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BOOK IV

The Muslim Powers of Northern India

CHAPTER 1

The rise of the Muslim power in India and the sultanate of Delhi
A.D. 1175–1290

Rise and decline of Muslim power. The Muslim conquest of India did not begin until the last quarter of the twelfth century, if the frontier provinces of Kabul, the Panjab, and Sind be excluded from consideration. It may be reckoned to have continued until 1340, when the empire of Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq attained its maximum extent, comprising twenty-four provinces more or less effectively under the control of the sultan of Delhi. The provinces included a large portion of the Deccan, and even a section of the Malabar or Coromandel coast.

After 1340 the frontiers of the sultanate of Delhi rapidly contracted, many new kingdoms, both Muslim and Hindu, being formed. The quick growth of the Hindu empire of Vijayanagar checked the southern progress of Islam and recovered some territory which had passed under Muslim rule. Elsewhere, too, Hindu chiefs asserted themselves, and it may be affirmed with truth that for more than two centuries, from 1340 to the accession of Akbar in 1556, Islam lost ground on the whole.

Under Akbar and his successors the Muslim frontier was extended from time to time until 1691, when the officers of Aurangzeb were able for a moment to levy tribute from Tanjore and Trichinopoly in the far south. After the date named the Marathas enlarged the borders of Hindu dominion until 1818, when their power was broken and they were forced to acknowledge British supremacy, as based on the conquest of Bengal and Bihar between 1757 and 1765. That, in brief, is the outline of the rise, decline, and fall of Muslim sovereign rule in India. From 1803 to 1858 the empire of Delhi was merely titular.

This chapter and the next will be devoted to a summary account of the progress of the Muslim conquest from A.D. 1175 to 1340. Most of the conquests, after the earliest, were made by or for the sultans of Delhi, whose line began in 1206. The dynasty of Ghūr (Ghūrī). The first attack was made by a

1 The list is in Thomas, Chronicles, p. 203.
chieftain of the obscure principality of Ghūr, hidden away among the mountains of Afghanistan to the south-east of Herat. The fortune of the Ghūr chiefs was made by means of a quarrel with the successors of Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazni, whose power in central Asia had been broken by the growing Seljuk empire. One of those successors named Bāhrām having executed two princes of Ghūr, the blood-feud thus started prompted 'Alā-ud-dīn Husain to take vengeance by sacking Ghazni in A.D. 1151 (= A.H. 544). The unhappy city was given to the flames for seven days and nights, during which 'plunder, devastation, and slaughter were continuous. Every man that was found was slain, and all the women and children were made prisoners. All the palaces and edifices of the Mahmūdī kings which had no equals in the world’ were destroyed, save only the tombs of Sultan Mahmūd and two of his relatives. Shortly afterwards Khusrū Shāh, Bahrām's son, was obliged
by an incursion of Ghuẓz Turkmāns to leave Ghazni and retire to Lahore (1160). But Ghazni was not incorporated in the dominions of Ghūr until twelve or thirteen years later (1173), when it was wrested from the Turkmāns by Sultan Ghiyās-ud-dīn of Ghūr, who made over the conquered territory with its dependencies, including Kabul, to the government as sultan of his brother Muhammad, the son of Sām, who is also known by his titles of Shīhāb-ud-dīn and Muizz-ud-dīn (r-daulat). It is most convenient to designate him as Muhammad Ghūrī, or ‘of Ghūr’, sultan of Ghazni, and conqueror of Hindustan.

Early operations of Muhammad Ghūrī. He began his Indian operations by a successful attack on Multan (1175–6), which he followed up by the occupation of Uch, obtained through the treachery of a rani. Three years later he moved southwards through the desert and attempted the conquest of rich Gujarāt. But Bhīmdev II of Anhilwāra or Pātan was too strong for the invader, who was defeated and repulsed with heavy loss (1178). The victory protected Gujarāt, as a whole, from any serious Muslim attack for more than a century, although intermediate raids occurred; and Anhilwāra was occupied twenty years later. Such checks to the progress of Islam as Bhīmdev II inflicted were rare.

In 1186 Muhammad Ghūrī deposed Khusrū Malik, the last prince of the line of Sabuktīgin and Mahmūd, and himself occupied the Panjab. Having already secured Sind he was thus in possession of the basin of the Indus, and in a position to make further advances into the fertile plains of India, teeming with tempting riches, and inhabited by idolaters, fit only to be ‘sent to hell’ according to the simple creed of the invaders.

First battle of Tarāin. The sultan organized a powerful expedition as soon as possible, and in 1191 (A.H. 587) advanced into India. The magnitude of the danger induced the various Hindu kings to lay aside their quarrels for a moment and to form a great confederacy against the invader, as their ancestors had done against Amīr Sabuktīgin and Sultan Mahmūd. All the leading powers of northern India sent contingents, the whole being under the command of Rāi Pithaura or Prithvirāj, the Chauhān ruler of Ajmer and Delhi. The Hindu host met the army of Islam at Tarāin or Tarāorī, between Karnal and Thānēsar. That region, the modern Karnal District, is marked out by nature as the battlefield in which the invader from the north-west must meet the defenders of Delhi and the basin of the Ganges. The legendary ground of Kurukshetra, where the heroes of the Mahābhārata had fought before the dawn of history was not far distant, and Panipat, where three decisive battles were lost and won in later ages, is about thirty miles farther south. The sultan, who met the brother of Prithvirāj in single combat, was severely wounded, and his army, surrounded and outnumbered, was utterly routed.

Second battle of Tarāin. In the following year the sultan returned, met the Hindu confederates on the same ground, and in his
turn defeated them utterly (1192, A.H. 588). Rāi Prithvīrāj, when his cumbersome host had been broken by the onset of 10,000 mounted archers, fled from the field, but was captured and killed. His brother fell in the battle. The victory gave to Muhammad Hansī, Samana, and all northern India to the gates of Delhi. In fact, the second battle of Tarāin in 1192 may be regarded as the decisive contest which ensured the ultimate success of the Muslim attack on Hindustan. No Hindu general in any age was willing to profit by experience and learn the lesson taught by Alexander’s operations long ago. Time after time enormous hosts, formed of the contingents supplied by innumerable rajas, and supported by the delusive strength of elephants, were easily routed by quite small bodies of vigorous western soldiers, fighting under one undivided command, and trusting chiefly to well-armed mobile cavalry. Alexander, Muhammad of Ghūr, Babur, Ahmad Shāh Durrānī, and other capable commanders, all used essentially the same tactics by which they secured decisive victories against brave Hindu armies of very large numbers. The Indian caste system was unfavourable to military efficiency as against foreign foes.

Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak. After the victory of Tarāin the sultan returned to Khurasan, leaving the conduct of the Indian campaign in the hands of Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak, a native of Turkistan, who had been bought as a slave, and was still technically in a servile condition while conquering Hindustan. In 1193 (A.H. 589) Qutb-ud-dīn occupied Delhi, and advanced into the Doab. He was there joined by Muhammad Ghūrī in an attack upon Kanauj, whose Rathor ruler, Jai Chand, was defeated and slain. Soon afterward Gwalior fell, and in 1197 Anhilwāra, the capital of Gujarat, was plundered, although the province was not subdued. In the same year Ajmer was occupied and garrisoned.

Conquest of Bihar. The overthrow of the rulers of the eastern kingdoms was effected with astounding facility by Qutb-ud-dīn’s general, Muhammad Khiljī, the son of Bakhtyār. The Muslim general, acting independently, after completing several successful plundering expeditions, seized the fort of Bihar in 1193, by an audacious move, and thus mastered the capital of the province of that name. The prevailing religion of Bihar at that time was a corrupt form of Buddhism, which had received liberal patronage from the kings of the Pāla dynasty for more than three centuries. The Muslim historian, indifferent to distinctions among idolaters, states that the majority of the inhabitants were ‘shaven-headed Brahmans’, who were all put to the sword. He evidently means Buddhist monks, as he was informed that the whole city and fortress were considered to be a college, which the name Bihar signifies. A great library was scattered. The ashes of the Buddhist sanctuaries at Sārnāth near Benares still bear witness to the rage of the image-breakers. Many noble monuments of the ancient civilization of India were irretrievably wrecked in the course of the early Muslim invasions. Those invasions were fatal to the existence
of Buddhism as an organized religion in northern India, where its strength resided chiefly in Bihar and certain adjoining territories. The monks who escaped massacre fled, and were scattered over Nepal, Tibet, and the south. After A.D. 1200 the traces of Buddhism in upper India are faint and obscure.

Conquest of Bengal. Bengal, then under the rule of Lakshmana Sēna, an aged and venerated Brahmanical prince, succumbed even more easily a little later, either in 1199 or 1202. Muhammad Khilji, son of Bakhtyār, riding in advance of the main body of his troops, suddenly appeared before the capital city of Nūdīah (Nuddea) with a party of eighteen troopers, who were supposed by the people to be horse dealers. Thus slenderly escorted he rode up to the raja’s palace and boldly attacked the doorkeepers. The raider’s audacity succeeded. The raja, who was at his dinner, slipped away by a back door and retired to the neighbourhood of Dacca, where his descendants continued to rule as local chiefs for several generations. The Muslim general destroyed Nūdīah, securing much accumulated treasure, and transferred the seat of government to Lakshmanavatī or Gaur, an ancient Hindu city. Muhammad secured the approval of his master, Qutb-ud-dīn, by giving him plenty of plunder, and proceeded to organize a Muslim provincial administration, in practical independence. Mosques and other Muslim edifices were erected all over the kingdom. The conquest so easily effected was final. Bengal never escaped from the rule of Muslims for any considerable time until they were superseded in the eighteenth century by the British.

Conquest of Bundelkhand. In 1203 the strong Chandel fortress of Kalanjar in Bundelkhand was surrendered to Aibak by Aja Deo, the aspiring minister of the late Raja Parmāl.

The gratified historian of the conqueror’s exploits states that ‘the temples were converted into mosques and abodes of goodness, and the ejaculations of the bead-counters [worshippers using rosaries] and the voices of the summoners to prayer ascended to the highest heaven, and the very name of idolatry was annihilated. . . . Fifty thousand men came under the collar of slavery, and the plain became black as pitch with Hindus.’ The victor passed on and occupied Mahoba, the seat of the Chandel civil government.

Death of Muhammad of Ghūr. In the same year Ghiyās-ud-dīn, the sultan of Ghūr, died and was succeeded by his brother Muhammad, who thus united in his person all the dominions of the family. Muhammad had returned to Ghazni after the capture of Kalanjar. Two years later, in 1205, he was recalled to the Panjab in order to suppress a revolt of the powerful Khokhar tribe. The sultan treated the foe in the drastic manner of the times. But fate overtook him. As he was on the march towards Ghazni in March 1206 (A.H. 602) he was stabbed by an Ismā’īlī fanatic at Dhamiāk, a camping-ground now in the Jhelum District.

The first sultan of Delhi. Qutb-ud-dīn, who had been dignified
with the title of sultan by Muhammad Ghūrī's brother's son, Ghiyās-ud-dīn Mahmūd, succeeded Muhammad Ghūrī as sovereign of the new Indian conquests, and from 1206 may be reckoned as the first sultan of Delhi. But his enthronement took place at Lahore. The new sovereign sought to strengthen his position by marriage alliances with influential rival chiefs. He himself married the daughter of Tāj-ud-dīn Yildız, governor of Kirmān, and he gave his sister to Nāṣir-ud-dīn Qabācha, the governor of Sind. Īltutmish (Altamsh), foremost of his slaves, married Qutb-ud-dīn's daughter.

The three persons named, Yildız, Qabācha, and Īltutmish, had been slaves like Qutb-ud-dīn himself. The dynasty founded by Qutb-ud-dīn and continued by other princes of servile origin is consequently known to history as the Slave dynasty.

Qutb-ud-dīn died in 1210 from the effects of an accident on the polo ground, having ruled as sultan for a little more than four years.

Ferocity of the early invaders. He was a typical specimen of the ferocious central Asian warriors of the time, merciless and fanatical. His valour and profuse liberality to his comrades endeared him to the historian of his age, who praises him as having been a 'beneficent and victorious monarch. . . . His gifts', we are told, 'were bestowed by hundreds of thousands, and his slaughters likewise were by hundreds of thousands.' This attitude of the writer of the Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī recurs in many other historians. With its vigorous exaggeration, it doubtless reflects the moral certainty of the Muslim, but also reminds us that the author was writing to flatter a court audience. The invaders' rapid success was largely due to their pitiless 'frightfulness', which made resistance terribly dangerous, and could not always be evaded by humble submission. It was a natural policy for the conquerors, who, few in number, had frequently to deal with revolts among the great mass of Hindus.

But the story of the Muslim conquest as seen from the Hindu point of view was never written, except to some extent in Rajputana. Such narratives as that of Elphinstone, who worked entirely on materials supplied by Muslim authors, too often reflect the prejudices of the historians who wrote in Persian.

Architecture of the early sultans. The prevailing favourable or at least lenient judgement on the merits of the earlier sultans in India is due in no small measure to the admiration deservedly felt for their architectural works. The 'Qutb' group of buildings at Old Delhi, although named after the saint from Ush who lies buried there, rather than after the first sultan, undoubtedly is in part the work of Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak, who built the noble screen of arches. The question whether the famous Minār was begun by him and completed by Īltutmish, or was wholly built by the later sovereign, has given rise to differences of opinion depending on the interpretation of certain inscriptions.

Indo-Muslim architecture, which derives its peculiar character from the fact that Indian craftsmen necessarily were employed on the
edifices of the foreign faith, dates from the short reign of Qutb-ud-din Aibak. The masterpieces of the novel form of art cost a heavy price by reason of the destruction of ancient buildings and sculptures in other styles perhaps equally meritorious. The materials of no less than twenty-seven Hindu temples were used in the erection of the ‘Qutb’ mosque.

The end of Muhammad, son of Bakhtyar. The ludicrous facility with which Bihar and Bengal had been overrun and annexed tempted Muhammad bin Bakhtyar to a more adventurous enterprise. ‘The ambition of seizing the country of Turkestan and Tibbat [Tibet] began to torment his brain; and he had an army got ready, and about 10,000 horse were organized.’ Unfortunately, the information available is not sufficient to determine exactly either the line of his march or the farthest point of his advance. He seems to have moved through the region now known as the Bogra and Jalpaiguri Districts, and to have crossed a great river supposed to be the Karatoya by a stone bridge of twenty arches, the site of which has not been identified. The rivers have completely changed their courses. The Tista, for instance, now a tributary of the Brahmaputra, formerly joined the Karatoya. He is said to have reached ‘the open country of Tibbat’, but what that phrase may mean it is not easy to say. Beyond a certain point, perhaps to the north of Darjeeling, he was unable to proceed, and was obliged to retreat. His starving force, finding the bridge broken, attempted to ford the river. All were drowned, except about a hundred including the leader, who struggled across somehow. Muhammad, overcome by shame and remorse, took to his bed and died, or, according to another account, was assassinated by ‘Ali Mardan Khalji. His death occurred in the Hijri year 602, equivalent to A.D. 1205–6. Early in the reign of Aurangzeb Mir Jumla invaded Assam and nearly failed as disastrously as his predecessor had done. The mountains to the north of Bengal were never reduced to obedience by any Muslim sovereign.

Sultan Ilutmish. Aram, the son of Qutb-ud-din, who succeeded to the throne, did not inherit his father’s abilities, and was quickly displaced (1211) in favour of his sister’s husband, Ilutmish, corruptly called Altamsh, who assumed the title of Shams-ud-din, ‘the sun of religion’. Much of his time was spent in successful fighting with his rival slave chieftains, Yildiz and Qabacha. In 1229 he received a patent of investiture as Sultan i Azam from the reigning khalif of Baghdad. Before he died, in 1236, he had reduced the Khalji Maliks of Bengal to obedience, and had retaken Gwalior, lost at Qutb-ud-din’s death. He not only brought back under control the territories of his late master, but added to them Malwa and Sind.

The Qutb Minar was built, except the basement story, under his direction about A.D. 1232. He made other important additions to the Qutb group of buildings, and is buried there in a beautiful tomb, ‘one of the richest examples of Hindu art applied to Muslim purposes that Old Delhi affords’. Ilutmish is also responsible for a magnificent
mosque at Ajmer, built like that at Delhi from the materials of Hindu temples.

Chingiz Khān. In his days India narrowly escaped the most terrible of all possible calamities, a visit from Chingiz Khān, the dreaded Great Khān or Khākān of the Mongols. He actually advanced as far as the Indus, in pursuit of Jalāl-ud-dīn Mangbānī, the fugitive sultan of Khwārizm or Khiva, who sought refuge at the court of Delhi, after surprising adventures. The western Panjāb was plundered by the Mongol troopers, but no organized invasion of India took place.

Chingiz Khān was the official title of the Mongol chieftain Temūrje or Tamūrje, born in 1162, who acquired ascendancy early in life over the tribes of Mongolia. About the beginning of the thirteenth century they elected him to be the head of their confederacy and he then adopted the style of Chingiz Khān, probably a corruption of a Chinese title. In the course of a few years he conquered a large portion of China and all the famous kingdoms of central Asia. Balkh, Bokhara, Samarqand, Herat, Ghāzni, and many other cities of renown fell under his merciless hand and were reduced to ruins. The vanquished inhabitants, men, women, and children, were slain literally in millions. He carried his victorious hordes far into Russia to the bank of the Dnieper, and when he died in 1227 ruled a gigantic empire extending from the Pacific to the Black Sea.

The author of the Tabaqāt-i Nāširī, who admired a Muslim, but abhorred a heathen slayer of men, has drawn a vivid sketch of the conqueror, which is worth quoting:

Trustworthy persons have related that the Chingiz Khān, at the time when he came into Khurāsān, was sixty-five [lunar] years old, a man of tall stature, of vigorous build, robust in body, the hair on his face scanty and turned white, with cat’s eyes, possessed of great energy, discernment, genius, and understanding, awe-striking, a butcher, just, resolute, an overthower of enemies, intrepid, sanguinary, cruel.

Sultan Razīyyat-ud-dīn. Sultan ʿItutmīsht, knowing the incapacity of his surviving sons, had nominated his daughter Razīyya or Razīyyat-ud-dīn (‘accepted by religion’) as his successor. But the nobles thought that they knew better and placed on the throne Prince

---

1 The spelling of the name varies much. Howorth gives Chinghiz as the most correct form. Raverty uses both Chingiz and Chingiz. Chingiz seems to be the simplest and safest spelling. Mongol (Mongol) is the same word as Mughal (Mogul, &c.), but it is convenient to confine the term Mongol to the heathen followers of Chingiz, who were mostly ‘narrow-eyed’ people, reserving the term Mughul in its various spellings for the more civilized tribes, largely of Turk blood, who became Muslims in the fourteenth century, and from whom sprang the Chagatāi or Jagatai section of Turks to which Babur and his successors in India belonged. The Turk races ordinarily resemble Europeans in features, and have not the Mongolian ‘narrow eyes’ strongly marked, but Turks and Mongols intermarried freely, and the Mongol blood often asserted itself. It shows in the portraits of Akbar.

2 She also bore the title of Jalāl-ud-dīn (Thomas, Chronicles, p. 138). Ibn Battūta gives her name simply as Razīyyat—his words are wa bintarī tasmī Razīyyat (Defrémery, tome iii, p. 166).
Rukn-ud-din, a worthless debauchee in 1236. After a scandalous reign of a few months he was put out of the way and replaced by his sister, who assumed the title of sultan and did her best to play the part of a man. She took an active part in the wars with Hindus and rebel Muslim chiefs, riding an elephant in the sight of all men. But her sex was against her. In 1240 the Turkish nobles deposed her. Later that year Altuniya, the governor of Bhatinda and an instrument in her overthrow, finding himself unrewarded, married her and attempted to replace her on the throne. He was defeated, and both she and her husband were killed by certain Hindus. The author of the *Tabaqat-i Nasi*, the only contemporary authority for the period, gives Sultan Raziyyat-ud-din a high character from his Muslim point of view. She was, he declares,

a great sovereign, and sagacious, just, beneficent, the patron of the learned, a dispenser of justice, the cherisher of her subjects, and of warlike talent, and was endowed with all the admirable attributes and qualifications necessary for kings; but as she did not attain the destiny in her creation of being computed among men, of what advantage were all these excellent qualifications unto her?

**Sultan Nasi-ud-din.** A son and grandson of Sultan Ùlututmish were then successively enthroned. Both proved to be failures and were removed in favour of Nasi-ud-din, a younger son of Ùlututmish (1246), who managed to retain his life and office for twenty years. The historian, Minhaji Siraj, who has been quoted more than once, held high office under Nasi-ud-din and called his book by his sovereign’s name. His judgement of a liberal patron necessarily is biased, but no other contemporary authority exists, and we must be content with his version of the facts. So far as appears, the sultan lived the life of a fanatical devotee, leaving the conduct of affairs in the hands of Ulugh Khân Balban, his father-in-law and minister.

**Mongol raids.** The Mongols whom Chingiz Khan had left behind, or who crossed the frontier after his retirement, gave constant trouble during the reign. They had occupied and ruined Lahore in 1241–2 and continued to make many inroads on Sind, including Multan. Nasi-ud-din, who had no family, nominated Ulugh Khân Balban as his successor. He died in 1266.

**Suppression of the Meos.** In 1258 and 1259 Balban led campaigns against the turbulent Hindus of the Doab, and in 1260 he attacked the Meos south of Delhi. They had infested the approaches to the capital and had ravaged the Bayana District. Now, in a twenty-days’ campaign they were slaughtered and pillaged. Two hundred and fifty of their leading men were taken back to Delhi for execution. By royal command many of the rebels were cast under the feet of elephants, and the fierce Turks cut the bodies of the Hindus in two. About a hundred met their death at the hands of the flayers, being skinned from...

---

1 Ibn Battuta alleges that Balban murdered Nasi-ud-din.
head to foot; their skins were all stuffed with straw, and some of them were hung over every gate of the city. The plain of Hauz-Rani and the gates of Delhi remembered no punishment like this, nor had one ever heard such a tale of horror.

Even so a second stroke was needed, in July 1260. 'He fell upon the insurgents unawares, and captured them all, to the number of 12,000—men, women, and children—whom he put to the sword. Thanks be to God for this victory of Islam.'

Sultan Balban. Balban, as Elphinstone observes, 'being already in possession of all the powers of king, found no difficulty in assuming the title'. He had been one of the 'Forty Slaves' attached to Sultan Ilutmish, most of whom attained to high positions. Balban's first care was to execute the survivors of the forty, in order to relieve himself of the dangers of rivalry. He had no regard for human life, and no scruples about shedding blood. He was, indeed, a 'ruthless king'. 'Fear and awe of him took possession of all men's hearts', and he maintained such pomp and dignity at his court that all beholders were impressed with respect for his person. He never laughed. His justice, executed without respect of persons, was stern and bloody. He secured his authority in the provinces by an organized system of espionage, and spies who failed to report incidents of importance were hanged. He refused to employ Hindu officials.

In the early years of his reign, Balban had again to clear the Delhi approaches of Meos, and to hold them down he built a fort and line of police posts. The Doab, which remained rebellious, was distributed in fiefs to nobles who would clear the jungles and root out the Hindu brigands. New forts were built, and Afghan garrisons were settled on the land to guard communications with Bengal.

The threat of the Mongols, now in Ghazni, was checked by the refortification of Lahore in 1270, and by the prowess of Balban's cousin, Sunjakr. With Sunjark's death, by poison, the way for new raids was opened, until Balban appointed his elder son Muhammad to guard the frontier from Multan. The prince utterly routed the invaders in 1279.

The three years from 1279 onwards were spent in suppressing the rebellion in Bengal of a Turki noble named Tughril who had dared to assume royal state. The rebel's family were exterminated. The country-side was terrified at the sight of the rows of gibbets set up in the streets of the provincial capital. The governorship of Bengal continued to be held by members of Balban's family until 1338, when the revolt occurred which resulted in the definite independence of the province. However horrible the cruelty of Balban may appear, it served its purpose and maintained a certain degree of order in rough times. When he died 'all security of life and property was lost, and no one had any confidence in the stability of the kingdom'.

Refugee princes. Balban's magnificent court was honoured by the presence of fifteen kings and princes who had fled to Delhi for
refuge from the horrors of the Mongol devastations. Many eminent literary men, the most notable being Amir Khusru the poet, were associated with the refugee princes. The sultan’s main anxiety was caused by the fear of a Mongol invasion on a large scale, which prevented him from undertaking conquests of new territory. His eldest and best-loved son was killed in a fight with the heathens in March 1285. That sorrow shook the strong constitution of Balban, the ‘wary old wolf, who had held possession of Delhi for sixty years’. He died in 1286 at an advanced age.

Sultan Qaiqabad. Balban left no heir fit to succeed him. In those days no definite rule of succession existed and the nobles were accustomed to select whom they pleased by a rough election. Qaiqabad, a grandson of Balban, aged about eighteen years, who was placed on the throne, although his father was living in Bengal, as governor of that province, disgraced himself by scandalous debauchery, and was removed after a short reign.

End of the Slave Kings. Balban’s hopes of establishing a dynasty were thus frustrated, and the stormy rule of the Slave Kings came to an end. Their chroniclers present them to us as either fierce fanatics or worthless debauchees. The fanatics possessed the merits of courage and activity in warfare, with a rough sense of justice when dealing with Muslims. Hindu idolaters and Mongol devil-worshippers had no rights in their eyes and deserved no fate better than to be ‘sent to hell’. The Muslim historians delight in telling of holy wars and they stress that ‘the army is the source and means of government’, but it is clear that the sultans were also ready to accept Hindus as vassals, to engage them as officers and troops, and regularly to employ them in the revenue administration. Politically, they acquired a tolerably firm hold on the regions now called the Panjab, Uttar Pradesh, with Bihar, Gwalior, Sind, and some parts of Rajasthan and central India. Bengal was practically independent, although Balban’s severities enforced formal submission to the suzerainty of Delhi and the occasional payment of tribute. Yet within this area Hindu Katehr was independent and but rarely invaded, and Hindu chiefs remained in turbulent vigour in the Doab. Malwa, Gujarat, and all the rest of India continued to be governed by numerous Hindu monarchs of widely varying importance to whom the tragedies of the sultanate were matters of indifference. Even their control of the Panjab was disputed by the Mongols, from the time of Chingiz Khan (1221).

**CHRONOLOGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sultan MUHAMMAD of GHUR (Ghuri, with titles of Shihâb-ud-din and Muizz-ud-din, son of Sâm)</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Multan and Uch</td>
<td>1175–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defeated by raja of Gujarat</td>
<td>1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposed Khusru Malik of Lahore</td>
<td>1186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First battle of Tarain</td>
<td>1191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLAVE KINGS</th>
<th>243</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second battle of Tarain</td>
<td>1192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of Delhi, Benares, Bihar, &amp;c.</td>
<td>1193-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conquest of Bengal</td>
<td>1199-1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Kalanjar</td>
<td>1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of the sultan</td>
<td>1206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sultans of Delhi; the Slave Kings

| QUTB-UD-DIN AIBAK or IBAK | 1206 |
| ARAM SHAH                  | 1210 |
| ILTUTMISH (Altamsh)        | 1211 |
| Mongol invasion            | 1221, 1222 |
| Death of Chingiz Khan      | 1227 |
| RUKN-UD-DIN and RAZIYYAT-UD-DIN (Raziyya) | 1236 |
| Bahrám, &c.                | 1240 |
| NAŞIR-UD-DIN MAHMÜD         | 1246 |
| GHIYAS-UD-DIN BALBAN        | 1266 |
| MUİZ-UD-DIN QAİQABAD       | 1286 |
| Murder of Qaiqabad; end of dynasty | 1290 |

AUTHORITIES

The leading contemporary authority, and to a large extent the only one, is the *Tabaqāt-i Nāsiri*, translated in full by Raverty (London, 1881), with learned but diffuse annotation. Part of the work is translated in E. & D., vol. ii. Other Persian authorities are given in that volume and vol. iii. Firishta mostly copies from the *Tabaqāt-i Nāsiri* through the *Tabaqāt-i Akbari*. Raverty’s *Notes on Afghanistan* (London, 1888), a valuable, though an ill-arranged and bulky book, has been serviceable to me.

CHAPTER 2

The sultanate of Delhi continued; A.D. 1290 to 1340; the Khilji and Tughluq dynasties

Sultan Jalāl-ud-dīn Khiljī. Qaiqabad having been brutally killed, a high official named Fīrūz Shāh, of the Khalj or Khiljī tribe, who was placed on the throne by a section of the nobles, assumed the title of Jalāl-ud-dīn. Baranī states that Jalāl-ud-dīn ‘came of a race different from the Turks’, but in fact the Khiljīs were a Turkish tribe though long settled in the Garmsīr in Afghanistan. Jalāl-ud-dīn was an aged man of about seventy when elected. His election was so unpopular that he did not venture to reside in Delhi, and was obliged to live in Qaiqabad’s palace in the village of Kilokhri, a short distance outside, which became known as Naushahr or ‘Newtown’. The year after his accession a famine occurred so severe that many Hindus drowned themselves in the Jumna. The administration of the sultan is criticized as having been too lenient, and it seems probable that he was too old for his work. On one occasion he is recorded to have lost his temper and to have cruelly executed an unorthodox holy man named Sīdī Maulā. That irregular execution or murder was believed to have been the cause of the sultan’s evil fate. Mongols at least 100,000 strong invaded India in 1292, reached Sunām, but were there defeated by Fīrūz, and agreed to withdraw, unmolested. Many of the Mongols elected to stay in India, becoming nominally Muslims. They were spoken of as New Muslims, and settled down at Kilokhri and other villages near Delhi.

Murder of Jalāl-ud-dīn. In 1294 ‘Alā-ud-dīn, son of the sultan’s brother, and also son-in-law of Jalāl-ud-dīn, obtained permission for an expedition into Malwa. But he went much farther, plunging into the heart of the Deccan, and keeping his movements concealed from the court. He marched through Berar and Khandesh, and having invested his capital compelled Rāmachandra, the Yādava king of Deogiri and the western Deccan, to surrender Ellichpur (Ilichpur). ‘Alā-ud-dīn collected treasure to an amount unheard of, and showed no disposition to share it with his sovereign. In fact, his reasonable intentions were patent to everybody except his doting old uncle and father-in-law, who closed his ears against all warnings and behaved like a person infatuated. Ultimately, Jalāl-ud-dīn was persuaded to place himself in his nephew’s power at Kara in the Allahabad District. When the sultan grasped the traitor’s hand the signal was given. He was thrown down and decapitated. His head was stuck on a spear and carried round the camp. Lavish distribution of gold secured the adhesion of the army to the usurper, and ‘Alā-ud-dīn became sultan (July 1296).
**The Khiljis**

*Thagi*. Jalāl-ud-dīn, although he did not deserve his cruel fate, was wholly unfit to rule. One act of leniency was particularly silly. At some time during his reign about 1,000 thags were arrested in Delhi. The sultan would not allow one of them to be executed. He adopted the imbecile plan of putting them into boats and transporting them to Lakhnauti (Gaur), the capital of Bengal. The story, told by Zīā-ud-dīn Barānī, is of special interest as being the earliest known historical notice of *thagi*.

**Sultan 'Alā-ud-dīn Khilji.** The African traveller Ibn Batūtā in the fourteenth century expressed the opinion that 'Alā-ud-dīn deserved to be considered 'one of the best sultans'. That somewhat surprising verdict is not justified either by the manner in which 'Alā-ud-dīn attained power or by the history of his acts as sultan. Zīā-ud-dīn Barānī, the historian who gives the fullest account of his reign, dwells on his 'crafty cruelty', and on his addiction to disgusting vice. 'He shed more innocent blood than ever Pharaoh was guilty of', and Barānī points the moral, telling us that he 'did not escape retribution for the blood of his patron'. He ruthlessly killed off everybody who could be supposed to endanger his throne, cutting up root and branch all the nobles who had served under his uncle, save three only. Even innocent women and children were not spared, a new horror. 'Up to this time no hand had ever been laid upon wives and children on account of men's misdeeds.' The evil precedent set by 'one of the best sultans' was often followed in later times.

**Political events.** In 1297 an army was dispatched against Gujarat. The territories of the Baghela Rajput ruler were overran and annexed, enormous booty was taken from the ports, and Kamalā Devi and Kāfūr, the young eunuch, were secured for 'Alā-ud-dīn.

In 1301 Ranthambhor was captured after a long siege, the Rajput defender Hamīr Deva was taken and killed, while his family committed jauhar. To this conquest was added that of Chitor, taken in 1303 and held until 1311. Tod graphically describes the closing scenes of the struggle and the immolation of the Rajput women. The death in battle of the raja of Malwa in 1305 led to the annexation of Ujjain, Mandu, Dhar, and Chanderi.

**Expeditions to the south.** These successes were followed by a series of most profitable raids into the Deccan, conducted by the sultan's favourite, Kāfūr. He first compelled the submission of Rāmchandradeva, the Yādava ruler of Devagiri who was taken to Delhi, but returned to the Deccan as a tribute-paying vassal. Early in 1310 the Kākatiya ruler of Warangal, Pratāprudradeva I, was besieged in his capital and forced to buy off the raiders. Later in the same year Kāfūr surprised the Hoysala king, Ballāla III, and secured further rich booty on his surrender in February 1311. One further raid into the deep south was then made and the capital of Mā'bar was looted.

1 *va kaʻna min kha'yār alsalātīn, 'il fut au nombre des meilleurs sultans* (Defrémery, tome iii, p. 184).
before Kāfūr was turned back. He arrived at Delhi with an extraordinary accumulation of plunder in October 1311. On Rāmchandradeva’s death in 1312, his rebellious son was driven out and Devagiri was annexed.

Mongol raids. Within this period there had been several Mongol incursions into the Panjab. Those of 1296 and 1297 were raids, that of 1299 under Qutlugh Khwāja was planned as a conquest. He was met outside Delhi by the sultan’s army, and was there routed. 'Alā-ud-din was particularly pleased by this victory, for in achieving it his too brilliant general Zafar Khān lost his life. Later the Mongols were generally held in check by the guardian of the marches, Ghāzī Malik (later Ghīyās-ud-dīn Tughluq). Internal security was achieved by wholesale massacre of the Mongol converts, the New Muslims, who had settled near Delhi.

Administrative measures. These political successes were backed by administrative measures. The conjunction of a Mongol raid to the Jumna, a disaster in Warangal, and a difficult campaign in Rajputana, made an increase in the standing army seem necessary, and a number of rebellions raised the problem of internal security. The standing army at the capital was increased considerably. To provide for it, at a time when prices were inflated, the sultan controlled the price of commodities in the central areas, ordered the payment of the revenue in kind, and stored large quantities of grain. His measures certainly succeeded in preserving an artificial cheapness in the markets of the capital even during years of drought, but at the cost of infinite oppression. Conviviality among the nobles—that cloak for conspiracy—was forbidden. The system of espionage was enlarged and intensified. Above all the means of rebellion were denied to would-be rebels. Barānī says, ‘the sultan ordered that wherever there was a village held by proprietary right, in free gift, or as a religious endowment, it should by one stroke of the pen be brought under the exchequer. . . . The people were so absorbed in obtaining the means of livelihood that the very name of rebellion was never mentioned.’ Rules were likewise drawn up ‘for grinding down the Hindus and for depriving them of that wealth and property which fosters disaffection and rebellion’. The cultivated land was measured and the government took half the gross produce instead of the one-sixth provided by immemorial rule. ‘No Hindu could hold up his head, and in their houses no sign of silver or gold . . . or of any superfluity was to be seen.’

Buildings and literature. ‘Alā-ud-dīn loved building and executed many magnificent works. He built a new Delhi called Šīrī on the site now marked by the village of Šāhpur, but his edifices there were pulled down by Sher Šāh and have wholly disappeared. He made extensive additions to the ‘Qutb’ group of sacred structures, and began a gigantic minār which was intended to far surpass the noble Qutb Minār. The unfinished stump still stands. When building Šīrī he remembered that ‘it is a condition that in a new building blood
should be sprinkled; he therefore sacrificed some thousands of goat-bearded Mughals for the purpose'.

In early life he was illiterate, but after his accession acquired the art of reading Persian to some extent. In spite of his personal indifference to learning several eminent literary men attended his court, of whom the most famous is Amir Khusrū, a voluminous and much admired author in both verse and prose.

Death of 'Alā-ud-dīn. The tyrant suffered from many troubles in his latter days, and ‘success no longer attended him’. This may perhaps be attributable—as Barānī believed—to his disregard of clerical authority in the pursuit of a purely secular state policy. His naturally violent temper became uncontrollable, and he allowed his guilty infatuation for Malik Kafūr to influence all his actions. His health failed, dropsy developed, and in January 1316 he died. ‘Some say that the infamous Malik Kafūr helped his disease to a fatal termination.’

Malik Kafūr placed an infant son of the sultan on the throne, reserving all power to himself. He imprisoned, blinded, or killed most of the other members of the royal family, but his criminal rule lasted only thirty-five days. After the lapse of that time he and his companions were beheaded by their slave guards.

Sultan Qutb-ud-dīn Mubārak. Qutb-ud-dīn or Mubārak Khān, a son of 'Alā-ud-dīn, who had escaped destruction, was taken out of confinement and enthroned. The young sovereign was wholly evil. He was infatuated with a youth named Hasan, originally an outcast parvāri, whom he ennobled under the style of Khusrū Khān. ‘During his reign of four years and four months, the sultan attended to nothing but drinking, listening to music, debauchery, and pleasure, scattering gifts, and gratifying his lusts.’ By good luck the Mongols did not attack. If they had done so no one could have opposed them. Qutb-ud-dīn Mubārak attained two military successes. His officers tightened the hold of his government on Gujarat, and he in person led an army into the Deccan against Deogiri, where the raja, Harpāl Déo, had revolted. The Hindu prince failed to offer substantial resistance and was barbarously flayed alive (1318). After his triumphant return from the Deccan the sultan became still worse than before.

He gave way to wrath and obscenity, to severity, revenge, and heartlessness. He dipped his hands in innocent blood, and he allowed his tongue to utter disgusting and abusive words to his companions and attendants... He cast aside all regard for decency, and presented himself decked out in the trinkets and apparel of a female before his assembled company;

and did many other evil deeds.

Ultimately the degraded creature was killed by his minion, Khusrū Khān, aided by his outcast brethren, ‘and the basis of the dynasty of Alā-ud-dīn was utterly razed’.

The usurper favoured Hindus as against Muslims, and it was said that ‘Delhi had once more come under Hindu rule.’ The low-born triumph did not last long. After a few months the usurper was defeated
and beheaded by Ghāzī Malik, a Qaraunah Turk noble, governor of Debālpur in the Panjab. Everything was in confusion and no male scion of the royal stock had been left in existence.

Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq Shāh. The nobles having thus a free hand, and recognizing the fact that the disordered state required a master, elected Ghāzī Malik to fill the vacant throne. He assumed the style of Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq, and is often called Tughluq Shāh (A.D. 1321). His father, a Turk, had been a slave of Balban; his mother, a Jat woman, was Indian born. His conduct justified the confidence bestowed on him by his colleagues. He restored a reasonable amount of order to the internal administration and took measures to guard against the ever-pressing danger from Mongol inroads.

He sent his son Jūnā Khān into the Deccan, where the countries conquered by 'Alā-ud-dīn had refused obedience. The prince reached Warangal, now in the eastern part of the Nizam’s dominions, and undertook the siege of the fort. The strong walls of mud resisted his efforts, pestilence broke out, his men deserted owing to intrigues among his officers, and he was forced to return to Delhi. But a second expedition was more successful, resulting in the capture of both Bidar and Warangal. At that time Warangal had recovered its independence, and was under the rule of a Hindu raja. The sultan meantime, having been invited to intervene in a disputed succession, had marched across Bengal as far as Sunārgāon near Dacca, and on his way home had annexed Tirhut. He left Bengal practically independent, although he brought to Delhi as a prisoner one of the claimants to the provincial throne.

Murder of Tughluq Shāh. His son Jūnā, or Muhammad, who had returned from the south, was then in charge of the capital. The sultan desired his son to build for him a temporary reception pavilion or pleasure-house on the bank of the Jumna. Jūnā Khān entrusted the work to Ahmad, afterwards known as Khwāja Jahān, who was head of the public works department and in his confidence. The prince asked and obtained permission to parade the elephants fully accoutred before his father, who took up his station in the new building for afternoon prayers. The confederates arranged that the elephants when passing should collide with the timber structure, which accordingly fell on the sultan and his favourite younger son, Mahmūd, who accompanied him. Jūnā Khān made a pretense of sending for picks and shovels to dig out his father and brother, but purposely hindered action being taken until it was too late. The sultan was found bending over the boy’s body, and if he still breathed, as some people assert that he did, he was finished off (A.D. 1325). After nightfall his body was removed and interred in the massive sepulchre which he had prepared for himself in Tughluqābād, the mighty fortress which he had built near Delhi.¹

¹ The facts as recorded by Ibn Batūta (vol. iii, p. 213) are certain, having been related to the traveller by Shaikh Rukn-ud-din, the saint, who was present when the carefully arranged ‘accident’ occurred. No reason whatever exists for giving Jūnā Khān the ‘benefit of the doubt’.
Accession of Muhammad bin Tughluq, February 1325. The parricide gathered the fruits of his crime, as 'Ala-ud-din Khilji had done, and seated himself on the throne without opposition.\footnote{1} He occupied it for twenty-six years of tyranny and then died in his bed. Like 'Ala-ud-din he secured favour by lavish largess, scattering without stint the golden treasure stored by his father within the grim walls of Tughluqabad. It was reported that Tughluq Shâh had constructed a reservoir filled with molten gold in a solid mass.

Ibn Batûta; character of the Sultan. Our knowledge of the second sovereign of the Tughluq dynasty, who appears in history as Muhammad bin (son of) Tughluq, is unusually detailed, because, in addition to the narrative of an unusually good Indian historian (Ziâ-ud-din Barani), we possess the observations of the African traveller, Ibn Batûta, who spent several years at the court and in the service of the sultan until April 1347, when he succeeded in retiring from his dangerous employment. His account of his Indian experiences, with which alone we are concerned, bears the stamp of truth on every page. Most of his statements concerning Muhammad bin Tughluq are based on direct personal knowledge.\footnote{2} Ziâ-ud-din of Baran (Bulandshahr) also was a contemporary official and wrote in the reign of Muhammad bin Tughluq's cousin and successor, Firuz Shâh. Although he naturally does not exhibit the impartial detachment of the foreign observer, his narrative is full of vivid detail.

Notwithstanding that Muhammad bin Tughluq was guilty of acts which the pen shrinks from recording, and that he wrought untold misery in the course of his long reign, he was not wholly evil. He established hospitals and almshouses, and his generosity to learned Muslims was unprecedented. It was even possible to describe him with truth both as 'the humblest of men' and also as an intense egotist. Elphinstone's summary of his enigmatic character deserves quotation:

It is admitted, on all hands, that he was the most eloquent and accomplished prince of his age. His letters, both in Arabic and Persian, were admired for their elegance long after he had ceased to reign. His memory was extraordinary; and, besides a thorough knowledge of logic and the philosophy of the Greeks, he was much attached to mathematics and to physical science; and used himself to attend sick persons for the purpose of watching the symptoms of any extraordinary disease. He was regular in his devotions, abstained from wine, and conformed in his private life to all the moral precepts of his religion. In war he was distinguished for his gallantry and personal activity, so that his contemporaries were justified in esteeming him as one of the wonders of the age.

Yet the whole of these splendid talents and accomplishments were given to him in vain; they were accompanied by a perversion of judgement, which, after every allowance for the intoxication of absolute power, leaves us in doubt whether he was not affected by some degree of insanity.

\footnote{1} 'Lorsque le sultan Toghoîk fut mort, son fils Mohammed s'empara du royaume, sans rencontrer d'adversaire ni de rebelle.'
\footnote{2} 'Quant aux aventures de ce roi-ci, la plupart sont au nombre de ce que j'ai vu durant mon séjour dans ses États' (vol. iii, p. 216).
Moreover, the sultan, like Jahangir afterwards, believed himself to be a just man, and was persuaded that all his atrocities were in accordance with the principles of justice and Muslim law. There is no reason to suppose that his conscience troubled him. On the contrary, he deliberately defended his conduct against criticism and avowed his resolve to continue his course to the end. ‘I punish’, he said, ‘the most trifling act of contumacy with death. This I will do until I die, or until the people act honestly, and give up rebellion and contumacy. . . . I have dispensed great wealth among them, but they have not become friendly and loyal. Thus, he went on, unmoved from his fell purpose, until his inhuman tyranny caused the break-up of the empire of Delhi.

Premising that the authorities are discrepant concerning the order of events, and that the chronology of the reign is consequently uncertain to some extent, the leading events of the Sultan’s rule will now be narrated.

Early rebellions. The first measures of the reign were designed to bring the empire fully under control, and to give order to the administration. By the end of 1328 Muhammad’s grip was complete, two rebellions, the one of his cousin Bahā-ud-dīn Garshāsp in the Deccan (1327), the other of Kishlū Khān, the governor of Multan and Sind (1328) having been suppressed by Khwāja Jahān and by the sultan respectively. The defeat of Garshāsp had also involved the destruction of the raja of Kampili, who had given him asylum. The conquest of Warangal, Ma’bar, and Dwarsamudra, and the establishment of Muslim power in Madura in the same period left only the Hoysala power of Ballāla III independent in the Deccan.

Administrative measures. Revenue records for all the provinces were ordered to be compiled, and the attempt was made to model all upon the pattern of the central area. With this change went an enhancement of the taxation of the rich but turbulent Doab, a move which echoes that of ’Alā-ud-dīn Khiljī. Barānī rhetorically states that the demand was increased ten or twentyfold and he gives a harrowing picture of the exactions of officials, the rebellion of the peasants, and the ruthless use of force to suppress them. Barānī perhaps exaggerates through personal interest in this his home country, but that there was distress, added to by local famine, is certain.

Evacuation of Delhi. The movement of the capital from Delhi to Daulatabad in 1327, which involved the court, army, and officials, together with the servants and tradesmen dependent upon them, was another source of discontent and hardship. But suggestions that it was punitive in purpose, a product of Muhammad’s petulance, and carried out with ruthless completeness seem rather improbable. Daulatabad was chosen for its position, in an attempt to solve the military and administrative problems of an empire astride the Vindhya. The need to increase Muslim numbers and influence in the south probably also played a part. Ibn Batūta relates that the very cripples were brutally evicted from Delhi, but the continuance of a mint in
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Delhi and of building activity, and the sultan’s re-equipment of his army there only two years later, suggest that the move was for nobles and officials only.

Forced currency. A more astonishing experiment was the issue, in 1330, of a token coinage. The motive is not clear, though the shortage of silver or the needs of the war chest may have been at work. It does not seem probable that financial stringency was the cause. For three years the issue of coins of brass or copper, stamped with legends denoting their value as if the pieces were silver, continued. But as there was no such close supervision as was exercised over the paper currency in China, there was widespread fraud.

"The promulgation of this edict turned the house of every Hindu into a mint, and the Hindus of the various provinces coined millions and hundreds of thousands of copper coins. With these they paid their tribute, and with these they purchased horses, arms, and fine things of all kinds..." Eventually the issue had to be recalled; repayment was made in gold or silver at the face value of the copper coins, at tremendous cost.

The Mongols. In 1328–9 Tarmāshīrīn, Khān of the Chagatāī section of the Mongols, crossed into India. He had been heavily defeated in 1326 in his attempt to invade Khurasan, and his rapid move, almost to Delhi, seems to have been a light raiding venture. The silence about this raid of Ibn Batūta, who in 1332 met the Khān and reported a friendship between him and the sultan, rather supports this view.

Expeditions to the north-west. Muhammad at one point planned an attack upon Abu Said the profligate Persian ruler, who suffered a serious revolt by his guardian and a triple change in the governorship of Khurasan in the years 1329–32. The sultan sought Egyptian support by the embassy of 1331–2, and was on good terms with Tarmāshīrīn in Transoxiana. But though a very large army was assembled and maintained at great cost for a year, the project was abandoned, possibly owing to the deposition of Tarmāshīrīn.

A second expedition—Ferishta’s expedition to China—was directed against the hill states of the Kumaon region. Though Ibn Batūta says that this Qarachil expedition did secure the submission of the hill chiefs, there was a disastrous loss of men among the hills, which made the venture a costly failure. Nagarkot (Kangra) was, however, taken in 1337.

But by that date Muhammad’s empire, far larger than that under the rule of any of his Muslim predecessors, was beginning to fall apart. The early revolts, which were many, had been ruthlessly suppressed. Later the sultan’s tyranny became so intolerable, and the resources at his command so reduced, that he was unable to resist rebellion or to prevent the break-up of the empire. The hostility of the native nobility to the foreign adventurers whom Muhammad favoured, and the opposition of the Ulema to a ruler who steadily disregarded their
advice and undermined their privileged position hastened the decline.

The turning-point was reached in 1334–5 when Ma'bar, or Coromandal, revolted and escaped from the Delhi tyranny. The decline and fall of the sultanate, which may be dated from that year, will be the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3

The decline and fall of the sultanate of Delhi, A.D. 1340–1526; the Tughluq dynasty concluded; Timur; the Sayyids; the Lodī dynasty; Islam in Indian life

Rebellion in the south. In 1334 Ahsan Shāh, governor of Ma’bar, rebelled, striking coin in his own name. The sultan marched south from Delhi in 1335 and passed through Bidar to Warangal. There, however, he and most of his army were stricken by pestilence, so that the advance was discontinued. Ma’bar was never recovered.

During the return march Muhammad bin Tughluq was able to view the effects of a disastrous famine in Malwa and around Delhi. A famine relief scheme, with payments for specific agricultural tasks, was introduced, but the people were too exhausted to make use of the money. Later the inhabitants of Delhi were moved to a temporary town in Oudh where adequate supplies were available.

The Warangal disaster, and rumours of the sultan’s death, led to a crop of revolts—by the Mongol Hulāgū at Lahore, by Malik Hoshang at Daulatabad, and by the son of Ahsan Shāh at Hansi. These were broken. In Bengal, however, rebellion succeeded.

Revolt of Bengal. Bengal had been ruled since the close of the twelfth century by governors who were expected to recognize the suzerainty of Delhi and to send tribute more or less regularly to court. We have seen how Balban suppressed with merciless ferocity Tughril Khān’s attempt to attain formal independence. After the extermination of Tughril Khān and his followers, the governorship was held by Balban’s second son, the father of Sultan Qaiqabad, and after him by other members of Balban’s family. A contest between two brothers for the viceregal throne resulted, as already mentioned, in the interference of Tughluq Shāh, who marched across Bengal and carried off to Delhi Bahādur Shāh, the claimant whose pretensions had been disallowed. The captive was pardoned and sent back to Bengal by Muhammad bin Tughluq, but rebelled unsuccessfully. He was killed and his stuffed skin was hawked about the empire.

In 1337–8 (A.H. 739) Fakhr-ud-din or Fakhra started a rebellion in eastern Bengal, which eventually involved the whole province and brought about its complete separation, under three rulers, from the sultanate of Delhi. Muhammad bin Tugluq was too much occupied elsewhere to be able to assert his sovereignty over Bengal. He let the province go, and it continued to retain its independence until reconquered by Akbar. Occasional ceremonial admissions of the superior rank of the sultan or padshah of Delhi did not impair the substantial independence of the kings of Bengal.
Later revolts. The historians give ample details of the endless revolts which marked the latter years of Muhammad bin Tughluq’s disastrous reign, and of his attempts at suppression, in some measure successful. ‘The people were never tired of rebelling, nor the king of punishing.’ One such was the revolt of Malik Shāhū Lodi in Multan, which ended in the flight of the rebel to Afghanistan. Of this Sir W. Haig says, ‘the subsequent rebellions in Gujarat and the Deccan were partly due to the severity of the restrictions placed upon Afghans in India in consequence of Shāhū’s revolt’. Another source of trouble lay in the increasing use of the system of farming provinces to the highest bidder, for not merely was the system oppressive to the people, but contractors unable to fulfil their contracts broke into rebellion.

By 1342 order had been restored in the north, but Muhammad felt the need for outside sanction and support. This he sought from the Khalif, living in Egypt, whose envoy, when he arrived with a robe and farman, was received with extravagant veneration. Muhammad bin Tughluq professed himself to be merely the vicegerent of the Khalif, removed his own name from the coinage, and replaced it by that of the supreme ruler of Islam. Firūz Shāh, the successor of Muhammad, also secured investiture from the Egyptian Khalif, and was as proud of the honour as his cousin had been.

The supersession in 1344–5 of Qutlugh Khān, governor of the Deccan, and the reorganization of the province, with Malwa, into four revenue divisions under new men pledged to increase the revenues caused further unrest. Attacks upon a whole class of officials, the ‘centurions’, as nuclei of disaffection, only served to spread the disorder to Gujarat.

It is needless to follow the wearisome story through all its horrors. The sultan, after ineffectual efforts to recover the Deccan, where he retained nothing except Daulatabad, moved into Gujarat in order to suppress the disorders of that province, where he spent three rainy seasons. He quitted Gujarat late in 1350 to pursue a rebel, and crossed the Indus into Sind, although his health had failed. While he was still on the bank of the river and a considerable distance from Thatha (Tattah), the capital of Lower Sind, his illness increased and developed into a violent fever which killed him in March 1351. Thus ‘the sultan was freed from his people, and the people from their sultan’. It is astonishing that such a monster should have retained power for twenty-six years, and then have died in his bed. The misery caused by his savage misrule is incalculable. Politically, he destroyed the hardly-won supremacy of the Delhi sultanate.

Vijayanagar and Bahmani kingdoms. A few years earlier the southern expansion of the Muslim power had been checked, and territory had been lost to the Hindus by the rapid rise of the kingdom of the rayas of Vijayanagar to the south of the Krishna. The traditional date for the foundation of the city is 1336. Ten years later the new kingdom had become an important power.
In 1347 the rebellion of Hasan or Zafar Khān, an officer of the sultan, and either an Afghan or a Turk, laid the foundation of the great Bahmani kingdom, with its capital at Kulbagh or Ahsanábād.

The history of both the Bahmani and Vijayanagar kingdoms or empires will be narrated with considerable fullness in Book V and need not be pursued farther in this place.

Court of the sultan. The arrangements and ceremonial of the court of Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq differed widely from those, mainly based upon the Persian model, which were observed by Akbar and his successors, as described in detail by Abu-1 Fazl and numerous European travellers. At the sultan’s court the proceedings were dominated by the forms of religion, each ceremony being preceded by the ejaculation ‘In the name of God’, and precedence being given to theologians. The Mughul ceremonial, on the contrary, was purely secular, precedence being given first to members of the royal family and then to officials according to rank.

Executions. The interior of the sultan’s palace was approached by three gates in succession. Outside the first gate were platforms on which the executioners sat. The persons condemned were executed outside the gate, where their bodies lay exposed for three days.

Audience-halls. The second gate opened on a spacious audience-hall for the general public.

The ‘scribes of the gate’ sat at the third portal, which could not be passed without the authorization of the sultan, who gave his formal audiences inside in the ‘Hall of a Thousand Columns’. The columns were of varnished wood, and the ceiling was of planks, admirably painted. The formal audience usually was given after prayers in the afternoon, but sometimes at daybreak. Special ceremonial was observed on the occasions of the two great Id festivals (‘Id-ul fitr and ‘Id-ul kurbān).

Meals in public. The Mughul sovereign always dined alone in the private apartments of the palace. Muhammad bin Tughluq used to dine in the audience-hall and share his meal with about twenty persons of eminence.

He also provided a public banquet twice a day, once before noon and again in the afternoon. The order of precedence was the same as that observed at levées, the judges and theologians being served first. The menu included loaves like cakes; other loaves split and filled with sweet paste; rice, roast meats, fowls, and mince.1

Accession of Firuz Shāh, 1351. The death of the sultan left his army camped on the bank of the Indus masterless and helpless. The fighting force, as usual in India, was hampered by a crowd of women, children, and camp followers. When it attempted to start on its long

1 Ibn Batūta, transl. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, tome iii, pp. 217-42. The whole account, which is well worth reading, has not been translated at all in E. & D.; but some details from another and less authoritative author are given in vol iii, pp. 575 ff. For Alā-ud-din see Zia-ud-din Barani in E. & D., vol. iii, p. 158.
homeward march it was assailed by Sind rebels and Mongol banditti. Much baggage was lost, and the women and children perished. Firuz Shâh, the first cousin of the deceased sovereign and governor of one-fourth of the kingdom, was then in the camp, but was unwilling to assert himself and occupy the seat of his terrible relative. The army endured utter misery for three days by reason of the want of guidance. Then all the chief men, Muslims and Hindus alike, decided that the only person who could deliver the expeditionary force from destruction was Firuz Shâh. He was enthroned in the camp on 23 March 1351. The existence of a leader soon effected an improvement, and the new sultan ultimately succeeded in bringing back the survivors of the army to Delhi through Multan and Debalpur.

A pretender. Meanwhile, Khwaja Jahân, the aged governor of Delhi, misled by an untrue report of Firuz Shâh’s death, had set up as sultan a child, probably, though not certainly, the son of Muhammad bin Tughluq. When Firuz Shâh approached the capital, Khvaja Jahân, finding resistance hopeless, surrendered. The sultan spared him, but he was assassinated shortly after.

Personality of Firuz. Firuz Shâh was scarcely a suitable choice as successor to Muhammad bin Tughluq, for he lacked the generalship necessary for the re-establishment of the authority of Delhi over the lost provinces. In his three main expeditions he showed a vacillating weakness at moments of crisis and despite favourable opportunities he refused even to attempt the subjugation of the Deccan. He led two campaigns against Bengal, in 1353–4 and 1359, and on both occasions after vainly besieging the Bengal ruler in his Brahmaputra stronghold, retreated. The second expedition did, however, include a successful raid on Puri, in Orissa. In 1362 he set out to avenge his sufferings in Sind, assembling some 90,000 cavalry and a supply fleet. The result was disastrous. Thatah was stubbornly defended, supplies failed, and the horses perished of some epidemic disease. Under pressure of dire necessity retreat to Gujarat was ordered. The army, misled, it was alleged, by treacherous guides, suffered unutterable misery in crossing the Rann of Cutch. For six months no news from it reached Delhi, and everybody believed that the sultan had perished. Order was maintained by Khân Jahân, the resourceful minister in charge of the capital, and in due course the sultan with the remnant of his army emerged in Gujarat.

After receiving reinforcements and equipping a fresh force Firuz Shâh again advanced into Sind from Gujarat. On this occasion the invaders secured the crops in time, with the result that the people of the country in their turn suffered from famine. When Thatah appeared to be seriously threatened the Jâm with another chief surrendered, and accompanied Firuz Shâh to Delhi, where they took up their residence, apparently as hostages. A relative of theirs continued to rule at Thatah, so that the government of Delhi failed to secure any substantial benefit from two costly campaigns and a final nominal success.
The only flash of his predecessor’s fire was seen in the vengeance, extended over five years, taken upon the raja of Katehr for his assassination of the governor of Budaun: ‘in those years not an acre of land was cultivated, no man slept in house, and the death of the three Sayyads was avenged by that of countless thousands of Hindus’.

Personal tastes of Firûz Shâh. He was extremely devout, although he allowed himself the kingly privilege of drinking wine, and spent much time in hunting. He was fond of the study of history, and his master-passion was a love for building. He followed the example of his predecessors, by building a new Delhi called Firûzbâd, which included the site of Indarpot or Indraprastha, famous in epic legend. The two inscribed Asoka columns now standing near Delhi were brought there by order of Firûz Shâh, the one from Topra in the Ambala District, and the other from Meerut. The contemporary historian Shams-i-Sirâj ’Affîf describes in interesting detail the ingenious devices used to ensure the safe transport and erection of the huge monoliths.

The sultan also founded the cities of Hisâr Firûza (Hisar, north-west of Delhi), and of Jaunpur (to the north-west of Benares), making use in each case of earlier Hindu towns and buildings. He has left on record under his own hand a list of the principal works executed during his reign of thirty-seven years, comprising towns, forts, mosques, colleges, and many other buildings, besides embankments and canals. The canal constructed to supply Hisâr Firûza with water was repaired in the reign of Shahjahan and has been utilized in the alignment of the Western Jumna Canal. His chief architect was Malik Ghâzi Shahnâ, whose deputy was Abdul-Hakk, also known as Jâhir Sundhâr. Asian kings, as a rule, show no interest in buildings erected by their predecessors, which usually are allowed to decay uncared for. Firûz Shâh was peculiar indevoting much attention to the repair and rebuilding of ‘the structures of former kings and ancient nobles... giving the restoration of those buildings the priority’ over his own new constructions.

Internal administration. The internal administration of the country, as distinct from the sultan’s personal hobbies, was in the hands of Khân Jahân, the minister, a converted Hindu from Telingana. When he died in 1370-1 (A.H. 772) his place was taken by his son, who assumed the same title of Khân Jahân, and conducted the government to the end of the reign. As Sir W. Haig has it: ‘His judgment of character was, indeed, the principal counterpoise to his impatience of the disagreeable details of government... ’ Sultan ’Alâ-ud-din, who had been in the habit of paying cash salaries to his officers, had disapproved of the system of payment by jâgirs, or the assignment of revenue, believing that that system tended to produce insubordination and rebellion. But Firûz Shâh and his advisers made the grant of jâgirs the rule. Akbar reverted to cash payments from the treasury and direct official administration so far as was practicable.
Alleged prosperity. The statements of Zia-ud-din Barani in praise of Firuz Shah cannot be accepted without reserve. It is no doubt true that the sultan "made the laws of the Prophet his guide", and desired to check oppression. But when we are told that

the peasants grew rich and were satisfied... Their houses were replete with grain, property, horses, and furniture; every one had plenty of gold and silver; no woman was without her ornaments, and no house was wanting in excellent beds and couches. Wealth abounded and comforts were general.

The exaggeration of courtly flattery is obvious. The historian states that it had been the practice of previous sultans to leave the peasant only one cow and take away all the rest. The milder rule of Firuz Shah, although it certainly diminished the tyranny practised, cannot have produced a paradise.

Slave-raiding. We are informed by the same author that

the sultan was very diligent in providing slaves, and he carried his care so far as to command his great fief-holders and officers to capture slaves whenever they were at war, and to pick out and send the best for the service of the court... Those chiefs who brought many slaves received the highest favour... About 12,000 slaves became artisans of various kinds. Forty thousand were every day in readiness to attend as guards in the sultan's equipage or at the palace. Altogether, in the city and in the various fiefs, there were 180,000 slaves, for whose maintenance and comfort the sultan took especial care. The institution took root in the very centre of the land, and the sultan looked upon its due regulation as one of his incumbent duties.

Such wholesale slave-raiding clearly must have been the cause of much suffering, even though it be admitted that the slaves after capture were well treated. The slaves, of course, all became Muslims, and the proselytism thus effected probably was the chief reason why the sultan favoured the system.

Abolition of torture. We have the good fortune to possess a tract written by Firuz Shah himself which enumerates his good deeds as he understood them to be. One reform, the abolition of mutilation and torture, deserves unqualified commendation, and the orders must have been acted on to a considerable extent during his lifetime. The enumeration of the 'many varieties of torture' employed under former kings is horrible.

The great and merciful God made me, His servant, hope and seek for His mercy by devoting myself to prevent the unlawful killing of Musalmans and the infliction of any kind of torture upon them or upon any men.

Intolerance. But Firuz Shah could be fierce when his religious zeal was roused. He records the following facts:

The sect of Shias, also called Rawafiz, had endeavoured to make proselytes... I seized them all and I convicted them of their errors and perversions. On the most zealous I inflicted capital punishment (siyasaat), and the rest I visited with censure (tazir), and threats of public punishment. Their books I burnt
THE TUGHLUQS

in public and by the grace of God the influence of this sect was entirely suppressed.

He caused the ‘doctors learned in the holy Law’ to slay a man who claimed to be the Mahdi, ‘and for this good action’, he wrote, ‘I hope to receive future reward’.

He went in person to a certain village named Malūh, apparently near Delhi, where a religious fair was being held, which was attended even by ‘some graceless Musalmāns’.

I ordered that the leaders of these people and the promoters of this abomination should be put to death. I forbade the infliction of any severe punishment on the Hindus in general, but I destroyed their idol temples and instead thereof raised mosques.

The historian witnessed the burning alive of a Brahman who had practised his rites in public.

Those unquestionable facts prove that Firūz Shāh carried on the tradition of the early invaders, and believed that he served God by treating as a capital crime the public practice of their religion by the vast majority of his subjects.

Bought conversions. The sultan continues:

I encouraged my infidel subjects to embrace the religion of the prophet, and I proclaimed that every one who repeated the creed and became a Musalmān should be exempt from the jizya or poll-tax. Information of this came to the ears of the people at large, and great numbers of Hindus presented themselves, and were admitted to the honour of Islam. Thus they came forward day by day from every quarter, and, adopting the faith, were exonerated from the jizya, and were favoured with presents and honours.

Such was the origin of a large part of the existing Muslim population. Several other sovereigns continued the process of conversion by bribery.

The jizya. The jizya in Delhi was assessed in three grades; namely first class, 40 tankas; second class, 20 tankas; third class, 10 tankas.1 In former reigns Brahmans had been excused. Firūz Shāh, after consultation with his learned lawyers, resolved to include them, and though the Brahmans threatened to fast to death—a decision which Firūz applauded—the measure was enforced.

Credit due to the sultan. Firūz Shāh, when due allowance is made for his surroundings and education, could not have escaped from the theory and practice of religious intolerance. It was not possible for him in his age to rise, as Akbar did, to the conception that the ruler of Hindustan should cherish all his subjects alike, whether Muslim or Hindu, and allow every man absolute freedom, not only of con-

1 Thomas, Chronicles, pp. 218 n., 219 n., 232, 281 n. Sixty-four jaits made one tanka in the fourteenth century. A Brahman, consequently, paid about 10 rupees a year. The coin No. 207 of Thomas shows that the word جیتال should be vocalized as aital.
science, but of public worship. The Muslims of the fourteenth century were still dominated by the ideas current in the early days of Islam, and were convinced that the tolerance of idolatry was a sin. Firūz Shāh, whatever may have been his defects or weaknesses, deserves much credit for having mitigated in some respects the horrible practices of his predecessors, and for having introduced some tincture of humane feeling into the administration. He was naturally a kind if indiscriminately charitable man, and his good deeds included the foundation of a hospital.

**Death of Firūz Shāh in 1388. Anarchy.** Firūz Shāh, who had been forty-two years of age when called to the throne, lost capacity for affairs as the infirmities of advancing years increased. Experiments made in the way of associating his sons with himself in the government were not successful, and his minister, the younger Khān Jahān, was tempted to engage in treasurable practices. In September 1388 the old sultan died, aged about eighty-three. The government fell into utter confusion. A series of puppet sultans, all equally wanting in personal merit, pass rapidly across the stage. The kingdom, in fact, ceased to exist, and the governor of every province assumed practical independence. For about three years, from 1394 to 1397, two rival sultans had to find room within the precincts of the Delhi group of cities. Sultan Mahmūd, a boy grandson of Firūz Shāh, was recognized as king in Old Delhi, while his relative Nusrat Shāh claimed similar rank in Firūzābād a few miles distant. ‘Day by day, battles were fought between these two kings, who were like the two kings in the game of chess.’ It is not worth while either to remember or record the unmeaning struggles between the many rival claimants to a dishonoured throne.

Mahmūd and his competitor, Nusrat Shāh, were the last of the series of nominal sultans who filled up the interval between the death of Firūz Shāh in 1388 and the invasion of Timur ten years later.

**Invasion of Timur, 1398.** Amīr Timūr (Timūr-i-lang, the Tamerlane or Tamburlaine of English literature) was a Barlās Turk, whose father was one of the earliest converts to Islam. Born in 1336 Timur attained the throne of Samārqand in 1369, and then entered on a career of distant conquests, rivalling those of Chingiz Khān, whom he equalled in ferocity, although he was a Muslim and equipped with considerable knowledge of Muslim lore. He died in 1405. He needed no formal pretext for his attack on India. The feebleness of the government, the reputed wealth of the country, and the fact that most of the inhabitants were idolaters offered more than sufficient inducement to undertake the conquest.

Late in 1397 his grandson Pīr Muhammad, commanding an advanced guard, laid siege to Uch, and then to Multan, which fell in May 1398. In the autumn Timur himself crossed the Indus, with a large cavalry force, said to number 90,000; sacked Tulamba, to the north-east of Multan, massacring or enslaving the inhabitants. Near Loni, where
Mahmūd Tughlūq essayed to oppose him, the invader won an easy victory. After a second victory near the city Timur occupied Delhi and was proclaimed king. Some resistance by the inhabitants provoked a general massacre. The city was thoroughly plundered for five days, all the accumulated wealth of generations being carried off to Samarqand, along with a multitude of women and other captives. Timur was careful to bring away all the skilled artisans he could find to be employed on the buildings in his capital.

He had no intention of staying in India. He returned through Meerut, storming that city, and slaying everybody. He then visited Hardwar, and marching along the foot of the mountains, where it was easy to cross the rivers, quitted India as he had come by the way of the Panjāb, 'leaving anarchy, famine, and pestilence behind him'.

The so-called Sayyids. The appalling atrocities of Timur’s raid, which have been barely indicated in the preceding paragraphs, destroyed all semblance of government in Upper India. No regular sultan’s government was established at Delhi until fifteen years after Timur’s departure. From 1414 to 1450 the affairs of the city and a fluctuating territory adjoining were administered, first by Khizr Khan, who had been governor of the Panjāb, and then by three of his successors. They pretended to be Sayyids, and consequently are described in the history textbooks as the Sayyid dynasty. Khizr Khan retained control from the Panjāb to the Doab by annual campaigns, which served also to bring in the revenues. But the area in which such operations could be conducted soon dwindled under his successors. The last of the line, named Alam Shāh, was allowed to retire to Budāon, where he lived in peace for many years.

Sultan Buhlūl Lodi. Buhlūl Khan, an Afghan of the Lodi tribe, who had become governor of the Panjāb and independent of Delhi, seized the throne in 1451, and was proclaimed sultan. Though many authors erroneously call all the sultans of Delhi from 1206 to 1450 Pathans or Afghans, in reality Buhlūl Lodi was the first Afghan sultan. He engaged in a war with the king of Jaunpur in the east, that kingdom having thrown off its allegiance during the anarchy following on Timur’s invasion; and when he died had succeeded in dispossessing Husain Shāh, the king of Jaunpur, and in replacing him by his own son Bārbak Shāh as viceroy. He may be said to have recovered a certain amount of control over territory extending from the foot of the mountains to Benares, and as far south as the borders of Bundelkhand.

Sīkandar Lodi. The nobles chose Nizām Khan, a son of Buhlūl, as his father’s successor. He assumed the royal style of Sultan Sīkandar Ghāzī (1489). The principal political event of his reign was the expulsion of his brother Bārbak Shāh from Jaunpur, and the definite annexation of that kingdom. The sultan also annexed Bihar and levied tribute from Tīrhuṭ. The reader must understand that in those days

1 Mahmūd’s opposition led Timur to order the execution of the 100,000 prisoners then in his camp.
‘annexation’ meant no more than an extremely lax control over the Afghan military chiefs of districts, who were compelled by superior force to yield temporary and imperfect obedience to the sultan of Delhi. Even from the Panjab, the original centre of Lodí power, Sikandar did not venture to exact more than the slightest practical acknowledgement of his supremacy.

Muslim authors speak well of Sultan Sikandar, who was a bigot. He entirely ruined the shrines of Mathura, converting the buildings to Muslim uses, and generally was extremely hostile to Hinduism. Politically he had good cause to be so, for the Hindus of the Doab were always turbulent, and in 1494 a full-scale campaign had to be waged against Hindu rebels in Jaunpur. He strictly followed Quranic law, and was a careful, scrupulous ruler, within the limits of his excessive bigotry. He took a special interest in medical lore. His reign was remarkable for the prevalence of exceptionally low prices for both food and other things, so that ‘small means enabled their possessor to live comfortably’.

Agra, which had been ruined by Sultan Mahmûd of Ghazni, and had sunk into insignificance, was improved by Sultan Sikandar, who generally resided there and used it as his base for operations against the powerful raja of Gwalior. Sikandara, where Akbar’s tomb stands, is named after the Lodí monarch.

A terrible earthquake, extending to Persia, occurred in 1505, and did much damage in northern India.

Sikandar died a natural death at the close of 1517.

The kingdom of Jaunpur. It will be convenient to notice briefly in this place the history of the short-lived kingdom of Jaunpur, the relations of which with the Lodí sultans supplied the most important political events of their reigns. The foundation of the Muslim city of Jaunpur by Firûz Shâh Tughluq has been mentioned. In 1394 Mahmûd Tughluq appointed a powerful eunuch noble entitled Khwâja Jahân to be ‘Lord of the East’ (Sultân-ush-Sharg) with his headquarters at Jaunpur. In those days the control exercised by Delhi was so feeble that every provincial governor was practically independent. After the violence of Timur had shattered the Delhi government in 1398, Khwâja Jahân’s adopted son seized the opportunity and set up as an independent king with the style of Mubârak Shâh Sharqi (sc. Eastern), in 1399.

The newly made king was quickly succeeded in 1402 by his younger brother Ibrâhîm, who reigned prosperously for thirty-four years. Like Sikandar Lodí he was ‘a steady, if not bloody persecutor’. He won the approval of the historians who shared his religious sentiments, but, as usual, the other side of the case is not on record. Ibrâhîm’s son Mahmûd also is spoken of as a successful ruler. Husain Shâh, the last independent king, was overcome by Buhlûl Lodí in or about 1476, and driven to take refuge with his namesake of Bengal.

The expedient attempted at the beginning of Sikandar Lodí’s reign
of leaving Jaunpur to his elder brother Bárbak Sháh in full sovereignty was a failure, and led to war, in which Delhi was successful.

The experiment, when repeated at the time of Ibráhím Lodi’s accession, again failed. Jalál Khán, Ibráhím’s brother, who had been set up as king of Jaunpur, was defeated and killed. From that time the ‘Kingdom of the East’ no longer pretended to an independent existence. It may be considered to have come to an end in or about 1476, when Sikandar Lodi expelled his brother Bárbak Sháh.

All the members of the Jaunpur dynasty were patrons of Persian and Arabic literature. Their principal memorial is the group of noble mosques at Jaunpur, designed in a peculiar style, including many Hindu features. The buildings are unusually massive, have no minarets, and are characterized by stately gateways with sloping walls. The mosques date from the reigns of Ibráhím, Mahmúd, and Husain Sháh.¹

Ibráhím Lodi. The new Sultan succeeded his father Sikandar after dealing with the attempt of a factious group of nobles to raise a younger brother to an independent throne in Jaunpur. His one great success was the capture of Gwalior, whose stalwart ruler Mn Singh had recently died. But thereafter he could not succeed in keeping on good terms with his Afghan nobles, and his reign was mostly occupied by conflicts with them. When he was victorious he took cruel vengeance. Ultimately the discontent of the Afghan chiefs resulted in an invitation being sent by Daulat Khán Lodi to Babur, the king or padshah of Kabul. Babur, after several indecisive incursions, started on his final invasion in November 1525; and on 21 April 1526 inflicted on Sultan Ibráhím a crushing defeat at Panipat, which cost him his throne and life. The battle will be described in connexion with the reign of the victor.

Low prices. The reign of Ibráhím was even more remarkable than that of his father for the extreme lowness of prices, due partly to copious rain followed by abundant harvests, and largely to the want of metallic currency. We are told that ‘gold and silver were only procurable with the greatest difficulty’, and that sellers were ready to offer most extravagant quantities of produce for cash. ‘If a traveller wished to proceed from Delhi to Agra, one bhâlōli would suffice for the expenses of himself, his horse, and four attendants.’²

The coin referred to appears to be the piece weighing about 140 grains, composed of billon or mixed copper and silver in varying proportions, and, by more normal standards, of little intrinsic worth. Timur’s invasion, apparently, must have produced tremendous economic effects, which have been very imperfectly recorded. Gold and silver seem to have been still abundant in the time of Firûz Sháh Tughluq, before Timur’s operations.

The sultanate of Delhi. The annals of the sultanate of Delhi, extending over nearly three centuries and a quarter (1206–1526), are

not pleasant reading. The episodes of Chingiz Khān and Timur are filled with sickening horrors, and the reigns of several sultans offer little but scenes of bloodshed, tyranny, and treachery. All the sultans without exception were convinced Muslims, and acted as such. Even Fīrūz Shāh Tughluq, who exhibited a certain amount of kindly humanity, and felt some desire to do good to his people, was by no means free from the intolerance of his contemporaries. It is to be remembered, however, that the student of the sultanate's history is forced to rely almost entirely upon Muslim authors, and for some periods upon a single witness only. Close examination of the intention of these writers, and steady attention to the exaggeration which a desire to flatter or to denigrate could cause, are at all times required.

Many of the sultans, including the most ferocious, had nice taste in the refinements of Arabic and Persian literature. They liked to be surrounded by men learned in the lore of Islam, and were liberal patrons of the accomplishments which interested them.

They introduced into India several new styles of architecture, based primarily on the model of buildings at Mecca, Damascus, and other cities of the Muslim world, but profoundly modified by Hindu influences. The many Hindu buildings overthrown supplied materials for the new mosques and colleges, for the construction of which the conquerors were compelled to utilize the services of Indian craftsmen. The buildings of the sultanate consequently display characteristics which distinguish them readily from the Muslim edifices in other parts of the world. Numerous authors group all the styles of architecture during the period of the sultanate under the term 'Pathan', a most inappropriate and misleading designation. Several distinct styles current in different localities and at various times during the period of the sultanate may be distinguished, but the subject is too technical for further notice in this place.

Causes of Muslim success. The Muslim invaders undoubtedly were superior to their Hindu opponents in fighting power and so long as they remained uncorrupted by wealth and luxury were practically invincible. The men came from a cool climate in hilly regions, and were for the most part heavier and physically stronger than their opponents. Their flesh diet as compared with the vegetarian habits prevalent in India, combined with their freedom from the restrictions of caste rules concerning food, tended to develop the kind of energy required by an invading force. Their fierce fanaticism, which regarded the destruction of non-Muslims as a service eminently pleasing to God, made them pitiless, and consequently far more terrifying than the ordinary enemies met in India. They were themselves ordinarily saved from fear by their deep conviction that a Ghāzi—a slayer of an infidel—if he should happen to be killed himself, went straight to all the joys of an easily intelligible paradise, winning at the same time undying fame as a martyr. The courage of the invaders was further stimulated by the consciousness that no retreat was open to them. They must either subdue utterly by
sheer force the millions confronting their thousands or be completely destroyed. No middle course was available. The enormous wealth in gold, silver, and jewels, not to mention more commonplace valuables, accumulated in the temples, palaces, and towns of India fired their imagination and offered the most splendid conceivable rewards for valour. The Hindu strategy and tactics were old fashioned, based on ancient textbooks, which took no account of foreign methods; and the unity of command on the Indian side was always more or less hampered by tribal, sectarian, and caste divisions. Each horde of the foreigners, on the contrary, obeyed a single leader in the field, and the commanders knew how to make use of shock tactics, that is to say, well-directed cavalry charges, which rarely failed to scatter the Hindu hosts. Elephants, on which Hindu tradition placed excessive reliance, proved to be useless, or worse than useless, when pitted against well-equipped, active cavalry. The Hindu cavalry does not seem to have attained a high standard of efficiency in most parts of the country.

Thus it happened that the Muslims, although insignificant in numbers when compared with the vast Indian population, usually secured easy victories, and were able to keep in subjection for centuries multitudes of Hindus.

Nature of the sultans’ government. Bengal, after it had been overrun by a few parties of horsemen at the close of the twelfth century, remained for ages under the heel of foreign chiefs who were sometimes Afghans, and the province never escaped from Muslim rule until it passed under British control. The wars with Bengal of which we read during the period of the sultanate were concerned only with the claim preferred by Delhi to receive homage and tribute from the Muslim rulers of Bengal. Those rulers, in their turn, often seem to have left Hindu rajas undisturbed in their principalities, subject to the payment of tribute with greater or less regularity. Indeed the same practice necessarily prevailed over a large part of the Muslim dominions. Some sort of civil government had to be carried on, and the strangers had not either the numbers or the capacity for civil administration except in a limited area. The sultans left few fruitful ideas or valuable institutions behind them.

The government both at headquarters and in the provinces was an arbitrary despotism, practically unchecked except by rebellion and assassination. A strong autocrat, like Alâ-ud-din, never allowed legal scruples to hamper his will, and Muhammad bin Tughluq, who professed reverence for the sacred law, was the worst tyrant of them all. The succession to the throne usually was effected by means of an irregular election conducted by military chiefs, and the person chosen to be sultan was not necessarily a relative of his predecessor.

Islam in Indian life. The permanent establishment of Muslim governments at Delhi and many other cities, combined with the steady growth of a settled resident Muslim population forming a ruling class in the midst of a vastly more numerous Hindu population, necessarily
produced changes in India. The Muslim element increased continually in three ways, namely, by immigration from beyond the north-western frontier, by conversions, whether forcible or purchased, and by birth. We do not possess any statistics concerning the growth of the Muslim population in any of the three ways mentioned, but we know that it occurred in all the ways. It was impossible that the presence of a strange element so large should not bring about important modifications of Indian life.

Strength of Muslim religion. The Muslims were not absorbed into the Indian caste system of Hinduism as their foreign predecessors, the Sakas, Huns, and others, had been absorbed in the course of a generation or two. The definiteness of the religion of Islam, founded on a written revelation of known date, preserved its votaries from the fate which befell the adherents of Shamanism and the other vague religions of central Asia. When the Sakas, Huns, and the rest of the early immigrants settled in India and married Hindu women they merged in the Hindu caste system with extraordinary rapidity, chiefly because they possessed no religion sufficiently definite to protect them against the power of the Brahmans. The Muslim with his Quran and his Prophet was in a different position. He believed in his intelligible religion with all his heart, maintained against all comers the noble doctrine of the unity of God, and heartily despised the worshippers of many gods, with their idols and ceremonies. The Muslim settlers consequently regarded themselves, whether rich or poor, as a superior race, and ordinarily kept apart so far as possible from social contact with the idolaters. But, in course of time, the barrier was partially broken down. One cause which promoted a certain degree of intercourse was the necessity of continuing the employment of unconverted Hindus in clerkships and a host of minor official posts which the Muslims could not fill themselves. Another was the large number of conversions effected either by fear of the sword or by purchase. The Hindus thus nominally converted retained most of their old habits and connexions. Even now their descendants are often half Hindu in their mode of life.

Evolution of Urdu. The various necessities which forced the Muslims and Hindus to meet each other involved the evolution of a common language. Some Muslims learned Hindi and even wrote in it, as Malik Muhammad of Jais did in the time of Humayun. Multitudes of Hindus must have acquired some knowledge of Persian. A convenient compromise between the two languages resulted in the formation of Urdu, the camp language, the name being derived from the Turki word 芜地, ‘camp’, the original form of the English word ‘horde’. Urdu is a Persianized form of western Hindi, as spoken especially in the neighbourhood of Delhi. Its grammar and structure continue to be Hindi in the main, while the words are largely Persian. The language of Persia after the Muslim conquest became filled with Arabic words, which consequently are numerous in Urdu. No definite date can be
assigned to the beginnings of Urdu, which shades off into Hindi by insensible gradations, but it is certain that during the sultanate period the evolution of a language intelligible to both conquerors and the conquered went on unceasingly. Urdu gradually became the vernacular of Indian Muslims and developed a literature. Many Hindi words occur in the writings of Amīr Khusru, who died in 1325, and is sometimes reckoned as a writer of Urdu.

Modification of Hindu religion. The introduction of the religion of the Prophet as a permanent factor in the life of India could not but modify the notions of Hindu thinkers. Although it is hardly necessary to observe that the idea of the unity of God always has been and still is familiar to even uneducated Hindus, it seems to be true that the prominence given to that doctrine by Muslim teaching encouraged the rise of religious schools which sought for a creed capabre of expressing Muslim and Hindu devotion alike.

Rāmānand and Kabīr. The most famous teacher whose doctrine was the basis of such schools was Rāmānand, who lived in the fourteenth century, and came from the south. He preached in Hindi and admitted people of all castes, or of no caste, to his order. He had twelve apostles or chief disciples, who included a Rajput, a currier, a barber, and a Muslim weaver, namely, Kabīr. The verses of Kabīr, which are still familiar in northern India, show clear traces of Muslim influence. He condemned the worship of idols and the institution of caste. Both Muslims and Hindus are included among his followers, who are known as Kabirpanthīs, or ‘travellers on the way of Kabir’, who claimed to be ‘at once the child of Allāh and of Rām’.

A few stanzas may be quoted to prove how Hinduism and Islam reacted one upon the other in the days of the Lodi sultans:

O Servant, where dost thou seek Me? Lo! I am beside thee.
I am neither in temple nor in mosque; I am neither in Kaaba nor in Kailash:
Neither am I in rites and ceremonies, nor in Yoga and renunciation.
If thou art a true seeker, thou shalt at once see Me: thou shalt meet Me in a moment of time.
Kabir says, ‘O Sadhu! God is the breath of all breath.’

It is needless to ask of a saint the caste to which he belongs;
For the priest, the warrior, the tradesman, and all the thirty-six castes, alike are seeking for God.
It is but folly to ask what the caste of a saint may be;
The barber has sought God, the washer-woman, and the carpenter—
Even Raidas was a seeker after God.
The Rishi Swapacha was a tanner by caste.
Hindus and Muslims alike have achieved that End, where remains no mark of distinction.
There is nothing but water at the holy bathing places; and I know that they are useless, for I have bathed in them.

The images are all lifeless, they cannot speak; I know, for I have cried aloud to them.

The Purana and the Quran are mere words; lifting up the curtain, I have seen.

Kabir gives utterance to the words of experience; and he knows very well that all other things are untrue.¹

Such teaching is closely akin to that of the Persian mystics, Jalāl-ud-din Rūmī, Hāfiz, and the rest; whose doctrine was embraced in the sixteenth century by Abu-l Fazl and Akbar. Kabir is the spiritual ancestor of Nānak, the founder of the Sikh sect.

Dr. Farquhar truly observes that it is a most extraordinary fact that the theology of Kabir was meant to unite Hindus and Muhammadans in the worship of the one God; yet the most implacable hatred arose between the Sikhs and the Muhammadans; and from that hatred came the Khālsā, the Sikh military order, which created the fiercest enemies the Mughul emperors had. It is also most noteworthy that caste has found its way back into every Hindu sect that has disowned it.²

Seclusion of women. Although ancient Indian literature, such as the Arthaśāstra of Kautilya, alludes occasionally to the practice of the seclusion of women, many records indicate that the seclusion, even among the wealthy and leisured classes, although practised, was less strict than it is now in most parts of India. The example of the dominant Muslims, combined with the desire of the Hindus to give the female members of their families every possible protection against the foreigners, made the practice of living 'behind the curtain' both more fashionable and more widely prevalent than it used to be in ancient times.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE SULTANATE, 1290–1526

The Khilji (Khalj) Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jalāl-ud-dīn (Fīrūz Shāh)</th>
<th>acc. 1290</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Famine</td>
<td>1291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongol inroad</td>
<td>1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexation of Ellichpur</td>
<td>1294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Alā-ud-dīn, acc.; murder of Jalāl-ud-dīn</td>
<td>1296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conquest of Gujarat</td>
<td>1297–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongol invasions</td>
<td>1296–1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massacre of Mongols at Delhi</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern campaigns of Malik Kāfūr</td>
<td>1302–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sack of Chitor</td>
<td>1303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ One Hundred Poems of Kabir. Translated by Rabindranath Tagore, assisted by Evelyn Underhill. Published by the India Society, London, at the Chiswick Press, 1914. Miss Underhill dates Kabir from about 1410 to 1518. He used to be placed between 1380 and 1420. A good translation of Kabir’s poems from the Hindi by Mr. Ahmad Shah was published at Hamirpur, U.P., in 1917.

DELHI SULTANATE

QUȚB-UD-DĪN MUBĀRĀK . . . . acc. Jan. 1316
Destruction of Harpāl Dēo Yādava . . . . 1318
[Khusrū Khān, usurper, &c.] . . . . 1318–20

The Tughluq Dynasty

GHĪYĀS-UD-DĪN TUGHLUQ SHĀH (GHĀZĪ MALĪK) . . . . acc. 1320
Wars in Bengal and Deccan . . . . about 1321–4
MUḤAMMAD ĀDĪL BIN TUGHLUQ (Fakhr-ud-dīn Jūnā, also styled Ulugh Khān) . . . . Feb. 1325
Evacuation of Delhi; foundation of Daulatabad . . . . 1327
Forced currency of brass and copper for silver . . . . 1329–32
Himalayan expedition . . . . 1337–8
Revolt of Bengal and Maʿabar . . . . 1338–9
General break-up of empire began about . . . . 1340
Prolonged famine for several years began . . . . 1342
Vijayanagar a powerful kingdom . . . . 1346
Bahmanī kingdom of the Deccan founded . . . . 1347
The sultan in Gujarat and Sind . . . . 1347–51
FĪRŪZ SHĀH TUGHLUQ . . . . acc. 1351
War in Bengal . . . . 1353–4
Attacks on Sind . . . . 1362–3
Death of Fīrūz Shāh . . . . Sept. 1388

Break-up of the sultanate

Sundry insignificant princes, MAHMUD TUGHLUQ, &c. . . . 1388–98
Invasion of Timur . . . . 1398
Independence of Jaunpur . . . . 1399
Anarchy . . . . 1399–1414
The so-called Sayyids at Delhi and neighbourhood . . . . 1414–50

The Lodi Dynasty

SULTAN BAHĪLĪL LODĪ . . . . . . . acc. 1450
Recovery of Jaunpur . . . . about 1476
SULTAN SIKANDAR LODĪ . . . . acc. 1489
Earthquake in Hindustan and Persia . . . . 1505
SULTAN IBRĀHĪM LODĪ . . . . acc. 1517
First battle of Panipat, defeat and death of Ibrāhīm; end of the sultanate . . . . . . . 1526

AUTHORITIES

The leading authority for the Khilji and Tughluq dynasties is the Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī by Zīā-ud-dīn Barāni in E. & D., vol. iii. For the reign of Muhammad bin Tughluq I have made large use of Ibn Batūta’s travels, translated into French by DEFRÉMY and SANGUINETTI (with Arabic text), Paris, 1853–8. Part of that work has been rendered into English in E. & D., vol. iv, App. An abridged version in English has been made by H. A. R. Gibb, London, 1929. Another version of the Travels appears in the Hakluyt Society’s edition of Cathay and the Way Thither, Yule and Cordier, 1916, vol. iv, pp. 1–166, with Introductory Notice, pp. 1–79. The notes are not up to date. Other authors will be found in E. & D., vol. iv; and, of course, FIRĐĪSTA, BĀDĀNĪ, &c., give abstracts. The history of Timur’s invasion, from his own Memoirs and other sources, is in E. & D., vol. iv, and the Lodi history in vol. v. I have also found E. THOMAS, Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, useful. For Kabir see text ed. by Rev. AHMAD SHAH, Cawnpore, 1911; and excellent transl. by
THE MUSLIM POWERS OF NORTHERN INDIA

CHAPTER 4

The Muslim kingdoms of Bengal, Malwa, Gujarat, and Kashmir

Scope of this chapter. Although it is impossible in the course of a general survey of Indian history to delineate in detail the story of each outlying kingdom, it is necessary for the completion of the picture to draw a sketch of the prominent events which happened in the more important of such kingdoms. The history of the Muslim Bahmani kingdom or empire of the Deccan, founded in 1347, which possesses features of special interest; the complicated affairs of the five kingdoms erected on the ruins of the Bahmani empire; and the history of the Hindu empire of Vijayanagar will be narrated in Book V. The short-lived kingdom of Jaunpur has been already dealt with. This chapter will be devoted to a summary notice of the more interesting passages in the histories of the Muslim kingdoms of Bengal, Malwa, Gujarat, and Kashmir, during the period of the Delhi sultanate. No attempt will be made to write a series of consecutive narratives.

Bengal

The independence of Bengal, that is to say, the definite separation of the Muslim provincial government from the sultanate of Delhi, may be dated from 1338, as the result of Fakhr-ud-din's rebellion against the tyranny of Muhammad bin Tughluq. A few years later Firuz Shâh Tughluq practically renounced all claim to the suzerainty of Delhi over the revolted province, which continued under a separate government until 1576, when Akbar's generals defeated and killed Dâûd Shâh, the last of the Afghan kings. The vicissitudes of the various dynasties which ruled Bengal between 1340 and 1526, when the sultanate of Delhi came to an end, present few events of intrinsic importance, or such as the memory readily retains. The wars, rebellions, and assassinations which usually fill so large a space in the histories of Muslim dynasties become almost unreadable when the drama is presented on a purely provincial stage isolated from the doings of the larger world. The story of the independent Muslim kings of Bengal seldom offers any points of contact with that world, even within the limits of India. The province ordinarily went its own way, apparently disregarding and disregarded by all other kingdoms, except for certain wars on its frontiers. Very little is known at present concerning the condition of the Hindu population during the period in question, that population being almost wholly ignored by the historians writing in
Persian. Toleration of their religion seems to have been the general rule, though there may have been a wave of conversion in the time of Jalāl-ud-dīn, himself a convert (1414–31).

Husain Shāh. The best and most famous of the Muslim kings of Bengal was Husain Shāh (‘Alā-ud-dīn Husain Shāh, A.D. 1493–1519), a Sayyid of Arab descent who had held the office of vizier or prime minister under a tyrant named Shams-ud-dīn Muzaffar Shāh. The tyrant was a negro slave, one of that large body of Abyssinians which had first risen to importance under Rukn-ud-dīn Bārbak (1459–74), and from which three rulers had arisen. When he was deposed and killed the chiefs unanimously elected Husain Shāh to be their sovereign. He justified their choice. His name is still familiar throughout Bengal; and no insurrection or rebellion occurred during his reign, which lasted for twenty-four years. He died at Gaur, having ‘enjoyed a peaceable and happy reign, beloved by his subjects, and respected by his neighbours’.

He hospitably received his namesake the fugitive king of Jaunpur.

Nusrat Shāh. Husain Shāh left eighteen sons, the eldest of whom, Nusrat Shāh, was elected by the chiefs as his successor. Nusrat Shāh departed from the usual custom of Asia in regard to his brothers, whom he treated with affection and liberality. He occupied Tirhat, and arranged with Babur honourable terms of peace. He is said to have become a cruel tyrant during his latter years.

Buildings. The mosques of Gaur and the other old cities of Bengal were constructed almost entirely of brick and in a peculiar style. At Gaur the tomb of Husain Shāh and the Lesser Golden Mosque built in his reign, with the Great Golden Mosque and the Kadam Rasūl built by Nusrat Shāh, may be mentioned as being specially noteworthy. The huge Ādina mosque at Pandua, twenty miles from Gaur, built by Sikandar Shāh in 1368, has about 400 small domes, and is considered to be the most remarkable building in Bengal. The vast ruins of Gaur are estimated to occupy from twenty to thirty square miles.

Hindu literature. The learned historian of Bengali literature states that the most popular book in Bengal is the translation of the Sanskrit Rāmāyana made by Krittivāsa, who was born in A.D. 1346. It may be called the Bible of Bengal, where it occupies a position like that held in the upper provinces by the later work of Tulsī Dās. Some of the Muslim kings were not indifferent to the merits of Hindu literature. A Bengali version of the Mahābhārata was prepared to the order of Nusrat Shāh, who thus anticipated the similar action of Akbar. An earlier version of the same poem is believed to date from the fourteenth century, and another was composed in the time of Husain Shāh, by command of his general, Parāgal Khān. ‘Frequent references are found in old Bengali literature indicating the esteem and trust in which the Emperor Husen Sāhā was held by the Hindus.’ In fact, it seems to be true that ‘the patronage and favour of the Muslim emperors and chiefs gave the first start towards the recognition of Bengali in the courts of
a. Akbar

b. Jahangir
the Hindu rajas', who, under the guidance of their Brahman teachers, were more inclined to encourage Sanskrit.1

Malwa

Malwa (Mālava), the extensive region now included for the most part in Madhya Bharat, and lying between the Narbada on the south, the Chambal on the north, Gujarat on the west, and Bundelkhand on the east, had been the seat of famous kingdoms in the Hindu period. Ilutmish raided the country early in the thirteenth century. In 1310 it was brought more or less into subjection by an officer of 'Alā-ud-din Khilji, and thereafter continued to be ruled by Muslim governors until the break-up of the sultanate of Delhi.

The Ghūri dynasty. Shortly after Timur's invasion in 1398 the governor, a descendant of the great sultan, Shihāb-ud dīn-Muhammad of Ghūr, set up as king on his own account under the style of Sultan Shihāb-ud-dīn Ghūrī (1401). He had enjoyed his new rank for only four years when he died suddenly, probably having been poisoned by his eldest son. The independent kingdom thus founded lasted for 130 years from 1401 until 1531, when it was annexed by Gujarat. Four years later Humayun brought the country temporarily under the dominion of Delhi, but it did not become finally part of the Mughul empire until the early years of Akbar's reign (1561-4). The political annals of the Muslim kingdom present few features of permanent interest, and the sultans are now remembered chiefly for their magnificent buildings at Mandu.

The first capital of the new kingdom was Dhar, where Raja Bhoja had once reigned, but the second sultan, who assumed the title of Hoshang Shāh, moved his court to Mandu, where he erected many remarkable edifices. He was defeated in a war with Gujarat, and was a prisoner for a year, but was restored to his throne, and retained his ill-gotten power until 1432, when he was succeeded by his son, Sultan Mahmūd, the third and last king of the Ghūri dynasty, a worthless, drunken creature.

The Khilji dynasty. Sultan Mahmūd Ghūrī was poisoned in 14362 by his minister, Mahmūd Khān, a Khilji Turk, who seized the throne and founded the Khilji dynasty, which lasted almost a century. He was by far the most eminent of the sovereigns of Malwa and spent a busy life fighting his neighbours, including the sultan of Gujarat, various rajas of Rajasthān, and Nizām Shāh Bahmani. Firishta, ignoring the irregularity of the methods by which he won his crown, specially extols his justice and gives him a good general character.

Sultan Mahmūd [we are told] was polite, brave, just, and learned; and during his reign, his subjects, Muslim as well as Hindus, were happy, and

1 Dinesh Chandra Sen, History of the Bengali Language and Literature, Calcutta University, 1913, pp. 12, 14, 170, 184, 201, 203.
2 A.H. 840—A.D. 16 July 1436–4 July 1437, as proved by coin No. 15 in Wright's Catalogue.
maintained a friendly intercourse with each other. Scarcely a year passed that he did not take the field, so that his tent became his home, and his resting-place the field of battle. His leisure hours were devoted to hearing the histories and memoirs of the courts of different kings of the earth read.

It would be pleasant to be able to believe this eulogy, but Mahmûd’s record of temple destruction and enslavement of Hindus makes such belief difficult. The fight with the rana of Chitor apparently must have been indecisive, because the rana commemorated his alleged victory by the erection of a noble Tower of Victory, which still stands at Chitor; while the sultan, making a similar claim for himself, built a remarkable seven-storied tower at Mandu, which unfortunately has collapsed.

Sultan Nāsir-ud-dīn parricide. The next sultan, Ghiyās-ud-dīn (1469–1501), ended a peaceful, if petty-minded reign by handing over power in his own lifetime to his elder son Nāsir-ud-dīn, in 1500. The son, however, faced with widespread rebellions, had his father removed from the scene by poison in 1501. Jahangir, who stayed at Mandu in 1617, and renovated many of the admired buildings, gives a lively, if fanciful, account of these events. He expressed his disgust by destroying Nāsir-ud-dīn’s tomb. ‘I ordered them to throw his crumbled bones, together with his decayed limbs, into the Narbadda.”

Nāsir-ud-dīn proved to be a cruel brute when in power. He died of fever in 1512, and was succeeded by his son, Mahmūd II, the last king of his race, who was defeated by Bahādur Shāh of Gujarat, and executed. The other male members of the royal family were exterminated, with the exception of one who was at Humayun’s court, and the kingdom was annexed to Gujarat (A.H. 937 = A.D. 1531).

Buildings. The fortified city of Mandu, now in ruins, stood on the extensive summit of a commanding hill, protected by walls about twenty-five miles or more in total length. The massive buildings still recognizable are numerous, and of much architectural merit. They include a splendid Jāmi Masjid, or chief mosque, the Hindolā Mahall, the Jahāz Mahall, the tomb of Hoshang Shāh, and the palaces of Bahādur and Rūpmani, besides many other remarkable edifices built of sandstone and marble, which have been repaired and conserved to a considerable extent by the officers of the Archaeological department and the authorities of the Dhar state. The hill, which was dangerously infested by tigers and other wild beasts for more than two centuries, can now be visited and explored in the utmost comfort.

Gujarat

The country. The name Gujarat is of wide and indefinite signification. It may be taken in its most extended sense to mean all the terri-

1 *Memoirs of Jahangir*, transl. Rogers and Beveridge, R. As. Soc., 1909, vol. i, pp. 365–7. Firi jente expresses disbelief in the accusations of parricide preferred against Hoshang Shāh and Nāsir-ud-dīn Shāh, but, so far as I can judge, the charges seem to be true in both cases. As regards the latter, it is highly improbable that both Sher Shāh and Jahangir should have been misinformed.
tory in which the Gujarati language is used, and so to include the peninsula of Cutch (Kachchh), which is not usually reckoned as part of Gujarat.¹ In the ordinary use of the term, Cutch being excluded, Gujarat comprises a considerable region on the mainland and also the peninsula now known as Kathiawar, which used to be called Saurashtra by the ancient Hindus and Sorath by the Muslims. The definition of the mainland region has varied from time to time. Some people fix the southern boundary at the Narbada, while others extend it to Daman. Certainly, in Muslim times, Surat at the mouth of the Tapti and Daman farther south always were considered as belonging to Gujarat. The Gujarat on the mainland of the Muslim period may be taken as extending north and south from the neighbourhood of Sirohi and Bhinmal in Rajputana to Daman, and east and west from the frontier of Malwa to the sea, and the Rann of Cutch. The region so defined comprises in modern terms six districts of the Bombay state, namely, Ahmadabad, Kaira, Panch Mahals, Broach (Bharuch), Surat, and part of the Thana District, with the late Baroda State or dominions of the Gaikwar, and many smaller states. The peninsula of Kathiawar, which was shared by a great multitude of such states, was in the Muslim period reckoned as part of the Gujarat.

The province, especially the mainland section, enjoys exceptional natural advantages, being fertile, well supplied with manufactures, and possessed of numerous ports where profitable overseas commerce has been practised since the most remote times. A country so desirable necessarily has attracted the attention of all the races which have effected conquests in northern and western India. Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazni’s famous raid in A.D. 1024 effected the destruction of the temple at Somnath and provided his army with much booty, but no attempt at permanent conquest was then made. The Muslim invasions in the latter part of the twelfth century also failed to produce any permanent result, and the country continued to be ruled by Hindu dynasties. In 1297 an officer of ‘Alā-ud-din Khilji annexed it to the sultanate of Delhi. Muslim governors continued to be appointed from the capital after that date as long as the sultanate lasted.

Independence. Zafar Khān, the last governor, who was appointed in 1391, and had been practically independent, formally withdrew his allegiance in 1401.² His son, Tātār Khān, in 1403 made his father prisoner and seated himself on the provincial throne as sultan, with the title of Nāsir-ud-din Muhammad Shāh. The new sultan seems to have been poisoned by his father in 1404. But in 1407 the old man, who had become Sultan Muzaffar Shāh, was succeeded by his grandson, and heir-designate, who assumed the style of Ahmad Shāh.

Ahmad Shāh. Ahmad Shāh, who reigned for thirty years from 1411

¹ Gujarati is the official and literary language of Cutch, but the spoken vernacular is a special dialect of Sindi.
to 1441, may be regarded as the real founder of the independent
kingdom of Gujarat. His father and grandfather during their few years
of power had controlled only a comparatively small territory in the
neighbourhood of Ahmadabad, then called Asāwal. Ahmad Shāh
devoted his energy and considerable ability to extending his territories,
spreading the religion of the Prophet, and improving the administra-
tion of his own dominions. Throughout his reign he never suffered a
defeat, and his armies invariably prevailed over those of the sultanate
of Malwa, the chiefs of Asirgarh, Rajputana, and other neighbouring
countries. Sultan Ahmad was a close friend of Sultan Fīrūz Bahmani,
and, like him, was zealous in fighting the infidels and destroying their
temples. He built the noble city of Ahmadabad adjoining the old Hindu
town of Asāwal. 'Travellers', the local historian avers, 'are agreed that
they have found no city in the whole earth so beautiful, charming, and
splendid.'

Sultan Mahmūd Bigarhā. Sultan Mahmūd Begarā or Bigarhā, a
grandson of Ahmad Shāh, ascended the throne at the age of thirteen
in (A.H. 863) 1459 and reigned prosperously for fifty-two years until
(A.H. 917) 1511. He was by far the most eminent sovereign of his
dynasty. Although a mere boy at the time of his accession he seems
to have assumed a man's part from the first and to have been able
dispensably with a Protector, such as was imposed on Akbar at the
same age.

He added glory and lustre to the kingdom of Gujarat, and was the best of
all the Gujarat kings, including all who preceded and all who succeeded him;
and whether for abounding justice and generosity, for success in religious
war, and for the diffusion of the laws of Islam and of Muslims; for soundness
of judgement, alike in boyhood, in manhood, and in old age; for power, for
valour, and victory—he was a pattern of excellence.

That vigorous eulogy by the leading Muslim historian of his country
seems to be justified by the facts as seen from his point of view.

Mahmūd was eminently successful in war. He made himself master
of the strong fortresses of Champaner to the north-east of Baroda, and
of Junagarh in Kathiawar; overran Cutch and gained victories over
the sultan of Ahmadnagar and other potentates.

Towards the end of his reign he came into conflict with the Portu-
guese and allied himself with the sultan of Egypt and the zamorin of
Calicut against them. An Egyptian fleet, built at Suez, commanded by
Amīr Husain, reached India in 1507, where it was joined by Indian
ships under Malik Ayāz. The combined force surprised a Portuguese
squadron at Chaul, defeated it, and killed Dom Lourenço, the viceroy's
son, in the battle (January 1508). But in 1509 the Muslim fleet was
annihilated in a battle fought off Diu in Kathiawar, then included in
the Gujarat kingdom. The foreigners, who finally secured Goa from
Bijapur in 1510, were thenceforward always able to maintain their
possessions against the Indian powers, but did not obtain a fort at Diu
until 1535. Even victorious Akbar was unable to disturb them seriously,
although no project was nearer to his heart than the expulsion of the hated intruders from the soil of his richest province.

The personal peculiarities of Mahmūd made a deep impression on his contemporaries, and became known in Europe, as told in fantastic tales chiefly conveyed through the agency of the Italian traveller Ludovico di Varthema. The Sultan’s moustaches were so long that he used to tie them over his head and his beard reached to his girdle. His appetite, like that of Akbar’s secretary, Abu-l Fazl, was so abnormal that he was credited with eating more than twenty pounds’ weight of food daily. He was believed to have been dosed with poison from childhood and thus to have become immune against its effects, while his body was so saturated with venom that if a fly settled on his hand it would drop dead. The legend has found its way into English literature through Samuel Butler’s reference to it:

The Prince of Cambay’s daily food
Is asp, and basilisk, and toad.¹

Sultan Bahādur Shāh. The latest notable sultan of Gujarat was Mahmūd Bigarhā’s grandson, Bahādur Shāh, who reigned from the close of 1526 to February 1537, when his uneasy life was ended by a tragic death at the hands of the Portuguese. He earned a full share of military glory by his defeat of Mahmūd II Khiljī, involving the annexation of Malwa in 1531–2, and by his storm of Chitor in 1534, when the Rajputs made their usual dreadful sacrifice.

In the following year, 1535, Bahādur, through over-confidence in his artillery, was utterly defeated by Humayun Fadshah, driven from his kingdom, and forced to take refuge in Malwa. The fortress of Champaner was gallantly taken by Humayun, who was himself among the earliest to escalade the walls. But the Mughul was soon recalled from the scene of his western triumphs by the necessity of meeting his Afghan rival, Sher Khān (Shāh), and Bahādur was then able to return to his kingdom.

Ordinarily the relations between the Portuguese and the government of Gujarat were hostile, but the Mughul pressure forced Bahādur to buy the promise of Portuguese help by the surrender of Bassein, and to conclude a treaty of peace with the proud foreigners. Negotiations on the subject of the port and fortress of Diu, then of much importance as a trading station, induced Bahādur Shāh to visit Nuno da Cunha, the Portuguese governor, and go aboard his ship. No less than eight distinct accounts of what then happened—namely, four Portuguese and four Muslim—are on record, all differing in details. Colonel Watson, who examined them all critically, came to ‘the conclusion ... that on either side the leader hoped by some future treachery to seize the person of the other; and that mutual suspicion turned into a fatal affray a meeting which both parties intended should pass peacefully and lull the other into a false and favourable security’. It is certain

¹ Hudibras, Part ii, Canto i, published in 1664.
that the sultan of Gujarat, attempting to return, jumped overboard, and while in the water was knocked on the head by a sailor. He was only thirty-one years of age. Manuel de Souza, captain of the port of Diu, also lost his life at the same time.

Bahādur Shāh’s intemperance in the use of liquor and drugs clouded his brain and made him prone to acts of ill-considered impulse. He left no son.

Later history. The history of the province from the time of his death in 1537 to its annexation by Akbar after the lightning campaigns of 1572–3 is a record of anarchical confusion, into the details of which it is unnecessary to enter. Disturbances continued to be frequent even after the absorption of the kingdom into the Mughul empire.

Architecture. The exquisite architecture of Gujarat, further beautified by wood-carving of supreme excellence, is the special distinction of the province. The Muslim conquerors adopted with certain modifications the charming designs of the old Hindu and Jain architects, filling Ahmadabad, Cambay, and many other towns with a multitude of buildings singularly pleasing to the eye, and enriched with the most delicate stone lattices and other ornaments. The ancient Hindu monuments of both mainland Gujarat and Kathiawar have been described by Dr. Burgess in two large, finely illustrated quarto volumes of the Archaeological Survey. The same author has described and illustrated with equal copiousness the Muslim architecture on the mainland in three other handsome volumes. The architects of the province still retain much of the skill of their ancestors. Ahmadabad is particularly rich in noble buildings, and during the time of its glory, extending from its foundation to the eighteenth century—a period of about three centuries—undoubtedly was one of the handsomest cities in the world. The population is said to have numbered 900,000, and millionaires were to be found among the merchants. The city is now again wealthy and prosperous, the second largest in the Bombay Presidency, with a population of nearly 800,000 in 1951. According to a local saying the prosperity of Ahmadabad hangs on three threads—silk, gold, and cotton.

Kashmir

The country. In medieval history the name Kashmir refers only to the beautiful valley on the upper course of the Jhelum, which is about eighty-five miles long and from twenty to twenty-five broad. The long the interesting story of the Hindu kingdom of the valley is painful reading on the whole, many of the rajas having been atrocious tyrants.

The first sultan. Early in the fourteenth century a Muslim adventu from Swat, named Shāh Mirzā or Mīr, became minister to the Hindu raja of Kashmir. In 1346 he seized the throne, married the late raja’s widow, and by his liberal revenue policy secured the position of his dynasty. The third of his sons, who ruled from 1359 to
1378, further improved the land revenue system, and proved a notable warrior.

Sultan Sikandar. The sixth sultan, Sikandar (1393–1416), who was ruling at the time of Timur’s invasion in 1398, managed to avoid meeting that formidable personage, and remained safely protected by his mountain walls. Sikandar, whose generosity attracted the learned from Persia, Arabia, and Mesopotamia, became a gloomy bigot, and his zeal in destroying temples and idols was so intense that he is remembered as the Idol-Breaker. He freely used the sword to propagate Islam and succeeded in forcing the bulk of the population to conform outwardly to the Muslim religion. Most of the Brahmans refused to apostatize, and many of them paid with their lives the penalty for their steadfastness. Many others were exiled, and only a few conformed.

Sultan Zain-ul-‘Abidin. The eighth sultan, Zain-ul-‘Abidin, who had a long and prosperous reign of about half a century from 1420 to 1467, was a man of very different type. He adopted the policy of universal toleration, recalled the exiled Brahmans, repealed the jizya or poll-tax on Hindus, and even permitted new temples to be built. He abstained from eating flesh, prohibited the slaughter of kine, and was justly venerated as a saint. He encouraged literature, painting, and music, and caused many translations to be made of works composed in Sanskrit, Arabic, and other languages. His public works included a number of bridges and many irrigation works. In those respects he resembled Akbar, but he differed from that monarch in the continence which enabled him to practise strict fidelity to one wife.

Later history. The reigns of the other sultans are not of sufficient importance or interest to justify the insertion of their annals in this history. For eleven years (1540–51) a relative of Humayun, named Mirzá Haidar, who had invaded the valley, ruled it, nominally as governor on behalf of Humayun, but in practice as an independent prince. Some years later the Chak dynasty seized the throne.

CHRONOLOGY
(Leading dates only)

Bengal

Independence of Fakhr-ud-din . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1338
Husain Shāh . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1493–1518
Nusrat Shāh . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1518–32
Bengal annexed by Akbar . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1576

Malwa

Independence of Sultan Shihāb-ud-din Ghūrī . . . . . . . . . 1401
Sultan Mahmūd Ghūrī . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1432
Sultan Mahmūd Khilji founded Khilji dynasty . . . . . . . . . . 1436
Malwa annexed by Bahādur Shāh of Gujarat . . . . . . . . . . . 1531
Malwa annexed by Akbar . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1561–4
### Gujarat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independence of Nāṣir-ud-din Muhammad Shāh</td>
<td>1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Ahmad Shāh; foundation of Ahmadabad</td>
<td>1411-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Mahmūd Bigārhā</td>
<td>1459-1511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval battles with Portuguese</td>
<td>1507, 1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation of Goa by Portuguese</td>
<td>1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Bahādur Shāh</td>
<td>1526-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malwa annexed</td>
<td>1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitor stormed</td>
<td>1534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahādur defeated by Humayun</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahādur killed by Portuguese</td>
<td>1537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarat annexed by Akbar</td>
<td>1572-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kashmir

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Shams-ud-din</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Sikandar, the Idol-Breaker</td>
<td>c. 1393-1416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Zain-ul 'Abidin</td>
<td>c. 1420-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirzā Haidar</td>
<td>c. 1541-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashmir annexed by Akbar</td>
<td>1586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Authorities

For my slight notice of the annals of Bengal I have used chiefly Firishtha, and Stewart, History of Bengal, 1813. See also Nalini K. Bhattachari, 'Coins and chronology of the Early Independent Sultans of Bengal', and History of Bengal, vol. ii, ed. R. D. Banerjee, Dacca.

Firishtha gives the most convenient summary of Malwa history.

The best and most authoritative abstract of Gujarāt Muslim history is that by Colonel Watson in the Bombay Gazetteer (1895), vol. i, part i. The same volume contains a good account of Mandu, the capital of Malwa. I have also consulted Bayley, History of Gujarāt (1886); and Whiteway, The Rise of Portuguese Power in India, 1497-1550 (Constable, 1899).

Various articles in the I.G. (1908) are serviceable for all the kingdoms.


The coins of the various kingdoms are described by H. N. Wright in the Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, vol. ii, Clarendon Press, 1907, with references to other publications.

The works by Burgess are the leading authority on the art of the province of Gujarāt, namely:

1. Report on the Antiquities of Kāthiāwād and Kachh, 1876 (A.S.W.I., vol. ii = Imperial Series, vol. ii);
4. Ibid., Part II, 1905 (A.S.W.I., vol. viii = Imp. Ser., vol. xxxii);

M. S. Commissariat, History of Gujarāt, 1938.