being left for an esplanade, and stretched southwards along the crest of the eminence, being regularly laid out with broad streets. There was a plentiful supply of beautiful water, though the
wells are deep; and in every respect, whether as regards climate, which is much cooler and healthier than that of Kulbagh, or situation, the new capital was far preferable to the old one. At the present time, though the city has diminished to a provincial town, and the noble monuments of the Bahmani kings have decayed, there is no city of the Deccan which better repays a visit from the traveller than Bidar.¹

'Alā-ud-dīn II. Ahmad Shāh was succeeded quietly by his eldest son, 'Alā-ud-dīn II (1435–57). Renewed war with Vijayanagar resulted ultimately in a peace favourable to the sultan. After the termination of the war the sultan neglected his duties and abandoned himself to the fleshly delights of wine and women. The efficiency of the public service was much impaired by the quarrels between two factions—the one comprising the native or Deccani Muslims allied with the Abyssinian (or Habshi) settlers, who were mostly Sunnis; and the other the so-called ‘foreigners’, that is to say, the Arabs, Turks, Persians, and Mughuls, who usually were Shias. The enmity between the factions led to the commission of a horrid crime by permission of the drunken sultan. When a force under one of his foreign officers had been defeated in the Konkan by the Hindus, the remnant took refuge in a fort named Chākan situated to the north of Poona. The Deccani party, having trumped up false accusations of treasonable intent against the refugees, persuaded the sultan to sanction the extermination of the Sayyids and Mughuls in the fort. The Deccani chiefs secured the confidence of their victims by a show of kindness, and then fell upon them treacherously, slaying every male, including 1,200 Sayyids of pure descent and about 1,000 other foreigners. Khalaf Hasan, the man who had helped Ahmad Shāh to gain the throne, and had subsequently become prime minister, was among the slain. The women were treated ‘with all the insult that lust or brutality could invoke’. The sultan, when he found that he had been deceived, punished the authors of the massacre.

Humāyūn. 'Alā-ud-dīn was followed by his eldest son Humāyūn (1457–61), who had already earned a terrible reputation for cruelty. An attempt to displace him in favour of a younger brother was easily defeated, and the new sultan was free to indulge his maniacal passion for the infliction of pain. Men and women, suspected without reason of favouring rebellion, were stabbed with daggers, hewn in pieces with hatchets, or scalded to death by boiling water or hot oil.

The fire of his rage blazed up in such a way that it burned up land and water; and the broker of his violence used to sell the guilty and innocent by one tariff. The nobles and generals when they went to salute the sultan used to bid farewell to their wives and children and make their wills. Most of the nobles, ministers, princes, and heirs to the sovereignty were put to the sword.

Humāyūn is remembered by the epithet Zālim, or the Tyrant. Some authorities suggest that he died a natural death, but the more probable

account avers that while intoxicated he was assassinated by his servants.
A versifier ingeniously expressed the universal joy at the death of the
monster by the chronogram:

Humāyūn Shāh has passed away from the world.
God Almighty, what a blessing was the death of Humāyūn!
On the date of his death the world was full of delight,
So 'delight of the world’ gives the date of his death. ¹

Strange to say the tyrant was served by an excellent minister, Khwāja
Mahmūd Gāwān,² who apparently was unable to check his master’s
furious rage. The minister lived long enough to do good service under
Humāyūn’s successors, and to be murdered for his pains.

Muhammad Shāh III; conquests; famine. The next sultan of
importance was Muhammad Shāh III, who reigned for nearly twenty
years (1463–82), and enjoyed the services of Khwāja Mahmūd Gāwān,
the capable minister who had served Humāyūn, and was equally com-
petent as a general and as a civil administrator. The Khwāja took the
strong fortress of Belgaum (1473), and recovered Goa in 1472, which
had been lost by one of the earlier sultans to the raya of Vijayanagar,
at a date not known exactly. The result of his operations was an
increase of the Bahmani dominions ‘to an extent never achieved by
former sovereigns’. The minister provided for the administration of
the new territories by increasing the number of provinces to nine.
Central control was strengthened by making many parganas into
crown lands, by taking local appointments out of the hands of the
provincial governors, and by accounting more rigorously for the
numbers maintained in military contingents.

A disastrous famine, known as the ‘famine of Bijapur’ because it
began in that state, devastated the Deccan in 1473 or 1474 and caused
many deaths. The rains failed for two years, and when they came at
last, in the third year, ‘scarce any farmers remained in the country
to cultivate the lands’.

The title of Ghāzī. When Kondapalli (Condapilly) was surrendered
early in 1481, previous to the raid on Kanchi, to be described presently,
an incident occurred which illustrates the spirit of fanaticism charac-
teristic of the Bahmani kings.

The king [Firishta relates] having gone to view the fort, broke down an
idolatrous temple and killed some Brahmins who officiated at it, with his own
hands, as a point of religion. He then gave orders for a mosque to be erected
on the foundations of the temple, and ascending the pulpit, repeated a few
prayers, distributed alms, and commanded the Khutba to be read in his
name. Khwāja Mahmūd Gāwān now represented that as his Majesty had

¹ The Persian words are دَوَقِي جهان, zauk- jahān. The numerical values of the
letters total 865, the Hijrī year, corresponding to A.D. 1460–1; thus, ژ = 700, اع
(w) = 6, ک = 100, ج = 3, ه = 5, ٱ (alif) = 1, and ن = 50.
² H. K. Sherwani, Mahmūd Gāwān.
slain some infidels with his own hands, he might fairly assume the title of Ghāzi, an appellation of which he was very proud.

The virtuous minister, it will be observed, shared the beliefs of his master.

Raid on Kanchi or Conjeeveram. The most remarkable military exploit of the reign was the successful raid made on Kanchi or Conjeeveram, one of the seven Hindu sacred cities, during the course of a campaign against Vijayanagar in 1481. The remote position of Kanchi, forty-two miles south-south-west of Madras, had secured it from Muslim attacks, so that the inhabitants believed themselves to be perfectly safe. The sultan was encamped at Kondapalli near Bezwada, now in the Kistna (Krishna) District of Madras, when glowing accounts of the rich booty to be obtained in the holy city induced him to plan a surprise. The story is best told in the words of Firishta, as follows:

Muhammad Shāh accordingly selected six thousand of his best cavalry, and leaving the rest of his army at Kondapalli, proceeded by forced marches to Kanchi. He moved so rapidly on the last day, according to the historians of the time, that only forty troopers kept up with him, among which number were Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri and Yūrish Khān Turk. On approaching the temple some Hindus came forth, one of whom, a man of gigantic stature, mounted on horseback, and brandishing a drawn sabre by way of defiance, rushed full speed towards the king, and aimed a blow which the latter parried, and with one stroke of his sword cleaved him in twain. Another infidel then attacked the king, whose little band was shortly engaged man to man with the enemy; but Muhammad Shāh had again the good fortune to slay his opponent, upon which the rest of the Hindus retired into the temple. Swarms of people, like bees, now issued from within and ranged themselves under its walls to defend it. At length, the rest of the king's force coming up, the temple was attacked and carried by storm with great slaughter. An immense booty fell to the share of the victors, who took away nothing but gold, jewels, and silver, which were abundant. The king then [12 March 1481] sacked the city of Kanchi, and, after remaining there for a week, he returned to his army.

Murder of Mahmūd Gāwān. Muhammad Shāh, a confirmed drunkard, gave way to his besetting sin more and more as time went on. His intemperance permitted the crime which disgraced and deservedly embittered the last year of his life. Khwāja Mahmūd Gāwān, his great minister, being a Persian, necessarily was counted as a 'foreigner', though he was on friendly terms with many Deccanis, and shared power fairly with them. He was hated, however, by the Brahman convert, Malik Hasan, governor of Telingana, who unceasingly sought his ruin. At last, early in April 1481, the plotters managed to lay before their intoxicated sovereign a treasonable letter falsely attributed to the minister, although an obvious forgery. The besotted sultan, without taking the slightest trouble to ascertain the facts, ordered the instant execution of his aged and faithful servant. When it was too late he found
out the deceit practised on him and tried to drown his remorse in drink, until he killed himself by his excesses in March 1482.

Consequences of the crime. Meadows Taylor justly observes that the death of Mahmūd Gāwān was 'the beginning of the end', and that 'with him departed all the cohesion and power of the Bahmanī kingdom'. The minister was a devout Sunni Muslim, as ruthless as any one else in slaying and despoiling idolaters. Subject to that qualification, his character seems to deserve the praise bestowed upon it by Firishta, which is echoed by Meadows Taylor in language still more emphatic, and deserving of quotation, even though it may seem tinged with exaggeration:

Character of Mahmūd Gāwān. The character of Mahmūd Gāwān [Taylor observes] stands out broadly and grandly, not only among all his contemporaries, but among all the ancient Muhammadans of India, as one unapproachably perfect and consistent... his noble and judicious reforms, his skill and bravery in war, his justice and public and private benevolence have, in the aggregate, no equals in the Muhammadan history of India.... Out of the public revenues of his ample estates, while he paid the public establishments attached to him, he built and endowed the magnificent college at Bidar, which was practically destroyed by an explosion of gunpowder in the reign of Aurangzēb, and which, while he lived at the capital, was his daily resort; and the grand fortresses of Ausā, Parēnda, Sholāpur, Dharūr [Dārūr], and many others attest alike his military skill and science.¹

Mahmūd Shāh, 1482–1518; end of the dynasty. Little more remains to be said about the annals of the Bahmanī dynasty. The successor of Muhammad III was his son Mahmūd, a boy of twelve years of age, who lived and in a manner reigned until 1518, but never possessed real power. The provincial governors, one after the other, declared their independence, and only a small area round the capital, which became the separate sultanate of Bidar a few years later, remained under the nominal jurisdiction of Mahmūd. The actual government was in the hands of Qāsim Barīd, a crafty Turk, and after his death in those of his son, Amīr Barīd. It is unnecessary to relate the story of the murders, quarrels, and rebellions of Mahmūd's miserable reign. They may be read by the curious in the pages of Firishta and the Burhān-i Ma'āsir. After the death of Mahmūd four puppet sultans in succession were placed on the throne, until in 1526 Amīr Barīd felt that the time had come for the assertion of his right to rule on his own account.

Character of the dynasty. Before we proceed to notice some of the more prominent events in the complicated history of the five separate sultanates formed out of the fragments of the Bahmanī

¹ See map, p. 287. Ausā (Owsah) is 70 miles north-north-west of Gulbarga, Parenda is 70 miles west of Ausā, Sholapur is 70 miles north-west of Gulbarga, and Dārūr is about 22 miles east of Raichur. Burgess gives a photograph and plan of the ruined college (A.S.W.I., vol. iii, pl. xxviii, xxix). It is illustrated also in the Ann. Rep. A. S. Nizam's Dominions for 1914–15.
dominion, it will be well to pause for a moment in order to consider the nature of the achievement of the Bahmani sultans of the Deccan, and to estimate the position in history to which they are entitled.

The story of the dynasty as it appears in the books is not attractive reading. Between 1347 and 1518 the throne was occupied by fourteen sultans, of whom four were murdered, and two others were deposed and blinded. With the exception of the fifth sultan, a quiet peaceful man, all the sovereigns who attained maturity were bloodthirsty fanatics. Humâyûn was a monster, comparable only with the most infamous tyrants named in history. Several of the sultans were drunken debauchees, and little is recorded about any member of the family which is calculated to justify a favourable opinion of his character. The only person mentioned who deserves much praise is the minister Mahmûd Gâwân, and even he was fanatical. It would be difficult to specify any definite benefit conferred upon India by the dynasty. No doubt, as Meadows Taylor points out, the Bahmanîs gave a certain amount of encouragement to purely Muslim learning, and constructed irrigation works in the eastern provinces, which incidentally did good to the peasantry while primarily securing the crown revenue. But those items to their credit weigh lightly against the wholesale devastation wrought by their wars, massacres, and burnings.

Misery of the common people. Our estimate of the character of the Bahmani sultans and the effect of their rule upon the people committed to their charge need not be based merely upon inferences drawn from the story of their conspicuous doings. Observations on the conditions of life of the unregarded Hindu peasantry must not be looked for in the pages of Muslim historians, whether they deal with the north or the south. The scanty information recorded concerning the commonalty of India in ancient times is obtained almost wholly from the notes made by observant foreign visitors. Such a visitor, a Russian merchant named Athanasius Nikitin, happened to reside for a long time at Bidar and to travel in the Bahmani dominions between the years 1470 and 1474 in the reign of Muhammad Shâh III. By a lucky accident his notes were preserved, and have been made accessible in an English version.

The merchant tells us that:

The Sultan is a little man, twenty years old,¹ in the power of the nobles. There is a Khorassanian Boyar [sc. Persian noble from Khurassan], Melik Tuchar [sc. Malik-ut Tujjâr, 'Lord of the merchants', or 'merchant-prince', a title of Khwâja Mahmûd Gâwân], who keeps an army of 200,000 men; Melik Khan keeps 100,000; Kharat Khan, 20,000; and many are the khans that keep 10,000 armed men. The Sultan goes out with 300,000 men of his own troops.

The land is overstocked with people; but those in the country are very miserable, whilst the nobles are extremely opulent and delight in luxury.

¹. He was in his tenth year in 1463 (King, p. 98). The remark therefore applies to 1473 or 1474.
They are wont to be carried on their silver beds, preceded by some twenty chargers caparisoned in gold, and followed by 300 men on horseback, and by 500 on foot, and by horn men, ten torchbearers, and ten musicians.

The Sultan goes out hunting with his mother and his lady, and a train of 10,000 men on horseback, 50,000 on foot; 200 elephants adorned in gilded armour, and in front 100 horsemen, 100 dancers, and 300 common horses in golden clothing; 100 monkeys, and 100 concubines, all foreign.

The armies were armed mobs. It is obvious that such an overgrown establishment of armed men, women, and beasts, controlled by a selfish minority of luxurious nobles, must have sucked the country dry. There is no difficulty in believing the positive statement that the common people were 'very miserable'. The mass of the people in the Hindu empire of Vijayanagar was equally oppressed and wretched. The huge armies maintained were little better than armed mobs, extremely inefficient in warfare. Similar unwieldy hosts were maintained by the neighbouring states, Muslim and Hindu. Various recorded incidents prove that such masses of undisciplined men had little military value, and often were routed by quite small forces of active assailants. But, on the whole, the armed mobs of the Muslim sultans were a little more efficient than those of their Hindu opponents, and, in consequence, usually were victorious.

Fortresses and other buildings. It is characteristic of the nature of the rule of the Bahmanis that Meadows Taylor, who judged the sultans with excessive partiality, should declare that the fortresses built by them are 'perhaps their greatest and most indestructible monuments, and far exceed any of the same period in Europe'. He mentions Gwalgarh and Narnāla, both in Berar, and especially the latter, as being choice specimens of the grandeur of design appropriate to mountain fortresses, and of work executed in good taste with munificent disregard of cost. The first gateway at Narnāla is decorated with elegant stone carving, which in Taylor's day was as perfect as it had ever been, and probably still is in the same condition. The works at Ausā and Parenda are commended for the military science displayed in their trace. The fortresses were equipped with huge guns built up of bars welded and bound together, of which several specimens still exist.

The buildings at Gulbarga are described as being heavy, gloomy, and roughly constructed. Those at Bidar, the capital from about 1430, are much superior in both design and workmanship. Enamelled tiles, a favourite Persian form of decoration, were applied to the Bidar edifices.

The Muslim population of the Deccan. The Bahmani sultans failed in the atrocious attempt made more than once by members of the dynasty to exterminate the population of the Hindu states of the Deccan, or in default of extermination to drive it by force into the fold of Islam. They succeeded in killing hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children, and in making considerable numbers of 'con-
verts"; but in spite of all their efforts the population continues to be Hindu in the main, the percentage of Muslims in the Nizam’s former

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Accession</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 'Alā-ud-din Hasan</td>
<td>A.H. 748</td>
<td>Full official title (according to the Burhān-i Maʿāṣir) was Sultan 'Alā-ud-din Hasan Shāh al-wali al Bahmani. He had been known previously as Zafar Khān. Died a natural death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Muhammad I</td>
<td>A.D. 1358</td>
<td>Son of No. 1. Died from the effects of 'an irreligious manner of living', presumably meaning drink.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mujāhid</td>
<td>775 1373</td>
<td>Son of No. 2. Drank hard: murdered by No. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dāūd</td>
<td>779 1378</td>
<td>Son of brother of No. 2: murdered by a slave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Muhammad II</td>
<td>780 1378</td>
<td>Brother of No. 4. Died a natural death. No wars or rebellions. Erroneously called Mahmūd by Firishta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shams-ud-dīn</td>
<td>799 1397</td>
<td>Brother of No. 6. Deposed and imprisoned, or blinded, according to Firishta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Firūz</td>
<td>800 1397</td>
<td>Son of younger brother of No. 2. Deposited and strangled by No. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ahmad</td>
<td>825 1422</td>
<td>Brother of No. 8: changed capital to Bidar. Died a natural death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 'Alā-ud-dīn II</td>
<td>838 1435</td>
<td>Son of No. 9. Died a natural death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Humāyūn</td>
<td>862 1457</td>
<td>Son of No. 10, probably assassinated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Nizām</td>
<td>865 1461</td>
<td>Son of No. 11, a minor. Died suddenly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—The names, genealogy, and order of succession are in accordance with the Burhān-i Maʿāṣir and other authorities, supported by the coins. Firishta, who differs in certain matters, is in error. The dates also are given variously in the books; the most serious discrepancy, amounting to four years, being that concerning the death of No. 10, and the accession of No. 11. Many discrepancies occur in the minute details of dates which are not shown in the table. Kalimullāh, the last nominal sultan, escaped to Bijapur, and thence retired to Ahmadnagar, where he died.
dominions and the Bijapur District being only about eleven. The origin of that section of the inhabitants, as noted by Meadows Taylor, is mainly a consequence of the Bahmani rule, under which large numbers of Persians, Turks, Arabs, and Mughuls settled in the country and formed unions with native women. Many Hindu families also were forcibly converted, and the continuance of Muslim dynasties in large areas for centuries has kept up or even increased the proportion of the Muslim minority. The author cited was willing to credit the Bahmani influence with 'a general amelioration of manners' in the Deccan, but that opinion might be disputed. The monuments of Hindu civilization certainly suffered severely.
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CHAPTER 2

The five sultanates of the Deccan, and Khandesh, from 1474 to the seventeenth century

The five sultanates. During the inglorious reign of Mahmūd Shāh Bahmanī (1482–1518), the provincial governors, as already mentioned, declared their independence one after the other, and set up five separate kingdoms or sultanates, namely, the Imād Shāhī dynasty of

Berar; the Nizām Shāhī of Ahmadnagar; the Ādil Shāhī of Bijapur; the Barīd Shāhī of Bidar; and the Qutb Shāhī of Golkonda.

Imād Shāhī dynasty of Berar (Bīrār). The earliest defection was that of the province of Berar, the most northern portion of the Bahmanī dominions, and more or less equivalent to the ancient
Vidarbha, famous in Sanskrit literature. Berar was one of the four provinces into which the first Bahmanī sultan of the Deccan had divided his dominions. Late in the fifteenth century the province comprised two districts, namely, Gāwil, the northern, and Māhūr, the southern. Early in the reign of Mahmūd Bahmanī, in the year 1484, according to most authorities, or 1490, according to others, the governor of Gāwilgarh, a converted Hindu, named Fathullāh and entitled Imād-ul Mulk, proclaimed his independence, and made himself master of the whole province. He thus founded a dynasty, the Imād Shāhī, which lasted for four generations, until about 1574, when the principality was absorbed by Ahmadnagar. The details of its separate history, so far as recorded, are not of interest. The province was ceded in 1596 to Sultan Murād, son of Akbar. The imperial governor resided at first at Bālāpur, and later at Illichpur (Ellichpur).

Barīd Shāhī dynasty of Bidar. The small principality governed by the Barīd Shāhī sultans was simply the residuum of the Bahmanī empire, consisting of the territory near the capital, left over after the more distant provinces had separated. Qāsim Barīd, minister of Mahmūd Shāh Bahmanī, was practically his own master from about the year 1492, which is given in some books as the date of the establishment of the dynasty. But he and his son Amīr long delayed to assume royal rank, and even after the death of Mahmūd in 1518 continued to set up and murder nominal Bahmanī sultans until 1527, when the formality was dispensed with, and Amīr openly assumed an independent position.1 The dynasty lasted until about 1619 or a little later, when the territory was annexed by Bijapur. The Barīd sultans did little, if anything, deserving of remembrance; but some of their buildings are noteworthy.

Qutb Shāhī dynasty of Golkonda. The three considerable states formed out of the fragments of the Bahmanī empire were Ahmadnagar, Bijapur, and Golkonda (Gulkandah). The Golkonda sultanate, although founded the last of all, in 1518, and the latest survivor, may be noticed first, because it remained in a comparatively detached position, taking only a minor part in the endless wars and quarrels, in which Ahmadnagar and Bijapur intervened more freely. But there was much fighting with Bijapur, and in 1565 Golkonda joined the transitory confederacy of the four Muslim kings which brought about the defeat and destruction of the Vijayanagar Raj.

The territory of Golkonda. The new kingdom was the representative and successor of the ancient Hindu Kakatiya principality of

---

1 According to Firishta, who depended on oral tradition for this dynasty, Amīr Barīd, who died in A.D. 1530 (A.H. 945), never called himself sultan or by any equivalent title. His son, Ali Barīd, ‘is the first of this dynasty who adopted the style of shah or king; for though his grandfather Qāsim Barīd assumed regalia, he did not take the royal title’. Compare the case of the so-called Sayyid dynasty of Delhi, the members of which never assumed the royal title or struck coins in their own names.
Warangal,¹ which had been reduced by Ahmad Shāh Bahmani early in his reign, about 1423. The territory was extensive, lying for the most part between the lower courses of the Godavari and Krishna rivers, and extending to the coast of the Bay of Bengal, along the face of the deltas. The western frontier was mostly identical with the eastern boundary of the Bidar principality. A northern extension was enclosed between the Godavari, Pen Ganga, and Wain Ganga rivers. The land was fertile, and the old irrigation works of Hindu times were maintained and extended by the sultans.

The sultans. The founder of the dynasty, a Turki officer, who assumed the title of Sultan Qulī Qutb Shāh, had been appointed governor of the eastern province by Mahmūd Gāwān. He withdrew from the Bahmani court after the wrongful execution of that minister, but continued to recognize the sovereignty of Mahmūd Shāh until 1518, when he refused to submit any longer to the Barid ascendancy, and declared his independence.

The first Qutbī sultan enjoyed a long life and prosperous reign, surviving until he had attained the age of ninety in 1543, when he was murdered at the instigation of his son Jamshid. The parricide reigned for seven years. The crown was then (1550), after a short interval, offered to and accepted by a brother of Jamshid named Ibrāhīm, who joined in the confederacy against Vijayanagar (1565), and died in 1580. His administration is reputed to have been good. In his time Hindus were freely employed in the service of the state and were permitted to attain high official rank. His son, Muhammad Qulī, lived until 1611, after which date the dynasty almost ceased to have a separate history, its affairs becoming entangled with those of the Mughul emperors of Hindostan. The state was finally annexed by Aurangzeb in 1687.

The capital. The capital had been moved from Warangal to Golkonda by the first sultan at the beginning of his reign. The new city was greatly developed in the reign of Ibrāhīm, but in 1589 it had become unhealthy. The court was then transferred to Bhāṅgavāra a few miles distant, which soon afterwards was called Hyderabad. The city thus created developed later as the capital of the Nizams and now has a population of about 750,000. Golkonda, largely in ruins, is best known for the tombs of the Qutb Shāhī kings.

The Nizām Shāhī dynasty of Ahmadnagar. Nizām-ul-Mulk Bahri, the head of the Deccani party at Bidar, who had contrived the death of Mahmūd Gāwān, came to a violent end himself not long after. His son Malik Ahmad, governor of Junnār (Joonair) to the north of Poona, then revolted. In 1490 he defeated decisively the army of Mahmūd Bahmani, and established himself as an independent sovereign. After a time he moved his court to a more convenient and strategically better position farther east, and so founded the city of

¹ Warangal is a corruption of Orukkal, meaning 'solitary rock', with reference to a prominent feature of the site of the old capital.
Ahmadnagar. The new sovereign having assumed the title of Ahmad Nizám Sháh, the dynasty established by him is called the Nizám Sháhi. Ahmadnagar is still a considerable town and the headquarters of a district in the Maharashtra state.

The main efforts of Ahmad Nizám Sháh for years were directed to the acquisition of the powerful fortress of Deogiri or Daulatabad, formerly the capital of the Yádava kingdom. Ultimately, he obtained the surrender of the place, in A.D. 1499, and thus consolidated his dominion.

The second and third sultans. The second sovereign, Burhān Nizám Sháh, who reigned for forty-five years (1508–53), was engaged in many wars with the neighbouring states, and made a new departure about 1550 by allying himself with the Hindu raya of Vijayanagar against the sultan of Bijapur. Some years earlier (1537) Burhān had himself adopted the Shia form of Islam. His successor, Husain Sháh, joined the confederacy which sacked Vijayanagar in 1565.

Later history. The subsequent history of the dynasty may be read in great detail in the pages of Firishta, who long resided at Ahmadnagar, but the incidents are not of much interest. Berar was absorbed in 1574. Chánd Bibi, the queen dowager of Bijapur, who had returned to Ahmadnagar, made a gallant and successful resistance to Akbar’s son, Prince Murad, in 1596, purchasing peace by the cession of Berar. But war soon broke out again, and in August 1600 after Chánd Bibi had perished at the hands of the mob, the Mughul army stormed Ahmadnagar. Those events, which belong to the history of Akbar rather than to that of the minor kingdom, will be dealt with more fully when the story of his reign comes to be told. Akbar, although he formally gave Ahmadnagar the rank of a new Súba or province, never obtained possession of more than a small portion of the kingdom. The remainder continued an obscure independent existence, and the state was not finally annexed until 1637 in the reign of Sháhjaháhn.

The Ādil Sháhi dynasty of Bijapur; the first sultan. Bijapur, the most important and interesting of the five sultanates or kingdoms, deserves more extended notice. The dynasty was known as the Ādil Sháhi, from the name of its founder, Yúsuf Ādil Khán, governor of Bijapur, who declared his independence in 1489, almost simultaneously with his colleagues in Berar and Ahmadnagar.

Yúsuf Ādil, so far as public knowledge went, was simply a Georgian slave who had been purchased by Khwâja Mahmûd Gâwân, and by reason of his own abilities and the discerning patronage of the minister had risen to high office at the Bahmani court, ultimately becoming governor of Bijapur. But according to private information, accepted by Firishta on respectable authority, he was really a son of Sultan Murâd II of Turkey, and had been brought up secretly in Persia. When the disguised prince was seventeen years old he seems to have found continued residence in Persia to be unsafe, and therefore allowed himself to be disposed of as a slave and sold in Bidar to the
minister of the Bahmani sultan. Firishta apparently was satisfied as to the truth of the story.

**Firishta's history.** Firishta's history, written in a spirit of remarkable independence, presents an agreeable contrast when compared with Abu-l Fazl's too courtly Akbarnama. But most of the wars and intrigues which seemed so important to the historian at the beginning of the seventeenth century are now seen to have had little or no effect on the development of India as a whole, and to be of only provincial interest. However, certain matters in the story of Bijapur and its rulers still deserve a place in the pages of even a short history of India.

**Preference of Yusuf Adil Shah for the Shia religion.** Yusuf Adil Shah waged wars against Vijayanagar and his Muslim neighbours with varying fortune. When residing in Persia in his youth he had learned to prefer the Shia form of Islam, and subsequently made a vow to profess publicly that faith. In 1502 he carried out his purpose, making the Shia creed the state religion, while giving free and untrammelled toleration to the Sunnis. A dangerous confederacy of neighbouring princes caused him to abandon this measure for a while, but later 'he renewed the public exercise of the Shia religion'.

**Capture of Goa by the Portuguese.** In those days Goa was a favourite residence of Yusuf Adil Shah, who at one time thought of making the port the seat of his government. It was the rendezvous of the Muslims of the Deccan who used to embark there for the pilgrimage to Mecca. In February 1510 (A.H. 915) the king's officers negligently permitted the Portuguese commander, Albuquerque, to surprise the city and occupy it without the loss of a man. But the sultan, being determined to recover his much prized possession, prepared an overwhelming force and won back Goa in August of the same year 1510 (A.H. 916). Albuquerque's fleet, which was reduced to intense distress during the rainy season, received reinforcements in the autumn. The death of Yusuf Adil Shah at the age of seventy-four, in October or November, weakened the defence, so that the Portuguese succeeded in storming the city after a hard fight.

**Marriage with Marathi lady.** Instances of Muslim princes in the Deccan marrying Hindu wives have been mentioned. Yusuf Adil Shah early in his reign defeated a Maratha chieftain named Mukund Rao, whose sister he espoused. She took the Muslim name of Bubuji Khanam, and became the mother of the second sultan as well as of three princesses who were married to members of the royal families of the neighbouring Muslim states. Yusuf Adil Shah freely admitted Hindus to offices of trust. The Marathi language was ordinarily used for purposes of accounts and business.

**Character of Yusuf Adil Shah.** The first sultan or shah of Bijapur is given a high character by Firishta, who testifies on good authority that he was 'a wise prince, intimately acquainted with human nature'; handsome, eloquent; well read, and a skilled musician.
Although he mingled pleasure with business, yet he never allowed the former to interfere with the latter. He always warned his ministers to act with justice and integrity, and in his own person showed them an example of attention to those virtues. He invited to his court many learned men and valiant officers from Persia, Turkistan, and Rûm, also several eminent artists, who lived happy under the shadow of his bounty. In his reign the citadel of Bijâpur was built of stone.

He lies buried, not at Bijapur, but at Gûgî or Gogî, farther to the east, near the grave of a saint whom he venerated.

No mausoleum was built over him; and in the precincts of the holy burying-ground his open tomb is as simple as many others, and an endowment, which has been preserved, still provides a covering of cotton chintz for it, renewed from year to year. Thus, as the people of Gogî assert, with an honourable pride, there are not as yet faithful servants wanting to the noble king to light a lamp at night at his grave, and to say *faihas* for his soul's peace, while the tombs of the great Bahmani kings and of all his enemies in life are desecrated.¹

**Ismail Shâh.** The new king, Ismail, being a minor, the government was carried on by Kamâl Khân, an officer of the late ruler, as regent. He proved faithless, and conspired to seize the throne for himself, but lost his preserved, still provides a covering of cotton chintz for it, renewed from year to year. Thus, as the people of Gogî assert, with an honourable pride, there are not as yet faithful servants wanting to the noble king to light a lamp at night at his grave, and to say *faihas* for his soul's peace, while the tombs of the great Bahmani kings and of all his enemies in life are desecrated.¹

Ismail Shâh. The new king, Ismail, being a minor, the government was carried on by Kamâl Khân, an officer of the late ruler, as regent. He proved faithless, and conspired to seize the throne for himself, but lost his preserved, still provides a covering of cotton chintz for it, renewed from year to year. Thus, as the people of Gogî assert, with an honourable pride, there are not as yet faithful servants wanting to the noble king to light a lamp at night at his grave, and to say *faihas* for his soul's peace, while the tombs of the great Bahmani kings and of all his enemies in life are desecrated.¹

**Ibrawlm Adil Shâh I.** The new ruler, who assumed the title of Ibrawlm Adil Shâh, rejected foreign practices, including the use of the Shia head-dress, and reverted completely to Sunni ritual. He favoured the Deccanis, with their allies the Abyssinians, as against the Persians and other foreigners. Many of the strangers entered the service of Râmarâja, the *de facto* ruler of Vijayanagar. At this time revolutions occurred at Vijayanagar which will be noticed more particularly in the history of that kingdom. In 1535 the Bijapur sultan accepted the invitation of the chief of one of the Hindu factions and paid a visit to Vijayanagar lasting a week. He departed enriched by an enormous present of gold coin, in addition to valuable horses and elephants. Subsequently the sultans of Bidar, Ahmadnagar, and Golkonda combined against Bijapur, which emerged victorious, thanks to the ability

of the minister, Asad Khān, whose reputation is scarcely inferior to that of Mahmūd Gāvān. It is needless to follow in detail the wars and intrigues which lasted throughout the reign. The sultan towards the end of his life abandoned himself to drink and debauchery, came to a dishonoured death in 1557, and was buried at Gogi by the side of his father and grandfather.

Ali Ādil Shāh. Ali Ādil Shāh, having succeeded his father, Ibrāhīm, began his administration by publicly resuming the Shia creed, professing it with a degree of intolerance which his ancestor had carefully avoided. In 1558, the sultan having made a transitory alliance with Rāmarāja, the combined Hindu and Muslim armies invaded the territory of Ahmadnagar, which they ravaged mercilessly—the Hindus taking the opportunity to avenge with pitiless savagery all the injuries which they had suffered from Muslim hands in the course of two centuries. The barbarous excesses committed by Rāmarāja and the insolence shown by him to his Muslim allies alienated Ali Ādil Shāh, who was advised that no single Muslim sovereign was capable of contending with success against the wealth and hosts of the arrogant Hindu prince. Ultimately all the four sultans of Bijapur, Bidar, Ahmadnagar, and Golkonda were convinced that their interests required them to sacrifice their rivalries and combine in an irresistible league in order to effect the destruction of the infidel. With a view to draw closer the bonds of alliance, Ali Ādil Shāh married Chānd Bibi, daughter of Husain Nizām Shāh of Ahmadnagar, whose sister was given to the son of the sultan of Bijapur.

Alliance against Vijayanagar. In December 1564 the four allied sovereigns established their joint headquarters at the small town of Talikota, situated about twenty-five miles to the north of the Krishna, in 16° 28' N. lat. and 76° 19' E. long.

The Vijayanagar government, in full confidence of victory, prepared to meet the threatened invasion by the assemblage of enormous levies numbering several hundred thousand men. Two large armies were sent forward under the command of Rāmarāja's brothers, Tirumala and Venkatādri, with orders to prevent the army of Islam from crossing the Krishna. But the allied princes by a simple stratagem got across by the ford of Ingāligi. The aged Rāmarāja then moved up from Vijayanagar with the main army, and encamped somewhere near the fortress of Mudgal, so often the subject of dispute between the Hindus and the Muslims.

Battle of Talikota. Battle was joined on 23 January 1565. The forces on both sides being unusually numerous the fighting must have extended over a front of many miles. The Muslim centre was commanded by Husain Nizām Shāh of Ahmadnagar, who possessed a powerful park of artillery; Ali Ādil Shāh of Bijapur led the right wing; and the left wing was entrusted to Ali Barid Shāh of Golkonda. The artillery, fastened together by strong chains and ropes, was drawn up

1 Mr. Sewell correctly points out that the week-day was Tuesday, not Friday, as stated by Firishta.
in front of the line, and the war elephants were placed in various
positions, according to custom. Each prince erected his particular
standard in the centre of his own army, and the allies moved in close
order against the enemy.'

Rāmarāja, then an old man, although in full possession of his
faculties, commanded the centre opposed to the king of Ahmadnagar.
His brother Tirumala encountered Ali Ādil Shāh of Bijapur, while his
other brother, Venkatādri, fought against the princes of Bidar and
Golkonda. After much strenuous fighting the Bijapur and Golkonda
chiefs gave way and thought of retiring, but the Ahmadnagar sultan
stood firm in the centre. Just then a furious elephant rushed at the
litter in which Rāmarāja was seated, so that his frightened bearers
let him drop. He was thus taken prisoner, and at once beheaded by
Husain Nizām Shāh with his own hands. The head was placed on the
point of a long spear so that it might be seen by the enemy. 'The Hindus
according to custom, when they saw their chief destroyed, fled in the
utmost disorder from the field, and were pursued by the allies with
such success that the river was dyed red with their blood. It is com-
puted by the best authorities that above one hundred thousand infidels
were slain during the action and the pursuit.'

Results of the battle. The victory, known to history as the battle
of Talikota, because the allies had assembled at that town, distant
about thirty miles from the battlefield, was one of the decisive con-
flicts of Indian history. The Hindus made no attempt to dispute the
verdict of the sword. The extensive Hindu empire of the south, which
had lasted for more than two centuries, was largely dissolved, and the
supremacy of Islam in the Deccan was assured. The noble city of
Vijayanagar was blotted out of existence and remains desolate to this
day. The dominions of both Bijapur and Golkonda were enlarged
considerably.

League against the Portuguese; death of the sultan. In 1570
the sovereigns of Bijapur and Ahmadnagar again joined their forces
and attempted to capture the settlements of the Portuguese, then at
the climax of their power. But even the help of the zamorin of Calicut
and the raja of Achin did not suffice to enable them to win success.
The siege of Goa by a huge army was raised after ten months, although
the defence had been maintained by only 700 European soldiers, sup-
ported by 300 friars and priests, 1,000 slaves, and some ill-equipped
boats. Ali Ādil Shāh was killed in 1579 by a eunuch who had good
reason for his act.

Ībrāhīm Ādil Shāh II. The heir to the throne, Ībrāhīm Ādil
Shāh II, being a minor, was taken charge of by his mother, Chānd
Bibī, while ministers ruled the kingdom. In 1584 the queen mother
returned to her native city of Ahmadnagar, and never visited Bijapur
again. We shall hear presently of her gallant doings in the conflict
with Akbar. In 1595 the last fight between Bijapur and Ahmadnagar
took place, and the Ahmadnagar monarch was killed. From that time
the separate history of both states may be said to end, their annals becoming merged in those of the Mughul empire. Ibrāhīm Ādil Shāh II survived until 1626, when he died, leaving a great reputation as an able administrator. The testimony of Meadows Taylor, who was well acquainted with the country and local tradition, may be quoted:

Ibrāhīm Ādil Shāh died in 1626, in the fifty-sixth year of his age. He was the greatest of all the Ādil Shāhī dynasty, and in most respects, except its founder, the most able and popular.

Without the distraction of war, he applied himself to civil affairs with much care; and the land settlements of the provinces of his kingdom, many of which are still extant among district records, show an admirable and efficient system of registration of property and its valuation. In this respect the system of Todar Mull introduced by the Emperor Akbar seems to have been followed with the necessary local modifications.

Although he changed the profession of the State religion immediately upon assuming the direction of State affairs from Shi’a to Sunnī, Ibrāhīm was yet extremely tolerant of all creeds and faiths. Hindus not only suffered no persecution at his hands, but many of his chief civil and military officers were Brahmans and Marāthās. With the Portuguese of Goa he seems to have kept up a friendly intercourse. Portuguese painters decorated his palaces, and their merchants traded freely in his dominions. To their missionaries also he extended his protection; and there are many anecdotes current in the country that his tolerance of Christians equalled, if it did not exceed, that of his contemporary Akbar. He allowed the preaching of Christianity freely among his people, and there are still existent several Catholic churches, one at Chitapur, one at Mudgal, and one at Rāichūr, and others, endowed by the king with lands and other sources of revenue, which have survived the changes and revolutions of more than 300 years. Each of these churches now consists of several hundred members and remains under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Goa.

Ibrāhīm’s dominions extended to the borders of Mysore. At the time of his death he left to his successor a full treasury and a well-paid army of 80,000 horse.

The splendid architectural monuments of his reign will be noticed presently.

It is not necessary to pursue the local history farther. The capital was taken and the country was annexed by Aurangzeb in 1686.

Fārūqī dynasty of Khandesh. Before quitting the subject of the Muslim kingdoms of the Deccan we may bestow a passing glance on the small kingdom of Khandesh in the valley of the Tapti, whose rulers were known as the Fārūqī dynasty. The principality, which did not form part of the Bahmanī kingdom, was established in 1388 at the close of the reign of Sultan Firuz Tughluq of Delhi, and took a share in the innumerable local wars. It was sometimes a dependency of Gujarat. The importance of the state resulted chiefly from its possession

1 Ibrāhīm’s partiality for Hindus led his Muslim subjects to give him the mocking title of Ḷagad-guru, or ‘World-Preceptor’. Akbar conferred that title in all seriousness on his own favourite Jain instructor, and received it himself informally from Hindu admirers,
of the strong fortress of Asirgarh. The seat of government was Burhanpur. The surrender of Asirgarh to Akbar in January 1601 put an end to the dynasty and the independence of the state, which became the Sūba of Khandesh or Dāndēsh.

**THE ĀDIL SHĀHĪ KINGS OR SULTANS OF BIJAPUR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Accession</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yūsuf</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>Had been governor under the Bahmani king.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ismai</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>Son of No. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mallū</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Son of No. 2; deposed and blinded after six months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ibrāhīm I</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>Brother of No. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ali</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Son of No. 4; assassinated. Destruction of Vijayanagar in 1565.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ibrāhīm II</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Nephew of No. 5; good civil administration; fine buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Muhammad</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Son of No. 6; became tributary to Shahjahan in 1636; Maratha aggression began.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ali II</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Son of No. 7; war with Sivaji.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Art and Literature.** The monuments of the Bahmani dynasty at Gulbarga and Bidar have been briefly noticed.

At Ahmadnagar the principal ancient building is the ruined Bhadr palace in white stone, built by the founder of the city, which possesses few other architectural remains of importance. The chief mosque at Burhanpur, the capital of the Fāruqī kings of Khandesh, erected by Ali Khān in 1588, is described as a fine building adorned with stone carvings executed in perfect taste. But Fergusson formed the opinion that the edifices of the town have 'very little artistic value'.

At Golkonda and Bijapur important schools of architecture developed, differing one from the other and from the styles of northern India. The precincts of the Golkonda fortress include a multitude of palaces, mosques, and other ancient buildings. The tombs of the Qutb Shāhī kings, which stand outside the fortress about half a mile to the north, are built of granite and characterized by narrow-necked domes of peculiar form.

The works executed to the orders of the Ādil Shāhī kings of Bijapur are 'marked by a grandeur of conception and boldness in construction unequalled by any edifices erected in India'. The gigantic walls of the city, begun by Yūsuf, the first sultan, and completed by Ali, the fifth sovereign, are six and a quarter miles in circumference, and still perfect for the most part.

The four leading builders at Bijapur were the kings Yūsuf (1490–1510), Ali (1558–80), Ibrāhīm II (1580–1626), and Muhammad Shāh
(1626–56). The principal mosque, an admirably proportioned building, erected by Ali, is still perfect, and would accommodate 5,000 worshippers. The same sovereign constructed aqueducts for the supply of water to all parts of the city, and also built the spacious audience-hall or Gagan Mahall (1561). The richly decorated tomb of Ibrāhim II is an exquisite structure; and the mausoleum of his successor, Muhammed (1626–56), built at the same time as the Tāj, is a marvel of skilful construction. The dome is the second largest in the world. The names of the architects employed do not seem to be recorded, and it is impossible to say whether they were foreigners or of Indian birth. The style shows traces of both foreign and native ideas.

Fine libraries are known to have existed at Ahmadnagar and Bijapur. One illuminated manuscript from the latter is in the British Museum. The excellent history of Muhammad Qasim, surnamed Firishta, was written to the command of Ibrāhim II of Bijapur. The author mentions many earlier writers whose works are not now extant.

The town of Bijapur, which long lay deserted and desolate, has revived in modern times, and is the prosperous headquarters of a district in the Bombay Presidency, with considerable trade and a population of about 25,000 persons.

AUTHORITIES

The Five Sultanates and Khandesh

The principal authority is Firishta, whose narratives are supplemented by observations recorded by Sewell (A Forgotten Empire) and Meadows Taylor (Manual of the History of India). For relations with the Portuguese I have used Fonseca, Sketch of the City of Goa (Bombay, Thacker, 1878), a sound book based on the official records of the settlement. See also T. W. Haig, ‘The History of the Nizām Shāhī Kings of Ahmadnagar’, in Indian Antiquary, 1920–3; ‘Historic Landmarks of the Deccan’, Allahabad, 1907; and G. Yazdani, Antiquities of Bidar.

The monuments are briefly described in Ferguson, Hist. of Eastern and Ind. Archit., 1910, and other works there cited. The information about Bijapur is tolerably full, and the principal buildings there are in good condition. See also V. A. Smith, H.F.A., Oxford, 1911. A good detailed catalogue of the Bijapur buildings (with plan of city) will be found in the Revised Lists of Antiquarian Remains in the Bombay Presidency, 2nd ed., 1897 (vol. xvi, A.S. India, New Imp. Ser.). All works on Bijapur are superseded by the magnificent volume Bijapur and its Architectural Remains, with an Historical Outline of the Adil Shāhī Dynasty, by Henry Cousens, Bombay Government Central Press, 1918, pp. xii, 132. The coinage is described in the monograph by Mr. Cousens, pp. 127, 128, pl. cxv. The known specimens, issued by five of the Sultans, comprise three gold and two or three hundred copper coins, besides the curious lāris, made of stamped silver wire.

The Archaeological Society of Hyderabad has plenty of unpublished material of all kinds on which to work. The first number of the Journal contains an interesting article on Warangal.
CHAPTER 3

The Hindu empire of Vijayanagar, from A.D. 1336 to 1646

Special interest of the history. Although the history of the Hindu empire of Vijayanagar is closely entwined with that of the Muslim Bahmanī empire and the later sultanates of the Deccan for more than two centuries, it is impracticable to combine the two histories in a single narrative. Separate treatment is inevitable, but a certain amount of repetition cannot be avoided. The story of the Hindu monarchy which proved a barrier to the armies of Islam is one of singular interest, and might be narrated with a fullness of detail rarely possible in Indian history. The multitude of relevant inscriptions, numbering many hundreds, is extraordinary. Several European and Muslim travellers from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century have recorded the historical traditions of the empire with vivid descriptions of the system of government and the glories of the magnificent capital. The study of the polity, manners, customs, and religion of the Vijayanagar Empire merits particular attention, because the state was the embodiment of the Telinga or Telugu and Kanarese forms of Hinduism which differed widely from the more familiar forms of the north. The sources of our knowledge are not confined to inscriptions and the notes of foreign observers. The Muslim historians who lived in the Deccan, headed by Firishta, give valuable information; and much may be learned from critical examination of the monuments and coins. A remarkable school of art was developed at Vijayanagar, and literature, both Sanskrit and Telugu, was cultivated with success.

Foreign relations of Vijayanagar. The external history of the Vijayanagar empire is mainly that of wars with the various Muslim dynasties of the Deccan. But from the middle of the fifteenth century both parties occasionally found it convenient to forget their principles and to enter into unholy temporary alliances. In the end the Muslims, who were more vigorous, better mounted, and better armed than the Hindus, won the long contest. Their destruction of the city of Vijayanagar in 1565 effectually put an end to the Hindu empire of the south as such. But the victory did not immediately increase very largely the territory under Muslim rule. The peninsula to the south of the Tungabhadra continued to be essentially Hindu, governed by a multitude of Hindu chiefs, uncontrolled by any paramount power. While the foreign relations of Vijayanagar were in the main concerned with the Muslim sultanates, the Hindu empire also had important dealings with the Portuguese, who first arrived on the Malabar coast in 1498, and established themselves permanently at Goa late in 1510. We are
indebted to Portuguese authors for the best accounts of the polity and manners of the great Hindu state.

Origin of the kingdom or empire. In 1323 Pratāparudra, the Kākatiya ruler of Warangal, was defeated and overthrown by Ulugh Khān, the general of Sultan Ghaiyās-ud-din. Two brothers, Harihara and Bukka, treasury superintendents of the defeated raja, thereupon fled to the court of Kampili and there took service. Three years later Kampiladeva was in his turn overthrown for having sheltered the rebel refugee Garshāsp, and his two officers Harihara and Bukka were carried prisoner to Delhi.

In 1328–9 Muhammad bin Tughluq’s withdrawal was the signal for Hindu resurgence in the Deccan, notably that of Kāpayā Nāyaka the leader of the Telingana Hindus, who by 1336 built up a kingdom on the east coast. In the same years there were rebellions against Malik Muhammad, the governor of Kampili, who had soon to call on Delhi for help. The sultan—so Nuniz and Barani say—decided to appoint a new governor, with local influence and chose Harihara and Bukka, now converts to Islam. They advanced with an army and took Gotti and later Anegondi. By 1336 the area subdued was quite extensive.

The rebellion of Ahsan Khān in Ma’bar led the sultan to move south in 1334–5, but at Warangal both he and his army were smitten by plague. Rumours of the sultan’s death caused revolts in the north and the expedition was abandoned. This in turn brought further Hindu risings, and Harihara now joined with Kāpayā Nāyaka in throwing off the Muslim yoke. Continuing disorders in the sultanate enabled the brothers to establish the nucleus of the Vijayanagar state. ‘Malik Maqbul, the naib-wazir, fled to Delhi’, writes Barani, ‘and the Hindus took possession of Warangal, which was thus entirely lost, and fell into the hands of the Hindus. Devgir and Gujarat alone remained secure.’

Early chiefs; Harihara and Bukka. The traditional date for the foundation of Vijayanagar on the southern bank of the Tungabhadra, facing the older fortress of Anegondi on the northern bank, is A.D. 1336. The building of it was finished in 1343. It is certain that ten years later the brothers were in a position to claim control over ‘the whole country between the Eastern and the Western Oceans’.

Harihara established order within the kingdom, and organized it into new subdivisions of villages and sthala, each under a karnam. The karnams were normally Brahmans. Agriculture he encouraged by rewards to those who cleared forest lands, and easy terms for the cultivators.

Bukka, who had been governor of the Western Telegu districts, with Gooty as his headquarters, was increasingly associated with his brother in his rule, and, on the death of the latter in 1354–5, succeeded to power. Bukka ruled until his death in 1377. Most of his life was spent in waging war against the Bahmani kings, notably Muhammad Shāh (1358–73).

1 For the view that Harihara and Bukka were chieftains under the Hoysala or Ballala kings of the Mysore country see H. Heras, Beginnings of Vijayanagar.
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Harihara II, 1377-1404. His reign coincided roughly with that of Muhammad Shâh II, the fifth of the Bahmani sultans, and the only peaceable man of his dynasty. Harihara consequently was free to extend and consolidate his dominion over the whole of south India. He began by uniting the Vijayanagar kingdom, hitherto a confederacy under five brothers, replacing his cousins by his own sons. One of these sons, Devarâya, was responsible for the slow advance towards the Krishna as north-east boundary of the kingdom, which was secured by the expulsion of the Reddis of Kondavidu. There was expansion elsewhere—Goa, Kharêpatan, Chaul, and Dabhol were taken, and Trichinopoly and Kanchi included within his dominions. He was tolerant of various forms of religion but gave his personal devotion to Śiva-Virūpāksha.

Devarâya I. On Harihara’s death, Virupâksha first seized power but was quickly ousted by the Yuvaraja, or heir designate, Bukka II, who was in turn overthrown by Devarâya after some two years’ rule.

This period of disorder was utilized by the active Sultan Firûz, who in 1406 conquered several districts, momentarily entered the capital, and secured both tribute and a daughter of Devarâya. At the same time the Reddis of Kondavidu, who are known to have been allied with the Bahmanis, recaptured the eastern districts lost to Harihara II. Attempts to use divisions among the Reddis only led to further defeats for Devarâya, and the establishment of the sultan as overlord of Telingana.

Devarâya II. Devarâya I died in 1422, and was briefly succeeded by his son Râmachandra. He in his turn was succeeded by Vijaya—known to have suppressed a rebellion in western Udayagir in 1421—whose reign extended from 1422 to 1425-6. For part of this period the Yuvarâja, Devarâya II, shared in the administration.

During his reign (1425/6-46) Devarâya was able to absorb the distracted Reddi lands of Kondavidu, and thus to establish the Krishna as his north-east boundary. By 1444 he had even advanced to Rajahmundry. He also established his supremacy over all Kerala, except Calicut—of whose ruler the visiting 'Abdur-Razzâq wrote, ‘although he is not under his (Devarâya’s) authority, nevertheless he is in great alarm and apprehension from him’. In the north, however, Devarâya had to meet the attacks of Firûz Shâh’s brother and successor, Ahmad Shâh (1422-35). The Hindu kingdom of Warangal was finally overthrown by him in 1425. To face this threat, Devarâya II seems to have considerably extended the recruitment of Muslim troops, recognizing his lack of well-mounted cavalry and archers.

Decline of the dynasty. In 1447, after the reign of Vijaya II, Mallikârjuna came to power. He was unable to control the nobles and was subject to vigorous attack from Sultan ‘Alâ-ud-din II and from the Orissa ruler Kapilâsvara who, by 1449, had overrun Rajahmundry and Kondavidu. In 1463 the Uriya forces, masters since 1460 of Warangal, raided as far south as Kanchi.

In 1465 Mallikârjuna was succeeded by his cousin Virûpâksha II. He
is described by Nuniz as 'given over to vice, caring for nothing but women, and to fuddle himself with drink'. The successes of this period were won by a noble of Chandragiri, Sāluva Narasimha, who had taken advantage of the death of Kapilēśvara to push his conquests from Udayagiri to the southern bank of the Godaveri. Many of these gains were lost later to Sultan Muhammad Shāh III.

The first usurpation. Virūpākṣa II was murdered by his eldest son in 1485, who in turn assassinated by a worthless younger brother. Sāluva Narasimha thereupon seized power. But it was only with much difficulty that the weakened central authority was restored, for although the imbecile Sultan Mahmūd II could not attack, the Uriya King Purusōthama did so. By 1489 he had retaken the Godaveri delta whence, crossing the Krishna, he invaded Kondavīdu. Narasimha was taken prisoner in a battle for Udayagiri, which was surrendered as the price of his liberty.

Nevertheless Narasimha did restore the authority of the government. The garrisoning of Honavar, Bhatkal, and other Malabar ports also served to strengthen the army by permitting the trade in Arabian and Persian horses to be resumed, after having been closed by the loss of Goa, Chaul, and Dabhol.

The second usurpation. Narasimha died in 1490–1, and was succeeded by his son, Immadi Narasimha, a minor. The regent, Narasa Nāyaka, a Tuluva, usurped real power, and eventually made the boy a state prisoner. In this period came the first of many struggles for the Raichur Doab between Vijayanagar and the newly founded kingdom of Bijapur. The regent was also much occupied by rebellions, but he did achieve successes in the south. He died in 1503.

His son and successor, Vira Narasimha, soon threw off the mask of regency and had Immadi brutally murdered. His reign (1505–9) was actively filled by suppression of the revolts of the nobles, resistance to 'Ādil Shāhī attacks, and reassertion of control over the western ports.

His successor, a half-brother, Krishnadevarāya, was the greatest of the dynasty. He reigned from 1509 to 1529 and was thus a contemporary of Henry VIII of England.

Within six months of his accession he had met the attack of Sultan Mahmūd of Bidar and thrown him back wounded. Yusuf 'Ādil Khān, attempting to stem Krishnadevarāya’s advance, was defeated and killed. In 1510 he again advanced north, besieging Raichur, and thence moving to Gulburga and Bidar.

With the north secure, Krishnadevarāya was able to turn south, and there he overthrew the rebels of Ummattur, whose territory was made into a new province with Srirangapatnam as its capital. Thereafter he turned against the Uriya ruler, Prataparudra, from whom he wrested Kondavīdu and the lands up to the Krishna. From Bezwada he pushed westwards into Telingana, and then, in 1516–17 to beyond the Godaveri.

His most famous fight took place on 19 May 1520, and resulted
in the recovery of the much disputed fortress of Raichur from Ismā'īl ʿĀdil Shāh of Bijapur. The Hindus gained a great victory in a contest so deadly that they lost more than 16,000 killed. The story of the fight is vividly told by the contemporary Portuguese chronicler, Nuniz. The raya, a man of a generous and chivalrous temper, used his victory with humanity and moderation. In the course of subsequent operations he temporarily occupied Bijapur, which was mostly destroyed by his soldiers tearing down buildings for fuel; and he razed to the ground the fortress of Gulbarga, the early capital of the Bahmanis. He died in 1529.

Description of the raya by Paes. Paes gives a good personal description of Krishnadevarāya:

This king is of medium height, and of fair complexion and good figure, rather fat than thin; he has on his face signs of small-pox. He is the most feared and perfect king that could possibly be, cheerful of disposition and very merry; he is one that seeks to honour foreigners, and receives them kindly, asking about all their affairs whatever their condition may be. He is a great ruler and a man of much justice, but subject to sudden fits of rage, and this is his title:

‘Crisnaraao Macacão, king of kings, lord of the greater lords of India, lord of the three seas and of the land.’

Character of Krishnadevarāya. The dark pages of the sanguinary story of the medieval kingdoms of the Deccan, whether Hindu or Muslim, are relieved by few names of men who claim respect on their personal merits. The figure of Krishnadevarāya stands out as one such. A mighty warrior, he

was in no way less famous for his religious zeal and catholicity. He respected all sects of the Hindu religion alike, though his personal leanings were in favour of Vaishnavism.... Krishna Rāya’s kindness to the fallen enemy, his acts of mercy and charity towards the residents of captured cities, his great military prowess which endeared him alike to his feudatory chiefs and to his subjects, the royal reception and kindness that he invariably bestowed upon foreign embassies, his imposing personal appearance, his genial look and polite conversation which distinguished a pure and dignified life, his love for literature and for religion, and his solicitude for the welfare of his people; and, above all, the almost fabulous wealth that he conferred as endowments on temples and Brahmans, mark him out indeed as the greatest of the South Indian monarchs.  

It is permissible to wonder, however, how far such lavish endowment was compatible with solicitude for the peasant.

In his time the Vijayanagar empire comprised substantially the same area as the Presidency of Madras, with the addition of Mysore and the other states of the peninsula.

Achyutarāya. Krishnadevarāya was succeeded by his brother Achyutarāya, a man of weak and tyrannical character, lacking even in

---

personal courage. Early attacks by Pratāparuda and the Golkonda ruler were staved off, but he soon lost the fortress of Mudgal and Raichur to Ismā’īl ʿĀdil Khān, for he was hampered by the efforts of Rāmarāja to place an infant son of Krishnadevarāya on the throne. Rāmarāja, the son of Krishnadevarāya’s minister Sāluva Timma, for a while got Achyutarāya into his power, but the prisoner escaped and by the dearly bought mediation of Ibrāhīm ʿĀdil Shāh secured his position until his death in 1542.

Achyutarāya was succeeded by his son Venkata I, but on the infant’s murder by an uncle, Rāmarāja was able to seize power in the name of Krishnadevarāya’s young son, Sadāsiva. In this process of seizing power, Rāmarāja destroyed many of the old nobility and replaced the Brahman officials by his own relations and adherents. He also considerably increased the importance of the Muslim element in the army.

Rāmarāja also instituted a policy of interfering in the perpetual struggles of the Muslim kings in the Deccan—and was most successful. In 1543 Rāmarāja made an alliance with Ahmadnagar and Golkonda in order to effect a combined attack on Bijapur, which was saved from destruction by the abilities of the minister Asad Khān. Fifteen years later (1558) Bijapur and Vijayanagar combined to attack Ahmadnagar. The territory of that state was so cruelly ravaged by the Hindus, and Rāmarāja treated his Muslim allies with such open contempt, that the sultans were convinced of the necessity for dropping their private quarrels and combining against the arrogant infidel.

Alliance of the four sultans. In 1564 the combination was duly effected. It seems probable that ʿĀli ʿĀdil Shāh at first stood neutral, and was only drawn in when the allies had been checked. The setback enabled them to spread false rumours that they wished for peace, and in the pause the ʿĀdil Shāh and the Muslim commanders in Rāmarāja’s army were won over. ʿĀli ʿĀdil Shāh was to the last an uncertain ally, for he is said to have hastened to Husain Nizām Shāh, when the capture of Rāmarāja was reported, ‘with the design of securing the release of the accursed infidel’.

The battle itself saw enormous forces engaged upon both sides. Estimates of the forces at the command of Rāmarāja vary, but it seems certain that his vast host numbered between half a million and a million men, besides a multitude of elephants and a considerable amount of artillery. On the other side, the sultan of Ahmadnagar brought on the ground a park of no less than 600 guns of various calibres. The total of the allied army is supposed to have been about half that of the Vijayanagar host.

The battle was fought on 23 January 1565. At first the Hindus had the advantage, but they suffered severely from a salvo of the Ahmadnagar guns shotted with bags of copper coin, and from a vigorous cavalry charge. Their complete rout followed on the capture of Rāmarāja, who was promptly decapitated by the sultan of Ahmadnagar with
his own hand. The princes fled from the city with countless treasures loaded upon more than 500 elephants, and the proud capital lay at the mercy of the victors who occupied it almost immediately.

The plunder was so great that every private man in the allied army became rich in gold, jewels, effects, tents, arms, horses, and slaves; as the sultans left every person in possession of what he had acquired, only taking elephant-for their own use.

Ruin of Vijayanagar. The ruin wrought on the magnificent city may be described in the words of Sewell, who was familiar with the scene of its desolation. When the princes fled with their treasures, then a panic seized the city. . . . No retreat, no flight was possible except to a few, for the pack-oxen and carts had almost all followed the forces to the war, and they had not returned. Nothing could be done but to bury all treasures, to arm the younger men, and to wait. Next day the place became a prey to the robber tribes and jungle people of the neighbourhood. Hordes of Brinjāris, Lambādis, Kurubas, and the like pounced down on the hapless city and looted the stores and shops, carrying off great quantities of riches. Couto states that there were six concerted attacks by these people during the day.

The third day saw the beginning of the end. The victorious Musalmans had halted on the field of battle for rest and refreshment, but now they had reached the capital, and from that time forward for a space of five months Vijayanagar knew no rest. The enemy had come to destroy, and they carried out their object relentlessly. . . . Never perhaps in the history of the world has such havoc been wrought, and wrought so suddenly, on so splendid a city; teeming with a wealthy and industrious population in the full plenitude of prosperity one day, and on the next seized, pillaged, and reduced to ruins, amid scenes of savage massacre and horrors beggaring description.

The pathetic language of the Hebrew prophet lamenting the ruin of Jerusalem applies accurately to the Indian tragedy:

How doth the city sit solitary, that was full of people! how is she become as a widow! she that was great among the nations, and a princess among the provinces, how is she become tributary! . . . The young and the old lie on the ground in the streets: my virgins and my young men are fallen by the sword. . . . How is the gold become dim! how is the most fine gold changed! the stones of the sanctuary are poured out in the top of every street.1

Rāmarāja's brother, Tirumala, who along with Sadāśiva, the nominal king, took refuge at Penugonda, himself usurped the royal seat some few years after the battle. This third usurpation, the beginning of the fourth dynasty, may be dated in or about 1570. The most remarkable king of the new dynasty was the third, by name Venkata I, who came to the throne about 1585. He seems to have moved his capital to Chandragiri, and was noted for his patronage of Telugu poets and Vaishnava authors. It is unnecessary to follow the history of his successors, who gradually degenerated into merely local chiefs. In 1639 a

1 Lam. i. 1; ii. 21; iv. 1.
Nāïk subordinate to Chandragiri granted the site of Madras to Mr. Day, an English factor. In 1645 that transaction was confirmed by Ranga II, who was the last representative of the line with any pretensions to independence. Much of the Deccan was overrun by the Muslims and passed under the sovereignty of the sultans of Bijapur and Golkonda, who in their turn were overthrown by Aurangzeb in 1686 and 1687.

The most important of the principalities formed by Hindus in the far south out of the fragments of the Vijayanagar empire was that of the Nāyaks of Madura. Tirumala Nāyak is justly celebrated for his buildings, which exhibit much dignity of design and splendour in execution.

**The city in the fourteenth century.** The grandeur of the city, the splendour of the buildings, the wealth of the bazaars, the volume of trade, and the density of the population are amply attested by a series of witnesses beginning in the fourteenth century, when Vijayanagar was only a few years old, down to the date of its irremediable ruin, and also by survey of the existing remains. The historian Firishta admits that as early as 1378 the rayas of Vijayanagar were greatly superior in power, wealth, and extent of country to the Bahmanī kings. Goa was then temporarily in possession of the raya, and his capital drew much wealth from commerce passing through the ports of the western coast.

Bukka II (1399–1406) improved and enlarged the fortifications of Vijayanagar. His most notable work was the construction of a huge dam in the Tungabhadra river, forming a reservoir from which water was conveyed to the city by an aqueduct fifteen miles in length, cut out of the solid rock for a distance of several miles. Firishta’s account of the ceremonial at the marriage between Firūz Shāh Bahmanī and the daughter of Devarāya I gives some idea of the magnificence of the capital in 1406.

**Nicolo Conti’s description, 1420.** The earliest foreign visitor whose notes have been preserved was an Italian named Nicolo Conti, who was at Vijayanagar about 1420, in the reign of Davarāya II. He estimated the circumference of the city to be sixty miles, and was much impressed by the strength of the fortifications, which were carried up the hills so as to enclose the valleys at their base. The traveller observes that the king had 12,000 wives, of whom no less than 2,000 or 3,000 were required to burn themselves with him when he died. Indeed the savage custom of sati was terribly common in the empire. The sacrifice was effected by burning in a pit, or, among the Telegus, by burial alive.

‘Abdur-Razzāq in 1443. The next visitor was the learned ‘Abdur-Razzāq of Herat, who was sent by Sultan Shāhrukh, son of Timur, as ambassador to the zamorin of Calicut. While the envoy was residing at Calicut a herald brought intelligence that the king of Vijayanagar required that he should be sent instantly to his court. The zamorin,
although at that time not directly subject to the authority of the raya, dared not disobey. 'Abdur-Razzāq accordingly sailed to Mangalore, 'which is on the borders of the kingdom of Bijanagar', and thence travelled by land to his distant destination, through the country now known as Mysore.

At Belur he admired greatly a magnificent temple, which he dared not describe 'without fear of being charged with exaggeration'. Presumably he saw the fine structure erected in A.D. 1117 by the Hoysala King Bittiga, which still exists and has been surveyed by the archaeological department of Mysore.1 Towards the end of April 1443 the traveller arrived at Vijayanagar. 'The city', he observes, 'is such that eye has not seen nor ear heard of any place resembling it upon the whole earth. It is so built that it has seven fortified walls, one within the other.' The writer goes on to illustrate his description by a comparison with the citadel of Herat.

The seventh fortress is placed in the centre of the others, and occupies ground ten times greater than the chief market of Hirāt. In that is situated the palace of the king. From the northern gate of the outer fortress to the southern is a distance of two statute parasangs [about 7 or 8 miles], and the same with respect to the distance between the eastern and western gates. Between the first, second, and third walls there are cultivated fields, gardens, and houses. From the third to the seventh fortress, shops and bazaars are closely crowded together. By the palace of the king there are four bazaars, situated opposite one to another. On the north is the portico of the palace of the Rāi.2 At the head of each bazaar there is a lofty arcade and magnificent gallery, but the palace of the king is loftier than all of them. The bazaars are very long and broad, so that the sellers of flowers, notwithstanding that they place high stands before their shops, are yet able to sell flowers from both sides.... The tradesmen of each separate guild or craft have their shops close to one another. The jewellers sell their rubies and pearls and diamonds and emeralds openly in the bazaar.

In this charming area, in which the palace of the king is contained, there are many rivulets and streams flowing through channels of cut stone, polished and even.... The country is so well populated that it is impossible in a reasonable space to convey an idea of it. In the king's treasury there are chambers, with excavations in them, filled with molten gold, forming one mass. All the inhabitants of the country, whether high or low, even down to the artificers of the bazaar, wear jewels and gilt ornaments in their ears and around their necks, arms, wrists, and fingers.

Account by Paes in 1552. We have another detailed description recorded by Domingos Paes, a Portuguese, about 1522, in the reign of Krishnadevarāya, just after the capitulation of Raichur, when the empire was at the full height of its glory. His account, which is obviously

1 There is no need to suppose that any place other than Belur is meant. It is eighty or ninety miles by road from Mangalore.
2 This sentence is from the version in Sewell. The rendering in E. & D. does not give sense. The rest of the quotation is from E. & D.
truthful, may be accepted with confidence. It is well worth reading in full as translated by Sewell.

Size of the city; the palace. Paes found a difficulty in estimating the size of the city, because the hills prevented him from seeing the whole at once. So far as he could judge, it was as large as Rome. The houses were said to exceed 100,000 in number. If that guess be near the truth, the population cannot have been less than half a million. The numerous lakes, water-courses, and orchards attracted his admiration. As to the people, he could only say that they were countless. He considered Vijayanagar to be 'the best provided city in the world... for the state of this city is not like that of other cities, which often fail of supplies and provisions, for in this one everything abounds'. Paes was shown round a large part of the palace enclosure, which contained thirty-four streets. He saw one room which was 'all of ivory, as well the chamber as the walls from top to bottom, and the pillars of the cross-timbers at the top had roses and flowers of lotuses all of ivory, and all well executed, so that there could not be better—it is so rich and beautiful that you would hardly find anywhere another such'.

The court. The ceremonial of the court was extremely elaborate. The royal words, as at the Mughul court, were carefully noted down by secretaries, whose record was the sole evidence of the commands issued. Nuniz, another Portuguese who visited Vijayanagar thirteen years later than Paes, declares that

no written orders are ever issued, nor any charters granted for the favours he (the king) bestows or the commands he gives; but when he confers a favour on any one it remains written in the registers of these secretaries. The king, however, gives to the recipient of a favour a seal impressed in wax from one of his rings, which his minister keeps, and these seals serve for letters patent.

In that respect the practice differed widely from that followed in the northern courts, where regular office routine was observed. The king always dressed in white. On his head he wore 'a cap of brocade in fashion like a Galician helmet, covered with a piece of fine stuff, all of fine silk, and he was barefooted'. His jewels, of course, were the finest possible.

The army. The army in the king's pay is said to have numbered 'a million fighting troops, in which are included 35,000 cavalry in armour', but this would be the total force called out in emergency. The standing army was probably no more than one-tenth of this figure. Paes declares that in 1520 Krishnadevarāya actually assembled for the operations against Raichur 703,000 foot, 32,600 horse, and 551 elephants, besides an uncounted host of camp-followers, dealers, and the rest. The efficiency of the huge army described was not proportionate to the numbers of the force. The soldiers were in terror of the Muslims, and their action against a fortress like Raichur in the absence of efficient siege artillery was ludicrously feeble. The men are described

1 Compare the 'ivory palaces' of Psalm xlv. 8.
as being physically strong and individually brave. Sometimes they fought gallantly, but the army as an organized force was inefficient.

Administration. The raya was assisted by a council of shifting composition and power. As usual, some offices tended to become hereditary or to be concentrated in one office—that of Pradhanī. To counter this, Krishnadevarāya suggested that new men should be advanced to break the control of too powerful ministers, and that too much trust should be put in no one since ‘the people employed by the king for the collection of revenue and discharging other duties are both friends and enemies according to circumstances. . . .’ There was a large secretariat and the usual officers of a royal household are mentioned.

The empire was divided into a small number of great provinces, often under members of the royal family, and into further subdivisions. The Nāiks—nobles or tributary rulers—held these subdivisions on condition that they provided a fixed contingent of troops and a certain amount of revenue. Nuniz gives us detailed observations for about 1535, and Paes states that the governors were expected to pay over to the treasury half of their gross revenue, and to defray all the expenses of their households, contingents, and government from the other half. The provincial governors and Nāiks could do much as they pleased within their territories, though they were themselves at the mercy of the king, who was a most absolute autocrat.

The ruler’s attitude in respect of law and order is summed up in Krishnadevarāya’s trenchant, ‘The king maintains the law (dharma) by killing.’ The extreme ferocity of the punishments inflicted for offences against property was well designed to protect the rich against the poor.¹

‘The punishments they inflict in this kingdom’, Nuniz states, ‘are these: for a thief, whatever theft he commits, howsoever little it be, they forthwith cut off a foot and a hand; and if his theft be a great one he is hanged with a hook under his chin. If a man outrages a respectable woman or a virgin he has the same punishment, and if he does any other such violence his punishment is of like kind. Nobles who become traitors are sent to be impaled alive on a wooden stake thrust through the belly; and people of the lower orders, for whatever crime they commit, he forthwith commands to cut off their heads in the marketplace, and the same for a murder unless the death was the result of a duel. . . .’

Land revenue assessment. The assessment varied according to the type of land under cultivation—whether wet, dry, or garden land. The revenue was taken either in cash or kind as it suited the ruler at the time, but the burden on the peasant was in any case crushingly heavy. Nuniz states that they ‘pay nine-tenths to their lord’. Such a

¹ Knox, An Historical Relation of the Island Ceylon, in the East Indies (London, 1681), gives terribly realistic drawings of ‘the execution by an elephant’; ‘one impaled on a stake’; and of ‘the manner of extorting their fine’. The last-named plate shows a poor man crouching with a heavy stone on his back, while his rich creditor stands over him.
proportion of the gross produce seems improbable, but what is clear is that to the observer the demand seemed inordinately high. Evidence of village revolt against the burden and the observations of later travellers tend to confirm Nuniz. All agree that while the nobles lived in luxury, the mass of the people went all but naked and lived in hovels.

Wilks and later authorities also refer to the multitude of vexatious cesses levied upon peasant and merchant alike. Trade was hampered by heavy city dues and by the existence of numerous toll-stations upon the roads. 'At the end of the century, too, the missionaries insist on the need for passports in this part of India in order to avoid infinite trouble regarding dues and taxes.'

Duellings. Nuniz states that 'great honour is done to those who fight in a duel, and they give the estate of the dead man to the survivor; but no one fights a duel without first asking leave of the minister, who forthwith grants it'. The usage was not confined to Vijayanagar. Duels fought with swords were common among the Nayars of Malabar until recent times, probably as late as the nineteenth century. The practice was imitated by the Muslims of the Deccan early in the sixteenth century, much to the horror of Firishta, who denounces 'this abominable habit' as being unknown in any other civilized country in the world.

Legalized prostitution. Prostitution was a recognized institution and an acceptable source of revenue. The women attached to the temples, as Paes informs us, 'are of loose character, and live in the best streets that are in the city; it is the same in all their cities, their streets have the best rows of houses'.

'Abdur-Razzāq gives further details on the subject. 'Opposite the mint', he writes, 'is the office of the Prefect of the City, to which it is said 12,000 policemen are attached; and their pay, which equals each day 12,000 fanams, is derived from the proceeds of the brothels.'

An interesting comparison might be made between the statements of the Persian envoy and the regulations in the Arthasāstra concerning the city prefect and the courtesans in Maurya times. Then, as at Vijayanagar, the public women played an essential part in court ceremonial.

Laxity in diet. Although vegetarian Brahmans were numerous at Vijayanagar and greatly pampered by the authorities, the diet of the general population and of the kings departed widely from the Brahmanical standard. Animal food was very freely used. Paes dwells with pleasure on the variety of meat and birds procurable in the markets. The sheep killed daily were countless. Every street had sellers of mutton, so clean and fat that it looked like pork. Birds and game animals were abundant and cheap; those offered for sale included three kinds of partridges, quails, doves, pigeons, and others, 'the common birds of the country', besides poultry and hares. The same author mentions that pork also was sold and that pigs kept in certain streets of butchers' houses were 'so white and clean that you could never see better in any country'. 
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His statements are confirmed by Nuniz, who writes that:

These Kings of Binsaga eat all sorts of things, but not the flesh of oxen or cows, which they never kill in all the country of the heathen because they worship them. They eat mutton, pork, venison, partridges, hares, doves, quail, and all kinds of birds; even sparrows, and rats, and cats, and lizards, all of which are sold in the market of the city of Binsaga.

Everything has to be sold alive so that each one may know what he buys—this at least so far as concerns game—and there are fish from the rivers in large quantities.

That was a curious dietary for princes and people, who in the time of Krishnadevarāya and Achyutarāya were zealous Hindus with a special devotion to certain forms of Vishnu. The kings of the first dynasty preferred to honour Śiva.

Bloody sacrifices. The numerous bloody sacrifices, similar to those still performed in Nepal, were equally inconsistent with the ordinary practice of Vaishnava religion. Paes mentions that all the sheep required for the market supply of mutton for Hindu consumption were slaughtered at the gate of one particular temple. The blood was offered in sacrifice to the idol, to whom also the heads were left. The same writer states that on a certain festival the king used to witness the slaughter of 24 buffaloes and 150 sheep, the animals being decapitated, as now in Nepal, by a single blow from a 'large sickle' or dào. On the last day of the 'nine days' festival' 250 buffaloes and 4,500 sheep were slaughtered.¹ Such practices prove clearly that the Hinduism of Vijayanagar included many non-Aryan elements. At the present day lizards and rats would not be eaten by anybody except members of certain debased castes or wild jungle tribes.²

The government of Vijayanagar Telinga and foreign. Doubts may be felt as to whether the founders of Vijayanagar had been in the service of the Hoysala king or in that of the raja of Warangal, but it is certain that they were foreigners in the Kanarese country, the Carnatic, properly so called. Wilks believed that Bukka and his brethren were fugitives from Warangal:

This origin of the new government at once explains the ascendancy of the Telinga [Telugu] language and nation at this capital of Carnatic, and proves the state of anarchy and weakness which had succeeded the ruin of the former dynasty. The government founded by foreigners was also

¹ Bishop Whitehead states that in the Telugu country as many as 1,000 sheep are sometimes sacrificed at once on the occasion of an epidemic (Village Deities, Madras, 1907, p. 136, as corrected in 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, 1916, p. 56). All the practices mentioned in the text seem to be Telugu or Kanarese. The modern Tamils usually are becoming averse to bloody sacrifices. The Kanarese still offer them freely.
² e.g. the Vaddas, who are numerous in Mysore, and said to come from Orissa, will eat any animal food, except beef or tortoise. 'Sheep, goats, pigs, squirrels, wild cats, lizards, and mice are equally welcome to them' (Ethnogr. Survey of Mysore Prelim. Issue, No. XI, p. 10, Bangalore, Govt. Press, 1907). Sewell (p. 13) suggests that the kings may have belonged to the Kuruba tribe or caste, who are shepherds and blanket-weavers primarily. For the Kurubas see Ethnogr. Survey, No. 1, 1906.
supported by foreigners; and in the centre of Canara a Telinga court was supported by a Telinga army, the descendants of whom, speaking the same language, are to be traced at this day nearly to Cape Comorin, in the remains of the numerous establishments, resembling the Roman colonies, which were sent forth from time to time for the purpose of confirming their distant conquests, and holding the natives in subjection. The centre and the west, probably the whole of the dominions of the late dynasty, including the greater part of the modern state of Mysore, were subdued at an early period; but a branch of the family of Bellal [= Hoysalā] was permitted to exercise a nominal authority at Tonoor until 1387, in which year we begin to find direct grants from the house of Vijayanuggur as far south as Turkanamby beyond the Caveri. The last of thirteen rajas or rayeels of the house of Hurryur [Harihara I], who were followers of Śiva, was succeeded in 1490 by Narsing Raja, of the religious sect of Vishnou, the founder of a new dynasty, whose empire appears to have been called by Europeans Narsinga, a name which, being no longer in use, has perplexed geographers with regard to its proper position.

Narsing Raja seems to have been the first king of Vijayanuggur who extended his conquests into Dраведa [Drāvida, the Tamil country], and erected the strong forts of Chandragerry and Vellore; the latter for his occasional residence, and the former as a safe place for the deposit of treasure; but it was not until about 1509 to 1515 that Kistna Rayeel [Krishna Rāya] reduced the whole of Dраведa to real or nominal subjection.

The fact that the kings and nobles of Vijayanagar were foreigners lording it over a subject native population would explain the severity of the government. It should be observed, however, that the Telugu or Telinga people themselves are noted for their submissiveness to official authority.¹

Patronage of literature. The rayas of Vijayanagar, although their title was Kanarese in form, gave their patronage to Sanskrit and Telugu literature. Sāyana, the celebrated commentator on the Vedas, who died in A.D. 1387, was minister in the early part of the reign of Harihara II, and his learned brother Mādhava served Bukka. The first dynasty had close associations with the great monarchy of Sringērī. The achievements of Sāluva Narasimha, the founder of the second dynasty, were enthusiastically celebrated by Telugu poets. Krishna-devarāya, himself a poet and author, was a liberal patron of writers in the Telugu language. His poet laureate, Alasāni-Peddana, is regarded as an author of the first rank. The tradition of the court was carried on by Rāmarāja and the other rayas of the fourth or Aravidū dynasty. Rāmarāja and his brothers were themselves accomplished scholars, and under their protection a great revival of Vaishnavava re'igion was accomplished.

Architecture and art. The kings of Vijayanagar from the beginning of their rule were distinguished as builders of strong fortresses, immense works for irrigation and water supply, gorgeous palaces, and temples decorated with all the resources of art, both sculpture and paint-

¹ Wilks, reprint, vol. i, p. 9. See the good article 'Telugu' in Balfour, Cyclopaedia, based on Caldwell's works. The dates given by Wilks require some slight correction.
They evolved a distinct school of architecture which used the most difficult material with success, and were served by a brilliant company of sculptors and painters. Enough of the sculpture survives to show its quality, but the paintings necessarily have disappeared. The descriptions recorded by the Portuguese authors and ’Abdur-razzāq permit of no doubt that the painters in the service of the kings of Vijayanagar attained a high degree of skill. The scenes from the Rāmāyana, sculptured in bas-relief on the walls of Krishnadevarāya’s chapel royal, the Hazārā Rāma-swāmī temple, built in 1513, are much admired. No adequate account of the buildings and sculptures at Vijayanagar has yet been prepared.

**The Rayas of Vijayanagar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Accession</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chiefs, not of royal rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARIHARA I, son of Sangama</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>Traditionary date for foundation of Vijayanagar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUKKA (BHUKKA, or BUKNANA) I, his brother and three other brothers, sons of Sangama; succession apparently disputed</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>Bukka I died 1377.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rayas of royal rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First dynasty: descendants of Sangama</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARIHARA II, son of Bukka I</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUKKA II, son of Harihara II</td>
<td>?1404</td>
<td>A brother named Virūpākṣa also a claimant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputed succession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVARĀYA I</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VĪRA VIJAYA</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputed succession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVARĀYA II (alias Immadi, Pratāpa, or Praudha); at first associated with Vīra Vijaya; became sole ruler</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>Empire prosperous and extensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALLIKĀRJUNA, son of Devarāya II</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>Sāluva Narasimha minister in power from about 1455.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decay of empire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virūpākṣa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAUDHADEVARĀYA (Padea Rao)</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second or Sāluva dynasty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SĀLUVA NARASIMHA</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>Worshippers of Vishnu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMADI NARASIMHA, alias Tammaya (Dharma) Rāya; son of Narasimha Sāluva</td>
<td>?1492</td>
<td>Power in hands of Narasa Nāyaka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third or Tuluva dynasty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARASA NĀYAKA succeeded as regent by his son Vīra Narasimha</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Rayas of Vijayanagar (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Accession</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vīra Narasimha murders Immadi and assumes power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishnadevarāya</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Raichur</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>Climax of the empire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHYUTA; brother of Krishnadevarāya</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENKATA I, son of Achyuta, succeeds but is murdered</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADASIVA, son of another brother of Achyuta</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>Nominal king; Rāmarāja in power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Tālikota</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>Break-up of empire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Rāmarāja; confusion</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth dynasty; Ārāvīdu or Karnāta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIRUMALA, brother of Rāmarāja</td>
<td>c. 1570</td>
<td>Capital at Penugonda, now in Anantapur Dis-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranga, son of Tirumala</td>
<td>c. 1573</td>
<td>tict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENKATA I, brother of Ranga</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>Capital removed to Chandragiri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other princes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranga</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Local chief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical end of dynasty</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Ranga’s inscriptions continue to 1684.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE.**—Dates and many details, especially those relating to disputed successes, are often doubtful.

### Synchronistic Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vijayanagar</th>
<th>Bahmani</th>
<th>Bijapur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harihara I, &amp;c. 1336</td>
<td>*Alā-ud-din I 1347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukka I 1354</td>
<td>Muhammad I 1358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harihara II 1377</td>
<td>Muhammad II 1378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghiyās-ud-din 1397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shams-ud-din 1397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firūz 1397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukka II ?1404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devarāya I 1406</td>
<td>Ahmad 1422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīra Vijaya 1422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devarāya II 1425</td>
<td>*Alā-ud-din II 1435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallikārjuna 1447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VIJAYANAGAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vijayanagar</th>
<th>Bahmani</th>
<th>Bijapur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virūpākṣa</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praudhadevarāya</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Mahmūd 1482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāluva Narasimha</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>Yūsuf 1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immadi Narasimha</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vira Narasimha</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Ismaīl 1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishnadevarāya</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Mallū 1534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achyuta</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm I 1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadāsiva</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>Ali 1557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumala Ranga</td>
<td>c. 1570</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm II 1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venkata I Ranga</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>Muhammad 1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AUTHORITIES


The coins are described by HULTSCH, *Ind. Ant.*, vol. xx (1891); and V. A. SMITH, *Catal. Coins in I.M.*, vol. i, Oxford, 1906. The art of the dynasty is briefly noticed in *H.F.A*. New inscriptions are published continually. Many dates and other matters of detail remain unsettled, and cannot be disposed of until somebody takes the trouble to write a bulky monograph. The small book (144 pp., 8vo) by A. H. LONGHURST, Superintendent, Archaeological Department, Southern Circle (Madras Government Press, 1917), entitled *Hampi Ruins described and illustrated*, has 69 illustrations, and is good as far as it goes.