intense interest in all the manifold affairs of this world saved him from that fate, and brought him back from dreams to the actualities of human life. He was not an ordinary man, and his complex nature, like that of St. Paul, Muhammad, Dante, and other great men with a tendency to mysticism, presents perplexing problems.

About this time (1578 or 1580?) Akbar was much gratified by the return of Hajji Habibullah, who had been sent to Goa with instructions to bring back European curiosities and information about the arts and crafts of Europe. The agent had been supplied with ample funds and was attended by a number of skilled craftsmen, who were instructed to copy anything worthy of imitation. The Hajji performed his mission to the emperor's satisfaction and brought back many objects of interest. Special admiration was bestowed on an organ, 'like a great box the size of a man, played by a European sitting inside'. The wind was supplied by bellows or fans of peacock's feathers. A company of persons dressed in European clothes, and seemingly including some actual Europeans, arrived along with Habibullah, whose craftsmen displayed their skill in newly acquired arts. Unluckily, the only two extant accounts of the occurrence fail to give any further details.

The discussions in the House of Worship were continued vigorously during 1578–9 with increasing acerbity, degenerating at times into open quarrelling. Two parties among the Muslim doctors formed themselves, one headed by Makhdu-m-I Mulk and the other by Shaikh Abdu-n Nabi, the

---

1 The references for the incident discussed are A. N., vol. iii, pp. 346–8, 358; Badāoni, i, 261; and Tabakāt, text, at beginning of 24th year as reckoned in that work. The passage in the history last named was not translated by Elliot and Dowson, and I am indebted for the text reference to Mr. Beveridge's note on A. N., iii, 846. The story of the ride on Hairān is told, ibid., ii, 92, and the reminiscence of the completion of the 20th year is in 'Happy Sayings', Afn, vol. iii, p. 386.

2 A. N., iii, 322; Badāoni, ii, 299. The latter author says that the Hajj brought the organ 'from Europe'. He, however, did not go beyond the port of Goa. Badāoni seems to date the Hajj's return in A. H. 988 = A. D. 1580–1; but Abu-J Fazl apparently places the incident earlier, in 1577 or 1578. His account of the 33rd Ilāhī year, running from March 11, 1578, begins on p. 387, fifteen pages after the notice of the Hajj's return.
Sadr-i sudûr. Akbar found it hard to keep the peace, and on at least one occasion lost his temper. Gradually, he was becoming wholly estranged from the faith of his youth, and was directing his energies to the evolution of a new religion, which would, he hoped, prove to be a synthesis of all the warring creeds and capable of uniting the discordant elements of his vast empire in one harmonious whole. The differences between the two parties of the Ulamâ, one of whom denounced as heretical notions declared by the other to be the truth, confirmed Akbar in the opinion that both parties were in error, and that the truth must be sought outside the range of their bickerings. He now consulted the adherents of other religions, Hindus, Jains, Parsees, and Christians, and no longer confined himself to the vain attempt at arbitrating between the various Muslim schools of thought. As Abu-I Fazl expresses it: 'The Shâhinshâh’s court became the home of the inquirers of the “seven cliques”, and the assemblage of the wise of every religion and sect.'

His relations at this period with Parsees, Jains, and Christians will now be described in some detail.

Akbar probably found more personal satisfaction in Zoroastrianism, the religion of the Parsees, than in any other of the numerous religions examined by him so critically in his odd, detached manner. The close connexion with Persia always maintained by his family, and his manifest preference for Iranian rather than Mogul (Uzbek and Chagatâi) officers predisposed him to look with a favourable eye on the creed and religious philosophy of Irân.

1 A. N., iii, 366. The author classifies the members of the assemblage as 'Sûfis, philosophers, orators, jurists, Sunnis, Shiás, Brahmans, Jaths, Sûrâs [sic. two kinds of Jains], Charsâks [sic. Chârvâka, or Hindu materialistic atheists], Nazarenes [Christians], Jews, Sabians [Christians of St. John], Zoroastrians, and others'. The Sûrâs or Sewras were Śvetâmbara Jains. Yatis are considered to be unorthodox (Stevenson, The Heart of Jainism, 1915, p. 233). Akbar does not seem to have known any Buddhist scholars. Abu-I Fazl met a few Buddhas at the time of his last visit to Kashmir, but 'saw none among the learned'. He observes that 'for a long time past scarce any trace of them has existed in Hindustan' (Ain, vol. iii, p. 212). The statements in E. & D., vi, 50 and von Nees, i, 326 n., that Buddhists took part in the debates are erroneous. The passages cited really refer to Jains. Abu-I Fazl briefly describes the Chârvâka or Nâstika doctrine (op. cit., p. 217).
The fit of religious frenzy which assailed Akbar at the
ing beginning of May 1578 was a symptom of the intense
interest in the claims of rival religions which he manifested
in 1578–9 prior to the signing of the ‘infallibility’ decree
in September of the latter year. Discussion in his ‘parlia-
ment of religions’ was fast and furious. About that time,
probably in the latter part of 1578, the Zoroastrians found
their opportunity for giving the emperor further instruction
in the mysteries of their faith, with so much effect that he
was regarded by many as having become a convert.¹ He
is said to have worn the sacred shirt and girdle which every
Parsee must wear under his clothes, just as, at a little later
date, he appeared in public with Hindu sectarian marks on
his forehead and also adopted the use of Christian emblems.

Akbar’s principal teacher in Zoroastrian lore was Dastūr
Meherjee Rānā,² a leading mobed or theologian from Nausāri
in Gujarāt, then the principal centre of the Parsee priest-
hood in India, whose acquaintance he had made at the
time of the siege of Surat in 1573, when the imperial army
was encamped at Kankrā Khāri. Even at that early date
Akbar was so eager to learn the mysteries of Zoroastrianism
that he extracted all the information he could from the
Dastūr, and persuaded him to come to court in order to
continue the discussion. It is not clear whether the Dastūr
accompanied Akbar on his return to the capital in 1578
or followed him later, but the Parsee scholar certainly
took part in the debates of 1578, and went home early in
1579.

His eminent services rendered at court to the religion of
his fathers justly won the gratitude of his colleagues at
home, who formally recognized him as their head, an honour-
able position which he held until his death in 1591. His
son who succeeded him also visited Akbar. Old Parsee
prayer-books of the eighteenth century are extant which

¹ 'The sun, the sun! they rail at
me, the Zoroastrian' (Tennyson,
'Akbar's Dream'). Blochmann
says that 'Akbar, though a Sūfī
in his heart, was a Parsee by his
rites' (J. A. S. B., part i, vol.
² The correct spelling is Māh-
yār-jī.
include the name of Dastur Meherjee Ranã among the most
honoured benefactors of the Zoroastrian faith.¹

Akbar rewarded him by a heritable grant of 200 bighas² of
land as subsistence allowance (madad-i-maãsh), which
after his death was increased by one half in favour of his
son. The deeds of grant are in existence. The Dastur
taught Akbar the peculiar terms, ordinances, rites, and
ceremonies of his creed, laying stress above all things on
the duty of reverencing the sun and fire. A sacred fire,
prepared according to Parsee rules, was started accordingly
in the palace and made over to the charge of Abu-i Fazl,
who was held responsible that it should never be extin-
guished.

From the beginning of the twenty-fifth year of the reign
(March 1580) Akbar began to prostrate himself in public
both before the sun and before fire, and when the lamps
and candles were lighted in the evening the whole court
was required to rise respectfully. The reverence for artificial
lights thus inculcated finds expression in his recorded say-
ings, one of which is: 'To light a candle is to commemorate
the (rising of the) sun. To whomsoever the sun sets, what
other remedy hath he but this? '³

Akbar's devotion to the fire cult partly explains, though
it does not justify, the passionate ferocity which he dis-
played on one occasion in or about A. D. 1603. He was
accustomed to retire to his rooms in the afternoon to rest.
One evening he happened to emerge earlier than was expected,
and at first could not find any of the servants.

'When he came near the throne and couch, he saw a
lackless lamplighter, coiled up like a snake, in a careless,
death-like sleep, close to the royal couch. Enraged at the
sight, he ordered him to be thrown from the tower, and he
was dashed into a thousand pieces.'

¹ 'Nausarinum caput, et sedes est, quorundam hominum qui se Persas, et Æteneos vocant, ex Ætene Persiae civitate, genere Gabraei, quos Lusitani Cuarinos vocant' (Commentarius, p. 548).
³ The bigha of Akbar was a little
more than half an acre, but its
exact area is not known.
⁴ 'Happy Sayings,' Afn, vol. iii,
p. 393.
The imperial wrath fell also upon the responsible officers, though in a fashion less terrible. The story is not a pleasant one, but its horror is somewhat lessened if we remember that in Akbar’s eyes the offence of the ‘luckless lamplighter’ was a profanation as well as neglect of duty.

The Parsee propaganda was supported by the zeal of the Hindu Rājā Bīrbal, an ardent sun worshipper from another point of view, and it also fitted in well with the practices of the Hindu ladies in the zenana who had their burnt offerings (hom), after the Brahmancial fashion. A few years later (1589) Akbar carried further his compliance with Parsee ritual by adopting the Persian names for the months and days, and celebrating the fourteen Persian festivals. But he stopped without ever reaching the point of definitely becoming a Zoroastrian. He acted in the same way with regard to Hinduism, Jainism, and Christianity. He went so far in relation to each religion that different people had reasonable ground for affirming him to be a Zoroastrian, a Hindu, a Jain, or a Christian.

Nevertheless, he could not bring himself to accept frankly any one of the four creeds, however much he might admire certain doctrines of each, or even practise some parts of the ritual of all four. He always cherished his dream of imposing on the empire a new and improved religion of his own which should include the best parts of all those named besides others; and, when at last he felt his throne secure in 1582, the only religion to which he could be said to adhere was that of his personal invention, the Taurīd Ilāhī, or Divine Monotheism, with himself as Pope-King.

---

1 Asad Beg, in E. & D., vi, 164.

2 Badāonī, with reference to the time about 1581, goes so far as to say that ‘His Majesty firmly believed in the truth of the Christian religion’ (ii, 267). The statement may be true for that time, when the influence of Aquaviva was strongly felt.

3 The leading authority for Akbar’s relations with the Parsees is the excellent and convincing treatise by J. J. Modi, entitled The Parsees at the Court of Akbar, and Dastūr Mehrjee Rānd; Bombay, 1903. The author, who presents many previously unpublished documents in both text and translation, proves conclusively that Akbar’s partial conversion to Zoroastrianism was the work of the Dastūr from Nausāri, begun in 1573 and continued to 1578–9. He deals fully with the testimony of Badāonī (Lowe,
The potency of the influence exercised by Jain teachers on the ideas and policy of Akbar has not been recognized by historians. No reader of the works of Elphinstone, von Noer, or Malleson would suspect either that he listened to the lessons of the Jain holy men so attentively that he is reckoned by Jain writers among the converts to their religion, or that many of his acts from 1582 onwards were the direct outcome of his partial acceptance of Jain doctrine. Even Blochmann failed to perceive that three of the learned men of the time, as enumerated in Abu-l Fazl’s long lists, were eminent Jain gurus, or religious teachers, namely Hiravijaya Sūri, Vijayasena Sūri, and Bhānuchandra Upādhyāya. The first named, the most distinguished of the three, and credited by Jain authors with the honour of having converted Akbar, is placed by Abu-l Fazl along with twenty others, including Shaikh Mubārak, in the first of the five classes of the learned, among the select few who ‘understand the mysteries of both worlds’.

In 1582 the emperor, after his return from Kābul, having heard of the virtues and learning of Hiravijaya, ordered the Viceroy of Gujarāt to send him to court. The holy man, in response to the viceregal summons, came to Ahmadābād, paid his respects to the emperor’s representative, and, in the interests of his religion, decided to accept the
imperial invitation. He refused all the costly gifts pressed upon his acceptance, and, in accordance with the rules of his order, started on his long walk to Fathpur-Sikri. The use of a conveyance of any kind by a man of his station would have involved excommunication.

The weary traveller was received with all the pomp of imperial pageantry, and was made over to the care of Abu-l Fazl until the sovereign found leisure to converse with him. After much talk upon the problems of religion and philosophy, first with Abu-l Fazl and then with Akbar, the Sūri paid a visit to Agra. At the close of the rainy season he returned to Fathpur-Sikri, and persuaded the emperor to release prisoners and caged birds, and to prohibit the killing of animals on certain days. In the following year (1580) those orders were extended, and disobedience to them was made a capital offence. Akbar renounced his much-loved hunting and restricted the practice of fishing. The Sūri, who was granted the title of Jagad-guru, or World-teacher, returned in 1584 to Gujarāt by way of Agra and Allahabad. Three years later the emperor issued written orders confirming the abolition of the jizya tax and prohibiting slaughter during periods amounting collectively to half of the year. The Sūri’s colleague, Bhānuchandra, remained at court. In 1593 Siddhichandra, who visited Akbar at Lahore, also received an honorary title, and was granted control over the holy places of his faith. The tax on pilgrims to Satrunjaya was abolished at the same time. The temple of Ādisvara on the holy hill of Satrunjaya near Pālītāna in Kathiāwār, which had been consecrated by Hiravijaya in 1590, has on its walls a Sanskrit inscription of unusual length, which combines the praises of the Sūri with those of Akbar, and gives particulars of the emperor’s generosity.

In 1592 Hiravijaya Sūri starved himself to death in the approved Jain fashion, and on the spot where his body

---

*Abu-l Fazl made a careful study of the doctrines of the Sērvās or Svetāmbara Jains, but was unable to obtain equally satisfactory information about the Digambara or nude sect* (Āfn, vol. iii, p. 210).
was cremated, at Unānagar or Unnatpur, a stūpa or memorial cupola was erected.

Akbar's action in abstaining almost wholly from eating meat and in issuing stringent prohibitions, resembling those of Asoka, restricting to the narrowest possible limits the destruction of animal life, certainly was taken in obedience to the doctrine of his Jain teachers. The infliction of the capital penalty on a human being for causing the death of an animal, which seems so unjust and absurd in our eyes, was in accordance with the practice of several famous ancient Buddhist and Jain kings. The regulations must have inflicted much hardship on many of Akbar's subjects, and especially on the Muhammadans.¹

The contribution made to the debates by Christian disputants was an important factor among the forces which led Akbar to renounce the Muslim religion. The strange story of the first Jesuit mission to his court will now be told in outline. The material is so copious that it is not possible to narrate the interesting details in full. The result of the communications with Christians described in the last preceding chapter was that in December 1578 Akbar

¹ The principal authority used is the article by 'C', entitled 'Hiravijaya Suri, or the Jainas at the Court of Akbar', in Jaina-Shāsana, Benares, 1910 (Vira Sam. 2437, pp. 113–28). The names of Akbar's Jain visitors, as recorded by Abu-l Fazl in slightly corrupted forms, will be found in Atn, vol. i, pp. 586, 547. The viceroys of Gujarrat who sent the Sūri to court was Shihab Khan (Shihabu-d din Ahmad Khan). For the prohibition of the use by Jain ascetics of any conveyance see Stevenson, The Heart of Jainism, Oxford University Press, 1915, p. 211. Mrs. Stevenson's book is the best readable treatise on Jainism. The mention of the abolition of the jīzā and the pilgrim tax at the instance of the Sūri and his disciple proves that the general orders issued early in the reign for the cessation of those imposts had not been fully obeyed, at least in Kāthiawār. Such evasion of imperial orders was common in Mogul times. Similarly, English kings repeatedly renewed Magna Carta and other charters, which they habitually violated whenever they got the chance. The great inscription mentioned is No. 308 of Kielhorn's 'List' in Ep. Ind., v, p. 44, App. The text, with a short abstract in English, was printed by Bühler, as No. XII, ibid., vol. ii, pp. 38, 50. 'C' gives the text and an old translation of the relevant portions.

The erection of a Jain stūpa so late as 1592 is worth noting. No other modern example is recorded, so far as I know. See V. A. Smith, The Jain Stūpa of Mathurā, Allahabad, 1901, a work accidentally omitted from Mrs. Stevenson's bibliography.
dispatched to the authorities at Goa a letter in the following terms:

‘In the name of God.
‘Letter of Jalāluddīn Muhammad Akbar, king placed in the seat of God.
‘[To the] Chief priests of the Order of St. Paul:
‘“Be it known to them that I am a great friend of theirs.
‘“I have sent thither Abdullah my ambassador, and Domenico Peroz, in order to invite you to send back to me with them two of your learned men, who should bring the books of the law, and above all the Gospels, because I truly and earnestly desire to understand their perfection; and with great urgency I again demand that they should come with my ambassador aforesaid, and bring their books. For from their coming I shall obtain the utmost consolation; they will be dear to me, and I shall receive them with every possible honour. As soon as I shall have become well instructed in the law, and shall have comprehended its perfection, they will be able, if willing, to return at their pleasure, and I shall send them back with great honours, and appropriate rewards. Let them not fear me in the least, for I receive them under my pledge of good faith and assure them concerning myself.” ’

Abdullah, Akbar’s envoy, reached Goa in September 1579, and was received with the stately ceremonial ordinarily reserved for the entry of a new Portuguese Viceroy. The wholly unexpected invitation from Akbar excited the warmest interest in the breast of every member of the colony and aroused the most extravagant hopes. The authorities of Goa had sought for years, and sought in vain, to find a way to introduce the gospel into the Mogul empire.

1 Translated direct from the Italian of Bartoli, p. 14. Maelagan (p. 48) gives another rendering, substantially identical. A third version, from Du Jarric, will be found in van Noor, i, 325. Goldie (p. 54 a.) furnishes a fourth, from the Latin of Alegame’s work, entitled Mortes illustres eorum de Societate Jesu, &c. (1657). All the versions agree so closely that we may be confident of possessing the correct text in substance. The date of the letter is given by De Sousa. The ‘Order of St. Paul’ is a synonym for Jesuits. Similar letters were addressed to the Viceroy and Archbishop of Goa. Abdullah the envoy may be the Khwāja Abdullah, who was with Akbar in the Samāl fight. See Blochmann, Afin, vol. i, p. 428, No. 100. Perhaps he may be identified preferably with Sayyid Abdullah Khān, a more conspicuous personage, No. 189 of Blochmann.
which was almost unknown to them except by report. Now, without any action on their part, they found the door suddenly thrown open by the king himself, who not only invited, but begged them to enter. The prospect of winning a king so great and a kingdom so extensive to the glory of the church and the benefit of Portugal was not to be neglected.\(^1\) Although the Viceroys hesitated at first to accept the invitation, his scruples were overborne by the advice of the ecclesiastical authorities, who earnestly recommended that the Fathers asked for should be allowed to go, 'without other securities than those of Divine Providence'. When the question of acceptance had been decided in November, anxious care was devoted to the choice of the missioners, who should be men qualified to take full advantage of the unique opportunity offered.\(^2\) The three Fathers selected were Ridolfo Aquaviva, as head of the mission; Antonio Monserrate, as second in command; and Francesco Enriquez, a convert from Muhammadanism, as interpreter and assistant. They joyfully welcomed the task imposed upon them, and were filled with eager anticipations of the conquest to be won for the Cross.

Before we proceed to narrate the story of the mission, it will be well to introduce to the reader the two remarkable men who conducted it, Aquaviva and Monserrate (Monserrat or Montserrat). The third member, Father Enriquez (Enrichez, Henriquez), the converted Persian, was of slight importance.

Ridolfo (Rudolf) Aquaviva, a younger son of the Duke of Atri, one of the most influential nobles in the kingdom of Naples, was born in 1550, and, therefore, was Akbar's junior by eight years. His parents were pious people, devoted to the Church and influential in its councils. Ridolfo, from early childhood, exhibited an intense vocation for the

\(^1\) 'Acquisto d'un Re, e d'un Regno guadagnato alla gloria della Chiesa, e all' utile di Portogallo' (Bartoli, p. 10). Political ambition was combined with missionary zeal.

\(^2\) De Sousa, *Oriente Conquistado*, vol. ii, C. 1, sec. 45, as transl. by Hosten in *Commentarius*, p. 544; and Monserrate himself, ibid., p. 547.
religious career, and may be said to have been born a saint of the ascetic type. He made no account of life or the pleasures of life, and a martyr’s crown was the one prize for which his soul longed. By sheer strength of will he beat down his father’s opposition, and forced an entry into the Jesuit Order. In September 1578, being then twenty-eight years of age, he landed at Goa, as a member of a proselytizing mission, full of enthusiastic zeal. A month after his arrival, he had the pleasure of baptizing a score of the attendants of a princess of Bijapur, who had been persuaded to become a Christian. He was appointed Professor of Philosophy, and devoted much time to perfecting himself in the local vernacular called Konkanī, until he was selected to be head of the mission. He then applied himself with equal diligence to the study of Persian, in which he rapidly became proficient.  

Father Antonio Monserrate, a Catalan Spaniard, was a worthy colleague of the saintly Aquaviva, although a man of a different type. During the visitation of plague at Lisbon in 1569 he had distinguished himself by exhibiting conspicuous zeal and devotion in his ministrations. At Akbar’s court his courage did not desert him, and in his attacks on the religion of the Prophet of Meca he allowed himself to use language so strong that even the latitudinarian emperor was obliged to check him. In 1582 he returned to Goa and continued his missionary labours at or near that city until 1588, when he was ordered to Abyssinia. While on his way he was taken prisoner by the Arabs, who kept him in confinement for six years and a half.

When deputed to Akbar’s court he had been appointed by the Provincial of Goa as historian of the mission. He

---

1 Aquaviva’s biography is to be read most conveniently in Goldie. The Bijapur princess was a niece of Mir Ali Khan, uncle of Ali Adil Shāh, the reigning King of Bijapur. The uncle was kept by the Portuguese as a possible pretender to the throne, and a check on their enemy, the king. There can be little doubt that the conversion of the lady and her suite was due to policy rather than to conviction. In the time of Archbishop Dom Gaspar, the Sultan of Bijapur had anticipated Akbar, by sending for priests and Christian scriptures, ‘without any further good result’ (De Sousa, in supra, in Monserrate, Commentarius, p.545).
carried out conscientiously the duty imposed upon him, and wrote up his notes each night. After his return to Goa he arranged his materials, and while confined by the Arabs was permitted to complete his literary labours. He was ransomed in 1596. The third mission was then at court, and Akbar was indignant when he heard that his old friend had been held captive.

Monserrate's principal work, entitled *Mongolicae Legationis Commentarius*, which had been long lost, and was not recovered until 1906, is of special importance as being 'the earliest account of Northern India by a European since the days of Vasco da Gama', and also as including the fullest description extant of Akbar's successful campaign against his brother of Kābul in 1581. The author, who was then tutor to Prince Murād, accompanied Akbar as far as Jalālābād on the road to Kābul.

A smaller tract, devoted to a description of Akbar personally, also has been preserved and is now accessible in an English translation. Monserrate's writings dealing with the geography, natural history, manners, and customs of India have not yet been found, but may be hidden in some European library. The map of Northern India which he prepared on the basis of astronomical observations is attached to the *Commentarius*, and is of much interest as the earliest European map of India since the time of Ptolemy and Eratosthenes.1

On November 17, 1579, the missionaries left Goa by sea, and after calling at Chaul arrived at Damān, a Portuguese port farther north. Thence they marched through Bulsār and Nausāri to Surat, the western entrance to the Mogul empire, where they arrived in December. After a necessary halt for nearly a month there they began their journey inland on January 15, 1580. They were accompanied by a caravan of merchants bringing with them China silks and other goods for sale in the interior. The roads were so unsafe in those days that only large caravans could travel with any hope of reaching their destination. A small mounted guard met the travellers

---

1 See *post*, Bibliography, section B.
Route of the FIRST JESUIT MISSION (1580) from Damān to Fathpur Sikri

Note: The mission proceeded from Goa to Damān by sea, calling at Chaul. The little river Pāmērā to the south of Balsār then marked the boundary between Portuguese and Mogul territory. The marching distance of about 650 miles from Surat to Fathpur Sikri was covered in 43 days, an average of 15 miles a day.
on the northern bank of the Tāptī. They then marched parallel to the river through Kukarmunda to Taloda in Khāndēsh, a country town still in existence. There they turned in a north-easterly direction, and, after passing through Sultānpur, now desolate, advanced through the difficult and perilous country of the Sātpura hills, infested by wild Bhils and other such tribes. After crossing the Narbadā they proceeded to Māndū and Ujjain. On February 9 they reached Sārangpur, now in the Dewās State, where the Fathers had the consolation of saying Mass. Six days later they arrived at Sironj, now in Tonk, and were met presently by a strong escort sent by Akbar. From that point their road ran nearly due north, through Narwar, Gwālīor, and Dholpur to Fathpur-Sikrī, where they arrived on February 28 (o. s.) after a journey from Surat of a little over six weeks.\(^1\)

Akbar was so eager to meet his visitors that he had them brought direct to his presence and kept them talking until two o'clock in the morning. He assumed Portuguese costume, and offered them a large sum of money, but the priests refused to accept anything beyond bare maintenance. The interpreter, Dominic Perez, was instructed to attend to their wants. On the following day Akbar again received them in the private audience chamber (Dīwān-i Khāss), and,

\(^1\) The stages of the journey are detailed by Francisco de Sousa, S. J., Oriente Conquistado, i. d. ii, p. 159, as translated by Goldie, pp. 58–61. Sultānpur, in the West Khāndēsh District, Bombay Presidency, 21° 38' N., 74° 35' E., was an important town until the beginning of the nineteenth century, when it was ruined by Jaswant Rāo Holkar, the Bhils, and famine. A petty village now occupies part of the site, on which the buildings still stand. Sārangpur (23° 34' N., 76° 29' E.), a small town at present, was an important and famous place in ancient times. Further details will be found in Monserrate, pp. 551–9. The date of starting from Surat is as given by De Sousa. Monserrate states it as January 24; but in his account (p. 551 n.) there is some confusion of old and new styles. The new style was adopted by the Portuguese Government with effect from October 5/15, 1582 (Nicholas, Chronology of History (1835), p. 32), and a year later in India. The change in England was made on September 3/14, 1752. The journey to the capital occupied 43 days. Monserrate, it should be observed, calls Gujarāt 'Gedrosia'. He describes all the principal places. The Hindu temples everywhere had been destroyed by the Muhammadans (p. 559).
on March 8, was pleased to accept the gift of a magnificently bound copy of the Royal Polyglot Bible of Plantyn, printed in 1569–72 for Philip II of Spain.¹ At a later date (1595) he gave back that work with the other European books to the Fathers then at his court.² The emperor treated the sacred text with the profoundest reverence, removing his turban, placing each volume on his head, and kissing it devoutly. He also commanded his artists to copy pictures of Christ and the Virgin which the Fathers had with them, and directed a gold reliquary to be made. Afterwards, he visited, with every mark of respect, the chapel which the Fathers were allowed to prepare in the palace, and made over his second son, Sultan Murad, then aged ten years, to Father Monserrate for instruction in the Portuguese language and Christian morals. The Jesuits describe the young prince as being very affectionate, of a good disposition, and excellent abilities.³ The priests were allowed full liberty to preach and make conversions at the capital, and when a Portuguese at court died his funeral was celebrated by a procession marching through the town with crucifixes and lighted candles.

The attitude of the missionaries was so uncompromising and fanatical that nothing but the strong protection of the emperor could have preserved their lives. They made no pretense of sharing the sympathetic feeling for the religion of the Prophet of Arabia commonly expressed in these days. A letter dispatched on December 10, 1580, by Aquaviva to the Rector of Goa expresses their sentiments and declares that

'our ears hear nothing but that hideous and heinous name of Mahomet. . . . In a word, Mahomet is everything here. Antichrist reigns. In honour of this infernal monster they bend the knee, prostrate, lift up their hands, give alms,

² Pinheiro's letter of September 8, 1595; in Peruschi, pp. 60–71, and Maclagan, p. 69. The books included the Laws of Portugal, the Commentaries of Albuquerque, and sundry theological treatises.
³ ' Molto affettionato . . . di molto buon naturale, & di grande ingegno ' (Peruschi, p. 8).
and do all they do. And we cannot speak out the truth lest, if we go too far, we endanger the life of the King.'

Although they could not utter everything that was in their minds, they said much, and, as already mentioned, Monserrate's freedom gave offence even to Akbar.

As a matter of fact, their presence at court, the marked favour shown to them by the sovereign, and the licence of their language, helped to inflame the discontent which found expression in two formidable rebellions, undoubtedly dangerous to both the throne and life of Akbar. During the course of the early disputations held in Akbar's apartments, certain Muhammadans proposed that the rival claims of Islam and Christianity should be determined by the ordeal of fire. They suggested that a champion of Islam holding a Koran, and one of the priests holding the Gospels, should enter a fire, and that whichever came out unhurt should be regarded as the teacher of truth. Akbar liked the notion, and intimated to the Fathers that he would arrange for their safety, while one of the Mullas, whom he much disliked, would be burnt. But Aquaviva denounced the proposal as being impious and would not accept it.

At Easter time Akbar suggested privately that he might arrange to be baptized by travelling to Goa on pretence of preparing for pilgrimage to Mecca. We must now part from the Fathers for a time, and deal with other matters, including some of earlier date.

At the end of June 1579 Akbar had introduced a startling innovation by displacing the regular preacher at the chief mosque in Fatehpur-Sikri and himself taking his place in the pulpit on the first Friday in the fifth month of the Muhammadan year. The address (khutbah) usually given on a Friday is composed somewhat on the lines of the 'bidding prayer' used in English universities, and always includes a prayer for the reigning sovereign. Akbar, in

---

1 Goldie, pp. 77, 78.
2 The story appears in various versions, and the challenge was offered two or three times (due, de tre volte), as Peruschi observes (p. 37). Monserrate gives a full account of the first occasion, early in 1580 (pp. 584-8).
order to emphasize the position of spiritual leader of the nation (Imām-i-ādil) to which he laid claim, availed himself of certain alleged ancient precedents and resolved to recite the Khutbah himself. Faizi, brother of Abu-l Fazl and Poet Laureate, produced a sort of Khutbah in verse, as follows, which the emperor recited:

‘In the name of Him who gave us sovereignty,
Who gave us a wise heart and a strong arm,
Who guided us in equity and justice,
Who put away from our heart aught but equity;—
His praise is beyond the range of our thoughts,
Exalted be His Majesty—“Allāhu Akbar !” ’ [Great is God !]

To those eloquent lines he added some verses of the Koran, expressing thanks for mercies and favours, and having repeated the fātiha, or opening section of the Koran, came down from the pulpit and said his prayers. According to Badāonī, he lost his nerve and broke down, but the other historians do not support that statement. He repeated the experiment several times.  

Even Abu-l Fazl admits that the innovation was unpopular and aroused much uneasy feeling. Some people said that the emperor wished to pose as the Prophet of the incomparable Deity. Others hinted that he was not unwilling to be regarded as himself sharing in the Divine nature. The use of the ambiguous phrase Allāhu Akbar gave colour to the most extreme criticisms, and, in spite of Akbar's disavowals, I am convinced that at times he allowed himself to fancy that in his own person he had bridged the gulf between the Finite and the Infinite. His

1 A. N., iii, 396; Badāonī, ii, 276; Tabakāt, in E. & D., v, 412. The version quoted is that in Lowe's tr. of Badāonī. The concluding words may be read as meaning that 'Akbar is God'. Some coins bear legends in the form 'Akbar Allāh', which distinctly suggests his claim to divinity. The fātiha is this: ‘Praise be to God, the Lord of all creatures; the most merciful, the King of the day of judgment. Thee do we worship, and of thee we beg assistance. Direct us in the right way, in the way of those to whom thou hast been gracious; not of those against whom thou art incensed, nor of those who go astray’ (Sale). Examples of Khutbah composition are given in Hughes, Dictionary of Islam.
recorded sayings prove conclusively that he rated very highly the kingly position.

'The very sight of kings', he said, 'has been held to be a part of divine worship. They have been styled conventionally the Shadow of God; and, indeed, to behold them is a means of calling to mind the Creator, and suggests the protection of the Almighty.'

His learned and skilful flatterers, Abu-l Fazl, Faizī, and the rest, were only too willing to fill his mind with such notions, and he, after the manner of kings, swallowed flattery with pleasure. Abu-l Fazl vainly tries to deny the patent fact that Akbar regarded with disfavour the Muhammadan religion. Although the emperor did not wholly cast aside the mask of conformity until 1582, his faith in Islam had been completely shaken at least three years earlier. But he always held firmly to the great doctrine of the unity of God.

Before he made up his mind definitely to renounce Islam, he tried to follow a middle path, and to seek peace by constituting himself the supreme judge of all differences between the rival Muslim doctors. When he returned triumphant from Gujarat at the turning-point of his career, Shaikh Mubarak had gratified him by expressing the hope that the emperor might become the spiritual as well as the political head of his people. The hint given in 1573 had never been forgotten by either its author or the sovereign. Six years later, in 1579, the time was deemed to be ripe for the proposed momentous innovation which should extend the autocracy of Akbar from the temporal to the spiritual side, and make him Pope as well as King.

Ultimately, at the beginning of September 1579, Shaikh Mubarak produced a formal document in his own handwriting, drafted in such a way as to settle that the emperor must be accepted as the supreme arbiter in all causes, whether ecclesiastical or civil. Probably it was suggested

\[1 'Happy Sayings' in Ain, vol. iii, p. 398. Guerreiro (Relación, Spanish tr., ch. iii, p. 16) describes Akbar as being 'so proud and arrogant that he is willing to be worshipped as God'; 'es tan soberbio y arrogante, que consiégue ser adorado como Dios.'\]
by the information then becoming available concerning the position of the Pope in Western Europe. We need not trouble about the technical discussions which raged round the interpretation of the legal terms, Mujtahid and Imām-i-Ādil. It will suffice to say that Akbar was solemnly recognized as being superior in his capacity of Imām-i-Ādil to any other interpreter (mujtahid) of Muslim law, and practically was invested with the attribute of infallibility. Both the rival party leaders, Makhdūmu-l Mulk and Shaikh Abdu-n Nabī, as well as other eminent doctors learned in the law, were induced or compelled to set their seals to a pronouncement which their souls abhorred. This is the translation of the document, as preserved in the text of both Nizāmu-d din and Badāoni.

‘Petition.

‘Whereas Hindostan is now become the centre of security and peace, and the land of justice and beneficence, a large number of people, especially learned men and lawyers, have immigrated and chosen this country for their home.
‘Now we, the principal Ulamā, who are not only well-versed in the several departments of the Law and in the principles of jurisprudence, and well acquainted with the edicts which rest on reason or testimony, but are also known for our piety and honest intentions, have duly considered the deep meaning, first, of the verse of the Korān:—

‘“Obey God, and obey the Prophet, and those who have authority among you” ; and secondly, of the genuine tradition:—

‘“Surely the man who is dearest to God on the day of judgment is the Imām-i-ādil; whosoever obeys the Amīr, obeys Thee; and whosoever rebels against him, rebels against Thee” ;

‘And thirdly, of several other proofs based on reasoning or testimony: and we have agreed that the rank of Sultān-i-ādil is higher in the eyes of God than the rank of a Mujtahid.

‘Further, we declare that the King of the Islām, Amīr of the Faithful, Shadow of God in the world, Abūl-fath Jalāl-ud-dīn Muhammad Akbar, Pādshāh Ghāzi (whose kingdom God perpetuate !), is a most just, a most wise, and a most God-fearing king.

‘Should, therefore, in future a religious question come up,
regarding which the opinions of the Mujtahids are at variance, and His Majesty, in his penetrating understanding and clear wisdom be inclined to adopt, for the benefit of the nation and as a political expedient, any of the conflicting opinions which exist on that point, and should issue a decree to that effect—

'We do hereby agree that such a decree shall be binding on us and on the whole nation.

'Further, we declare that should His Majesty think fit to issue a new order, we and the nation shall likewise be bound by it; Provided always, that such order be not only in accordance with some verse of the Korân, but also of real benefit to the nation; and further, that any opposition on the part of his subjects to such an order passed by His Majesty shall involve damnation in the world to come and loss of property and religious privileges in this.

'This document has been written with honest intentions, for the glory of God and the propagation of the Islâm, and is signed by us, the principal Ulamâ and lawyers, in the month of Rajab in the year nine hundred and eighty-seven (987).

That document assured to Akbar, so far as any written instrument could have such effect, the utmost power that any man could claim to exercise within the limits of Islâm. The decree had no concern with any other religion. Although it purported to have been devised for the propagation of the Muslim faith, and to recognize the authority not only of the Korân, but of the genuine traditions of the Prophet, yct, as Badâonî truly observes, 'the superiority of the intellect of the Imâm was established, and opposition was rendered impossible'.

1 Badâonî, ii, 279. Rajab is the 7th month. The year 987 began on February 28, 1579.

2 The meaning and effect of the decree are absurdly misrepresented by Malleson in the following passage: 'The signature of this document was a turning-point in the life and reign of Akbar. For the first time he was free. He could give currency and force to his ideas of toleration and his respect for conscience. He could now bring the Hindû, the Pârsî, the Christian into his councils. He could attempt to put into execution the design he had long meditated of making the interests of the indigenous princes the interests of the central authority at Agra. The document is, in fact, the Magna Charta of his reign.

'Farther, we declare that should His Majesty think fit to issue a new order, we and the nation shall likewise be bound by it; Provided always, that such order be not only in accordance with some verse of the Korân, but also of real benefit to the nation; and further, that any opposition on the part of his subjects to such an order passed by His Majesty shall involve damnation in the world to come and loss of property and religious privileges in this.

'This document has been written with honest intentions, for the glory of God and the propagation of the Islâm, and is signed by us, the principal Ulamâ and lawyers, in the month of Rajab in the year nine hundred and eighty-seven (987).'

That document assured to Akbar, so far as any written instrument could have such effect, the utmost power that any man could claim to exercise within the limits of Islâm. The decree had no concern with any other religion. Although it purported to have been devised for the propagation of the Muslim faith, and to recognize the authority not only of the Korân, but of the genuine traditions of the Prophet, yct, as Badâonî truly observes, 'the superiority of the intellect of the Imâm was established, and opposition was rendered impossible'.

1 Badâonî, ii, 279. Rajab is the 7th month. The year 987 began on February 28, 1579.

2 The meaning and effect of the decree are absurdly misrepresented by Malleson in the following passage: 'The signature of this document was a turning-point in the life and reign of Akbar. For the first time he was free. He could give currency and force to his ideas of toleration and his respect for conscience. He could now bring the Hindû, the Pârsî, the Christian into his councils. He could attempt to put into execution the design he had long meditated of making the interests of the indigenous princes the interests of the central authority at Agra. The document is, in fact, the Magna Charta of his reign.

'The reader will, I am sure, pardon me if I have dwelt at some length on the manner in which it was obtained, for it is the keystone of the subsequent legislation and action of the monarch, by it placed above the narrow restrictions of Islâm' (p. 156).
DEBATES ON RELIGION

It may be doubted if the House of Worship remained in use for long after the promulgation of the decree. Wrangling between the rival Muslim doctors became futile when the infallible autocrat could solve any problem at issue by a decisive word. Discussion, no doubt, still continued for years, but it seems to have been conducted generally in the private apartments of the palace, and not at the House of Worship in the gardens. The field of debate was widened, and representatives of all religions were henceforth welcomed.

The pretence or profession of a desire to define and propagate the teaching of Islam was soon dropped, and in the course of a year or two Akbar had definitely ceased to be a Muslim. As early as January 1580, when Aquaviva and his companions were travelling from Surat to Gujarát on their way to the capital, they had met the imperial couriers, who told the escort that Akbar had forbidden the use of the name of Muhammad in the public prayers. Afterwards he went much farther, and definitely renounced all faith in the Prophet, although he continued to perform occasional acts of conformity for political reasons.

In September 1579 Akbar, although no longer a sincere believer in the efficacy of the prayers of Muslim saints, made a pilgrimage, as had been his annual custom, to the shrine at Ajmer. The date, however, was not that of Muinu-d din’s anniversary on which he had been accustomed to go. Abu-l Fazl candidly states that he made this special visit as ‘a means of calming the public and enhancing the submission of the recalcitrants’. He never went again, but in the year following (1580) sent Prince Dāniyāl as his representative.

About this time Akbar, becoming alarmed at the widespread resentment aroused by his innovations, adopted a policy of calculated hypocrisy. When on his way back from Ajmer he caused a lofty tent (bārgāh) to be furnished as a travelling mosque, in which he ostentatiously prayed

1 De Sousa, Oriente Conquistada, ed. Lisbon, 1710, i, ch. ii, p. 160, as cited by Goldie, p. 65 n.
2 He started early in September, marching leisurely and hunting on the way. He arrived at the shrine about the middle of October (A.N., iii, 405).
five times a day, as a pious Muslim should do. A little later, apparently in 1580, he carried his hypocritical conformity still farther. A certain Mīr Abū Turāb had returned from Mecca, bringing with him a stone supposed to bear an impression of the Prophet’s foot. Akbar, knowing well that ‘the thing was not genuine’, commanded that the pretended relic should be received with elaborate ceremonial. He went out in person to meet it, and helped to carry the heavy stone for some paces on his shoulder.

‘All this honour was done out of abundant perceptive-ness, respect and appreciation, and wide toleration, in order that the reverence due to the simple-minded Saiyid might not be spilt on the ground, and that jovial critics might not break out into smiles. The vain thinkers and ill-conditioned ones who had been agitated on account of the inquiries into the proofs of prophecy, and the passing of nights (in discussion), and the doubts of which books of theology are full—were at once made infamous in the market of ashamedness’,

and so on, according to Abu-l Fazl. The make-believe, however, was too obvious to impose on any intelligent person. Indeed, Badāoni expressly states that when the emperor took the trouble of walking five kōs to the shrine at Ajmēr,

‘sensible people smiled, and said:—“It was strange that His Majesty should have such faith in the Khwājah, while he rejected the foundation of everything—our prophet, from whose skirt hundreds of thousands of saints of the highest degree, like the Khwājah, had sprung.”’ ¹

We may be certain that the farcical reception of the sham relic must have excited still more outspoken ridicule.

The unworthy hypocrisy which Akbar condescended to practise failed to effect its purpose, and he found himself compelled to meet by force the violent opposition aroused by his rash proceedings.

¹ For the mosque-tent see A. N., iii, 407 n. The story of the stone is told, ibid., p. 411. Beveridge discusses in his note the date of the incident, which is placed later by Badāoni (ii, 320).

For the remark that ‘sensible people smiled’ see ibid., p. 280.
Early in 1580 he got rid of both Shaikh Abdu-n Nabi, the late Sadr, and his opponent Makhdûmu-l Mulk by sending them into exile under the form of a pilgrimage to Mecca. Both were allowed to return, but they did not survive long. Makhdûmu-l Mulk died at Ahmadâbâd in 1582, leaving great riches and valuable books, which were all confiscated. His sons several times suffered torture, and were reduced to abject poverty.¹ Two years later Abdu-n Nabi was murdered, presumably in pursuance of secret orders from the emperor. Akbar’s hostility was terribly vindictive in some cases. ²

¹ Badāonī, in E. & D., v, 536; Lowe, p. 821. The words translated by Elliot as ‘several times underwent torture’ are taken by Lowe in a figurative sense to mean ‘being some time on the rack of distress’. Inasmuch as the deceased had taken cunning precautions to conceal his wealth, the use of torture is probable.

² Afn, vol. i, p. 278; Badāonī, ii, 32.
CHAPTER VII

REBELLION IN BENGAL AND BIHĀR; THE KĀBUL CAMPAIGN AND ITS RESULTS; END OF THE FIRST JESUIT MISSION; REBELLION OF MUZAFFAR SHĀH IN GUJARĀT, ETC.

Khān Jahān, governor of Bengal, died in December 1578, and after a short interval was replaced by Muzaffar Khān Turbatī (March 1579). Various officers were appointed to assist the new governor as Diwān (revenue department), Bakhshi (paymaster, &c.), and Sadr (ecclesiastical and grants department). The offences which at various times had cost Muzaffar Khān his sovereign’s favour were blotted out, and he was now entrusted with one of the most responsible posts in the empire. Instructions from the court required the officials in Bihār and Bengal to enforce the unpopular regulations concerning the branding of horses for government service, and to secure the rights of the Crown by investigating the titles to jāgīr lands and resuming unauthorized holdings. At that time the imperial Diwān or Finance Minister was Khwāja Shāh Mansūr, an expert in treasury business, but over-fond of gain, and unsympathetic in temperament. The strict and apparently over-strict enforcement of the orders of the government by the local officials produced violent discontent among the Muhammadan chiefs in Bihār and Bengal. Special cases of severity to individuals increased the ill feeling, and it is said that the officials added fuel to the fire by their greed for money. Particular exasperation was caused by an interference with the local allowances payable to soldiers serving in the eastern provinces. Akbar had directed that the pay of men serving

1 Muzaffar Khān had been in Bairām Khān’s service. For his life see Aīn, vol. i, p. 348, No. 87. Blochmann seems to be mistaken in attributing to him the old Jāmī or Kālī mosque at Agra.

According to Latif (Agra, p. 197), that building was erected by Mirzā Muzaffar Husain, the grandson of Shāh Ismail of Persia. The life of the Mirzā is narrated in Aīn, vol. i, p. 818, No. 8.
in Bengal should be raised by 100 per cent., and that of those serving in Bihār by 50 per cent. Shāh Mansūr took it upon himself to order that those allowances should be cut down to 50 and 20 per cent. respectively. The orders to that effect led to irritating demands for the refund of excess payments. In addition to all those material reasons for dissatisfaction, the Musalmans of Bihār and Bengal were profoundly alarmed by Akbar’s vagaries in the matter of religion and his manifest alienation from Islām. His policy, represented in theory to be one of universal toleration (sulḥ-i-kul), was resented as being in substance an attack upon the Muhammadan religion. Subsequent proceedings proved that the malcontents were fully justified in their interpretation of the action taken by Akbar, who quickly developed a bitter hatred for everything connected with the name or religion of the Prophet, and allowed his ‘universal toleration’ to be perverted into a toleration of all religions except the Muhammadan, on which he lavished insults and outrages. At the time of the rebellion in the east he had not gone so far as he did afterwards, but he had already manifested his hostility to Islām, and the officers in Bihār and Bengal had good reason for fearing that he would become a thoroughgoing apostate. They therefore began to look to Muhammad Hakim, his younger half-brother at Kābul, as the orthodox head of Indian Muslims, and to conspire for placing him on Akbar’s throne. The transparently insincere devices adopted by the emperor to keep up appearances as a Muhammadan could not deceive any person of ordinary intelligence. Early in 1580 Mullā Muhammad Yazdī, a theologian who had been in intimate converse with Akbar, ventured to issue a formal ruling (fatwā), in his capacity as Kāzī of Jaunpur, that rebellion against the innovating emperor was lawful.¹

The reasons above enumerated, which might be amplified largely in detail, brought about a sudden revolt of influential chiefs of Bengal in January 1580, when Wazir Jamīl, Bābā

¹ Mullā Muhammad Yazdī had shared with two Brahmans and Shaikh Tāju-d din the honour of being drawn up to the top of the wall of the Fathpur-Sikrī palace in order to hold confidential converse with Akbar (Bādānī, ii, 265–7). He was a bitter Shia.
Khān Kākshāl, and other officers rebelled openly. 1 Dissen-
sions among the imperial officials encouraged the rebels to
hope for success greater than their actual strength would
have justified them in expecting. Muzaffar Khān, the
governor, an arrogant man, was jealous of the Diwān and
other officers appointed to help him as subordinate colleagues,
some of whom were not men of high character.

In February 1580 Akbar received dispatches announcing
the rebellion. He promptly sent Rājā Todar Māl and other
officers to suppress the disturbances, and attempted to
remove the causes of discontent by the issue of conciliatory
orders censuring the governor for indiscretion. They failed
to effect their purpose. The rebellion acquired added force
by the adhesion of Masūm Khān of Kābul, jāgīrdar of
Patna, commonly distinguished as ‘the Revel (Aṣī)’, a nick-
name given him by Akbar, and of his namesake known by
the cognomen of Farankhūdī. Those officers were largely
influenced by the legal ruling given by Mullā Muhammad
Yazdī, the Kāzī of Jaunpur, that the apostasy of Akbar
justified rebellion against him, as mentioned above. Masūm
Khān of Kābul, who was in communication with Akbar’s
brother, Mīrzā Muhammad Hakīm, ruler of that province,
may be considered the chief leader of the revolt. The royal
arms in the early stages of the war were not successful.
In April 1580 Muzaffar Khān, who had retired to Tānda, an
indefensible place, was captured and killed, ‘with all sorts
of tortures’. 2 The equipage and treasure of the royal army
fell into the hands of the rebels. Akbar dared not proceed
in person to conduct the campaign in the eastern provinces,
because he rightly felt that the really serious danger threaten-
ing him was that on the north-west, where his brother was
preparing an invasion in communication with the Bengal
insurgents for the purpose of winning for himself the throne
of Hindostan. A successful invasion from Kābul, resulting
in the occupation of Delhi and of Agra with its enormous

ch. 50, 51. For biography of
Wazīr or Wazīr Beg Jamīl see.

2 Bādāoīī, ii, 290.
store of treasure, would have meant the destruction of the empire which Akbar had built up with so much labour and skill. But if that invasion should fail, the rising in the east might be safely regarded as a mere provincial trouble to be adjusted sooner or later by the imperial officers. Events proved the soundness of Akbar's judgement. The invasion from the north-west was repelled, and the eastern insurrections were suppressed in due course.

Rājā Todar Mall was besieged in Mungir (Monghyr) for four months, until he was relieved by the gradual melting away of the rebel contingents. The Teliagarhī Pass, the 'gate of Bengal', was recovered by the imperialists, and the back of the rebellion was broken.

Akbar appointed his foster-brother, Mirzā Azīz Kokah, to be governor of Bengal. The Mirzā, a man of an insubordinate disposition, had been in disgrace and excluded from court for a long time. He was now recalled to favour, raised to the rank of a commander of 5,000, given the title of Khān-i-Azam, and entrusted with the honourable task of recovering the eastern provinces. Shāhbaẓ Khān was recalled from a campaign in Rājputāna, and sent to help the governor. It is evident that at this period Akbar was in a position of imminent danger. He could not afford to leave a noble so influential as Mirzā Azīz Kokah sulking, nor could he fritter away strength in minor enterprises.

In order to conciliate the rebels Shāh Mansūr was removed for a short time from the office of Diwān or Finance Minister, and replaced, as a temporary measure, by Wazīr Khān.

Shāhbaẓ Khān inflicted a severe defeat on one section of the insurgents between Ajodhya in Southern Oudh and Jaunpur in January 1581. It is unnecessary to follow the further operations in detail. It may suffice to say that by 1584 the rebellion in both Bihār and Bengal had been

---

1 *A. N.*, iii, 434.
2 For life of Wazīr (Vazir) Khān see *Ām*, vol. i, p. 353, No. 41. He was brother of Asaf Khān I, and had been governor of Gujarāt.
3 Ibid., p. 486. The fight took place near Sultānpur-Bilahri, 25 kōs from Ajodhya (Awadh). The neighbouring city of Fyzabad had not been built at that date.
generally suppressed. The partial subjugation of Orissa was deferred to a later date. Akbar exhibited his usual politic clemency in favour of several of the prominent rebel leaders, who sometimes abused his leniency and renewed their disloyal conduct.¹

The Mullās, or religious teachers, who had instigated the insurrection, were sternly punished in an irregular fashion, without trial or public execution. Mullā Muhammad Yazdi, the Kāzi of Jaunpur, who had dared to give the ruling that rebellion was lawful, was sent for, along with his colleague, the Kāzi of Bengal. Their boat 'founclered' in the river, and sundry other Mullās suspected of disaffection were 'sent to the closet of annihilation', by one way or another² Akbar never felt any scruple about ordering the private informal execution or assassination of opponents who could not be condemned and sentenced publicly without inconvenient consequences. In such matters his action resembled that of the contemporary Italian princes.

In the early years of the reign, while Akbar's dominions were still comparatively small, the assessment of the land revenue, or government share of the produce, had been made annually on the strength of a rough estimate which was submitted to and passed by the sovereign.

In the fifteenth year of the reign (1570–1) Muzaffar Khān Turbatī, then Diwān, or Finance Minister, assisted by Rājā Todar Mall, at that time his subordinate, prepared a revised assessment based on the returns made by the provincial Kānūngos, and checked by ten chief Kānūngos at head-quarters.

In the 24th and 25th regnal years (1579–80), the inconveniences of annual 'settlements' or assessments having become apparent, Khwāja Shāh Mansūr introduced a system of decennial or ten year's 'settlement', the assessment being based on the average of ten years, namely the 15th to the

¹ Masūm Khān Faranqhūdī was pardoned thrice. Soon after the last public exercise of clemency he was waylaid when returning from the palace at night and killed, probably in accordance with secret orders from Akbar (Ain, vol. i, p. 443, No. 157).
² Badāoni, ii, 285.
24th regnal years inclusive, and fixed for a term of ten years. Abu-l Fazl, who was not a revenue expert, is rather obscure in his description, because he says that a tenth of the total of ten years was fixed as the annual assessment, and then proceeds to state that, as regards the last five years of the period above named (i.e. 20th to 24th years), 'the best crops were taken into account in each year, and the year of the most abundant harvest accepted'.

If the best year was taken as the standard, the assessment must have been severe; but, if Abu-l Fazl may be believed, 'the people were thus made contented and their gratitude was abundantly manifested'. Unfortunately little if any definite evidence exists concerning the actual facts.

Rājā Todar Mall was associated with the Khwāja in the imperial commission, but when he was obliged to go eastwards in order to suppress the Bengal rebellion which broke out in January 1580, the whole burden of the work fell upon Shāh Mansūr, a highly skilled accountant.1

About the same time, 1580, the enlarged empire was divided into twelve provinces or viceroyalties, generally known as Sūbas, and a regular establishment of high officials was fixed for each province. The original twelve Sūbas were: Alla-habad, Agra, Oudh, Ajmēr, Ahmadābād (Gujarat), Bihār, Bengal, Delhi, Kabul, Lahore (Pānjab), Multān, and Mālāwā. When subsequent annexations took place, Kashmir was included in Lahore, Sind in Multān, and Oriśa in Bengal. The conquests in the Deccan towards the close of the reign added three new Sūbas, Berār, Khāndēsh, and Ahmadnagar, bringing up the total to 15.2

The superior staff of each province comprised: the Diwān (finance); Bakhshī (pay department, &c.); Mir Adal ('doomster', to pronounce sentence on persons condemned by a Kāzī); Sadr (ecclesiastical and grants department); Kotwāl (police); Mir Bahr (shipping, ports, and ferries); and Wākia-navis (record department).


2 The list is as given by Abu-l
The viceroy, who was usually known as Sūbadār in later times, was called Sipāhsalār or Commander-in-Chief in Akbar's day.

The arrangements made by Shāh Mansūr formed the basis of all subsequent Mogul administration, and have left some trace even to this day.

The tragic fate of the Khwāja in the year following his reforms will be narrated presently.

The year 1581 may be regarded as the most critical time in the reign of Akbar, if his early struggles to consolidate his power be not taken into account. When the year began he was undisputed master of all the great fortresses in northern India, and had extended his dominion east and west from the Arabian Sea to the Bay of Bengal, and southwards as far as the Tāptī river. But the revolt in Bihār and Bengal which had broken out at the beginning of 1580 was still far from being completely crushed. In the course of that year the rebels began to aim at something more than a mere provincial insurrection. They sought for an orthodox Muslim sovereign and plotted to replace the impious Akbar by his half-brother, Mīrzā Muhammad Hakīm, the ruler of Kābul, who was practically independent, although supposed to owe fealty to the emperor of Hindostan. They were not troubled by the thought that the man whom they desired to substitute for their gifted monarch was a drunken sot, cowardly and irresolute, incapable of governing the empire acquired and consolidated by the genius of Akbar. It sufficed for them to know that Muhammad Hakīm was reputed to be sound in doctrine. Accordingly, the Masūms and other rebel leaders in the eastern provinces conspired with several influential personages at court to invite the Kābul prince to invade India and wrest the throne from its blasphemous occupant. They promised their nominee ample support and a bloodless victory.

The Bengal rebels obviously were at a great disadvantage in being separated from the territories of Muhammad Hakīm by many hundreds of miles of country strongly held by Akbar and under his effective control. Their hopes of success
rested on two things only, namely, a vigorous offensive in adequate force from Kābul threatening Delhi and Agra, and the seduction of high officials capable of paralysing the imperialist defence by reason of their position. If the conspirators had had on their side a single man of commanding ability they might have succeeded, because Akbar’s conduct had excited bitter hostility in the hearts of most Muhamma-
dans of influence, while his Hindu supporters might not have been strong enough to maintain his authority. But Muhammad Hakim was a contemptible creature, wholly incapable of meeting his brother either in statecraft or in the field, and the rebellion in the east failed to produce any leader of real eminence. The court officials who felt inclined to play the part of traitors were dominated by the craft and genius of their master. They were powerless unless the claimant to the throne could justify his pretensions by decisive military success, and that he failed to attain.

Akbar learned at an early date the nature of the conspiracy, and prepared to crush it by a combination of guile with force.¹

¹ The history of the Kābul campaign rests upon the testi-
mony of three authors, all of whom took part in the expedition; namely (1) Father Monserrate; (2) Abu-l Fazl, in the Akbarnāma; and (3) Nizāmü-d din, in the Tabakat. Particulars of their works will be found in the Bibliography (App. D). The treatise by Monserrate is entitled to be considered the primary authority, as being by far the fullest account of the transactions, based on notes written up each evening while his recollection of the events was fresh by a learned, able, and conscientious man. He gives numerous material facts not mentioned by any other writer. The Akbarnāma account, the next in value, is tolerably detailed, but the narrative is disfigured by the author’s usual faults, and leaves obscure many incidents clearly related by the Jesuit. Nizāmü-d din’s abstract of the events is meagre. The principal matter of interest in it is the assertion that Shāh Mansūr was hanged on the strength of evidence, partially forged. Badāoni, in the main, copies from the Tabakat, adding one or two details. The notice of the cam-
paign in Firishta is slight and of no independent value.

Monserrate, Abu-l Fazl, and Firishta agree in ignoring the story about the alleged forgery, and in treating Shāh Mansūr as a traitor deservedly punished. Badāoni follows the lead given by Nizāmü-d-din and amplifies his statement on the incident, which will be discussed more fully in subsequent notes.

As usual the three contemporary authorities do not always agree. Mr. Beveridge has been good enough to send me most of the proof-sheets of volume iii of his translation of the Akbarnāma, not yet published, which contains the account of the Kābul expedi-
tion. The Latin text of Monser-
The leader of the conspiracy at court was Shāh Mansūr, the Finance Minister, whom Akbar had raised from a humble position as a clerk, in recognition of his exceptional skill in dealing with accounts. Letters from him to Muhammad Hakim were intercepted. Akbar placed the traitor under surveillance for a month and suspended him from office, replacing him temporarily by Shāh Kulī Mahram. Steps were taken to scatter the conspirators and prevent them from combining. Akbar then reinstated Shāh Mansūr, who, however, renewed his communications with Kābul. His correspondence was again seized. Shāh Mansūr was then finally removed from office and imprisoned.

In December 1580 an officer of Muhammad Hakim named Nūru-d din made a raid into the Panjāb, which was repulsed, as also was a second inroad under the command of Shādmān, who was killed. When his baggage was examined more documents were found incriminating Shāh Mansūr and other high officials. Mīrzā Muhammad Hakim in person then invaded the Panjāb with 15,000 cavalry. He made overtures to Yūsuf, commandant of the northern Rohtās, asking him to surrender the fortress, which were rejected with indignation. The prince then advanced to Lahore, and camped in a garden outside the city, hoping that the gates would be opened to him. Mān Singh, the governor, however, was faithful to his charge and refused to commit treason. Muhammad Hakim then retired to his own territory. He had been led on by the counsels of his maternal uncle, Faridūn, who was convinced that the country would rise in his favour. Notwithstanding the care taken by the invaders to abstain from pillage, the expectations of Faridūn were completely falsified by the event, and not a man stirred.

rate's treatise, edited by Father H. Hosten, S.J., in 1914, is still practically unknown to nearly all students of Indian history. It has been largely used in the composition of this chapter.

1 'Xamansurus (hoc enim erat nomen, conjuratorum duci)' (Commentarius, p. 576).
2 The exact dates of those events do not seem to be recorded, and there is some obscurity about the occasions. Shāh Kulī Mahram seems to have taken the place of the Khwāja on one occasion and Wāsr Khān on another.
3 Now in the Jhelum (Jihlam) District, in 82° 55' N. and 73° 49' E. The fortress was built by Shār Shāh.
to help the Mirzā, whose force by itself was obviously inadequate to withstand the might of Akbar. Speedy retreat was imperative. Muhammad Hakīm fled in such haste that he lost 400 men who failed to swim across the Chināb.

Akbar, who had hoped to avoid war with his brother, was reluctantly compelled to decide that the time had come to defend his throne by arms. He made his preparations for an advance in overwhelming strength with the utmost forethought, and prudence, assembling a force of about 60,000 cavalry, at least 500 elephants, and an unnumbered host of infantry. He advanced eight months’ pay from the imperial treasury. His army, which was at least three times more numerous and ten times more powerful than that of his brother, was mustered near the capital.

On February 8, 1581, Akbar marched. As a precaution he took with him Shāh Mansūr, who had been released from custody. The emperor was accompanied by his two elder sons, Prince Salīm, then in his twelfth year, and Prince Murād, who was about a year younger. Father Monserrate, tutor to Murād, was in attendance, by Akbar’s express command. Suitable measures were taken for the administration of the capital, the provinces, and chief cities of the empire. A few ladies of the harem travelled with the camp, which was arranged with well-ordered splendour. The huge multitude, including innumerable camp followers and dealers in every commodity, moved with admirable precision along the great northern road through Mathurā (Muttra) and Delhi. Father Monserrate was astounded at the low prices which prevailed, notwithstanding the immense numbers of men and animals, more especially of elephants.

1 'Bellum Chabulicum quod magna cum animi constantia et miro consilio, Hachimo fugato Zealadinus [Jalālu-d din] confecit' (Commentarius, p. 525).
2 Tabakāt in E. & D., v, 421.
3 Bartoli, p. 59.
4 The date, according to Monserrate, was 'sext. Idus Feb.', which his editor correctly interprets as February 8. Akbar formed his camp at Fathpur-Sikri on the 6th, waited there for two days (biduo, p. 579) until everything was in order, and actually marched on the 8th. That circumstance explains the statement in A. N., iii, 495, that Akbar set off on Monday, Muharram 2, which undoubtedly was equivalent to February 6.
5 The number of elephants
He ascribes the extraordinary plenty to the care and foresight of Akbar, who had personally seen to the collection of supplies. The dealers employed for the commissariat had been relieved from the payment of all dues or customs.¹

When the camp was in the neighbourhood of Sônpat, Malik Sâni, a confidential servant of Muhammad Hakim, arrived and offered his own services to the emperor. The fact that the visitor accepted the hospitality of Shâh Mansûr, who was already so deeply compromised, was regarded as additional evidence of the minister's treason. About the same time letters purporting to have been sent by Muhammad Hakim to Shâh Mansûr were intercepted. This third seizure of treasonable correspondence left Akbar in no doubt concerning the guilt of Shâh Mansûr, who was again arrested.

The army then moved on through Pânîpat and Thânêsar to Shâhâbâd, midway between Thânêsar and Ambâla (Umballa).² Near Shâhâbâd, Shâh Mansûr was solemnly hanged on a tree adjoining the sarâi of Kôt Kachhwâha.³ The story of this memorable execution is best told in the words of Father Monserrate, who was with the camp, and wrote up his notes each evening.

'The army', he writes, 'arrived at Shâhâbâd, where Shâh Mansûr, by order of the King, was hanged on a tree, and so paid the just penalty for his perfidy and treason. The thing was done in this manner. The King commanded the officers of the guards and of the executioners, as well as certain chief nobles, to halt at that place with Shâh Mansûr. He

¹ Shâhâbâd is now in the Karnâl District (30° 10' N., 76° 52' E.). The name is disguised as 'Baâdum' in Commentarius, p. 590. The correct name is given in the Tabâdût (E. & D., v, 422).
² Actually with the force was 500 (Monserrate, p. 592), not 5,000 as Bartoli puts it (p. 53). The army comprised people of many nationalities. At that time the strength of the Imperial Service troops, as distinguished from contingents, was 45,000 cavalry, 5,000 elephants, and an unnumbered host of men on foot. The expeditionary force included part of the Imperial Service Troops, besides considerable contingents, making up the total stated in the text.
³ Commentarius, p. 581.
directed Abu-l Fazl to expound in the presence of those witnesses the benefits which the King had conferred upon the condemned man from his boyhood. The speaker was further instructed to reproach him with his ingratitude, to denounce his treason, and to prove that Shāh Mansūr, convicted on the evidence of letters in his own handwriting and in that of Muhammad Hakīm, was rightly sentenced to be hanged by order of the King. He was also commanded to urge the criminal to undergo his punishment with a stout heart, accepting it as only his due. He was further instructed to convince those present that the King had planned no injustice against Shāh Mansūr, and to warn them to abide by their duty.

‘Abu-l Fazl, as representing the King, performed the above duty to a nicety.¹ When the culprit was dead, they returned to the camp, which was not far off. The King openly testified by the sadness of his countenance that he grieved over the man’s fate.

‘But by his execution the whole conspiracy was extinguished, and the sword-point was withdrawn from the throats of all who adhered to the King. Throughout the whole camp, the punishment of the wicked man was approved with rejoicing. No internal sedition being now to be feared, Akbar anticipated the successful issue of the war, which he accomplished by the favour of God. Muhammad Hakīm, when he heard of what had happened, repented his action and thought of peace.’

The execution of Shāh Mansūr has been denounced by writers of authority as ‘a judicial murder’, or ‘a foul murder’, and attributed to the machinations of Rājā Todar Mall. Neither Father Monserrate nor Abu-l Fazl gives any support to such charges. Both authors treat the punishment as deserved and say that it was acclaimed by general rejoicing.² The belief that the execution was a judicial murder rests upon the following passage in the Ṭabakāt:

‘When the Emperor was waited upon at Kābul by the confidential servants of Mirzā Muhammad Hakīm, he made

¹ ‘Quod Abdulfasilius, qui Regis personam sustinebat, ad unguem perfecti’ (p. 591). Compare the case of Essex and Bacon, twenty years later.
² Abu-l Fazl, although not quite so definite in his judgement as Father Monserrate, states as one among the criminal’s faults that he lacked ‘a little loyalty to the lord of the universe’.
inquiry into the case of Khwâja Shâh Mansûr, and it appeared that Karmu-lla, brother of Shâhbaž, had colluded with others to concoct letters, and that he had forged the last letter on the evidence of which Khwâja Mansûr was executed. After this was discovered, the Emperor often regretted the execution of the Khwâja.¹

It will be observed that Nizâmû-d din distinctly affirms the forgery of only the last set of letters, those seized near Sônpat towards the end of February 1581, which induced Akbar to decide on the execution. Badãonî, whose work was based on the Ṭabâkât, extends Nizâmû-d din’s statement so as to cover all the letters, saying that Akbar ‘found out that Karamu-lla, brother of Shâhbaž Khân, together with other Amîrs had concocted all this forgery and deception, and that the last letter also, which had been the cause of his being put to death, was a forgery of the Amîrs. So the Emperor was very much grieved about the execution of Shâh Mansûr.’²

After careful study of the various versions of the incident, I am of opinion that in 1580 genuine correspondence passed between the Mirzâ and the Khwâja. Monserrate’s detailed account shows that Akbar was unwilling to take strong action on those documents, and that it was the third discovery in 1581 which induced him to harden his heart and order the execution. The Khwâja was extremely unpopular, and the truth seems to be that his enemies, who were determined to compass his destruction, forged the last batch of letters in order to force Akbar’s hand. The documents seized on earlier occasions were genuine. I believe that

¹ E. & D., v, 426. Nizâmû-d din evidently believed in the genuineness of the letters taken from Shâd&m’s baggage. He writes: ‘When Kunwar Mân Singh defeated Shâd&m, he obtained from Shâd&m’s portfolio three letters from Mirzâ Muhammad Hakim: one to Hakim-ûl Mulk, one to Khwâja Shâh Mansûr, and one to Muhammad Kâsim Khân Mir-bahr; all in answer to letters of invitation and encouragement. Kunwar Mân Singh sent these letters to the Emperor, who ascertained the contents, but kept the fact concealed’ (ibid., p. 422). Hakim-ûl Mulk was sent to Mecca for life, as being a person ‘not to be trusted in matters of religion and faith’. He refused to come back when sent for (Badãonî, p. 293). He was a physician (Atâ, vol. i, p. 542).

² Badãonî, ii, 308.
Shāh Mansūr really had been guilty of sending letters of invitation to Muhammad Hakīm in 1580, and that he actually was the head of the treasonable conspiracy, as stated by Monserrate. The suggestion that Rājā Todār Mall was concerned in the alleged forgery plot does not seem to be supported by any evidence of value.

Abu-l Fazl suppresses the information about the unpleasant duty assigned to himself, which is known only from the pages of Monserrate.

Akbar's grief appears to have been caused by annoyance at the unnecessary loss of a skilled financier rather than by remorse for a judicial murder. According to Abu-l Fazl: 'The appreciative monarch often uttered with his pearling tongue, "From that day the market of accounts was flat and the thread of accounting dropped from the hand."'

Probably the emperor's unwillingness to punish the traitor was due to his fear of losing the services of an irreplaceable expert more than to anything else. In the course of his long reign he was often obliged to accept the services of men on whose loyalty he could not depend. For instance, he continued to utilize Kāsim Khān as being his best engineer, although he, too, had sent an invitation to the Mirzā. It is evident that several of Akbar's officers tried to keep on terms with both parties, as English statesmen did when Jacobite plots were being arranged. Akbar relied on himself alone, and was always confident that he could detect treason and defeat it one way or another.

After the execution Akbar continued his march to Ambāla and Sirhind. On reaching Pāēl (Pāyal), the next stage beyond Sirhind,1 he heard the pleasant news that his brother had withdrawn from the Panjāb. The cloud of anxiety disappeared from his countenance, and he gave vent to his high spirits by taking a drive in a two-horsed chariot. The news, however, did not induce him to change his plans. He was determined to pursue his fugitive opponent, and to dictate terms of peace in Kābul.

He therefore marched on, crossing the Sutlaj and Biās by Akbar's march to the Indus.

1 Pāēl, a mahāl of Sirhind (Ata, vol. ii, 295 ; iii, 69).
bridges of boats. He avoided the direct main road through Lahore, in order that he might keep close to the base of the hills. He camped at Kalānaur, in the extensive and charming gardens which he had caused to be made in honour of the scene of his accession to the throne. The Rāvi was crossed by a bridge of boats, but when the army reached the Chināb boats were scarce, and the transit of the whole force in such ferry-boats as were available occupied three days. Yūsuf, who had held Rohtās against the invader, gave his sovereign a splendid banquet when the army reached the fortress in his charge. After quitting Rohtās Akbar pushed on towards the Indus.

The ardour of his passion for theological discussion is illustrated by the curious anecdote that at this time Father Monserrate thought it proper to present the emperor with a treatise on the Passion, which excited a lively argument. On arrival at the bank of the Indus Akbar was delayed for fifty days. The construction of a bridge at that season was impracticable, and the passage of the flooded stream could have been easily prevented by a small force of resolute men. The Mirzā’s reasons for allowing his brother to make his arrangements for the transit undisturbed and to cross without opposition are not recorded.

The chief officers of the imperial army manifested a mutinous spirit while encamped on the bank of the Indus. For one reason or another, all, or almost all, were unwilling to cross the river, and urged their opinions at several councils of war. Akbar amused his leisure with hunting. Monserrate, as a priest and man of peace, advised Akbar not to press the quarrel with his brother to extremity. But the emperor decided to go on. He sent Prince Murād, accompanied by experienced officers, across first with several thousand cavalry and five hundred elephants. Two days

1 Alexander the Great, when operating at the same rainy season, did likewise.
2 A. N., ch. lix, vol. iii, p. 522. Abu-I Fazl is more detailed than Monserrate in his account of the councils. He was near losing his life because his enemies falsely accused him of supporting the malcontent officers (p. 527). Akbar ordered a fort to be built at Attock (Āṭāk Benares) (ibid., p. 601).
after he had dispatched his young son on his dangerous duty, Akbar characteristically spent many hours of the night discussing with Monserrate a variety of geographical and theological problems. The report of the conversation occupies several quarto pages.  

About July 12 Akbar himself crossed the Indus, and was followed in due course by the army which was to accompany him. A standing camp was left behind. Some alarm was caused by the arrival of a messenger who reported a disaster to Murād’s force, but more accurate accounts received later showed that the young prince had been saved from defeat by the timely arrival of a reserve under the command of Mān Singh. Prince Murād, notwithstanding his extreme youth, took part in the fight (August 1), and, jumping down from his horse, seized a lance and declared that he would not yield an inch of ground whatever might happen.  

Akbar encamped near the junction of the Kābul river with the Indus and waited until all his troops had crossed safely, an operation which consumed much time. He diverted himself by labouring in the workshops, and by renewed debates on Christian theology. He then marched to Peshāwar, which had been evacuated and burnt by Muhammād Hakīm. While staying there he further gratified his ruling passion by paying a visit to the Gōr Katri Jogīs, who occupied the building now used as the offices of the tahsildār, or sub-collector.  

Prince Salīm entered the Khyber Pass in advance of his father, halting at Ali Masjid, and reaching Jalālābād in safety. Prince Murād entered the city of Kābul (August 3),

---

1 Commentarius, pp. 604–8.  
2 He left the main camp with an immense quantity of baggage on the banks of the Indus, and gave the command of that spot to Kāsim Khān, in order that he might subdue the refractory spirits there and construct a bridge (A. N., iii, 523). I understand that the principal standing camp was on the Indian side of the river.  
3 Commentarius, p. 610. The date was August 1 (A. N., iii, 536).  
4 ‘Eo quidem tempore, existis tectis, soli cinere videbantur’ (Commentarius, p. 612). For the ‘Gorkhatri’ monastery see I. G. (1908), xx, 125; A. N., iii, 528. The spelling Gōr Katri is correct. The site is not that of Kanishka’s stūpa (Ann. Rep. A. S. India, 1908–9, p. 39 n.).
which was abandoned by Muhammad Hakîm, who fled into the hills.\textsuperscript{1}

Akbar issued a proclamation reassuring the inhabitants, and made his entry into his grandfather's capital on Friday, Rajab 10, corresponding with August 9, 1581. He stayed there only seven days, being anxious to return home, and cherishing hopes that he might be able to manage an attack on Kashmir as an interlude. He was obliged, for the time being, to drop the proposed enterprise against the mountain kingdom, because his army was weary and the season too far advanced.\textsuperscript{2}

The Muhammadan historians represent Akbar as having restored the government of the Kâbul province to his brother directly. But the Mirzâ had never come in to make personal submission to Akbar, and there can be no doubt that Father Monserratt is correct in stating that the emperor made over Kâbul to his sister, the wife of Khwâja Hasan of Badakhshân, when she came in to see him. Akbar informed her that he had no concern with Muhammad Hakîm, whose name he did not wish to hear; that he made over the province to her; that he would take it back when he pleased; that he did not care whether his brother resided at Kâbul or not; and that she should warn Muhammad Hakîm, that in the event of his misbehaving again he must not expect a repetition of the kindness and clemency now shown to him.\textsuperscript{3} The orders were recorded in writing. Apparently the lady did not attempt to retain the country in her own charge. She seems to have tacitly allowed the Mirzâ to resume the government.

\textsuperscript{1} Murâd's entry is recorded in the \textit{Tabakât}, E. & D., v, 424. The historian Nizâmû-d din rode out to his camp, doing 75 kâs in a day and a night. See also \textit{A. N.}, iii, 538.

\textsuperscript{2} 'Septem vero diebus Chabuli . . . constitit' (Commentarius, p. 618). 'A week' (Budâoni, p. 308). 'Twenty days' (\textit{Tabakât}, in E. & D., v, 425). From 29 Amârdâd to 2 Shahryâr (\textit{A. N.}, iii, 540, 542). That would give only 6 days, even if Amârdâd was a month of 32 days. For design on Kashmir see Commentarius, p. 620.

\textsuperscript{3} Commentarius, p. 618. The lady was own sister of Muhammad Hakîm, and half-sister of Akbar. Her name is variously given as Najîbu-n nîsâ, Fakhru-n nîsâ, and Bakhtu-n nîsâ: The last form seems to be correct. The variants probably are due to misreadings of bad writing (Jâhângrî, R. & B., i. 144 n.; Blochmann, \textit{Afîn}, vol. i, p. 822).
Akbar celebrated his victory by distributing alms to 8,000 poor people at Alī Masjid, and offering up thanksgivings according to Muslim ritual at that place.

But he would not allow the white mosque tent to be pitched. While he was on the outward march and the issue of his enterprise was uncertain he had used it regularly. He never hesitated to show outward conformity with the requirements of Musalman law when he could gain any political advantage by complaisance. The emperor now was able to cross the Indus near Attock by a bridge of boats, the work of his clever chief engineer, Kāsim Khān, the builder of the fort at Agra. The other rivers were crossed in the same manner, with the exception of the Rāvi which proved to be fordable.

Kunwar Mān Singh was placed in charge of the Indus province.

Akbar arrived at the capital on December 1, 1581, and celebrated his achievements by magnificent public rejoicings. The whole undertaking had been completed within ten months. Although the actual fighting was on a small scale, the results won by the expedition were of the highest value.

In February Akbar's life and throne seemed to be in imminent danger. Subtle traitors surrounded his person; rebels disputed his authority in the eastern provinces; a hostile army, led by his half-brother, an apparently formidable pretender to the crown, had invaded the Panjāb, threatening the safety of the imperial capital; and no man could tell what might be the result of the struggle between the brothers. The extensive range of the preparations made by the emperor, and the care with which he conducted his advance, show that Akbar fully realized the magnitude of the danger threatening him. The execution of Shāh Mansūr effectually cowed the conspirators at court; the imperial officers gradually curbed the rebellion in Bengal; the personal dread inspired by Akbar's name and character held waverers to their duty; the Hindu chiefs remained loyal; and the overwhelming numerical superiority and equipment of the army employed rendered effective military

1 Commentarius, p. 620.  
2 A. N., iii, 545, 546.
opposition impossible. Thus, in December, Akbar could feel that he had put all enemies under his feet, that his life and throne were secure, and that he could do what he pleased in religion and all other matters of internal administration. The success of the Kābul expedition gave him an absolutely free hand for the rest of his life, and may be regarded as the climax of his career. His power was now established so firmly that he was able to take extraordinary liberties with his people and to defy criticism with absolute impunity.

Father Aquaviva, who had been left at Fathpur-Sikrī while the Kābul expedition was in progress, had spent his time in the practice of rigid austerities and unsparing mortification of the body. When Akbar had won the campaign he sent for Aquaviva, who fell dangerously ill at Sirhind. But he survived, and had a happy meeting with the emperor and Father Monserrate at Lahore. When he told Akbar that hostilities between his officers and the Portuguese of Damān were going on, the emperor professed to be shocked at the news. Akbar’s policy with regard to the Portuguese at this time was tortuous and perfidious.

As early as February 1580, at the very moment when the missionaries were approaching his court in response to the friendly invitation addressed to the viceroy and other authorities of Goa, he had organized an army ‘to capture the European ports’, under the command of one of his most trusted officers, his foster-brother Kutbu-d din Khān, with whom the imperial officials of Gujarāt and Mālwā were directed to co-operate. We learn for the first time from Monserrate how the war thus initiated had been caused, and how, as he puts it, the ordinary obscure quarrels between the Muhammadans and Portuguese developed into avowed hostilities. Quarrels never ceased, because the Portuguese claimed to control the sea and refused to allow any imperial ship to proceed to Mecca or elsewhere in safety unless provided with a pass. Such a position naturally was intensely galling to the emperor and his officers, but their lack of a

---

1 A. N., iii, 409, 410 n. The fact, it should be observed, rests on the authority of Abu-l Fazl, not on that of the missionaries.
sea-going fleet and of all knowledge of maritime affairs precluded them from effective remedy.¹

When Gulbadan Bégam was going on pilgrimage in 1575, she had bought the necessary pass by ceding to the Portuguese a village called Bûtsâr, situated near Damân. After her return, when she was no longer dependent on the hated Christians, she directed the imperial officers to retake the village. When they tried to do so they were repulsed with loss. The Portuguese, in retaliation, detained a Mogul ship. At that time the fleet commanded by Diogo Lopes Coutinho was lying in the Tâptî near Surat. A party of young men who had landed in Mogul territory for sport, believing themselves to be in friendly country, were attacked, and nine of them taken prisoners. They were brought to Surat and executed because they refused to apostatize. Their stout-hearted leader, Duarte Pereyra de Lacerda, deserves to be commemorated by name. The governor sent the victims’ heads to the capital as being a presumably acceptable present to his master. The affair became generally known, but Akbar pretended not to have seen the heads, and professed regret that hostilities had broken out.

Kutbu-d din Khân, acting on the official imperial orders of 1580, assembled an army of 15,000 horse, and cruelly ravaged the Damân territory. On April 15, 1582, when he attacked Damân itself, he was gallantly repulsed by the garrison and navy under the command of Martin Alfonso de Mello, Fernão de Castro and other officers. The Fathers, having been informed of those events, complained to Akbar, who falsely swore that he had no knowledge of the war, alleging that Kutbu-d din Khân, as a senior official of high rank, had acted on his own initiative. The emperor said that he could not well censure his viceroy for acts done with the intention of serving the public interest. Nevertheless, when Akbar, yielding to the remonstrances of the Fathers, sent orders recalling his troops from Damân, his commands

¹ Mr. Radhakumud Mookerji makes the most he can of Akbar’s marine in his History of Indian Shipping, Book II, ch. ii (Longmans, 1912), but the most is not much.
were obeyed instantly. About the same time a treacherous attack on Diu was defeated by clever stratagem.

The Fathers were disgusted at the clear evidence of the duplicity of Akbar, who pretended a desire for the friendship of the King of Spain, to whom Portugal was then subject, while actually ordering hostilities against the Portuguese. Moreover, their Jesuit superiors had sent urgent letters requiring the missionaries to return, as they did not seem to have any prospect of success. The missionaries themselves were eager to go, being wholly unable to accept Akbar’s denial of the facts about the war, and feeling conscious that they were not in a position to do any good.

While still at Lahore the emperor had mentioned to Aquaviva a project for sending an embassy to the King of Spain, accompanied by one or other of the Fathers. He seems to have been largely influenced by a desire to communicate the news of his own conquests to the European powers. After his return to the capital he resumed the subject, and proposed to invite the King of Portugal to join him in a league against the Turks, and also intimated a desire to send an envoy to the Pope. He exhibited much interest in the Pontiff’s position, and renewed his theological inquiries. He avowed explicitly that he was not a Muhammadan, and that he no longer paid any regard to the Muslim formula of the faith (Kalima). His sons, he remarked, were at liberty to adopt whatever religion they might choose.

Ultimately it was arranged that Aquaviva should stay and take over his colleague’s duty as tutor to Prince Murâd.

Akbar now resumed for a short time the theological debates, which had been interrupted by the war. One night he assembled in the private audience chamber the leaders of both Muhammadans and Hindus as well as the Fathers, names follow Father Hosten. ‘Ad haee se non esse Agarenun [scil. “descendant of Hagar”—Muslim], professus est, nec Mahomeddis symbolo [scil., the kalima, as on p. 630], quicquam tribuere. . . . Sic similiter filius integrum reliquer, ut quam malint legem accipient ’ (p. 628).
and renewed the old discussions about the relative values of the Korân and the Bible. He said that he wished the controversy to be continued on stated days in order to discover which religion was the truer and sounder. The next evening he held another meeting at which the two elder princes and sundry vassal chiefs were present. But after that occasion the attendance gradually dwindled, until the Fathers alone came. They, too, soon found that it was not worth their while to attend, Akbar being preoccupied with his scheme for promulgating a new religion of his own. In practice he inclined more and more to the observance of Hindu rites and customs. Thus the debates on religions which had begun in 1575 came to an end in 1582. They seem to have been usually conducted in the House of Worship for about four years, and afterwards in the private apartments of the palace. In all probability, as has been suggested above, the House of Worship had been pulled down before the Kâbul campaign.

Akbar arranged that his envoy to Europe should be Sayyid Muzaffar, with Father Monserrate as his colleague, and that Abdullah Khân, the Persian Shîa who had fetched the Fathers from the coast, should not proceed farther than Goa. After many delays the persons so selected started on their long and arduous journey in the summer of 1582. The roads were everywhere infested with robbers, and Monserrate was often in danger of death by reason of Muslim hostility. It would take too much space to relate his adventures in detail. He arrived safely at Surat on August 5, 1582, and learned the painful news that two Christian young men had been executed there on the previous day. The local authorities had rejected an offer of a thousand gold pieces made by the Jain merchants as ransom for the lives of the victims.

Sayyid Muzaffar, who had been forced into the expedition against his will, deserted and concealed himself in the

---

1 'Nam cum in dies magis et magis, gentilibus favor et eorum postulatione bubulas carnes in macello vaenire prohiberet; indignum esse existimarent cum Evangelicas margaritas, pedibus obuculandas et proterendas tradenter' (ibid., p. 684).
Deccan. Abdullah Khān accompanied Monserrate to Damān and Goa.

A suitable ship not being available that season, the authorities at Goa decided that the embassy must wait until the year following. Abdullah Khān, however, never sailed, and ultimately returned to court.

Meantime, Aquaviva had remained at Fathpur-Sikri. But he was thoroughly weary of the Protean changes exhibited by Akbar, and had become sorrowfully convinced that he could do no good by staying on. He obtained his release with much difficulty, and left the court early in 1588, arriving at Goa in May. Two months later he was murdered by a Hindu mob, incensed at the fanatical destruction of their temples by the priests. Akbar was much grieved when he heard the news. Aquaviva and his four companions who perished with him are venerated by members of the Roman Church as martyrs, and were solemnly beatified by the Pope in 1893.

Aquaviva had steadfastly refused to accept from Akbar wealth in any form, beyond the means barely sufficient for meagre sustenance. When leaving he begged as a final boon that he might be allowed to take with him a family of Russian slaves—father, mother, two sons, and certain dependants—who had been among Muhammadans so long as to be Christians in name only. Notwithstanding the strong opposition of the Queen-Mother, Akbar granted his friend’s request. ‘Those souls’, Bartoli observes, ‘were the only treasure which he brought back from the Mogul realm to Goa after an absence of three years and a half.’

Thus ended the first Jesuit Mission. It was a failure. Concerning which disappointment Father Monserrate wrote in sadness of heart:

'It may be suspected that Jalālu-d din [Akbar] was moved to summon the Christian priests, not by any divine

1 'At vero Rodolfus, tum Regis inconstantiae pertaesus, qui se, in plures figuras quam Proteus vertebat' (Commentarius, p. 637).
2 Bartoli, p. 88. The story of

the martyrdom is in many books, but is most conveniently read in Goldie. Bartoli gives a list of old books dealing with the subject.
inspiration, but by a certain curiosity, and excessive eagerness to hear some new thing, or a design to devise something novel for the destruction of souls. Because, if this work had been of God, it could not have been hindered by any inconveniences or obstacles. But, inasmuch as it was not of God, it collapsed and melted away of itself, even against the resistance of the King.\footnote{Commentarius, p. 688.}

Akbar, while on his return march, had been able to devote some attention to matters of internal administration. The importance of the office of Sadr-i sudūr as it existed in the time of Akbar's predecessors and in the early years of his reign was explained in a former chapter. As time went on and Akbar's alienation from Islām became more and more accentuated, he watched with ever increasing jealousy the grant of heritable revenue—free lands to Muhammadians, reputed to be specially learned or pious. Such grants were known by either the Turkī name of sayūrghāl or the Persian designation of madad-i maāsh, meaning 'subsistence allowance'. The bestowal of grants of that kind after due investigation and on proper conditions was one of the most important duties of the Sadr-Sudūr. After the removal of Shaikh Abdu-n Nabi from office in 1578 (986), the post was shorn of its ancient dignity. Now in November 1581, on the day he crossed the Rāvi, Akbar abolished it altogether, substituting for the one central dignity six provincial officers, as follow: (1) Delhi, Mālwā, and Gujarāt; (2) Agra, Kālpī, and Kālanjar; (3) Hājīpur to the Sarjū or Ghāghra (Gogra) river; (4) Bihār; (5) Bengal; (6) Panjāb.

At the same time a head or principal Kāzi was appointed for each of the larger cities, to supervise the minor judicial officers. The emperor hoped that these arrangements would check delay, fraud, and bribery, and at the same time benefit the exchequer.\footnote{A. N., iii, 546. The account in Badānī, p. 304, differs. On the office of Sadr see Abu-l Fazl, Ain, Book II, Ain 19, with Blochmann's commentary in Ain, vol. i, pp. 268-74. Sayūrghāl lands were heritable, and so differed from fiefs for service (jāār or tuyūl). But there was nothing to hinder the sovereign from resuming at will a grant of any kind, and Akbar freely exercised his power in that respect.}
During the progress of the wars in Bengal and the expedition to Kābul, the province of Gujarāt was much disturbed by the revolt of Muzaffar Shāh, the ex-king of that country. He had escaped from surveillance in 1578, and taken refuge at Jūnāgarh in Kāthiāwār until 1583, when he collected discontented followers of Shihāb Khān, the recalled viceroy, and started a formidable rebellion, which lasted for about eight years. When Itimād Khān was appointed viceroy in 1583 he was lucky enough to be assisted by Nizāmu-d dīn Ahmad, the historian, in the capacity of bakhšī, who proved himself to be a most energetic and efficient officer. In September 1583 Muzaffar took Ahmadābād, and assumed the title and state of king. In November he treacherously killed Kutbu-d dīn, the distinguished imperial officer who had surrendered to him, and he occupied Bharōch. The alarming news from the west obliged Akbar to return from Allahabad to the capital in January 1585. He had meantime appointed Mīrzā Khān (Abdurrahīm, Bairām Khān’s son), better known by his later title of Khān Khānān, to the government of Gujarāt. The pretender was severely defeated by much inferior imperial forces at the battle of Sarkhēj near Ahmadābād in January 1584, and again at Nadōt or Nāndōd in Rājpīpla. After many vicissitudes he was driven into Cutch (Kachh), where he received support from certain local chiefs. Nizāmu-d dīn inflicted a terrible punishment on their territory by destroying nearly 800 villages and ravaging two parganas. He was then recalled.

Muzaffar continued to give trouble in the wild regions of Kāthiāwār and Cutch until 1591–2, when he was captured. He committed suicide by cutting his throat, or any rate was reported to have done so. Abdurrahīm got his title of Khān Khānān for his defeats of Muzaffar.
CHAPTER VIII

THE DĪN ILĀHI, 'DIVINE FAITH', OR 'DIVINE MONOTHEISM'; FANTASTIC REGULATIONS; FOUNDATION OF ALLAHABAD; BEGINNING OF INTERCOURSE WITH ENGLAND, ETC.

Akbar's long-cherished project of establishing throughout his empire one universal religion, formulated and controlled by himself, was avowed publicly for the first time in 1582. He was so well acquainted with history that it is possible that he may have been influenced by the example of Sultan Alau-d din Khilji, who at the beginning of the fourteenth century had allowed his vanity to be flattered by a similar mad scheme. Although the Sultan contemplated the enforcement of conformity by the power of the sword, while Akbar trusted to the influence of persuasion aided by bribery,\(^1\) the parallel between the two cases is sufficiently close to warrant quotation of the historian's account of Alau-d din's proposal.

'One of the two schemes which he used to debate about he thus explained:—'God Almighty gave the blessed Prophet four friends, through whose energy and power the Law and Religion were established, and through this establishment of law and religion the name of the Prophet will endure to the day of judgement. Every man who knows himself to be a Musalmān, and calls himself by that name, conceives himself to be of his religion and creed. God has given me also four friends—Ulugh Khān, Zafar Khān, Nusrat Khān, and Alp Khān—who, through my prosperity, have attained to princely power and dignity. If I am so

\(^1\) 'But His Majesty was at last convinced that confidence in him as a leader was a matter of time and good counsel, and did not require the sword. And, indeed, if His Majesty, in setting up his claims and making his innovations, had spent a little money, he would easily have got most of his courtiers, and much more the vulgar, into his devilish nets' (Badā'oni, p. 339). At a later date, as will appear presently, he did spend some money on the propaganda. He disliked expense, except on certain personal whims, if it could be avoided.
inclined, I can, with the help of these four friends, establish a new religion and creed; and my sword, and the swords of my friends, will bring all men to adopt it. Through this religion, my name and that of my friends will remain among men to the last day like the names of the Prophet and his friends." . . . Upon this subject he used to talk in his wine parties, and also to consult privately with his nobles.'

Alān-d din was more fortunate than Akbar in finding among his councillors one man who had the courage and sense to offer reasoned opposition to a proposition born of overweening vanity. Alāu-l Mulk, Kotwāl of Delhi, and uncle of the historian who tells the story, promised to open his mind freely if His Majesty would be pleased to order the removal of the wine and the withdrawal of all listeners save the chosen four. The Sultan, tyrant though he was, had sufficient sense to accept the conditions and to allow his faithful friend to say what he thought, as follows:

"Religion, and law, and creeds ought never to be made subjects of discussion by Your Majesty, for these are the concerns of prophets, not the business of kings. Religion and law spring from heavenly revelation; they are never established by the plans and designs of man. From the days of Adam till now they have been the mission of Prophets and Apostles, as rule and government have been the duty of kings. The prophetic office has never appertained to kings, and never will, so long as the world lasts, though some prophets have discharged the functions of royalty. My advice is that Your Majesty should never talk about these matters. . . . Your Majesty knows what rivers of blood Changiz Khān made to flow in Muhammadan cities, but he never was able to establish the Mughal religion or institutions among Muhammadans. Many Mughals have turned Musalmāns, but no Musalmān has ever become a Mughal."

1 In the thirteenth century the State religion of the Mongol Khāns was Shamanism, which is defined as 'a name applied loosely to the religion of the Turanian races of Siberia and north-eastern Asia, based essentially on magic and sorcery. . . . The Siberian Shaman works his cures by magic, and averts sickness and death by incantations' (Chambers's Encyclop. (1906), s.v. Shamanism). Monserrate, following Rodericus Gon salarius, believed that the Mongol religion practised by Timūr in his youth, before his conversion to Islam, consisted in the adoration of the sun, moon, stars, and fire (Commentarius, p. 669).
The Sultan listened, and hung down his head in thought. His four friends heartily approved what Alāu-ī Mulk had said, and looked anxiously for the Sultan’s answer. After a while he said, . . . “From henceforth no one shall ever hear me speak such words. Blessings be on thee and thy parents, for thou hast spoken the truth and hast been loyal to thy duty.” ¹

The incident is creditable alike to the councillor and to the Sultan. Akbar had not one friend equally faithful, unless the Jesuit Aquaviva be excepted, and he was not allowed a voice in the matter. Nor did Akbar listen kindly to unwelcome criticism of his claims to be the spiritual guide of his people. Men who ventured to express opinions contrary to his fancies in religious matters usually suffered for their honesty, and sometimes even unto death.

The best account of the formal promulgation of Akbar’s political religion is that given by the Jesuit author, Bartoli, on the authority of his missionary brethren. He writes:

‘Akbar, after his return from Kābul, feeling himself freed from the great terror due to fears concerning the fidelity of his vassals and anxiety about the rebels in Gujarāt, ² began to bring openly into operation the plan which he had long secretly cherished in his mind. That was to make himself the founder and head of a new religion, compounded out of various elements, taken partly from the Korān of Muhammad, partly from the scriptures of the Brahmins, and to a certain extent, as far as suited his purpose, from the Gospel of Christ.

In order to do that he summoned a General Council, and invited to it all the masters of learning and the military commandants of the cities round about; excluding only Father Ridolfo, whom it was vain to expect to be other than hostile to his sacrilegious purpose—a fact of which more than enough proof had been given already.

When he had them all assembled in front of him, he spoke in a spirit of astute and knavish [malvagio] policy, saying:—

‘“For an empire ruled by one head it was a bad thing to have the members divided among themselves and at

¹ Tarīkh-i Firūz Shāhī, in E. & D., iii, 168, 169.
² In Bengal, rather than in Gujarāt, where the trouble was of later date (1583).
variance one with the other. That is to say, he referred to the discord between the many kinds of [religious] laws observed in the Mogul territory; some being not only different from, but hostile to others; whence it came about that there are as many factions as there are religions.

"We ought, therefore, to bring them all into one, but in such fashion that they should be both 'one' and 'all'; with the great advantage of not losing what is good in any one religion, while gaining whatever is better in another. In that way, honour would be rendered to God, peace would be given to the peoples, and security to the empire.

"Now, let those who are present express their considered opinion; because he would not move until they had spoken."

"Thus he spake; and the men of note, especially the commandants, who had no God other than the King, and no law other than his will, all with one voice replied, 'Yes; inasmuch as he who was nearer to heaven, both by reason of his office and by reason of his lofty intellect, should prescribe for the whole empire gods, ceremonies, sacrifices, mysteries, rules, solemnities, and whatever else was required to constitute one perfect and universal religion.'

'The business being thus closed, the King sent one of the Shaikhs, a most distinguished old man, to proclaim in all quarters, that in a short time the [religious] law to be professed throughout the Mogul empire would be sent from the Court; and that they should make themselves ready to take it for the best, and accept it with reverence, whatever it might be.'

That account asserts that the resolution of the Council was passed unanimously, but we learn from Badāoni, who probably was present, that one feeble dissentient voice was heard, although the speaker failed to argue the matter out in a manly way, as Alāu-ī Mulk had done with the fierce Sultan nearly three centuries earlier.

"At a council held for the renovating of the religion of the empire, Rājāh Bhagwān Dās said:—"'I would willingly believe that Hindūs and Musalmāns have each a bad religion, but only tell us what the new sect is, and what opinion they hold, so that I may believe.'" His Majesty reflected a little, and ceased to urge the Rajah. But the alteration of the decisions of our glorious Faith was continued. And "the

1 No doubt Abu-ī Fazl's father, Shaikh Mubārk, who lived until 1598. Bartoli, pp. 75–7.
innovation of heresy” (ʿıḍāq ʿı ḏidʿat) was found to give the date.'¹

The interesting fact that a formal council was held to sanction the promulgation of the proposed new religion is known from the testimony of Bartoli and Badāoni only, and has escaped the notice of modern authors. We know nothing about the missionary tour assigned to Shaikh Mubārak and presumably undertaken by him. It is certain, however, that the success attained by the propaganda was very small.

Some years later, Kunwar Mān Singh, adopted son of Rājā Bhagwān Dās, practically repeated his father's sentiments. For the report of that incident also we are indebted to Badāoni, who says, under date December 1, 1587, when Mān Singh had just been appointed to the government of the eastern provinces of Bihār, Hājipur, and Patna, that Akbar was sharing a ‘cup of friendship’ with the Khān Khānān and Mān Singh.

‘His Majesty brought up the subject of “Discipleship”, and proceeded to test Mān Singh. He said without any ceremony:—

‘“If Discipleship means willingness to sacrifice one’s life, I have already carried my life in my hand: what need is there of further proof? If, however, the term has another meaning and refers to Faith, I certainly am a Hindū. If you order me to do so, I will become a Musalmān, but I know not of the existence of any other religion than these two.”

‘At this point the matter stopped, and the Emperor did not question him any further, but sent him to Bengal.’²

That anecdote shows that even four or five years after the promulgation of the new religion so-called a good deal of uncertainty as to its meaning still existed.

The truth is that Akbar’s pretended ‘religion’ consisted essentially in the assertion of his personal supremacy over things spiritual as well as things temporal. Its ‘only successor without material change.

¹ Transl. by Blochmann, An, vol. i, p. 198; and by Lowe, p. 328. Lowe followed his predecessor without material change.
² Badāoni, p. 375. Lowe’s version agrees with Blochmann’s.
begetter’ was Shaikh Mubarak, who, when Akbar came home in 1578 after the victorious campaign in Gujarāt, had greeted his sovereign with the expression of the wish that he should become the spiritual as well as the temporal guide of his people. The idea germinated in Akbar’s mind, but its development was hindered by wars and other exigencies. In September 1579 the emperor acted on Mubarak’s hint, and assumed the primacy of the Muslim faithful by means of the ‘infallibility decree’. At that time he kept professedly within the limits of Islām, and gave at least lip-service to the authority of the Korān and tradition. He still went on pilgrimage, and was in many respects a conforming Musalmān. But in his heart he had rejected Islām, Prophet, Korān, tradition and all. As early as the beginning of 1580, the Fathers, when on their way to the capital, were told that the use of the name of Muhammad in the public prayers had been prohibited; and during the course of that year

‘the four degrees of devotion to His Majesty were defined. The four degrees consisted in readiness to sacrifice to the Emperor, Property, Life, Honour, and Religion. Whoever had sacrificed these four things possessed the four degrees; and whoever had sacrificed one of these four possessed one degree. All the courtiers now put down their names as faithful disciples of the Throne.’

In a passage preceding the account of the ‘infallibility decree’ of September 1579, Bādāoni states that

‘in these days, when reproach began to spread upon the doctrines of Islām, and all questions relating thereto . . . base and low men of the higher and lower classes, having accepted the collar of spiritual obedience upon their necks, professed themselves his disciples. They became his disciples through the motives of hope and fear, and the word of truth could not proceed out of their mouths.’

Abu-l Fazl and certain Muhammadan authors in modern times have tried to make out that Akbar always continued

1 Bādāoni, p. 299. The date is fixed by the following paragraph which refers to Muharram 989 = February 1581.

2 Ibid., p. 277; Blochmann, in Asia, vol. i, p. 185, with some variation, but nearly the same sense.
to be a Muslim, although it is admitted that he discarded the ceremomial of the Prophet's religion. They regard his 'Divine Faith' or 'Divine Monotheism' (Dīn or Tauskīd Ilāhī) as being a mere reformed sect of Islām.¹ That opinion is erroneous and opposed to a mass of evidence.

I see no reason whatever to disbelieve Badāoni's statement referring to a time about A. D. 1592, when he says:

"Ten or twelve years later things had come to such a pass that abandoned wretches, such as Mīrzā Jānī, Governor of Tattah, and other apostates, wrote their confession to the following effect—this is the form:——

"I, who am so and so, son of so and so, do voluntarily, and with sincere predilection and inclination, utterly and entirely renounce and repudiate the religion of Islām which I have seen and heard of my fathers, and do embrace the 'Divine Religion' of Akbar Shāh, and do accept the four grades of entire devotion, viz., sacrifice of Property, Life, Honour, and Religion."

"And these lines—than which there could be no better passport to damnation—were handed over to the Mujtahid [sci. Abu-l Fazl] of the new religion, and became the source of confidence and promotion."²

The Jesuit letters are full of emphatic expressions showing that both at the time of the First Mission (1580–8) and that of the Third Mission (1595 to end of reign) Akbar was not a Muslim. He not only rejected the revelation of Muhammad, but hated the very name of the Prophet. While it would be tiresome to cite all the relevant passages, two brief quotations from the Jesuit writers may be given. Peruschi, writing on the basis of Aquaviva's or Monserrate's letters of 1582, states roundly that 'the King is not a Muhammadan';³ while Monserrate reports a conversation between himself and Akbar early in 1582, when the emperor declared not only that he was not a Musalmān,

¹ e.g. Mr. Yūsuf Ali in J. of E. I. Assoc., July 1915, p. 304.
² Badāoni, p. 314. The differences between Lowe's version as quoted and Blochmann's, as in Ain, vol. i, p. 194, are merely verbal, not affecting the sense. The italics are mine.
³ 'Il Rè non è Moro' (Peruschi, Rome ed., p. 80; and Maclagan, p. 52).
but that he did not pay any heed to the Muslim formula of the faith. Similarly Badāonī observes that

'after the short space of five or six years [scil. from 1579], not a trace of Muhammadan feeling was left in his heart.'

Blochmann correctly states that the development of Akbar's views led him to the 'total rejection' of Islām, and 'the gradual establishment of a new Faith combining the principal features of Hinduism and the fire-worship of the Pārsīs'. There were other elements in it also, but for the present purpose the points to be emphasized are that Akbar totally rejected the fundamental doctrines of Islām, excepting monotheism, and invented a new religion, hostile to and irreconcilable with that of Muhammad. The demand that a disciple should renounce his religion (dīn) was inconsistent with his continuing to be a Muhammadan.

The official account of the Divine Faith is given by Abu-l Fazl in Aīn No. 77 of the Aīn-i Akbarī, which begins with a preamble in a Sūfī strain to the effect that all religions have much in common, and that God and man are one in a mystic sense. The author then, in pursuance of his father's teaching, proceeds to expound the doctrine that a people seeking guidance to truth

'will naturally look to their king, on account of the high position which he occupies, and expect him to be their spiritual leader as well; for a king possesses, independent of men, the ray of divine wisdom, which banishes from his heart everything that is conflicting. A king will therefore sometimes observe the harmony in a multitude of things, or sometimes, reversely, a multitude of things in that which is apparently one; for he sits on the throne of distinction, and is thus equally removed from joy or sorrow.'

In Akbar the peoples of India had been given a king of the ideal kind.

---

1 'Ad haec se non esse Agarenum, professus est: nec Mahammedis simbolo, quiequam tribuere.' The word symbolum means the kalima, 'there is no God but Allāh, and Muhammad is his messenger' (Commentarius, pp. 628, 630). Monserrate wrote up his notes each evening.

2 Blochmann, in Afr, vol. i, p. 178; Lowe, p. 268, with verbal variation, but the same meaning.

He now is the spiritual guide of the nation, and sees in the performance of this duty a means of pleasing God. He has now opened the gate that leads to the right path, and satisfies the thirst of all that wander about panting for truth.

But, whether he checks men in their desire for becoming disciples, or admits them at other times, he guides them in each case to the realm of bliss. Many sincere inquirers, from the mere light of his wisdom, or his holy breath, obtain a degree of awakening which other spiritual doctors could not produce by repeated fasting and prayers for forty days.'

Abu-l Fazl then goes on to give instances of Akbar's gifts of healing and other miraculous powers.

The ceremony of initiation was performed personally by Akbar in this manner:

When a novice bears on his forehead the sign of earnestness of purpose, and he be daily inquiring more and more, His Majesty accepts him, and admits him on a Sunday, when the world-illuminating sun is in its highest splendour. Notwithstanding every strictness and reluctance shown by His Majesty in admitting novices, there are many thousands, men of all classes, who have cast over their shoulders the mantle of belief, and look upon their conversion to the New Faith as the means of obtaining every blessing.

At the above-mentioned time of everlasting auspiciousness, the novice with his turban in his hands, puts his head on the feet of His Majesty. This is symbolical, and expresses that the novice, guided by good fortune and the assistance of his good star, has cast from his head conceit and selfishness, the root of so many evils, offers his heart in worship, and now comes to inquire as to the means of obtaining everlasting life. His Majesty, the chosen one of God, then stretches out the hand of favour, raises up the suppliant, and replaces the turban on his head, meaning by these symbolical actions that he has raised up a man of pure intentions, who from seeming existence has now entered into real life. His Majesty then gives the novice the Shast, upon which is engraved "the Great Name", and His Majesty's symbolical motto, "Allahu Akbar". This teaches the novice the truth that

"the pure Shast and the pure sight never err".'

The exact nature of the Shast taken is not recorded. At the time of initiation members of the Divine Faith also
received a likeness of the emperor which they wore in their turbans.\(^1\) The 'great name' is one or other of the epithets or names of God. Commentators differ concerning the one which is to be regarded as pre-eminent. Which was selected by Akbar does not appear. The giving of the _shast_ and the communication of the 'great name' seem to be imitated from Hindu procedure. A _guru_, or spiritual preceptor, always whispers into his pupil's ear a secret _mantra_ or formula. The ambiguity of the phrase _Allâhu Akbar_, which may mean either 'God is great', or 'Akbar is God', has been already noticed. Many people believed that Akbar dared to regard himself as divine, and, although he warmly repudiated the imputation, it was not without foundation. His recorded sayings prove that he fully shared the views expressed by Abu-l Fazl concerning the closeness of the relation between kings, in virtue of their office, and the Deity.

Abu-l Fazl concludes his notice of the Divine Faith by the following description of certain ordinances observed by members of the Order, which may be transcribed verbatim.

'The members of the Divine Faith, on seeing each other, observe the following custom. One says, "_Allâhu Akbar_"; and the other responds, "_Jalla Jalâluhu_".\(^2\) The motive of His Majesty in laying down this mode of salutation is to remind men to think of the origin of their existence, and to keep the Deity in fresh, lively, and grateful remembrance.

'It is also ordered by His Majesty that, instead of the dinner usually given in remembrance of a man after his death, each member should prepare a dinner during his lifetime, and thus gather provisions for his last journey.

'Each member is to give a party on the anniversary of his birthday, and arrange a sumptuous feast. He is to bestow alms, and thus prepare provisions for the long journey.

'His Majesty has also ordered that members should

\(^1\) Jahângîr, R. B., i, 60; Badâoni, in _Alm_, vol. i, p. 208. The candidates used to be introduced by Shaikh Ahmad, the Sûfi of Lahore, whom Jahângîr promoted.

\(^2\) The words, of course, refer to the emperor's names or titles, _Jalâlu-d din Akbar_. _Jalla jalâluhu_ means in Arabic, 'glorious is his glory', or 'resplendent is his splendour'; an implied resemblance between Akbar and the sun probably being hinted at.
endeavour to abstain from eating flesh. They may allow others to eat flesh, without touching it themselves; but during the month of their birth they are not even to approach meat. Nor shall members go near anything that they have themselves slain, nor eat of it. Neither shall they make use of the same vessels with butchers, fishers, and bird-catchers.

‘Members should not cohabit with pregnant, old, and barren women; nor with girls under the age of puberty.’

A later passage gives a special rule about funerals, as follows:

‘If any of the darsaniyyah disciples died, whether man or woman, they should hang some uncooked grains and a burnt brick round the neck of the corpse, and throw it into the river, and then they should take out the corpse, and burn it at a place where no water was.

‘But this order is based upon a fundamental rule which His Majesty indicated, but which I cannot here mention.

‘People should be buried with their heads towards the east, and their feet towards the west. His Majesty even commenced to sleep in this position.’

The last-quoted rule appears to have been prescribed for general compliance. It had the double purpose of honouring the rising sun and offering an insult to Muhammadans who turn towards Mecca, which lies westwards from India.

A torrent of new regulations poured forth from the secretariat after the Council of 1582, many being issued in 1588 and 1584. Fresh batches of fantastic orders appeared during the years from 1588 to 1594, but at present only a small number of the earlier proclamations can be noticed. Members of the Divine Faith, as being disciples of His Majesty, were expected to pay particular attention to every edict. The organization of the adherents of the Din Ilahi was that of an Order rather than of a church. The creed, so far as there was one, inculcated monotheism with a tinge of pantheism; the practical deification of the emperor as the viceregent of God, filled with special grace; and the adoration of the sun, with subsidiary veneration of fire and

---

1 *Ats.,* vol. i, p. 166.
2 *Ibid.,* p. 207. *Darsaniyyah* refers to the *darsan,* or sight of Akbar on his throne. I do not understand the symbolism.
artificial lights. The partial prohibition of animal food was
due more especially to the Jain influence, already described.

It is impossible to mention all the silly regulations that
were issued, and the exact chronological order of the issues
has not been recorded fully. A few samples must suffice.

No child was to be given the name of Muhammad, and
if he had already received it the name must be changed.
New mosques were not to be built, nor were old ones to
be repaired or restored. Later in the reign mosques were
levelled to the ground.

The slaughter of cows was forbidden, and made a capital
offence, as in a purely Hindu state. In 1588 (A. H. 991)
abstinence from meat on more than a hundred days in the
year was commanded. This order was extended over the
whole realm, and [capital] punishment was inflicted on every
one who acted against the command. Many a family
suffered ruin and confiscation of property. Those measures
amounted to a grave persecution of the large flesh-eating
Muslim population.

Ideas concerning the millennium and the expected appear-
ance of a Mahdi, or Saviour, being then in the air, and the
year 1000 of the Hijra approaching, arrangements were
made for the compilation of a history of the thousand years,
and for the use on coins of a millenary (alfi) era.

Beards were to be shaved.

Garlic and onions, as well as beef, were prohibited, in
accordance with Hindu prejudices.

The sijdah, or prostration, hitherto considered lawful
only in divine worship, was declared to be the due of the
emperor.

Gold and silk dresses, forbidden by Muhammadan rule,
were declared to be obligatory at the public prayers. Even
the prayers themselves, the fast of Ramazán, and the
pilgrimage to Mecca were prohibited.

The study of Arabic, of Muhammadan law, and of Koranic

1 Badāsonī, p. 381; Blochmann, 
Ātm, vol. i, p. 200. The clause
about the confiscation of property
comes from the corrections on
p. xii of Lowe's translation.
exegesis was discountenanced, the specially Arabic letters of the alphabet were banned—and so on.1

The whole gist of the regulations was to further the adoption of Hindu, Jain, and Parsee practices, while discouraging or positively prohibiting essential Muslim rites. The policy of insult to and persecution of Islām, which was carried to greater extremes subsequently, was actively pursued even in the period from 1582 to 1585.

Notwithstanding the fine phrases about general toleration which occupy so large a space in the writings of Abū-l Fazl and the sayings of Akbar, many acts of fierce intolerance were committed.

In the year 1581–2 (A. H. 989) a large number of Shaikhs and Fakirs, apparently those who resisted innovations, were exiled, mostly to Kandahār, and exchanged for horses, presumably being enslaved.2

A sect of Shaikhs, who had the impudence to call themselves Disciples, like the followers of His Majesty, and were generally known as Ilāhīs, were sent to Sind and Kandahār, and given to merchants in exchange for Turkish colts.3

The number of adherents of the so-called Divine Faith, Akbar’s political sham religion, was never considerable. Blochmann has collected from Abū-l Fazl and Badāoni the names of eighteen prominent members, Rājā Birbal being the only Hindu in the list. The herd of unnamed and unrecorded followers probably never numbered many thousands. In order to complete the subject, it may be noted that in September 1595, Sadr Jahān, the Mufti of the empire, with his two sons, took the shast, joined the Faith, and was rewarded with a ‘command of 1,000’. At the same time sundry other persons conformed and received ‘commands’ ranging from 100 to 500. Father Pinheiro, writing from Lahore on September 3, 1595, mentions that in that city the royal sect had many adherents, but all for the sake of the money paid to them.4

1 See Bartoli, p. 78; Badāoni, pp. 810–11.
2 Badāoni, p. 309.
3 Badāoni, p. 308.
4 ‘Questo Rē fa lui da se una setta, e si fa chiamar profeta.’
No later contemporary account of the *Din Ilahi* has been found.

The organization cannot well have survived the murder of Abu-l Fazl, its high priest, so to say, and, of course, it ceased to exist with the death of Akbar.

The whole scheme was the outcome of ridiculous vanity, a monstrous growth of unrestrained autocracy. Its ignominious failure illustrated the wisdom of the protest addressed by the Kotwál to the Sultan of Delhi some three centuries earlier, and the folly of kings who seek to assume the rôle of prophets.

The Divine Faith was a monument of Akbar’s folly, not of his wisdom. His actions throughout his reign exhibited many illustrations of both qualities.

We now leave for a time the consideration of Akbar’s religious vagaries and proceed to narrate sundry political events and certain minor incidents, some of which are illustrative of the emperor’s strangely compounded character.

An alarming accident occurred at Fatehpur-Sikri at some time in 1582. A great lake, six miles or more in length and two in breadth, had been constructed to the north of the ridge for the purpose of supplying the town and palaces with water, which was raised and conveyed by an elaborate system of waterworks. An amphitheatre used as a polo ground and arena for elephant fights was arranged on the margin. In hot weather pleasure parties were glad to make themselves comfortable by the edge of the broad sheet of water. Such a party, consisting of the princes and their friends, was assembled one day in 1582, engaged in playing chess, cards, and other games, when suddenly the embankment burst and everybody on the spot was in imminent danger of being swept away by the torrent. But, although many of the houses below the ridge were destroyed along with their inhabitants, the members of the court with their

---

Ha di già molta gente, che lo seguita, ma tutto è per danari, che gli dà' (Peruschi, p. 69; Macclagan, p. 70). Macclagan’s less forcible English is translated from the Latin version; I have used the original Italian text, published in 1597. For biography of Mirān Sadr (Cadr) Jahān see *Ain*, vol. i, p. 468, No. 194.
attendants were fortunate enough to escape, excepting only one leopard keeper. In memory of that signal deliverance Akbar expended vast sums in alms, and ordained that flesh should not be brought to his table on that date.¹

Akbar's successful demonstration of force against his brother had convinced him of his invincibility and encouraged him to develop the projects of far-extended conquests which had long occupied his ambitious soul. Akbar's lust for dominion was never satisfied. He longed with intense fervour to extend his rule over all the nations and kingdoms lying within the possible range of his sword, and even allowed himself to dream the mad dream that he might be the spiritual as well as the temporal lord of a vast empire with one religion, and that he might thus combine the parts of emperor, pope, and prophet.

The drunken brother in Kâbul, although much frightened, had never made personal submission, and Akbar desired to bring him definitely to heel. He also wished to annex the turbulent hill region of Badakhshân, the scene of perpetual conflicts between the princes of Kâbul and the chiefs of the Uzbegs. He hoped, when firmly established in Kâbul and Badakhshân, to win back the ancestral territories of Transoxiana (Turân), from which his grandfather Bâbur had been expelled early in life; and lastly, he meditated the sub-

¹ Chalmers, MS. transl. of A. N., ii, 280. He puts the accident shortly after the murder of Masûm Khân Farankhûdi, which occurred in the twenty-seventh regnal year (Blochmann, Āfn, vol. i, 444). That year began March 11, 1582 (= Safar 15, A. H. 990), as stated in E. & D., v, 246. Chalmers dates the death of Masûm on Safar 23 = March 19, and states that the embankment burst in the hot season of the same year. But he adds that, the accident having occurred on Akbar's birthday according to the solar calendar [sic!: October 15 by official reckoning], the custom of weighing the emperor on his solar as well as his lunar birthday was introduced. October 15 cannot be reckoned in the hot season. Evidently there is a mistake somewhere. I cannot find the passage in Mr. Beveridge's proof-sheets. Latif (Agra, p. 159) agrees that the lake burst in the 27th year, in a.d. 1582. He erroneously adds that no lives were lost. For description of the lake and waterworks see E. W. Smith, Fatehpur-Sikr, part iii, pp. 38-40. The breach in the dam must have been repaired, because in 1619 Jahângîr held an entertainment on the bank of the lake, which was then seven kâs, or nearly fourteen miles in circumference (Jahângîr, R. B., ii, 66). The bed of the lake was finally drained under the orders of Mr. James Thomson, Lieut.-Governor of the North-West Province from 1843 to 1858 (Latif, p. 160).
jugation of Bijapur and the other kingdoms of the Deccan plateau.\textsuperscript{1} There is no direct evidence that Akbar knew or cared anything about the Dravidian kingdoms of the far south, but he may have hoped to carry his arms to the extremity of the peninsula.

The immense empire of Vijayanagar, occupying all the southern parts of the peninsula, was shattered by the combined forces of the Muhammadan Sultans of the Deccan at the battle of Talikota in 1565, while Akbar was fighting for his crown and life against the rebel Uzbek chiefs. No echo of the crash of the mighty edifice of the Vijayanagar empire seems to have reached the ears of the ruler of northern India. After the revolution consequent on the battle of Talikota, the considerable Hindu princes who continued to rule at Chandragiri and elsewhere seem to have been unknown to and ignorant of the northern empire and its ambitious sovereign. The only trace of communication between Akbar and the far south is a trivial anecdote that an envoy from the Rājā of Cochin once came to court and gave a magic knife to the emperor, who professed to believe in its virtues.\textsuperscript{2}

In pursuance of his ambitious plans, Akbar decided to secure the important strategical position at the confluence of the Jumna with the Ganges. The spot from time immemorial has been one of the most sacred places of pilgrimage and known to Hindus as Prayāg or Payāg. It does not appear to have been fortified.\textsuperscript{3} In October 1588 Akbar travelled from Agra to the confluence, proceeding most of the way by river. He began the building of the fort, which still exists, in November; and, in accordance with his regular practice, hurried on the work so that it was completed in a remarkably short time. A great city, the modern Allahabad, grew up in the neighbourhood of the fortress.\textsuperscript{4} The rapidity of Akbar's building operations much impressed

\textsuperscript{1} A. N., iii, 616.
\textsuperscript{2} A. N., ii, 499.
\textsuperscript{3} Jhūsī, on the opposite side of the Ganges, seems to have been the old Hindu fortress. It was important in the fourth and fifth centuries A.C.
\textsuperscript{4} Ilāhābās is the Hindu form of the name, and still in common use. Some writers assert that Akbar gave that name, but it is more probable that he employed the Persian form Ilāhābād.
AKBAR AND PRINCE SALİM
Father Monserrate, who cites instances of quick construction at Fathpur-Sikri.¹

The disturbances in Gujarāt, already noticed, obliged the emperor to return to the capital and forgo his intention of visiting the eastern provinces.

The year 1584 was marked by two interesting domestic events, the marriage of the emperor's eldest son, Prince Salim, and the birth of a daughter. The lady selected to be the young prince's first consort was a daughter of Rājā Bhagwān Dās of Jaipur and a sister by adoption of Kunwar Mān Singh. The wedding was celebrated in February with exceptional magnificence. Many Hindu customs were followed and the Rājā gave the bride a dowry of immense value, including a hundred elephants.² The name of the princess was Mān Bāī, and her husband gave her the title of Shāh Bēgām. He was deeply attached to her, and twenty years later records her death in touching language:

'What shall I write of her excellences and goodness? She had perfect intelligence, and her devotion to me was such that she would have sacrificed a thousand sons and brothers for one hair of mine.'

She did her best to keep her son Khusrū in order, and when Mādho Singh, one of her brothers, brought disgrace on the family, the high Rājpūt spirit led her to end her life by an overdose of opium. She lies buried near her rebellious son in the Khusrū Bāgh at Allahabad.³

The daughter, Ārām Bānō Bēgām, was born towards the close of the year, and died unmarried forty years later in the reign of Jahāngīr.⁴

¹ Commentarius, p. 642, 'Mira celeritate, plurimis adhibitis architectis, fabris, et operis exaedificavit et absolvit.'
² A. N., iii, 673; Badāoni, p. 352.
³ Jahāngīr (R. & B.), i, 55; Beveridge in J. R. A. S., 1907, pp. 599–607. She committed suicide in May 1604, not in 1605. The Tākmīl describes her suicide under the forty-ninth regnal year, 1604–5, and erroneously ascribes it to 'a quarrel with one of her rivals' (E. & D., vi, 112). The authority of Jahāngīr is better; he must have known the facts, although his text misdates the event. Her name is given in I. G. (1908), xiv, 184.
⁴ Jahāngīr (R. & B.), i, 36.
The death of the famous artist Daswanth, which occurred at some time in the twenty-ninth regnal year, apparently in 1584, deserves notice as a tragic incident in itself, and as being one of the few closely dated events in the history of Indian art. Daswanth was the son of a Kahār, or palanquin-bearer, but his lowly position could not conceal his innate genius. He used to draw and paint figures even on walls, and had devoted his whole life to his art. Some accident brought him to the notice of Akbar, who recognized his ability, and had him taught by his own former drawing-master, Khwāja Abdu-s samad. In a short time he excelled his teacher, and became, in the judgement of many critics, the first master of the age, a worthy rival of the best Persian and Chinese artists. Unhappily his genius was clouded by insanity. One day he stabbed himself with a dagger, and died two days later.1

A romantic adventure, characteristic of Akbar at his best, shows that even when he was past forty he retained the activity and chivalrous spirit of his youth. Jaimall, a cousin of Rājā Bhagwān Dās, who had been sent on duty in the Eastern Provinces, rode hard to comply with urgent orders, and died near Chausā from the effects of the heat and over-exertion. His widow, a daughter of Udai Singh, the Motā or Fat Rājā, refused to commit suttee, as demanded by the custom of the family. Her son, also named Udai Singh, and other relatives insisted that, willing or unwilling, she must burn. Early one morning Akbar heard the news while in the female apartments of the palace, and resolved to prevent the sacrifice. Throughout his reign he insisted on the principle that no widow should be forced to burn against her will. He jumped on a swift horse and rode to the spot, unattended, although some of his personal staff galloped after him as soon as they learned of his disappearance. He was in time, and his unexpected arrival stopped the proceedings. At first he was disposed to execute the guilty parties, but on consideration he granted them their lives and merely imprisoned them for a short period.2

2 A.N., iii, 595; abstract version in E. & D., vi, 69. For the
Direct intercourse between England and India began in October 1579, when the Reverend Father Thomas Stevens or Stephens, a Jesuit, born in Wiltshire and educated at Winchester and Oxford, landed at Goa. So far as is known he was the first Englishman to land and reside in India. He remained at or near Goa for forty years, engaged in his work as Christian priest and missionary. He made himself thorough master of the local Konkani tongue, called Lingua Canarim by the Portuguese, and composed a grammar of it, which was printed at Goa in 1640, after the author's death. That is the first grammar of an Indian language compiled by a European author. Father Stevens also wrote in the same language a huge poem, designed for the religious instruction of converts, which contains more than 11,000 strophes, and is considered to possess high literary merit.

Shortly after his arrival at Goa he wrote to his father a long letter, dated November 10, giving a detailed description of the incidents and sights of the voyage. That letter, which was published by Hakluyt in 1589, seems to have become known before it was printed, and to have stimulated English interest in the mysterious land of India, which obviously offered rich possibilities of commerce, abundantly realized in the following century.¹

In 1581 Queen Elizabeth granted a charter to a small company entitled the 'Company of Merchants to the Levant', the region of the eastern Mediterranean. Two years later the Company sent out John Newbery, a London merchant, on the first British trading adventure in India. Newbery, who took with him as assistants William Leedes, a jeweller, and James Story, a painter, was accompanied

¹ F. M. Mascarenhas, 'Father Thomas Estevão, S.J.' (Ind. Ant., vii (1878), pp. 117, 118); Dict. Nat. Biogr., Supplement (1909), vol. xxii, p. 1227. The letter is printed in Hakluyt, Principal Navigations, ed. MacLehose, vol. vi, pp. 377–85, and also in Purchas. It does not give any material information about trade. Stevens was about thirty years of age when he arrived in India, and about seventy when he died in 1619.
by Ralph Fitch, another London merchant, who volunteered because he desired to see the world. They sailed in the Tyger for Tripoli in Syria, whence they journeyed to Aleppo, and so overland through Bagdad to Ormuz, at the mouth of the Persian Gulf. At Ormuz the Englishmen were put in prison by the Portuguese governor, and after a time were shipped for Goa to be disposed of by the higher authorities there. At Goa, too, they were imprisoned, and found much difficulty in obtaining their release on bai through the good offices of Father Stevens. James Story, who was welcomed by the Jesuits as an artist capable of painting their church, settled down in Goa, married a half-caste girl, opened a shop, and gave up all thought of returning to Europe. His three companions, finding themselves in danger of being tortured as suspected heretics, forfeited their bail and escaped secretly. They made their way into the Deccan, visited Belgaum, Bijapur, Golkonda, Masulipatam, Burhanpur, and Mându. No doubt they did some trading during their wanderings, but nothing on that subject has been recorded. From Mându they travelled across Mālwā and Rājputāna, through Ujjain and Sironj, and so to Agra, 'passing many rivers, which by reason of the rain were so swollen that we waded and swam oftentimes for our lives'.

Fitch, the only member of the party who returned to Europe, has recorded a brief description of Agra and Fathpur-Sikrī as he saw those cities in the rainy season of 1585, which has been already quoted in Chapter IV.

The narrative does not state the date on which the adventurers arrived at Fathpur-Sikrī, but it must have been either in July or early in August, because Akbar started on August 22 for the north, and he had taken Lecdes into his service before that day. Newbery and Fitch stayed at the capital until September 28, when they

---

1 Ralph Fitch, England's Pioneer to India and Burma, his Companions and Contemporaries, with his remarkable Narrative told in his own words, by J. Horton Ryley; London, Unwin, 1899. The extracts from that useful and well-illustrated work are given in modern spelling, except the quotation from Queen Elizabeth's letter, which is given in the old spelling, save that v and j are used instead of u and i.
parted. Newbery took the road for Lahore, intending to travel overland through Persia to either Aleppo or Constantinople. As head of the expedition he directed Fitch to proceed to Bengal and Pegu, holding out hopes that in the course of two years he might find an English ship.

Fitch duly accomplished his travels in the eastern kingdoms, and arrived safely at home in 1591. Newbery was never heard of again.

Fitch’s meagre narrative, which is mainly concerned with the obvious peculiarities of the country and people, as noted in most books of travel, and possibly copied in part from other authors, is chiefly of interest because of its early date. He quitted India at Sunārgāon, now an insignificant village in the Dacca District, but at that time an important port.

When the expedition left England early in 1588 Queen Elizabeth had given Newbery letters of recommendation to both the Indian monarch and the emperor of China. She knew Akbar’s name, and addressed him as ‘the most invincible and most mightie prince, lord Zelabdim Echcbar king of Cambaya’. She requested politely that the bearers of her letter, as being her subjects, might be ‘honestly intreated and received’. She further asked that ‘in respect of the hard journey which they have undertaken to places so far distant, it would please your Majesty with some libertie and securitie of voyage to gratify it, with such privileges as to you shall seem good’; and concluded by promising that ‘wee, according to our royall honour, wil recompence the same with as many deserts as we can’.

Although the grammar of the missive leaves something to be desired, the meaning of the letter is plain enough. The document is of high interest as being the earliest communication between the governments of India and England, and also as proving that Akbar’s name and fame had reached the isles of the west as early as 1588. Probably

---

1 Fitch, p. 44. Elizabeth evidently knew of Akbar only as the sovereign of Gujrat, which he had conquered ten years earlier. Probably she had never heard of Agra or Fatehpur-Sikri.
any slight knowledge of him that penetrated to the court of Queen Elizabeth had been derived from the letters of Father Stevens. Fitch renders no account whatever of the reception of the party by Akbar, nor does he give any important information concerning the emperor or his court. The only really vivid descriptions of Akbar and his court are those recorded by the Jesuits, who were skilled observers and competent writers.

Early in the thirtieth regnal year, which began on March 11, 1585, important administrative changes were made. Shihāb Khān received the government of Mālwā; Rājā Bhagwān Dās, Rājā Todar Mall, Abu-l Fazl, and other officers were promoted.

Amīr Fathullāh of Shīrāz, an intimate friend of the emperor, and a man of great learning, who held office as a Sadr, was given the title of Amīnu-l Mulk, and was directed, with the assistance of Rājā Todar Mall, to examine the old revenue accounts, which had not been checked since the time of Muzaffar Khān in 1574. The proceedings were guided by an elaborate code of rules, approved by Akbar, and set forth at length by Abu-l Fazl. Those rules provided for assessments on the average of a series of years, for an equitable settlement of the arrears due from each ryot or cultivator, and for the protection of collectors from unjust demands and penalties.1

Bādāoni expresses the official position of Amīr Fathullāh by saying that he was associated with Rājā Todar Mall in the office of Vizier.

The death of Mirzā Muhammad Hakīm of Kābul towards the end of July 1585, at the age of thirty-one, from the effects of chronic alcoholism, finally freed Akbar from anxiety concerning rival claims to the throne, and enabled him to incorporate Kābul definitely as a province of the empire. No question of formal annexation arose, because

---

1 A. N., iii, 687-93, in much detail. For life of Amīr Fathullāh see Blochmann’s note, Ṣīr, vol. i, p. 88. Bādāoni (pp. 325, 326) gives interesting anecdotes about him. He was a staunch Shia and would not have anything to do with the Divine Faith. He was too useful to be persecuted for his independence.
the territory ruled by the Mīrzā, although in practice long administered as an independent State, had been always regarded in theory as a dependency of the crown of India. The campaign of 1581 had rendered the dependence more of a reality than it had been for many years. The decease of Muhammad Hakım at an early age, leaving only minor children, settled the question, and the province passed quietly under the rule of imperial viceroys. Akbar, on receiving the news of his brother’s death, sent Mān Singh on in advance with some troops to maintain order until he himself could arrive. He was, no doubt, prepared for what had happened, as it was obvious that the Mīrzā’s constitution could not long resist the violence done to it by his vicious habits.¹

The necessary arrangements were rapidly completed, so that Akbar was able to march in the autumn,² and to proceed quickly along the northern road which he had traversed four years earlier. He was not to see Agra or Fathpur-Sikṛī again for thirteen years. The queen-mother joined the camp in November, and early in December Akbar pitched his tents at Rāwalpindi. While he was staying there Mān Singh came in and reported the arrival of the Mīrzā’s sons, as well as of the turbulent Farīdūn and many other men of note, including Farrukh Beg, afterwards famous as one of the best painters at Akbar’s court. Farīdūn was detained under surveillance, and ultimately sent to Mecca.³

Before the death of Muhammad Hakım, Abdullah Khān, the Uzbeg chief, had made himself master of all Badakhshān. The dread of an Uzbeg invasion was the principal reason for Akbar’s long-continued residence at Lahore.

¹ Akbar’s prescience is indicated in A. N., iii; 702.
² A. N., iii, 705, ‘11 Shahrīyār’, the sixth month of year beginning 11 March. Beveridge gives the equivalent date as August 22, which is not necessarily inconsistent with the statement of Fitch (p. 99) that ‘Here in Fatehpore we staid all three until the 23. of September 1585[.o.s.]. . . . I left William Leades the jeweller in service with the King Zelabdim Ecebar in Fatepore’. Leedes must have been accepted for service prior to August 22, and have remained at Fathpur-Sikṛī on the imperial establishment after Akbar’s departure.
³ A. N., vol. iii, ch. lxxxiv, p. 713. For Farrukh, known as the Calmuck (Kalmāk), see H. F. A., p. 470.
Akbar's pride was much offended by the conduct of Yusuf Khān, the Sultan of Kashmir, who had always evaded compliance with suggestions that he should come to court and do personal homage to the emperor. At the close of 1581 he had tried to compromise by sending Haidar, his third son, to court, but that concession did not satisfy Akbar, who demanded from the ruler himself the obedience and submission of a vassal.\(^1\) The Sultan always hoped that the difficulties of invading his country would save him from the necessity of forfeiting his independence. In February 1585, while still trying to escape the painful humiliation of personal vassalage, he had sent his elder son Yākūb to Fathpur-Sikrī,\(^2\) but even that act of complaisance did not suffice. Akbar, who was resolved to put an end to the pretensions of the Sultan of Kashmir to pose as an independent sovereign, directed the assemblage of an army for the purpose of coercing him.\(^3\) 

\(^1\) H. M. asks nothing from the princes of the age beyond obedience, and when they render this he does not exert the might of sovereignty against them\(^4\) (A. N., vol. iii, ch. lxv, p. 550).

\(^2\) Ibid., ch. lxxix, p. 676.

\(^3\) Ibid., ch. lxxxv, p. 715. Abu-l Fazl offers his usual sophistry in defence of the aggression.
CHAPTER IX

WARS ON NORTH-WESTERN FRONTIER; ANNEXATION OF KASHMIR AND SIND; SECOND JESUIT MISSION; REGULATIONS; ANNEXATION OF BALUCHISTAN AND KANDAHAR, ETC.

Akbar moved from Rāwalpindi to Attock (Aṭak-Benares), so that he might occupy a position favourable for the control of the operations against Kashmir and also against the Afghans of the Yusufzī and Mandar tribes, who had been very troublesome. Zain Khān Kokaltāsh, who was commissioned to chastise the tribesmen, began by entering the Bājaurl territory to the westward, while other officers were sent into the Samāh plateau—the home of the Mandar tribe—lying between Peshāwar and the Suwāt (Swat, Sūwād) river. Zain Khān having asked for reinforcements, Rājā Bīrbal was sent up with orders to march through the Samāh and enter the Suwāt country. Hakīm Abu-l Fath was also directed to enter the same region in the neighbourhood of the Karakar Pass further east. Ultimately, all the three commanders united their forces at Chakdara, just inside the Suwāt boundary, and on the north side of the Suwāt river. Violent disputes then broke out between the generals, Rājā Bīrbal being unwilling to recognize Zain Khān as his superior. Zain Khān, the only one of the three who had any knowledge of the military art, advised that Chakdara should be held in strength while the tribesmen were being reduced by punitive expeditions. The Rājā and the Hakīm, on the other hand, agreed that they were not required to occupy the country, and that they should make their way back to Akbar at Attock. The advice given by Zain Khān that the withdrawal should be effected through the Malākhand Pass was ignored, and his colleagues resolved to retire through the Karakar and Malandarai defiles.
Sketch Map to illustrate the campaign against the Yusufzi in 1585-1586

Note: The disaster to the imperialists occurred in the Malandarai Pass.
They soon found reason to regret their rash decision. The retirement through the Karakar Pass, which had been ill managed, was grievously harassed by the tribesmen; but after passing the crest of the Malandarai Pass further south the retirement became a rout. Nearly 8,000 of the imperialists, something like half of the force, perished, and only a shattered remnant rejoined Akbar at Attock in the middle of February 1586.

Both Zain Khān and the Hakim survived. Rājā Birbal was killed. He seems to have frankly run away in a vain attempt to save his life.1 Akbar grieved bitterly over the loss of his old friend, and was particularly distressed because his body could not be found and cremated according to the rites of Hinduism and the ‘Divine Faith’, of which the Rājā was a disciple. The accident that the Rājā’s body was never recovered gave rise to stories that he had escaped alive, which Akbar was inclined to believe for a time. There is, however, no doubt that Birbal was killed. The disaster appears to have been due in large part to his folly and inexperience. Akbar made a serious mistake in sending such people as Birbal and the Hakim to command military forces operating in difficult country against a formidable enemy. Neither possessed the knowledge or ability qualifying them for the task committed to them. When Birbal was appointed, Abu-l Fazl had claimed the command. Akbar decided the rival claims of his favourites by drawing lots. Abu-l Fazl at that time was no better equipped with military experience than the Rājā was, but his subsequent proceedings in the Deccan wars suggest that, if the lot had happened to fall upon him, he might have done better than the Hindu jester.2 Akbar censured Zain Khān and the

1 ‘Nearly eight thousand men were killed, and Rājā Birbal, who fled for his life, was slain’ (Tabakat, in E. & D., v, 451).

2 ‘Bir Bar also, who had fled from fear of his life, was slain, and entered the row of the dogs in hell, and thus got something for the abominable deeds he had done during his lifetime’ (Badāoni, tr. Blochmann, in Afn., vol. i, p. 204; tr. Lowe, p. 361, with same pur-port). The statements as to the number of casualties are widely discrepant (A.N., iii, 732 n.).

3 The best account of the Yūsufzai campaign is that by Haverty, Notes on Afghanistan
Hakim, but rather for their failure to recover Birbal’s body than for their defeat. So far as appears Zain Khan was not to blame. If he had been free to act on his own judgement, it is probable that he would have avoided disaster.

The defeat was avenged to some extent by Raja Todar Mall, who entered the mountain region with great caution. Here and there he built forts and harried and plundered continually, so that he reduced the Afghans to great straits:” Man Singh subsequently fought a battle in the Khyber Pass against other tribes, winning what is described as ‘a great victory’. But the imperial government never thoroughly subdued any section of the tribesmen, who, even now, are imperfectly controlled.

Raja Birbal, who thus perished ingloriously, was a member of Akbar’s innermost circle of friends, rivalling in intimacy Abu-l Fazl, whom the Jesuits called the emperor’s Jonathan. Indeed, it is said that Birbal possessed the uncanny power of divining his master’s secrets, a dangerous gift to which Abu-l Fazl did not pretend. Akbar loved to have Birbal by his side, that he might enjoy his witty conversation.

Birbal, originally a poor Brahman named Mahesh Das, was born at Kalpi about 1528, and consequently was fourteen years older than Akbar. He was at first in the service of Raja Bhagwan Das, who sent him to Akbar early in the reign. His gifts as musician, poet, story-teller, and conversationalist soon gained him high favour, with

(1888), pp. 259-65. The leading contemporary authority is A. N., iii, 719 seqq. The Karlakar and Malandarai (Malandri) Passes, not marked on all maps, are shown on Stanford’s Sketch Map of the North-Western Frontier (1908). The order of the passes from east to west is Karlakar, Shakhkot, Malakhand. The Malandarai Pass lies to the south of the Karlakar. Elphinstone did not know the position of the passes (5th ed., p. 519 n.). The Afghans of Swat (Swat) deny that the imperialists ever succeeded in crossing to the north of the Swat River, and assert that the disaster occurred in the Shakhkot Pass, but they seem to be mistaken (Raverty, op. cit., p. 262 n.). Abu-l Fazl has written much insincere nonsense about the defeat (A. N., iii, 735). Yusufzai, not Yusufzai, is the correct form.

1 Tabakat, in E. & D., v, 451. Nizamudin din does not give the date of the victory gained by Man Singh, who did not succeed his adoptive father Bhagwan Das as Raja until November 1589. Elphinstone gives 1587 as the year in which Jalal was defeated by Man Singh (5th ed., p. 520).
the title of Kabi Rāi, or Hindu poet laureate. He is sometimes described in English books as a ‘minister’ or even as ‘prime minister’, but erroneously. He is not recorded as having held any important office, although he was occasionally employed on special missions, and enjoyed the rank and pay of a ‘commander of 2,000’. The proximity of his beautiful house in the palace of Fathpur-Sikrī to the stables has suggested the hypothesis that he may have been Master of the Horse. At one time, in the eighteenth year of the reign, Nagarkot or Kāngrā had been assigned to him as his jāgīr or fief, but he does not seem ever to have obtained possession of it. He then received the title of Rājā Bīrbal. He actually enjoyed the jāgīr of Kālanjar in Bundelkhand later in his life.¹

He was devoted to the cult of the sun, and his influence supported that of the Parsees in inducing Akbar to give much prominence in practice to solar worship. He took an active part in the discussions about religions, and is the only Hindu named as having become a member of the Divine Faith order. No complete work by Bīrbal is known to exist. Tradition credits him with numerous verses and witty sayings still quoted. A collection of facetious tales, in which he and Akbar figure as the principal personages, is commonly sold in the bazaars of Bihār.

He was hostile to the Sikhs, whom he considered to be heretics. They consequently regard his miserable death as the just penalty for his threats of violence to Arjun Singh, their revered Guru.² Akbar did not agree with Bīrbal concerning the merits of the Sikh religion, the doctrines of which seemed to the emperor deserving of high commendation.³

¹ ‘The castle of Kālanjar, which had been in that dog’s jāgīr’ (Badāoni, p. 369).
² Mahēsh Dās was the personal name of the Rājā. Badāoni (ii, 164 and Errata) calls him Brahma Dās, probably because when he was in the Jaipur service he used to sign his compositions as Brahmin Kabi. His title Bīrbal is often written Bīrbah or Bīrbhā. See Grierson, The Modern Vernacular Literature of Hindustan, Calcutta, 1889, being a Special Number of J. A. S. B., part i, 1888, No. 106, p. 85; and Blochmann in Âin, vol. i, No. 85, p. 404. The story concerning Bīrbal and Guru Arjun Singh, too long to quote, is in Macauliffe, The Sikh Religion, Oxford, 1909, vol. iii, pp. 15–17.
³ Macauliffe relates interesting
The exquisite structure at Fathpur-Sikri known as Rājā Bārbal’s House was erected in 1571 or 1572 (S. 1629), and, according to tradition, was intended for his daughter’s residence. The beauty and lavishness of the decoration testify to the intensity of Akbar’s affection for the Rājā.¹

The troubles on the frontier had

'originated in a fanatical spirit, which had sprung up, many years before, among this portion of the Afghans. A person named Bāyazīd had then assumed the character of a prophet; had set aside the Korān, and taught that nothing existed except God, who filled all space and was the substance of all forms. The Divinity despised all worship and rejected all mortifications; but he exacted implicit obedience to his prophet, who was the most perfect manifestation of himself. The believers were authorized to seize on the lands and property of infidels, and were promised in time the dominion of the whole earth.'

They called themselves Roshaniyya (Roshani), or ‘Illuminati’. That attractive creed, which should have met with Akbar’s approval on its merits, captivated the tribesmen of the Sulaimān hills and Khyber Pass. The Yūsufzā, who adhered to its tenets for a time, had renounced them when they fought Zain Khān and Bārbal. Bāyazīd, the founder of the sect, who died in A. D. 1585, had been succeeded by a son named Jalāl, a boy of fourteen. Notwithstanding his youth the new prophet proved to be a most troublesome enemy. He kept up the fight with the imperialists for years, and in 1600 captured Ghazni. He was killed soon afterwards, but the religious war was continued by his successors during the reigns of Jahāngīr and Shāhjahān. When the sectarian fervour died out the vigorous tribal spirit enabled the clans to maintain their independence, which they still enjoy to a large extent.²

anecdotes concerning the transactions between Akbar and the Guru (op. cit., pp. 81–4).

¹ E. W. Smith, Fathpur-Sikri, part ii, pp. 1–15, with numerous plates; part iii, p. 5.
² Elphinstone, ed. 5, pp. 517–21; Bādāuni, p. 860, as corrected on p. xii. The word ‘Tājik’ given by Elphinstone on p. 521, n. 1, as a synonym for Roshaniyya is a misreading for Tārtīki, ‘heretics’; see Raverty, p. 598.