The role of the nobility during early Turkish rule in India, 1210 - 1266

by

K.G. Asghar, B.A.Hons, (Calcutta); M.A.International Relations (Dacca); M.A.History (Dacca); L.L.B. (Dacca)

Thesis presented for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Edinburgh, Faculty of Arts

March 1969
PREFACE

The history of the kings and royal dynasties of the region have received the attention of historians. The Turkish nobility, who were the real founders of the Muslim kingdom, and were an essential part of the administration, have failed to attract the attention of scholars up until now. Inadequate original material for its study may be said to account for the lack of interest. It could hardly be denied that a study of this particular class - their composition, traditions, role in administration and society - is extremely important to understand correctly this most fascinating period which marked the establishment of Muslim rule in India.

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to my teacher and supervisor, Mr. J. R. Walsh, for the numerous helpful suggestions and ideas I received from him during my stay at Edinburgh. In fact, this work would never have seen the light of day without his help and guidance. His stimulating discourses of basic historical problems were always a source of inspiration to me which made my task considerably easy. He took personal interest in my welfare, and has been more than a teacher to me. I am also indebted to Professor W. M. Watt for his keen interest in my papers in his seminars.

I am also grateful to Dr. M. O. Ghani, Vice-Chancellor, University of Dacca, for providing me the opportunity of preparing this work. Nor can I fail to thank Professor M. Kabir, Head of the Department of History, University of Dacca, who ungrudgingly spared me for the period I stayed at Edinburgh, in spite of his heavy pressure.
of work. My thanks are also due to my colleague, Dr. M.M. 'Alī, Reader in History, University of Dacca, who suggested to me to work on this unexplored field.
NOTES ON TRANSLITERATION

The transliteration of Arabic and Persian letters is essentially that of the second edition of the Encyclopaedia of Islam. There have, however, been two modifications in order to accommodate the text to the traditional spellings used in the histories of Islamic India. q has been used instead of k, and j for dj.

Vowel signs (short vowels) = a, i, u.
Long vowels = ā, ī, ū.

In the present work, three rulers appear to have the common name, 'Mu'izz ud-Dīn'. In order to distinguish them, the following system has been adopted. The ruler of Ghazna, is written as 'Mu'izz al-Dīn', the son of Ilutmish, is written as 'Mu'izz ud-Dīn', 'Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahram'or simply 'Bahram', and the grandson of Balban, the son of Buγhra Khan, is invariably written as Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubad.
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INTRODUCTION

The first Muslim attack on India was initiated by the Arabs under Muḥammad bin Qāsim, in the early eighth century (712 A.D.). Politically its effects were confined to a small portion of India, particularly its western boundaries. Three centuries later (c. 1000 A.D.), Mahmūd of Ghazna commenced his military operations against India and shattered the military might of its princes. He had no intention of establishing an Islamic Empire in the heart of India. The development of Ghazna with Indian wealth was his main objective. It was only a question of time for the age-old Indian political structure to collapse.

Towards the end of the twelfth century, Turkish adventurers under Mu’izz al-Din of Ghur commenced their attacks on northern India. Their success made them rulers of the territory. The Sultan became the de facto head of the state and the military nobility formed the ruling class. The Sultan could maintain his pre-eminence and leadership but was to remain careful that he did not do anything which incurred the displeasure of this influential group of nobles, as it would inevitably cost him the Crown.

His kingdom was a part of the caliphate; he was himself an agent of Islam, whose duty was to spread the Islamic faith and encourage the maintenance of the Muslim way of life. Often before a battle commenced, the offer to accept Islām was made. Every war was ultimately waged for the sake of religion, and each victory was
supposed to have added to the glory of Islam. The converted Turks with their fierce fanaticism, in less than two decades, carried all before them from the Siwālik to Bengal. Immediately after the military activities which established Muslim rule, they became materialistic in outlook. Military purposes having apparently been achieved, a desire for power and wealth overwhelmed them. Their loyalty to the ruler became questionable; the interplay of racial feelings and group interests divided them. Although such group interests tore them apart, the aim of preserving the Islamic kingdom was maintained. The unruly amirs and maliks, though always a threat to the existence of individual rulers, united when the existence of the state was threatened from outside, the uniting factor being the bond of religion.

For the early history of the Sultanate (1191-1218), Hasan Nizāmī Nīshāpūri’s Tai ul ma'āthir is the first important authority. The author came to India in search of a career soon after the conquest of Delhi. The work deals mainly with the history of Qutb ud-Dīn, and also describes the campaigns of Mu'izz al-Dīn in northern India and a short account of the reign of Iltutmish till 1217/1218 A.D. A profuse display of rhetorics has been made in it, and the style of the book is extremely tedious. In trying to search for historical information, the reader has to turn page after page, going through superfluous descriptions and diversions before he could come across

---

1 Laodicea Office 1486 (Eth 209).
Extracts translated in Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. II.
something concerning history. This clearly diminishes the historical value of the work. Some of its information, such as the figures of the massacre of the Hindus on the battlefield, and of their enslavement, are clearly exaggerated and cannot be accepted without question. With a few exceptions, the facts recorded are a truthful narration.

The Tarikh-i Fakhr ud-Din Mubarak Shāh, written by Fakhr-i Mudabbir in the thirteenth century, and discovered and edited by Sir E. Dennison Ross, is a work of great value. It is wholly devoted to Qutb ud-Din and provides some additional information of his campaigns not recorded in any other contemporary text. It enables us to know the social and cultural background of the Turks and, also, their qualities, such as devotion to religion and their capacity to rise in life. Another work by the same author, Adab al muluk wa kifāyat al mamluk is a treatise on the art of war and political administration. Though written in the thirteenth century it contains a large number of anecdotes relating to the Ghaznavids and gives little information about the Turkish Sultans of Delhi. A third work by the same author, Adab ul Harb wa Shulā'at deals with the art of war and bravery. The last two works are dedicated to Ilutmish.

1 Edited by Sir E. Dennison Ross, Litho, London 1927
2 InOn Office 647 (Ette 2767)
3 Rieu II, Add. 16, 853. This work with a different title has the same contents as the Adab al-muluk wa kifāyat al mamluk, but it has less chapters than the latter.
The Tabagat-i-Nasiri of Abu 'Umar Minhaj ud-Din Uthman ibn-i Siraj ud-Din al-Juzjani, dedicated to Sultan Nasir ud-Din Mahmud, the royal patron of the author, is a general history of Islam from the earliest times to 1260 A.D. From 1228/1229, when Minhaj joined the Court of Iltutmish, till 1260 A.D., he was an eyewitness of all that happened in the Delhi Sultanate. He is the only authority for this period. His short sketches of the leading nobles are invaluable, as these help to know the various stages in the official hierarchy and, also, the internal condition of the Sultanate. For his information on the earlier period he often quotes his authority. He has arranged his work in chronological order and is generally correct in dates, but his treatment is not that of an impartial historian. Barani's statement, "If I state anything which is contradictory to that master's (Minhaj's) writings, or concise or enlarge what he has stated, it will not only be disrespectful and rash, but would raise doubts and difficulties in the minds of his readers; I have therefore deemed it appropriate to exclude from this history everything that is included in the Tabagat-i Nasiri, and to confine myself to the history of the later kings of Delhi," increases the suspicion of the veracity of Minhaj. He unceasingly tries to justify every activity of a particular faction, of which he

1 a) Rieu, I. Add. 26, 189
b) Persian text: Edited by Nassau Lees, Khadim Hussain and 'Abdul Hayy (Bib. Indica, Calcutta 1864). This is also a defective edition.
c) Edited by Chughtai, Lahore, 1952. It only contains an account of the Delhi Sultanate. The editing is not much up to expectation, otherwise it is a more complete copy.
d) All important details of the Delhi Sultans are translated in Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. II.

2 Barani, p. 21.
was obviously a member. This has led him to disfigure the reign of 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd by suppressing facts which would expose the undesirable activities of his patron, Balban. In view of the fact that he survived Naṣīr ud-Dīn Māḥmūd and was a qādī in the reign of Balban his abrupt ending of the Tabaqat Naṣīrī is extremely disappointing.

The Tarikh i-Firuz Shahi of Diyā ud-Dīn Barānī, written in the second half of the 14th century is an account of the Delhi Sultāns, commencing with the accession of Balban till the first six years of Fīrūz Tughlag's reign. Barānī's ancestors held offices under the Sultāns of Delhi. He, himself was Muhammad Tughlag's nadīm for about seventeen years. The information he collected from his ancestors, who are frequently cited, and his personal access to the Delhi Court, enabled him to correctly record the events of the reign he has covered. For details of administrative reforms and the campaigns, his work is valuable and reliable. He seldom gives dates even of campaigns and accessions and where he has done so, it is usually inaccurate. He was a sensitive writer, reacting strongly to anything he did not like. In describing the personal relationship of Qutb ud-Dīn Mubārak Khaljī and Khusrau Khan he goes to the extent of using foul language, unbecoming of a historian.

† Barānī, p. 111

2 Rieu III, Or. 2039
Persian text: Bib. Indica, edited by Sayyid Ahmed Khan, Calcutta 1862. The printed text, which is substantially identical with the manuscript has been extensively used.
All important facts are translated in Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. III.
The *Tārīkh-i Firuz Shahī* of Shams Sirāj-i 'Afiī covers the reign of Firuz Tughaq. It gives valuable information of the administrative organization of the Sultanate, the condition of slaves, and the ruler's attitude towards them. It also describes the social, cultural and economic condition of the period. It is a systematic work, conforming largely to the modern standard of history writing. For the reign of Firuz Tughaq it is most reliable, as the author was associated with the royal court and also attended the hunting parties of the Sultan.

The *Futuhat-i Firuz Shahī* is said to have been written by Sultan Firuz Tughaq himself. It contains eight folios. In spite of the small size it is a valuable document for the social and religious condition of the medieval period. It also helps us to know the liberal attitude of the early Muslim rulers towards the Hindus. The reforms of the Sultan for eradicating abuses from society are, also, embodied in it.

An extremely useful work composed in 1350 A.D. is the

1 Bib. Indica, edited by Maulavi Vilayet Hussain, (Calcutta, 1891) Editing is extremely defective as pages have not been inserted in their proper place. Much of this work is translated in Elliot and Dowson, *History of India as told by its own historians*, Vol. III.

2 Rieu III, Or. 2039. The entire work is translated in Elliot and Dowson, *History of India as told by its own historians*, Vol. III.
Futūḥ us salāṭīn of 'Iṣāmī. The author's real name is nowhere given in his work. It describes in verse the political history of India for over three hundred years from the rise of Maḥmūd of Ghazna to the reign of Muhammad Tughlaq. It was composed at Daulatābād, away from the influence of the Delhi court. Additional information which has not been supplied by the contemporary chronicler is furnished in it. The way he has illustrated the intrigues of the Turkish nobility, before the deposition of every Sultan, is indeed classic. The source of his information for the Delhi Sultanate, was perhaps his aged grandfather, 'Izz ud-Dīn 'Iṣāmī, who had migrated with him in 1327 A.D. to Daulatābād. Unlike Minhāj and Baranī, he never cites an authority. Some of his information is inaccurate; mentioning Sultan Naṣīr ud-Dīn Maḥmūd as the grandson of Iltutmīsh (the posthumous son of Naṣīr ud-Dīn Maḥmūd), is absolutely incorrect. His treatment of some royal characters is uncharitable. His damaging language against Raḍīya and the entire women-folk is unpardonable. Nevertheless, its usefulness as an important document for the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is unquestionable.

1 Printed text: Edited by Āghā Mehdi Ḥussain (Agra, 1938). It is a defective copy, most of its verses are missing in the manuscript, which is admitted by the author.

2 Futūḥ us Salāṭīn, p.140
The Jawaml'ul Hikayat of Sadid ud-Din Muḥammad Ḥawī though a collection of anecdotes and stories, has much historical value. It helps to understand the literary and cultural climate of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Its preface contains details of Iltumish's military operations against Qubacha when the author was himself besieged in the fort of Bhakkar, with the latter. The work is dedicated to Iltumish's wazir, Niẓām ul mulk Junaidī.

The works of Amīr Khusrau (1253-1325 A.D.) are also an important source of information. The author was a contemporary of Barani and his works, though non-historical, throw lurid light on the social and political conditions of the period. He passed his early life as the favourite courtier of Prince Muḥammad, the eldest son of Balban. He is said to have composed about half a million verses. The Qiran us sa'daln describes the historic meeting of Bughrā Khān with his son Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād. The Nuh Siphr relates the military campaigns of Qūb ud-Dīn Mubārāk Khālījī and also describes the cultural life of the period. The 'Ashīgā is a descriptive account of the romance of Dewal Rānī
the daughter of Rai Karan of Gujarāt, and Khidr Khān the son of 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī. In its preface, a brief history of the Sultāns of Delhi up to 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī is provided. The Tarikh-i 'Alāī 1 or Khaza'in ul Futuh gives the history of the first fourteen years of 'Alā ud-Dīn's reign. It helps to know the mode of warfare during the period. The 'Iāz-i-Khusrawī has great deal of historical importance. It contains letters and farnāns of the ruler, describing the administrative functions of the officials. The 3 Maṭla'ul Anwar gives an access into the social condition of the period. Another useful contemporary work is the Fawa'īd ul 4 Fawa'īd of Amīr Ḥasan 'Alā Sanjārī. Apparently it contains the talks of Nizām ud-Dīn Auliya, but has much historical value as it throws light on the religious attitude of the rulers and nobility of the 13th/14th centuries.

The accounts of travellers are also a very valuable source of history. The most important traveller who concerns our period was Ibn-i- Batūta. He visited India in 1333 A.D., and for eight years was the qādī of Delhi, and administrator of the

1 Litho., edited by M. Wahīd Mirzā (Calcutta, 1953)
2 Litho. (Lucknow, 1876)
3 Litho. (Lucknow, 1885)
4 I have used the Urdu translation by Malik Faḍl ud-Dīn Naqshbandī, Litho. (Karachi, n.d.).
mausoleum of Quṭb ud-Dīn Mubārak Khaljī. He provides much information on the important events of the period. For an insight into the judicial, political and military institutions, and the social and economic conditions and Court ceremonials, his work is extremely useful. For the political history of the period preceding 1333 his information is open to question.

The accounts of al-Qalqashandī's Subh-ul a'sha fī sinā'at il' insha and Ibn Faḍl ullā 'Umarī's Masālīk ul Absār fī Mamālik il' Amsār are prepared from the reports of various travellers and Indian Muslims living abroad. Although most of their details are exaggerated, they provide valuable information about the administrative organization and cultural life of the Sultanate.

Other travellers, such as Nicolo Conti and 'Abdur Razzaq, visited India in the fifteenth century and their accounts, though not directly concerned with the Delhi Sultanate, provide useful information about the cultural life of the country.

---

   b) Safarnama-i-Ibn Battūta, Urdu translation by Ra'īs Ahmed Jdārī, Litho. (Karachi, 1961)

2 Translation of the Chapters on India from Al-Qalqashandī's, Subh ul-'Asha, by Otto Spies, (Stuttgart, 1936)

3 Extracts translated in Ellidtand Dowson's History of India as told by its own historians, Vol.III.

The Ahkām us Sultāniyāh of Abū-Ḥasan 'Ālī al Bağhdādī al-ṣawāndī, the Siyāsatnāmā of Abu 'Ālī Ḥasan ibn-i 'Ālī Ṭusi Nizām ul mulk, and the Muqaddimah of Ibn Khaldūn, are excellent works for the study of the origins of Muslim institutions. These works served as the model for the subsequent development of Muslim political thought.

The Tarikh i-Mubarak Shāhī of Yāhīya bin Ahmad bin 'Abdullāh Sirhindī, written in 1434 A.D., begins with the reign of Mu'izz al-Dīn. Up until the reign of Firūz Tughlaq, the work is mostly based on the authority of contemporary writers. The Raudat us Sufā of Mir Khwand, the Tabaqāt-i Akbarī of Nizām ud-Dīn Ahmed Bakhshī, the Muntakhab ut Tawāriḵ of Abdul Qādir Badayūnī, the Gulshan-i-Ibrāhīmī also known as Tarikh-i-Fīrūṣhta by Muḥammad Hūdū Shāh

1 Urdu translation by Sayyid Muḥammad Ibrāhīm, Litho. (Karachi, 1965)
2 a) Persian text. Edited by Muhammad Qazwīnī, (Tehran, 1956)
   c) Siyāsatnāmā, Urdu translation by Ṣāḥīb Ḥasan 'Aṭā, Litho. (Karachi, n. d. ).
   b) Urdu translation by Maḥmūd Sa'd Ḥasan Ṣanṣūfī, Litho. (Karachi, n. d. ).
5 Tehran, 1854.
7 Bib. Indica, edited by Maḥmūd Ahmed 'Aṭī, 3 Vols. (Calcutta, 1869)
Firishta and the Tarikh-i-Hacfori of 'Abdul Haqq were written between the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These works are compiled from earlier sources, but where they provide additional information no authority is quoted. Firishta, however, mentions his authorities for the extra information that he gives, but his dates and names are often incorrect, nor are his statements authentic.

The Rahat us Sudur of Najm ud-Din Abū Bakr Muḥammad Bin 'Ali-ar Rawandi is a history of the later seljūqs and the Tarikh-i-jahan Gusha of 'Alā ud-Dīn 'Alā Malik juwaynī is a history of Mongol Central Asia. The last named gives useful information about Mongol activities against jalāl ud-Dīn, and also of Mongol relationship with the Turkish power in India. The Tarikh-i-Wassaf of 'Abd ullah bin Fadl ullah Shirazi written about the first quarter of the fourteenth century, does not give much information about India’s political history. It, however, acquaints us with Mongol activities on the Indian frontier, and their relationship with the malcontents of Delhi Court.

The Athār us Sanādīd of Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan, the Chronicles.

2 Edited by M. Iqbal, Gibb memorial series, (London, 1921).
4 Rieu, Add. 23,527; Extracts translated in Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. III.
5 Urdu Text, Karachi, 1966.
of the Pathān Kings of Delhi by Edward Thomas, and the Coinage and Metrology of the Sultāns of Delhi by H. Nelson Wright provide architectural and numismatic evidence for the political history of the period.

The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, edited by Sir Wolseley Haig, S. Lane Poole's Medieval India, and A.B.M. Ḥabīb ullah's Foundation of Muslim rule in India, have their usefulness as subsidiary sources. Where I have differed from the last three works, it is based on a thorough examination of the primary sources. Raverty's Translation of the Tabāqāt-i- Nāṣirī is not a mere translation but a mine of information, and is indispensable to anyone studying the early Muslim history of India. The usefulness of Dr. I.H. Qureshī's Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi for understanding the administrative system of the period can hardly be over-emphasized. Other helpful works are Dr. R.P. Tripathī's Some aspects of Muslim Administration, Dr. Ṭārāchānd's Influence of Islam on Indian Culture and Dr. C.E. Bosworth's The Ghaznavids.

1 London, 1871
2 Government of India Publication, (Delhi, 1936).
3 Cambridge, 1928.
4 London, 1903.
5 Allahabad, 1961.
6 London, 1881 (2 Vols.).
7 Lahore, 1942.
8 Allahabad, 1935.
CHAPTER I
The Slave System in Islamic Administration

In Arabia, before the advent of Islam, slaves were usually acquired by capture during tribal feuds. In the course of such conflicts women and children would be carried as prizes who, if not ransomed by their tribes, were then sold as slaves. The slave was an integral part in the life of an Arab. In fact, a respectable Arab family was considered incomplete without slaves. The slave performed domestic and industrial labour for his master; like a commodity he was also offered as a present, more especially to a bride as a wedding gift. In time of need he was also required to fight on behalf of his tribe.

As part of the social order, the slave system continued in Arabia even after the coming of Islam. Writing in the twentieth century, Bertram Thomas says that the Arabs, as a body, are too proud to work as servants and far too independent in spirit to obey a master, on account of which the well-to-do have either to do their own work or to resort to slavery. He calls the maintaining of slaves as a traditional part of the social structure of the Arabs.

1 Professor W. Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Medina, p. 293 says that Zayd b. Harithah, the adopted son of Muḥammad, was thus carried off as a stripling and sold at 'Ukáz.
3 Muhammad at Medina, p. 293.
4 Bertram Thomas, The 'Arabs, p. 266.
Slave-holding, since the early days of Islam until recent times, has been an established institution throughout the Muslim world. Perhaps, as the keeping of slaves added to the prestige of their owner, and enabled him to display his power, every nobleman and everyone who was possessed of means owned a few slaves. A Sultan usually possessed considerable number of slaves belonging to different races. Sultan Firuz Tughlaq had 180,000 slaves. His proselytizing zeal probably prompted him to build a slave community of war captives. He, therefore, ordered his mughals and officers to capture slaves during war, and send the best to him to be used in the service of his court.

The mughals, aware of their Sultan's weakness in this respect, brought well-attired, attractive slaves with them when they visited the royal court, to be offered as gifts. He who brought a large number of slaves entitled himself to more royal favour, while he who came with a small number received proportionate consideration. Some of these slaves were attached to the

1 Shams Siraj-i 'Aff, Tarikh-i Firuz Shahi, p.398. Khan-i jahan Maqbul, during Firuz Tughlaq's absence from the capital, would ride in the vicinity of Delhi with his slaves and children, and make a show of being the deputy of the Sultan.
2 Ibn Battuta, translated and selected by H.A.R. Gibb. pp.205. Ibn Battuta records that in Delhi every person while travelling is accompanied by a slave-boy who carried his bed on his head; Mrs. Meer Hasau 'Ali, Observations on the Mussalmans of India, p.323, she describes that even in the nineteenth century the poorest lady in India retained a number of slaves and domestics.
3 Khwand Amir, Habib us sivar, B.M. Add. 27,237, Vol.II, f 475a. The author says that Mu'tizz al-Din had a craze to purchase slaves and rear them up.
4 'Aff, pp. 270,268. 'Aff says that the slaves of Firuz Tughlaq were spread throughout the provinces and some were even sent to settle at Mecca.
provincial army and were assigned villages for their maintenance. Those who stayed in cities were given allowances carrying from ten to a hundred tankas, either monthly or every three, four or six months. The periodical payment and, in some cases, the small amount, suggest that allowances to city-dwelling slaves were in addition to their other requirements of life with which they were supplied.

A Sultan exercised absolute authority over his slaves, both as master and as king. When Haibat Khan, a slave of Ghīyāth ud-Dīn Balban, killed a person under the influence of drink, Ghīyāth ud-Dīn displayed his sense of justice and his authority as master, by handing over Haibat Khan to the widow of the deceased, and asking her to stab him with a knife until he died.

Moreover, whatever a slave possessed belonged to the master. Firuz Tughlaq was once presented with a crore (ten million) of tankas by one of his slaves named Bashīr. The Sultan accepted it, as in the final analysis it really belonged to him, being the property of his slave.

1 'Afīf, p.272. 'Afīf says that 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī, possessed about 50,000 slaves who formed the fighting squads and were attached to every branch of the administration.

2 Diya ud-Dīn Barānī, Tarikh-i Firuz Shāhī, p.40. Barānī says that Balban first inflicted five hundred stripes on Haibat Khan, perhaps as the dispenser of justice, and then handed him over to the widow saying "this murderer is my slave, whom I make over to you to be killed with a knife."

3 'Afīf, p.442.
In 1192 A.D., when Mu’izz al-Din defeated the combined princes of India under Prithvirāj, he was confronted with a formidable situation. The people of India in general, and the subdued Rajput princes, as was to be expected, were hostile. Threats of invasion from the Mongols who had burst like a storm from the north-west of China was no small danger. His only physical force in India was his army, which, according to Minhāj, was 120,000 with which he had encountered Prithvirāj. It was by no means adequate to contain the threatening dangers.

Besides, Mu’izz al-Din’s main mission was to found a Muslim kingdom in India. Nizāmī’s statement "the Turkish occupation of India was the inevitable result of the emigration of races from Mongolia and Central Asia", is not the whole truth. The wealth of India of which much had been known from the invasions of Māḥmūd of Ghazna was no less an attraction. Administration of the conquered territories, therefore, figured as one of his most immediate problems. Since those were days of slow communications, it was impossible for any ruler to govern effectively the remoter parts of the kingdom from his capital.

1 E.B. Havell, A short history of India, p.131. According to Havell, muslim rulers needed the entire military strength of the Muslim world to contend only against Chengiz, who at the head of his well-organized army had begun his terrific drive across Asia and Eastern Europe.

2 Minhāj al Sirāj, Tabagat-i Naṣiri, p.119

3 K.A. Nizāmī, Religion and Politics in India during the Thirteenth Century, pp. 90-91.
As such, the provinces required loyal officers, who were to collect revenues and enforce the authority of the Sultan.

For the palace-service, also, a fund of human material was necessary. The man-power resources at the disposal of the conqueror was far too insufficient to cope with the situation. Thus, the ruler's desperate need was to procure men somehow. One of the answers consisted in purchasing men of foreign origin and training them for their ultimate responsibilities. The tradition of giving important offices to slaves had existed since the ninth century A.D., from the days of the 'Abbasids.

Ahmed ibn Tulun, the son of a slave of the Caliph, Ma'mun, was the deputy of Bayakbak in Egypt. He declared himself independent in 875 A.D. and established a short-lived dynasty there which lasted until 905 A.D., when Egypt again came under the Caliph's authority.

In Fatimid Egypt, 909-1171 A.D., both black and white slaves held important offices in the palaces and were, also, posted as guards.

1 Nizam ul-mulk, Siyasatnama, p.108. Nizam ul-mulk recommends that five to ten thousand pages should be available at a short notice when needed.

2 Amir Khusrau, 'Izz-i Khusravî, Vol. II, pp.141-144. Even a century after the establishment of Muslim rule in India, Sultan 'Ala-ud-Din Khalji urged the merchants of Ma'bar and Cambay to purchase for him among other rarities, the ghulaman-i jangi (slaves to be employed as soldiers).


5 Sir W. Muir, The Mamlûk or Slave dynasty of Egypt, p.2.
The Seljuqs, who ruled over a large part of Central and Nearer Asia from the eleventh to the thirteenth century, organised their army and civil force with a body of Turkish slaves.1

The nucleus of the Saffarids, the Samanids, and the Ghaznavids, army and civil officials were the slaves.2

In Islamic countries there was no social opprobrium in being a slave. Theoretically, a slave was the property of his master, but in actual practice, he was treated just like other members of the family. Minhâj says that Qutb ud-Dîn Aybek, while a slave of the chief Qâdi Fakhir ud-Dîn 'Abdul 'Azîz Kûfî read the Qur'an with the sons of his master and also received instructions in horsemanship, shooting and archery. Mu'izz al-Dîn called his slaves as his sons.3

To be a personal slave of the Sultan was in fact an honour.4 In Eastern Islamic countries it was one of the stages in the elevation to dignity and power. The slave enjoyed a privileged position in relation to the free man, who had no opportunity of a meteoric rise to power.5

---

1 Stanley Lane-Poole, Mediaeval India, p. 64, where it is said, "the mamlûk guard of the emperor Malik Shâh formed a school of capable rulers."
3 T. N., pp. 138, 132; Tarîkh-i Firîshta. Translated by J. Briggs, Vol. I. Firîshta says that Mu'izzal-Dîn educated his slaves and adopted them as his sons; B. Miller, The Palace School of Muhammad the Conqueror, p. 71.
4 'Afîf, p. 395. Qiwam ul-mulk, in spite of being a free man called himself a slave of Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq.
To a Sultan, a dependable salve was the protector of his life. The office of Taudar, invariably went to the faithful and loyal salves. The troops in the capital consisted of royal salves and guards like the Taudas, a testimony of the Sultan's complete faith in their loyalty. When in battle, they formed the centre of the army and were directly under the command of the king. \(^1\) 'Afd informs us that forty thousand slaves daily attend Sultan Firuz Tughlaq as his guards, either at the palace or in his equipage. The figure may seem to be exaggerated, but the keenness of the Sultan to rehabilitate his large number of slaves is well known. \(^3\)

A faithful slave seldom failed to enjoy the affection and trust of his master, and his meritorious services rarely went unrewarded. Mu'izz al-Din, in recognition of Iletmish's bravery against the Khokars, in 1206 A.D., asked Qutb ud-Din not only to manumit him, but, also, to look after him properly, as he was full of promise. \(^5\)

A loyal slave could, also, attain to the highest office even before his manumission, and if he had discharged his responsibilities creditably, he could as well aspire for the hand of his master's daughter in wedlock. \(^6\) When slaves gave evidence of their worthiness to

---

2. L. H. Qureshi, *Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi*, p. 133; T. N. pp 183, 323. Minhaj calls them 'lashkar-igalb'  
3. 'Afif, p.270.  
4. T. N. p.120. Mu'izz al-Din after conquering the territories of India placed them in charge of his trusted slave Qutb ud-Din and returned to Ghazna.  
5. Ibid., pp. 169-170  
6. T. N. p.141. Qutb ud-Din being satisfied with the abilities of Iletmish, married him to his daughter.
succeed a sovereign, the latter without hesitation preferred them to the descendants of the royal family. Lane Poole has very ably analysed the reasons for preference to a slave over a royal descendant. "While a brilliant ruler's son is apt to be a failure, the slaves of a real leader of men have often proved to be equals of their master. . . . . He (the son) may or may not inherit his father's talents; even if he does, the very success and power of the father creates an atmosphere of luxury that does not encourage effort. . . . . On the other hand the slave is the 'survival of the fittest'; he is chosen for physical and mental abilities, and he can hope to retain his position in his masters' favour only by vigilant effort and hard service." 2

During the early days of Muslim rule in India, the courts of Ghazna and Delhi were a paradise for the slave dealers. The chroniclers inform us that Mu'izz al-Din possessed several thousands of slaves, which may be said to have been dictated by necessity. The shrewd slave-dealer would cautiously select

---

1 T.N., pp131-132, Mu'izz al-Din mentioned his slaves as his successors ignoring his brother's son, Ghilyath ud-Din Mahmud.
2 Stanley Lane Poole, Medieval India, p. 64.
3 T.N., p. 132.
his human wares, and spare no effort to present them in
an attractive form to the royal customer so as to receive a
handsome price in return. Undoubtedly, the best slaves went
to the king and the eminent nobles at a high price. Sometimes
the nobles, also, sold their trained slaves to the Sultan.
Iletmish purchased Malik Naṣīr ud-Dīn from the descendants of
Malik Bahā ud-Dīn Tugh Ṣil.  

1A. Mes, *The Renaissance of Islam*, translated by S. Khudā Bakhsh, and D.S. Margoliouth, p.160., where it is said that the slave-dealers in order to sell their human-wares “paint blue eyes black, yellow cheeks red, make emaciated faces chubby, remove the hair from the cheek, make light hair deep-black, convert the straight into curly, thin into well rounded arms, efface small-pox marks, warts, moles and pimples; Kai Khus ibn Iskandar, *Qabus nama*, p.63, recommends the following marks to be observed for purchasing a brave slave. “thick hair, tall and erect body, powerful-build, hard flesh, thick bones, coarse skin, straight limbs, firm joints, tight tendons, sinews and blood vessels prominent and visible on the body, broad shoulders, deep chest, thick neck, round head - preferably bald, concave belly, buttocks drawn in, long strides and black eyes; T.N, p.166, Iletmish was sold with necessary preparations.

2T.N. p.247, Iletmish purchased Qawr ud-Dīn Tamar Khan for 50,000 *fi ḡalq*.
A Sultan could hardly afford to miss a slave who impressed as promising. Minhaj says that Mu'izz al-Din had forbidden the purchase of Iletmish, at Ghazna, on account of the high price demanded by his slave-dealer. When Quṭb ud-Dīn saw Iletmish, he requested the Sultan's permission to purchase him. The restriction was modified and Quṭb ud-Dīn was allowed to buy him at Delhi.  

During the late twelfth and the early thirteenth century, the Turkish slaves were chiefly in demand, as they had acquired a reputation for their martial qualities. Mu'izz al-Dīn was a great admirer of the Turkish slaves. Out of his contingent of many thousand slaves, a large number were of Turkish origin. Niẓam ul mulk expresses his definite preference for Turkish slaves, because they came of a race which had proved its ability for loyal service.

The dependence of a ruler on the support of a homogenous body was not without its attending dangers. The chief cause of confusion in the Delhi Sultanate from 1236-1266 A.D. was the domination of the Turks in every sphere of activity. During the campaign of Sultan Rukn ud-Dīn Firūz in 1236 A.D. against his disaffected nobles, his Turkish slaves played havoc in the neighbourhood of Delhi. When Rādīya marched against Altūnīya in 1240 A.D., the Turkish slaves force

1 T.N. p.168. The slave-dealer, after bargaining for almost five years, finally succeeded in selling Iletmish. 'Abdul Haqq, Tarikhī, B.M. Or.26, 210, f.7b. The author says that a Turk of Iletmish's qualities and beauty had not till then come to Ghazna.


3 Siyāsah nāma, p.108

4 T.N. p.183.
betrayed her at Bhatinda, and made her over to the enemy to be imprisoned. 1

From the time of Iletmush the need for slaves became more pressing. The Mu'izzí amírs had challenged the accession of Iletmush and had, also, engaged him in a battle in which they suffered defeat. 2 This probably impelled Iletmush, to building a nucleus of personal slaves, whose unflinching allegiance, on account of their lack of local interest, would guarantee his own protection and, also, assure the succession of his nominee. 3 Ibn Ba'ttûta informs us that Iletmush would send merchants to Samarqand, Bukhârâ and Turmuz in order to purchase slaves for him. The Tabagat-i Nasiri and the Futuh usSalatin give us to understand that the slave-dealers frequently visited the court of Delhi 4.

The accession of each of the first four successors to Iletmush was sudden and unexpected, and, also, very brief. This, perhaps, did not leave them with much time to mobilise a contingent of slaves for themselves.

Sultan Naşir ud-Dîn Maḥmûd possessed slaves but the domination of the Shamsî malîks during his reign (1246-1266) suggests that they were neither large in size nor effective as a force. 5

---

1 Yahya Sirhindî, Tariikh-i Mubârak Shâhî, p. 27
2 Hasân Nizâmi, Tai ul ma'athir, I.O., 214a-216b; T.N., P.170.
3 The Social Structure of Islam, p.418. Levy says that sovereigns took great care to win the allegiance of their troops for ensuring the succession of their nominee.
4 Travels of Ibn Ba'ttûta, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.III, p.594; T.N., pp.254,259,260; 'Isâmi, p.117
5 ST.N.p.214. Sultan Naşir ud-Dîn Maḥmûd granted one hundred slaves to the author of the Tabagat-i Nasiri to be presented to his sister in Khwâsan where she was in financial distress; Raverty, op.cit., Vol. I, p. 696. Raverty has forty slaves as the gift to Minhaj.
A. **Palace Training of Pages**

The contemporary chroniclers of the early Turkish rule in India give very little information on the training of palace-pages. But the fact that slaves received training before being assigned an office is scarcely to be disputed. Scattered evidence gives the clue that a training system did exist during the period.\(^1\) Minhaj furnishes only the official structure of the Sultan's court. Offices were then chiefly in the possession of slaves. The Turks, who came fresh from the steppes hardly possessed any substantial knowledge either in the art of administration or in the science of warfare.

Admittedly, it was the aim of the Turkish rulers in India to discover youths of exceptional merits and to train them as warrior-statesman.\(^2\) When such Turkish slaves or adventurers arrived in India, they had first of all to shed their earlier proclivities and to cultivate in them a dense of duty and discipline.

A training to this end was to be considered essential, as it rendered the incumbents fit for wars and other active employments. It is likely that the Samanid system of training, as recommended by Nizam-ul-mulk, was accepted as a basis by the early Muslim rulers of India.

The prescribed training extended over a period of seven years.\(^3\)

---

1. Barani, p. 108 Barani says that Amīn Khān was a trained army commander; 'Aff in Takīkh-i Firuz Shaḥī, page 273, says that during the reign of Firuz Tughlaq slaves were sent to the amirs and maliks in the provinces, to be trained in their various duties.

2. Büşbèqqu writing in Augerī Gisbenui Busbequii omptu quae extant, Pest, 1758, pp. 234-77, 262-63, as quoted by B. Miller "The curriculum of the Palace School," The Macdonald Presentation Volume, p 308, "The Turks rejoice greatly when they find an exceptional man as though they had acquired a precious object, and they spare no labour or effort in cultivating him; especially if they discern he is fit for war.

3. Siyasat nāma, p. 110
In the first year the slave was to serve on foot at the stirrup wearing a 'zandanji' garment; and on no account even in private could he ride a horse, and if he did so he was to be punished.

In the second year the tent-leader would inform the haflib of his progress, and if satisfactory a Turkish horse with plain harness was given to him. After he had served for one year with a horse and whip, he was given a belt to gird on his waist. In the fifth year he received a better saddle, and a bridle, ornamented with stars, and, also, a rich cloak with a club which he hung on his club-ring. In the sixth year he was granted a coloured-dress (perhaps to be worn while parading). In the seventh year he was given a single apex, sixteen-peg tent and three slaves, and the rank of tent-leader was conferred by decorating him with silver wire and Ganja clothing.

The prevailing circumstances in India hardly suggest that the recommended curriculum was rigidly followed. Conditions demanded the utilisation of all available human materials at the earliest opportunity. Therefore, for the raw-Turk, a basic training to the extent which could make him equal to the needs of the time, can be assumed. Subsequent

---

1 Siyāsītānāma (ed. Qazwīnī), p.263, Qazwīnī says that according to some 'zandanji' is a fine cloth while according to others it is a coarse material; W. Barthold, Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion, p.227. Barthold says that Zandanji derives its name for the Bukharan village of Zandan.

2 Hubert Darke in his translation of the Siyāsītānāma, pp 104–105, mentions training in the fourth year, also, when the slave was given a quiver and a bow case to fasten at the time of mounting. As the Persian text edited by Qazwīnī does not mention what Darke says, it seems that the third stage of training lasted for two years.

3 Barthold, op.cit., p.227, Ganja is the present Elizabetpol.
palace-duties served as the nursery to train them for higher offices. On acquiring a brilliant person, the Sultan would keep him close to himself and devote his personal energies in cultivating the former's qualities. Qutb ud-Din stimulated Iletmish to more devoted duties by frequently raising his status. A slave possessed of qualities usually rose to a high rank. Career was open to talents, while the lazy and the dull had no future and lived in obscurity.

At the preparatory stage, instruction most probably was given in the polite arts, physical exercises and specialized vocations. As the State business was transacted in the Persian language, it inevitably followed that the first business of a Turk was to learn this language. Since the producing of loyal Muslims was one of the concerns of the infant Muslim State, a knowledge of the Arabic language which would help to read the Qur'an, was also to be acquired.

Gymnastic exercises, and participation in sports of various kinds, which increased the strength and agility of the body must have been

---

1 T.N, p.169
2 Travels of Ibn Battûta, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliott and Dowson, Vol. III, p.594, where it is said that Balban rose from the low post of a water-carrier to the rank of a Sultan; S. Lane Poole, Mediaeval India, p.78. T.N, p.242. Malik 'Izzud-Din Tughril could become amir-lâkhur only after a long time. He had earlier given proof of his carelessness by losing Iletmish's specially decorated ink-pot.
3 T.N, p.242. Malik 'Izzud-Din Tughril could become amir-lâkhur only after a long time. He had earlier given proof of his carelessness by losing Iletmish's specially decorated ink-pot.
4 T.N, pp 284-285, Arkali Rad-bak Saif ud-Din, a slave of Iletmish, held the post of Judge for a period of eighteen years, when, according to Minhraj, he guided himself by the laws of the Sharî'ah.
an important part of the training. The title of 'Hazar Mardah', conferred by Iletmish on Malik Kabir Khan Ayyaz, suggests that the physical strength of the latter was equal to that of one thousand persons.¹

Since the cavalry force figured as the deciding factor in Indian wars, cavalry exercises leading to fine horsemanship, were indispensable.² The Subh ul A'sha says that slaves occupied the front rank in the battle-field. Being attired in light-dress and equipped with shields and weapons, they were posted in the front row holding the ropes of elephants in their hands. As they were the first target of attack, a training in the methods of warfare could not be dispensed with.³

The stage of vocational training, perhaps followed the completion of instruction in the liberal arts and strenuous physical exercises. As pages were required to attend the Sultan in various capacities, such as tashhedar, silahdar, farrooh, sami-khaas, shurbadar.

¹T.N., p.234; The Macdonald Presentation Volume, pp 318-319. Where it is said that in the Ottoman empire initial exercises were the lifting and carrying of heavy-weights. Each year during the festivities, competitive tests in the lifting and carrying of heavy-weights were held, which were attended by the Sultan and all members of the Palace-school.

²T.N., p.258. Minhaj says that Malik Taj ud-Din Sanjar Kuret Khan, was an expert horseman and a skilled archer. While riding he would have two horses under saddle. When the horses were in a fast gallop he would jump from one to the other and then return back to the first. In archery, no enemy or game could escape him. He would collect his game by spurring his horse ahead of the retinue and would not use a hunting dog, leopard or hawk.

³Subh ul a'sha, Indian portion translated by Otto Spies, p.76; T.N, pp259-260. Minhaj says that Saif ud-Din Bat Khan Aybek, was perfect in war-like accomplishments, and Taj ud-Din Sanjar Tiz Khan, was famed for his valour and military talents.
etc., training in the rules of etiquette and the various duties was undoubtedly essential.

It could, also, be asserted that training in works of technical nature, such as those connected with the Treasury, was imparted to the incumbents.

Besides the rulers, men of high social status and, also, slave dealers trained their slaves. In the Ottoman empire the prince, the lord, and even the Emperor himself, would have their children instructed in some art or science, so that it could prove an asset if they came across adverse days.

1 T.N. p.248 Minhāj says that Malik Hindu Khan, a slave of Iletmīsh, started his career in the palace as a keeper of the hunting leopards, later he became the torch-bearer and thereafter the ewer-keeper. He finally held the office of the royal treasurer; Qabusnāma, p. 132, where it is said, "an appointment should be given to one who is adapted to it, and not to one who lacks the needful capacity."

2 E.B. Havell, Aryan rule in India, p. 293, Havell calls Qutb ud-Dīn an expert archer as he succeeded in killing Rāja Jaychandra with the shot of his arrow.
CHAPTER II

The Palace hierarchy and the Religious Institutions

A The Sultan

Nizam ul-mulk says, God at all times chooses a human-being for looking after the interest of the world and the well-being of the people. He probably aimed at establishing the theory of the divine-right of a ruler, which made the chosen human-being a representative of God on earth. The early Muslim rulers of India came to be addressed as Sultan, Vice-gerent of God, Shadow of God on earth, and so on.

The existence of a law-enforcing authority is the basic necessity of a civilised society, without which lawlessness and confusion would prevail, peace and security would vanish, and civilisation would remain under the threat of extinction.

Adam Smith lays down three essential duties for a sovereign. Firstly, to protect society from violence and invasion of other independent societies; secondly, to protect every member of a society from injustice or opposition of another member of the same society, and thirdly, to maintain and erect certain public works and public institutions.

1 Siyasatname, p.5
2 Barani, p.34 (Niyabat-1 Khudai)
3 T.W. Arnold, The Caliphate, p.128; Amir Khusrau, Qiran us-Saidain, p.155
4 Fakhr-1 Mudabbir, Adab ul Muluk wa Kifayat al-mamluk, I.O. 647, f.83b. The author says, if there were no Sultan the people would devour each other.
The term 'Sultan' occurs in the Qur'an as an abstract expression of 'power, authority'. Towards the end of the first century of the Hijrah, the word Sultan was used in the 'Egyptian papyri' for the governor of a province, which denoted an official with delegated powers. Mahmūd of Ghazna was probably the first important Muslim ruler to style himself as Sultan. Usually it was the Caliph's prerogative to confer such a title but sometimes the successor of an overlord, also, exercised this privilege. Minhāj says that after Mu'izzal Dīn's death, his royal successor Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Mahmūd, honoured Qutb ud-Dīn with the title of Sultan. It appears that Iletmish after his accession styled himself as Sultan Shams ud-Dīn. Arnold, apparently without authority, states that Iletmish was conferred the title of Sultan by the 'Abbasid Caliph, al-Mustansir, when his emissaries visited Delhi on February 19, 1229 A.D.

The Qabusnāma lays down six essential qualifications for a Sultan. He should inspire awe and fear in the hearts of the people, dispense justice, practise generosity, be capable of protecting his kingdom, symbolise dignity and remain truthful to his words.

1 Qurān, 14.12.13.
3 S.Laneboole, The Muhammadan Dynasties, p.286.
5 Raverty, op.cit., Vol.I, p.624. Raverty refers to a coin of Iletmish dated 612 A.H/1215-16 A.D., bearing the inscription 'Sultan Shams ud-Dīn'; In the Tarikh, I Mubārak Shāhl, p.17, it is stated that Iletmish assumed the title of Sultan after defeating Arām Shah in 1210 A.D, but it does not mention any authority; Arnold, op.cit., p.86.
6 Qabusnāma, p.135.
According to the Siyasatnama, it is obligatory for a king to interest himself in developing works for promoting the prosperity of his people. These should include, providing irrigation facilities, building bridges, inns and towns, and the raising of fortifications, lofty buildings, magnificent dwellings and schools for the seekers of knowledge.¹

Providing redress to the aggrieved should also be one of the main concerns of a ruler, as it would curb the activities of those given to tyranny. The strength of a kingdom and the activities of its people could be measured primarily in the scales of justice.²

In the absence of any definite law of succession in the Islamic kingdom, in India, during the period under review, a person was raised to the throne by a consensus of opinion, consisting of a limited number of people. These were the nobles, the 'ulema and the influential religious men who, in all probability were attached to the royal court.³

A successor nominated by the Sultan whether at his death-bed or before, was quite often ignored.⁴

On the accession of a Sultan the people were required to take a formal oath of allegiance (bay'at-i 'amm) to him. De Santillana says that since the time of Abu Bakr, bay'at has been a 'symbol of acceptance

¹ Siyasatnama, p. 7.
² M. Habib and Afsar, The Political Theory of the Delhi Sultanate, p. 16.
³ T.N., p. 170; Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p. 21; Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p. 52.
⁴ Iletmish nominated his daughter Radjiya, and Balban named his grandson Kai Khusrum, but both of them were rejected. (T.N., pp. 185, 182, Barani, p. 122)
by the people of the person elected. If the sovereign had been originally a slave, it was perhaps necessary for him to show his letter of manumission to the jurists in order to receive their recognition. This probably happened when the jurists were in doubt about the free status of the sovereign, as others who were also slaves, were not questioned about their freedom. A slave could in no account become a chief because he was unable to freely dispose of himself, his will being controlled by his master.

For an elected monarch the throne offered no secure position as he always stood the risk of being replaced and, also, of losing his head. At least four successors of Iltimish and one of Balban were dethroned and subjected to tragic consequences for their inability to effectively control their Turkish officers.

After ascending the throne a Sultan would have the Khutbah read in his name throughout the empire. It proclaimed his sovereignty and extended formal recognition to his authority in the distant areas of his kingdom.

1 De Santillana, 'Law and Society', The Legacy of Islam, p.297; Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p.31. Yahya says that when the Mongols ravaged Lahore in 1241 A.D., Mu'izzud-Din Bahram made the amir maliks and other renowned chiefs pledge their loyalty to him for a second time.

2 Travels of Ibn Battuta, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, p.591, where it is recorded that the qadi and the lawyers swore their allegiance to Iltimish, after inspecting his deed of manumission.

3 There is no evidence that Qutb ud-Din Aybek and Balban, who were also slaves before their accession were asked to produce their deed of manumission when they ascended the throne; De Santillana, op. cit., p.296, J.H.Nieboer, Slavery as an Industrial System, p.8, where it is said that the master possesses a right not only over the body of the slave but also over his will.

4 T.N., pp.184,188,197,201; Barani, pp.171,173.
The Sikka (coinage) was also an insignia of royalty. Every ruler, when he came to the throne struck coins to commemorate his accession. When a rebel governor defied the authority of the Sultan and assumed independence, he invariably struck the name of his sovereign from the Sikka and Khutbah, and substituted his own.  

Chatr (royal canopy) and dūr-bāsh (royal baton), were, also, symbols of royalty, but they were not as important as the Sikka and Khutbah. Members of the royal family and powerful nobles were allowed their use under authority of the Sultan.  

Tirāz was also a privilege of the Sultan. It was the embroidering of the ruler's name with other words of good omen and prayer on the hem of the sovereign's garment which was usually made of gold-brocade or pure silk. The writing was woven with a gold-thread or some other coloured thread different from the colour of the garment in order to make the embroidery work distinct. Sometimes a ruler honoured an officer by allowing him to wear such a garment.

---

1 Barānī, p. 83. According to Barānī, when Tughrīl Beg, the governor of Lakhnouti, assumed independence, he took the title of Sultan Muqthīd ud-Dīn which he used in his Khutbah and Sikka.  

2 Otto Spies, op. cit., p. 75. Muḥammad Tughlaq would have one Chatr when not on the battlefield, but during war time seven Chatrs were held over his head, two of which were well ornamented and were priceless; The dur-bash literally meant 'stand-aside'. It was a kind of spear with two horns or branches, the wood-staff of which was studded with jewels and ornamented with gold and silver. It was carried before the sovereign when he issued forth and also accompanied him in the battlefield (Raverty, Vol. I, p. 607, n. 5).  

3 T.N., p. 181., Prince Rukn ud-Dīn, Fīrūz, was allowed the use of Chatr by Ibetmish; T.A. Vol. I, p. 87. When Balban nominated Prince Muhammad as his successor he conferred on him a Chatr and a durbāsh.  

4 'Īsāmī, p. 152. 'Īsāmī says that Balban solicited a white chatr from Nasīr ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, because it was the cause of his sickness.  

In practice the authority of a Sultan in his kingdom was absolute, but in theory, perhaps, to keep the fiction of the Caliph's legal sovereignty alive, he considered himself as a lieutenant of the court of Baghdad, wherefrom he expected a formal recognition to his kingship. ¹ He was the supreme executive authority in his kingdom and also the Commander-in-chief of his forces. He exercised the right of appointing his officers and, also, of dismissing any official however powerful he might be.²

As a legislator, he was perhaps conscious of not transgressing the limits of Sharī`ah, but while framing rules for the well-being of his people and country, he considered himself beyond all limitations.³

A Sultan, in order to consolidate his own position, was obliged to maintain a certain standard of religion in a country where his main source of strength were his co-religionists, who, also, were in a minority.⁴ He demonstrated his interest in religion in various ways. Qutb ud-Dīn bn his accession, patronised the scholars, jurists, the reciters of Qur`ān, pious men and reformers.⁵ Minhāj says that Iltmīsh

¹ H.N. Wright, The Sultans of Delhi, their coinage and metrology, pp.17-21. The Delhi Sultans, in their coinage recognized themselves as the supporter or helper or right hand of the Caliph.
² T.N., p.298. Sultan Nasir ud-Dīn Mahmūd dismissed Balban, who was his na`ib-i mulk and the most powerful noble in those days.
³ Barānī, p.47. Balban used to say "I do not understand what is religious or irreligious for the country, whatever I think best I act upon it."
⁴ K.M. Ashraf, op.cit., p.147, rightly says that a Sultan had at least to maintain an outward show of respect for the rituals and symbols of Islām.
⁵ Tarikh-i Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubarak Shāh, p.35.
was a sovereign of exemplary faith, who showed respect to recluses, devotees, divines and the doctors of law and religion. According to 'Īsāmī, Iltutmish built the Hauz-i Shamsī under religious inspiration and poured a flask of zamzam water into it for the benefit of mankind.

Baranī informs us that Belban was fond of convivialities in his early life, but on becoming a ruler he changed completely. He would regularly offer his prayers and never missed them even when on a journey. Despite his desire for princely dignity he would invite religious men to his meals and discuss religious problems with them. He would show his interest in religious sermons (tadhkir) which he quite often attended and would give vent to his emotions by weeping bitterly. Whenever he heard about the death of any scholar or religious person, he made it a point to attend the funeral procession. He would also visit the house of the deceased on the third day (sivum) of the funeral, when, after consoling the bereaved members he would grant stipends to them.

The Sultan was probably the richest individual in his kingdom. His unlimited wealth helped him to make gestures of his liberality. It enabled him to mobilise a large army and win supporters for himself.

1 T.N., p.167.
2 'Īsāmī, p.111.
3 Baranī, p.46.
4 Baranī, pp.46-7.
5 Oebusnāma, p.135, where it is said that people will not lay down their lives for a ruler, who does not distribute wealth lavishly; Habib and Afsar, The Political Theory of the Delhi Sultanate, p.22, where the saying of Aristotle is quoted "an army can only become large and well-organised through bold expenditures of enormous treasure"; A. J. Arberry, Kings and Beggars (Translation of first two chapters of Sa'dī's 'Gulīstān'), p.45, where it is said, "when the Sultan grudges gold to his soldiery they cannot be ready to sacrifice their lives chivalrously on his behalf."
Quṭb ud-Dīn Aybek is known to have bestowed his gifts in lakhs, while Iletmish displayed his munificence by giving a hundred times more than the former.¹

The author of the Masālik ul Absār informs us that Sultan Muḥammad Tughlaq would distribute 20,000 "costly" dresses every year to persons attached to his court. He would also present gold-brocades to the amīrs and their wives. Twenty thousand men, consisting of khāns, maliks, amīrs, sipah sālārs, and important officers, daily enjoyed Muḥammad Tughlaq's hospitality both in the morning and evening. When the Sultan himself sat for dinner and supper, he was joined by two hundred learned lawyers with whom he indulged in intellectual discussions.²

Barānī has, perhaps rightly, said that after the prophetic office the next most important is that of the king, and the latter should, therefore remain conscious of the importance of his office and offer thanks to God for the honour conferred upon him. These words imply that a king had a definite obligation towards religion.³

A ruler demonstrated his devotion to the faith by appointing men who were well-versed in ecclesiastical affairs. Such officials included the shaikh ul Islām, the sadr us sudur, the qādī, the mufti, etc.

¹ T.N. pp. 138, 166; Tarih-i Mubarak Shāhī, p. 15. Yahya says that Quṭb ud-Dīn earned the title of lakh-baksh for his generosity.
² Masālik ul-Abār fi Ma'mulik ul Amsār, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot & Dowson, Vol. III, pp. 578, 579.
³ Barānī, pp. 70-1; Tarih-i Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubarak Shāh, p. 14, for the religious obligations of a Muslim ruler.
B The Court Officials
1 Senior Officials
a) Na'ib-i mulk

Next in political importance to the sovereign was the na'ib-i mulk. This office was usually exercised as a temporary device, when a ruler was considered inexperienced and young in age. The na'ib was generally an influential noble who was either a nominee of the powerful elements of the court or appointed by the Sultan himself. In some cases, the condition preceding such an appointment was the delegation of sovereign power to the deputy by the de jure ruler. Ikhtiyar ud-Din Aytigîn was the first na'ib-i mulk of the Delhi Sultanate. On his appointment as the na'ib in 637 A.H./1240 A.D., during the reign of Mu'tizz ud-Din Bahram, the nobles and commonalty offered their allegiance (bay'at-i 'amm) to him in the same manner as they had done to the Sultan.

A na'ib was sometimes appointed to deputise with full powers during the sovereign's absence from the capital. When Balban led his expedition to Lakhnout against Tughril, he authorised Malik Fakhr ud-Din, the kotwal of Delhi to act in his place.

1 T.N., pp.191, 153; Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahî, p.28.
2 T.N., pp.191, 198, 294. Ikhtiyar ud-Din Aytigîn, the na'ib-i mulk of Mu'tizz ud-Din Bahram, and Qutb ud-Din Hussain Ghori, the na'ib-i mulk of Ila ud-Din Mas'ud, were the choice of the nobility while Balban was appointed by Sultan Nasîr ud-Din Ma'bud.
3 Ibid, p.253. This is the only instance when allegiance was offered to the na'ib.
4 Barâni, p.85. A deputyship during the ruler's temporary absence was called niyabat-i qhalbat.
A ruler sometimes conferred this office on a noble as a token of affection. 'Ala' ud-Din Khalji, appointed Malik Kafur hazar-dinari as malik na'ib (deputy king), due to his weakness for him. 'Ala'ud-Din's son, Qutb ud-Din Mubarak Khalji, also, gave this title to the convert Khusrau for the same reason.

A powerful noble would sometimes without any authority, become a de facto na'ib and administer the government on behalf of a weak ruler.

b) Wakil-i dar

Barthold calls the office of the wakil an important one. Qureshi says that the wakil-i dar was in many respects considered to be the Sultan's deputy. Minhaj tells us that when 'Imad ud-Din Rayhan became the wakil-i dar in 1253 A.D. the entire administration of the kingdom passed into his hands. According to Nizam ul-mulk, a highly respected person of reputed integrity should be appointed to this office as, the royal palace, kitchen, cellars and stables, the king's children and also, his own retainers, were placed under his care. It is,

Baranî, p.251, 'Ala' ud-Din Khalji was deeply infatuated by the physical charms of Malik Kafur, for which he made him his malik na'ib.
2Baranî, pp.389,390.
3Ibid., p.131. Malik Nizam ud-Din, was a dadbak (judicial officer) but he exercised control over the administration of the kingdom without assuming the title of na'ib.
4Barthold, op.cit., p.229.
5Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.57; T.N, p.298.
6Siyasat nama, p.95; Barthold, op.cit., p.229, he says that the wakil managed the domestic affairs of the court.
therefore not unlikely that he, by his association with the palace-establishment exercised great influence in the palace, and, also, commanded respect by successfully discharging his duties. We hear of this office under the Ghaznavids, but according to Nizām ul-mulk, perhaps, it did not continue during the Seljuq period. ¹

All orders from the Sultan concerning the royal household passed through him. ² This has probably led some scholars to suggest that his functions were secretarial. ³ Nizām ul-mulk lays great emphasis on his free accessibility to the Sultan at any hour of the day, for furnishing reports on all matters, seeking advice and rendering accounts of his arrangements and transactions. ⁴ From these it seems that his functions were of an administrative nature. The first noble to be assigned this office in the Delhi Sultanate was of Indian origin named 'Imād ud-Dīn Rayhān. ⁵ The wakīl-i dar was assisted by a nā'īb-i wakīl-i dar, who was, also, an important noble. ⁶

² Ḍabīl ul-mulk wa kifāyat al mamlūk, I. O. 647, f. 42b.
³ A. M. Hussian, The rise and fall of Muhammad bin Tughlag, p. 220. The author calls the wakīl-i dar, an officer who performed the secretarial functions of the court; K. K. Basu in the Translation of Tarīkh-i Mubarak Shāhī, p. 50 n. 3, says that the wakīl-i dar superintended ceremonies of presentation. I do not think Mr Basu is correct.
⁴ Siyāsāt-nāma, p. 95.
⁵ T. N., p. 217.
⁶ Baranī, pp. 36, 275; Tarīkh-i Mubarak Shāhī, p. 47.
c) **Amir-i Ha'ilib**

The amir-i ha'ilib was an important officer of the royal household. As he often belonged to the military aristocracy, in time of need, he was entrusted to lead expeditions against an enemy. In the palace his rank was equivalent to that of a foreign dignitary. He was the most active officer of the Sultân's secretariat. Practically all business of the palace was transacted either through him or through his Hajibs. The office carried much prestige and was usually assigned to a prince of royal blood or a favourite noble. His powers were very wide.

Intending visitors to the court, were first scrutinized by him and then presented to the Sultân in accordance with the court etiquette. As master of ceremonies, he organised royal festivities and also arranged court functions. The ruler consulted him on vital matters and included him as a member of his mājlis-i khalwat (secret council). When a ruler

---

1) Siyâsatnâma, p.141. Nişân ul-mulk calls him the highest officer at the court; Barthold, op.cit., p.227. He calls him as one of the first dignitaries of the kingdom.

2) T.N., p.288.

3) *Safarnâma-i Ibn Battuta* (Urdu translation by Ra'is Ahmed ja'fari, p.570, where it is recorded, if the visitor to the Sultân held an important status he stood in the row of the amir-i ha'ilib, otherwise behind him.

4) Ibid., pp.667, 673. where it is said that the ha'ilib conducted Ibn Battuta to his seat and on another occasion obtained an acknowledgement receipt for a letter delivered to him.

5) Barani, p.61. Barani says that Malik Bektars, the amir-i ha'ilib, was a favourite noble of Balban.


7) *Afif*, p.361.

8) Barani, p.36. When Balban was enraged at the appointment of Kamāl Mahyār, whose father was a Hindu of low birth, he summoned his mājlis-i khalwat (secret council), which included the amir-i ha'ilib, in order to discuss the consequences of such appointments.
held his court the ḥājibs received petitions from the people and handed them over to the amīr-i ḥājib who, in turn, presented them to the Sultān. The royal orders were conveyed by him to the secretaries (dabīrān) who communicated them to the petitioners. Those present in the court could hear from him directly. The amīr-i ḥājib, also acted as a confidential messenger of the Sultān. Important secret messages to different parts of the kingdom were sent through him. He was the foremost of the ḥājibs, the ḥājib-i ḫāvīd and ḥājib-i ḥurāfī standing below him in rank.

One or two ḥājibs always waited on the Sultān. Those who attended to the general duties of the ruler were probably styled khās-ḥājibs. During the reign of Iltimish's successors the post of amīr-i ḥājib was monopolised by members of the 'famous forty' who practically reduced the rulers to an insignificant position. Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Ayṭīqīn's proximity to Rādiyya, as her amīr-i ḥājib, gave him the opportunity to know every detail of the latter's activities and organise conspiracies against her. Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur occupied this post in the reign of Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahārān, when he ignored even the authority of the Sultān-Malik Qaraqāsh and Balban held this rank under 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd. Safūd-Dīn Aybak Kashli Khān, occupied this office in the reign of Naṣīr ud-Dīn Ḍahān, and perhaps

1 Otto Spies, op. cit., p. 74.
2 Taj ul ma'athir, I. O. 1486, f. 182b, where it is said that Sirāj ud-Dīn Abu Bakr, the amīr-i ḥājib, was sent by Mu'izz al-Dīn from Ghazna to inform Qūṭ b ud-Dīn at Delhi about his proposed action against the khokars.
3 Ibn Battūta (Urdu translation), p. 570.
strove his best to retain the authority of his brother, Balban, as the de facto ruler. Minhāj addresses Saif ud-Dīn Aybek by the title of malik ul ḫujūf, because he was Balban's brother. ¹

c) Sar-i jāndār: (chief of the body-guards)

Every ruler possessed a number of personal body-guards called the jāndārs.² As the number of jāndārs was expected to be large, they were probably split up into groups and placed under the command of different chiefs. The chief was styled as Sar-i jāndār.³ As protectors of the ruler's life, the jāndārs and sar-i jāndār were usually loyal and trustworthy people.⁴ Rawlinson informs us that in Persia, men of the highest rank became the bodyguards of kings, and they were usually a force of fourteen to fifteen thousand.⁵

Although the rank of Sar-i jāndār was not high in itself, it was nevertheless a stepping stone to a higher office. Iletmīsh, the future Sultan, was the sar-i jāndār under Qutb ud-Dīn. Iḥtiyār ud-Dīn Aytīgīn the nāťb-i mulk of Bahram, served as Iletmīsh's sar-i jāndār. Saif ud-Dīn Aybek Kashī Khan, the younger brother of Balban, and the future āmīr-i ḥālib, held the post of sar-i jāndār in the reign of Mu'izzud-Dīn Bahram.⁶

¹ T.N., p.278.
² Siyasat nāma, p.99. Nizām ul mulk recommends that a hundred Dailamī, and a hundred Khuṣāsī should remain in constant attendance upon the king whether he is at home or abroad; Barāni, p.30; Qubusnāma, p.134. Kāis Kāus says, "If a king's body-guards consist of a single race, the king is virtually a prisoner of his bodyguards." ³ Siyasat nāma, p.141. Nizām ul mulk says that the post of the Commander of the guards is next in importance to that of the āmīr-i ḥālib; Barāni, p.30. Where it is said that Balban, for his personal safety appointed awe-inspiring body-guards who stood around his person with bared glittering swords. ⁴ T.N., p.115. Mu'izz al-Dīn had been the sar-i jāndār to his brother, Ghiyath ud-Dīn.
⁵ George Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, Vol.IV, p.290.
⁶ T N , pp.169,252,279.
Besides having charge of the retinue guarding the king's person, the sar-i jandar also dealt with punishment and execution of certain classes of offenders and criminals. Nizam ul-mulk says that as the office of the guard-commander was concerned with the punishment of wrong-doers, the people feared him more than the king.  

Minhaj mentions about a noble, Malik Saif ud-Din Aybek, who expressed his reluctance to accept the office of sar-i jandar as it involved bloodshed, torture, extortion and oppression upon Muslims and the subjects.  

c) Amîr-i mailis

Usually a noble having the privilege of intimacy with the ruler was appointed as the amir-i mailis. Iletmish gave this office to Saif ud-Din Aybek Yughantat on account of his close association with him. The officer catered to the recreational needs of the ruler, by organising private parties, where the latter enjoyed the wit and humour of brilliant conversationalists, and intelligent people. The medieval Sultans, who were usually without much education, found in such parties the opportunity

---

1 Nizamul-Mulk, Siyasatnama, pp.141,142.  
2 T.N., p.237.  
3 T.N., p.238.  
4 Nizamul-Mulk recommends that a king should pass some time with his boon-companions (nadar) in order to refresh himself, by enjoying jests, stories, jokes and curious tales.
of discussing a variety of topics which gave them an access to the finer aspects of life and broadened their outlook. 1 At such parties, the chosen companions of the ruler, who usually received large salaries, assembled to display the qualities of their head and heart. 2 The amīr-i majlis was held in high esteem by the Sultan as he was one of the few nobles who had the distinction of dining with the ruler. 3

2) Amīr-i shikār.

Hunting was a favourite sport with the medieval Sultāns. 4 For an active ruler it was a means of recreation and a period of relief from his hectic palace life. This was, perhaps, the only period when the king could breathe freely with his loyal supporters. Here, the ruler found himself in a surrounding which was free from palace intrigues and court jealousies. Balban would go out on hunting excursions during winter. His hunting party consisted of several thousand men. 5 Five to six hundred courtiers, a thousand cavalry and a thousand infantry and archers who enjoyed Balban's full confidence usually accompanied him. Besides these, a number of falconers, hunting dogs and leopards,

1 Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p. 70.
2 Otto Spies, op. cit., p. 72.
4 Afīf, p. 316, Muhammad Tughlaq complains of Fīrūz Tughlaq's fondness for hunting; Masalik ul Absār, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol. III, pp. 579-580, says that when Muhammad Tughlaq would go on a hunting excursion, 100,000 horsemen, 2000 elephants, four wooden horses of two stories, 200 camels, and tents and pavilions of all kinds used to follow him.
5 Barānī, p. 54.
also, fPHowed the train of the Sultan. Festivities, music and song, were part of these hunting parties. An area near the capital was earmarked for the sport where there could be no outside intrusion. The provinces, also, contained spots where the king could hunt special game. The hunting excursion was organised by an officer called the amir-i shikar. He, probably, made an early survey of the hunting area as it involved the security of the ruler. A number of officials worked under him who looked after the hunting animals and birds. He was usually an important noble on whose loyalty the ruler fully relied. The amir-i shikar was an accomplished military officer, as in the time of need he was required to lead an army against the enemy. The noble who assisted him in his work was known as the na'ilb-i amir-i shikar.

1 Barani, p.55; 'Afif, pp. 317-318
3 'Afif, pp. 319-328. An area near Badaun was fixed for Firuz Tughlaq's hunting excursion.
4 Barani, p.54, Barani says that the post of amir-i shikar was an important office in the reign of Balban; T.A. Vol. I, p.83; T.N. p.169. Minhaj says that Ilemtish was promoted from the post of sar-i landar to that of amir-i shikar.
5 'Afif, pp. 115, 318. Malik Khidr Bahrám was the na'ilb-i amir-i shikar of Firuz Tughlaq.
The royal horses were placed under an officer called the amīr-i ʿakhur. As horses, because of their swiftness, played a vital part in warfare against the slow-moving elephants of the Hindu rulers, they had to be properly looked after. The amīr-i ʿakhur was a responsible officer of the royal household with a numerous staff under him. The maintenance of order in the stable, and the appointment of junior officers, grooms and water-carriers of the stable were his responsibility. The officer of the stable who remained in permanent attendance on the king, the keeper of the saddlery, the head of the stirrup-holders, and some footmen, who followed the ruler's retinue, were also attached to his staff.

There is no information of a royal stud being maintained during the thirteenth century A.D. It was, in fact, not necessary as the wants of the Turkish rulers in respect of horses were supplied by Central Asia, north Punjab and Sind.

1 Barānī, p.52. Balban considered six to seven thousand cavalry quite enough to keep the Hindu chiefs in subjugation; B.P. Mazumdar, in Socio-economic history of northern India, p. 50, quotes Manasollasa Vimsati, II, p. 574 "A king in possession of a strong cavalry need entertain no apprehension regarding his territory".

2 Tadhkīrat ul-Mulūk, (Translated by V. Minorsky, G.M.S.) pp. 52, 120.

3 B.P. Mazumdar, Socio-economic history of northern India (1030-1194 A.D.), pp. 50, 51; Barānī, p.53. Prince Muhammad would send horses to Balban from Sind and its adjacent areas.
Minhāj tells us about Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur, the na‘īb-i amīr-i ākhur, that he never absented himself from the gate of the stable even for a single moment, save through unavoidable necessity. Barani says that 'Ala ud-Dīn Khalījī, in order to check mal-practice and fraud in the royal stable, which involved replacing good animals with bad ones, regulated the system of branding horses.

The post of amīr-i ākhur was a coveted office and presaged well for its holder. The next appointment of an amīr-i ākhur was usually that of muṣta‘ī. Qūṭb ud-Dīn Aybek, Ghayth ud-Dīn Tughlaq and Muḥammad Tughlaq who held this office in their early career, ultimately rose to the rank of Sultān.

1 T.N., p.254.
2 Barani, p. 319.
3 T.N., p. 139; Ibn Battūta, Urdu translation, p.554; Barani, p.411
2. **Junior Officials**

There were other functionaries in the palace whom scholars are accustomed to describe as minor officials. According to them their office did not carry much importance. In fact, some of the officers were really important because they were invested with a sufficient degree of responsibility. Barani says that Malik Asghari, the *sar-i dawat dar* of 'Ala ud-Din Khalji was in the category of the highly important nobles.

a) **Chash nigar** (Comptroller of the royal kitchen and food-taster).

The *chash nigar* not only supervised the royal kitchen but also tasted the royal food before it was served on the dinner linen. On his careful supervision and honest intentions depended the safety of those who partook of the royal dinner. There was enough wealth in India to seduce men to crime. The office, though minor, was one of immense responsibility. It appears, men of tested honesty were given this post. Malik Tāj ud-Dīn Sanjar Gazlāk Khān was assigned this office by Iltumish, most probably on the recommendation of his eldest son Nāṣīr ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, with whom the former had spent his early days. Bitter factionalism

---

1 I.H. Qureshi, *Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi*, p.62 calls the *Chashnigir, shurbdar, saqi-i khas, farrash, tashtdar* and others, minor officials, and discusses them casually. Habib ullah in his, *The foundation of Muslim rule in India*, p.243, describes these as minor posts having more a decorative value than administrative. Barthold, *op.cit.*, p.228, calls these "smaller offices".

2 Baranī, p.336

3 T.N., p.232.
within the court and hostility towards the invaders from the Hindu population, carried a good deal of risk for the chāsh nīgīr, as he was the first to have a taste of the food.

b) Shurbdār

He was in charge of the drinkables. He served drinks to the guests of the Sultan. Usually before dinner was served in the palace, the shurbdār entertained the royal guests with sherbet. Like the chāsh nīgīr, a reliable person was usually entrusted with this work.

c) saqī-i khas

He was one of the personal attendants of the ruler and stood in the category of the principal members of his private staff. In order to make drinking parties more pleasant and romantic, the Sultan usually appointed a person of attractive appearance to this post. Like the chāsh nīgīr, probably the saqī-i khas, before serving wine to the king, first tasted it himself lest it should be poisoned.

1 G. Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, Vol. IV, p.166

2 Ibn Battūta, (Urdu translation), pp. 580, 654. Ibn Battūta, who was an eye-witness in the court of Muhammad Tughlaq, says that the shurbdār served the drinks, therefore the statement of I.H. Qureshi, in his Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.62, that the shurbdār was in charge of drinks which were served by the saqī-i khas, cannot be accepted as conclusive; K.A. Nizāmī, in his Religion and Politics in India during the thirteenth century, p.125, n.1, has the same opinion as that of Qureshi.

3 Siyāsatnāma, p.130

4 T.N. p.242. Minhāj tries to convey the impression that Malik Izz ud-Dīn Tughrīl was appointed by Iltmish as saqī-i khas because of his handsome appearance; G. Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, Vol. IV, p. 166
d) **Silahdar**

The silahdar carried the arms of the Sultan and was among the principal members of the ruler's private staff. When the king held audience he stood around the throne and accompanied him when he rode out. Loyal and tried persons were commonly entrusted with this job, as a silahdar having evil intentions could be a potential danger to an unarmed Sultan. In Turkey, during the sixteenth century, the sword-bearer was regarded as the first chamberlain of the court and, also, one of its most important officers.

1 *Sivasatname*, p.130

2 *Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi*, p.69, where we read that Mahmud Salim, the silahdar, stabbed Sultan jalal ud-Din Khalji and killed him; Barani in p.234, says that when the first blow of Muhammad Salim (he has Salim instead of Salim) failed, he struck the Sultan a second time with the sword and wounded him.

3 B. Miller, *The Palace School of Muhammad the Conqueror*, p.145. Miller says that a 'distinguished sword-bearer' was granted the privilege of being present in ceremonies such as the celebration of the birthday of the prophet.
C. The Religious Institution

a) Shaikh ul Islam

The main functions of the Shaikh ul Islam seem to have been the maintenance of those holy men and faqirs who enjoyed state patronage, and the delivering of sermons in presence of the ruler. In fact, he was, also, one of the advisers to the king on religious matters. Sayyid Nur ud-Din Mubarak Ghaznavi held the office in the reign of Iltumish. Barani, who is noted for his orthodoxy as a chronicler, says that the Shaikh, in one of his sermons, "emphasized that it was the duty of a Muslim ruler to abolish "Kufr" and Kafiri" (infidelity), shirk (associating other gods with God) and the worshipping of idols, for the sake of God and, also, in order to protect the religion of the prophet of God. If the total annihilation of idolatry was not possible, the ruler should spare no effort to disgrace, insult and slander the mushrik (polytheist) and idol-worshipping Hindus, who are the worst enemies of God and his prophet." Najm ud-Din Sughra, and Sayyid Qutb ud-Din occupied this post during the reign of Iltumish and Mu'tizz ud-Din.

1Barani, p.343. Barani out of reverence uses this title for Shaikh Niẓām ud-Dīn Auliya although it was not conferred by the Sultan.
2M.T. Titus, Indian Islam, p.66, where it is said that the darwishes were under the care of the Shaikh-ul-Islām; Masalik ul Absar, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.III, p.579, where it is said "the faqirs, whether natives or strangers are under the Shaikh ul Islam"; Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.179.
3Barani, pp. 41, 42.
4Abdul Haq, Akhbar ul Akhivar, Urdu trans. by Iqbal ud-Din Ahmed, p. 91; T.N., p.196; Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, pp. 31-32.
The Sadr us Sudur was an important official commanding much respect. He was responsible for ecclesiastical affairs and, also, looked after all learned men, whether they were inhabitants of the country or were foreigners. The educational establishments were under his control, promising and suitable persons deserving state-stipends were recommended by him to the Sultan. He led the Friday prayers and appointed the khatib (preacher) and imām (leader in prayer) to local mosques. Generally the ṭadi-i mamālik (chief-justice of the kingdom), also held the office of Sadr us Sudur, indicating that law and religion in a wider sense were identical.

c) Qādī

The function of a ṭadi is to settle disputes between the parties concerned. In the early days of Islam the Caliph himself exercised the office of ṭadi. 'Umar, the second Caliph of Islam, was the first to have introduced the system of appointing someone else to this office.

During the early Turkish rule, the post of ṭadi carried much prestige.

1 Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, pp.166-167; Masālik ul Absār, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.III, p.579.
2 A.B.M. Ḥābīb ʿulāḥ, Foundation of Muslim rule in India, pp. 239, 240.
3 Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.166
5 Tarikh-i Mubarak Shāhī, pp. 65, 66. Yahya says that Sultan Jalāl ud-Din Khalji told Qādī Jalāl ud-Dīn Kashānī, who was accused of conspiracy against the ruler "An intelligent and eminent person is raised to the rank of a ṭadi, how could you aspire to a higher position than this".
Stem despots like 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī and Muḥammad Tughlaq, also showed respect to the wisdom and authority of the qādī's office. The capital had its own qādī, who was appointed by the ruler himself. He was connected with the department of 'Sīyasat and mazālim' which gave him jurisdiction over civil and criminal disputes. Every town which possessed a thick Muslim population had its own qādī.

In dealing with disputes, as the qādī exercised jurisdiction over the lives and property of the Muslims, and also sometimes acted as adviser to the ruler, it was essential for him to be a pious person, thoroughly conversant with Islamic law, and above reproach in private conduct. In awarding justice he was to remain absolutely impartial.

1 Baranī, pp. 293-297. 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī would consult Qādī Muqīth on religious issues.
2 Tārikh-i Mubarak Shahī, p.116, where it is said that Muḥammad Tughlaq personally complained to Qādī Kamāl ud-Dīn that Shatīk Zādah Jāmī had called him a tyrant and sought redress according to the law.
3 Sīyasatnāma, p.43; T.N., p.175. Iltimāsh personally appointed Minhāj as the qādī.
4 T.N., p.3.
5 Ibid, p.188; Sir Jādū nāth Sarkār, Mughal Administration, p.110.
6 Sīyasatnāma, p.47, where it is said "as a judicial officer the qādī is the standard-bearer and lieutenant to the Caliph."
The Caliph 'Umar advised his qādis to treat all people equal in the court so that the noble would not feel that you would be partial to him, and the humble would not be despaired of justice from you'. The qādi did not make laws, but decided cases according to rules laid down in the fāih books. His judgment was final; there was no appeal from it. He could compromise a case without violating the spirit of the Islamic law. According to the Caliph 'Umar, 'compromise is permissible among Muslims, provided the agreement is not such which permits of something that is forbidden, or forbids that which is permitted'. A qādi could retract his earlier judgment if on a second thought he is convinced that his revised opinion is more correct; but the interval between the two judgments should not be more than that of a day.

\[1\] Ibn Khaldūn (F. Rosenthal), Vol. I, p. 453; TH.W. Juynboll, 'Qādi', Encyclopaedia of Islam Vol. II, p. 606, where it is said, "the qādi has to conduct his court exactly in accordance with the procedure laid down by the law"; Barani, p. 289.
CHAPTER III

The Post-Ghaznavid Period in Muslim India

A. Political History to 1210 A.D.

After the death of Mahmūd of Ghazna in 1030 A.D., India enjoyed respite from major foreign invasion for almost a century and a half. India was then divided into a number of principalities where each ruler was independent in himself. Its rich resources, coupled with the perpetual conflict among its rulers for political hegemony, offered a strong source of temptation to foreign invaders.

It was from the mountainous principality of Ghur (lying between Ghazna and Herāt) that Mu'izz al-Dīn, the third Muslim invader, led his attacks on India in the later part of the twelfth century. He directed his earlier raids through the Gomal Pass, a route which was well known to the merchants of Central Asia.

1A.F. Bāhaqqī, Ta'rikh-i Bāhaqqī, p. 267, where it is said that during the reign of Mas'ud, Ahmed Inaltīqīn was appointed commander-in-chief of the Ghazna army in Hindustān; S. Lane Poole, Medieval India, pp. 41, 47, says, in India "for more than a century there had been, if not peace, at least little war. The later kings of Ghazna had been mild, unambitious rulers, and had left the Punjab very much to itself. Probably their Hindu troops and Hindu officials had to some extent Indianated them, and the last descendants of Mahmūd made their home at Lāhore without difficulty". T.N., p.14.

2A. Yūsuf 'Ali, Medieval India, p. 47, where it is said, "the caravans, each consisting of droves of six thousand horses, came through the Gomal Pass, and found their chief frontier mart in the city of Multān"; A.B.M. Ḥabīb ʿulā, Foundation of Muslim rule in India, p. 55.
His first expedition into India was against Multan in 1175 A.D. It was captured from the heretical Carmathians whom Mahmūd had temporarily subdued in the beginning of the eleventh century.  

Mu'izz al-Dīn followed his conquest by taking the strong fortress of Uchch on the South West of Multan, which gave him a secure hold on upper Sind. In 1178 A.D. he moved his army against Nahrwālā, the rich capital of Gujerāt, which was ruled by the young king Mulraj II. His soldiers exhausted by the long marches through the Indian desert, suffered a heavy defeat at the hands of the fresh and well-supplied forces of the Rajput ruler.  

The hardship of the long and arduous desert route, which had kept the soldiers waterless and the cattle without forage, made a profound effect upon Mu'izz al-Dīn's future military schemes.

---

1. T.N., p.116. Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit. p.15, says, when Mahmūd besieged Multan in 1005 A.D., its ruler Abu'l Fath Daud purchased peace on a promise of a yearly tribute of 20,000 golden dirhams and abjuration of his heretical doctrines; both Fīrishtā and Nizām ud-Dīn say 20,000 dirhams was the price of peace, but Badayunī (Muntakḥeb ut Tawārīkh, vol I, p.11), says it was twenty times twenty thousand dirhams.

2. J. Briggs, History of the rise of Mahomedan power, Vol I, p.162, Fīrishtā introduces an amusing story which has been disproved by later researches. "Muhammad Ghori (Mu'izz al-Dīn) finding it would be difficult to reduce the place (Uchch), sent a private message to the Ja Raja's wife promising to marry her if she would deliver up her husband. The base woman replied that she was too old for marriage, but that she had a beautiful and young daughter, whom if he would promise to espouse, leaving her in free possession of her wealth, she would in a few days remove the Raja. Muhammad Ghori accepted the proposal; and this princess, in a few days assassinated her husband and opened the gates to the enemy". Ḥabūb ulūlah, op.cit. p.36.

3. T.N., p.116, Mīnhaḏ, and following him, all subsequent historians call the ruler of Nahrwālā, as 'Ehīm' but subsequent researches are conclusive that it was Mulraj II!
In 1179 A.D., he attacked Peshawar and wrested it from the Governor of Khusrau Malik, the last of the Ghaznavid rulers. Two years later, Mu'izz al-Din advanced against Lahore when Khusrau Malik compromised by giving his son as hostage and presenting an elephant. In 1182 A.D., the Muslim army occupied Debal, the capital of Lower Sind, and acquired possession of the entire territory lying on the sea-coast. Three years later, in 1185 A.D., Mu'izz al-Din again marched to Lahore but remained satisfied by plundering the countryside and seizing the fortress of Sialkot, which was garrisoned and placed in the charge of Husain Kharmil. Khusrau Malik sensing Mu'izz al-Din’s ultimate design took the bold step of besieging Sialkot with the help of the khokars, but being unable to capture it returned to Lahore.

Provoked by this act Mu'izz al-Din marched to Lahore in 1186 A.D., and when Khusrau Malik came to negotiate for peace, he was seized and taken to Ghazna, from where he was sent to the court of

---


2 T.N., p.121, In the Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p.6., it is stated that Khusrau Malik presented only an elephant, and does not say that he also gave his son as hostage. Yahya is wrong as subsequent events show that he was the Ghori ruler as a pledge; Badayuni, vol.I, p.47., T.A., vol. I., p.37.

3 T.N., p.121; Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, p.7, Yahya says that as the days of the Ghaznavid’s had become numbered, Khusrau Malik inspite of his strong army was unable to capture the fort.
Ghiyāth u'd-Dīn at Fizūz koh, who had him imprisoned at the Castle of Balarwan and where in 1191 A.D., both Khusrau Malik and his son Bahram were put to death. 1

Lahore was captured and placed under the governorship of 'Ali-Karmākh in 1186 A.D. It provided Mu'izz al-Dīn the much sought for base for operating against the Hindu kingdoms across the Rāvi. About four years after, he began his operations against the Hindu Rajas of India. The capture of Lahore had, perhaps, extended his south-eastern boundary up to the Sutlej, as in 1191 A.D., he captured Bhatinda within the kingdom of the Chauhān ruler Prithvīrāj, and placed it under the command of Qāḍī Diya u'd-Dīn Tulakī. A contingent of twelve hundred horse was provided to the Qāḍī, and he was instructed to retain the captured territory for a period of eight months. 2

As Mu'izz al-Dīn had no plan to advance any further, he decided to return. Before he could retrace his steps news reached

---

1 T.N., p.122. Musíliaj says that when Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Mu'izz al-Dīn were preparing to encounter Sultan Shah of Khwarazm, Khusrau Malik and his son Bahram were put to death. S. Lane Point Mediaeval India, pp 48-49. Lane Point is right when he says that 'Mu'izz al-Dīn's first aim was to bring the Muhammadan provinces of India under his control - as Muhammadans held the strategic points, its occupation was indispensable to an invader whose object was to march into the heart of Hindustan.

2 T.N., p.118; Sir Wolseley Haig, op. cit, p.40; Adris Banerji, 'The Muslim occupation of northern India', 'Indian Culture', vol. IV (July 1937- April 1938), p.506 says, "The annexation of the Punjab brought about a disastrous change in the political stage of India, because it exposed the Tomaras, the Chahamanas and the Gahadvalas to the constant attack of the Turks."
him that Prithviraj, the ruler of Ajmir, was advancing with a large army to recover the fortress of Bhatinda. The danger to which Bhatinda now lay exposed being evident to Mu'izz al-Din, he was left with no choice but to defend it despite his unpreparedness for battle, and his much smaller army which was perhaps further reduced by the early dispersal of some of his troops. He turned round and encountered Prithviraj at Tarain near Karnal, when the two wings of his army being overwhelmed by the huge size of the enemy's force retreated from the battlefield; but the centre division under his leadership resolutely stood up against all attacks of the enemy.

In the engagement Mu'izz al-Din shattered two front teeth of Govind Rae, the brother of Prithviraj, but the latter also drove his javelin into the Sultan's arm and severely wounded him. The Sultan was about to fall from the saddle when a young Khali cavalryman sprang on his horse and took him to the spot where the remnant of his forces had halted. A litter was prepared on

---

1 T.N., p.118; Muthaj says that all the Ranas of Hind had joined Prithviraj on this occasion; J. Briggs, op.cit, p.172, Firishta confidently gives the figure of Prithviraj's army as two hundred thousand horsemen and thirty thousand elephants; Badayuni, Vol I, p.49, says, Rae Pathaura (Prithviraj) arrived with a vast army; Tarikh-i-Mubarakshahi, p.8. Yahya says that Prithviraj came with innumerable cavalry, infantry and elephants.

2 T.N., p.119.

3 T.N., p.119; T.A. Vol I, p.38; Badayuni Vol I, p.49
which he was carried to Ghazna. The fortress of Bhatinda was immediately besieged by Prithviraj's army, and surrendered after thirteen months of resistance.¹

Smarting under the humiliation of his first major defeat in Northern India, Mu'izz al-Dīn passed restless days and nights and concentrated his whole energy on preparing for a return encounter. The following year, 1192 A.D., he returned with a cavalry force said to number 120,000 and met the same Rajput adversary once again on the battlefield of Tarain.² With a view to bolstering the morale of his army and possibly, also, to demoralise the enemy, he despatched Qiwām-ʿul Mulk Rukn-ud-Dīn Ḥamza in advance from Lahore to offer Prithvirāj the option of embracing Islam and acknowledging his supremacy. The Rajput chief, proud of his numerous soldiers and conscious of his previous victory, treated the offer with contempt and defiance.

The battle commenced and Mu'izz al-Dīn by his superior generalship defeated the enemy.³ Govind Raṇe was killed, while Prithvirāj tried

¹ T.N. p.119; T.A. Vol I, p.38; Badayuni, Vol I, p.50. Both Niẓām ud-Dīn and Badayuni say that Prithvirāj took the fortress of Bhatinda after entering into negotiations with Diya ud-Dīn Tulakī; which is improbable.
² Taj ul maʿāthir, I.O.1486 f.34a; J. Briggs, op. cit. p.173, Firishta informs us that Mu'izz al-Dīn, after being defeated, disgraced all those officers who had deserted him in battle. He compelled them to walk round the city of Ghur with their horses mouth-bags, filled with barley, hung about their necks, and forced them to eat the grain like brutes.
³ Taj ul maʿāthir, I.O.1486, F.36a; where it said, "the size of Prithvirāj's army can not be conceived in the picture gallery of imagination". J. Briggs, op. cit. p.175. Firishta says, 'one hundred and fifty princes joined Prithvirāj, and his army consisted of 300,000 horse, more than 3,000 elephants and a number of infantry; Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, p.9, where it is said, "Mu'izz al Din divided his 40,000 cavalry into four equal sections and ordered them to attack the enemy from four different quarters", T.N. p.12 (cont'd on next page)
to escape on a horse but was pursued and taken captive near Sarsu. Minhaj informs that he was put to death, but this may be the substance of the whole later account, as there is enough testimony to show that he survived and acknowledged Muslim suzerainty.

Hansi, Kuhram and Sarsu were captured and garrisoned. Delhi and Ajmir were also, reduced, but the shortage of man-power and the attending administrative problems made Mu'izz al-Din behave like a practical statesman. He allowed the son of Prithvraj to rule at Ajmir on promise of payment of tribute, Hasan Nizami says, Delhi was also assigned to a Hindu chief on the same condition.

Mu'izz al-Din returned to Ghazna leaving Qutb ud-Din as his representative in India, with Kuhram as his headquarters. He was

---

1 Edward Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, p.18, see specimen of the sliver and copper coin No.15, with inscription "Prithvi, and Sri Muhammad Sam."

2 T.N., p.120

3 T.N., p.120; Talul Ma'athir, I.O. 1486, f 40b; V.A. Smith, Oxford history of India, p.220. Smith thus sums up the effect of the victory at the second battle of Tarain. "In fact, the second battle of Tarain in 1192 may be regarded as the decisive contest which ensured the ultimate success of the Muhammadan attack on Hindustan. All the numerous subsequent victories were merely consequences of the overwhelming defeat of the Hindu league on the historic plain to the north of Delhi".
empowered to deal as he liked with the Hindu chiefs, and also to extend the conquests. During the next two years Qutb u'd-Din had to contend with many a difficult situation. In 589 A.H./1193 A.D., when the Hindu chief Jåtvān, perhaps a tributary of the Rāja of Nahrwāla, besieged the Muslim garrison at Hansī, Qutb u'd-Dīn rushed to their rescue. On his approach, the besiegers took to flight, but the Muslim army pursued them so closely that they were obliged to turn and enter into an engagement, which resulted in the defeat of the Hindu army, and the death of their leader. ¹

After re-fortifying Hansī, Qutb u'd-Dīn crossed the Jumna and occupied Baran² and Meerut, which came to serve as the base of operation, against the ruler of Qanauj and Benāres. In 589 A.H./1193 A.D., he occupied Delhi and made it the seat of his government.³ Soon after he had taken possession of Delhi, he was called upon to deal with Hariraj, the brother of Prithviraj, who had captured Ajmīr after driving out Prithviraj's son, and had also besieged Ranthambhor, which was under Qiwām ul Mulk Rukn u'd-Dīn Ḥamza.⁴ On the arrival of Qutb u'd-Dīn the besiegers withdrew

---

¹ Tai ul-ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff 55a, 64a, Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit., p.41
² Habīb ulFah, op.cit., p.62, and Appendix 'A'.
³ T.N., p.120; T.A. vol.1 pp.38-39.
⁴ Tai ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff.70.
from both directions. Prithviraj's son was re-instated, but Aybek could hardly take any effective step against them, as the attempt of the former ruler of Delhi to recapture his lost territory demanded his immediate attention there.¹

He returned and dealt with the situation with an iron hand. After defeating the Rae his head was struck off and sent to Delhi to serve as a warning to his fellow-citizens.² Qutb ud-Din soon had to leave for Ghazna on the summons of Mu'izz al-Din, and here he was detained for six months on account of illness.³ During his stay he received all honours and affection from his master, and when he was on his way back to Delhi, Taj ud-Din Yalduz gave his daughter in wedlock to him.⁴ It seems Aybek had returned with instructions from his master to prepare the ground for the conquest of the powerful kingdom on the Ganges, as on his return towards the end of 1193 A.D., he attacked and captured Kol⁵ (modern 'Aligarh).

¹Tāj ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, f.72a, where it is said that Qutb ud-Din, on this occasion, conferred a robe on the son of Prithviraj, who in return gave abundant treasure, which included three golden melons resembling the full moon.
²Ibid. ff.72b, 73a.
³Ibid. f74b-83a. According to Hasan Nizami, Qutb ud-Din was invited by Mu'izz al-Din in the summer of 1193 A.D., to receive thanks in person T.N., p.168. Minhaj says that after Qutb ud-Din visited Ghazna, after he had conquered Nahrwala, in 1197 A.D; Cf 'Iṣāmi, p. 86 who says, 'In order to prove the intruthfulness of the courtiers, who had represented that Qutb ud-Din had become disloyal, Mu'izz al-Din called him to Ghazna concealed him under a bed-stead, and made his opponents repeat their allegations.
⁴T.N., p.133; Tāj ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, f.846.
⁵Tāj ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff 104a-105a.
The stage was now set for an attack on Jaychandra, the powerful Raja of Benares and Qanauj. In fact his expulsion was the logical sequence of Muslim conquest, as otherwise their domination over northern India would remain incomplete. In 1194 A.D., Mu'izz al-Din marched to Benares at the head of fifty thousand horse, and met the Rathor army in the neighbourhood of Chandwär. After a hotly contested battle the Muslim army gained victory.

Jaychandra lost his life, his body being so disfigured that it could be identified only by his golden teeth.

The victors then marched to Benares and Āsnī, and captured them with their fabulous treasures. Temples in the conquered territory were converted into mosques and colleges. Muslim conquest now extended to the border of Behār. The conquered territory was garrisoned and Malik Husain ud-Dīn Aghul bak was appointed as its first governor.

After Jaychandra's defeat Mu'izz al-Dīn returned to Ghazna. Quṭb ud-Dīn once more found himself confronted with a formidable situation. Koḻ was besieged by a Rajput force which was relieved in 591 A.H./1195 A.D. Ajmīr was again under the menace of Harīrāj, while an army commanded by Šhārdā Fāe supposed to have been organised by Harīrāj was proceeding to Delhi. In order to meet the situation, Aybek left a detachment at Delhi and himself proceeded to intercept Šhārdā Fāe. The latter, on the advance of the

1 Ibrjīl Aṭṭirā, Kaml ut-Tawārikh, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Vol.II, p.251, Ibrjīl Aṭṭirā says about Jaychandra, "The king of Benares was the greatest king in India, and possessed the largest territory, extending length-wise from the borders of China to the province of Malwah, and in breadth from the sea to within ten days journey of Lahore.

2 'Īsānī, p.91, says, Jaychandra was killed and could not be traced, seven hundred elephants were captured; T.N. p.120. According to Minhāl three hundred elephants fell in the hands of the Muslim army.

3 T.N. (ed. Chughraī), p.60; Habīb ullaḥ, op.cit. p.64. Note 4 see over.
Muslim army, took refuge in Ajmir, where both he and Hariraj were besieged by Qutb ud-Din. Hariraj finding defeat inevitable immolated himself in fire. As Prithviraj's son had proved incapable of holding Ajmir, Aybek placed it under a Muslim officer.

In 592 A.H./1196 A.D., Mu'izz al-Din again returned to northern India and marched against Bayana. Its ruler Kunwar Pala, after a short siege, surrendered the city of Bayana and the fortress of Thangir to the invading army. These were assigned to the charge of Baha ud-Din Tuqhril, who founded a city in the territory of Bayana styled Sultankot, to use it as a base for raids against adjacent territories. Mu'izz al-Din then advanced to Gwaliyur and invested it, but raised the siege when its ruler Sulkana Pala sent ten elephants as a peace offering and promised to pay tribute.

Hoping that tactics of encroachment would reduce Gwaliyur to a difficult plight, Baha ud-Din began to make regular incursions there from Sultankot, and also from the fortification he had built at a

---

4 Tajul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, f.125b. (note from previous page).

1 Ibid, ff 131b-136a; J. Briggs, op.cit., p.17 Firishta gives an interesting description of the Rajput soldiers, 'The Rajputs, if driven to desperation, murder their wives and children, set fire to their houses and property, let loose their hair, and rushing on the enemy, are heedless of death'; Habibullah, op.cit.,p.33, says "But the Rajput excelled the Turk in reckless bravery and a chivalrous sense of honour that led him to commit self-destruction rather than suffer defeat or go down in his own estimation."

2 Taj ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff 136b-139b; J. Briggs, op.cit., p.194 Firishta says, 'Ajmir was restored to the Muhammadan government, and was afterwards ruled by its laws.'


4 Tajul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, f.146b; 'Isami, p.80, says that Mu'izz al-Din returned the fort of Gwaliyur on the intercession of the Raja's daughter, who promised to have a mosque built inside the fort.
distance of two leagues from the Gwaiiyur fortress. As was expected, the defenders fell into despair and ultimately surrendered the fortress to Qutb ud-Din, whose relations with Baha ud-Din were not cordial.

In the year 1196 A.D., the Turks had to face one of the most difficult situations so far encountered, when a body of the Mher tribe dwelling in the vicinity of Ajmir resolved to expel the Muslim invaders from Rajputana. In order to implement their design they sought the alliance of other Rajput tribes. Since the Muslim garrison at Ajmir was not adequate to meet the combined force of the Rajputs, re-inforcement was sought from Delhi. Aybek responded by immediately marching to Ajmir, where he encountered the Mher forces which had assembled outside the city. The conflict continued the whole day; it was the next morning that a large Rajput army arrived from Nahrwala to turn the tide of battle and resolve the issue. Aybek being seriously wounded withdrew to Ajmir, the Rajputs holding the city in siege. The situation would have worsened, if news of the approach of armed assistance from Ghazna had not dispirited the Rajputs and made them retire.


2 Tai ul ma’athir, I.O. 1486, ff. 152a-153a.

3 Ibid., ff 153b-156a; R.C. Bramley, 'Ajmir-Merwara,' Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol.V. p.141, without quoting his authority, the author says that after the death of Qutb ud-Din, in 1210 A.D., the Mhers and the Solankis of Gujerat (i.e. the Chalukiya Rajputs which composed the army of Nahrwala), made a night attack on Taragarh, the fort commanding Ajmir town, and massacred the Muhammadan garrison to a man. The shrine of Sayyid Hussain, the governor who perished in the attack, along with the tombs of his comrades stand in an enclosure known as gani-i shahidan or 'Treasury of Martyrs'.

4 Tai ul ma’athir, I.O. 1486, f 157a.
Aybek could hardly forget this treacherous attack. Early next year, 1197 A.D., he marched with a strong army against Nahrwāla. Its ruler, Bhīm Deo, on the approach of the Muslim army, retired to some far off fortress, leaving two chiefs, Rāe Karan and Darabarās, with a huge Rajput force at the foot of Mt. 1 Abū to engage Aybek in battle. The Muslim army, deeming the situation unpropitious hesitated to take the initiative for this was the very spot where Mu'izz al-Dīn had suffered his first defeat. The Rajputs misconstrued this hesitation for cowardice and, abandoning the Pass, turned their faces towards the field for 2 battle. On 13th Rabi'ul Awwal 593 A.H./5th January 1197 A.D., an obstinately contested battle continued from dawn to noon, 3 ending in the complete defeat of the Rajputs.

The accounts have it that nearly fifty thousand Rajputs were slain and twenty thousand were taken captives. Rāe Karan effected his escape leaving twenty eight elephants and cattle and arms of 4 all descriptions, as war booty to the Muslim army. The city of

1 Tai ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff 157b-158a; Ḥabīb ullah, op.cit p.67. Ḥabīb ullah, on the basis of inscriptions, has Kelhana instead of Rāe Karan, and Dharavarsha in place of Darabarās, J. Briggs, op.cit., p. 194, Firishta says, 'Jeewun Rāe, the general of Bhīm Dew, gave battle to Quṭb ud-Dīn'.

2 Tai ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff. 158b-159a.

3 Ibid, ff. 159a - 162a.

4 Ibid, ff. 162a - 163a; Tarīkh-i-Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubarak Shāh, p. 23, where it is said, 'besides other booty, thirty rare elephants were captured and sent to Sultān Mu'izz al-Dīn.
Nahrwala was occupied. The victory was a retaliation for an earlier treacherous attack of the Mher tribe whom the army of Nahrwala had supported, and it also avenged the early defeat of Mu'izz al-Dīn on the same battlefield.

Aykbek next directed his campaigns against the country across the Upper Ganges. Fakhır-i Mudabbir informs us that in 594 A.H./1197-98 A.D., Badaun was captured and the temples of Benares were destroyed; in 595 A.H./1198-99 A.D., Chantarwal? (Chandwar), and Qanauj were occupied; and in 596 A.H./1199 A.D., Sirhī and Mālwhāh on the south of Delhi were conquered.

Subjugation of the southern frontier of Delhi, and elimination of the last major Rajput power, now formed Aybek's ultimate aim. In 599 A.H./1202 A.D. he attacked Kālinjar which was held by the powerful Chandel Rāja, named Pārmār. The Rāja, on being hard pressed, sued for peace and agreed to pay tribute, but before the provisions of the treaty could be given effect, he died, and his minister Āj Deo, depending on a newly discovered water supply, refused to abide by the peace terms. Hostilities were resumed, but after a few days all the reservoirs in the fort dried up, which compelled the garrison to surrender to the Muslim army. Hasan

---

1 Tai ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, f.163a; J. Briggs, op. cit, p.197. Flrishta says that a Muslim officer was appointed to the government of Nahrwala; M. Elphinstone, History of India, p.366; where it is said, 'Qutb ud-Dīn took and garrisoned the capital, and after ravaging the province returned to Delhi.'

2 Tarikh-i Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, p.24

3 Tai ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff 165b-166a. According to Hasan Nizami, Netmīsh was purchased about this time, and had joined the Kālinjar expedition.
Niẓāmī says fifty thousand were taken slaves, and elephants, cattle and countless arms became the spoils of the victors. Mahoba the capital of the Chandel Rāja was occupied and Hizbar ud-Dīn Ĥasan Arnāl was entrusted with the government of the territory.

While Aybek was busy obtaining victories in northern India, another soldier of fortune, a daring adventurer named Ikhtīyār ud-Dīn Muḥammad Bakhtīyar Khāliṯ, was engaged in reducing the eastern provinces of Bengal and Behār for Muʿizz al-Dīn. His humble and unimpressive appearance stood in the way of getting employment either at Ghazna or at Delhi. Without being thwarted, he proceeded to Badaun in 1193 A.D., where its governor Hizbar ud-Dīn Ĥasan Adīb fixed a salary for him. After some time he went to Awadh where Ḥusām ud-Dīn Aḥubak assigned him for his upkeep the villages of Bhagwat and Bhûlū, lying between the Ganges and the Karma-nasah river. From here he commenced his incursions into Behār and Muner and acquired much booty. When the fame of his bravery and fortune gained circulation, Khāliṯīs from different parts of India turned towards him and swelled the size of

---

1 Tai ul maḏāthīr, I.O. 1486, ff. 172b–175b.
2 T.N. (ed. Chughtā) p. 60.
3 T.N. (ed. Chughtā), p. 60. His edition has Sylhet and Sehli, which are not traceable in the area of Awadh. According to Raverty, the names Bhagwat and Bhûlū found in the oldest copies of the Tabagat-i Nasirī, are correct, and these, also, confirm the location of the area. Niẓām ud-Dīn and Badayunī, have Kāmpīla and Patīlā, which are three degrees north and the same distance west of the places mentioned in the oldest copies of the Tabagat-i Nasirī.
his army. Emboldened by his unresisted early deprivations, in 1137-98 A.D., he launched a final attack with two hundred horsemen on the southern parts of Behar and captured its capital Odantapuri with immense booty. The victims of his attack were the shaven-headed Buddhist monks dwelling in a College, who were through mistake taken to be Brahmins. This conquest brought the Turks to the border of Lower Bengal.

Bakhtiyar Khalji soon after this visited Aybek at Badaun bringing rich presents, and he was greatly honoured and distinguished. Within a year of his success in Behar, Bakhtiyar led a campaign against Nudīya, the capital of Lakshman Sen, the ruler of Bengal. Nudīya was then partly deserted on account of the panic created by the appearance of Muhammad Bakhtiyar Khalji. The Muslim commander, initially, had set out with sufficient army, but when he entered Nudīya only eighteen horsemen were able to keep pace with him and these passed the city gates unchallenged, as the guards and inhabitants took them to be horse dealers. Reaching the gates of the palace, they

---

1 T.N. (ed. Chughtai) pp. 60-61, where it is said that when Quṭb ud-Dīn heard of Muḥammad Bakhtiyar's deeds of valour, he sent him a robe and also conferred on him much honour; T.A. Vol. I, p. 47; Iṣkawī Frasād, in Medieval India, p. 126, says that Behar was then the only place in India where Buddhism existed, owing to the patronage of the kings of the Pala dynasty, who were staunch Buddhists.

2 Ṭāj-ul maʿṣūmī, I.O. 146, ff 176b-177a, where it is said Muḥammad Bakhtiyar was presented by Quṭb ud-Dīn with a tent, a naubat, a drum, a standard, a magnificent robe of honour, a horse, trappings, a waist-band, a sword and vest from the royal wardrobe; T.N. (ed. Chughtai), p. 61, Minhāj says that Quṭb-ud-Dīn gave Muhammad Bakhtiyar, a rich robe of honour from his special wardrobe along with many other presents.
attacked the royal guards unawares, whose sudden hue and cry reached the ears of Lakshman Sen who was having his dinner from his usual gold and silver dishes.

The apprehension of an inevitable disaster at the hands of a person of Bakhtiyar's features coupled with a surprise attack, unnerved Lakshman Sen to the extent that he lost all courage to offer resistance. Consequently, he fled barefooted by the rear-gate of the palace leaving his women-folk and treasures at the mercy of the invaders. On the arrival of his whole army, Muhammad Bakhtiyar established control over the capital. Nudīya was subsequently abandoned by Bakhtiyar, and Lakhnoutī was made the headquarters, as it was nearer his base in Behār and thus more suitable for extending his conquests. Lakshman Sen escaped to Vikrampūr, some eight miles south-east of Dacca, from where he ruled over the remnant of his kingdom.

---

1 T.N. (ed. Chuhtal), pp. 63-64; 'Isāmī, pp. 95-96. says Muhammad Bakhtiyar entered Nudīya, situated on the left bank of the Bhagirathi, in the disguise of a horse-dealer.

2 T.N. (ed. Chuhtal), pp. 63-64, Minhāj provides an interesting anecdote concerning the conquest of Lakhnoutī. He says, - prior to the conquest of Lakhnoutī a number of astrologers, wise men and counsellors, had told Rāe Lakshman Sen that according to the books of the ancient Brahmans, his kingdom would be conquered by the Turks, and the aforesaid conquest was near at hand. When Rāe Lakshman Sen enquired whether the conqueror had any particular sign, he was told that while standing the fingers of his hands would reach the calves of his legs. On investigation, these indications were found in Muhammad Bakhtiyar, which made the Brahmans and the money-lenders leave the place; H. Blochmann, Geography and History of Bengal, Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta 1873, Vol. XLII, p.211 n, Blochmann is of the opinion that though Lakshman Sen was called "king" he was not more than the principal zamindar of his time. This is not correct as Minhāj testifies to the sovereignty of his descendants even in the late thirteenth century.
The phenomenal success in the eastern parts of India, widened the range of Bakhtiyar's ambition and stirred him for another adventure in the north-east. He now planned to conquer Tibet and China famous for the export of horses into north Bengal. In spite of being unacquainted with the communications of his projected invasion he undertook his perilous enterprise with ten thousand horsemen, towards the later half of 1205 A.D. A converted tribal chief named 'Ali the Mech offered to guide Muhammad Bakhtiyar through the hills. The Muslim commander arrived at Burdhankot from Lakhnoutī, and for ten days proceeded northwards along the river Bangmatī, whose size according to Minhāj, was in all respects three times that of the river Ganges. When the army reached a spot where there was a stone bridge spanning a river, Muhammad Bakhtiyar posted at the head of the bridge, a detachment under two officers, a Khalji and a Turk, for guarding it, and then proceeded onwards.

In the meantime, the advice sent by the Rāja of Kamrpū to postpone the expedition until next year, when he would himself assist with his forces to cause the subjugation of that territory, produced little impression on Bakhtiyar. After a

1 T.N. (ed. Chughtai) pp. 65, 66. Chughtai's edition has 'lān-bāstā' (tightly tied) horses, whereas Raverty, Vol. I, p. 567, has 'tangahan'horses, which were brought from Karmbattan to be sold into Lakhnoutī.

most arduous passage through river, defiles, passes and mountains, the Muslim army reached the open country of Tibet on the sixteenth day, where the exhausted force was engaged in a fierce battle by the local garrison, who were supported by the inhabitants of the adjacent areas. Though the conflict was indecisive, Minhaj says, 'a number of Muslim lives were lost'. Later, when Muhammad Bakhtiyar learnt from his prisoners that a force of fifty thousand mounted archers from 'Karambattan' were on the way to confront his worn-out army, he decided to retreat and return next year for its conquest.

While returning Bakhtiyar found that the inhabitants had destroyed all vegetation on the retreating route, which compelled his soldiers to live on the flesh of horses. The bridge by which the army had crossed had been demolished by the Hindus of Kamrup, as the officers posted by Bakhtiyar for its protection, had quarreled among themselves and abandoned it. The Muslim army thereupon took shelter in a temple to construct rafts for crossing the river, but they were soon besieged by the Kamrup forces. With a concerted

---

2 T.N. (ed. Chughtai), pp.67, 68; T.A. Vol.I, p.49. According to Nizam ud-Din, "Muhammad Bakhtiyar found that two arches of the bridge were broken".
attacked Muhammad Bakhtiyar and his men fought their way out of the temple and reached the bank of the river, where they were left with the only choice of jumping into it to swim ashore. As the river was deep and its current very swift most of his men were washed away, and only a small number of horsemen along with Muhammad Bakhtiyar could reach the opposite bank. From here he returned to Diwkot, where, overwhelmed with grief, he lay sick and bed-ridden until the knife of one of his lieutenants 'Ali Mardan Khalji, rescued him from his mental agony in 1206 A.D. Sir Wolseley Haig has rightly said that it was one of the greatest disasters for the arms of Islam when the entire Muslim army was annihilated; it would have been better for Muhammad Bakhtiyar if he had perished with them.

Mu'izz al-Din, after the occupation of Bayana in 1195-96 A.D., remained pre-occupied with the affairs of Central Asia.

On the death of his brother Ghiyath al-Din, he ascended the throne of Ghor in 1203 A.D. In 1205 A.D. he suffered a


Niẓām ud-Din's statement that Muhammad Bakhtiyar, after the conquest of Lakhnauti, assumed the canopy, and had the khutbah read, and coin struck in his own name, is not correct as according to Minhaj, the latter even in his last days would affirm his allegiance to Mu'izz al-Din, by saying 'perhaps some calamity has visited Mu'izz al-Din, that good fortune has forsaken me'.

2 Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit., p. 50; T.N. (ed. Chughtai), p. 68, Minhaj says, 'After returning to Diwkot, whenever Muhammad Bakhtiyar would go out in the streets he would have to hear the lament and reproaches of the wives and children of those whom he had led to their death'.

---


Niẓām ud-Din's statement that Muhammad Bakhtiyar, after the conquest of Lakhnauti, assumed the canopy, and had the khutbah read, and coin struck in his own name, is not correct as according to Minhaj, the latter even in his last days would affirm his allegiance to Mu'izz al-Din, by saying 'perhaps some calamity has visited Mu'izz al-Din, that good fortune has forsaken me'.

2 Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit., p. 50; T.N. (ed. Chughtai), p. 68, Minhaj says, 'After returning to Diwkot, whenever Muhammad Bakhtiyar would go out in the streets he would have to hear the lament and reproaches of the wives and children of those whom he had led to their death'.
severe defeat at Andkhud, which shattered his military prestige in India, and encouraged the forces of disorder to rise in revolt on the rumour of his death. The Khokars dwelling between Lahore and Ghazna, commenced plundering and harrying the districts around them. Hasan Nizami's statement that Aybek-Baḵ, a confidential servant of Muʿizz al-Dīn, relying on the rumour of the Sultan's death flew like a wind to Multān and occupied the city, and that the Khokars also believed in Muʿizz al-Dīn's death because of the act of Aybek-Baḵ, is accepted by Firishta but is not mentioned by Minhāj and other subsequent historians.

Muʿizz al-Dīn had returned a defeated prince to Ghazna, and as such he was burning for revenge on the Khwarazm Shahs, but the serious situation in India made him alter his plan, and led him to proceed first against the Khokars. He sent a message to Qutb ud-Dīn to join him on the Jhelum, and he himself set out

---

1 Taj ul maʿathir, I.O. 1486, ff 176; Barthold, op.cit., p.350.

2 Taj ul maʿathir, I.O. 1486, ff 179a-180a; J. Briggs, op.cit., p.182. Firishta gives the name of the officer as 'Zeeruk', and says that Muʿizz al-Dīn before taking action against the Khokars, marched against the usurper and took him prisoner.

3 Barthold, op.cit. p.352.
from Ghazna on October 20, 1205 A.D. Proceeding through Peshawar he made a surprise attack on the enemy. The Khokars severely contested the battle between the Jhelum and the Chenab but with the arrival of the army under Qutb ud-Din they were completely overwhelmed. Many of the Khokars were killed and captured, while those who escaped to the jungle suffered a more miserable fate as the forest was set on fire.

Having satisfactorily dealt with the Khokar menace, Mu'izz al-Din proceeded to Lahore, reaching there on February 25, 1206 A.D. Once arrived, he permitted his troops to return to their homes and enjoy rest, because they were soon to move again for settling scores with the Khwarazm Shāhs. Having allowed Qutb ud-Din to return to Delhi, he left for Ghazna.

On the way he halted at Damyak, on the bank of the Indus where, while offering evening prayers, he was slain by assassins on March 15, 1206 A.D.

1 Ta'ī ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, f 182b; Barthold, op.cit., p.352; Juwayni, Tarikh-i Jahan Gushā, Vol.II, p.58. According to Juwayni, Mu'izz al-Din's purpose in giving priority to his Indian campaign, was to replenish his treasury and to put his army in order.

2 Sir Woleseley Haig, op.cit., p.48; Ḥabīb ullah, op.cit., p.77.

3 Ta'ī ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff.197a-198a; Badayuni, Vol.I, p.53, says that some mischief-makers out of jealousy accused Imam Fakhr ud-Din Razi of being a conspirator in the murder of Mu'izz al-Din, because one day while addressing the Sultan during his weekly sermon, of which he had got very wearied, had said, 'Oh! Sultan Mu'izz al-Din some time hence, neither will this greatness and glory of yours remain, nor the flattery and hypocrisy of Razi; T.N., p.124.
There are conflicting opinions on the identity of the assassins. Some held that the Khokars were guilty of the crime, while others are of opinion that the Mulāḥidas, a heretical sect who were very hostile to Mu'izz al-Dīn, had a direct hand in it. The Mulāḥidas had no doubt suffered at the hands of Mu'izz al-Dīn, but it is less possible that they shadowed him desperately for his destruction. The Khokars are more probable, because they had grievously suffered most recently for which the fire of vengeance must have been fiercely burning in their hearts.

Muslim power in India sustained a severe blow by the death of Mu'izz al-Dīn, but it came at a time when most of his work in India was practically accomplished. By 1206 A.D., the Turks were masters of the territory ranging from Peshāwar to Assam. The need for providing more lands and subsistence for the emigrants from Central Asia, caused by Mongol irruption, was partly fulfilled. Gold for economic measures was considerably replenished, and the dreams of Muhammad bin Qāsim and Maḥmūd of Ghazna of a political invasion of India were

1 Juwaynī, *op. cit.*, p. 59. He says that the assassins were Hindus, who attacked Mu'izz al-Dīn when he was having his nap.

realised to a great extent. Elphinstone thus sums up the Indian conquests of Mu'izz al-Dīn:- "At his death Shahāb ud-Dīn held in different degrees of subjection the whole of Hindostān Proper, except Mālwa and some contiguous districts, Sūd and Bengal were either entirely subdued or in rapid course of reduction. On Qūjerāt he had no hold except what is implied in the possession of the capital. Much of Hindostan was immediately under his officers and the rest under dependent or at least tributary princes. The desert and some of the mountains were left independent from neglect."

Qutb ud-Dīn Avbēk 1206 - 1210

Mu'izz al-Dīn had no son, but he had trained a band of slaves, who during his life-time had convinced him that they would carry to a successful conclusion the work he had initiated in India. His sudden death brought to the surface the knotty problem of succession, and also threatened the various parts of his kingdom.

1 History of India, p. 368; Cf. Ishwari Prasad, Medieval India p.132, who says that 'from humble beginnings the kingdom of Delhi gradually developed into one of the greatest empires of the east'; Barthold, op.cit., p.338, says that Ghīyāth al-Dīn and Shīhāb ud-Dīn (Mu'izz al-Dīn) raised their kingdom to the rank of a world power'.

2 T.N., p.132, Minhāj says that Mu'izz al-Dīn's prophesy that his slaves would take care of the kingdom after him, has been true up until the time the Tabāqat-i-Nāṣīrī was written.
Khwarazm Shah was left free to extend his authority beyond the Hindukush. The Khokars and other Hindu chiefs had been defeated but not crushed, and they could, therefore, always prove a source of trouble to the infant Muslim State. Taj ud-Din Yalduz, the governor of Kirmān, having succeeded Mu'izz al-Dīn at Ghazna, was claiming sovereignty over the entire possession of his master. Quṭb ud-Dīn Aybek, undoubt-edly the ablest commander of Mu'izz al-Dīn, had not only conq-uered territories on behalf of his master, but had also acted as his representative in India. His right to succeed to the Indian possessions of his late master was more legitimate than that of anyone else. Quṭb ud-Dīn had, also, strengthened his position by matrimonial alliances with the powerful Mu'izzī nobles.

Although a contemporary account states that Mu'izz al-Dīn, prior to his death, had nominated Quṭb ud-Dīn as his successor, the question of succession in India was really decided when

---

1 Barthold, op. cit., p. 352, says that Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Mahmūd, the ruler of Ghur, acknowledged Khwarazm Shāh as his overlord in December 1206 A.D., and read the Kutha and coined money in Muḥammad's name; Tarikh-i-Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubarak Shāh, p. 22. Quṭb ud-Dīn's first headquarters was at Kuhram. The author Fakhr-i-Mudabbir says that it was an auspicious assignment, as the compound word 'Kuh-rām' 'mountain and rendering to obedience' indicated that the mountain with all the wealth of Hindustan would be subservient to his authority.

2 T.N., pp. 133, 141, 142, Quṭb ud-Dīn was the father-in-law of Iltumish, and Naṣīr ud-Dīn Qubacha, and the son-in-law of Taj ud-Dīn Yalduz.

3 Tarikh-i Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubarak Shāh, p. 28; Taj ul ma'ṣūhir, I., p. 1486, f. 164b, where we read that the kingly rank of Quṭb ud-Dīn was further elevated by Mu'izz al-Dīn.
Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Mahmūd, the nephew and nominal successor of Muʿizz al-Dīn, despatched to Qub̲b ud-Dīn a canopy of state, and the title of Sūltān.

It was after this investiture that Qub̲b ud-Dīn could ascend the throne at Lahore, on June 24, 1206 A.D. His period of rule being short, owing to premature death, he could not, therefore, conquer new territories. Besides, it was necessary for him to remain alert of the developments in the north-west. After accession, his only battle engagement was with his father-in-law, Tāj ud-Dīn Yalduz, as the latter was loth to see his authority superseded by the son-in-law.

Since Nasir ud-Dīn Qubācha had acknowledged the sovereignty of Qub̲b ud-Dīn, Tāj ud-Dīn Yalduz led an army against Qub̲b̲a cha in 1208 A.D., and drove him from Multān. Qub̲b ud-Dīn took this aggression as a challenge to his authority; he therefore marched against Yalduz, defeated the latter, and forced him to retreat to Kirman.

Aaybek then moved to Ghazna and occupied it for a period of forty days, when he gave himself up entirely to pleasure and revelry. Minhāj says, as Qub̲b ud-Dīn neglected his responsibilities on account of his merriments and debauchery, the people became disgusted with him and invited Tāj ud-Dīn Yalduz.

---

1 T.N., p. 140; Tarīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p. 14, Yahya Sirhindī includes a dūr bash, with the canopy of state and the title of Sūltān; T.A. Vol. I, p. 42.

to return. Complying with promptness, Yalduz appeared at Ghazna and took Qutb ud-Din by surprise and the latter, finding himself unprepared, fled to Lahore without resistance.

At Lakhnouti, after the murder of Muhammad Bakhtiyar, the Khaljis imprisoned his assassin, 'Ali Mardan, and elected Muhammad Shiran as their new chief. 'Ali Mardan escaped from prison and reached Delhi where he persuaded Qutb ud-Din to intervene in the affairs of Lakhnouti.

Qaymaq Rumi was despatched from Awadh for this purpose. On gaining success he appointed Husam ud-Din 'Iwad Khalji to the government of Lakhnouti with headquarters at Diwkot. Subsequently Qutb ud-Din conferred the territory of Lakhnouti on 'Ali Mardan Khalji, who remained subordinate to Delhi until the former's death.

While playing polo, Aybek fell from his horse and the high pommel of his saddle pierced into his breast, which caused his immediate death in 1210 A.D., at Lahore.

---

1 T.N. pp.135,136, Minhaj says, 'On this occasion no battle took place as both were conscious of their delicate relationship; T.A. Vol. I, p.43; In Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, p.15, we read that Qutb ud-Din Aybek withdrew from Ghazna because the people were in favour of Taj ud-Din Yalduz.

2 T.N., pp.157-158; T.A., Vol. I, p.51; Nizam ud-Din says that 'Ali Mardan won over Baba Kotwal Isfahani, the prison warden, and escaped to Delhi.

3 T.N., p.159.

The sovereignty of Qutb ud-Din gave a new political frontier and a separate identity to the Delhi Sultanate. It was no longer a part of the kingdom of Ghazna or subordinate to it.

B The Delhi Sultanate

Iltmish (1210 - 1236 A.D.)

On Aybek's death in 1210 A.D., the amirs and maliks at Lahore in order to avoid disturbances in the country, usually arising when the throne was vacant, selected Aram Shah, the son of Qutb ud-Din as ruler. His nomination was not supported at Delhi, where Sipah-salar 'Ali Isma'Il the Amir-i-dad, and other nobles invited Iltmish, the governor of Badaun and the son-in-law of Aybek, to come and ascend the throne at Delhi, which he accordingly did in 1210 A.D. The contemporary accounts do not state how long Aram's reign lasted, but Minhaj and 'Isami both say that he died soon after.

The new ruler was the son of Ilam Khān, a chief of one of the clans of the Ilbari tribe of Turkestan. While young he was sold into

---

1 T.N., p.141, T.A., Vol.I, p.55. Nizam ud-Din confidently says that Aram Shah was Qutb ud-Din's son. (Aram Shah ke be-ghair azali nisar na-dash) "He had no son other than Aram Shah." Badayuni, in Vol.I, p.60 and 'Isami, in p.102, also say that Aram was the son of Qutb ud-Din. The contemporary works, Tai ul ma'athir and Tarikh-i Fakhr ud-Din Mubarak Shah, do not even mention the name of Aram Shah; 'Abdul Haqq Dehlawi, Tarikh-i Haggī, B.M., Or.26,210,f.8a; 'Abdul Haqq is incorrect in saying that Iltmish was raised to the throne, by general agreement of the nobles.

2 T.N., p.141; 'Isami, p.102; The sixteenth and seventeenth century historians, Badayuni, Nizam ud-Din and Firishia, say that Aram Shah encountered Iltmish, and was defeated. Minhaj does not describe any battle between Iltmish and Aram, and indicates that the enthronement of Aram was a temporary arrangement, which appears to be true, as the contemporary authorities, Hasan Nizami and Fakhr-i-Mudabbir, have completely ignored the short reign of Aram.
slavery by his cousins. After his purchase by Qutb ud-Dīn at Delhi, his ability endeared him to his master, and this secured for him the governorship of Gwalīyūr, Baran and Badaūn. He was manumitted under the orders of Muʿizz al-Dīn in 1206 A.D.¹

After his enthronement he contended successfully with the Muʿizzī nobles who, considering themselves his seniors, were reluctant to recognize him as their sovereign.² On accession, his kingdom embraced simply a portion of Aybek's extensive dominion. 'Alī Mardān had assumed independent sovereign status at Lakhnoutī and was behaving like a world ruler. Qubācha had extended his dominions to include Multān, Taichch, Bhatinda, Kuhrām, Sarsutī and Lāhore,³ Yalduz still supposed himself to be Muʿizz al-Dīn's successor and therefore claimed sovereignty over his master's Indian conquests. The Hindu chiefs, also, had won back many of their strongholds. Kalinjar, Jalor, Ranthambor, Gwalīyūr, Mandawar and Thangīr, had been recovered by them.

Iletmīsh approaching his problems with caution, overcame all of them. He first restored peace in the eastern districts of Delhi where some Turkish nobles had shown signs of hostility towards him.

¹T.N., pp. 166-70; Cf. 'Īsāmī, p. 90, who says, 'Muʿizzal-Dīn, himself gave Iletmīsh his letter of manumission.'
²Tā‘ul maʿāthir, I.O. 1486, ff. 212b, 213a. Hasan Nizāmī conveys that Iletmīsh was at first reluctant but, subsequently, decided to march against the jandārs, T.N., p. 170.
³T.N., pp. 159-60, 142, 143.
He even accepted royal insignia from the self-styled overlord, Yalduz. ¹ Iletmish kept on consolidating his authority and by the time political developments in the Delhi Sultanate reached the state where his intervention was necessary, he proved himself equal to the situation. In 1215-16 A.D. when Yalduz, on the approach of Khwārazm Shāh, retired towards Lahore, and having expelled Qubācha from there made some ridiculous demands on Iletmish, as he considered him his vassal, he found the ruler of Delhi ready to explode the myth of the former's overlordship. In reply to the demand, Iletmish marched with a strong force and decisively defeated Yalduz near Samāna, in 1215-1216 A.D. Yalduz was taken prisoner and sent to Badaūn, where he was put to death. ² For Iletmish, it was an important victory as it eliminated a formidable obstacle to the independence of the Delhi Sultanate.

After Iletmish returned to Delhi, Qubācha restored the status quo ante by occupying Lahore. Iletmish, who was now strong enough to annul the usurpation, marched against Qubācha in 1217 A.D. and occupied the whole of the Upper Punjab, ³ where he installed his eldest son Nasīr ud-Dīn Mahmud as the governor. ⁴

¹ T.N., p.170.
² Tai ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff.230b-232b, 238a; T.N., p.171.
³ Tai ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff.243b-247b.
⁴ Tai ul ma'athir, I.O., 1486, f.248a.
Qubāchā remained in possession of the Lower Punjab, Multān and Sind, for sometime, but the same deluge that had overwhelmed Yalduz in 1215-16 A.D. overtook him in 1221 A.D. The Mongols, having rolled up the Khwārazm Shāhī empire, were now launching relentless onslaughts on Islamic kingdom in the East. The fugitive prince Jalāl ud-Dīn on being pursued by Chengīz Khān, crossed into the Punjab and advanced within two or three days journey from Delhi, from where he sent the following message to Iletmīsh, through his messenger, 'Ayn ul mulk. "The vicissitudes of fortune have established my right to approach thy presence, and guests of my sort arrive but rarely. If, therefore, the drinking place of friendship be purified upon either side and the cups of fraternity filled to the brim (muvaffā) and we bind ourselves to aid and assist one another in weal and woe, then shall all our aims and objects be attained; and when our opponents realise the concord that exists between us, the teeth of their resistance shall be blunted".

1 T.N., p.171, Minhāj says that Jalāl ud-Dīn Khwārazm Shāh had advanced up to the limits of Lahore. Cf. H.H. Howorth, History of the Mongols, pt.I, p.90, who says 'Chengiz Khan, on hearing that the Khwarazmi prince had fled to the Indus, left a governor at Ghazna and marched in that direction. Jalāl ud-Dīn thereupon retired towards Delhi; Barthold, op.cit. pp. 445, 446.

2 Juwaynī, op.cit. pp. 144-145 says, Jalāl ud-Dīn relying on the saying that the noble have a place for the noble, requested Iletmīsh to assign him a place where he could remain for a few days.

3 J.A. Boyle, History of the World Conqueror, Vol.II, p.413. I have quoted verbatim the translation of Boyle.
Iletmish had certainly not forgotten the difficulties of his benefactor (Mu'izz al-Dīn) at Andkhūd in 1205 A.D., and besides, as a prudent ruler, he could not ignore the danger of sheltering a fugitive of the Mongols; so he not only refused to comply with the request, but also had the emissary murdered. It was done without doubt to please the Mongol chief, Chengīz Khan, who was sweeping over Central and Western Asia like an irresistible avalanche. His wise step, no doubt, succeeded in saving the Delhi Sultanate from getting involved in the first onrush of the Mongol invasion; but it provoked the wrath of Jalāl ud-Dīn, who made incursions into the Punjab in order to avenge his insult.

Minhāj says that Iletmish marched with an army against him but no engagement took place as Jalāl ud-Dīn turned his attention towards Qubāchā.

Jalāl ud-Dīn settled for sometime in the vicinity of Lāhore, at a place called 'Balālah and Nakālah', and contracted marriage with the daughter of the Chief of the Salt Range. From there he

---

1 Juwaynī, op.cit., p.145, says Iletmish was willing to accommodate Jalāl ud-Dīn in the region of Delhi; Raverty, Translation of the Tabagat-i-Nasiri Vol.I, p.293, n.5, Raverty quotes an anonymous author, who says, "The Sultān's envoy was put to death (some say he had been poisoned), under pretence that the envoy had been conspiring against him (Iletmish), but in reality fearing the effect upon his own Turkish followers and probably the Sultān's superiority over himself, his war-like character, his nobility of mind and great energy."

2 T.N., p.171; Juwaynī, op.cit., p.146.

3 T.N., p.171; Raverty, op.cit., p.294, n.5. Raverty refuses to accept that an army was sent against Jalāl ud-Dīn.
sent an expedition under Oz-Beg Tae against Qubācha, which completely surprised the latter's army at Uchch. Being routed, Qubācha fled to the island-fortress of Bhakkar, and from there to Multān. Having extorted a considerable sum of money from Qubācha as tribute, Jalāl-ud-Dīn returned to the Salt Range during the hot season.

In 1224 A.D., when news reached Jalāl-ud-Dīn that the Mongols were again in pursuit of him, he moved towards Lower Sind. While passing by Multān he demanded of Qubācha, through his agent, a contribution known as 'shoe-money', but as the latter knew that the Mongols were on the heels of the Khwārazmī prince, he not only refused to pay, but also showed himself prepared for hostility. After an hour's skirmish, Jalāl-ud-Dīn moved towards Uchch where, the people demonstrating defiance, he halted for two days, set fire to the city, and went to Sadusān near the Indus. Fakhr ud-Dīn Salārī, the governor of Qubācha at Sadusān surrendered the city to Jalāl-ud-Dīn after a short siege, but it was restored to Tuwānī._qcp.cit., pp. 146-147; Howorth, _op.cit._, p. 91, who says, Chengiz Khān left the Indus before the summer of 1221 A.D., as he feared its deadly heat would destroy his army; Barthold, _op.cit._, p. 453, who, basing his conclusion on the statement of Minhaj, correctly gives the end of February or early March 1222, as the probable period of Chengiz Khān's return from the Indus.

1 Juwaynī, _op.cit._, pp. 146-147; Howorth, _op.cit._, p. 91, who says, Chengiz Khān left the Indus before the summer of 1221 A.D., as he feared its deadly heat would destroy his army; Barthold, _op.cit._, p. 453, who, basing his conclusion on the statement of Minhaj, correctly gives the end of February or early March 1222, as the probable period of Chengiz Khān's return from the Indus.

2 Juwaynī, _op.cit._, p. 147, uses the term 'na'īl baha'(shoe-value), Cf. Boyle, _op.cit._, p. 415 and n. 14, who calls it 'shoe-money', a tribute which a king exacted from the ruler of a place in passing by, being the price of the shoes of the horse on which he was riding at the time; Sir Sayyid Ahmed, _Qādīm nizarn-i dehī-i Hindūstān_, p. 20, where it is said that in India the zamindars used to collect travelling charge known as 'Hath hīfāl' and _Khak urā_. The former was realised from the 'pedestrians' because they moved their hands' while travelling, and the latter from 'travellers on vehicle', as they 'raised the dust' of the territory.

3 Juwaynī, _op.cit._, p. 147.
him after a month, when Jalāl ud-Dīn moved further south to Debāl, Damrilah and Chatisar. He encamped near Debāl and Damrilah, from where he sent an expedition under Khāṣṣ Khān against Nahrwāla, the capital of Gujerāt, and acquired much booty. He also built a jāmī' masjid on the site of a temple at Debāl. Jalāl ud-Dīn left India in 1224 A.D., on receiving the news that his presence was solicited in 'Iraq.

Qubācha, now a crippled power, did not take long to succumb to Iletmish. In 1228 A.D., a two-pronged attack by Iletmish and Malik Naṣīr ud-Dīn Aytemur, the governor of Lāhore, made Qubācha flee once again to the fortress of Bhakkar, where also a force was despatched under Nizām ul Mulk Kamāl ud-Dīn Muhammad Junaidī, the wazīr of Iletmish.

On the fall of Uchch, Qubācha despatched his son 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd Bahram Shah to Iletmish with the offer of peace, but in the meantime the news of the capitulation of Bhakkar broke his heart and made him drown himself in the Indus, in May 1228 A.D. Qubācha's death removed another obstacle to Delhi's sovereignty, and brought Lower Sind under Iletmish's effective authority.

---

1 Juwaynī, op. cit., p. 148-149; Raverty, op. cit., p. 295, n. 5.
2 T.N., p. 172.
3 Ibid., p. 173.
4 Ta'īl ul ma'athīr, I.O. 1486, f. 241b, Hasan Nizāmī says that Qubācha was a tributary prince, and because he had not maintained a correct account, Iletmish marched against him; Khwand Amir, Habib us-Siyar, B.M. Add. 27, 237, Vol. II, f 476α.
Malik Sinān ud-Dīn, the ruler of Debal, personally came to the capital to acknowledge Iltutmish as his sovereign.

Jalāl ud-Dīn's successor, Saif ud-Dīn Ḥasan Qarlugh who occupied Banīyān, the western part of the Salt Range, was however left undisturbed to act as a buffer between the Mongols and the Delhi Sultanate.

From 1225 A.D., after Jalāl ud-Dīn's departure, Iltutmish could give his attention to the problems of the East. 'Alī Mardān's hysterical rule of two years was brought to an end by his officers in 1211 A.D., when he was murdered and replaced by Husam ud-Dīn 'Iwad Khalji. Finding Iltutmish preoccupied with the situation in the North, Husam ud-Dīn assumed the title of Sultan Ghvath-ud-Dīn, and considerably strengthened his authority by annexing Behār and receiving tributes from the neighbouring Hindu states of Jājnagar, Tirhut, Bang and Kāmrūp.

In 1225 A.D., Iltutmish resolved on re-asserting Delhi's authority on Lakhnoutī, as it had existed in the reign of Qutb-ud-Dīn. He, therefore, marched against 'Iwad but an agreement was concluded without a showdown. 'Iwad agreed to relinquish Behār and acknowledge Iltutmish as his suzerain. He also presented the Sultan eighty lakhs in treasure and thirty-eight elephants. Behār was placed under Malik 'Alā ud-Dīn Janī.

1 T.N. p.173.
2 Ibid, p.160. Minhāj calls 'Alī Mardān, a blood-shedder and murderer.
The condition of being a vassal must have seriously undermined 'Iwaḍ'¡s position before his tributaries and he, therefore, repudiated the agreement within a year, drove out the governor from Behār and again established his independence.

As Iletmish was busy with operations against the Rajputs in the Siwālik territory, he asked his eldest son Naṣīr ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, the governor of Awadh, to take appropriate measures against 'Iwaḍ. In 1227 A.D., when 'Iwaḍ was away on an expedition against the rulers of Kāmrūp and Bang, who it seems had withheld tribute, Maḥmūd, seizing the opportunity, came and occupied Lakhnoutī. 'Iwaḍ returned and gave battle but was defeated and killed. A large booty with many Khaljī Amīrs were captured. Maḥmūd now held Lakhnoutī, but after his death towards the end of 1229 A.D., the Khaljīs under the leadership of Balkā Malik Khaljī again seized Lakhnoutī and defied Delhi's authority. Balkā was, however, slain in a campaign led by Iletmish himself in 628 A.H./1231 A.D., and 'Alā ud-Dīn Jānī was appointed to the government of Lakhnoutī.

1 T.N., p.164; Cf. "Išāmī, p.119, who says, 'Iwaḍ's head was struck off in the battle; Nusakh-i Jahān Ārā, B.M. Or.141, f 119a.

2 T.N., p.174; Cf. J. Horovitz, 'The inscriptions of Muhammad Ibn Sam, Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek and Iletmish', Epigraphia Indica-Moslemica, 1911-12, p.24, who says that the title of Iletmish's eldest son, Naṣīr ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, according to the inscription was 'Malik ush Sharq', when he was governor of the eastern provinces. His tomb in Malikpur is known as that of the 'Sultan-i-Ghari', because he lies buried in a vaulted crypt.
So long as danger threatened the Delhi Sultanate the Hindu chiefs to the south of Delhi were also active in recovering their territories. To allow the subdued enemy to revive would be to imperil the existence of the recently established Muslim power. So from 1226 A.D., Ilemish exerted himself against them and succeeded in re-capturing Ranthambor, Mandawar, Jalor and Thangir. In 1232 A.D., Gwaliyur was besieged - its ruler, Malak Deo, son of Basii, withstood the siege for eleven months, but ultimately, being unable to sustain the pressure, escaped one night leaving the fortress in the hands of eight hundred defenders who, without resistance, surrendered the following morning to the invaders, to be severely punished.

Kālinjar, which had received a shattering blow at the hands of Ḟutb ud-Dīn, had since revived. Malik Nuṣrat ud-Dīn Taysāf led an attack against it in 1234 A.D., his only success being the capture of the Raja's standard, canopy of state, and other

1 T.N., p.172; Minhāj says that in the past, seventy kings had unsuccessfully attempted the conquest of Ranthambor; Tāj ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, f.70a; Tarikh-i-Fakhīr ud-Dīn Mubarak Shah p.22. According to both of these contemporary works, Ranthambor was conquered in the reign of Mu'izz al-Dīn.

2 T.N., p.175; T.A. Vol.11, pp. 60, 61. Nizām ud-Dīn says that a large number of men were taken prisoners at Gwaliyur, out of which three hundred were executed. Tāj ud-Dīn Reza, the secretary, wrote a quartain on its conquest which is carved on a stone on the gate of the fort. (See Appendix 'B'). In the Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, op.cit., p.24, we read that an inscription recording the conquest of Gwaliyur in 630 A.H./1233 A.D., had existed on the gate of the fort, but no traces of it are now left.
booty which, according to Minhāj, was considerable. While returning through the defiles he was attacked by Rāna Ghahār of Ajār whom he overcame only with much difficulty.

In 1235 A.D., Iltumish planned to enlarge his conquests. Fakhr-i-Mudabbir says that Mālwhah was conquered by Qutb ud-Dīn in 1199 A.D., but some modern scholars are inclined to doubt the authenticity of this statement. The demolition of a temple at Bhīlsa, said to have been three hundred years old, suggests that the first blow at Mālwhah was struck by Iltumish in 1235 A.D. It is very improbable that such a place, where the Hindūs were known to have used as a repository for their gold and other precious objects, would have been left standing had Qutb ud-Dīn pillaged this place at the time stated. This was followed by the capture of the city of Bhīlsa. To shatter the Hindu power of resistance and also to capture more gold, Iltumish continued his triumphal march to Ujjain, to the south-west of Bhīlsa, where he destroyed the famous temple of Mahākāl Deo and carried off to Delhi the image of Vikramaditya.

2 Tarikh-i Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 24; Hābīb ullaḥ op. cit., p. 68.
3 T.N., p. 176, The Hindū calendar all over northern India begins with the reign of Vikramaditya. It is reckoned from the year 57 B.C. Cf. H.G. Rawlinson, A Concise History of the Indian people, p. 62.
His last expedition was against Banīyān, possibly to supplant the Khwārazmī nominee, Ḥasan Qarluq, but while on the way, he was attacked with fever, and was carried back to Delhi in a litter, where he died on April 30, 1236 A.D.

At his death, Iltutmish had not only given political unity to the loosely conquered territories, but also made the Delhi Sultanate stable enough for a dynastic rule. The Caliph of Baghdc, Abī jaʿfar al-Manṣur, in acknowledgment of his contribution to the Islamic cause, recognized his kingship by honouring him with an investiture in 1229 A.D.

Iltutmish discarded the coinage of Muʿizz al-Dīn, which had contained Nāgarī and Arabic inscriptions along with symbols of the bull of Siva and the Chohan horseman. In its place he introduced a purely Arabic Coinage similar to those used in countries further West, and adopted as his standard coin the silver tanka, weighing 175 grains.

Rukn ud-Dīn Fīrūz (May 2, 1236 A.D. - November 19, 1236 A.D.)

Iltutmish, being satisfied with the ability of his daughter, Radiya, named her as his successor in preference to his son, but

1 T.N., p. 176
2 Ibid, p.174
3 S. Lane-Poole, Medieval India, p.73
the nobles disregarded the nomination after his death, and placed on the throne his eldest living son, Rukn ud-Din Firuz, who during his father's lifetime had discharged the duties of governor at Badaun in 1228 A.D., and at Lahore in 1233 A.D.

According to Minhaj, the young king, before his accession, was famous for generosity and adaptability - qualities which the nobles seem to have taken into account in making him the king. The same authority tells us that after enthronement, Rukn ud-Din became a debauch and wasted money on singers and buffoons. Worst of all, he allowed his mother Shah Turkân to exercise authority in the kingdom, and she had probably proved to be a stern administrator. On acquiring power, she is accused of having mercilessly persecuted the children and the co-wives of Iletmish, and also of having deprived Qub ud-Din, the infant son of Iletmish, of his eye-sight in a barbarous manner, and of putting him to death.

Minhaj's statement concerning Shah Turkân appears to be contradictory. He praises the queen-mother's good nature and charitable disposition, particularly to the 'Ulema, Sayyids, and Zahids, but he also presents her as a devil in human form. Her

1 T.N., pp. 181-182; Cf. 'Isami, p.124, who says that Firuz became the choice of the nobility in preference to Radya; Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, p.21

2 T.N., pp. 182, 183; T.A, Vol. I, p.64. Nizam ud-Din says that Shah Turkân, who was jealous of the other ladies of the harem, on obtaining power, had some of them killed with indignity, and those who were spared, lived in utter humiliation; Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, p.21. Yahya says that the queen mother ruined Iletmish's harem, owing to her old rivalry.
real offence can be traced in the following words of Minhāj:

"Dar hej wa'agg-i mulk tassaraf numudan girift wa farān mī-dād,"

(She acquired complete control over state affairs and issued orders).

Those nobles who had thought that while the weak Rukn ud-Dīn would reign like a submissive king real power could be exercised by them, were completely frustrated by the unexpected emergence of Shāh Turkan, with her hold on the administration.

It was, therefore, not unexpected that Rukn ud-Dīn came to be described as an incompetent ruler, and his mother a vicious woman, in order to excite indignation against them throughout the kingdom.

Rukn ud-Dīn's younger brother, Ghiyāth ud-Dīn, the governor of Awadh, doubtless in the hope of occupying the throne, initiated the rebellion by plundering several towns to the east of the Jumna, and seizing the revenue proceeding to Delhi from Lakhnoutī. The fate of this prince is not known; he is not heard of any more.

Several provincial governors also united to oppose Rukn ud-Dīn and his mother. 'Izz ud-Dīn Kābīr of Multān, 'Alā ud-Dīn Jānī of Lāhore, Saif ud-Dīn Kocḥ of Hānsī and Muḥammad Sālārī.

---

1 T.N., pp. 181-182, 184. Minhāj says that Rukn ud-Dīn, being drunk would ride on an elephant in the street and scatter gold tankas; 'Īsāmī, p. 125.

2 T.N., p. 183.
of Badaun, moved their forces towards the capital for action.  

Nizam ul mulk Junaidi the wazir, who had perhaps been ignored by Shah Turkān in the administration, deserted Rukn ud-Din and joined the hostile maliks.

The king now awoke to the gravity of the situation, and marched out of Delhi to oppose the advancing forces of the maliks, but his own army revolted on the way, in the vicinity of Mansūrpūr and Tārā'īn, murdered a number of non-Turkish officers who probably had tried to dissuade them from the rebellion, and returned to the capital.

Rādiya, in the meantime, had cleverly exploited the hostile sentiments of the people against the queen-mother, Shah Turkān. 'Iṣāmi says, 'she had reminded the citizens of her father's nomination in her favour, and offered her head as the stake, if she did not prove better than men.' Her move produced its desired effect on the citizens of Delhi and the army officers, as

---

1 T.N., Cf. Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shāhī, p.22. In place of Malik 'Īzūd-Dīn Kabīr Khān, it has Malik 'Īzūd-Dīn Kanjan; Cf. Ahmed Muhammad al-Qādī, Nusakh-i Jahān Ārā, B.M. Or.141, f 117a, where it is stated that due to the excesses of the queen-mother, all the nobles of the frontier provinces drew their army against Rukn ud-Dīn; Cf Habib us Sīyar, B.M. Add. 27, 237, Vol.II, f 476b, Khwand Amir says, 'when Shah Turkān attempted to kill Rādiya, the populace of Delhi seized the former and offered their bay'at to Rādiya'; Mir Khwand, Randat us Safa, Vol.IV, f 521b.

2 T.N., p.183, Taj ul Mulk Muḥammad the dabīr and mushrif-i-mamālīk. Bahā ul mulk Ḥasan Asa'īrī, Karim ud-Dīn Zāhid, Diya' ul mulk son of Nizam ul Mulk Muḥammad Junādī, Nizam ud-Dīn Shārqānī, Khwaja Rāshīd ud-Dīn Malkānī, and Amīr Fakhīr ud-Dīn the dabīr, and a number of other Tajik officials were slain; Cf. T.A. Vol.I, p.65; Cf Tarikh Mubarak Shahrī, p. 23; Nizam ud-Dīn, and Yahya, state that these Tajik officers returned to Delhi, and acknowledged Rādiya as their sovereign. For such details, Minhāj is a more reliable authority, as he was present on the occasion.

3 'Iṣāmi, p. 127.
by the time Rukn ud-Dīn returned to the capital, Shāh Turkān was already a prisoner and Rādīya's accession an accomplished fact. Under orders of Rādīya, Rukn ud-Dīn was brought from Kīlūkharī and imprisoned on November 19, 1236 A.D. where he was put to death.

Rādīya (November 19, 1236 - October 13, 1240 A.D.)

In the year 1233 A.D., Iletmīsh on his return from the Gwāliyur expedition asked Tāj ul muolk Maḥmūd, who was the dabīr and mushrif-i-mamalik, to draft a proclamation announcing the appointment of Rādīya as his heir-apparent.

Her accession on the deposition of Rukn ud-Dīn beset her with enormous difficulties, which hardly abated until the last moment of her life. The energy with which she faced her problems won the applause of Minhāj, 'for her admirable qualities worthy of kings'.

The continued march of the provincial governors, in spite of the dismissal of the former sovereign against whom it had been initiated, was clearly intended to challenge her sovereignty. To encounter their hostile design, she summoned to her aid Malik

1 T.N., p.184.


3 T.N., p. 185; Cf J. Briggs op.cit., p. 217. Fīrishta informs us that Rādīya could read the Qur'ān with correct pronunciation.
Nusrat ud-Din, the governor of Awadh, who on crossing the Ganges was captured by the rebel maliks and died of illness after some time.\(^1\)

Left with no support from the provinces, and devoid of an army capable of coping with the governors who had besieged Delhi, she marched out of the capital, and encamping on the bank of the Jumna had recourse to diplomatic devices.\(^2\) Her able contrivance succeeded in causing misunderstanding among her enemies, and in winning over two of the insurgent governors, 'Izz ud-Din Salari and Kabir Khan, to her side. News of secret alliance and understanding was cleverly circulated to the opposite camp, which worked according to plan in upsetting and disheartening the other rebel governors and the wazir.\(^3\)

As a result, the rest of the rebel maliks fled to save their lives but were pursued. Saif ud-Din Kochi and his brother Fakhr ud-Din were captured and put to death after a short imprisonment. 'Ala ud-Din Jani's head was brought to Delhi from Pael, while Nizam ul mulk Junaidi the wazir died a fugitive in the Simur hills.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) T.A., vol.1, p.66, where we read 'Izz ud-Din HansI in place of Nusrat ud-Din; T.N., pp.186, 242; Minhaj says, Nusrat ud-Din was seized by the rebels, brought under control, and he died of illness after some time; Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, p.25. Yahya being misled by the term 'istagbal' used by Minhaj, has changed the entire text as follows; 'he was welcomed by the rebel governors, won over and was dissuaded to assist Raktu.

\(^2\) T.N., p.186, Minhaj says that a minor skirmish took place between the rival forces and then peace was restored; Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, p.25, Yahya says that after battle engagement peace was at last restored at the intervention of the Imams and Shaikhs of the city.

\(^3\) T.N., pp.186-187; Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, p.25, Yahya says that one might Kanjan and Salari assembled in front of the royal pavilion to seize Malik Jani, Malik Kochi and Nizam ul Mulk.

\(^4\) T.N., p.187.
Having successfully encountered her initial difficulties, like a wise ruler she now set herself to the task of reorganising the government in order to increase the strength of her supporters. Khwāja Muḥa ḍab-ud-Dīn was appointed the wazīr with the usual title of Nizām ul mulk; Kabīr Khān was rewarded with the governorship of Lahore for helping during her crisis; Saif ud-Dīn Aybek was appointed deputy-chief of the army with the title of Qutlūgh Khān, and he was succeeded on his death by Qutb ud-Dīn Ḥussain.¹

That the solution of the problems of the kingdom was now well within her grasp is shown by the arrival of a message of loyalty and valuable presents from ‘Īzz ud-Dīn Tughrīl, the governor of Lakhnoutī. Raḍīya returned the compliments by raising him to the dignity of Viceroy, but this did not deter him from later becoming a cause of concern to Delhi.²

According to Minhaj, the maliks and amirs from Debal to Lakhnoutī tendered their allegiance to the Delhi sovereign.³ The appearance of the Qarlūgh prince, Naṣīr ud-Dīn Muḥammad, before Raḍīya when she was in the Punjab, in 1240 A.D. probably to request military assistance against the mongols, provides another proof of her effective sovereignty. The prince returned disappointed, without leave, as the best Raḍīya

²T.N., pp.243-245, Raḍīya conferred on him a canopy of state and a red standard.
offered to do, was to assign him the territory of Baran for his shelter and expenses.  

Such success must have considerably strengthened her self-confidence, as soon after, to attach more weight to her authority, which she presumed was handicapped by her effeminate appearance, she decided to behave every bit like a male. She gave up the female attire, left the veil, and appeared both in the court and in the camp dressed as a man. Her lifting the veil, and appearing in public seem to have alienated public opinion.  

The proximity to Radīya of Jamāl-ud-Dīn Yaqūt, the amir-i ākhr, served as a pretext for casting aspersions on her character, and for arousing the indignation of the Turks. A conspiracy to depose her was hatched under the leadership of Ikhtiyyār ud-Dīn Aytigīn, the amir-i haṭib.

The first to rise in revolt was Kabīr Khān, the governor of Lāhore, in 1240 A.D. Radīya promptly marched against him into the Punjab and compelled the rebel to surrender unconditionally, thus foiling the first

---

1 T.N., p.392; Raverty, op cit., p.645, n.7; T.A., Vol.I, p.66. Niẓām ud-Dīn says that Radīya, after her accession, again enforced the rules and principles of the reign of her father which had fallen into disuse in the days of Rukn ud-Dīn.

2 T.N., p.188; Cf. Isāmī, p.128, who says that three years after accession, Rādīya gave up purdah, became shameless and immodest, and donned the male garment. When she came out of the palace and mounted the elephant, everyone enjoyed her beauty.

3 T.N., pp.187-8; Cf. Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shāhī, p.26, Yahya says 'As Jamāl ud-Dīn Yaqūt, the Abyssinian, was made the amir-i ākhr and became her close companion, and the envy of the amira and malka, was excited.' Cf. Isāmī, p.129, who says, 'As the Abyssinian used to raise Rādīya on the elephant by her arms, the nobles became offended; Cf. T.A., Vol.I, p.67, Niẓām ud-Dīn says that the amir-i ākhr placed his hand under Rādīya's arms and put her on the animal she rode; Cf. Badayuni, Vol.I, p.84, who says that whenever Rādīya rode horse or elephant, she would rest upon the shoulder of Jamāl ud-Dīn.
plot against her. Kabir Khan was transferred as the mufati of Multan, and Malik Qaraqash was placed in the charge of Lahore. Soon after, Altuniya, the governor of Bhatinda, rebelled, but this time the conspirators had moved with more measured steps, as is suggested by subsequent developments. Before Raddiya was drawn into Bhatinda, a close co-operation was established between the court and the provinces; the army had been won over and a successor had been already chosen.

With uncompromising determination, Raddiya marched out to crush Altuniya's uprising in April 1240 A.D., defying the heat of summer and the inconvenience of Ramdan; on her arrival at Bhatinda, she discovered the plot against her, when Jamal ud-Din Yaqut, one of her chief supporters, was murdered by her own retinue, and she was seized and imprisoned in the fort of Bhatinda.

When the news of her capture reached Delhi, Mu'izz ud-Din Bahram, the son of Ilutmish, who had been selected earlier to replace her, was raised to the throne.

---

1 T.N., p.188; Cf. T.A., Vol.I, p.67; Nizam ud-Din is wrong in saying that in 1240 A.D. Raddiya assigned Multan to Kabir Khan, in addition to Lahore.

2 T.N., pp.188-189; Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p.27, Yahya says that when the army of Raddiya appeared before Bhatinda on April 10, 1240 A.D., some of the amirs, maliks and shamsi slaves, having seceded and joined Altuniya, put Jamali ud-Din Yaqut to death; Cf. Esam, p. 130, who says that Yaqut was murdered in the palace when Raddiya was giving audience. Afterwards she was herself imprisoned and sent to Bhatinda. This statement is incorrect as it differs from that of Minhaj, who was an eye-witness.

3 T.N., p.191; Cf. Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, Yahya says that after imprisoning Raddiya the seceders sent a letter to the amirs at Delhi to enthrone Bahram.
The conspirators having executed the whole scheme according to plan, returned to Delhi to work out the details of the new arrangement. They were cautious to avoid the mistake they had committed in the case of Radiya.

Radiya, now in prison, made a final effort to retrieve her position. She married her captor, Altuniya, probably in the hope of receiving the support of his old confederates; this came to be partially true, as when they jointly marched to Delhi to wrest back the crown, they were joined by Malik Qaraqash and Malik Sarari, but this effort was doomed to failure. According to 'Isami, Bahram entrusted young Balban to head the troops. He competently carried out the assignment and completely routed the mercenary army of Radiya. Minhaj says that Mu'izz ud-Din Bahram himself led the army, when Badr ud-Din Sunqur performed creditably on the battlefield against Radiya.¹

Radiya and Altuniya were unsuccessfully pursued by the royal troops, and though they did not fall into their hands, they were murdered by Hindu robbers, on October 13, 1240, A.D., while taking shelter under a tree at Kaitthal.²

¹ T.N., pp.190, 255; Cf. 'Isami, pp.133-136, who furnishes a story which is not quoted by any other authority. He says that Radiya remained imprisoned at Bhatinda for one year and six months. Latunl, an adventurer Turk, seized Bhatinda, freed Radiya from the prison and married her. They assembled a large army consisting of Khokars and others, and marched to Delhi; Cf. J. Briggs, op.cit., p.221.

² T.N., p.190; Cf. 'Isami, pp.134-136; Cf. T.A., Vol. I, pp.67, 68. Nizam ud-Din, 'Isami, and some others say that Radiya twice marched with an army against Bahram, but Minhaj mentions only one expedition; Cf. Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, p.29, where it is said that Altuniya and Radiya when fleeing were seized by the Hindus and sent to Bahram in chains where they were put to death.
The reign of Radīya except for some minor events, hardly had any political bearing on the Delhi Sultanate; nevertheless, these indicated the religious and political climate of the country, and her capacity to deal with them.

Fresh from her success over the provincial governors, she provided proof of the vigour of her reign by sending an expedition under Malik Quṭb ud-Dīn Ḥussain to relieve the garrison at Ranthambor; which had been under Hindu siege, since the death of Iltutmish. The royal force could do nothing more than relieve the besieged men and destroy the fortress.¹

In March 1237 A.D. about one thousand heretics under instigation of Nur Turk attacked the congregation assembled for the Friday prayer in the Jāmi' masjid of Delhi. Many of the congregation lost their lives, some by the sword and others in the stampede. The situation was relieved when Turkish warriors, aided by the worshippers who had ascended the roof of the mosque and were throwing down stones and bricks, entered the mosque and killed the heretics to the last man.²

Tāj ud-Dīn Sa’dar Qiqluq's sudden arrival from his ḥajj of Baran to Gwālīyūr under the orders of Radīya, the cause of which Minhāj seems unwilling to give in clear language, taken together with what happened

---

¹ T.N., p.187, Minhāj says that the siege was in effect for a long time; Tarikh-i Mubarak Shāhī, p.26, Yahya tells us that the siege continued since the death of Iltutmish.
² T.N., p.189; Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shāhī, p.24. Yahya says that two thousand Qaramitahs attacked the congregation.
in future, suggests that the new ruler was determined to suppress any sign of disaffection towards her. In March 1238 A.D., Taj ud-Dīn compelled Dīyaūd-Dīn Junaidī, the amīr-i dād of Gwāliyūr, and the latter's supporters, which included Minhāj, to return to Delhi. The subsequent assignment of the qādishīp of Gwāliyūr and the charge of the Naṣirīya college in Delhi to Minhāj, shows Raḍīya's satisfaction with the former's explanation. The Amīr-i dād Junaidī, who was perhaps a relation of the late wazīr, Kamāl ud-Dīn Muḥammad Junaidī, is not heard of again.

Muʿizz ud-Dīn Bahārān (April 22, 1240 A.D. - May 10, 1242, A.D.)

Bahārān's kingship involved the condition of delegating all authority to a deputy of the kingdom, known as naʿīb-i mulk, for a period of one year. The newly created office was given to Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn Aytīğīn as a reward of his successful conspiracy, and in the hope that domination of the Turkish oligarchy would remain assured in his hands.¹

Minhāj gives us to understand that since Aytīğīn married the king's sister and assumed all powers with the royal insignia of triple naubat and elephant, he fell into Bahārān's disfavour.² The pretext is unconvincing as Muhādhdhab ud-Dīn who was simultaneously

¹ T.N., pp.191-192; Cf. Tarikh-i Mubārak Shahī, p.28. Yahya says that the amīrs and māliḵs who had accompanied Raḍīya, on their return, paid homage to Muʿizz ud-Dīn on the condition that Aytīğīn would be appointed as the naʿīb-i mulk.

stabbed with the naʿīb-i mulk could not be accused of any such excesses.

In fact, the young king had become impatient of the control exercised by the naʿīb-i mulk and the wazīr, and in order to terminate the existing arrangement, he lured both of them to attend a religious discourse. After the sermon was delivered, two Turks, under direction of the king appeared from the upper part of the palace and stabbed the unsuspecting Aytigīn and the wazīr in the 'Audience Hall' of the Qasr-i-Safed (White Castle). The former succumbed to his injuries on the spot, while the latter after receiving two wounds, managed to escape with his life.¹

Bahram's aggressive role, though in open contravention of the original agreement, was the only recourse of which he could avail himself in order to end the tutelage and to exercise unquestioned authority. But he was soon to be disillusioned. The new amīr-i ḡālib, Badr-ud-Dīn Sinqur, though not invested with the title and powers of his predecessor, appeared to be more undesirable in his attitude than the former naʿīb-i-mulk. He attempted to behave like a de facto ruler by usurping the powers of the wazīr, and issuing his own orders in complete disregard of the Sultan's authority.²

¹ T.N., p.192; Cf. J. Briggs, op. cit., p.224. Firishta describes the incident differently. He says that when the king was giving public audience, two Turks began to create trouble, and as Ikhtiyar ud-Dīn Aytigīn (the Aytigīn of other works) tried to turn them out they stabbed him first and then went after the wazīr, on whom they inflicted two wounds.
² T.N., pp.193,255.
Sunqur, conscious of the fact that his conduct would not be condoned by the king, and also to avoid Aytigin's fate, entered into conspiracy with the religious men, the amīra, and other important personages, for the dethronement of Bahram.  

1 Wedded to the belief that Muhadhdhab ud-Dīn had not forgotten the treachourous attack on his person at the Qasr-i-Safed, he committed the blunder of including him in the conspiracy.

For the wazīr this was the opportunity of avenging the insult of being ignored in state matters. When Sunqur's emissary, the Sadr al-mulk Sayyid Taj ud-Dīn 'Alī Musawwī, arrived at the wazīr's residence and disclosed the plot in which his participation had been solicited, the wazīr had a confidential servant of the Sultan concealed in a place from where he could overhear the conversation. When the emissary departed, Wazīr Muhadhdhab-ud-Dīn at once despatched the concealed person to the king to report all that he had heard.  

Bahram personally went to the scene of the conspiracy where he detected Sunqur red-handed. After dispersing the gathering, he

---

1 T.N., pp. 193-5. The religious men were offended with Bahram, as Shams ud-Dīn, the cādī of Mehr, was thrown under the feet of an elephant on the instigation of a recluse, named Ayūb.

2 T.N., pp. 193-4; Cf. T.A., Vol.1, p. 69, Nizām ud-Dīn is wrong in saying that Sadru'l-mulk, who had been sent to summon Nizām ul mulk kept a person concealed in a corner, and afterwards through the concealed person, represented the facts to the Sultan. According to Minhāj, Sadru'l-mulk Taj ud-Dīn Musawwī was later executed.
ordered Sunqur to proceed forthwith to his 'iqta' of Badaun, and Qadi Jalai ud-Din Kashani, one of the chief conspirators, was removed from the post of qadi. Qadi Kabir ud-Din and Shaikh Muhammad Shami, who were also involved, out of fear fled from the city.1

Bahrain's conduct had hitherto alienated the maliks and religious men, but the person who at heart was his bitterest enemy was the wazir, Muhadhdhab ud-Din. Although the wazir's dream of exercising all power had been realised after Sunqur's death, he still nursed his grudge against the ruler for being stabbed. His opportunity to retaliate came when the Mongols besieged Lahore in 1241 A.D. and he and Malik Quṭb ud-Din Ḥussain were sent with troops from the capital to relieve the city. When the army reached the Sutlej, the wazir sent a letter to the king asking his permission to destroy the Turkish nobles, as they had become ill-disposed to him. The ruler, without realising the gravity of such an edict, sent the desired order to the wazir. The latter made no delay in showing the death-warrant from the Sultan to the Turks and amirs, who in a fury turned back to the capital to effect Bahrain's dethronement.2

1T.N., p.194.
2T.N., p.196. Minhāj says that the Sultan, out of childishness and haste consented to the destruction of the Turkish nobles, as requested by Nizām ul maik; Cf. Badayuni, Vol.1, p.86, who says Bahrain wrote that the disaffected amirs would be punished in due time, until then they should be treated with civility; Cf. T.A., Vol.1, p.70. Nizām ud-Dīn says that the king, out of his simplicity and the confidence he had in Muhadhdhab ud-Dīn, replied that these people deserved to be executed, and at the right time they would get their punishment, but for a few days it would be better to temporize with them. Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p.30.
On being informed of the army's attitude, the king sent the Shaikh ul Islam, Sayyid Qutb ud-Din, to pacify them, but the Shaikh instead used his influence to stir the marchers to more hostile action. ¹

The army returned to the capital on February 22, 1242 A.D. and continued hostility for a period of about three months, in which many people were killed and disabled. At last the city fell to the besiegers on May 10, 1242 A.D., when the king was taken prisoner, and executed after three days.²

'Ala ud-Dīn Mas'ūd (May 10, 1242 A.D. - June 10, 1246 A.D.)

After the capture of Bahram, 'Izz ud-Dīn Balban Khashlu Khan, one of the ring-leaders in the uprising against the last ruler, made his bid for the throne, but his claim was repudiated by his own partisans, who assembled at the tomb of Iltumish and decided to elect 'Ala ud-Dīn Mas'ūd, the son of Rukn ud-Dīn Fīrūz, as their king.³

On the accession of Mas'ud, Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain was appointed nā'ib-i mulk, Malik Qaraqash was given the office of amīr-i hājib, while

¹ T.N., p.196; T.A., Vol.1, p.70, Nigar ud-Dīn wrongly says that the Shaikh ul Islam, who had been sent by Bahram to pacify the army, returned to Delhi on being unsuccessful in his mission; Cf. Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p.32.
² T.N., p.197, Minhaj attributes the prolonged siege to the influence of Mubarak Shah Farrash, who dissuaded Bahram from accepting the terms of accommodation.
Balban Kasbli Khan was assigned the extensive territory of Mandawar, Nagor and Ajmir, as an appreciation of his withdrawal from the throne. On the resignation of Minhaj from the post of the Chief Qadi, it seems the faction in power was opposed to him - 'Imad ud-Din Muhammad Shafrqani was appointed in his place.

Muhadhchab ud-Din, the chief architect of the last rebellion was allowed to retain the office of wazir. He concentrated all authority in his hands, and having forgotten the fate of Ikhtiyar ud-Din Aytiqin, unauthorisedly assumed regal pretensions by establishing the naubat and stationing an elephant at the door of his residence. To complete his grip on the government, he began to exclude the Turkish aristocracy from the offices of the state. This policy proved costly to him. The Turkish amirs, who could hardly allow their racial interest to suffer, assassinated him on October 28, 1242 A.D. The office of wazir was then assigned to Najm ud-Din Abu Bakr.

Subsequent activities in the province and centre furnish proof of the vigour of Mas'uds' reign. In 1242 A.D., Malik Tajud-Din Sanjar Qilguq, the governor of Badaun, successfully suppressed the troublesome Rajputs of Katehr and Badaun, and while he was planning to extend his conquest, he died of poison.

Malik Taj ud-Din Sanjar Kuret Khan, the governor of Awadh, after reducing the local tribes to obedience, marched to the subjugation after reducing the local tribes to obedience, marched to the subjugation

1 T.N., p.198.
2 T.N., pp.198-199; Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p.33.
3 T.N., p.257.
of Behār which the Hindus had recovered during the stalemate in the Delhi Sultanate. Although he lost his life during the invasion, nevertheless, he succeeded in subjecting the city to plunder.  

The Mongol pressure on Upper Sind had obliged Hasan Qarlugh to seek a secure shelter to the east of the Indus. He therefore attacked Multān but was repulsed by Tāj ud-Dīn Abū Bakr, whose father Kabīr Khān had renounced his allegiance to Delhi, during the Mongol invasion in early 1242 A.D. In the year 1242 A.D., Hasan Qarlugh again attacked Multān and captured it, which remained with him till 1246 A.D.  

Malik 'Izz ud-Dīn Tughril Tughān Khān, the governor of Lakhnouti, whose de facto rulership of the eastern territory of the Delhi Sultanate had been confirmed by the royal court, sought to extend his authority under the instigation of his confidential adviser Bahā ud-Dīn Hilālī, by attempting to annex Awadh and Kara-Manikpur to his government. Minhāj who was then waiting on Tughril at Awadh, leaves the impression that the latter abandoned his ambitious project and returned to Delhi, on his persuasion.  

1 T.N., p.259.  
2 T.N., p.235; Cf. Muhammad Ḥamīd Quraishi, 'Multān its brief history and Persian and Arabic inscriptions', Epigraphia Indo Moslemica, 1927-28, p.4, Quraishi says that Sāiufud-Dīn Ḥasan Qarlugh conquered Multān in 639 A.H./1242 A.D. and ruled over it as an independent sovereign, coining money in his own name; Cf. E.Thomas, op.cit., pp.94-96. Thomas is wrong in saying that Ḥasan Qarlugh died in 1239-40 A.D., as according to Minhāj he was killed in 1246-47 A.D. (T.N., p.270).  
3 T.N., pp.243-4; Cf. Yazdānī, 'The Barī Daryāh Inscription Behār', Epigraphia Indo Moslemica, 1913-14, pp.16-7. Yazdānī calls Izzud-Dīn Tughril the de facto ruler of the territory extending from Lakhnouti to Kara-Manikpur, and Tirhut to Jājnagar.
Towards the end of 1243 A.D., the Raes of Jajnagar pillaged the southern parts of Lakhnouti. Izz ud-Din Tughril, the governor of the eastern provinces, marched against him and plundered Katasin in reprisal. In retaliation, the Jajnagar army surprised Tughril in his camp when his soldiers had retired for food. Tughril, having lost a number of his men, retired to Lakhnouti, from where he despatched Sharf ul mulk Agha'rī to Delhi soliciting armed assistance. The Jajnagar army encouraged by its previous success, in the following year marched towards Lakhnouti, under the leadership of Samanta Rae, Karim ud-Dīn Lāghirī, the governor of Lakhnor intercepted the invaders but was slain with a number of his soldiers. To check the advance of the invading army Tughril himself came out of the city but was again compelled to retreat. The Jajnagar force retired on hearing about the arrival of reinforcement from Awadh.¹

Tamura Khan, the governor of Awadh, arrived at Lakhnouti in April 1245 A.D. and perhaps on the basis of a royal order, demanded the surrender of the city to him. Tughril's reluctance led to an appeal to arms, but a compromise was ultimately affected through the good offices of Minhāj. Tughril made over the city to Tamur and retired to Delhi, with his treasures, elephants, and troops, where after some time he was assigned the province of Awadh.²

---

¹ T.N., pp.243-5; Cf. T.A., p.72. Niẓām ud-Dīn has confused the infidels of Jajnagar with the infidels of Chengxz Khan and this error has been copied by Firghita and others; Cf. J. Briggs, op. cit., p.231. Briggs questions Firghita's statement that a Mongol army had invaded Lakhnouti, and calls it 'extremely curious.'

² T.N., pp.244-6; T.A., p.72.
The Mongols who were hammering on the western frontier of Delhi, appeared before Multān in 1246 A.D. and drove out Hasan Qarluq. They also besieged Uchch, where they had been led by Jaspal Sehra, a chief of the Salt Range. The inhabitants resisted for some time, but ultimately asked relief from Delhi. 'Ala ud-Dīn Mas'ūd, responding promptly, marched with a strong force to the Beas, upon which the Mongols withdrew beyond the Indus, leaving a number of captives behind.¹

The statement of Minhaj, accepted without question by subsequent chroniclers, that the energetic Mas'ūd, who had so long been a conscientious ruler, and had most recently been successful against the Mongols, 'suddenly became a villain and a murderer', hardly seems to contain any particle of truth. Like his predecessors, Mas'ūd also became a victim of conspiracy and was consequently imprisoned on June 10, 1246 A.D. and put to death some time later.²

Nāṣir ud-Dīn Mahmūd (June 10, 1246 A.D. – February 18, 1266 A.D.)

'Ala ud-Dīn Mas'ūd, during the later part of his reign, had released from confinement his two uncles, Nāṣir ud-Dīn Mahmūd and Jalāl ud-Dīn,

¹T.N., p.200.
²T.N., p.201, Cf. Īṣāmī, pp.138-9, who says that Mas'ud became proud of his success against the Mongols, and began to behave like a tyrant, which led to his being despised by everyone; Cf. T.A.Vol.I, p.72. Nisām ud-Dīn says that after success over Mongols, Mas'ud turned away from the path of righteousness and justice and resorted to the practice of malevolence; Cf. Tarikh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.34. Yahya says that Mas'ud was seized and imprisoned and he drew his last breath in prison; Habib us Siyar, B.M., Add 27,237, Vol.II, f.480a; Cf. Tarikh-i Haggī, B.M., Or.26,210, f.11b, 'Abdul Ḥaqq, adds to the information of Minhaj, without quoting his authority, by saying that Mas'ud besides killing the maliks, gave himself up to wine, hunting and excessive debauchery.
the sons of Iletmish, and had assigned the governorship of Bahraich to the former, and that of Qanauj to the latter.¹

The deposition of Mas'ud brought to the throne Naṣir ud-Dīn Māhmūd, a youth of seventeen. From the very beginning of his reign he furnished proof of being an energetic ruler. The Hindu chiefs occupying the hilly tract west of the Upper Sind-Sāgar Doab, were the first to engage his attention with their menacing activities against the Delhi Sultanate. In 1246 A.D. he set out from Delhi, and having himself halted on the bank of the Chenāb directed Balban to advance to the Salt Range to punish Jespal Sehra, who, according to Minhāj, had guided the Mongols to Uchch during the reign of Mas'ud.²

Though no substantial gain could be achieved, satisfaction was derived by a widespread plunder of the territory as far as the neighbourhood of Nandānah. The Mongols, who were reconnoitring on the opposite bank of the Jhelum, retired when they found the Delhi army on the opposite side.

In 1247 A.D., in order to acquire wealth, an expedition was sent against the Hindu chiefs established south of the Jumna. 'Dalakī wa Malakī' a powerful Rāna with strongholds between Kalinjar and Kara was pursued by Balban from one fortress to another, and although the Rāna succeeded in withdrawing after a stiff resistance, his wives and children

²T.N., p.209; Cf. Nysakh-i Jahanārā, B.M., Or. 141, f.118a, where it is stated that Māhmūd was born in 626 A.H./1229 A.D.
and a rich booty fell into the hands of the Muslim army. 1

In 1249 A.D. Balban moved to the south of Delhi to punish the Mewātis for their persistent hostility to the Delhi Sultanate. During this period, he also made an ineffective attempt to recapture Ranthambor, which had been recovered by the Rajputs in the reign of Raṣīya. 2

As Kashfū Khan had occupied Uchch without relinquishing his lotā of Nāgor, which had been the stipulation of Nasir ud-Dīn Mahmūd, in 1250 A.D., the royal army marched against him to enforce obedience. 3 As Kashfū submitted and moved to Uchch, whereupon Nāgor was assigned to Saif ud-Dīn Aybek Kashfū Khan, the younger brother of Ghayth ud-Dīn Balban. 4

In 1251 A.D., Balban led an army to the southern frontier of Delhi and attacked the powerful Rāna, Chahār Ajārī, whose fortress situated among the defiles and passes was plundered, and immense booty and prisoners were captured. 4

As Balban now exercised unrestricted authority in the kingdom, a group of nobles, consisting of Indian Muslims and some Turks, became resentful of his domination. 5 According to Minhāj, the leader of the

---

1 T.N., p.291, Cf. E.De., Translation of Tabagat-i Akbarī, pp.86-7, n.7. De says that Rāna Dalakī wa Malakī had numerous followers and immense wealth and his territory had never before been reached by the Muzzafīrīns, on account of its extremely difficult road; Cf. Tarīkh-i Mubarak Shāhī, p.35. Yahya wrongly says that Dalakī wa Malakī was taken prisoner in this expedition.

2 T.N., pp.212-3; 293; Cf. T.A., Vol.1, p.74. Nizām ud-Dīn says that Balban proceeded against Ranthambor and returned after chastising the Rajputs.

3 T.N., pp.269, 280.

4 T.N., p.215; T.A., Vol.1, p.74; Cf. Tarīkh-i Mubarak Shāhī, p.36. Yahya syas that Chahār Ajārī, the mightiest infidel of the area, endurced the Muslim army with five thousand horse and two hundred thousand infantry.

5 T.A., Vol.1, p.74. Nizām ud-Dīn says that Balban established his authority as nāḥī-ī nūlkh in such a way that everything connected with administration came under his direct control, and noone else had any hand in the affairs of the kingdom.
of the dissident group, 'Imād ud-Dīn Rayhān, 'poisoned the mind' of the Sultan so successfully that he quickly responded to the demand for Balban's removal from the key position in the kingdom.

During the expedition to Multān and Uchch, which was directed against Shir Khān Sunqur for his unauthorized aggression on the north-west, Balban was dismissed on the way from the office of naʿīb-i mīlkh, and asked to proceed to his igtāʾ of Hansī.¹

Balban's dismissal was followed by the removal of his prominent supporters from the court. Within five months the palace administration was reshuffled, and some of the important offices were assigned to Rayhān's men. Saif ud-Dīn Aybāk, the brother of Balban, was removed from the post of amīr-i hājīb, and sent to his igtāʾ of Kara. 'Imād ud-Dīn Rayhān became the wakīl-i dar, and Muḥammad Junaidī was made the wazīr. Shahzāda Rukn ud-Dīn was appointed as the amīr-i hājīb, and was given the igtāʾ of Hansī on the transfer of Balban to Nagor. Shams-ud-Dīn of Bahraich replaced Minhāj as the chief qādī, and Arsalan Khān was assigned the igtāʾ of Multān, Uchch and Bhatinda, which had been held by the deputies of Shir Khān Sunqur.²

In 1254 A.D., Mahmūd resumed his military operations against the Hindu chiefs. According to Minhāj, success was attained at Bijnur

¹ T.N., p.217, Cf. P.Saran, 'Sultan Nasirud-Dīn Mahmūd the slave and his two ministers,' Journal of the U.P. Historical Society, Vol.XV, part II, p.74, says "Indeed it was Balban's supercilious behaviour with the Sultan which was responsible for his fall and disgrace."

² T.N., p.280, 217-8; Cf. T.A., Vol.1, p.75, Nizām ud-Dīn is wrong in saying that Malik 'Izz ud-Dīn Kashlu Khān became the amīr-i hājīb, on the dismissal of Balban.
and Bardar, but at Tanklabali, where the contest was probably more serious, a Muslim officer, Malik 'Izzud-Din Durmashi, lost his life.¹

That the Turks would soon resist the domination of the Indian wakil-i dar, was not unexpected. Minhaj tells us that the Turks and Tajiks, in 1254 A.D., became disgusted at the insolence and domination of the upstart eunuch, Rayhan, and organised themselves into a confederacy to effect his removal. As a result, Balban from Nagenj, Bat-Khan Aybek from Sanam, and Arsalan Khan from Bhatinda joined Jalal ud-Din, the brother of the king, at Bhatinda, with the intention of moving towards the capital.²

Nasir ud-Din Mahmud, showed no sign of yielding and moved out of Delhi to oppose the hostile maliks.

The rival forces confronted each other at a place between Kaithal and Hansi. Minhaj who is seldom kind to Rayhan, says that the latter prompted by personal interest, tried his best for an armed clash, but the intervention of sensible men from both sides prevented the conflict and brought about a settlement. The same authority says that as Rayhan was aware of the fact that the confederates of Jalal ud-Din would not accept anything less than his dismissal, he tried to foil the negotiation by plotting the assassination of the emissary of the opposite camp.

¹T.N., p.218.
²Ibid., p.219, Cf. P. Saran, op. cit., p.71, who rightly says, "The policies and actions of the Turkish nobility who were in power, were determined and moulded by a deep vanity, born of a feeling of superiority, natural to all conquerors over the conquered."
expecting that it would be retaliated by the murder of the Sultān's envoy. The plot was detected and Rayhān was ordered to proceed to his ļata' of Badāūn, from where after some time, he was transferred to Bahraich. 1 Jalāl ud-Dīn was appointed to the government of Lāhore, and Balban once again became the nā'īb-i mulk.

Balban's adversaries, who had thrived at his dismissal, now came under the axe of his retribution. In 1255 A.D. Qutlugh Khān, a strong supporter of Rayhān, was asked to go to the ļata' of Awadh, the reason given was his marriage with the queen-mother. 2 According to Minhāj, Quṭb ud-Dīn Hussain, who had perhaps discharged the duties of nā'īb-i mulk, was imprisoned and executed by the order of the king in 1255 A.D., because he had made some insolent remarks. 'Isāmī tells us that the latter was murdered in the court at the instigation of Balban, and when Mahmūd came out hearing the dying shrieks, he was told 'a thorn had been removed from the garden of the kingdom'. 3

A dangerous rival like Rayhān could hardly be allowed to live in peace; his destruction was inevitable. The tactics of playing one noble against another was employed. Although Rayhān was in physical possession of his ļata' of Bahraich, it was assigned to Tāj ud-Dīn Sanjār Shīhwistānī with instructions for its occupation at the cost of the former's expulsion.

1T.N., pp.301-3.
2T.N., p.220; Cf. T.A., Vol. I, p.76. Nizām ud-Dīn says that Mahmūd, being annoyed with his mother for her marriage with Qutlugh Khān, asked her to leave the capital and go to Awadh.
Qutluqh Khan, who held Awadh, came to the support of Rayhân, and succeeded in seizing and imprisoning Sanjar, who managed to escape; returning later with a small force, he encountered Rayhân and killed him in 1255 A.D.¹

Qutluqh's assistance to Rayhân was not overlooked, as soon after he was asked to relinquish Awadh and go to Bahraich; when he did not comply, a force was despatched under Malik Bak-Tamur for his expulsion. As Bak-Tamur was defeated and killed, Balban himself took the field against him, when, according to Minhâj, Qutluqh evaded a battle-engagement and retired. Balban then marched to Kalinjar where he plundered the Hindu tribes and returned to Delhi. As in the meantime Qutluqh had made an unsuccessful attempt to seize Kara-Manikpur, in 1257 A.D., the royal army was once again sent in pursuit of him, and it went as far as Sirmur hills where he had taken shelter. As Qutluqh, and also the Râna who had provided him asylum, fled on the approach of the Delhi army, Balban satisfied his vengeance by thoroughly plundering the territory.²

In 1256-57 A.D., Kashlu Khan the governor of Uchch and Multâh, renounced his loyalty to Delhi and acknowledged Mongol-overlordship. In 1257 A.D., on the secret invitation of the discontented people of Delhi, which included religious men, he also made an attempt in co-

¹ T.N., pp.220-304.
² Ibid., p.221; Cf. Tarîkh-i Mubarak Shâhi, p.37. Yahya is wrong in stating that an encounter took place in which Qutluqh and his followers were defeated.
operation with Qutlugh Khan to surprise the capital and capture the
throne, but on his arrival in the vicinity of Delhi he found the city
prepared for resistance and his supporters banished.¹

In 1257-58 A.D., Delhi came under the threat of a Mongol
invasion for which a vigilant body of troops had to be posted through¬
out the kingdom.² It was only in 1260 A.D. that the Delhi Sultanate
could feel free of the threat of foreign aggression when emissaries
from Khurasan conveyed Hulagu's message to Nasir ud-Din Mahmud,
that there would be no further Mongol raids on Hindustan.³

In 1260 A.D., when Hulagu's messengers were in the neigh¬
bourhood of Delhi, Balban decided to take punitive measures against
the Mewattis for their plundering activities in 1257-58 A.D. By a single
forced march he surprised the Mewattis and punished them with utmost
rigour. After continuous slaughter and destruction for twenty days, he
returned to the capital with immense booty and prisoners.⁴ The captured

¹ T.N., p.224.
² Ibid., pp.225,273; Cf. Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p.38. Yahya says that
at the end of 1257 A.D., a Mongol army arrived in the neighbourhood of
Uchch and Multan when Kashlu Khan made a common cause with them.
Mahmud collected an army to march against them, the Mongols on receiving
this news retired towards Khurasan.
³ T.N., p.322; Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p.38, Yahya is wrong in stating
that Mongol envoys visited Delhi in 1258, A.D.
⁴ T.N., p.315, Minhaj says that Balban rewarded his soldiers, one silver
tanka for bringing a head, and two for a live captive.
rebels with their two hundred and fifty leaders including Malka, were given condign punishment.

When those Mewattis who had managed to escape, after returning, reverted to their old practices, Balban again attacked them by surprise and according to Minhaj, brought twelve thousand of them under the sword.¹

The contemporary chronicler closes his account in 1260 A.D., and the gap till 1266 A.D. is inadequately touched upon by the later historians, some of whom say that Mahmud fell sick in 1265 A.D. and died on February 18, 1266 A.D.² However, they have no reliable information on this period.

¹ T.N., p. 323.
² T.A. Vol. I, p. 77. Nizām ud-Dīn says that Maḥmūd wrote two copies of the Qur‘ān every year, and spent the sale money on his food. As he had no attendant his wife used to cook food and one day she complained that her hand ached when she had to bake the bread. On requesting a slave-girl to assist her in work, Maḥmūd replied that the treasury was not his private property, and that she should remain patient to be rewarded on the day of judgment. Minhaj, however, does not mention any such thing regarding his patron; neither there any evidence in the activities of the Sultan to support such a statement.
CHAPTER IV

The Classes and Offices of the Nobility

During the thirteenth century the most important class in the official hierarchy of the Delhi Sultanate was the nobility. Having replaced the Hindu ruling class, they became the caretaker of the Sultanate's administration. Theoretically the nobles stood next to the Sultan but, in practice, they enjoyed a pivotal position around whom the whole administrative machinery revolved, and until the accession of Balban in 1266 A.D., they were more powerful than the the ruler himself. By being conquerors of the territory, they had established the right to monopolise all positions of importance and to be deemed the aristocracy of the Turkish Empire in India.\(^1\)

The Sultan conferred ranks on them to confirm their official status. The status of a noble usually changed with the accession of a ruler. As a king was more often installed with the support of a powerful faction of the nobility, he would, out of gratitude raise the status of his supporters, while those who held power in the previous reign disappeared automatically.\(^2\)

\(^1\) T.N., p.132, Mu'izzal-Din had remarked that after his death, his slaves would take care of his kingdom; Cf. Sir Wolseley Haig, *op. cit.*, p.62, who says "During the reign of Ilmish the leading Turks formed themselves into a 'College of Forty' and divided among themselves the great fiefs of the empire and all the highest offices in the state;" Cf. V.A. Smith, *Oxford History of India* (edition 1919), p.228, "He (Balban) refused to employ Hindu officials.

\(^2\) T.N., p.170. The phrases, Mu'izzal Amirs, Qutbi Amirs, Shamsi Amirs, etc. indicate that each group existed in the reign of a particular ruler.
Usually the highest rank held by a noble was that of Khan; the the maliks and amirs followed in descending order. All these indicated a military rank. The term amir, besides being a title, was also used as a general term applicable to any noble who held a civil or military office. Ranks like Ulugh Khan and Sipahsalar were rare. The title Sipahsalar was not exclusively meant for military personnel.

Besides the general title, special alqab, such as Niẓām ul mulk, 'Ayn ul mulk, Qiwām ul mulk, 'Imād ul mulk, Sadr-ī jahan etc. were also awarded to civil officials for recognized services. In view of the military character of the state, no officer was spared from taking an active part in war in time of need. A noble would also be distinguished by being conferred a special robe, a sword, a number of horses, and elephants and nauhat.

Usually a noble commenced his career either as a slave of the king or of some other noble and until such time as he could reach some

---

1 Barani, p.145. The ranks signify how the Turkish army was modelled under the Delhi Sultans - Ten horsemen should be put under one sarkhail; ten sar-khails under one sipahsalar, ten sipahsalar under one amir, ten amirs under one malik; ten maliks under one khan; and at least ten khans under the king. Barani's figure is purely imaginary, as the cavalry-strength of the king becomes on such reckoning one million; Cf. Otto Spies, op.cit., p.67, who says, In India the khan has under him 10,000 riders, the malik 1,000 the amir 100, and the sipahsalar less than that; Cf. H.H Howorth, History of the Mongols, part I pp.108-9, who says, under the Mongols the highest unit was 10,000 horsemen called 'tuman'.

2 T.N., p.170; Mihāj says, Sipahsalar 'All Isma'īl, the chief justice of Delhi, along with other Amirs invited Iltutmish from Badārūn.

3 T.N., pp.186-187; Barani, p.410; Cf. N.Manucci, Storia du Mogor, trans. W.Irvine, Vol.II, p.369; Manucci says "The king confers these names either as a mark of distinction and of the esteem he holds them in for reasons of their services, or else from friendship and liking."

4 Ta'īl u'll Ma'āthīr, I.O. 1486, f 55a; Cf. T.N., p.173; Niẓām ul mulk Junaidīr, the ważīr was given charge of the Bhakkar expedition.
position of importance he had to struggle for his existence. The important political offices which the nobles held were those of court officers and provincial governors. The high posts were usually the preserve of the khan and maliks. The posts held by the amirs, though relatively less important than those of the khan and maliks, nevertheless carried the prospect of attaining to a higher rank.

There was no fixed rule for awarding a position either at the court or in the provinces. It was at the pleasure of the king that a noble’s rank could increase or his privileges diminish and be brought to an end. Neither a noble’s title nor his office was hereditary. These could remain his possession during his life-time, but if the king desired the office could be revoked at any time.

A noble who enjoyed the confidence of the ruler was given an important office in the court and made to remain near him. For preserving the territorial integrity of the kingdom, a ruler usually posted either his son or one of his highly trusted nobles to the frontier provinces.

---

1 Sivasat nama, pp.109-110; Nizam al mulk prescribes a rigorous training of seven years for a slave before being given any position, and says, in no case should anyone be made an amir and posted to a province before the age of thirty five; W.H. Moreland, Agrarian System of Moslem India, p.217.

2 T.N., pp.231-324; Sivasatnama, pp.34-40. See the story of the army commander and Mushirwan the Just; Iletmish tried to observe some criterion in the promotion of his officers, although, at times, it was arbitrary.

3 T.N., p.226; The offices though not hereditary were quite often assigned to the heirs of the deceased. In 1259 A.D., when Shaikh u’l Islam Jamal ud-Din Bustami, Qadi Kabir ud-Din, and Aybek Kashi Khan died, their posts were given to their sons.

4 T.N., p.169; Qutbud-Din Aybek posted Iletmish, whom he called his son near the throne; Cf. P. Saran, Studies in Medieval Indian History, p.209, where it is said, Balban appointed "as wardens of the marches tried and experienced military hands such as his cousin Shir Khan Sunqur, the most distinguished warrior of the age, who had been since the time of Iletmish governor of Bhatinda, Bhatmir, Sanam and Sama which gave him control of the junction points of all the main routes from the west and the north western frontiers."
The contemporary accounts give little information about the total number of nobles during the Sultanate period. Minhaj has furnished the careers of twenty-five nobles and has, also, mentioned some others about whom nothing much has been said. Barani, also, does not give any definite figure. Amir Khusrau states that Mu'izz-ud-Din Kaiqubad possessed five thousand nobles, which seems to be an exaggeration. In any case, it appears that he had inherited them from his grandfather Ghīyāth ud-Dīn. Baiban, as he on his own part, was incapable of organizing such a large body of nobles, having devoted his short reign (1287-1290 A.D.) to revelry and dissipation. His ambitious Dādbak, Nizām ud-Dīn, was also not expected to let him build a band of supporters for himself as it would jeopardise his own position.

Minhaj and Barani both seem to lay much emphasis on heredity as the criterion of nobility but the fact remains that most of the Turks who had come to India with the first onrush of Muslim invasion were men of unknown origin. Speaking about the first generation of Turks in India, ʿHābīb says, "Coming from a Central Asian region of which few of them had the faintest recollection and to which none of them

---

1 T.N., pp.177-8; 206; 231-324; Cf. Barani, p.26; Amir Khusrau, Qiran us Sa’dain, p.27.
2 Barani, pp.156-164; Qiran us Sa’dain, pp.154,160; Bughra Khan while parting whispered to his son Kaiqubad to get rid of evil counsellors like Nizam ud-Din.
3 T.N., p.300; Turks of pure lineage and Tajiks of noble birth could not tolerate that ‘Imad ud-Dīn of the tribes of Hind should rule over (them) the high-born chiefs; Barani, p.29-30; Tarikh-i Fakhir ud-Dīn Mubarak Shah, p.36. The author, an ardent admirer of the Turks, says, "When in their own country they are merely a tribe among other tribes and enjoy no particular power or status."
hoped or wished to return, and with no childhood memories to sweeten their lives except what they remembered of the families of the slave-merchants who had brought them up they were the citizens of all lands and any land.  

During the early period, the nobles were composed of four groups: the Turks, the Tajiks, the Khaljis, and the Indians.

In the beginning of Muslim rule almost all nobles were of Turkish origin. Fakhr-i Mudabbir calls the Turks the proudest race in the world. This much is at least true, that the Turks considered themselves superior not only to the conquered people of India, but also to other non-Turks who had come to live and occupy eminent positions in the Sultanate. Being subordinate to one other than a Turk was considered as a great insult by them. The Raudat us-Safa says that Raqiya had appointed Jamal ud-Din yaqut, the Abyssinian, to lead the army against Altunlya, but he was killed by the Turks who were members of the army. Whatever be the real cause of the grudge against Jamal ud-Din, the leadership of the Abyssinian excited their animosity more against him.

2 T.N., p.124; Minhaj also uses the term 'Turk' in the sense of a nomadic group; In the Oabismama, pp.64-65, we read "A Turk has a large head, a broad face, narrow eyes, a flat nose and unpleasing lips and teeth. Regarded individually the features are not so handsome, yet the whole is handsome. Without any doubt what is fine in the Turks is present in a superlative degree, but so also what is ugly in them. They are brave, free from pretence, open in enmity and zealous in any task allotted to them. For the domestic establishment there is no better race."
3 Tarikh-i Fakhr ud-Din Mubarak Shah, p.37.
4 Mir Khwand, Raudat us Safa, Vol. IV, f.521h.
It was during the time of Caliph al-Muta'sim that the Turks came to dominate the political life of the Islamic world. The Turks had approached the western outskirts of India in the tenth century. Bosworth says, "The Ghaznavid army was a great stronghold of Turkish nationality and feeling, for a considerable proportion of it was Turkish." Their constant flow from Central Asia to the Islamic Empire in the East was in line with their penetrating into areas further east, and when opportunities were to be provided.

The adventurous spirit of the Turks on leaving their hearth and homes, which they usually did at an early age, gave them the opportunity to gain a place of distinction by showing their skill in the art of war. Gibbon says, "It is useless to praise the valour of a Turk." Another writer comments that renunciation of homes and relatives by the Turks was one of the processes of their becoming amirs and generals. To this may be added the zeal for their new religion where at least they were guaranteed social equality, irrespective of what their ancestors might have been. Fakhr-i-Mudabbir states that unlike other races the Turks have never apostatized.

2 *The Ghaznavids*, p. 56.
3 M. Ḥabīb, *op. cit.*, p. 99, says, "The Turkish slave aristocracy was never found wanting in the field of battle"; *The Ghaznavids*, p. 108, where it is said, "War was the obvious field in which to employ the Turks."
4 *Tarikh-i-Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shah*, p. 36, where it is said, "From the days of Adam till the present day no purchased slave has ever become a king, except the Turks."
This seems true, as the Turks owed their elevated status to their new religion which undoubtedly they would forfeit if they reverted to their original faith. Minhâj, also, conveys the impression that almost all Turks were converts. In the case of a noble named Badr ud-Dîn Sunqur Rûmî, he makes a significant statement 'being a Muslim he had become a slave.'

The hard life to which they had been accustomed from their early days had, it seems, dried their milk of human kindness. Instances such as the massacre of Tajiks and the inhuman punishment to servants furnish proof of their cruel nature.

Barâni calls the Turkish aristocracy of the days of Iltutmish as the Turkân-i-Chehlânî (The Forty Turks). It can by no means be assumed that the number of the nobles was restricted to the small figure of forty. It seems that the term Chehîânî was adopted by a militant group consisting of forty Turks who had resolved on resisting interference from the non-Turks in the affairs of government. Minhâj does not use the term at all.

The Tajiks—The term 'Tajik' does not apply to any race. In the general and sociological sense it is used to mean non-Turks.

According to D'Ohsson, 'the Mongols gave the name 'Tajiks'

---

1 T.N., p.254.
2 Barâni, p.40; Cf. T.N., p.183; In the Qabusnama, p.64; we read: The general faults of the Turks are that they are blunt-witted, ignorant, boastful, turbulent, discontented and without a sense of justice. Without any cause they will create trouble and utter foul language, and at night they are poor-hearted.
3 Barâni, p.28.
to Muhammadans and used it particularly for the non-Turks.  

Nizām ul mulk uses the term 'Tajik' for civil officials, the ahl-i galam. According to Minhāj, the 'Tajiks' were non-Turks but he does not include the Khaljīs and Indians in that category. Like Nizām ul mulk, he also means civil officials by the term Tajik. Bosworth says, the Persians used the term 'Tajik' in order to distinguish themselves from their Turkish rulers. Baranī does not expressly mention the word 'Tajik' but means them when he speaks of the free-born maliks and dignitaries who had adorned the reign of Iletmish. Ikrām says, "Tajiks are Persian speaking Turks who had migrated from Turkish homelands earlier and differed from the Turks in several national characteristics. The term Tajik was originally used for the Arabs, particularly the Arab conquerors of Central Asia. Later it was loosely used for the Persian speaking people of eastern Iran, Ghor and the adjacent territories, irrespective of their ethnic origins." From the accounts of Minhāj and Baranī, it appears that

1 Mirza Muḥammad Haldar Dughlat, Ṭarīkh-i-Rashidi, p. 85, (quoted by N. Elias)
2 Siyāsatnāma, p. 153.
3 T. N., p. 253, Minhāj says, on account of the favour shown to the Abyssianian all nobles, Turks, Ghoris and Tajiks were afflicted.
4 The Ghaznavids, p. 304, n. 37.
5 Baranī, p. 26; "muluk-i ahrār wa muʿārif-i ashraf ra ki pish-i takhl-i-Šamsāl namwar wa muʿtabir budand." (The free-born maliks and dignitaries, who were famous and respected before the Šamsāl throne.)
6 S. M. Ikrām, History of Muslim Civilisation, p. 59 and n. a.; A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and Peasant, p. 57, Tajik is used as a general term for a non-Turk.
Tajiks were emigrants from Central Asia who, on account of their rich administrative experience, were appointed to important civil posts, and who also held sway in the literary and intellectual fields. Their predominance in the administrative hierarchy made the Turks jealous and intent on their destruction.

**Khaljis** — Sir Wolseley Haig calls the Khaljis a Turkish tribe, who on account of having long settled in the hot region of Afghanistan had probably acquired Afghan manners and customs. Other scholars like Raverty, Barthold and Minorsky, also regard the Khaljis as Turkish in origin. Bosworth is of the view that the Khalaj Turks were the fragments of those Turkish peoples who had been brought from the north of the Oxus as part of the Ephthalite confederation and were left over in Eastern Afghanistan.  

Evidence exists about the presence of the Khaljis in the Helmund valley of Afghanistan during the ninth and tenth centuries.  

Barani clearly distinguishes the Khaljis from the Turks. He says as the Khaljis "belonged to a race different from the Turks, so he

---

1 Sir W. Haig, *op. cit.*, p. 92.
2 *Hudud al-‘alam*, Trans. by V. Minorsky, p. 348, who quotes a passage from the manuscript of Muḥammad b. Najīb, Bakram (†. 17) written circa A.D. 1200–20; "The Khalaj were a tribe of Turks who from the Khullukh limits migrated to Zābulistān. Among the districts of Ghazna there is a steppe where they reside. Then on account of the heat of the air their complexion has changed and tend all towards blackness, the language too has undergone alterations and become a different dialect. By mistake the people call the Khullukh Khalj."
4 *Sivasat nama*, p. 112. Mīrzā-ul mulk says that once Alptigīn deputed two hundred pages, which included Sebuktigīn to collect some money from the Khalaj Turks and Turkmans.
(jalāl ud-Dīn Khaljī) had no faith in them (the Turks), neither would the Turks recognize them (the Khaljīs) as belonging to their own group.  

Minhāj, also, does not identify the Khaljīs with the Turks. Describing the Tibet expedition, he says, Bakhtiyar Khaljī appointed two amīrs to guard the bridge, one was a Turk slave and the other a Khaljī.  

From the statement of Barani that the people of Delhi disliked the Khaljīs as they believed them to be of non-Turkish stock, it could be assumed that by the end of the thirteenth century the Khaljīs had lost their Turkish characteristics; as a result they were distinguished from the Turks.

The Khaljīs were also good warriors. In the army of Mu’izzal-Dīn, they were in substantial strength. In the first battle of Tarā’in (1191 A.D.) it was a young Khaljī who rescued Mu’izzal-Dīn from the battlefield and saved his life.

The Khaljīs were not slaves like the Turks. Muhammad Bakhtiyār Khaljī, the founder of Muslim rule in Bengal had come to Ghazna about 1196-97 A.D. in search of employment as a soldier in the army of Mu’izzal-Dīn, where being rejected, he proceeded to the court of Aybek at Delhi with the same intention. Here also on account of his short

---

1 Barani, pp.171-3; says, by the death of Kaiqubād the Turks lost their kingdom, which passed to the Khaljīs.


3 The Ghaznavids, p.36; K.R. Qanungoe, 'Race, parentage and dates of Muhammad Bakhtiyār Khaljī, History of Bengal, Vol. II, p.30. (University of Dacca publications), says, "It is therefore nearer the truth to call the Khaljīs Turkman or Tartar by ethnic origin."

4 T.N. (edited Chughtāi), p.34.
stature, ill-favoured appearance, long arms and being without the means to provide himself with a horse and a suit of armour he had to face disappointment. From Delhi he moved eastward to Badaun where Malik Hizbar ud-Dīn, the sipahsalar, offered him an appointment. After some time he joined the services of Husam ud-Dīn, the governor of Awadh, who assigned to him the territories of Bhagwat and Bhiūli for his maintenance. This helped him to carve out for himself the kingdom of Lakhnouti, the easternmost province of Delhi, which seemed independent in outward appearance, but remained an appanage of the Delhi Sultanate until 1210 A.D. After the death of Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek (1210 A.D.), the Khaljis declared themselves independent but the king of Delhi was unwilling to tolerate their sovereign status. Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Balka Khalji was the last independent king of Lakhnouti; he was defeated and killed by Iltumish in 1230-31 A.D.

The Khaljis rose to real power on the ruins of Balban’s dynasty, in 1290 A.D. when they brought to an end the domination of the Turkish aristocracy. Their ascendancy marked the turning point in the socio-political history of India. With the decline of the Turks, the long-awaited Indian Muslims fast established themselves on the political

---

2 T.N., pp. 159, 174, ‘Ali Mardan was the first Khalji to declare his sovereignty at Lakhnouti in 1210 A.D.; T.A., Vol. I, p. 53, where it is said that after the death of Qutb ud-Dīn, ‘Ali Mardan assumed the royal canopy, had the Khutbah read and sikka struck in his own name, and styled himself Sultan ‘Ala ud-Dīn.
scene. The Khalji reign though comprising only thirty years (1290-1320 A.D.) found the Muslim power at its zenith, when vast areas to the south of Vindya Range where no Muslim ruler had yet directed his arms, came to be conquered.¹

The Indians: — Since the days of Iletmish some of the Indian Muslims, evidently converts, had come to occupy important positions in the Delhi Sultanate, and even became nobles.² Barani states that Iletmish was meticulous in assigning posts to persons of high birth. Having discovered thirty-three men of obscure origin in his secretariat, he ordered their dismissal. On the instigation of Malik 'Izz ud-Dīn Salarî and Malik Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain Ghori, he also ordered an enquiry to be instituted into the parentage of his minister Nizām ul mulk Junaidī, who was found to belong to a weaver’s family.³ Iletmish would have hardly dared to dismiss thirty-three Turks, and neither 'Izz ud-Dīn Salarî nor Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain would suggest an investigation into the origin of a high official like the wazīr, if he came of the Turkish stock. Those who had come from central Asia under Mongol pressure were, according to Mīhāj, Barani and 'Isāmī, men of noble extraction, while the Khaljis had by now

¹ Barani, p.173. Barani says about Sultan Jalal ud-Dīn Khalji, the first Khalji ruler of Delhi in 1290 A.D. "He (Jalal ud-Dīn), out of fear of the citizens did not go to Delhi because the inhabitants of the city could not accept this change of dynasty in their heart of hearts. In the History of Muslim Civilisation, p.74, we read: "By the end of 'Ala ud-Dīn's reign converts like Malik Kafur were occupying the highest position in the state. Apparently the efforts of the Muslim missionaries and sufis had begun to bear fruit and a sizeable number of Muslim converts were available for the services of the state.

² T.N., p.177; In the reign of Iletmish, Mīhāj mentions an Indian noble name d Malik 'Izz ud-Dīn 'Ali Sialkoti.

clustered around their own chief at Lakhnouti. 1

It seems Iletmish had become apprehensive that the local elements would soon come to the forefront and rival the power of the Turks. His racial prejudices, therefore, urged him to make birth a pretext for curbing the growing strength of the Indian faction in the Court.

As Islam disapproved of any social distinction on the score of birth, such an attitude was most unexpected from a ruler like Iletmish, who had earned a high reputation for his saintly virtues. 2

In spite of being consistently suppressed by the Turkish aristocracy, the Indian Muslims came to the forefront in 1253 A.D., during the reign of Nasir ud-Din Mahmud, when the too powerful Balban with his entire body of supporters was ousted from the court and 'Imad ud-Din Rayhan, an Indian Muslim, for whom no amount of derogatory language by Minhaj could be sufficient, came to assume the control of affairs. 3 The policy of placing a new king on the throne with the

2 T.N., p.167; Fawa'id ul Fawa'id, op.cit., p.173, where it is said that Nizam ud-Din Auliya had once told his audience that Iletmish had found access to Shaikh Shihab ud-Din Suhrawardi and Shaikh Auhad ud-Din Kimani, and one of them had predicted that he would become a king.
advent of a new powerful faction was not continued by Rayhan which cost him his life, and also temporarily eclipsed the Indian influence.

The Indian Muslims were prominent in the reign of the Khaljis, and under the patronage of Muhammad Tughlaq they were sufficiently strong. In the reign of Firuz Tughlaq the Indian Muslims became the dominating force in the political scene.

It may be said that most of Barani's Fatwah-i-Jahandari (Decree on the rules of Government) is a lamentation on the rise of the Indians in the political sphere of the Delhi Sultanate.

The functions of the nobles may be divided into three broad categories: Court officials, Army officers, and Provincial governors.

The court served as a nursery to train men for higher offices. From this nursery the Sultan picked his officers and attached them to the court. When a responsible court officer forfeited the confidence of the king he was deprived of his office and transferred to his iqta aides if he commanded a following.

---

1 Barani, p. 503, 'Aziz Himar, whom Barani calls low born, was appointed by Muhammad Tughlaq to the governorship of Malwa and its dependencies.

2 Afif, pp. 400, 425-426. Khan-i Jahan Maqbul, a native of Telengana was the wazir of Firuz Tughlaq. About him the Sultan would often say: "Khan-i Jahan is the grand and magnificent king of Delhi." When Khan-i Jahan died, his son succeeded him in the same post.

3 T.N., pp. 194, 255; Although Mu'izz ud-Din Baham had himself detected Badr ud-Din Sunqur discussing his dethronement; on account of Sunqur's influence in the court, the king could not punish him more than by sending him forthwith to his iqta of Badaun.
As the Delhi Sultanate was organised on a military basis, every official, irrespective of the character of his assignment was required to be enrolled in the army list. Every person who came either with the invading army or joined the Turkish Conquerors of India as an adventurer formed a part of the Muslim soldiery. Thus the army of the Turkish rulers in India somewhat resembled the citizen-army of the early Islamic period when the entire Muslim population was required to take up arms at the hour of need.

The Sultan was the de facto commander-in-chief of the army but sometimes he appointed a deputy to assist him in his work. There is no direct reference to the various ranks of the army but some available evidence suggests the existence of a military hierarchy.

The army maintained at the capital, though usually small in number, was the rulers reserve force which he employed for putting down internal rebellions, repelling foreign invasions and, also, for relieving provincial governors when besieged by an aggressor with whom the local force had proved unable to cope.


2 T.N. p.187; In the reign of Raḥīya, Saif ud-Dīn Aybēk was appointed the naʿīb-i lashkur, and was given the title of Qutlugh Khan.

3 ʿAdab ul mulūk wa kifāyat ul mamlūk, I.O. 647, f82b. In the description of a military review by the Ḥalīld it is mentioned "Every soldier had an assigned place"; T.N., pp. 317-318. Minhāj says, two hundred thousand footmen and fifty thousand cavalry besides others, were arranged in order for receiving the Mongol emissary.

4 ʿAffī, p.298. In the reign of Fīrōz Tughlaq, eighty thousand soldiers were paid throughout the year; Barānī, p.55. Hulāgū described Balban's hunting excursions, in which the cavalry and infantry accompanied him, a pretext for exercising his troops in order to keep them fit.
It also avoided the risk of depending entirely on the army raised by the nobles and provincial governors for meeting an emergent situation. A strong army at the capital was an indispensable need in those turbulent days, when a slight pretext was enough for like-minded nobles to combine and march against the Sultān. Radīya felt herself helpless when she was besieged by four hostile provincial governors in 1236 A.D., and sought the aid of the governor of Awadh. She however succeeded in dealing with the situation with the assistance of the army that was directly under her control.

Minhāj leaves us in no doubt that Naṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd marched his forces from Delhi towards Sunām against Balban and other nobles in 1254 A.D., unaided by any provincial governor.

Balban had assigned the charge of the armed forces to his ṛawat-i-ʿard, and exalted his rank above other nobles. He thus emphasized the importance of the military organization in his kingdom. The ṛawat also responded to the wishes of the ruler by giving his undivided attention to the conditions of the soldiery.

1 Barānī, pp. 86, 508. For meeting a particular situation a Sultan would order emergency recruitment from the local people; against Tughrīl, Balban ordered a general levy at Awadh, when 200,000 men of all classes were enrolled; when Muhammad Tughlaq appointed Shaikh Muʾizz ud-Dīn as the naʿīb of Gujerāt, he ordered 300,000 tankas to be paid to the Shaikh to enable him to raise a thousand horse within two or three days, which would accompany the royal army against the rebels of Gujerāt.

2 T.N., p. 186.

3 T.N., p. 219.
His approach in dealing with the problems of the army was one of extreme kindness and affection. Barani says the rawat would call himself the guardian of the kingdom, whose duty was to spend day and night in providing comfort to the soldiers and in treating them better than his brothers and sons, failing which he would prove untrue to his salt and feel ashamed before God.

Pandey is of the opinion that the effort of Muslim rulers to keep their army efficient and strong did not meet with success. His view does not appear to be sound, when it is realised that one of the greatest conquerors of the world, Chengiz Khān, could not march into Delhi although he had approached as far as the Indus, and that subsequent Mongol invasions also bore no fruit. The stable military condition of India under the Turkish rule is indicated by the fact that in 1260 A.D., Hulāgū, who was stationed at 'Īraq, decided to seek the friendship of the Delhi Sultanate.

According to the Masālik ul Ahsār, the army of Muhammad Tughlaq, consisted of 900,000 horsemen, a figure that is open to

---

1 Baranī, pp. 115-116; Balban in his advice to his sons, time and again stressed the importance of the army, 'Kingship is not possible without justice, beneficence, pomp, army and treasury'. (Baranī, p. 77); 'Keep the army, subjects, and the merchants, happy and affluent'. (Baranī, p. 79); 'A king should be careful about regular payment of salaries to his soldiers'. (Baranī, p. 100); 'A king should know that on the maintenance of a large army depends the permanence and stability of his authority. The condition of the army should be reported daily to the king.' (Baranī, p. 102).

2 A.B. Pandey, Society and Government in Medieval India, p. 28; Cf P. Saran, Studies in Medieval Indian History, p. 210, who says, "During the reign of Kalqubad, there was another invasion under Tamar Khān of Ghazna, in which the Mughals (Mongols) carried rapine and plunder as far as Sāmāna but the well organized defence measures set up by the late Sultan (Balban), were still strong enough, and the Mughals were once more vanquished with terrible loss to their numbers".

3 T.N., p. 322.
question. Hypothetically the infantry should have been still more. That the Sultans of Delhi were always anxious to have a well-organised military potential, on account of the inherent dangers, cannot be denied.

At a period when means of fast communication were not developed it was difficult for the Central Government to exercise authority over the distant territories. In order to solve this problem, the kingdom was divided into a number of kutas, large and small; the large ones remaining administrative units under governors called mugta's, while the smaller ones were assigned to individual troopers to provide for their means of subsistence.

The assignment of ita's was no novel idea of the thirteenth century. R. Levy on the authority of Baladhuri says that grants of lands were made in the days of the earliest caliphs. Lambton states that the ita system emerged as a necessity during the 'Abbasid period when the citizen army was replaced by the mercenaries. The Buwayhids used to grant lands to their officers in lieu of pay. But they did not take any step to remove the

---

1 Masalik ul Abgar fi Mamalik ul Amsar, Quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. III, p.576, where it is said "The army of Muhammed Tughlaq consists of 900,000 horsemen, some of whom are stationed near the prince, and the rest are distributed in the various provinces of the empire".

2 T.N., pp. 231-324; cf 'Afif, pp. 296-297.


4 A.K.S. Lambton, Landlord and Peasant, pp.49-50, where it is said, "the rapid expansion of the Arab empire had put a certain strain upon its internal structure. By the tenth century A.D., this was becoming apparent in the breakdown of the lands of the eastern Caliphate. Some new basis had to be found to replace the gold economy. This basis was land"; M. Kabir, The Buwayhids, p.12.
abuses that had crept into the 

system since the eleventh century A.D.  

The Seljuqs, however, streamlined the assignment system. As they were not rich enough to pay their troops, in order to meet their financial obligations they made an extensive use of the system of grants. According to Barthold, it was the prosperous agricultural condition under the Samanids which enabled them to pay their troops in cash. The Ghaznavids, also, made cash payments to their army as their treasury had been replenished with the wealth of India. On the authority of Hieun Tsang, Ghoshal says, the system of granting assignments to the ministers of state and other officials in return for their services had existed in Ancient India.

Like the Seljuqs, who employed trained Turkish slaves and freed men for running the administration, the Turkish rulers in India, also entrusted the government of the various parts of the kingdom to members of the dominant group, chiefly the Turks, who

1 Lambton, op.cit. p.53, says "The Seljuqs regularized the position of the muqta' and brought order into the iqtā' system, which became the dominant feature in the field of land-tenure and land-revenue administration for many years to come."


3 Barthold, p.236; R. Levy, The Social Structure of Islam, pp. 374, 384, where it is said, under the Samanids, taxation was light, the government had stability, and the administration was well organized.

4 The Ghaznavids, pp.124, 125.

5 U.N. Ghoshal, Agrarian System in Ancient India, p.49.
came to be styled as muqta's or wālīs.

Scholars like Moreland, Qureshī and some others have tried to discover the distinctions between muqta' and wālī. Moreland on the authority of Abu yūsif calls wālī an Islamic term for a bureaucratic governor, and says he has not come across the terms muqta' or iqtā' in the early Islamic literature. He suggests that the term wālī and muqta' were perhaps used in India in the sense that a wālī had no obligation to maintain troops, while a muqta' was required to do so.

While rejecting the view of Qanūngoe that the term wilāyat was used for a distant province and iqtā' for one that was near the capital, as Barani indiscriminately uses the terms for any province whether near or far, he suggests that perhaps there was a minor difference in their position, such as in the accounts procedure of the Revenue Ministry. Qureshī is of the view that the wālī was higher in status than the muqta', as the former term was used for a governor with extraordinary powers while the latter was applied to any governor.

1 T.N., p.297; Barani, pp.82, 96; Lambton, op.cit., p.56
2 W.H. Moreland, the Agrarian System of Moslem India, p.222.
3 Ibid, pp. 221-222; Barani, pp.58, 584. Barani calls Bada un, which was near Delhi, wilāyat', and Multan, the western-most province, iqtā'.
4 Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.186.
As used in the *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri* and Barani’s *Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi*, the two terms *wall* and *muqta* are synonymous. Barani calls the governor of Lakhnouti *wall* and *amir*, while Minhaj uses the term *muqta* for the governor of the same territory.

Throughout the Sultanate period the governor of Lakhnouti seems to have enjoyed a privileged position in relation to the governors of other provinces. Evidently, Lakhnouti’s long distance and difficult communication with the capital obliged the ruler of Delhi to appoint a loyal and trustworthy noble to its charge. When Balban assigned the administration of Lakhnouti to his second son, Bughra Khan, he counselled him to give up his lewd practices, as it was an important province. “If on the day of judgment I am asked why the governorship of such a kingdom, and the kingship of such a distant territory was assigned to a debauchee, what could my answer be”. Barani calls Lakhnouti Bulghakpur (the abode of rebellion). The abundance of resources

1 Barani, pp. 82, 95-96; (The *Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi*, ed. by Shaikh ‘Abdur Rashid, p. 99, has *amir* instead of the *amir* of Bib. Indica series. Both terms, however, mean ‘governor’); cf. T.N., p. 242; A.M. Hussain, *The Rise and Fall of Muhammad bin Tughlag*, pp. 28, 29, n. 5; Dr. Hussain is of the opinion that the *muqta* was politically lower than or subordinate to the *wall*.

2 Barani, pp. 82, 93. Barani explains why Lakhnouti is called the ‘dwelling-place of rebellion’. “Since Mu’izz al-Din conquered Delhi, every governor of Lakhnouti has taken advantage of the difficulties and of the distance of the road to rebel. If they did not rebel themselves, others rebelled against them, killed them and seized the territory.”
which had made Lakhnouti independent of the central authority for its needs tempted its governor to throw off the yoke of Delhi.

A muqta' was appointed by the king, and he could dismiss or transfer him to another iqta' at his pleasure. Out of the twenty-five biographies of nobles furnished by Minhāj, almost all who rose to the rank of muqta' had to go through graduated stages.

As the office of muqta' carried immense responsibility it was the practice of the king to appoint men of experience and tested ability to the charge of administrative iqta's.

Minhāj says that Malik Naṣīr ud-Dīn Ayetmar was initially appointed sar-i iandār by Iltumish, and after sometime, on his rendering satisfactory service was assigned the iqta' of Lahore. Regarding another noble, 'Izz ud-Dīn Tughrīl Tughān Khan, he mentions that he served Iltumish in the capacity of sāqī-i-khas, dawāt-dār and chāshmīqīr, and it took him a long time to become the amīr-i-akhur, whereafter he was made the muqta' of Badaun.

Important provinces were usually assigned to the heir-apparent. The object was to cultivate in the prince a sense of

1 Barānī, pp.96-97; T.N., pp.217, 220. 'Imād ud-Dīn Raybān and Balban were transferred from one iqta' to another in quick succession.

2 W.H. Moreland, The Agrarian System of Moslem India, where it is said, p.218. "what we see is a royal household full of slaves, who could rise, by merit or favour, from servile duties to the charge of a province, or even of a kingdom.

3 T.N., pp.242.
responsibility and, also, to acquaint him with the problems of kingship. Iltamish had entrusted to the charge of his eldest son, Naṣīr ud-Dīn Māḥmūd, the frontier provinces of 1 Lahore (1217 A.D.) and Lakhnautī (1227-1228 A.D.). Balban had appointed his eldest son, Prince Muḥammad, popularly known as Khān-i-Shahīd (Martyr Prince) to the charge of Sūd with over-all command of the north-western frontier, and to his younger son, Bughrā Khān, he had assigned the frontier iqṭāʾs of Sāmāna and Sanām. Barani says the object of their appointment was achieved as, thereafter, they obtained several victories over the Mongols.

Although assignment of iqṭāʾs was the exclusive privilege of the Sultān, it seems that nobles of the court and muqtaʾs had implied authority from the ruler to assign lands or villages to their trusted men. Such assignments did not carry any administrative responsibility. When Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur became the amīr-i kāfība, he granted to Balban, who held the post of amīr-i akhur, the iqṭāʾ of Riwāʾi to the east of Delhi. 2

1 Tai-ul Maʾathir, I. O. 1486, f.248a; T.N., p.181.
2 Barani, pp. 80-81.
3 T.N., pp. 285, 295; Balban granted a village to Minhāj which yielded an income of thirty thousand lītals annually. From the language of Minhāj, "the gift (of thirty thousand lītals) comes annually to this sincere well-wisher," it is clear that there was no administrative obligation; Barani, p.80; Balban instructed his son Bughrā Khān to assign iqṭāʾs to trusted and loyal officers, 'Aṭīf, p.96. Firuz Tughlaq gave the grant a hereditary character. He allowed the iqṭāʾ-holders to bequeath their iqṭāʾs to their sons, near relations and even slaves.
Qutb ud-Din Aybek enumerated the following functions for the muqta’, when he appointed Malik ul Umara Husam ud-Din to the charge of Kol.

1) to demolish the idols of that region,
2) to enforce the laws and regulations of Islam,
3) to enhance the status of Ulama,
4) to be mindful of the welfare of the subjects,
5) to administer justice and protect the weak from being oppressed by the strong,
6) to maintain the efficiency of the army and to provide for the well-being of the troops,
7) to wage a holy war against the infidels and destroy them,
8) to guard the highways and punish the offenders; also, to maintain law and order in the province.

Iltimish’s instructions to his eldest son Nasir ud-Din Mahmud, when he was appointed governor of Lahore in 1212 A.D., hardly differ in details from that of Qutb ud-Din Aybek. Such directives provide only the ideal, as in practice the muqta’s functions were different. His main responsibility was to collect revenue from his territory, use the sanctioned expenditure for himself and for the maintenance of his troops, and remit

1 Talul Ma’athir, I.O., 1486, f.126b.
2 Talul Ma’athir, I.O., 1486, ff. 246.
the surplus to the royal court. He had complete authority to recruit his own contingent of troops and to appoint army officers for dealing with the local situation. When Balban appointed Bughra Khan as governor of Samana and Sanam he directed him to increase the allowances of the old soldiers and to enlist twice as many more new men. He was told to be particularly careful in the appointment of his army officers who should be competent to repel any Mongol aggression.

The system of the recruitment to the army by the nobles continued throughout the thirteenth century and even later. Minhaj says the Khaljis, hearing of the good fortune and affluence of Bakhtiyar Khalji, rallied around him and joined his army. Even in the days of 'Ala ud-Din Khalji when the army had become centralised and the soldiers remained in service throughout the year, being paid in cash, we are informed by Barani that the nobles possessed their own troops.

---

1 Siyasatnama, pp.32-4. Nizam ul mulk says the muqta's functions also included: keeping the people happy, the subjects light-burdened, not to oppress the weak, show respect to the learned, consort with the good, avoid the bad, and cause no harm to those who mind their own affairs; Barani, p.220 says, When 'Ala ud-Din Khalji was governor of Kara and Awadh, he requested Sultan Jalal ud-Din Khalji to postpone the demand for the surplus revenue (Jawadil).

2 Barani, pp.80,81.

3 T.N., ed. Chughtai, p.60.

4 Barani, p.328 says, In 1309 A.D. when Malik Kafur marched towards Warrangal, the maliks and amirs of Hindustan, with their cavalry and infantry joined him at Chanderi, where a review was held; T.N. p.273; where it is said, When Nusrat Khan Badr ud-Din Sunqur became the amir of Kol, he exercised authority over his army and subjects in a just manner.
It was necessary to keep sufficient force in the provinces as they assisted in the collection of revenue, and also in exercising authority over the Hindu chiefs and the local population. A muqta could on his own authority wage war with the independent Hindu rulers and extend his jurisdiction. Out of the spoils of victory the provincial governor was required to send a fifth share to the sovereign, which implied the permission of the ruler. Minhāj tells us that Melik Nusrat ud-Dīn was reinforced with contingents from other territories to make inroads into Kalinjar and Chanderī. In 1234 A.D. he ravaged these territories and the fifth share of the Sultan in fifty days came to twenty-five lakhs of jīdāls. The acquiescence of the ruler in the extension of territories by the muqta, had probably led a noble to conjecture that he had acquired right of conquest over the whole world. Minhāj gives an amusing story of a muqta. "Once a merchant who had become poor approached Āli Mardān, the governor of Lakhnoutī (1210-1211 A.D.), for financial help. The governor enquired the name of the country from which the merchant came; on being told that he belonged to Isfahān, the governor ordered the iqtā of Isfahān to be assigned to him. For fear of punishment no one could have the courage to tell him that Isfahān was not in his territory and if

1 Society and Government in Medieval India, p.11, where it is said, Even after the coming of the Turks to India, "they had to be busy waging a ceaseless war because Rajput nobles and rulers allowed them no peace, while the Hindu chiefs within the Turkish sphere of influence withheld taxes as long as superior military force was not applied".

2 T.N., p.240.
anyone said, so, he would retort, I will conquer it. ¹

The muqta's force was to remain in readiness for responding to the call of the sovereign. ² Non-compliance was tantamount to an act of rebellion for which the central authority when powerful, seldom hesitated to take punitive steps. ³

As a convention, a muqta was also required to bring presents when he visited the royal court which, perhaps, was once in a year. As such presents ensured the allegiance of the provincial governor to the sovereign, evidence exists that rulers insisted on their muqta's to be regular in sending presents. After crushing Tughril's rebellion at Lakhnouti, Balban appointed Bughra Khan to its governorship, and he advised him to send presents from time to time to Delhi which should include some elephants. ⁴ Firuz Tughlaq made an innovation in the system by allowing his muqta's to deduct the value of their presents from the revenue payable to the royal treasury. ⁵

Besides the administrative iqta's, the other type of iqta's prevalent in the Seljuq period correspond somewhat with the Indian type. The practise of assigning iqta's to members of the royal family

¹ T. N., pp.159-160; Khwand Amir, Habib u.s Siyar, B.M., Add.27, 237, Vol II. f. 477b, says "Ali Mardan was reputed for his lunacy." ²Lambton, op. cit., p. 62. The author is of the view that during the Seljuq period the holder of an iqta was obliged to furnish the sovereign with military contingents, in return for the money he received from the areas granted to him. ³T. N., pp.311, 312. Nasir ud-Din Mahmud had to march against two nobles, Arsalan Khan and Mas'ud Jan, for not assisting him with their troops against the Mongols. ⁴Baranī. p. 96. ⁵Affīf, pp.340-1.
without being given any specific responsibility does not seem to have existed in India. Hetmîsh’s sons, who had been given iqṭā’s, were governors of their respective provinces. Sultan Naṣīr ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, who had held the iqṭā’ of Bahraich at the age of fifteen, was also responsible for its administration. After Balban was dismissed from the governorship of Hansî, Prince Rukn ud-Dīn, whose relationship with the royal family is unknown, was assigned that territory with the post of amīr-i ḥālib.¹

Military iqṭā’s were assigned to members of the standing army who were directly under the Sultan. They were entitled only to the produce of the iqṭā’ so long as they remained in service.²

High officials, who were permanently stationed at the court were assigned extensive iqṭā’s which they administered through their representatives.³ It was an old custom. In the ‘Abbasid period, Bāyakbāk (Babakyl) had been assigned a large tract of Egypt as his iqṭā’, but as he lived at Baghdad he managed his estates through his agents, one of whom was Ahmad ibn Tulũn. ⁴

¹Lambton, op. cit., p.61; T.N., p.217.
²Lambton, op. cit., p.63, says, “military grants were made for services actually being rendered at the time." Cf. Elphinstone, History of India, p.61, who says, “Such (military) grants originate in the convenience of giving an assignment on a district near the station of the troops, instead of an order on the treasury, a mode of transfer particularly adapted to a country where the revenue is paid in kind."; Bareκ, p.62, says, Balban ordered the grants of the old and infirm troopers who had become unfit for service to be withdrawn and granted them a monthly allowance of forty to fifty tankas for their maintenance.
³T.N., pp.214,286,285. Balban had been assigned the iqṭā’ of Hansî. The income of one of its villages was 30,000 īṭāls annually; Lambton, op. cit. p.63; Elphinstone, History of India, p.84.
During the reign of the Seljuq ruler Malik Shah, iqta’s were assigned throughout the country to provide for the need of the army on campaigns. In India, as the army was often on the march, the existence of such an arrangement is quite probable.

Iqta’s were also granted as personal estates which were usually gifts for some faithful service. Men of letters and holy men were granted lands of the nature of personal estates, in order to provide means for their subsistence.

The muqta’ was allowed independence in his internal administration, but his financial transactions were subject to the control of the Treasury.

With the chaos prevailing after the death of Iletmish, when every of muqta’ considered himself equal to the ruler, as being the same stock, it is doubtful if the Treasury could have exercised effective authority over the provincial governors. Minhaj informs us that in the year 1236 A.D. Ghivath ud-Din the governor of Awadh, seized the revenues of Lakhnout, which were being sent to the capital. It is not known whether the Ministry could take effective steps for the recovery of the seized revenue.

1 Lambton, op. cit., p. 64.
2 Barani, p. 62. The two thousand Shamsi iqta ‘dars, whose grants Balban had ordered to be confiscated, claimed that they had been given those lands by Iletmish as rewards for their meritorious services; Lambton, op. cit., p. 64. The author is of the opinion that personal iqta’s were usually granted on a life-long or hereditary tenure, but, like other gifts, they were perhaps according to Islamic law revocable during the lifetime of the grantee; ’Ala ud-Din Khalji ordered that all villages, whether held by proprietary right, as free gifts, or as religious endowments should be brought back under the exchequer. (Barani, p. 283.)
3 Barani, p. 67. Prince Muhammad, the son of Balban, entreated Shaikh Uthman, a religious divine, to stay at Multan, where he offered to build (continued on next page)
The activities of the nobles during the period 1210-1266 A.D. may be divided into two distinct phases. In the first phase 1210-1236 A.D., Iletmish by his wise administration prevented the nobles from causing political upheaval in the kingdom, but from 1236-1266, for want of an effective leader, unrestrained ambition plunged the country into utter confusion.

In the early part of the thirteenth century, the nobles who were soldiers as well as statesmen were the real backbone of the kingdom.1 Living among an overwhelming Hindu population, they had to maintain perforce a separate existence. Their powers had begun to develop from the time of Mu'izzal-Dīn. There were efficient persons both for the administration and for the battlefield. The contemporary chronicler Ḥasan Nizāmī, tells us that Amīr Sabiq ul Mulk Nasīr ud-Dīn was superior to his contemporaries in the knowledge of political administration, and that his resolution and courage were celebrated throughout.

(continued from previous page)
3 a hospice for him and, also, grant villages for its maintenance, but the saint did not agree.
4 'Affī, pp. 414, 415. When 'Ayn ul mulk was appointed governor of Multan, he requested Firuz Tughlaq to be allowed to submit his accounts to the throne and not to the Treasury.
8 T.N., p. 183.

1 Barani, p. 137. In recognition of the importance of the nobles, Baranī attributes the following remarks to Iletmish: “How shall I thank God who has given me such noble courtiers, who are a thousand times better than myself. Each time in accordance with imperial custom, they pass before me and behind, and raise their hands in salutation, and stand before me in Darbār, their greatness and nobility make me ashamed of myself, and I feel like coming down from the throne to kiss their hands and feet.” Tripathi, Some aspects of Muslim Administration, p. 28. Tripathi thinks that this attitude of Iletmish towards the nobles was not hypocrisy, as the position of a sovereign ruler in those days was not more than an exalted peer.
Regarding Bahā ud-Dīn Tughril, who was placed in the charge of Thangir, the same author says, that he was acquainted with both matters of administration and the art of organising an army on the battlefield. ¹

'Tisami says that Fakhr ul mulk 'Isami, who had held for thirty years with distinction the post of a minister at Baghdad, came and joined Iletmish's court. The king himself went some stages to receive the distinguished minister when he was approaching Delhi. ²

The name of Shīr Kān Sunqur was proverbial in those days for bravery and courage. Baranī praising his valour says, "he was a highly celebrated Kān, who for thirty years after the death of Iletmish had stood like a rock against Mongol incursions." ³ Muhammad Bakhtīyar Khaljī was also a warrior of unshakable courage, but his last days were clouded. ⁴ That there was no dearth of brave and skilled fighting men in the thirteenth century is demonstrated by the establishment of the Delhi Sultanate itself. ⁵

¹ Ta‘lul Ma‘āthir, i.o. 1486, ff. 70b, 144a.
² 'Isāmī, pp. 122-123.
³ Baranī, p. 65
⁵ K. A. Nizāmī, Religion and Politics in India during the thirteenth Century, p. 132, n. 2. Comparing the nobles of the 13th and 18th centuries, Nizami says, "But there was a world of difference between the character and activities of the nobility during the thirteenth and eighteenth centuries. The conflict in the 18th century was due to the lack of really gifted men to shoulder the burden of the administration. In the 13th century it was the other way round. It was not the dearth of talent but its abundance which led to constant conflicts and strifes;" A. L. Basham, Politics and Society in India, p. 14, says "The Turks in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries repeated on an even larger scale the feats of the Yavanas, Sakas, Kushanas and Hunas of earlier times, and drove Hindu society even further back upon itself."
Once settled as conquerors the nobles, individually and in groups, began to pull the strings of administration in the direction which served their interest most. Clash of interests among the nobles inevitably led to bitter rivalry. The reply of Mu'izz al-Din to a slave, that he possessed thousands of sons in his slaves who would take care of his kingdom after his death, was a clear indication of the role the slaves were to play in the newly established kingdom of India. As desired by him, they soon became the be-all and end-all of his kingdom and divided the important offices among themselves. All ranks in the army, almost all key political posts, central and provincial, were firmly in their grip. The free nobility, i.e. non-Turks, were appointed in purely administrative offices, such as wazirs, revenue officials and clerks.

Iletmish had experienced the hostility of the Mu'izzi Amirs at his accession and in order to avoid its repetition, he built a nucleus of his own slave-aristocracy for the preservation of his dynasty after him. These slaves he treated with great tact and wisdom. He allowed

---

1 T.N., pp 131-132; Sir George Dumbar, Rt, A history of India, p. 98, where it is said, "The highest authorities in the administration were the Muhammedan holders of military fiefs."

2 M. Habib, Introduction to History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol. II, p. 97.
his provincial governors independence in their internal administration but never relaxed his control over them. He treated them like bureaucratic officers, regarding them for good services and punishing them for their faults. 1 Malik Nasir u'd-Din, the governor of Lahore, had assisted Iletmish in 1228 A.D., in capturing Sind, Uchch and Multan which were held by Qubach. When Iletmish returned to the capital he rewarded Ayetmar's services by assigning to him an extensive iqtas, which consisted of Siwalik, Ajmir, Lawa, Kasili and Sambal, the territories to the south of Delhi, and, also, conferred on him an elephant to distinguish him from the other nobles. 2

During the Chandwar expedition, Qamr u'd-Din Qiran Tamur Khan had captured Laddah, the son of the Raja, and brought him as a captive to Iletmish. The Sultan praised his performance, and soon

---

1 W.H. Moreland, The Agrarian System of Moslem India, pp 217-218; says, "Shams u'd-Din Iletmish the second effective king of Delhi, who had himself been the property of the first king, bought foreign slaves in great numbers, employed them in his household, and promoted them according to the judgement of their capacities, to the highest positions in the kingdom." Cf. Sir G. Dunbar, op.cit., pp 100-101 who says, the Moslem rulers found these able servants excellent advisers, gave them the highest posts, and at times rewarded them by marriage with their daughters"; Cf Siyasatnama, pp 137, 131, where it is said "Whenever any servant does a praiseworthy act he should at once receive some appreciation and when one commits an offence unnecessarily and not by accident, he should be punished according to the seriousness of his transgressions, as it would make others more diligent in their work, and the guilty ones more afraid." "If a high official makes a mistake he should not be publicly censured; rather, at first his offence should be overlooked, but later, he may be called and told that his mistake has been pardoned, in order to make him more careful in future."

2 T.N., pp 236, 237; Mithaj says that Saif u'd-Din Aybak on rendering approved services was gradually transferred from small iqtas to bigger ones. When he became the mugta of Lakhnouti, he was conferred the title of Yughantat.
after made him the nā'ib-i amīr-i ākhur. When the vacancy of the amīr-i-ākhur occurred he was promoted to that post. 1

Regarding Malik Ta'īd-Dīn Sanjar Tīz Khān, a slave of Iletmish, Minhāj says, he was energetic, manly, sagacious, intelligent, and endowed with many other excellent qualities. He was also famed for his valour and military talents, and possessed an amiable disposition. Possessed of all these qualities he was not assigned any office by Iletmish. It seems he had not come up to the criterion of the king. The first office that he held was that of the amīr-i-ākhur, in the reign of Mu'īzz u'd-Dīn Bahāram. 2

The chronic delinquent Kabīr Khān was granted titles and important lāta's so long he rendered commendable services. But when he was found guilty of some offence, which Minhāj does not disclose, Iletmish did not fail to punish him by transferring him from the administrative lātā of Multān to the small territory of Pulwāl, which was simply meant to provide him with a bare-means of subsistence. 3

Iletmish showed no consideration for the high social status of his compatriot 'Alā u'd-Dīn Jānī when he removed him from the governorship of Lakhnūtī. 4

---

1 T.N., p.248.
2 T.N., p.260.
3 Ibid, p.234; Minhāj says, "after two or four years Kabīr Khān was recalled from Multān to the capital and assigned Pulwāl for his maintenance.
Lakhnauti had been allowed some degree of independence since the days of Qutb u'd-Dīn. But when after his death, the Khaljī chiefs, one after another, repudiated Delhi's authority and assumed sovereign status, Iletmīsh marched against them as he would have done against the Hindu chiefs, and after defeating them in battle he showed no mercy in killing the rebel leader and his supporters. ¹

As Iletmīsh had fully vindicated royal authority, the nobles had to turn towards him, even for small favours. ²

With the death of Iletmīsh, respect for royal authority vanished from the hearts of the nobles. From the days of Mu'izz al-Dīn the king had controlled the nobles, but now the table was turned. Baranī alleges that the incompetent descendants of Iletmīsh were responsible for the situation but this is not wholly justified. The rejection of Iletmīsh's nomination, and the accession of Rukn u'd-Dīn, was the first blow struck by the nobility to the authority of the Sultan.

¹ T.N., p.174; G. Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, Vol.IV, p.141, who says, in Ancient Persia, sentences of extreme rigour were passed upon rebels found to have been most in fault. The ordinary punishments were crucifixion or impalement of some sort; the least penalty being removal of the rebels en masse from their own country to some remote place.
² T.N., p.237, Saif ud-Dīn Aybek appealed to Iletmīsh to be allotted some other office as temperamentally he was unsuited for the post of sār-i īlāndār.
Since they became supreme, 1 From now on commenced a trial of strength among the nobles themselves.

The frivolous allegations against Rukn u'd-Dīn, of squandering public money, encouraging musicians, buffoons and eunuchs, became a pretext for the governors of Badaun, Multān, Šansī and Lāhore, to march to Delhi in order to punish the Sultān, leaving the frontier territories exposed to foreign aggression. 2 As was to be expected, Hasan Qarlūgh the agent of Jalāl u'd-Dīn Khwārazm Shāh at Banīyān, marched with an army to Ḥich with an eye on Multān; luckily Saif u'd-Dīn Aybek the governor of Ḥich proved more than a match for him. 3

Even this situation could not make the governors of the frontier provinces of Lāhore and Multān return to their administrative charge. Instead, they kept on marching to Delhi with two other

---

1 Sir George Dunbar, Bt. op. cit. p.101, says, "But while Iltumish was establishing his rule from the Indus to the mouths of the Ganges, a power (the Turkish slaves) was rising in his own capital which was to master his successors."

2 Barani, p.26, says, "On account of the inability of the sons of Iltumish and the dominance of the Shamsī slaves the kingdom was without a ruler and everybody had become his own master."; Cf. Sir Wolseley Haig, op. cit. p.62 who says, "The commanding genius of Iltumish preserved the royal dignity intact, but in the reigns of his children the power of the "Forty" was increasing."

3 T.N., p.173; Elphinstone, History of India, p.378; Musakh-i-Ishār-Ābā Or. 141, f117a.
governors and the waṣīr Ḫunaḏī in order to depose Raḍḥya, who had now replaced Ruḵn u’d-Dīn, against whom they had no ostensible cause for complaint. Raḍḥya met the situation through her sheer intelligence, and rewarded Kabīr Khān by assigning the irtīsā' of Lahore with its dependencies for deserting his confederate and joining her. This royal favour, also, could not check his restless ambition from revolting against Raḍḥya in 1240 A.D. Although he was then reduced to submission, he did not scruple to throw off Delhi’s yoke and assume sovereignty in 1242 A.D., when the Mongols were battering Lahore, and the condition of the infant state was extremely critical.

Ilṣmī史上最 had been careful in preventing the nobles from developing any personal interest in the throne. This, broadly speaking, had kept his reign free from overt factionalism within the nobility, inspite of the fact that they were composed of diverse ethnical elements. A tendency towards factionalism among the

1 T.N. p. 187; Elphinstone, op. cit.; pp 375-376 who says, "of the two separate factions which had concurred in dethroning her (Raḍḥya’s) brother, one was opposed to the elevation of the Sultaṇa. The waṣīr of the last two kings was at the head of the latter faction and they were strong enough to appear before Delhi and to defeat the army that was coming to its relief. But the queen’s arts were more effective than her arms. She succeeded so well in growing dissension among her enemies that the whole confederacy dissolved and left the individuals composing it at her mercy."

2 T.N., p. 393.

3 K.A. Niṣāmī, Religion and Politics in India during the thirteenth century p. 135 Niṣāmī says, "Ilṣmī史上最’s vigilance and political adroitness, however, kept the nobles tightly under his control. His death (April 30, 1236) was a signal for the nobles to start a mad race for political power."
nobles became visible towards the close of his reign, upon the question of succession. Out of his many children, the interest of two, Rukn u'd-Dīn and Raḍīya, was chiefly centred in the throne. Therefore, immediately after his death, the formation of groups with vested interest was the inevitable outcome of the struggle between the rival candidates for wearing the crown. In fact, the many children of Iltumish became excellent pretexts for the various factions to take sides with each prince and manoeuvre to positions of advantage.

The promises to individual nobles by each contestant for the throne, and, also, the preference of a noble for a particular prospect, doubtless became the basis on which the nobles organized themselves into different groups. As an evidence of this, we find that with every new ruler a new set of officials appeared.

Minhāj says, Rukn ud-Dīn was the choice of the provincial governors and elders of the kingdom, and the people, also, had their eye

---

1 Barani, pp.132-133. Dadbhak Nizām u'd-Dīn, thus expressed his fear to Sulṭān Mu'tizz u'd-Dīn Kaiqubad against Kai Khusrān, whom he considered a formidable competitor for kingship. "Kai Khusrān is your rival in the empire, he is distinguished by kingly qualities, and there is an inclination on the part of the maliks to his side. They know he is the rightful heir to Emperor Balban, and if a few of Balban's maliks stand by him, it will not take a day to thrust you aside and place him on the throne of Delhi."

2 Barani, p.149. The author attributes these words to Bughra Khan during his interview with Mu'tizz ud-Dīn Kaiqubad, "Ever since I was informed that you were putting to death some chosen officers and faithful men of my father, which undoubtedly has alienated you from the loyalty of the rest, a picture of your destruction has been forming in my mind.

---

Tarikh-i-MubarakShāhī, p.71, where it is said that 'Ala u'd-Dīn Khalji conferred suitable posts and titles on his supporters when he ascended the throne.
on him. The 'people' of Minhâj were probably those men of the court whom Rukn ud-Din had won over to his side, as he knew his father's weakness for Radiya, on account of her competence. The author of Tabagat-i-Nasiri does not provide the names of Rukn ud-Din's supporters, but it is more than probable that among others there were Kabir Khan and 'Ala ud-Din Janî, the two malcontents of the reign of Iltumish, who must have thought that disregarding the late Sultan's nomination was an adequate revenge for being deprived of their administrative charges.

Rukn ud-Din on his enthronement, assigned Multan to Kabir Khan and Lahore to 'Ala ud-Din Janî, but this bribe did not prevent them from rising against their benefactor within six months.¹

Minhâj alleges that Radiya's intimacy with the Abyssinian Jamâl ud-Din Ya'qût had made the maliks and Turk amîras jealous, and when she gave up the female dress and Pardah, and donned the male dress and cap, and appeared before the people who would have a good look at her when she mounted the elephant, they became more incensed.²

Minhâj's statement is questionable, as, according to Firishta, Radiya had exercised royal authority in the absence of her father, when he had

¹ T.N. pp.182-183.
² Ibid., p.188; S.R. Sharma, The Crescent in India, p.95; The author says that Radiya's successful administration soon set up her rivals against her, especially "The Forty" who were a powerful body of Turkish slaves at the Court. 'Isâmi, pp 128-131; 'Isâmi insinuates impropriety in her behaviour with the Abyssinian Jamâl ud-Din ya'qût.; Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit. p.59; He rejects the allegations against her moral character and says, "the mere advancement of an African was sufficient to excite the jealousy of the Turkish nobles."
been on the Gwaliyur expedition.\footnote{\textit{Tarikh-i Firishta}, p. 118, \textit{Vol. I.}} Evidently, she had not discharged royal functions in the Muslim veil, nor did she screen herself from the public gaze when she pitched her pavilion on the banks of the Jumna to encounter the hostile maliks in 1236 A.D.

The real fact appears to be that Ikhtiyar ud-Din Aytagin, the amir-i hālib, could not overshadow the Abyssinian amir-i ākhur, and that Radiya refused to yield to any pressure of the amir-i hālib, which became her real offence. By wearing the male dress she meant to give weight to the kingly responsibilities which she had been discharging. In trying to assert royal authority, she lost the throne and, also, her life.

The accession of Mu'izz ud-Din Bahram was a triumph for Ikhtiyar ud-Din's faction, as the new Sultan agreed to remain a shaddw figure, allowing the nobles to exercise sovereign power at least for a year.\footnote{S. M. Ikram, \textit{History of Muslim Civilization}, p. 161. According to Ikram, this experiment did not basically differ from the contemporary attempts of the English barons, which contained immense possibilities of constitution progress. In Delhi it proved a failure for which the nālib-i mulk, nominated by the nobles was solely responsible; \textit{T.N.}, pp 192, 253.} But the success was short-lived. Ikhtiyar ud-Din, who had become the nālib-i mulk and Muhabdhab ud-Din the wazir, were now the chief pillars of the administration, and were attacked by assassins at the White Palace after a religious discourse. The former at once succumbed to his injuries, but the latter escaped with two wounds.\footnote{T. N. p. 254; \textit{T.A.}, Vol. I, p. 68.}
That the king was not the sole author of the assassination plot, and that there were other powerful hands behind it, may be gathered from a passage of the Tabagat-i Nasiri, and also from the fact that there was no protest when the leader of the powerful faction that had overthrown Raqiya had been assassinated.

After the murder of Aytigin, his two supporters, 'Izz ud-Din Salari, and the vacillating Qaraqash, the governor of Lahore, returned from the Court and joined Altuniya, who had by now married Raqiya and was marching with an army to Delhi to wrest the throne from Mu'izz ud-Din Bahram. How Qaraqash after the defeat and death of his confederates, Altuniya and Raqiya, still retained the governorship of Lahore is not known. His performance at Lahore was far from satisfactory. There he not only failed to win the confidence of the people, but also acted in a craven-hearted manner by stealthily leaving the city at night when the Mongols attacked it in December 1241 A.D. As a result, first the Mongols and then the Hindus subjected the defenceless city to thorough devastation.

1 T.N., p. 254; Minhaj thus describes the assassination of Aytigin: After the religious discourse, Sipah Salar Ahmed Sa'id came secretly to the Sultan and made some representation; upon which intoxicating drinks were given to several Turks, who on becoming intoxicated came down from the Qasr-i-safed (White Palace) at the direction of the king and stabbed Ikhtiyar ud-Din Aytigin to death.

2 T.A., Vol. I, p. 68; where it is said that Malik TigIn on both occasions marched against Raqiya and defeated her; T.N., pp. 190, 255; Minhaj mentions only one encounter with Raqiya, when Badr ud-Din Sunqur, the amir-i hadib performed distinguished services; 'Isami, pp. 134-6; says that on both occasions Bahram entrusted the command of the army to Balban-i khurd (junior Balban); Minhaj clearly says that the king led the army, and is undoubtedly a more reliable authority as he was an eye-witness to it.

3 T.N., pp. 393-5; Minhaj says that the Mongols used catapults to destroy Lahore.
Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn’s successor, Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur, on being appointed amīr-i hājīb adopted a dictatorial attitude. He ignored both the wazīr and the Sultān and issued his own orders. He even conspired to dethrone Mu’izz ud-Dīn, and place a brother of the latter on the throne. But he could not play the game with skill and perfection, as he confided his plan to wazīr Muhadhdhab ud-Dīn who was a camp follower of the late Aytigīn, and to whom he had also given good cause to be his sworn enemy. The wazīr disclosed the whole plot to the Sultān through an agent. Bahram himself raided the scene of the conspiracy and discovered Sunqur hatching the plot. It cost Sunqur, first his office and afterwards his life. Jalālud-Dīn Musawī, his accomplice, in the conspiracy, also, shared the same fate.

Bahram had so far played his trump cards successfully. But when the Mongols advanced on Lahore in 1241 A.D. and the city was left defenceless by its governor, Bahram despatched an army from the capital against the Mongols, entrusting the charge to Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain, along with the wazīr and other maliks and amīrs.

After the incident of Sunqur it seems the Sultān had begun to consider Muhadhdhab ud-Dīn his well-wisher. But the wazīr was hardly sincere, as he nursed a grudge since the day he was stabbed. In order to have his revenge on the Sultān, he sent a note to him from

2 Ibid., p.195.
the bank of the Beas asking for an edict to destroy the amīrs and Turks who would never become obedient. Minhāj says that Mu'izzud-Dīn, in haste and out of childishness, despatched the desired order, which, as was expected, the wazīr showed to the amīrs and Turks.

The army officers, instead of being frightened, considered revenge on the king as their prime concern. Leaving Lahore to its fate, they returned to the capital. Lahore was devastated but Muḥadhdhab ud-Dīn gained his satisfaction in that he had outwitted and avenged the Sultan. 1

After the capture of Mu'izz ud-Dīn, the nobles who had become masters of the destiny of Iltīmish's descendants, according to Minhāj consented to bring out from confinement three princes, 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd, Jalāl ud-Dīn and Naṣīr ud-Dīn Maḥmūd. 2

They chose 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd, the son of Rukn ud-Dīn Fīrūz, as king, in preference to the sons of Iltīmish. The appointment of Qūṭb ud-Dīn Hussain of Ghor as the na'īb-i mulk of the new king indicates that Muḥadhdhab ud-Dīn had consolidated his authority as wazīr, with the support of the non-Turks. To have a firm grip on the

1 T.A., Vol. I, p. 70, where it is said that the wazīr, out of treachery and deceit wrote to the Sultan, "Nothing could be achieved from the body of treacherous men sent with him and that the disturbance would not be quelled unless the Sultan should himself march to that part of the country."; T.N., pp. 196-7, Minhāj says, "be ishrāt-i Khwaja Muḥadhhab ud-Dīn bar ikhraj wa'azl-i-Sultan bay'at kardand" (On the instigation of Khwaja Muḥadhhab ud-Dīn they pledged to expel and punish the Sultan); Tarikh-i Mubarak Shāhi, p. 31.

2 T.N., p. 197.
administration, elimination of the Turks from key posts was the natural course of his policy. But it seems he acted in a tactless manner which offended the general body of Turks and ended in his murder. ¹

It appears that Qaraqash Khan and Ikhtiyar ud-Din Yuzbak Tughril Khan resorted to treachery to bring about Mu'izz ud-Din's destruction. They were evidently suspected as such by Mu'izz ud-Din and his faithful adviser, Mubarak Shah Furrukhi, the farrash, for when they came to offer their aid to the king against the maliks and amirs who had besieged Delhi, they were cast into prison. That the suspicion was not ill-founded is confirmed by the appointment of Qaraqash as the amir-i hālib in the reign of Mu'izz ud-Din's successor.²

Minhāj does not mention why Qaraqash within six months was removed from the post of amir-i hālib, and transferred first to the kātal of Beyana and later to Kara. That a new faction was on the way to seizing power in the administration is indicated by the removal of Qaraqash and the murder of Muhadhdhab ud-Din.

Balban, who succeeded Qaraqash in the post of amir-i hālib was the leader of the new faction.³ In order to assert its authority this faction employed every means to remove its former rivals. Minhāj has tried to obscure certain facts of the reign of 'Alā ud-Din Mas'ud

¹ T.N., p.198. Ṭārīkh-i Mubarak Shahī, p.32, says, "Muhadhdhab ud-Dīn took all functions out of the hands of the Turks and brought them under his authority.
² T.N., p.250.
³ Ibid., p.287.
as it would expose his patron, Balban. Nevertheless, his statement and that of 'Isāmī help to reveal to a large extent the real picture. According to Minhāj, "A number of characterless persons belonging to the army had clandestinely gained access to Sultan 'Alā ud-Dīn and they used to influence him in the commission of unworthy acts and habits, to the extent that the practice of seizing and killing his maliks acquired a place in his nature.,"¹ It is surprising that the energetic king who had expelled the mongols from the western frontier, overnight became an addict to these practices. Minhāj does not like to say that Balban, in order to seize complete authority began to eliminate and kill his political adversaries. The young Mas'ūd, as a dispenser of justice, resented his activities and it seems, also, punished with death some members of the powerful faction, who were found guilty of high-handedness. In all probability these were the 'maliks' referred to by Minhāj, whom Mas'ūd began to 'seize and kill'. That the Sultan had realised the consequences of his action, for which he kept himself always alert, is indicated by 'Isāmī. He says "for two or three weeks the nobles were seeking the opportunity to seize him, until one day when he was off guard, they captured him."²

¹T.N., pp.200-1; Tarīkh-i Mubarak Shāhi, p.34. Yahya, without quoting his authority, tries to improve on the information given by Minhāj. He makes the amusing statement that 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd during his operation against the Mongols, suddenly came under the influence of 'Abyssinians' and low-born persons, who instigated him to commit unworthy acts; Ra'dat us safā, Vol.IV, f.522b. Mirkhwand, calls Mas'ūd a generous ruler of good behaviour and pious character.

²'Isāmī, p.139; Tarīkh-i Mubarak Shāhi, p.34. Yahya says that "On Sunday June 10, 1246 A.D., Mas'ūd was seized and cast into prison." T.N., p.201. Minhāj simply says that Mas'ūd was imprisoned on Sunday, June 10, 1246 A.D.
The dethronement of Mas'ud and the accession of Nasir ud-Din Mahmud was the successful conclusion of the conspiracy of Balban and his followers.

Ikram calls the reign of Mahmud as the 'Era of Balban'.

Habibullah is of the opinion that Balban was in firm control of the affairs of the kingdom during Mahmud's reign. Barani says that Balban ruled while Mahmud was a mere namuna (puppet). Balban's authority had immensely increased after the murder of Wazir Muhadhdhab-ud-Din. The appointment of Najm ud-Din Abū Bakr as the wazir in the reign of Mas'ud is the first evidence in this respect. When Balban was removed from the post of na'il-i mulk in 1253 A.D. Najm ud-Din, being considered his partisan, was also deprived of his office.

Nasir ud-Din Mahmud was completely eclipsed by Balban and his faction. It was probably the condition of his accession. The complete domination of a group of nobles over the ruler encouraged others and undermined the authority of the crown. That the youthful king was not lacking in energy and daring is evident from the interest he evinced in personally conducting various campaigns.

---

1 S.M. Ikram, History of Muslim Civilization, p.63.
2 Habibullah, Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, p.125.
3 Barani, p.26. Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p.40. Yahya informs us that when Balban was a Khān the reigns of sovereignty were in his hands.
4 T.N., p.217.
5 Ikram, History of Muslim Civilization, p.62; Referring to the accession of Nasir ud-Din, Mahmud, Ikram says, "after receiving many assurances the nobles among whom Balban played a dominant role, enthroned Iltumish's youngest son, Nasir ud-Din Mahmud; Cf. P.Saran, Studies in Medieval history, p.235; says, "The Turkish maliks (continued on next page..."
"'izz ud-Dīn Balban Kashān Khān, in recognition of his valiant assistance against the Mongols in 1246 A.D. had been assigned by Mas'ūd the territory of Multān. After the murder of Mas'ūd, he requested Nasīr ud-Dīn Mahmūd to be given the territory of Uchch, in addition to Multān. The king agreed on the condition that he gave up his previous iqṭā's of Nāgor and the Siwālik territories. But 'izz ud-Dīn Balban, who was a powerful noble and had led the uprisings against Rukn ud-Dīn Firuz and Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahram, was reluctant to abide by the condition. The Sultan had to march his troops to implement his order, and according to Minhāj, 'izz ud-Dīn agreed to relinquish his former assignments after much protraction and difficulty.*

'izz ud-Dīn Balban soon lost Multān to Hasan Qarlugh and Uchch to Shir Khān; on returning to the court he was assigned Badasun, with its dependencies. When Shir Khān turned refractory to the royal authority and visited the court of Mangū Khān in Turkestan, 'izz ud-Dīn was given Uchch and Multān, but it did not help to restore his shattered relations with the sovereign of Delhi, as he probably suspected that the occupation of his territory by Shir Khān was planned by the Delhi court. Immediately afterwards,

(Continued from previous page)

5 led by Balban decided to pull down Mas'ūd and invited Mahmūd from Bahrānī to occupy the throne because they expected that he would prove a 'good boy' and would let Balban be the virtual ruler. "; Cf. T. N., p. 209; Cf. Tarikh-i Mubārak Shāhī, pp. 35-8.

* T. N., pp. 269-70.
he made overtures to Hulagu, who was then in 'Iraq, for sending an Intendant. He even sent his son to the Mongol Court as a pledge of his loyalty. In alliance with Qutlugh Khân, the stepfather of Naṣir ud-Dîn Mahmûd, he made a second attempt to seize the throne in 1258 A.D.; this time by appeal to arms.¹

'Isz ud-Dîn and Qutlugh failed in their attempt on account of the timely defence arrangements by the ruler. 'Isz ud-Dîn returned to Uchch, from where he proceeded to the court of Hulagu in 'Iraq to seek consolation for his disappointment. Regardless of the consequences to the infant Muslim kingdom, he even brought a Mongol army to Sind with aggressive intentions.² The Mongol army, however, withdrew leaving behind an Intendant.

In the reign of Mahmûd every noble attempted to become more and more powerful, either at the expense of the ruler or another noble. In such a contest Rayhân succeeded in overthrowing Balban, but as he lacked the tact to rally around him those Turkish nobles who had become disaffected towards his opponent, and also because he did not clear the court of the supporters of Balban, he could not enjoy the fruits of his success. Very soon Najm ud-Dîn Abû Bakr and Minhâj were again appointed wasîr and qâdi respectively. That both these supporters got back their posts before their patron Balban was reinstated

¹T.N., pp.271-2.
²Ibid., p.273.
indicates that there had been internal pressure on the Sultan.¹

The confusion was complete when, for the sake of Balban, his supporters were even prepared to take up arms against the ruler. Those nobles who did not have the resources to match the crown, either took shelter with Hindu chiefs, whose doors, according to Minhāj, were always open, or applied to the Mongol court for help.²

¹T.N., pp.218-9.
CHAPTER FIVE

The Nobles and the Succession of the Sultan

As the state was not the private property of an individual or of a family or group of families, there were therefore no established rules in Islam which could govern the procedure of succession of a state-chief. Islamic political theory recognizes the Muslim community as the Supreme body, which alone is authorised to organize the political and administrative functions of the state, and to elect the most competent person as its leader.

The elected leader should be invested with authority for discharging governmental obligations on behalf of the community, and should receive acknowledgement, so long as he is virtuous, God-fearing and follows the right path. If he transgresses he should not be allowed to retain his leadership.

1 Qur'an, 42.38; It says, Muslims should settle their affairs by mutual consultation; David De Santillana, 'Law and Society', Legacy of Islam, p.286, who says, 'In a Muslim state, sovereignty essentially belonged to God - "the public treasury is the treasury of Allah, the army is the army of Allah, even the public functionaries are the employees of Allah."'

2 Qur'an, 9.1 says "And certainly we have given you power on Earth, and created in it means of livelihood for you."

3 R. Levy, The Social Structure of Islam, p.287, n.1, says that according to Shiraz, Tanbih, p.311, the election of an Imam is a duty incumbent on the whole community. If there is only one man suitable for it he must seek the office. If he refuses, he must be compelled to take it; al-Mawardi, Ahkam us Sultaniyah, Urdu translation by sayyid Muhammad Ibrahim, p.12, who says, the Imamate concerns two groups - those vested with power to elect the Imam, and the group from whom the Imam is to be elected. This of course is applicable when competent persons decline to accept the office.

4 Qur'an, 18.4; T.N., p.223. The turban-wearers (j'ulema) and the citizens of Delhi attempted to depose Nasir ud-Din Mahmud; al-Mawardi, op.cit., p.35.
The leader and the people become bound to one another by a ceremony called bay'at. The recognition of the community as the supreme political authority, explains the absence of the concept of kingship and hereditary rule in the early days of Islam.

The first Caliph of Islam, Abū Bakr, was elected by a consensus of Muslim opinion. Since that time it became for the Muslim world an important precedent and an accepted principle, in the election of their future leaders.

The succession of the second Caliph, 'Umar, did not take place on the same principle. He was nominated by Abū Bakr himself because of his ability. The first Caliph however did not fail to give his nomination the shape of a general election by securing the consent of the highly important Ansār and Muhājjīn. His strongest point in favour of his choice was the fact that 'Umar was no relation of his.

---

1 Ibn Khaldūn, Mughaddimah, Urdu Trans. by S.H. Khan Yusufi, p.239. Bay'at is an oath of allegiance by the people to the supreme temporal power; but at the same time the oath of allegiance imposed an obligation on the sovereign to see that the 'Laws of God' were obeyed; T.W. Arnold, The Caliphate, pp.31-4, 72; David De Santillana, 'Law and Society', Legacy of Islam, pp.297-8.

2 Von Kremer, Culturgeschichte des Orients, translated by Khudā Bakhsh, as Orient under the Caliphs, p.9; al-Mawardi, op.cit., p.14, where it is said, Initially five persons offered their allegiance to Abū Bakr, and this was followed by the community.

3 Sir W. Muir, The Caliphate, p.77, quotes Abū Bakr, "I swear that when I meet my Lord, I will say unto Him, I have appointed as ruler of Thy people him that is best among them."

4 Ibn Khaldūn, Eng. Trans. by P. Rosenthal, Vol. I, p.430, where it is said "(the Caliph) is the guardian and trustee of the (Muslims). He looks after their affairs as long as he lives. It follows that he should look after their affairs after his death, and therefore should appoint someone to take charge of their affairs."
'None of mine own kin'.

'Umar on his death-bed asked 'Abd al-Rahmān to succeed him, but when the latter declined to accept the burden of responsibility, he appointed a council of regency to elect his successor. The conclave consisted of 'Abd al-Rahmān, 'Aṭā, Uthmān, Zubayr, and Sa'd; Talha was to be included if he returned within three days from Medina. He instructed his son 'Abd-Allāh to vote with the majority in the first instance, but in the event of an equal vote he should support the candidate for whom 'Abd al-Rahmān had voted. His words clearly brought out the points that a restricted selection conducted by the leading elements of the community was valid to elect the head of a state; and that his son had no place in the succession, as an Islamic state was not a hereditary monarchy.

Mu'āwiya was the first Caliph to have laid the foundation of a hereditary rule. Although he appointed his son Yezid as his successor, he could not ignore the impact of public opinion, and therefore sought the support of the leading men for his nomination. His daring innovation changed the republican character of the Islamic caliphate into a monarchy. Habib says, "thereafter it became an unwritten

---

1 Sir W. Muir, The Caliphate, pp.78,188.
law that the Caliphs, and following them the Sultans of later days,
united the authority to nominate their successors from among their
sons and brothers, and that the nomination would become valid when
accepted by the leading officers of the State. Thus the theories evolved that the executive head of a state could be installed by the
consent of the majority, or by the nomination of the leading men of
the community, or by being a descendant of the deceased ruler.
Subsequently a school of jurists developed a constitutional theory
which recognized monarchy as an inevitable institution. Von Kremer
says, the Arab thinkers considered kingship absolutely essential for
the maintenance of social order.

Over the question of succession, therefore, Islam's attitude
was flexible. In India, also, on the issue of the succession of rulers
the Turks tried to follow the traditions that had been crystallized by

---

1 M. Habib, 'Introduction', Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told
by its own historians, Vol. II, p. 6 (ed. 1952); Sir W. Muir, The Caliphate,
p.303, says, "Mu'awiyah's action becomes the received precedent of
Islam." Ibn Khaldun (Rosenthal), op. cit., p. 431, says, "No suspicion
of the Imam is justified if he appoints his father or his son as his
successor... especially if there exists some reason for the appointment
of a successor, such as desire to promote public interest, or fear that
some harm might arise if no successor were appointed, suspicion of the
Imam is out of question. This was the case with Mu'awiyah's appointment
of his son Yezid."

2 Niaami _'Arudi sharh Maqala_, Eng. trans. by E. G. Browne, p. 11, writes,
"The Imam must have vicars to act in different parts of the world, and not
everyone of these shall have such powers that all mankind shall be compelled
to acknowledge it. Hence there must be an administrator or compeller, who
is called monarch or king and his vicarious function 'Sovereignty'; Ibn
Khaldun (Rosenthal), op. cit., pp. 91-3; "When mankind has achieved social
organisation - and when civilisation in the world has thus become a fact,
people need someone to exercise a restraining influence and keep them apart,
for injustice and aggressiveness are in the animal nature of man. The person
who exercises a restraining influence, therefore, must be one of themselves.
He must dominate them and have power and authority over them, so that no-
one of them will be able to attack another." Tarikh-i Fakhr ud-Din Mubarak
Shah, pp. 12-13; Orient under the Caliphs, p. 25.
Islam. Being the senior members of the Muhammadan community in India, they considered the right to select kings as their special prerogative.

When Ghīyāth ud-Dis Muhammad died in 1203 A.D., the people and the nobles of Ghur acquiesced in the succession of his brother Mu'izz al-Dīn, as he was the most senior and also the most competent member of the royal family; Ghīyāth ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, the son of the deceased Sultān, finding that the people had tacitly agreed to his uncle's accession, also, submitted to the fait accompli.¹

Minhāj would have us believe that Mu'izz al-Dīn had given Taj ud-Dīn Yalduz a black banner because he intended him to be his successor at Ghazna. But the nobles of Ghazna considered that electing the ruler was their privilege. As, in their opinion, after the assassination of Mu'izz al-Dīn at Damyak in 1206 A.D., Ghīyāth ud-Dīn Maḥmūd was the rightful heir, being a member of the royal family, they invited him to come from the environs of Garmsīr and ascend the throne.²

It is not to be doubted that the mutual jealousy of the nobles had, also, played a strong part in the invitation. Hence, in the first instance, they ignored one of their numbers, and attempted to have a member of the ruling dynasty as the king. The words of Minhāj give a

¹T.N., pp.7,121. Minhāj says that the nobles set aside Amīr Pari from the throne of Ghazna and placed Sebuktigin on it, as he had proved his ability by defeating the combined force of Abū 'All Anuk and the Prince of Kābul. al-Mawardi, op.cit., p.16, says, "when the people accept someone whom they like as their Imām, the decision is irrevocable."

²T.N., p.133: 'Darḵhāṭirāsh ān bud ki wali-'ahd-i Ghaznī... b'ad az Sultān u bashad.' He (Mu'izzal-Din) had in his mind that after him, he (Taj ud-Din Yalduz) should succeed at Ghazna.
clue to the sentiments of the nobles who were unwilling to recognize anyone else except Ghiyath ud-Din Mahmud for rulership. Only when the faint hearted nephew of Mu'izz al-Din showed his disinclination to shoulder the responsibilities of kingship did the nobles accept the supremacy of another noble.

Qutb ud-Din had to go through the ordeal of convincing the nobles, and it took him three months to ascend the throne at Lahore. The Tai ul Ma'athir informs us that Qutb ud-Din took over the administration of the Indian portion of his deceased master's kingdom, upon which the nobles and the dependants of the court offered their allegiance to him. The expression of loyalty by the nobility was an instrument of ratification of Qutb ud-Din's sovereignty.

With the death of Qutb ud-Din, factions formed among the nobles. Minhaj mentions that after the sudden death of Aybek, the nobles and princes of Hindustan, for the contentment of the army and peace and tranquility of the people and country, thought it advisable to place

---

1. T.N., p.133; "Muluk wa umarā vi Turk-rā khātir wa mizaż-an būd ki Sultan Ghīyath ud-Dīn Mahmud Sam az huḍud-i Garmāsīr ki tarf-i Ghaznīn aved wa bar takhīl-i-'am-i khud nāshinad." So they wrote to him 'Warīth-i mulk tu-i wa ma bandagan-i tu." (The maliks and Turkish amirs had the intention and sentiment that Sultan Ghīyath ud-Dīn, Mahmūd Sam should come from the region of Garmāsīr to Ghazna and ascend the throne of his uncle. You are the heir to the throne and we are your slaves); Sir Percy Sykes, History of Persia, Vol.I, p.489; where it is said. When the soldiers killed the usurper Shahr Baraz in 629 A.D., they carried his corpse through the streets of the capital crying out 'Whoever not being of the blood-royal seats himself on the throne of Persia will share the fate of Shahr Baraz; G. Rawlinson, The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchies, p.543.


3. Tai ul Ma'athir, I.O. 1486; f.202a; R. Levy, op. cit., p.286. He says, when persons having power to 'bind and loosen' (i.e. the 'Ulema) acknowledge a person as 'Imam, the acknowledgement confirms the office in his hands; T.N., p.140.
Āram Shāh on the throne. The accession was a direct challenge to the importance of Delhi, which had occupied a central position during Qutb ud-Dīn's conquest. The Delhi nobles could not be expected to accept a secondary position by recognizing a ruler who had been nominated by the Lahore barons. They therefore, without considering the fact that Āram Shāh was Qutb ud-Dīn's son, implored Iletmish to come from Badoun and ascend the throne at Delhi.

The accession of Iletmish was soon challenged by the Mu'izzī Amīrs, which led to a full scale battle between them and the Sultan. It was the Delhi faction which emerged triumphant. From now on, the nobles claimed undisputed right to nominate a successor to the throne.

Thereafter until the accession of Nasir ud-Dīn Māhmūd, 1246 A.D. the ruler of Delhi was always a creation of the nobles. Their monopoly was broken by Balban, but it reappeared immediately after his death.

The motive force in placing a king on the throne was the self-interest of the various groups of nobles. Whenever a group acquired strength it made a demonstration of it, by pulling down a reigning king and

---

1 Dr K.S. Lal, 'Succession to the Sultanate of Delhi', Journal of Indian History, Vol.XX, parts 1-3 (88-90), p.146. Dr Lal says that Aram was too young for the throne and this went against him; but quotes no authority for his statement.

2 T.N., p.170; 'Īsām', pp.102-3. The author conveys the impression that after Qutb ud-Dīn's death, Āram Shāh and Iletmish ruled simultaneously at Lahore and Delhi respectively; R. Levy, op.cit., p.287; where it is said "Two Imāms cannot exist in the community at one and the same time." Mir Khwānd, Reaidat us safa, Vol.IV, p.521a, says when the nobles and important men of the kingdom found Āram Shāh incompetent, they invited Iletmish to occupy the throne, - which according to the contemporary chronicler is not a correct statement.

3 T.N., p.170, Minhāj says, 'Many of the Mu'izzī chiefs were brought under the sword, Tai ul Ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff.214b-216b. Hasan Nizāmī says that two of the rebel leaders, Aq Sunqur and Furrūkh Shāh were slain, while Sar-i Jándar Teerakī took to flight. Many others were also put to the sword. (continued on next page)
installing its own candidate. Iletmish, while nominating his daughter Radiya as his successor, forgot that she was encroaching on the dearly cherished right of the nobles to elect the Sultan. The nobles could not remain silent spectators to the violation of their authority, so they protested against the nomination and demanded a convincing explanation for his choice.\(^1\) Without taking the protest as a warning, Iletmish had his nomination proclaimed, which after his death became the cause of his dynasty's destruction.

No sooner had he died than the maliks and elders of the kingdom who were present during his illness, ignored the nomination\(^2\) of their dead king and raised to the throne their own nominee, Rukn ud-Din Firuz.

Radiya's intelligence soon discovered the weight of the nobles in the matter of succession. It appears that during the short rule of Rukn ud-Din she had played her cards well in widening the breach between the court nobles and the governors of the provinces. It was

\(^{(continued \ from \ previous \ page)}\)

3 H. Nelson Wright, *Coinage and Metrology of the Sultans of Delhi*, p.71; explains that the inscription *Qutbi* on Iletmish's coinage is suggestive of his early conflict with the Mu'izzi Amirs.

\(^1\) T.N., p.185; Minhaj says, "At the time of the proclamation of (Radiya's) nomination some of the servants of the court who were close to him (Iletmish) asked the wisdom in nominating a daughter when he had grown up sons". T.A., Vol.I, p.65.

\(^2\) Sir Wolseley Haig, *op.cit.*, p.33, writes, "Mas'ud aged three, the son of Maudud, was nominated heir by his father according to a will. The servants of the household proclaimed him Amir, but the nobles of Ghazna who had not been consulted refused to ratify this arrangement and on December 29, 1049, A.D. deposed the child and proclaimed his uncle, 'Ali Abul Hasan." Maudud had died of intestinal complaint on 22 December 1049 A.D.; 'Isami, p.124. 'Isami does not mention that Radiya had been nominated as the successor. He however describes the concern of the nobles for choosing an heir to the throne after the death of Iletmish. The faction among others consisted of Balban-i buzurq and Balban-i khwārid.
found that when she made her final appeal for the crown to the court nobles, on whom she must have clearly impressed that they had as much a right to award the throne as the provincial governors, the guards and Turkish nobles of the court presented her the throne, despite the fact that Rukn ud-Din was still alive and was, also, wearing the crown. Where Iltutmish's nomination had failed, the consent of a group of nobles prevailed. The enthronement of Radiya was an adjustment of convenience by a group of nobles who were coming into prominence, and appeared to be prepared for an open conflict with the faction that had placed Rukn ud-Din on the throne. On the issue of Radiya's accession the rival groups, each concerned to safeguard its own interest, did not take long to clash among themselves. The governors who had been marching to Delhi to depose Rukn ud-Din refused to accept Radiya's enthronement, and attempted to pull her down by force. Their plan could not succeed as the nobles who had supported Radiya's cause, resisted the pressure successfully.  

1 T.N., p.184; Minhâj says, "the afwâlî gahlb and Turkish amirs, having returned to the capital attached themselves to Sultan Radiya and offered their bayâ'ât to her and placed her on the throne." R.P. Tripathi, Some aspects of Muslim Administration, p.28. He says, as fitness to rule was a decisive qualification with Iltutmish and the Turkish commanders, the high officials became silenced when Iltutmish told that Radiya was the fittest of his descendants to rule. It may be noted that Radiya was never given the throne after the death of Iltutmish. In fact, a strong ruler was never liked as may be seen in the case of Ala ud-Din-Masûd; 'Isâmî, pp.126-7, says, the erkân-i daulat (Elders of the court), who were seriously concerned to find a successor, agreed to place Radiya on the throne.

2 T.N., p.186.
The faction that now emerged powerful in the Court was led by Ikhtiyar ud-Din Aytiigin. He found in Radiya an ambitious ruler and one unresponsive to his dictates. As the nobles wanted a pliant and weak ruler, she was subjected to baseless charges which only expose the incensed atmosphere of the court against her, rather than her own personal guilt. 1

The next ruler, Mu'izz ud-Din Bahram, was raised to the throne by the nobles after the imprisonment of Radiya at Bhatinda. 2 Describing the qualities of Bahram, Minhaj says, "he was unassuming and frank, never wore jewellery and finery like other kings, nor showed any desire for girfles, silken garments, decoration, banners or display." 3

Bahram's simplicity led Ikhtiyar ud-Din's faction to believe that he would prove a submissive ruler, for which he came to be selected. As it was the condition of his enthronement, the king

---

1 Tripathi, op.cit., p.30. Tripathi says that the Turkish nobles wanted a vigorous king who could rule with strength and also be amenable to the general wishes of the peers; M.Habib, op.cit., p.96; Habib analyses the motive of the nobles in enthroning a monarch, as follows: "In practise the leading chiefs through force or intrigue combined to instal or dethrone a monarch. Very often their attempt was to put the crown into commission - to have a dummy king and to do everything in his name."; 'Isami, p.133. As mouth-piece of Radiya, 'Isami has rightly mentioned the cause of the hostility of the nobles towards Radiya; Be-wahshat zi nau bandagan-i pidar-Rubudand Taj-i Kayani zi sar. (Being frightened of me (i.e. my strong administration) the slaves of my father, have snatched away the Kayani (a ruler of Persia) crown from my head.)

2 'Isami, p.130 says, after Yaqut was murdered at the court, Radiya was imprisoned and sent to Bhatinda; T.N.pp.188-9; Minhaj says, Yaqut was killed at Bhatinda by the Turk amirs and Radiya was also seized and imprisoned there. Minhaj being present on the occasion, is a better authority than 'Isami for such details.

3 T.N. pp.190-1, Minhaj calls Bahram also a 'murderer and a tyrant' but there is little doubt that circumstances forced him to adopt this role after he had become king.
delegated the powers of a de facto ruler to his nā'īb-i mulk, Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Aytigīn. Subsequent developments show that Bahram could not reconcile himself to the position of a puppet. The Tarīkh-i Mubārak Shahī tells us that the nā'īb-i mulk overstepped his limit, which produced a great dislike in the mind of the Sultān. The result was that the king entered into a conspiracy with the nobles belonging to the opposite camp, and had him assassinated.

Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur the new amīr-i hālib, who stepped in the place of the deceased nā'īb-i mulk, belonged to a different faction. He vigorously disagreed with the wazīr Muhadhdhab ud-Dīn who belonged to the former faction, and even reduced him to the position of a nonentity by usurping his powers. That Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur’s faction had plotted the murder of Aytigīn and Muhadhdhab ud-Dīn is a probable assumption. Bahram’s wisdom in retaining elements of diverse factions in his administration in order to maintain a balance of power in the court soon made him unpopular with the amīr-i hālib. As was natural, the amīr-i hālib hatched a conspiracy to dethrone the king, and have a more yielding ruler. The attempt to include Muhadhdhab ud-Dīn in the intrigue was Sunqur’s fatal blunder. The wazīr exposed the machination to the king through an agent, and succeeded in bringing about Sunqur’s destruction.

---

1 Tarīkh-i Mubārak Shahī, p.28.
2 T.N., pp.192-3.
3 Isāmī, p.132. A graphic description of the discussion of the nobles for deposing Bahram and electing a new ruler is presented by the author.
4 T.N., (ed. chuqīltāi), pp.103,156.
The death of Sunqur marked the temporary collapse of his faction, as most members of his party became scattered; the wazīr once again strengthened his position with the support of the non-Turkish elements in the court.

When Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahrām was deposed, an ambitious noble, 'Izz ud-Dīn Balbān Kashīlū Khaṅ, proclaimed himself king, but the amīrs and malīks who considered themselves the sole authority to elect rulers repudiated his pretensions. Some of them even went to the tomb of Iletmīsh, perhaps to re-affirm their oath of fidelity to his dynasty. 'Izz ud-Dīn Balbān realised that without the support of the nobles he would not be able to remain on the throne, as such, he accepted the accession of 'Alā ud-Dīn Masūd, son of Rukn ud-Dīn Firūz, whom the dominant group had chosen in preference to the living sons of Iletmīsh. ¹

The appointment of Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain of Qhor as 'Alā ud-Dīn's nā'īb-i mulk, indicates that the new king was the choice of Muhadhdhbab ud-Dīn's faction, which included the non-Turks. The reaction of the Turks to the supremacy of the non-Turks was inevitable. The first casualty was the non-Turk wazīr, Muhadhdhbab ud-Dīn, as he had, according to Minhāj, wrested all authority from the Turks and concentrated them in his own hands. Muhadhdhbab ud-Dīn's death opened the

¹T.N., p.197; Tripathī, op.cit., p.29, says, "another significant fact in the history of the so-called slaves was the unanimous recognition by the nobles of the right of the descendants of Iletmīsh to reign. P Cf. R. Levy, op.cit., p.283; speaking about the 'Abbāsid monarchs from the third century onwards, he says, "The 'Commander of the Faithful' was then elected or deposed according to the whim of the Turkish amīr ul umarā, or Supreme Commander, who happened to be in power, though he was always chosen from the 'Abbāsid family."
path for Balban’s rise to power who had undoubtedly exploited the sentiments of the Turks in their racial interest.

For exercising effective authority a new group coming into power required a new ruler. 'Ala ud-Dīn had to pay with his life for Balban’s ascendancy. His destruction was accelerated on account of his disapproval of Balban’s vindictive policy. Ḥasanī clearly states that it was Mas‘ūd’s independent attitude which made the nobles (Balban’s faction) hostile to him.¹

Even before Mas‘ūd’s dethronement, the nobles had selected his successor and clandestinely brought him from Bahraich to Delhi. Minhāj says, “the amīras and malikās agreed together and despatched letters secretly to Sulṭān Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd (for assuming kingship)”. The undisputed right of the faction in power to install its own candidate on the throne is established by the fact that Jalal ud-Dīn Mas‘ūd, the governor of Qanawāj and the elder brother of Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, was not even considered for the throne.

It could be assumed that prior to Maḥmūd’s accession, a secret agreement envisaging the faithfulness of the new ruler to Balban’s party had been concluded with Malka’-l-i-jahān, the mother of Maḥmūd.²

The modus operandi of Maḥmūd’s journey to Delhi from Bahraich supports

¹Ḥasanī, p.139.
²T.N., p.201. Ḥabib ullaḥ, p.120. He says that Maḥmūd’s accession resulted from personal ambitions and was a palace affair in which Balban, in league with Maḥmūd’s mother, had a hand.
such an assumption. Minhāj says, 'The Malka-i-Tahan, his (Mahmūd's) mother, represented to the people that her son was going to Delhi for the purpose of obtaining medicine and remedy of his sickness. She placed the Sultan on a litter and the Malka his mother, taking him along with her and attended by a great number of domestics, on foot and on horseback, set out from Bahraich towards the capital, Delhi. When night came they covered the Sultan's face with a woman's veil and placed him on horseback and proceeding with maximum speed in a short time reached Delhi in such a manner that not a living being had information of his arrival until the day he ascended the throne. 1

The author of Tarikh-i Hāqqī, who is not a contemporary authority, without quoting his source, tells us that the childless Mahmūd had nominated Balban as his heir-apparant. 2

The Tarikh-i Muhammadi mentions the acquiescence of the nobles on Balban's accession, and so does Barānī. 'Isāmī says that Balban had given indications of his aspiration for the throne. Balban's son Bughra Khān, while advising his son Kaiqubād, mentioned that his father had to face an uphill task in getting to the throne. It is known

1 T. N., p. 209; Dr K. S. Lal, op. cit., p. 149, He says, "the way Nasir ud-Dīn Mahmūd got the throne alone shows the power of the nobles."
2 'Abdul Ĥaqq Dehlawi, Tarikh-i Hāqqī, B. M. Or. 26, 210, f. 12b.
that Balban during the reign of Mahmūd had organised a strong body of supporters for himself from among the nobles, which doubtless exerted itself in getting him the throne.  

The main consideration of the powerful faction in raising someone to the throne was to keep power in its own hadds. Whether the accession conformed to the prescribed conditions or not hardly concerned the nobles. If it suited their interest a Rādīya could be placed on the throne or an infant son of Kāiqubād, Kaimurth, was made the king.  

1 Isāmī, pp.153-4; Barānī, pp.149-50, says, Bughrā Khān told Kāiqubād, "My father had to wade through blood to attain the kingdom of Delhi ... which was the object of his ambition, and that he had wrested it from the hands of men who were possessed of all the advantages of birth, Sir W. Muir, The Caliphate, p.303, Sir Muir says, When Muʿawiya met assistance to his nomination at Medina, 'he called out the bodyguards and at the point of the sword, caused the city to take oath."

2 David de Santillana, 'Law and Society', The Legacy of Islam, p.296. Being a male adult is an indispensable condition of kingship; al-Mawardi, op.cit., p.13; He does not expressly say 'male adult' but the qualifications which he lays down clearly mean it; Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.184; C. Huart, 'Imam', Encyclopaedia of Islam, Vol. II (old edition), p.473.

3 Tripathi, op.cit., p.43; On the enthronement of Kāi Kāus (Kaimurth) Tripathi says, "The supporters of the Albari house wanted to keep power even by taking shelter behind a child." S. R. Sharma, Studies in Medieval Indian History, p.34, says, "The great public officials usually functioned as king-makers placing now one prince, now another on the throne, sometimes doing so in a spirit of mockery.", Sīyāsāt-nāma, p.183; Nizām ul mulk says "women should not be allowed to interfere in state affairs, because they are wearers of veil and are devoid of complete intelligence; Fakhr-ı Mudabbir, Ādāb ul Muluk wa kifayat ul Mamluk. I.O. 647, f.53a, quotes the Prophet - 'Women should never be consulted and whatever they say ought not to be listened to.'
CHAPTER VI

Social and Cultural Life of the Nobles

With the Turkish invasion of India in the twelfth century, the nobles of the Delhi Sultanate became the dominating factor in Muslim social life. The invaders on their arrival came in contact with a Hindu social system which was rigid in details and deeply influenced by superstitions. At the initial stage, therefore, close social contact between the Muslims and the caste-ridden Hindus was only remotely possible. Describing the abhorrence of the conquered for the invaders, a twentieth century Indian writer observes, "the leaders of Indian society regarded themselves as Aryans, i.e., a race superior to any in the world, while the customs and manners of the Turks appeared to them to be so contemptible, low and vulgar that they called them 'melechchha' or the unclean". It was in the context of

1 AlBiruni's India, Translated by E.C. Sachau, Vol.I, pp. 100-104, 125 and Vol.II, p.137. At the top of the Indian Society there were four varnas or castes, the Brahman, the Kshattriya, the Vaishya and the Sudra. Only the Brahman and the Kshattriya could learn the Vedas; they were the exclusive heirs to the spiritual and intellectual achievements of Hinduism. The remaining two castes were assigned a lower place in the social hierarchy and were deprived of all sacred knowledge. If any one of them dared to hear, pronounce or recite vedic texts, he was hauled up by Brahmans before the ruler who ordered his tongue to be cut off.

2 A.B. Pandey, Society and Government in Medieval India, p.11; AlBiruni's India, Trans. by E.C. Sachau, Vol.II, p.101; India in the fifteenth century, (ed. by R.H. Major), 'The travels of Nicolo Conti in the East', p.31, where we read: "While they call other nations blind, that they themselves have two eyes and that we have but one, because they consider that they excel all others in prudence."
such an attitude that the Turks were obliged to establish the pattern of their social behaviour. The economic circumstances of the country also, greatly influenced their social and cultural outlook.

Among the nobles, a body parallel to the highest class of the Hindus was created. They replaced the Hindu ruling class and discharged almost the same functions as the Kshatriyas of the Hindu period, their chief responsibility being the preservation of the institutions of religion and the protection of the kingdom from foreign invasions. In order to mark their status and authority, they were invested with titles, such as Ulugh Khan, Khan, Malik, Amir, Sipahsalar and Sarkhail. Ulugh Khan (Great Khan) was the highest title, but it was rarely awarded; while the titles Sipahsalar and Sarkhail denoted junior military status and were not in much use.

For their subsistence and also for the maintenance of troops under them, they were given large assignments from the revenues.

1 F.W. Thomas, Mutual Influences of Muhammadans and Hindus in India, p.29.
2 In the history of the Delhi Sultanate, only Balban had held the title of Ulugh Khan.
3 Otto Spies, op.cit., p.67, where we read that none of the Sipahsalar are considered worthy to be near the Sultan. A sipahsalar had less than a hundred horsemen as his followers; Barani, p.145, says that a Sipahsalar would command a hundred horsemen and the Sarkhail, ten.
4 Masālik ul Ābsār fi Mamālik ul Amsār, quoted in History of India as told by its own Historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.III, p.577.
Contemporary and later records are in accord that the allowance of the nobles was very substantial. The Tabagat-i-Nasiri states that the allowance of a saar-i-lander was three hundred thousand lutals. On the authority of Shaikh Mubarak ul-Anbati, the Subh ul Ateha informs us that the allowance of a Khan was two lakh tankas, of a Malik fifty to sixty thousand tankas, of an Amir thirty to forty thousand tankas, and of a Sipahsalar nearly twenty thousand tankas. The statement of 'Afif confirms that these figures are not imaginary, for Khan-i-jahan the famous wazir of Firuz Tughlaq received, in addition to the allowances he would draw from the state-treasury, a sum of thirteen lakh tankas as revenue from his assignment. The contemporary writer Fakhir-i Mudabbir says that when the Turks left their own country they were without any capital, but after their arrival in India they came to possess immense wealth and slaves.

1 T.N., p.237; Hobson-jobson, A.yule, p.457, where it is said that the lutal is "a very old Indian denomination of copper coin, now entirely obsolete - the lutal of the Delhi coinage of 'Ala'ul-Mulk (c.1300) was, according to Mr. E. Thomas's calculations, 1/64 of the silver 'tanga', the coin called in later days the rupee. Ibn Battuta, translated and selected by H.A.R. Gibb, pp. 187-188, informs us that the governors received 1/20th part of the total revenue. 'Ala'ul-Mulk's allowance as the governor of Lahar (in Sindh) came to three lakhs. The governor of Uchch, Jalal ud-Din gave Ibn Battuta the revenue of his village, which within a short time yielded him five thousand dinars.

2 Otto Spies, op.cit., pp. 71-72, the allowance of other officers was also considerable.

3 'Afif, p.197.

4 Tarikh-i Fakhr ud-Din Mubarak Shah, pp. 20, 36.
The nobles on acquiring wealth, which could not be inherited by their successors, would indulge in indiscriminate liberality simply to satisfy their wayward fancies. Minhāj states, that Mu'izz al-Dīn while marching to India halted at Kirmān, where Tāj ud-Dīn yalduz the governor, displayed his large-heartedness by distributing one thousand head-dresses and quilted tunics to the amīrs and maliks, and gifts to the entire retinue, besides feasting them. The same writer says that Imāmzādah Jalāl ud-Dīn son of Jamāl ud-Dīn Ghaznavī was presented with a sum of five thousand tankas by Ghiyāth ud-Dīn 'Iwad Khalī and his nobles for delivering a single religious discourse, and while he was returning home, he was given another five thousand.

Regarding the frivolous spending of the nobles, Barānī tells us that Balban, while a khan, had been addicted to wine-drinking. He was fond of arranging convivial parties two or three times a week, at which the khāns, maliks and notables were invited to indulge in gambling, wine-drinking, and enjoying music. For his gay parties he kept in his permanent employment sweet-tongued nadīms, melodious-voiced kitāb-khwāns, and reputed 2 musicians, who were also maintained by him.

1 T.N., pp.132-133, 161-162; Barānī, p.113. Malik 'Ala ud-Dīn, the nephew of Balban, presented all his horses to Khwaja Shams Mu'in, whose poem had been sung in his praise, and to the musicians he gave ten thousand rupees.

2 Barānī, p.46. Balban would also bestow gifts at his pleasure parties; Clement Huart, Ancient Persia and Iranian Civilisation, p.145. During the Sassanid period, the musicians were in great demand at the Court. They appeared in ceremonies and, also, accompanied the king when he went out hunting.
'Imād ul mulk a slave of Iletmish and the Ḳawat-i ‘ard of Balban would frequently summon his subordinates and present robes to each of them. He would, also, give them twenty thousand tankas to distribute proportionately according to their ranks among themselves. At times he would entertain his whole department with sumptuous dishes; whatever remained of the rich food, he ordered to be distributed to the poor.

Barānī's language reflects his extreme dissatisfaction with the extravagance of the nobles, when he says, "If one khan or malik would learn that another khan or malik had five hundred guests on his victual-carpet, he would feel mortified if he could not entertain one thousand. If a noble heard that a certain malik had given at the time of riding two hundred tankas as charity, he would feel humiliated until he had given four hundred tankas on a similar occasion for the same purpose. If it came to be known that a noble had donated fifty horses and clothed two hundred people in a wine-drinking party, others would become jealous and arrange to bestow one hundred horses and clothe five hundred people." Owing to

1 Barānī, p.115; K.A. Nizāmī, Religion and Politics in India in the thirteenth century, p.149. Nizāmī is incorrect in saying that the total cost of the entertainment was twenty thousand tankas.

2 Barānī, p.116. the dinner consisted of flour-bread, mutton, sweet-paste, pigeon and chickens, round loaf, roasted rice, drinks of rice and fruit, syrup and betel-leaf; Mrs. Meer Ḥasan ‘Alī, Observations on the Mussulmans of India, Vol.1, p.326; the dinner table of a rich person consisted of boiled rice, sweet rice, kheer (pudding made of rice and milk), mutanian (chicken with rich spices), curries of many varieties some cooked with vegetables, others with unripened fruits (with or without meat), keebabs, sillaus, preserves, pickles and chutneys, and many other things, which she thinks are too tedious to be mentioned.

3 Barānī, pp.119-120.
such senseless expenditures, there was left no trace of gold
and silver in the house of the nobles and they remained constantly
in debt to the Hindu money-lenders.

'Affif tells of a few nobles who were possessed of an extreme
love for Mammon, and who inspite of being fully conscious that
the law of escheat was operative in their case, could not resist
their temptation for hoarding wealth. After the death of Malik
Shahin, a noble of Firuz Tughlaq, a sum of fifty thousand was
found in cash, besides other valuables and property. Another
noble, Bashir, left thirteen crores of tankas when he died. But
these were the exceptions and not the rule.

There is definite evidence that the lesser nobility, also, led
a luxurious life. 'Ala ud-Din, on discovering that the Khuts and
Mugaddams rode on fine horses, wore fine clothes, shot with
Persian bows, made war upon each other, drank wine, and went
out hunting, thought it necessary to frame stringent measures to

1 Baranji, p. 120; Sir Wolseley Haig, op. cit., p. 56 says that Iltimish
being more generous than his master (Quṭb ud-Din) is little to his
credit, for the useless and mischievous prodigality of eastern rulers
is more often the fruit of vanity than of any finer feeling and at a
Court at which a neat epigram or a smart repartee was almost as
profitable as a successful campaign the resources of a country
are wasted on worthless objects."

2 'Affi, p. 297.

3 Ibid, p. 440.

Moreland assumes that a khut was a Hindu chief subject to the
Sultan; according to the measures taken against them by 'Ala ud-Din
Khalji, the view appears to be correct. Administration of the Sultanate
of Delhi, p. 195. Qureshi says, "the khut was an agent or middleman
who helped the government in assessment and realization of revenue
from the administered territories".

5 Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p. 194, where it is said
that the 'Mugaddam' was the headman of the village through whom the
government dealt with the peasants.
curb their affluence, which would also serve to make them more obedient.

The superfluous wealth had made some of the nobles extremely prodigal, and although it was not an age of national reconstruction, it is not unlikely that their rash expenditure adversely affected the standard of living of the common man. In those days when the cost of living was extremely cheap, Malik Qutb ud-Din 'Alwi, a noble of Jalāl ud-Dīn Khaljī had spent two hundred thousand tankas on the marriage of his eldest son. On the wedding day he also presented robes to one thousand persons, and distributed a hundred horses with trappings.

The dress of the nobles was in keeping with their material property. They wore costly clothes embroidered with gold and silver in delicate designs. According to Shaikh Mubārak ul Anbātī the (official) dress of the Sultan, khans, maliks and other army officers were Tartaric gowns, Takhlawāt, and Islamic gabās of

1 Baranī, pp.287-288.
2 Otto Spies, op. cit., pp.56-57, where it is stated that in the early fourteenth century, four persons could eat at Delhi, beef, bread and melted butter (ghee), to their full satisfaction for one jital only.
3 Barani, pp.202, 118, says that Malik Amīr 'Alī, the sar-i jāndar was the son of a slave of Balban. For his unbounded generosity he was styled Hātim (a legendary name for munificence); he never gave a horse or robe to anyone without a purse of silver, and to beggars he would always give either a gold or a silver coin; the copper coin jital was beneath his consideration.
Khwarazm buckled in the middle of the body, and short turbans not exceeding five or six fore-arms in length. On the usual dress of the nobles, Ḥash-Shārīf Ṣuqūr ud-Dīn Muhammad al-Husainī al-Ādami informs us that it was a gold embroidered Tartaric gown; some of them wore gold embroidered sleeves and others put the embroidery between the shoulders. Their head-dress was four-cornered in shape, ornamented with jewels and mostly inlaid with diamonds and rubies. They plaited their hair in hanging locks as it used to be done in the beginning of the Turkish rule in Egypt and Syria, except that they put silk tassels in the locks. They would fasten gold and silver belts round their waists, and wear shoes and spurs. The sword was attached to the waist only when they were out on journey. The wazīrs and khatībs, also, dressed like soldiers, but they had no belts. According to Sirājud-Dīn al-Hindī, clothes made of Russian and Alexandrian cotton could be worn only if they had been presented by the Sultan.

The Masālik ul Absār says that in the reign of Muḥammad Tughlaq rich materials were imported from China, 'Iraq and Alexandria, and four hundred silk-weavers remained employed in the royal factory for manufacturing silk-cloth; these were to be

1 Otto Spies, op.cit., p.69.
2 Otto Spies, op.cit., pp. 69-70; George Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, Vol. IV, p.130, "where it is said that the officers of the Court wore either the long Median robe (which was of various colours) and the fluted cap, or the close fitted Persian tunic and trousers of loose felt. All had girdles in which sometimes a dagger was placed, and all had collars of gold about their necks, and ear-rings of gold in their ears. Sometimes, over the Persian tunic a sleeved cloak or great coat, reaching to the ankles, was worn; Medieval India, S. Lane Poole, p.38; describes the dress of Khwaja Hasan Maimandi when he made his first appearance before Amir Maṣūd."
given as presents or as robes of honour to the persons who were attached to his court. Also, five hundred manufacturers of golden tissues were kept in the royal service for weaving gold brocades; these were worn by the wives of the Sultan, and were given as presents to the amirs and their wives.

It was a common practice with the Muslim rulers of India to present rich dresses on some happy occasion, or in recognition of one's services. Rukn ud-Din Firuz, on his accession in 1236 A.D. presented robes of honour to the nobles who were present in the court. Even nobles would offer a robe to visitors of distinction. Ibn Battuta was presented a robe of goathair by the wakir of Muhammad Tughlaq.

The khans, maliks, and amirs, would always ride with flags in order to symbolise their authority. According to the Subh ul 'Ashā the khan was attended with seven flags and the amir with three. It could be assumed that the flags of the Maliks were less than that of the Khans and more than that of the amirs. A khan was authorised to keep ten extra horses in his house, and the amir three, similarly a figure between the two could be supposed

1. Masalik ul Absār fi mamalik ul Amsar, quoted in History of India as told by its own Historians, Elliot and Dowsen, Vol.III, p.578.
2. Clement Huart, Ancient Persia and Iranian Civilisation, p.148; says, The gift of a robe of honour from the kings wardrobe was a very ancient custom, and survived in the East until our own time, when it was superseded in the 19th century by orders of knighthood copied from Europe. T.N., pp.182, 242. Minhāj says that 'Izz ud-Dīn Tughrī-i Tughan Khan received a rich dress from Iltumish when he was appointed Chashmīgīr.
3. Ibn Battuta, translated by H.A.R.Gibb, p.206; T.N., p.295, When Balban was a noble, he conferred upon Minhāj a dress of honour, a great roll of gold-brocade cloth, a bay horse saddled and bridled and a village in Hānsī, yielding a revenue of thirty thousand jītalas yearly.
The building of the nobles were often situated near the royal palace. This helped to establish more intimate relationship between themselves and the Sultan, and, also, facilitated the performance of their official duties.  

Barani says, that when Mu'izz ud-Din Kaiqubad moved to Kilukhrī with the princes, nobles, intimates and servants, he built there a beautiful palace on the bank of a stream and also laid down a garden of unequalled beauty. When the princes, chiefs, confidants, men of learning and officials noticed that the king was inclined to stay at Kilukhrī, also, went and built their houses there.  

Amīr Khusrau, who had himself been a noble (ahl-i galam) describes the house of a noble, as usually a big building with spacious apartments, containing drawing rooms, baths, a water-tank, a court yard and even a library.  

In spite of the opportunities for closer contacts and better relationship, the nobles were torn apart by their mutual jealousies. That personal
ambition and greed for material prosperity were at the root of their rivalries cannot be doubted. When Qutb ud-Din received Muhammad Bakhtiyar with much respect and marks of distinction at Badaun, the nobles present in the court became filled with envy and began to slander him to the formes and with the design of bringing about Bakhtiyar’s destruction they attributed to him foolish boast that he could overcome an elephant in single combat. Bakhtiyar had in fact never said such a thing, but the nobles persuaded Qutb ud-Din that the vain glorious statement should be demonstrated. Bakhtiyar accepted the challenge and with one stroke of his mace put the elephant to flight. 1 The vindictive nature of Balban came to the fore when he had Qutb ud-Din Hussain, the na’ib-i mulk, murdered in the open court. 2 If Barani is correct, the same Balban poisoned Shir Khan, a cousin of his, whom he feared to be a potential claimant to the throne, after his death. 3

As the nobles had formed themselves into a distinct social class, it seems more than certain that almost all marriages were contracted within

1 T.N. (ed. Chugh ta’i), pp. 61, 96; Kabir Khan and Salar had joined Radia on the assurance that their allies, Malik Jami, Malik Kochi, and Nisam ul mulk Junaidi, who had marched with them against her, would be imprisoned.

2 Isami, p. 154, Isami says that the sharp-tongued Qutb ud-Din Hussain had passed some unsavoury remarks when Balban entered the Court with the white char (canopy, umbrella) over his head; T.N. p. 220. Minhaaj says, that Qutb ud-Din Hussain was imprisoned and slain on the orders of Nasir ud-Din Mahmud, as he had made some stinging remarks.

3 Barani, p. 65; T.N. p. 257. Minhaaj mentions, that Taj ud-Din Sanjar-i-Qiqluq died of poison which was given to him in a betel by a certain party (of nobles), as they had become envious of his qualities and growing strength.
their own circle. The ruler, also, coming of the same stock as the nobles, had no hesitation to enter into matrimonial alliances with the latter. Some rulers showed personal interest in the marriage of their nobles, and, also, used their influence to promote better relationships by marriage among the upper class. Minhâj says that Sultan Mu'izz al-Dîn was instrumental in getting Quhtâ ud-Dîn married to the daughter of Taj ud-Dîn Yaltuz; another daughter of Yaltuz was married to Nâsîr ud-Dîn Qubârâ. Of the three daughters of Quhtâ ud-Dîn, one was married to Iletmîsh and the other two to Nâsîr ud-Dîn Qubârâ. Prince Muhammâd, the eldest son of Balhân was married to the daughter of Iletmîsh. Balhân's other son Bughrâ Khan was married to the daughter of Nâsîr ud-Dîn Mâhmûd, the eldest son of Iletmîsh. That they did not have a sectarian view in the matter of matrimonial relationship is established by the fact, that most of the

---

1 William Archer, India and the Future, p.100. The author is of the opinion that "Inter-class marriages are of doubtful advantage, because marked differences of education and social tradition are not conducive to married happiness".

2 T.N. pp.133,141,142,265; Minhâj says that Iletmîsh had arranged the marriage of Malik Taj ud-Dîn Arsalân Khan with the daughter of Baha-ud-Dîn Tughrîl.


4 Habîb ullah, op.cit., p.161; It is more probable that Bughrâ Khan was married to the daughter of the elder Nasîr ud-Dîn Mâhmûd who was Iletmîsh’s eldest son, and not to the daughter of the younger Mâhmûd by a second wife as stated by Habîb ullah. Minhâj does not mention that Sultan Nasîr ud-Dîn Mâhmûd had any living child, and ‘Abdul Haq says, that Balhân was nominated successor by Nasîr ud-Dîn Mâhmûd since the Sultan had no child. (Tarîkh-i-Nasqâ) B.M. Or. 26, 210, f 12a.
nobles offered to marry outside the community, if the other party belonged to the same status. This was encouraged only where the male was a Muslim and the female a Hindu, and not otherwise. The seventeenth century historian Firishta, who, of course, is no authority for the events of the twelfth century, says that Mu'izz al-Dīn had married the daughter of a Rajput Chief.  

1 'Ala ud-Dīn Khaljī had taken Kamla Devī as his wife, and his son had married, Deval Rāni, a daughter of the latter by her first husband. 2 Firuz Tughlaq's mother was the daughter of a Rajput chief. 'Afī furnishes the interesting account of Siyahsalar Rajab's marriage with Firuz's mother. 3

It is extremely doubtful that these alliances led to any strong bond of unity among the nobles. Instances are not wanting of nobles connected by such ties who gave precedence to their personal ambition and remained engaged in conflict with one another. 4

---

1 Tārīkh-i Firishta. Vol. I, p. 98; D. F. Mulla, Principles of Muhammadan Law, pp 217, 219 (sec. 200, 201a), 'Marriage with an idolatoress is irregular, but the irregularity could be removed by the wife becoming a convert to Islam.

2 'Isamī, p. 324; Ishwarī Prasad, Medieval India, p. 250.

3 'Afī, pp 37-39. Firuz Tughlaq's mother was originally styled 'Bibi Na'īla', but after her marriage with Siyahsalar Rajab, Ghīyāth-ud-Dīn Tughlaq gave her the name of Bibi Kad-Bamī.

4 Barānī, pp 234-235, 249; 'Alū ud-Dīn Khaljī treacherously murdered his father-in-law to occupy the throne and, also, killed his other in-law relations whom he considered obstacles in his path; 'Isamī, p. 234; Tārīkh-i-Mubarak Shāhī, p. 69.
Taj ud-Din Yalduz did not hesitate to march against his son-in-law Qubacha to deprive him of his territory. Quṭb ud-Din waged war against his father-in-law, Yalduz, and expelled him from Ghazna. Balban appeared all set for an armed conflict with his son-in-law, Naṣir ud-Din Mahmud, and if Ibn Baṭṭuta and 'Isāmī are correct, he poisoned the latter to occupy the throne.¹

Baranī says that a common characteristic of the nobles was to name their sons after Prophet Muḥammad. This was obviously intended to invoke the blessings of the name,² and, also, to show respect to the founder of the Islamic faith.³ Whatever the spirit, in practice their life was contrary to most of the preachings of Muḥammad. The armed attack on the congregation offering prayer in the mosque, and the invitation by the religious men, whom Minhāj tauntingly calls dastar-baudān, to the rival group of nobles to come and occupy the throne of Delhi, provide ample proof that religion was used only as a

---

¹T.N., pp.134, 143, 219; Baranī, p.286. In order to prevent conspiracies for rebellion 'Alā ud-Din Khaljī ordered that nobles and great men should neither visit each other's houses, nor give feasts, nor organize meetings. They were also, forbidden to form family alliances without permission from the throne.

²'Affī, p.278. While reciting the Qurān, Firuz Tughlaq would with great fervour kiss that spot where he would fill the name of God.

³Baranī, p.66, says that although all the sons of the eminent Khāns who had been named Muḥammad became famous, the one most distinguished among them was Prince Muḥammad, the eldest son of Balban.

⁴T.N. p.189. Minhāj states that the attack took place during the reign of Radiya, while 'Isāmī (Futūḥ u's Salātīn, pp.116-117) mentions the attack in the reign of Ḥotmīšāh.
slogan of war, and morality was at a low ebb during the period.

Minhaj describes Nur Turk as a leader of heretics, and accuses him of having instigated an armed attack on a prayer gathering in the mosque in the reign of Ra’diya; while Nizām ud-Dīn Auliya, a highly respected contemporary saint, has praised the piety and integrity of the latter.  

As a rule, the mystics and religious divines were treated with consideration and respect by the nobles. Ilmetnish would always say after he had become king that whatever he had achieved he owed to the benediction of a saint.  

Regarding Balban we know that he would take his meals in the company of the learned men, and would visit the tombs of religious men after Friday prayer.  

Nizām ud-Dīn Auliya mentions Shīr Khān as being hostile to the saints, but assigns no reason for his attitude.

1. Fawāʾid ul Fawaʾiḍ (Urdu) translation by Malik Fadl ud-Dīn, pp 155, 161; Nizam ud-Dīn Auliya says that Nur Turk was an ’Allīm (a learned man) and he finally settled at Mecca; T. N., p.189. Minhaj alleges that Nur Turk had called the ‘Ulema Nasibī and Murījī. (According to Nizām ud-Dīn Auliya, the Rafidīs were called Nasibīs,) Professor W.M. Watt, Islamic philosophy and Theology, pp.35,32, says that the Murījītes held the belief that a person accused of grave sin should not be ex-communicated but ought to be given the prescribed punishment for his offence; the final judgement should be left to God on the Last Day. The Rafidīs sincerely believed that ’Aṭī should have succeeded Muḥamnad as the Imām; D. S. Margoliouth, Early development of Muhammadanism, p.224, where it is stated that Murījī believed in the precedence of faith over works.  


3. Barani, p.46; Fawāʾid ul Fawaʾiḍ (Urdu translation), pp 188,189. Nizām ud-Dīn Auliya testifies that Balban possessed a strong faith, he never missed any of his prayers and was punctual in the Friday prayer.  

4. Fawāʾid ul Fawaʾiḍ (Urdu translation), p.179. Nizām ud-Dīn Auliya says that Shirkhan was not well disposed to Shaikh ul Islam Fari’d ud-Dīn, although the Shaikh was a true Muslim divine.
The learned men, also, received much respect from the nobles. The story of Taj ud-Din Yalduz, as given by Minhaj, is indeed a classic example of the esteem in which teachers were held during the period. Taj ud-Din had placed one of his sons under a preceptor. The teacher once chastised the boy by striking an earthen water-flask on his head, and caused his death. When Taj ud-Din Yalduz was informed, he instead of taking the teacher to task gave him some money for expenses and advised him to leave the place before the boy's mother learned of it. When Minhaj for the first time proceeded to the court of Iltumish for meeting the latter, the first Malik whom he met was Taj ud-Din Sanjar. The noble offered Minhaj his own coat and also gave him a red apple saying "Take this, Mawlana, so that it may be auspicious."  

The autocrat, 'Ala ud-Din had openly denounced the interference of the Ulama in state-affairs, but nevertheless he would himself at times seek the verdict of the learned men of his policies. Barani furnishes

---

1 T.N., p. 133
2 T. N. p. 232. Ab-i-Kaukhan, Dr. S. M. Ikrām, pp. 116-117, where we read that Nasir ud-Din Qubadā, the governor of Uchch, was a great patron of the learned. Salīd ud-Din Muhammad 'Awfī flourished in his court, and Chachrama, the first history of Sind' was written during his governorship. Due to his munificence to scholars a number of learned men thronged his court; Ibn Battuta, Transl. H. A. Gibb, p. 207, where it is stated that in India scholars were called Mawlana (our master).
3 Barani, pp. 290-5; Taj ul ma'athir, 1486, I. O. f. 655: In spite of his incessant campaigns, Qutbud-Din could spare some time to join the company of the learned and extend patronage to them.
a list of learned men, but that can by no means be considered complete; for on the authority of Shaikh Mubarak ul Anbati we are told that in the mid-fourteenth century in the city of Delhi alone there existed one thousand madrassahs. The term probably is used for all types of educational establishments. These madrassahs undoubtedly were not built exclusively by the rulers but were also the result of private enterprise. R. Nathan says, "In former times the higher education of Muhammadans was in the hands of men of learning who devoted themselves to the instruction of youth. Schools were attached to mosques and shrines and supported by state grants in cash or land, or by private liberality. Individual instructors of merit were also aided by the state, and land-holders and nobles vied with each other in supporting scholars of repute."  

The nobles, after a successful expedition, showed keen interest in establishing at the captured place, mosques, madrassahs, and monasteries. The mosques were also institutions of learning, where primary education was imparted. This practice continues even

---

1 Otto Spies, op. cit., p. 29; Barani, pp. 353, 354. Barani admits that a complete list of the learned men would be an exceedingly lengthy work.

2 Futuhat-i Firuz Shahi, quoted in History of India as told by its own Historians, Vol. III, p. 383, 4, mentions only one madrasah as the contribution of Iltumish. The original text says, "The madrasah of Shams ud-Din Iltumish had been destroyed, which I rebuilt and furnished with sandal-wood doors."

to this day, in Pakistan and India. Religious discourses were held in the dervish monasteries and some of these have been collected into books.¹ Dr Yusuf Husain describes the madrassahs "as the stronghold of orthodoxy which aimed at stabilizing a body of beliefs and discipline prescribed by these beliefs, around which the entire social structure revolved."² At the initial stage, the founding of such institutions was indeed inevitable. These served not only as the channels through which the philosophy of the Islamic religion was to be made known, but also as the source for supplying the much needed religious personnel, the Qādis, the Muftis, the Imāms and other authorities and functionaries of religion. Hasan Nizāmi informs us that Mu'izz al-Dīn after conquering Ajmār, demolished the temples and established mosques and madrassahs.³ On the authority of Minhāj we know that Muḥammad Bakhtiyār and his Āmīr had founded mosques, madrassahs, and monasteries at Lakhnoutī, when it was made the seat of government.⁴

¹N.N. Law, *Promotion of Learning in India,* p.19. Law says, "Muhammadan learning was promoted by the establishment of hundreds of mosques which like the churches of Medieval Europe were centres of both religion and learning." ²S.M. Ja'ffar, *Education in Muslim India,* p.18. Ja'ffar says, "Muslim khanqahs, analogous to the monasteries of Medieval Europe, made provision for education which was mostly religious."; the discourses of Nizām ud-Dīn Auliyya enabled his disciple, Hasan ʿAla Sanjārī to compile an invaluable work entitled Fawā'id ul-fawā'id; Early development of Muhammadanism, p.215, where a mosque is described as a place of worship, instruction and debates.


³Tāj-ul-maʿathir, I. O. 1486, f.43b.

⁴T.N. (ed. M.A. Chughtai), pp.64,157. Regarding Tāj ud-Dīn Sanjar-i-Qīqluq, Minhāj says that he had founded ʿJamīʿmasjīds in several places.
two famous madrasahs in the early period of the Delhi Sultanate; the madrasah-i-Nasiriya and the madrasah-i-Mu'izzil. The charge of madrasah-i-Nasiriya was assigned to Minhaj in the reign of Radia. This madrasah was built by Iltutmish as referred to in the Funtat-i-Firuzshahi, who it seems had named it after his eldest son Nasir ud-Din Mahmud, whom he had designated as his heir-apparent, but who had pre-deceased him. The other madrasah being situated in the cloth-market, was most probably originally a Hindu-temple, which was converted into an educational institution during Aybek's vice-royalty, as the location and name of the institution would suggest.

The court of Prince Muhammad, the eldest son of Balban, was famous as a meeting place for the men of letters. The prince demonstrated his taste for literature by collecting twenty thousand unique couplets composed by the most celebrated authors. On two occasions he sent presents with messengers to Shiraz to Shaikh Sadi, the reputed Persian poet, and invited him to Multan, but the poet could not comply on account of his infirmity and old age. However, on

1 Dr Yusuf Husain (Glimpses of Medieval Indian Culture, p.73) states that the madrasah-i-Nasiriya was built by Balban when he was the Chief Minister, after the name of his master, Nasir ud-Din Mahmud; S.M. Ja'far, Education in Muslim India, p.41. says that the madrasah-i-Nasiriya was built by Sultan Nasir ud-Din Mahmud himself; T.N., pp.188-9. Both Mr Ja'far and Dr Yusuf appear to be incorrect as Minhaj had held the charge of madrasah-i-Nasiriya in the reign of Radia, when Balban was of no importance and Nasir ud-Din was then only eight or nine years old.

2 T.N., p.188.

3 F.E. Keay, Indian Education in ancient and later times, p.112, says that Qutb ud-Din was a man of literary tastes who destroyed Hindu temples and built many mosques which were centres not only of religious worship but also of education, T.N., p.189.

4 Barani, pp.68-9; Prince Muhammad was a great admirer of the learned, the skilful and the ingenious. Barani quotes Amir Khusrau and Amir Hasan as having said, "if we and other accomplished ones had been fortunate the martyred Khan would have remained alive." N.N. Law (Promotion of Learning in India, p.24, n.2) is entirely wrong in stating that the sixth sphere of Khusrau's Nuhsirihr refers to the education of Prince Muhammad, the son of (continued on next page)
both the occasions he sent to the prince verses written in his own hand, and also praised in a prolific manner the abilities of Amīr Khusrau, who according to Fīrishta was the most esteemed member of the prince's learned society.\(^1\) Amīr Hasan 'Alā Sanjārī, styled the Sa'dī of India and Amīr Khusrau basked in the sunshine of the prince's patronage. Barānī says that the reputation of Prince Muhammad's literary tastes and his patronage extended to scholars attracted to his court the most learned and accomplished men of his time. In his literary gatherings, his attendants would read the Shāh-nāma, the Dīwān-i Sana'i, the Dīwān-i-Khusānī and the Khamsa of Nizāmī, while the knowledgeable would review the literary merits of these works.\(^2\)

Whatever the status and authority of a noble, he was required to observe the court etiquette when he appeared before the Sūltān.

Bughra Khaṇ was obliged to follow the court ceremonials, when he approached his son, Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād, the Sūltān of Delhi.

(continued from previous page)

\(^{4}\) Balban. In fact, it gives an account of the education of Mubārak Khalīfa's son, who was also called Prince Muhammad; Barānī, pp.144-45. Barānī makes some reference to the education of both sons of Balbān; Tarikh-i Fīrishta, Vol.1, pp.137-8.


\(^{2}\) T.A., Vol. I, p.37. Nizām ud-Dīn, tells us that Prince Muḥammad always associated with accomplished men whom he esteemed more than any of his other courtiers; cf. Barānī, pp.67; 197-8, who says, Jalāl ud-Dīn Khalīfa was a great appreciator of talents. The day he was appointed the 'Adār-i Mamallik, he fixed twelve hundred tankas as allowance for Amīr Khusrau, the same amount that Khusrau's father used to receive; Tarikh-i Fīrishta, Vol. I, p.137; J. Briggs, op. cit., Vol. I, p.252. Fīrishta says that Balbān's second son, Bughra Khaṇ, also organised a society which consisted of musicians, dancers, actors and story tellers.
After Bughrā had made obeisances and kissed the ground thrice, Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kāiqubād casting aside all pretensions of royalty, fell at the feet of his father and began to weep, a scene that touched the hearts of all the courtiers who were present. ¹

A noble while appearing in the Darbār was required to don the Khilaṭ (robe) bestowed by the Sultan, otherwise he was to come in the dress usually worn by people of his rank; the cap being an essential part of the dress. ² In the court a special row was assigned for the nobles. ³ Usually they would stand behind the throne, but in some cases would also have a place on the ruler's left. ⁴

It was customary for the nobles to bring presents when they came to the Darbār. ⁵ The governors of the provinces, as taken of their

¹Barānī, pp.142-3; Otto Spies, op.cit., p.73; According to custom, no one even with a small knife can have access to the Sultan; J.P. Tavernier, Travels in India, Vol. I, p.302; According to Tavernier, obeisances consist in placing the hand three times on the ground, and as often on the head and at the same time praying for the Emperor's health and long life, and the power to vanquish his enemies.

²'Arīf, p.280; G. Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, Vol. IV, p.154. Rawlinson says "The Persian ruler was distinguished by his headdress which was peculiar alike in shape and colour."

³Ibn Battūta, Trans. by H.A.R. Gibb, p.199. Ibn Battūta records that the wazir stands in front of the Sultan, the functionaries and nobles stand along the hall to the right and left, the secretaries stand behind the wazir, then comes the chamberlains, and others behind him in order of precedence.

⁴'Arīf, pp.279, 283; 'Arīf informs us that the ruler usually addressed the court through his wazir, in order to dispel any misgivings of strained relations with this important officer of the court; Otto Spies, op.cit., p.73; where it is said that the ministers stood around the ruler on the Sultan's right and left and behind were the armour-bearers, while the Government officers stood before him. Only the khāns, the sadr-i-jahan, and the dābirān, who were on duty had the right to sit.

⁵Ibn Battūta, Trans. by H.A.R. Gibb, p.200 says that a donor was required to make three obeisances before reaching the Sultan, and had to make another at the station of the Chamberlain. The Sultan, out of courtesy, would ask for some part of the present and then, turning it this way and that way, would express his approval.
allegiance, would send presents to the Sultan if they did not come in person. Būghra Ḵān, the father of the king of Delhi, sent numerous presents to his son from the eastern bank of the Sarjū, where he had encamped. Bernier, the seventeenth century traveller describing the general custom of Asia, says, "In Asia, the great are never approached empty-handed." In the fifteenth century, 'Abd-ur-Razzāq, the ambassador from emperor Shāh Rūkh presented five beautiful horses and some costly dresses to the king of Vijaynagar.

The Sultan usually reciprocated by conferring a title, or increasing the rank, or giving gifts of greater value. In the reign of Muḥammad Tughlaq shrewd traders would advance money to an intending visitor to the Sultan for bringing presents and would later share the profits resulting from the return gifts of the sovereign.

While the ruler interpreted the present as an expression of loyalty and respect by the noble, it was in fact a form of bribe.

1 Barānī, pp. 143, 144.
2 François Bernier, Travels in the Mongol Empire, p. 200. Bernier informs us that as a mark of respect, he presented eight rupees to emperor Aurangzib when he was first taken before the emperor.
4 Ibn Batūta, Trans. by H.A.R. Gibb, pp. 184-5. Ibn Batūta says that the merchants in Sind and India place both their money and their persons at the service of any new visitor to the Sultan. When the visitor is requited with a magnificent gift from the Sultan, he pays off his debt to the trader who makes an enormous profit through such transactions; T. N., p. 239; Minhāj says that when Saif ud-Dīn Aybek sent some elephants from Lakhnūṭī to Delhi, he received the title of Tughān tat.
as the noble offering the present expected in return certain favours from the Sultan.  

Bribery was not an uncommon feature in the administration of the Delhi Sultanate, Barani says, that in the reign of Balban, two thousand igta'dars of the days of Iltumish, some of whom had died, still retained possession of their igta's through their sons and slaves. Some of them attended laxly to their military duties, while others obtained exemption by offering bribes of wine, goats, hens, pigeons, oil and corn, to the na'ib-i-'ard-i mamālik (deputy muster-master), and other officers of the department.  

Muhammad Tughlaq had ordered his treasurer to pay off the sum Ibn-Battuta owed to his creditor, but the latter demanded a bribe of five hundred tankas from Ibn Battuta to execute the royal order. 

During the Sultanate period, the judiciary perhaps remained somewhat immune from this social vice. Minhaj has immense praise for the integrity of Dādbak Malik Saif ud-Dīn Aybek. The conversation between 'Alā ud-Dīn Khalji and Qādī Mughīth ud-Dīn reveals the courage and moral rectitude of the Qādī, who at the risk of his life, did not hesitate to tell the autocrat 'Alā ud-Dīn that most of his

1 Ibn Battuta, Trans. by H.A.R.Gibb, p.198. Ibn Battuta says that if any official is absent for three or more days he presents the Sultan a gift suitable to his rank, if he has a reasonable excuse for his absence.

2 Barani, p.62

3 Ibn Battuta, Trans. by H.A.R.Gibb, p.209. Ibn Battuta, Urdu translation by Ra'is Ahmed Ja'fari, p.666; once Ibn Battuta had to pay two dinars to a ḥālib to bring an order of Muhammad Tughlaq in which a gift of twelve thousand dinārs was sanctioned for him.

4 T.N., p.275. Minhaj says that wherever Dādbak Saif ud-Dīn Aybek was posted, that tract became prosperous on account of his justice and sincerity, and the people led a quiet and tranquil life.
proceedings were against the Shari'ah, and were therefore illegal. Ibn Battuta was an eye-witness when a certain qadi remained uninfluenced by the personality of the despot, Muhammad Tughlaq, and gave the verdict against him in a suit brought by a noble.

The nobles used horses and palikis (palanquins, litter) for their conveyance. Riding on elephants was the exclusive privilege of the ruler, but in some cases the king would present an elephant to a noble in order to exalt him above his equals. The richer class of people also used palikis when they travelled over longer distances. 

Palikis being a comfortable conveyance was usually resorted to, even by rulers. After the first battle of Jarain in 1191 A.D. Mu'izz al-Din was carried to Ghazna in a litter. In 1236 A.D. when Iltutmish was attacked with illness during his expedition to Banyan, he was brought back to Delhi in a similar conveyance.

1 Barani, p.295.
3 T.N., p.236; B.K. Sarkar, Inland Transport and Communications in Medieval India, p.57.
4 K.M. Ashraf; Life and Conditions of the People of Hindustan, p.274. A Book of Duarte Barbosa, ed. by M.L. Dames, Vol.I, p.121; Barbosa in his description of Western India in the early sixteenth century, says that women used to travel in horse-carriages which were entirely covered, so that no one could see who travels within; Mrs Meer Hasan 'Ali, Observations on the Mussulmans of India, Vol.I, pp.317-9, says that Timur (Tamerlane) invented in India several covered conveyances in order to secure his womenfolk from the contamination of the neighbours. The Hindu women travelled in palanquins, a kind of litter, supported on the shoulders of four bearers two supporting the front pole, and two the pole behind; B.K. Sarkar, Inland Transport and Communication in Medieval India, p.56; says that the palanquin was usually carried by four men but for distant journeys eight or twelve men were employed for relieving one another. Being more comfortable, it was more expensive and was generally used by the wealthier members of society.

5 T.N., pp.119,176. Minhaj says that spears were broken and made into a litter to carry the wounded Sultan Mu'izz al-Din.
In 1246 A.D., Nasir ud-Din Mahmud moved out of Bahraich in a litter, but on the way he mounted a horse to reach Delhi more swiftly for his enthronement.  

The time of a noble was spent mainly in either leading expeditions or in organizing pleasure parties. The political thinker of the thirteenth century, Fakhr-i Mudabbir, considers the former as an essential factor in the life of an individual. The nobles believed that expeditions and pleasure parties were complementary to each other. The pleasure party of a noble included music, wines and gambling; betels were also freely distributed.

The nobles as a body were given to wine drinking. In the history of the nobles, Minhaji mentions with approval a solitary noble who never drank what was forbidden, inferring that the rest drank wine with impunity. Amir Khusrau tells us that wine drinking, as a habit, had taken firm root in Muslim society. The women, the 'ulumā, the

---

1 T.N., p. 209.
2 Adab-ul Harb wa Shuja'at, B. M. Add, 16, 853, 96b-109b. The author says that the gifts of God are not confined to soul, wisdom and intelligence, but also extend to the use of weapons.
3 Qiran ul sa'dain, Amir Khusrau, p. 51. Amir Khusrau says that after the Mongols were captured, Mu'izz ud-Din Kaiqubad ordered a pleasure party to be organized where wine was to flow freely; 'Afif, p. 146. During the second expedition against Lakhnauti, Firuz Tughlaq's wine drinking was interrupted by the sudden arrival of Tatar Khan.
4 'Afif, pp. 145-6; Firuz Tughlaq had no fixed time for drinking wine. Once he was seen drinking wine after the early morning prayer. His nobles also used to drink different varieties of wine; T.N., p. 266.
mu'ezzins all were fond of the forbidden drink. Undoubtedly
the common man copied those who claimed to belong to the highest
rung of the social ladder. Some rulers having realised the harmful
effects of excessive wine-drinking attempted to stop it altogether.

Balban, while a noble, was a hard-drinker, but on becoming
king he gave it up totally and also forbade it to the others. But
this prohibition had hardly any effect on his own sons. Bughrā
Khān, the youngest son of Balban, was often rebuked by his father
for his excessive indulgence in wine; while the eldest son, Prince
Muhammad, according to Baranī, drank with moderation. The
Tabaqat-i Akbarī says that Prince Muhammad, while in a state of
drunkenness, divorced his wife; later, on regaining his senses,
he wanted to revoke it, but it was not permissible according to
Muslim law.

1 Matla' ul Anwār, pp. 58, 194. Amīr Khusraw is very bitter when he says
"it is extremely ugly that the 'Ulema pour wine in the same bosom
where they have preserved the Qur'ān."

2 Baranī, p. 46; Tarikh us Sebuktīgin, quoted in History of India as told by
its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol. II, pp. 144-5, which describes
the excessive wine-drinking of the nobles; Medieval India, S. LanePoole,
p. 37.

3 Baranī, p. 81. Balban warned his youngest son, Bughrā Khān that if he did
not give up his habit of excessive wine-drinking he would be deposed from

4 Baranī, p. 67.

5 Nizām ud-Dīn Ahmad, Tabaqat-i-Akbarī, Vol. I, p. 88; The divorce incident
as narrated by Nizām ud-Dīn reflects seriously on the moral conduct of Prince
Muhammad. Hbsmī'ah's daughter was not prepared to go back to the prince,
and she told Shāhī Shad ud-Dīn, to whom she had been married after being
divorced by Prince Muhammad, that she had sought shelter in his house
from that perfidious man and God would not allow that she should again be
made over to his tender mercies. Tarikh-i Sindi, Muhammad Ma'sum 'Ali
c. 5); where the husband was repudiated his wife by three pronouncements,
it is not lawful for her to marry him again until she has married another
man, and the latter has divorced her or died after actual consummation of the
marriage.
'Alā ud-Dīn would inflict severe corporal punishment on the winebibbers who tried to violate his prohibition, as he had diagnosed it as one of the major causes of rebellion against him. Muhammad Tughlaq also took stern measures against the wine-drinkers, even confiscating their property as a punishment.

Wines were usually served by handsome young boys for whom the winebibbers had great affection. The rulers and nobles alike, had weakness for handsome young boys. Ilutmish, according to Minhāj was extremely handsome. It may seem that Qutb ud-Dīn was attracted by the comely appearance of Ilutmish, as in spite of the prohibition of his patron and master, Sultan Mu'izz al-Dīn, he could not resist his desire to purchase him. Ilutmish's leaning for attractive faces is conclusively affirmed by Minhāj and 'Isāmī.

The former demonstrated his admiration by appointing his attractive slaves as his sāqi-i-khas (personal cup-bearer). The handsome

1 Barani, pp.235-6. At first the wine-drinkers were beaten with sticks and then cast into prison, but when their number rose high they were thrown into a well which had been constructed for them near Badīn gate.

2 Otto Spies, op. cit., p.64. Shaikh Taj ud-Dīn relates that Muhammad Tughlaq once arrested one of his khana and confiscated his property for wine-drinking habits.

3 Barani, pp.160-1. Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād, having lost his self-control by the beauty of his male sweet-heart, said "If you be my cup-bearer, who will dare to call it a forbidden thing."

4 T.N., pp.160-242. Ilutmish appointed 'Isa ud-Dīn Tughril Tughan Khān, a boy of handsome appearance, as his personal cup-bearer; Barani p.160. The author says that Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād and his men were so much enchanted by the charms of a heart-ravishing boy that when the pleasure-party was organised, they declared with un Concealed ardour that they would drink wine from no other hands but his.
Qamr ud-Dīn Qirān-i Tamur Khān was purchased by Ilemtiṣh for the fabulous price of fifty thousand jītāla. Ḥīsāmī informs us that when the slave-dealer first presented Balban to Ilemtiṣh he was rejected for his ugly appearance. Male sweethearts had come to play a significant part in the life of the nobles. The fixing of the price of handsome boys by 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī, when he introduced his price-control system, strongly supports this contention. The slave system, and also the camp life of the Turks which had segregated them from the conditions of a normal family life, may be said to have been greatly responsible for promoting this vice among them. Fakhr-i Mudabbir thus gives a curious picture of the restricted sexual life of the Turks in Turkestan: "the men would live on banks of the river and the women on the opposite. On a fixed night in the year the women would cross the river and have indiscriminate intercourse since no one had a fixed husband or

---

1T.N., p.247.
2Ḥīsāmī, p.117; Ibn Battūta, Urdū translation, p.532.
3Buṣānī, p.314. In the price control regulation of 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī the price of a handsome beardless slave-boy ranged from twenty to thirty tankās, that of trained slaves from ten to fifteen tankās, and of untrained slave-boys from seven to eight tankās.
wife, in the morning the women went to their own bank, and except that night throughout the year they never met again. If any man crossed the river and went to the bank where the women lived, he was torn into bits with finger-nails and teeth and killed. ¹

Khuda Bakhsh is of the opinion that the germ of sodomy contaminated the Arabs when they came in contact with the Persians, particularly after the ascendancy of the 'Abbásids. ² In the Qabusnama, a book on statecraft and royal manners, Prince Kā'īkūs advises his son to confine his sexual inclinations to either sex, so that he could find pleasure from both kinds without embittering relations with either of them. ³ The relations of 'Alā ud Dīn Khaḍīj with Malik Kāfūr and of his son Mubārak with Khusrau Khān are well-known in the history of Muslim India. ⁴ Baranī and Nizām ud-Dīn furnish us the dialogues of a love-scene exchanged between Sultan Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kā'īqubād and his heart-ravishing boy sweet-heart. ⁵ Khuda Bakhsh provides the following explanation for this degenerated behaviour of the aristocracy, "the wealthy debauchee, enfeeble and

¹ Tārīkh-i-Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, pp. 40-1.
² S. Khuda Bakhsh, Studies Indian and Islamic, p. 102.
³ Qabusnama, pp. 48-9. C. E. Bosworth, The Ghurids, p. 103. Bosworth says that the ethical climate of the time did not disapprove physical connections with male slaves.
⁴ Baranī, pp. 251, 389-390.
satiated with the enjoyment of the harem, looked for new diversions and gaieties, and found them in these revolting practices.  

The Pardah system or the seclusion of women is ascribed to be originally a Muhammadan institution. According to F.W. Thomas, "in Hindu times women were not encouraged to court publicity, but there was no stringent restriction." Mrs Meer Hasan 'Ali traces the origin of Pardah to the time of Muhammad. Pardah was then understood merely as the veiling of the face, and 'Tyosha, the wife of Prophet Muhammad, led an army against 'Ali at the 'Battle of Camels.' But in India, the lenient Pardah system was abused by the powerful aristocracy.

Prior to the Muslim invasion in 1192 A.D. Prithviraj, the powerful ruler of Ajmir, had forcibly carried away the beautiful daughter of Raja Jachand from Qanauj. 'Ali refers to the unbecoming and

1 S. Khuda Baksh, Studies Indian and Islamic, p. 102; Tavernier’s travels in India, Vol. I, p. 44, where it is stated that the governor of Bampour had a handsome page who came of a good family. One day when the page noticed that the governor harboured the evil design of committing an immoral offence, he stabbed the governor thrice, killing him.

2 F.W. Thomas, Mutual influences of Muhammadans and Hindus in India, p. 72.


4 A. Yusuf 'Ali, Medieval India, pp. 41-5; The author narrates in brief, how Prithviraj won his bride, Sanjogin, the beautiful daughter of Raja Jachand of Qanauj; Firuz-i-Firuzshahi, quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol. III, p. 380. Firus Tughlaq says when he saw that on holy days women went out of the city to visit the tombs where immoral people found the opportunity to indulge in riotous actions, he ordered that no woman should go out to the tombs and that non-compliance would make them liable to severe upunishment.
sexual morality of the soldiery and the nobles when he puts the following words in the mouth of Khwāja Jahān, "In spite of my army and elephants, Sultān Fīrūz will capture the place and Muslim ladies will fall into the hands of the ruffians of his army."¹ To such conditions could be added the constant fear of Mongol invasion, which had tended to increase the insecurity of the womenfolk. Maintaining innumerable females in the harem for entertainment, had become a fashion with almost every noble. "Aqīf informs us that Khān-i Jahān, the wazār of Fīrūz Tughlaq, was much devoted to the pleasures of the harem, which he had filled with some two thousand women of Ḫūm and Chīn. He spent most of his time in their company and had a large number of children.² The common man who was not left with more than bare subsistence, could hardly conceive of more than one wife.³

Such conditions had necessitated the strict seclusion of the females, and the custom soon became sacrosanct in Indian society.⁴

¹ Aqīf, pp. 69, 70.
² Ibid., p. 400.
³ R. Roberts, Social Laws of the Qurʾān, p. 121; Roberts quotes the extract of a letter which he had received from the Rev. T. W. Reese, Calvinistic Methodist Missionary in Sylhet. Speaking about polygamy in India, Rev. Reese says, "Concubinage among the wealthy is extensively practiced, and also divorce. But among the poor these things involve money, their circumstances act as a sufficient preventative."
⁴ R. Levy, Social Structure of Islam, p. 127. Levy says, that by the time of Ḥārūn al-Raṣḥid, women belonging to the upper strata were completely secluded from the rest of the household under the charge of aunnah, and by the middle ages it was indeed shocking for an innocent visitor to notice free social intercourse between men and women.
Mrs Meer Hasan 'Ali maintains that the strict privacy of women in India originated with the conquest of Timur (Tamerlane) in December 1398. This was because the conqueror wanted to conceal his female members from the view of the strangers who were idolaters. In India, in the early thirteenth century, Pardah was looked upon as compulsory for the upper class Muslim females. When Radiya discarded the veil, there was strong reaction from all quarters.

The thirteenth and fourteenth century writers, Minhāj, Amīr Khusrau, and 'Isāmī, all have alike bitterly criticised her action.2

Chewing ān or betel leaves formed an essential item of every social party. On the testimony of Baranī we know that the ṭawat-ī 'ard of Balban, would employ fifty slaves in his social functions, only for distributing betel-leaves.3 Travellers visiting India have reported that offering betel-leaves in the house of the nobles and also in the royal court was a part of their social etiquette.4 A king would honour his visitor by presenting him ān in a silver or golden platter. 'Abd-ur-Razzaq, the ambassador from emperor Shāh Rukh, received along with other presents two packets of betel from the King of Vijaynagar, when

---

2 Amīr Khusrau, Matla'ī Anwār, p. 194. The poet advises his daughter that if by keeping indoors her face has become pale, it is better than the redness acquired on the face by viewing strangers. "Do not desire collyrium in your eyes by gazing at people, because by this collyrium your entire face will become black." T.N., p. 177; 'Isāmī, pp. 128-30; 'Isāmī advocates strict seclusion for women.
3 Baranī, p. 117; The ān of the ṭawat-ī 'ard was famous for its delicacy, which the ṭawat frequently consumed and freely distributed to his guests.
4 M. Athar 'Ali, The Mughal Nobility under Aḥmanqīzā, p. 139. The Mughal Emperors bestowed marks of honour on their nobles even by presenting betel-leaf.
he met him for the first time. On every other occasion when he
saw the king, he was given a packet of betel with other presents.
During the Mahānādī festival the king gave him some money, some
betel, and also some fruits reserved for his own use. 1 'Abd-ur-
Razzāq says, "the betel is a leaf, like that of the orange, but
longer. In Hindoostan, the greater part of the country of the Arabs
and the kingdom of Ormuz, an extreme fondness prevails for this
leaf, which in fact deserves its reputation. The manner of eating
it is as follows. They bruise a portion of faufal (areca), otherwise
called Sīrāt, and put it in the mouth. Moistening a leaf of the
betel, together with a grain of chalk, they rub the one upon the
other, roll them together, and then place them in the mouth. They
thus take as many as four leaves of betel at a time, and chew
them. Sometimes they add camphor to it, and sometimes they spit
out the saliva, which becomes of a red colour. This substance
gives a colour to and brightens the countenance, causes an intoxica-
tion similar to that produced by wine, appeases hunger and excites
appetite in those who are satiated; it removes the disagreeable smell
from the mouth and strengthens the teeth. It is impossible to express
how strengthening it is and how much it excites to pleasure. 2

1 India in the Fifteenth Century, ed. by R.H. Major, "Journey of 'Abd-ur
Razzāq," p.31.
2 Ibid., pp.31-2.
Chewing *pan* later became part of the Indian culture. Mrs Meer Hasan 'Ali' says, "the *pan*, the dear delightful *pan* which constitutes the greatest possible luxury to the natives."¹

In an assembly, the *pan* creates an atmosphere of cordiality, and when consumed alone, it gives a feeling of relaxation. Even these days in Pakistan and India, a visitor is always entertained with tea and *pan*, while in social functions, several trays of *pan* are kept at some prominent place for the guests. Mrs Meer Hasan 'Ali' is right when she says that in the month of Ramadan (the fasting month), the Muslims enjoy *pan* every much in the evening.² 'Abd-ur Razzāq's statement is nothing more than a mere surmise when he says, "it is probable that the properties of this plant may account for the numerous harem of women that the king of this country maintains."³

Polo, horse-riding, archery and chase, were the favourite sports of the nobles.⁴ Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek died of an accident while

---

¹ *Observations on the Mussulmans of India*, Mrs Meer Hasan 'Ali', Vol.1, p.102; Amir Khusrav, Nuh SiPhr, p.161; The poet says that during his period *pan* was exclusively the luxury of the upper class, *The India of Aurangzeb*, translated and annotated by Jadunath Sarkar, pp.311, Lvi, Lzi, Behar and Mālwa were known for the production of betel leaf, while Bengal was famous for growing the finest quality of betel-nut.


³ *India in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. by R.H. Major, "Journey of 'Abd-ur-Razzāq", p.32. Barani, p.238. says that the measures of 'Abd ud-Dīn succeeded in stopping the chewing of betel by the chaurhi, Khuts and Muggdama; Amin ud-Dīn Khan, *Muntakhab az kitab-i ma'jīnāt ul Afār*, B. M., Or. 1741, f. 83b. In North India the senior of the city was known as chaurhi.

⁴ Ab ul Fadl, *A'in-i Akbari*, Vol.1, pp.268-70, says that Akbar was fond of playing polo. He played it in dark nights with a fire-ball made of Palas wood, which was light and would burn for a long time. Pigeon flying was also one of his favourite sports, which he discontinued for sometime but resumed on ascending the throne.
playing polo. Baranī says that when 'Alā ud-Dīn Kāshī Kān was appointed Barbak, he was presented a gold polo-stick. Amīr Khusrau is quoted in Baranī's Ţārīkh-i Firuz Shahī as having said, "in generosity, archery, in striking the ball, and in chasing a game, no mother had given birth to one like 'Alā ud-Dīn Kāshī Kān."

Minhāj informs that Malik Ṭāj ud-Dīn Sanjar Kūrēt Kān was highly accomplished in horsemanship, archery and chasing.

Soon after the establishment of the Muslim kingdom in India, the construction of monumental buildings engaged the attention of the new rulers. The early architectural activity of the conquerors is thus explained by Fergusson, "Nothing could be more brilliant, and at the same time more characteristic, than the commencement of the architectural career of these Pathans in India. So soon as they felt themselves at all sure of their conquest, they set to work to erect two great mosques in their two principal capitals of Ajmīr and Delhi, of such magnificence as should redound to the glory of their religion and mark their triumph over the idolaters."

---

1 T.N., pp.140-141.
2 Baranī, pp.113,114, says that Hulāgū, having heard about 'Alā ud-Dīn Kāshī Kān's skillfulness in polo and the chase, sent him a knife as a present and offered him half of 'Iraq if he went to him.
3 T.N., p.258.
4 E.B. Havell, Indian Architecture, p.9. The great love of the Muḥammadan conquerors for architecture may be judged by the statement of Havell. "In times of war their (master-builders) lives were often the only one that were spared by the victors in battle or even in the sack of cities, for their services were highly valued by all combatants."
5 James Fergusson, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, p.499.
In C. 1192 A.D., Qutb ud-Din laid the foundation of Quwwat-ul Islam (Might of Islam) mosque at Delhi in order to commemorate its conquest. He also built a mosque known as Ar-jai-dln-ka-ihopra (hut of two and a half days) at Ajmir, which had been the capital of the vanquished Hindu Raja, Prithviraj, and according to Percy Brown, was the subsidiary stronghold of the Muslims in Rajputana.

In 1199 A.D., Qutb ud-Din laid the foundation of the Qutb Minar (the tower of Qutb), which on its completion came to be regarded as one of the 'Wonders of the World'.

From the balconies of the Qutb Minar, the faithfuls were called to prayer by the mu'ezzin. All these constructions had taken place when Qutb ud-Din was a noble, but extremely powerful.

Besides the monumental buildings of Delhi, construction work of a purely Muslim style went apace, also, in those parts of India which subsequently came under Muslim occupation. Minhaj informs us that Baha ud-Din Tughrul founded in the territory of Bayana, the city of Sultankot, where numerous proofs of his goodness exist. The rulers and nobles of the period evinced their interest, not only in religious

---

1 Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan, Athar ul-Sanadid, p.67; Percy Brown, Indian Architecture, p.10 says, "the mosque consisted of a courtyard some 141 feet by 106 feet surrounded by pillared cloisters, three aisles deep."

2 Percy Brown, op. cit., p.12, H. Sharp, Delhi, p.41.

3 Minhaaj, p.67. Sir Sayyid rightly says that the Qutb Minar was constructed to be used by the mu'ezzin for making his call to prayer. Percy Brown, op. cit., p.11, says that its primary object was to proclaim to the whole world the prestige and authority of Islam; Delhi, Sharp says, p.45, "opinion inclines to the view that it was the pillar of victory ... but ... one of the inscriptions on the building and some lines of the poet Amir Khusrau would appear to indicate that it was in fact the minaret of the mosque (Quwwat ul Islam) and used by the mu'ezzin."

buildings and palaces, but also in works of public utility.

Ghiyāth ud-Dīn 'Iwāḍ Khaljī had built a great embankment between Lakhnouti and Lakhnoīr, and on another side up until Diwākot, a distance of ten days journey, to render the roads passable during the monsoon, when the area would remain inundated. 1 When Taj ud-Dīn Sanjar Gazlak Khan assumed charge of Uchch, he established charitable foundations, works of public utility, and also exerted himself to secure tranquility for the peasantry and happiness for all the people. 2

The strong architectural instincts of the Turks have been complimented by almost all scholars. Sharp says, "If we judge from their earliest efforts, the Turks were by nature great builders, endowed with large architectonic ideas." 3 Elphinstone observes, "the progress of the Mussulmans may be judged by the specimens they have left of their architecture. The arches of the unfinished mosque (Quwwat ul Islam) near the Quāb Minār, besides their height and the rich ornamental inscriptions with which they are covered deserve mention as early instances of the pointed arch." 4

Almost all the architectural works of this period have perished, but whatever traces still remain bear ample testimony to the architectural ability of the Turks.

---

1 T.N., ed. pp. 162-3. Minhāj says 'When Ilutmish noticed the public utility works of Ghiyath ud-Dīn 'Iwāḍ, he observed that it would not be unfair to call such a person a Sultan.'

2 Ibid., p. 233.

3 Delhi, p. 21.

4 M. Elphinstone, History of India, p. 491. J. Ferguson, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, p. 499, says "A nation of soldiers equipped for conquest and that only, they of course brought with them neither artists nor architects, but like all nations of Turkian origin, they had strong architectural instincts, and having a style of their own, they could hardly go wrong in any architectural project they might attempt." E. B. Havell, Indian Architecture, p. 31. Havell assumes that most of the craftsmen were
CONCLUSION

It was from the time of Maḥmūd (998-1030 A.D.) that the exploitation of India entered into the plans of the Muslim invaders. The third attack on India, led by the Ghori chief Mu‘īsṣ al-Dīn, had a more profound effect on the history of India than the first two. Regarding the Arab invasion of Sind, Sir Wolseley Haig writes "It was a mere episode in the history of India and affected only a small portion of the fringe of that vast country. Maḥmūd’s repeated incursions into northern India resulted in the annexation of the Punjāb in the later years of his reign, which was intended to serve as a base for further operations against India and, also, to act as a buffer in the event of a counter-attack on Ghazna.

The Sultan himself resided at Ghazna, while his representative governed the Punjāb on his behalf. Both the Ghaznavid representatives, Aḥiyyāruq and Ahmed Ināltīgīn, during the reign

1 C.E. Bosworth, The Ghaznavids, p.235
2 Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit., p.10.
3 Jaipal’s invasion in the reign of Maḥmūd’s father, Sebuktīgīn, seems to have necessitated this precautionary arrangement.
of Mas'ūd were suspected of throwing off the yoke of Ghazna. Lane Poole’s observation is beyond dispute, "A capable Turkish amīr who had witnessed the successful rise of other Turks in Asia was likely to be tempted to convert his distant province into a kingdom." Ariyāruq was lured to Ghazna and when under the influence of heavy drinks he entered into the Court, was arrested and done away with. The pretensions of Ināltīgīn received a deadly blow at the hands of Tilak in 1033-34 A.D.

Mu‘izz al-Dīn was fortunate, as Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek, his representative in India was sincere and loyal to him. He conquered territories and administered them on behalf of his royal patron. After the death of Mu‘izz al-Dīn, Qutb ud-Dīn did not conquer any new territories. After his death in 1210 A.D., confusion prevailed and nobles such as Ārām Shah, Iletmīsh, Nāṣir ud-Dīn Qubācha and ‘Alī Mardān each carved out a kingdom for himself; the Hindus in turn were, also, not found to be slow in recovering some of their territories, including Ranthambor, Gwāliyūr, Mandwar, Jalor and Thangīr. By 1227 A.D., Iletmīsh had recaptured all of these regions and in 1235 A.D., a year before his death, he even made new accessions to the Delhi Sultaṇate by conquering Mālwah, Bhilsa and Ujjain.

1 Tārīkh-i Baihaqi, pp.221, 404; After Ahmed Ḥasan had lured Ariyāruq to Ghazna, he told the Amir to keep Ariyāruq out of India if it were to be retained.
2 S. Lane Poole, Medieval India, p.35
3 Tārīkh-i Baihaqi, pp. 229, 433
4 T.N., pp. 172, 174, 176.
Iletmish had purchased a number of slaves for his own protection, hoping also that they would support his dynastic rule; but instead it was they who within a period of thirty the years brought about extinction of his dynasty. Elphinstone writes, "At the death of Iletmish the contest with the Hindus was at an end, and the period which followed was occupied by a succession of plots, mutinies and revolutions, equally destitute of present interest and permanent effects."

After the death of Iletmish the Muslim empire shrank in its dimensions. Taking advantage of the political disorder in the Delhi Sultanate, Vagbhata wrested Ranthambor from Muslim control. Dissension among the nobles, which sometimes led to hostilities, made reconquest of lost territories a remote possibility. As the rift among the nobles widened, the Mongol threat increased, paralleled by that of the Hindus. During the reign of Iletmish, in 1221 A.D., the Mongols in pursuit of Jalāl ud-Dīn Khwārazm Shāh could not advance beyond the Indus, but in 1241 A.D., after Raḍīya and Muʿizz ud-Dīn had exhausted the energies of the empire in fighting for the throne and the nobles had taken their respective sides, the Mongols found

---

1 M. Elphinstone, *History of India*, p.375.
their opportunity to attack Lahore and subject it to sack and plunder; whatever remained to complete its destruction was done by the Hindus after the Mongols had left.

Balban did not appreciate that it was the disunity among his own people that was at the basis of these troubles, and from 1241 A.D. to 1260 A.D., he was so dispirited by the Mongol incursions that he decided on the policy of making plundering raids into the territory of the Hindus in order to mobilise resources for meeting further Mongol attacks.

The rivalry among the nobles did not even deter them from imperilling the security of the Delhi Sultanate. The discontented among them, like Shīr Khān Sunqur, who had stoutly defended the frontiers of the Sultanate against the Mongols, and Jalāl ud-Dīn, the son of Iltutmīsh, did not scruple to take refuge in the Mongol Court at Turkestan. Most unfortunate was the conduct of 'Īzz ud-Dīn Balban Kاشhī Khān, who not only transferred his allegiance to the Mongols, but also, in 1257 A.D., conspired with other nobles to overthrow Nāṣīr ud-Dīn Maḥmūd with Mongol help. The Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica informs us that in the year

1 T.N., pp. 171, 393-395.
2 T.N., p. 291.
1257 A.D., the Mongols appeared before Multān and Shaikh Bahā ud-Dīn Zakariya, a Muslim divine, was obliged to purchase the safety of the city by paying one hundred thousand dinars. Luckily 'Izz ud-Dīn Balban’s plan did not succeed; its consequences would have been disastrous in that the sovereignty of Delhi would have passed over to the Mongols. Contrary to the practice of other Muslim states, the acts of these nobles were condoned, and some were even rewarded by being given extensive igīās. In the reign of 'Ala ud-Dīn Mas'ud, Ikhāyār ud-Dīn Yuzbāk rebelled against the Court but was pardoned on the recommendation of Ghāyāth ud-Dīn Balban. A second time he behaved in a refractory manner, but was simply reduced to obedience and after some time was entrusted with the charge of Awadh. Like a born rebel, he finally threw off the yoke of Delhi and proclaimed himself king at Awadh, under the style of Sultān Mughīth ud-Dīn. His reckless career came to an end during the Kamārup expedition, when he was taken prisoner and he is believed to have died of heart failure in the presence of its ruler.

1 M.H. Quraishi, ‘Multān - Its brief history and Persian and Arabic inscriptions’ Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, 1927-28, p. 4

2 William Emin, History of India under Baber and Humāyūn, Vol.I, pp.418, 420. In 1524 A.D., when Sultān Ibrahim Lodī sent an army against Daulat Khān Lodī, the governor of Lāhore, who had been suspected of rebellion, the latter sought the assistance of Babar, who came of the same Mongol stock, and in return promised to recognize him as his overlord. Babar readily responded to the invitation and succeeded in defeating the Imperial army under Behār Khān, but instead of restoring Lāhore to Daulat Khān he himself took possession of it.

3 T.N., p.278; In 1260 A.D., Shir Khān Sunqur was assigned a large territory as his igta’, comprising Kol, Bayana, Balāram, Jalīsar, Menr, Mahawan and the fortress of Gwaliyur.

Evidence exists that all nobles were not anxious to occupy the throne. The fact that a sovereign stood the risk of losing his life, as was not uncommon with the unfortunate successors of Iltutmish, explains the attitude. Büghra Khan, the son of Balban, refused the throne of Delhi and preferred the governorship of Lakhnouti. Two rulers of the Tughlaq dynasty, Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Tughlaq and Firuz Tughlaq, were initially reluctant to accept the throne. The contemporary accounts tell us that they subsequently yielded to the pressure of the nobles. About Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Tughlaq, Sir Wolseley Haig says, "After a decent profession of reluctance he was proclaimed king on September 2, (1320 A.D.), under the title of Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Tughlaq Shah". As it would appear, 'Izz ud-Dīn Balban Kashtu Khan and Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Balban were the only nobles who never disguised their thirst for sovereignty.

While the acts of the nobles had tended to weaken the sovereign power, their relations with the peasantry and the common man were rather better. The appointment of Hindus for assessment and collection of revenue, and a policy of non-interference with their traditional customs went far to securing an attitude of harmony. Except in Mewāt, when the security

1 Baranī, pp.121-122, 421-423, 535-536; Baranī says, however much Firuz would decline kingship, the elders were determined not to accept any refusal from him.

2 Sir Wolseley Haig, op. cit., p.126.

3 Tārā Chand, Influence of Islam on Indian Culture, p.137.
of the Sultanate was in danger due to Mongol depredations, there is no evidence of any local uprising, neither was revenue ever withheld. The great wealth of India had made the nobles extremely debauched. A picture of their dissipated life is thus presented by Barani. "Seekers of pleasures, convivialists, sensualists, purveyors of wits, and clowns, who (during the reign of Balban) had disappeared, and had remained unemployed in the corner of abasement and were without a customer, came into demand with the accession of Mu'izz ud-Din Kaiqubad. Beautiful damsels re-appeared in the shadow of every wall, and handsome figures came into display on each balcony. Master of melodies and chanter of odes were to be found in every lane. In every quarter a singer and a composer of melody lifted his head. The time became ripe for the debauched and the seekers of romance. Fortune smiled on the parasites and the courtiers; prosperity extended its welcome to the jesters and buffoons. The star of musicians, lovely damsels, and the moon-faced ones was in its ascendancy. Sultan Mu'izz ud-Din Kaiqubad, his nobles, the sons of his khans and maliks, the gay, the rich, the sensualists, and the epicures, one and all gave themselves up to pleasure and merriment, and the hearts of the notables and the common men of the realm became inclined to wine, sweet-

1 Barani, pp. 129-130; Cf Amîr Khusrau, Watt-ul-Havat, I.O.1457, f 28b. Khusrau is elated that wine-drinking is given up in the month of Ramdan.
The irruption of the Mongols in Central Asia had driven
the learned men from their homes, many of whom found refuge
in the Court of Delhi. Some were absorbed in to the administra-
tion while others were appointed as teachers in madrassahs.
Titus writes, "in their new found home they successfully
established the tradition of scholarship, which had made the
Muslim schools of the west, whence they had come, so famous".
The presence of these learned men made the Sultanate the cultural
centre of the East. But the Turkish amirs, in the reign of Rukn-
ud-Din, killed a number of them just to preserve their political
supremacy. The conception of a regular administrative or
judicial system had no existence for the nobles. In the reign
of Balban after the overthrow of the Caliphate of Baghdad by
Hulagü in 1258 a.D. the Delhi Sultanate became a magnet
for foreign luminaries of whose company Barani says, the Sultan
was extremely fond.

It is generally agreed that the early conversion in India was
largely the work of those missionaries who either came independ-
ently or followed in the wake of the conquering army. Arnold is
of opinion that force played no significant part in conversion,

1 M.T. Titus, Indian Islam, p.77
2 T.N., p.173.
rather it was the effect of the teachings and persuasion of peaceful missionaries.

The offer of Islam usually made to the Hindūs before an attack, no doubt was sometimes responded to, but on the whole the effect was short-lived and ceased to be effective after the retreat of the invaders. The most famous "missionary" of the thirteenth century was Khwāja Muʿīn ud-Dīn Chishtī, who came and settled at Ajmīr. About him, Arnold says that he exercised great influence over the Hindus, so much so, that while he was on his way to Ajmīr he succeeded in converting some seven hundred persons at Delhi. Another missionary, BuʿĀlī Qalandar, according to Arnold, in late 13th century converted one Amīr Singh at Panipat, whose three hundred Muslim Rajput descendants testify to the conversion at the hands of the saint.

It is doubtful if the nobles had made substantial provision for the maintenance of missionaries who were hardly men of means. On the authority of Akhbār ul Akhīvār we know that Qutb ud-Dīn Bakhtīyar Kākī, after whom the Qutb Minar is named and who was a disciple of Khwāja Muʿīn ud-Dīn Chishtī,

1 T.W. Arnold, Preachings of Islām, pp. 208-210 (edition 1896). This statement is deleted from later editions.

used to subsist on loans. Titus writes, "Usually they have been individuals endowed with piety and religious zeal, frequently men of learning, who through their own personal interest in the spread of Islam, and inspired with a divine call, have been content to wander from place to place and gather disciples".

By far the most important factor which attracted the Hindus to Islam, were the benefits which would follow conversion. According to Lane Poole, "the moment an Indian accepts Islam he enters a brotherhood which admits of no distinction of class in the sight of God, and every advancement in office, and rank and marriage is open to him".

The majority of them entered the fold of Islam of their own free will. It is not unlikely that when someone became a Muslim, he persuaded other members of the family to follow his example. Arnold says that besides missionaries, Muslim men and women of all ranks tried to convert people to their own faith". He writes, "In a list of Indian missionaries published in Anjuman-ī Himayat-ī-Islām kā māhvari risālah (Lahore, Oct. 1889, pp. 5-13)

1. Akhbar ul Akhīrār, Urdu Translation by Iqbal ud-Dīn Ahmad, p. 55.
2. M.T. Titus, Indian Islam, pp. 42, 43; Titus says that Syed Ahmad Kabir, known as Makhdum-i-Jahānīyān, had converted many tribes in the Punjab. He quotes no authority for his information.
3. S. Lane Poole, Medieval India, p. 62.
we find the names of schoolmasters, government clerks in the canal and opium department, traders including a dealer in camel carts, an editor of a newspaper, a book-binder and a workman in a printing establishment. These men devote the hours of leisure left them after the completion of the day's labour, to the preaching of their religion in the streets and bazars of Indian cities, seeking to win converts both from Christians and Hindus whose religious beliefs they controvert and attack".

With the passage of time harmony increased between the two communities; the seed of which had been sown in the time of Mahmūd when he began employing Hindūs in his army. On the appointment of Tilak who was the son of a barber, as Mas'ūd's commander in chief against Ināltigīn, Lanejool observes, "the fact that a Hindū should have attained such a position shows how far the process of assimilation between the Turks and the Indians had already gone".

The intercourse between the Hindūs and Muslims after the Ghaznavid invasion of India, led to the growth of a new language called Urdu. The difficulties which the Persian-

---

2 S. Lanejool, Medieval India, p.42.
speaking foreigners and the local people faced in their mutual dealings, for want of a common medium of expression, was obviously the motive force in its evolution. Dr. Sādiq attributes the beginning of Urdu to the patronage of the Bahmani dynasty (1347-1526 A.D.), the first independent Muslim rulers in the South. He says, "It may be surmised that when they broke away from the tutelage of the north, the Bahmanids discarded, like all newly emancipated people, the forms and conventions of the north, and remained intent on developing their own culture, and although they had strong affiliations with Persian, the cultural language of the Musulmans in India, they decided, nevertheless, to cultivate their own language in preference to it". Dr. Sādiq's theory cannot be entirely accepted. It is true that the language received encouragement at the Bahmani court, which led to its advancement, but its development-process may be traced to the 13th century in the works of Amīr Khusrau. His Dībācha-i Ghurrat ul Kanāl, and other Hindī (pre-Urdu) compositions may be cited as cases in point. Dr. Yusaf Husain says that several later writers have mentioned the popularity of

1 H.G. Rawlinson, A concise history of the Indian people, p.2, says that the official language of the Muhammadan invaders was Persian, but later from a combination of Persian and Hindī they evolved a new language known as Urdu, or the language of the camp.

2 Muhammad Sādiq, A history of Urdu literature, p.44
Khusrau's Hindi poetry in their works. Khusrau calls himself an Indian Turk who is ignorant of Arabic, but is nevertheless capable of answering fluently anything that is asked in Hindi. He was an ardent protagonist of the language and possessed a keen desire to accord it an acknowledged status. Ja'ffar has very rightly analysed the circumstances which brought the language into existence. For Urdu "the soil was prepared and the seeds were sown during the early Muslim period and that the harvest was reaped during the Mughal rule and the British Raj. And what gave rise to the new language is not difficult to say. Forces such as the system of instruction, Hindus and Muslims studying together in the same schools, without any restrictions of race, rank or religion - compulsory education in Persian; translation of Sanskrit and Hindi books into Persian; mutual exchange, adoption and incorporation of words, thoughts and ideas; Hindu-Muslim social intercourse, combined and collectively created Urdu, which in course of time, superseded its parents - Persian and Hindi - and became the lingua franca of northern India".

1 Yusuf Husain, Medieval Indian culture, p.105; Sayyid Ahmad Khan, 'Ashur us sanadid, pp. 204-212
2 S. M. Ja'ffar, Education in Muslim India, pp.216-217
Amīr Ruhānī, an illustrious literary figure who had migrated from Bukhara to Delhi after the catastrophe of Chengīz Khān, wrote the following verses when Iltmish conquered Ranthambor and the Siwalik territories.

خریب به اهل سا بر و جب پر سر
نفح تا ملک نب عید نصرت نا

که از سر آسمان بر سر
پی بشرت بعد کل و چک

که از باد ملک ما حضر شیش خاص
کت شد با رٍ چر چر اپه سهوا آ گی

شک ماجد فانی کے دست غیس یا
روای حیدر کیا میکا محسین

---

1 Tabaqat-i Akbarī, Vol. I, p. 61
2 This misra is corrupt.
When Iletmish conquered Gwalliyur, his dabir, Taj ud-Din Reza composed the following ruba'i, which was carved on a stone on the gate of the fort. It gives the year of the conquest.

APPENDIX 'G'

Cultural prosperity during the reign of Iltutmish

The following extract from 'Isami's Futuh us salatin, describes
the cultural richness of the Delhi Sultanate during the reign of
Iltutmish.

**Extract from Futuh us salatin**

"Рай ярдеми даларас илем..." (Praise is given to those who support..."

---

See next page.

1 Futuh us salatin, pp. 109 - 110.
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