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The loving memory of
Sir Shāh Muḥammad Sulaimān
and
Dr. Sir Ḍiyā-u’d-dīn Aḥmad
Vice-Chancellors of the Muslim University, ‘Alīgarh
FOREWORD

Syed 'Azīz Aḥmad came to us as a research scholar from the Lucknow University, desirous of working on the Muslim Political Institutions. He prosecuted his research work with remarkable assiduity on the Political History and Institutions of the Early Turkish Empire of Delhi (1206-1290 A.D.) and was awarded a Ph.D. degree—the first in History and Political Science in our Department—by the Academic Council of our University on the recommendation of the external examiners—Sir E. Denison Ross, Director of Oriental Studies, London University, and Dr. Tara Chand, M.A., D.Phil. (Oxon.) of the Allahabad University.

There is nothing in the history of India within historic times more important than the coming of the Mussalmans. In almost every aspect of Indian life—philosophy, administration, architecture, languages—their influence has been felt. The literature on the subject is not so extensive as we could wish and manuscripts have still to be discovered. Nevertheless, the existing literature on the subject enables us to see the whole problem of the thirteenth century in a definite form.

The bulk of Dr. 'Azīz's thesis gives a detailed account of the political history and institutions of the period under review. The account is based on the best available sources. The Introduction is devoted to a critical study of the Hindu and Muslim socio-political systems of the time and the facts collected by him are well-authenticated.

I am inclined to give a few extracts from the reports of his examiners, which speak for themselves. Sir E. Denison Ross stated, "Before proceeding to any general criticism I
would like to say that this thesis represents a great deal of most careful research, and a utilization of most of the best authorities available, including many untranslated Persian Texts. The candidate has produced a well-put-together narrative of the events in Upper India during the thirteenth century, which witnessed the reigns of several very remarkable men of Turkish extraction. He has obviously read very widely; and has formed sound judgments with regard to their policies and their personal character. The work as a whole bears evidence of great thoroughness and scholarly instincts."

Dr. Tara Chand said, "The thesis gives a detailed account of the political history—careers, conquests and achievements of the Sulţâns of Delhi. The account of the Turkish Empire opens with a chapter describing the political conditions obtaining in 'Ajam. The third part discusses the origin and theory of kingship; the basis of the state; the position and functions of the Sulţân or Emperor; the composition and gradation of the nobility, the constitution of the imperial councils and the list of principal office-bearers and their functions, the organization and ceremonial of the imperial court and the organization of the four Dīwāns and the departments of the state. The thesis shows that the author has carefully studied the literature on the subject and has made good use of the original authorities. Besides the printed texts of Persian chronicles—both contemporary and later, use has been made of a number of manuscripts in Persian. The authorities used have been handled judiciously and critically. The author has produced a work on the early history of the Delhi Sultanate which is fuller and more detailed than any previous work in English. His discussion of the problems of central administration is clear, and, so far as such a difficult subject could be made clear, quite lucid."

Dr. 'Aziz has done a great service to Indian history and
politics by his volume on the "Early Turkish Empire of Delhi." It co-ordinates, as is essential for this period, the march of events in India, Central Asia and Persia. It subjects the originals to a thorough analysis in order to bring out all the implications. It views the whole problem in a scientific light. It breaks a new ground and takes the reader back to the past instead of regaling him with latter-day prejudices. All students of Indian history and politics will find Dr. 'Azīz's work a most welcome addition to the literature of the middle ages.

MUḤAMMAD ḤABĪB,
B.A., (HONS.), (OXON.)
Professor of History and Politics,
Muslim University, 'Aligarh.

April 5, 1949.
PREFACE

Political institutions of an age are not intelligible without a thorough study of the political history of the period. The ensuing pages are devoted to an elucidation of facts—social, religious, political and architectural—based on a study of authorities, both contemporary and later. The last two chapters deal with the political organization of the Empire of Delhi (1206-1290 A.D.), opening with a discussion of the nature of Islamic Political Theory and leading to a criticism of the political institutions in vogue in the thirteenth century.

Modern historians have not done full justice to the glorious past of Islām: some have not viewed our institutions in the light of Islām; others have occasionally tried to identify all the existing institutions with the teachings of Islām. A more scientific attitude should be to separate the great ideals of Islām from the individual acts of the individual rulers, so as to judge the actions and behaviour of the latter according to the specific ethical ideals of Islām. This is how we can retain the nobility and purity of Islām. This is the Ḥabībian school of thought—the 'Allīgarh school of history and politics to which I have the honour to belong.

Today I deplore the loss of many—my mother, who gave me the first lessons in Islām; Kanīz Khātūn, my sister, who loved me tenderly; the two Vice-Chancellors, Sir Shāh Muḥammad Sulaimān and Dr. Sir Ḍiyā-ud-dīn Aḥmad, who encouraged my research and studies; Professor Ghilānī, who taught me Persian, Dr. Ḍabdul 'Azīz Purī, my invaluable colleague, and Sir Muḥammad Ya'qūb, my benefactor.
I am indebted to many of my esteemed colleagues for the varying degrees of kindness and sympathy—Mr. ‘Aẓmat Eiḥṣi Zubairī, Registrar; Mr. Ḥamīd-u’d-dīn Khān, Reader in Persian; Mr. Bāshīr-u’d-dīn, Librarian; Mr. Zubair Aḥmad, Acting Librarian; Syed Akhṭar Ḥusain of the Botany Department; Mr. S. M. Shaft’, Provost S. S. Hall; Mr. ‘Abdu’l Majīd Quraishī, Provost; Dr. Nafts Aḥmad Quraishī of the University Hospital; Dr. Ģishtiḡq Ḥusain Quraishī of the Delhi University; Mr. S. Zafar Ḥusain, ex-Director of Archaeology, Government of India, and Mr. Nazīr Bakhsh of the Vice-Chancellor’s office.

Iam grateful to my colleagues of the Department of History and Political Science, who always treated this youngest colleague of theirs with consideration. My special thanks are due to Dr. S. ‘Abdu’l Ḥalīm, through whose efforts it was possible to persuade Mr. Amīr-u’d-dīn, of the Ģāṭāb Hall Office to deposit the inscription of the Khwājah Jahān in the Lytton Library of the Muslim University.

My thanks are due to Śhaikḥ Muḥammad Aṣḥaf for kindly undertaking the publication of this voluminous book, and for printing it so excellently.

I cannot express in words the gratitude that I owe to my noble professor and guide, Muḥammad Ḥābib, who, in consonance with the true Islamic tradition, regards me as a son and takes a personal interest in my life and welfare.

MUḤAMMAD ‘AZĪZ AḤMAD

The following system of transliteration has been followed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ل$</td>
<td>$a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ب$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$پ$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ت$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ث$</td>
<td>$th$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ج$</td>
<td>$j$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ش$</td>
<td>$sh$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ض$</td>
<td>$dz$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ط$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ث$</td>
<td>$th$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$غ$</td>
<td>$gh$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ق$</td>
<td>$q$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ث$</td>
<td>$k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ش$</td>
<td>$g$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ش$</td>
<td>$sh$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vowel signs: short vowels = $a$, $i$, $u$.

long vowels = $ā$, $ī$, $ū$. 
INTRODUCTION

I

THE EARLY TURKISH EMPIRE OF DELHI lasted from 1206 to 1290 A.D. It is popularly, but inaccurately, called the ‘Slave Dynasty’; and is sometimes also known as the ‘Pathān’ or ‘Afgān Dynasty’: all these terms are misnomers. Contemporary, as well as the later authorities, do not contain a word with regard to such apppellations, for which European writers are alone responsible. The rulers of the Early Turkish Empire of Delhi were styled by contemporary historians as Mu‘izzī, Quṭbī, Shamsī and Balbāt kings, after the names of the prominent sovereigns, who placed themselves first on the throne from Sulṭān Shihāb-u’d-dīn of Ghūr to Sulṭān Mu‘izz-u’d-dīn Kaiqubād. There is no doubt that they had been, at the outset of their careers, slaves, or slaves of such slaves or sons and daughters of slaves. Nevertheless, ‘Slave’ and ‘King’ are contradictory terms; a slave is no longer slave when he is manumitted by his master, and no slave could ascend a throne unless he had obtained a letter of manumission (khaṭṭ-i-āzādī) from his master. Sulṭān Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak was sent a letter of manumission and a canopy of state by Sulṭān Maḥmūd, the nephew and successor of his master, Sulṭān Shihāb-u’d-dīn of Ghūr. Quṭb-u’d-dīn’s slave and successor, Sulṭān Shams-u’d-dīn Īltutmīsh got his freedom from his master before the latter’s death. The

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 135, 157 & 164. In the reverse legend of the tankah, Shams-u’d-dīn is entitled as القطبي (al-Quṭbī), which refers to his original position as a freed slave of Quṭb-u’d-dīn. (H. N. Wright: Sultans of Delhi—Their Coins and Metrology, p. 71.)

2 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 140.

3 Ibid., p. 170.
successors of İltutmış were not slaves, but the Sultan's own sons and daughter. The next ruler, Balban, belonged to the 'forty Turkish slaves of İltutmış' better known as 'Chaheğān' or 'Forty', and was liberated along with them.¹ Sultan Mu'izz-u'd-din Kaiqubād, the last of the Dynasty, was Balban's grandson. It is clear, therefore, that none of these rulers was a slave when they ascended the throne.

Secondly, they were Turks and not Afghāns or 'Pathāns'. Qutb-u'd-din was brought from Turkistan and sold to Qāḍī Fakhr-u'd-din 'Abd-u'l-'Azīz Kūft.² "Even if the Turks have no status, nobility, or position of their own," says the author of the Nisbat-Nāmah, "it is a source of pride, for the king of Islam (i.e., Qutb-u'd-din) is a Turk."³ Both İltutmış and Balban belonged to the renowned Ilbarī tribe of Turkistan.⁴

Thirdly, all the Sultans did not belong to one family or dynasty. Qutb-u'd-din had no son to succeed him. Ārām is a solitary figure of no importance. His successors are İltutmış and the latter's sons and daughter. Lastly, it is the house of Balban that rules.

The Turkistan of the medieval historians was an extensive country: it was bounded on the east by China, on the west by Rūm, on the north the walls of 'Yājjūj and Mājjūj' (Gog and Magog) and on the south by the mountains of Hindūstān;⁵ and was famous for its rare and precious products such as musk, rich cloth, fur, horses and camels. The Turks, as a people, were divisible into two sections—the civilized town-dwellers and the backward migratory tribes, still trekking across the desert or wilderness—between whom there was often a good deal of friction. The development of the Turkish race cannot be discussed here. But the following remarks of Fakhr-u'd-din Mubārak Shāh

¹ Dūr Barnī, Tārikh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 26.
² Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 138.
³ Tārikh-i-Fakhr-u'd-din Mubārak Shāh, edited by Sir E. D. Ross, p. 37.
⁴ Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, pp. 166, 281.
⁵ Tārikh-i-Fakhr-u'd-din Mubārak Shāh, edited by Sir E. D. Ross, p. 38.
may be noticed in passing. The Turks possessed books and an alphabet of their own, knew logic and astronomy and taught their children how to read and write. The Turks living in the forest of Lurā (Lawrā) had peculiar customs, and whenever a son was born to them, they used to place a dagger by his side so that when he grew young he might make it a means of his occupation. Some burnt their dead, and others buried them in earth. He also mentions a quaint totemic survival: "All men lived on one side of the river and all women on the other, and no system of marriage prevailed. However, a night was fixed in the year, when women crossed the river and went over to the men and returned to their original homes the next morning. With the exception of that particular night, no man at any time was allowed to visit a woman, and if he did, his teeth and nails were cut off and he was put to death."

The various tribes of the Mongolian race—Turks, Tartars Turkomen, Tibetans, Chinese and Mongols extended from Anatolia to the shores of the Pacific Ocean. With the extension of the Muslim frontier to the north and west of Persia, one Turkish tribe after another came under subjection, and attracted the attention of their conquerors by the bravery of their men and beauty of their women. Alone among the unbelievers converted to Islam, the Turks did not hanker after their original homes and relations, and turned out to be orthodox Mussalmans and zealous warriors. Also unlike other races, the Turks enjoyed no special power or prestige so long as they remained in their homelands, but when they migrated to foreign countries, their status increased and they became Amīrs and generals. "Since the dawn of creation up to the present day," says the author of the Niṣbat-Nāmah, "no slave bought at a price has ever become a king except among the Turks." Afrāsiyāb, a legendary Turkish king, is once supposed to have remarked, "The Turk is like a pearl in its shell at the bottom

1 Tāriḵh-i-Fāhr-ud-dīn Mubārak Shaḥ, edited by Sir E. D. Ross, p. 44.  
2 Ibid., p. 42.  
3 Ibid., pp. 40, 41.  
4 Ibid., p. 35.  
5 Ibid., p. 36.
of the sea, which, when it leaves the sea, becomes valuable
and adorns the diadems of kings and the ears of brides." ¹

Thus, the period under review is marked by the ascen-
dancy of Turks, who had slowly and steadily replaced the
Persians from the ordinary post of royal bodyguard to the
highest officers of the state, and, through sheer force of
military efficiency, became the absolute masters of the
Abbasid Caliphate. It is interesting to recall how Mu'taşim
took the fatal step of introducing the Turkish element
in the army. The fact that the Turks were the virtual
masters of the Caliphate can be well illustrated by a story
related by Ibn Ṭīqtaqā, who says, "The courtiers of Mu'taz
summoned the astrologers and asked them how long his
Caliphate would endure. A wit present in the gathering
said, 'so long as the Turks please', and every one present
laughed." ²

A despotic form of government cannot exist long with-
out an efficient bureaucratic machinery for its executive
work, and it was soon discovered that the young slaves
brought from Turkistān and Māwarā-u'n-Nahr formed an
excellent material for such a corps. While the bureaucracy
owed its classification from the decimal system of the Turks,
is origin may, however, be traced to the slaves purchased
and trained by the 'minor dynasties' of Persia from the
time of the Samanids. Slave trade, thus, became one of the
most profitable business ventures of the age. The slave
dealers left no stone unturned in the selection and training
of Turkish slaves and they were handsomely paid for their
investment and labour. The best slaves were purchased by

¹ Tārīkh-i-Fahhr-u'd-dīn Mubārak Shāh, edited by Sir E. D. Ross, p. 37:
"مثل تركي مهربون دری است که در صدف و دریا باشد.
هر چند در مسکن خود است، په قدر و قیمت باشد و چون
از صدف و دریا بیرون افتاد، بها گیرد و قیمتی گردید و زیان
تاج پادشاهان و زیور و نامی اه گردید و گوش عروسان شود.

²  Kitāb-u'l-Fahhrī, p. 333.
kings and princes and had prospects in life, which were denied to free-born subjects.

The great quality of a Turkish slave was the efficiency of his work. Starting with an education, which was seldom within the reach of middle-class free man, he gradually won his way up the strings of the bureaucratic ladder. In those days of anarchy and confusion, governments were not stable; provincial governors were too prone to declare independence and their subordinate officers followed their example. A bureaucracy of Turkish slaves was the only remedy possible. Torn away from his tribe and kinsmen and a stranger in a strange land, no consideration interfered with his devotion to his master's person. His whole course of training inculcated loyalty and submission. The slave was the property of his master; for him there was honour in bondage. Though the Apostle had commanded the slave to be clothed and fed like the master,¹ he, nevertheless, fell legally in his master's power. Every sphere of his life, public or private, was under the personal control of the monarch. He could neither marry nor hold pleasure parties nor even visit his fellow-officers without the master's consent. And curiously enough, when he died, he was inherited not by his sons but

1 "العبد وما في يده مثلا" (the slave and what he possesses is the property of his master).

In Arabic slave is called 'Abd (عبد) or Mamlûk (مملوك). The term used in the Qur'ân for slaves is مملكتكم (That which your right hand possesses). The commandments of the Qur'ân with regard to slavery are as follows:—

"Honour God and be kind...even to your slaves." (IV, 40.) "And slaves, who crave a writing (i.e., a document of freedom), write it out for them, if ye know any good in them." (XXIV, 33.)

Ṣaḥīḥ-u'l-Bukhārī and Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim account as follows:—"When a slave of yours has money to redeem his bond, then you must not allow him to come into your presence any more." It is incumbent upon the master of the slaves to find them victuals and clothes. The Prophet strictly enjoined the duty of kindness to slaves. "Feed your Mamlûks," said he, "with food which ye eat, and clothe them with such clothing as ye wear, and command them not to do that which they are unable to do."
by the monarch, who, as a compensation, looked after the children of the deceased slave-officer and very often employed them in his service. Consequently, the progress of a slave depended upon the degree of loyalty he showed to his master. And to be a slave of the king constituted a special title of respect. 'The slave of today is the Sultan of tomorrow' was a time-honoured proverb. Everything depended upon his merit, intellect, sagacity and skill, and should he be found wanting at any stage, his fate was sealed. No favour or partiality was shown; those, who were really competent rose from the humble post of Khāṣahdār (king's personal attendant) to positions of power and sovereignty. Merit and not favouritism was the standard; and the slave system in a way, secured the survival of the fittest.

The career of Sultan Shihāb-ud-dīn of Ghūr is generally dismissed as a side issue in the general history of Muslim Asia. His defeat at Andkhud spoiled his reputation, and his former conquests presented an insignificant and hollow contrast to the extensive empire established by the Mongols in Asia or Europe. For part of the oblivion that has befallen him Shihāb-ud-dīn Ghūrī is himself to blame. Unlike many other warriors, he was no patron of letters, had no cultured court, no society of educated men. Still he was a man of action, full of life and energy and unfailing resources. His success in life was due to an insatiable ambition backed by a tenacity of purpose, such as few men have ever possessed. His real achievement lay not in his conquests but in the organization of a system, according to which his generals and descendants continued to govern Hindūstān for about a century after his death. When during the latter part of Shihāb-ud-dīn's reign, a bold courtier condoled him on the lack of male offspring, the Sultan contented himself with saying that he had several sons, namely Turkish slaves, to rule after his death. But for his slaves, there would have

1 Examples of Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak, Shams-ud-dīn Ilutmish and Ghīyāth-ud-dīn Balban may be cited in this connection.
2 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 123.
3 Ibid., pp. 131, 132.
been, perhaps, no Turkish rule in India. The example of the
gallant Sultān Shihāb-u'd-dīn of Ghūr bred heroic followers,
and his slaves Tāj-u'd-dīn Yildiz, Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Qabāchah
and Quṭb-u'd-dīn Aibak rose to power and command in the
Afghan mountains, on the Indus and at Delhi, respectively.
The Turkish government of the thirteenth century was
composed of several elements, borrowed from various coun-
tries. The king and his courtiers breathed the atmosphere of
Persian paganism; the army was organized after the manners
of the Mongols and the Turks, and below the central govern-
ment was the old Hindu system of local government. The
Indian Empire, which the early Turkish Sultans inherited
from their master, was a 'flimsy structure.' Unloved by the
people and dependent on a Turkish oligarchy, it had neither
the material strength nor the moral prestige, requisite of a
permanent government. But the emperor-sultans of Delhi
knew of no legal limitations to their power. Practical limi-
tations there were—riots, civil wars, palace intrigues, dis-
loyalty of his officers and above all an armed and militant
class of the subject races. However, the will of the Emperor
was very often, really, supreme over all causes, judicial or
administrative.

Medieval kingship was a hybrid institution, non-Muslim
and non-Hindu. Maḥmūd of Ghaznah, Shihāb-u'd-dīn of
Ghūr and Shams-u'd-dīn ʿIlutmish were not inspired by the
democratic ideals of the early Saracens. The Muslim Caliph
was elected by the faithful; his power originated from the
people below and not from God above. But the Sassanian
Emperors of Persia had claimed 'divinity' and an exclusive
right of their family to the throne. The Muslim king, on the
other hand, was symbolically the 'shadow of God on earth'
(Zīllullāh), and not a divine incarnation. Yet the Medieval
kingship was essentially a secular institution; its power was
based on Persian tradition and not on Islamic law.
The 'new monarchy', however, fared well for some time.
The death of Shihāb-u'd-dīn and the extinction of his dynasty
left his slaves and officers without a master, and the tie of 'salt and sonship' was broken. As a consequence, a triangular duel commenced between Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak of Delhi, Nāṣir-u’d-dīn Qabāchah of Sind and Tāj-u’d-dīn Yildiz of Ghāznīn,¹ and when the Mongols snatched away the dominion of Tāj-u’d-dīn and Ŭltutmīsh overpowered Nāṣir-u’d-dīn, the Turkish slave-aristocrats took to intriguing against each other. Their object as a class was twofold—first, to prevent the crown from becoming too powerful and, secondly, to monopolise the offices of government. As a result of the Mystic Propaganda of the Chishtiis and the Suhrwardis, a large number of Hindus had been converted to Islam by the end of the thirteenth century, and the shari‘at of Islam gave an equal status to all Mussalmans. But the Turkish aristocracy strictly forbade an equal treatment, and held the new Muslims in scorn and contempt.

The Turkish officers were successful at first, and to a large extent held the crown in check. Quṭb-u’d-dīn died without suppressing his rivals.² Shams-u’d-dīn Ŭltutmīsh could with great difficulty, retain his storm-tossed throne, but his sons were set up and pulled down with bewildering rapidity and the heroic Raḍīyyah gave up her life in a vain attempt to subdue the spirit of aristocratic lawlessness.³ The Turkish officers struck both at the crown and the people, and were themselves divided into bitter factions. Every one of them said to the other, "what art thou? and what shalt thou be, that I shall not be?"⁴ Thus, the reigns following the death of Ŭltutmīsh were very much disturbed by the rivalry and insubordination of Turkish Malikis. All was panic and confusion, and Delhi became the scene of a series of tragedies. To reform the corrupt condition of the kingdom and to infuse a fresh vigour in the government, Balban resolved upon devising more effective schemes. For

¹ TINGSIT-i-NASIRI, p. 140. ² IBID., pp. 140, 141. ³ IBID., p. 190. ⁴ DIZ BARNI, TARHI-i-FIRUZ SHAHI, p. 28: "تو کیستی که من نه ام؟" و "تو که باشد که من نیاهم."
the rebellious Maliks and Amirs, he thought, the assassin's dagger or poison was the only remedy possible, and got rid of most of the 'Forty' by a liberal use of both, and in order to reduce the remnant to a sense of their inferiority, he made them stand motionless in his presence with folded arms and vexed them with petty rules of etiquette. Frequent executions and even massacres restored the loyalty of the people and their governors, and the state slowly recovered from its ruinous condition.

Balban was after all a Turk and desired the subjection, not the annihilation, of the aristocracy. Soon after his death, the Turkish officers again began their factious intrigues. Balban's grandson was a pleasure-loving, mild, cultivated and humane prince. He gave himself up to the pleasures of the senses, indulged in gross vices and never shook off sloth and luxury. The officers abandoned every pretence of submission to the Sultan's authority, but, nevertheless, maintained that reckless racial vanity which was the medieval birth right of the Turks. The family of Balban was to an extent their rallying point. But circumstances had changed, the Khalji opposition was strong and the revolutionary forces, strengthened by an ever-increasing number of converts, were gaining ascendency. The Turkish Amirs, though divided in many groups, were unified by a common hatred of the Khaljis. To the proposed insensate persecution of the Turks, the Khaljis replied with the assassin's dagger. The feeble representation of the once mighty empire of Delhi offered an easy prey to the hardy warriors of the Khalji clan and their low-born Indo-Muslim supporters. One by one the Turkish Amirs were assassinated, and Muizz-u'd-din

2 Qirun-u's-Sa'dain, p. 56.
3 Compare for example a  رباعي sent by Babar to the ruler of Bayana:  

با ترك ستيره مكن اه مير بيانه  
جالاک و مردانگي ترك یمان است  
اکر زود نيلاي و نصابت نه کنی گوش  
آن را که یمان است چه حاجت ز بيان است  
4 Baduni, pp. 163, 164; Tarih-i-Mubarak Shahi, pp. 60, 61.
Kaiqubād was murdered in the Kilū Kherī palace.¹ With him the 'Early Turkish Empire' came to an end. The revolution was complete. The government had passed from the foreign Turks to the Indian Mussalmans and their Hindu allies. India was henceforth to be governed by administrators sprung from the soil. The new aristocracy had not its origin in slavery, but all the servile conditions were imposed upon servants recruited from a free-born population by the ruthless 'Alā-u'd-dīn Khaljī and with the Khaljī Revolution, the period, with which we are concerned, comes to a close.

II

The last decade of the twelfth and the first decade of the thirteenth century in India were marked by the clash of two degenerate and decaying social systems—the Turkish and the Rajput. In this clash the former proved itself to be decisively superior; for in war as in peace success depends upon comparative merit. And so it came to pass that the Ghurians were defeated by the Khwarazmians, and the larger part of Afgānistān passed into the hands of 'Alā-u'd-dīn Khwārazmshāh. But the weakness of the Khwarazmian Empire was patent to all keen observers long before it was extinguished by Chingiz; lack of morality among the people led to lack of morale in the administration and the army, and two good Mongol campaigns were sufficient to expose the hollowness of Turkish power in Central Asia and Persia. And yet this very period of moral and spiritual decay in Muslim Asian lands, the Turkish race, soon to be crushed and humiliated in its own homelands, subduced the whole of northern India. Between the defeat of Shihāb-u'd-dīn at the first battle of Tarāin in 1191 and the retreat of Bakhtiyār Khaljī from the banks of the Brahmaputra in 1205, there intervenes the brief period of thirteen or fourteen

years. But it sufficed not only for the conquest but also for the consolidation of Turkish rule in the Punjab, Sind, Oudh, Doāb, Bihar, Bengal and a part of Rajputana. The rapidity as well as the permanence of the Turkish conquest stands in sharp contrast with the slow, uphill progress of British rule in India, specially if it is remembered that the Turkish generals as compared with the great British pro-Consuls had no superiority (apart from military organization) against their Rajput opponents; no navy to place their communications beyond the enemies' reach, no artillery-parks, which the enemy could not match and, above all, no home-government with its practically unlimited resources. The Turkish regime was completely annihilated by 'Alā-u'd-dīn Khaljī in the early years of his reign, but the Empire of Delhi, founded with such rapidity, lasted with varying fortunes till the middle of the eighteenth century and was not formally extinguished till after the Mutiny of 1857. And never, if we except the Khaljī Revolution, had the Delhi Empire to face any extensive movement that, even belated communalism or patriotism can consider religious or national. The oddest part of the Turkish conquest was its general acceptance by the country—acceptance temporarily of the Turkish bureaucracy and permanently, of the centralized government of the Empire of Delhi, which they had inaugurated. It is one of the most puzzling facts in Indian history.

The mules succeeded where the war-horses had floundered. Alexander the Great retired sulkily to his tent by the bank of the Jhelum after leading the most heroic expedition in the history of mankind, because his war-worn veterans refused to follow him further east. Maḥmūd of Ghaznah, in spite of twenty-six years of brilliant campaigning—and for sheer military genius our country has never seen anything like them—never attempted to annex any territory beyond the Rāvī. It was left to Shihāb-u'd-dīn Ghūrī, the hero of three stupendous defeats—Gujārāt, Tarāin and Andhkhud—to achieve what the Greeks and the Kushans, the Huns and the Ghaznavids had hardly dared to dream of. The Ghurian conquest of India might have been dismissed as a fable,
were the evidence for it not so absolutely convincing and complete. On the face of it, the thing seems palpably absurd. The Ghurian dynasty lost its prestige in Central Asia; even its homelands were trampled by hostile troops; nevertheless, its Turkish slave-officers succeeded in establishing one of the greatest empires in the Middle Ages. The economic resources of the Ghurian Empire, even at the height of its power, about the year 1202, could hardly have been equal to those of a second rate Indian Raja, whose state covered five or six districts. The territory of Ghūr and Ghārijistān, though equal in area to an Indian province, is a bleak desert of rocky mountains swept by the bitter cold north-wind, where the snow lies thick on the ground for more than half the year; its reputed valleys of a thousand springs' ¹ are only charming to eyes that have seen nothing better. The comparatively fertile regions to the south and east of Ghūr—Bāmiyān, Kābul, Zābulistān, Nīmrūz, Sījistān etc.—annexed by Ghiyāth-u’d-dīn and Shihāb-u’d-dīn in the earlier years of their reign, had been thoroughly ransacked and plundered by the Ghazz Turks. Ghaznīn, shorn of its earlier glories, had become a small city of mud-houses, all traces of which have now been lost. The resources of the Ghurian state in man-power were equally meagre. Counting Turks and non-Turks, men, women, and children, the Ghurian brothers may have ruled at the most over a million souls, possibly less, certainly not more. Unlike Mahmūd, Shihāb-u’d-dīn could officially enrol no recruits, volunteers or professionals from outside his territory. He was intensely unpopular in Persia, specially in Khurāsān, which he had repeatedly ravaged. Khwārazm (the Trans-Caspian region), Māwarā-u’n-Nahr and Turķistān were in the hands of hostile powers. Nor was meagreness of resources compensated by the extraordinary ability of those in command. Shihāb-u’d-dīn had, undeniably, that sort of genius, which Carlyle defines as 'the infinite capacity of taking pains'. But nothing more. As a general he was

¹ Hence probably the name 'Hazārah' (thousand), by which Ghūr is now known.
industrious but incompetent. A resolute foe could always drive him away from the battle-field; in the face of a competent strategist, like 'Alā-u'd-dīn Khwārazmshāh or Tānikū Ṭarāż, he completely lost his nerve, and became panicky, confused and muddle-headed. Nor do the recorded achievements of principal generals show any remarkable strategic capacity—apart from that bull-dog tenacity of persistent endeavour in the face of repeated defeats—which might explain their undeniable success. They were brave, but not braver than most men brought up in the profession of arms.

Nor had Ghūr any of those moral or constitutional virtues, which have enabled small states, like Rome, Medina or England, to establish extensive dominions. The hold of the Ghurian monarchy over its subordinate officers was weak, very weak; in the hour of trial and gloom, most generals of Shihāb-u'd-dīn proved untrue to their master, and after his death they proved even more faithless to his legitimate successor and to each other. The victorious Ghurian state was rotten with intrigues to the core. That is the primary reason for its collapse. Shihāb-u'd-dīn himself had set the example of chicanery and fraud in the realms of diplomacy. He never hesitated to break his plighted word, whenever it suited his plans. Like many of his contemporaries in that demoralized age, he apparently considered the assassination of political opponents a justifiable, if not a commendable, measure of public policy. His generals, needless to add, improved upon his example. Add to it, while the Shansabāniyyah Dynasty represented a stock of respectable Turkish hill-chiefs, the officers of the state were Turkish slaves purchased in the market. Whatever the strength of their loyalty to their master so long as he was strong enough to command them, they had no loyalty to the Ghurian Dynasty, and proceeded, as we shall see, to appropriate or misappropriate the dominions of Shihāb-u'd-dīn to the exclusion of Shihāb-u'd-dīn’s legitimate heirs.

The Ghurian conquest of northern India, when all factors are kept in mind, can be explained by one fact only—
the caste-system and all that it entails; the degeneration of
the oppressor and the degeneration of the oppressed, priest-
craft, king-craft, idol-worship with its degrading cults, the
economic and spiritual exploitation of the multitude, the
division of the people into small water-tight sub-caste
groups, resulting in the total annihilation of any sense of
common citizenship or of loyalty to India as a whole.

Indian historians have often deplored the lack of histori-
cal material after the death of Harshavardhana. Competent
experts may, with the advance of time, be able to piece
together a more consecutive narrative than we have at pre-
sent on the basis of copper-plates and coins. So far as
Muslim records are concerned, a flood of light is thrown on
the condition of Sind by the Chāch-Nāmah (or Tārīkh-i-Hind
wa Sindh), the Arabic original of which, there is every reason
to believe, was compiled on the basis of government records
and personal investigation by no less a person than Muḥammad bin Qāsim’s qāḍī of Multān. The Arab tra-
vellers in India have left records of their impressions. Some of their records were translated by Elliot in the
first volume of his History of India and later scholars
have improved upon his work. But the Arab travellers
were neither Sanskritists nor trained observers; their primary
business was import and export, and they very often com-
pletely misunderstood the significance of what they saw.
On the other hand, translations were inaccurate to start
with, and after several generations of incompetent copyists,
had added to the errors of the translators; the manuscripts
became a sheer jumble of nonsensical figures and diagrams,
which no assiduity on the part of a mere Arabic scholar
could put into form and order. Lastly, as we can well un-
derstand, owing to that innate tendency of human nature to
misunderstand and misrepresent one’s opponents, the wildest
and the most impossible stories about India were current in
Muslim lands. Abū Rihān Alberūnī, the greatest Muslim
scholar, whom India has seen, protested against all this and
after years of patient investigation produced the Kitāb-u'l-
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Hind—'a simple historic record of facts.' For us the great importance of the Kitāb-u'll-Hind depends upon its methodology—a fine modification of the dialectical system of Socrates, in which Alberūni had been trained at Khwārazm, to suit the subject-matter of his inquiries. He gives us a unique survey, unsurpassed by anything yet written in its comprehension of general sociological and philosophical principles as well as minute scientific details, of the achievements of Hindu thought in ages gone-by, specially the Gupta period. During his internment in India, he associated extensively with Hindu Pandits, whose habitual contempt for the mlechcha changed ultimately to one of deep reverence. It was, apparently, his habit during these discussions to drive his Pandit friends by repeated examination and cross-examination—conducted after the manner of Socrates—to the most consistent statement of the basic doctrines of their faith. Though intimately acquainted with the works of Plato, Alberūni has (very wisely) not given us a record of his discussions but only brief, lucid and remarkably accurate definitions of the 'fundamental categories of Hindu thought'—the Weltanschauung or world-outlook of the educated upper classes of his day. "The main and most essential point of the Hindu world of thought is that which the Brahmins think and believe, for they are specially trained for preserving and maintaining their religion. And this is what we shall explain, viz., the belief of the Brahmins." Critical scholarship, however, necessitated a careful comparison of the faith of the educated classes with the sacred texts on the one hand and with the silly notions of the multitude on the other. A student of comparative religion and philosophy was further bound to put the thought of various peoples side by side; all this comes within the compass of Alberūni's work.

A careful examination of Alberūni's India leaves upon one the impression that the philosophical, religious and

1 Alberūni's India, translated and edited with notes by Professor E. S. Sachau.

scientific ideas of the educated classes were all they could have been; that the mass of the people wallowed in mud and mire, raising the dirtiest, filthiest, and crudest fancies of the day to the dignity of religion; that educated Brahmans of the better sort were horrified at this degradation of their beloved faith, but were too weak or too disorganized to make an effective protest; that less scrupulous Brahmans not only earned their livelihood but established their authority by praying upon the weaknesses and the fears of the multitude; and that the Rajas or chiefs, instead of joining the reformers, consciously promoted many vicious institutions for the benefit of their treasury. And, consequently, the governing classes, willy-nilly, were dragged down to the moral and intellectual level of the governed.

First as to the categories of contemporary Brahmanical thought, which Alberūnī regards with such tender reverence:

1. **Idea of God.**—"The Hindus believe with regard to God that he is one, eternal, without beginning and end, acting by freewill, almighty, all-wise, living, giving life, ruling, preserving, one who in his sovereignty is unique, beyond all likeness and unlikeness, and that he does not resemble anything nor does anything resemble him. If we now pass from the ideas of the educated people among the Hindus to those of the common people, we must first state that they present a great variety. Some of them are simply abominable, but similar errors also occur in other religions."¹

2. **Noumenon and Phenomena.**—Hindu ideas on this question are difficult to interpret, but Alberūnī's account may be summarized as follows: "The whole creation is a unity and the totality of 'the twenty-five' elements is called tattva. The Hindus are not decided among themselves on the point of the cause of action; they attribute action to different causes like nature, the soul, or time; but the truth is that action belongs to matter, for the latter binds the

¹ *Alberūnī's India*, edited by Sachau, Vol. I, p. 27.
soul, causes it to wander about in different shapes and then sets it free." All Indian systems, except Buddhism, admit the existence of a permanent entity variously called Atman, Purusha or Jiva. As to the exact nature of this soul, there are indeed divergences of views; but all agree in holding that it is pure and unsullied in its nature.

3. Reincarnation.—The distinctive feature of Hinduism or, to be more exact, of all Indian cults is not belief in one God, which is found in all faiths, but the peculiar path of salvation prescribed. Alberūnī’s statement of the doctrine of metempsychosis or reincarnation deserves to be carefully considered. "As the word of confession, 'there is no god but God, Muhammad is His prophet,' is the shibboleth of Islam, the Trinity that of Christianity, and the institute of the Sabbath that of Judaism, so metempsychosis is the shibboleth of the Hindu religion. Therefore, he, who does not believe in it, does not belong to them, and is not reckoned as one of them. For they hold the following belief:—

"The soul, as long as it has not risen to the highest absolute intelligence, does not comprehend the totality of objects at once, or, as it were, in no time. Therefore, it must explore all particular beings and examine all the possibilities of existence; and as their number is, though not unlimited, still an enormous one, the soul wants an enormous space of time in order to finish the contemplation of such a multiplicity of objects... The world is not left without some direction, being led, as it were, by a bridle and directed towards a definite scope. Therefore, the imperishable souls wander about in perishable bodies conformably to the difference of their actions, as they prove to be good or bad. The object of the migration through the world of reward (i.e., heaven) is to direct the attention of the soul to the good, that it should become desirous of acquiring as much of it as possible. The object of its migration through the world of punishment (i.e., hell) is to direct its attention to the bad

1 Alberūnī’s India, Edited by Sachau Vol. I, p. 31.
and abominable, that it should strive to keep as far as possible aloof from it.

"The migration begins from low stages, and rises to higher and better ones, not the contrary, as we state on purpose, since the one is a priori as possible as the other . . . This migration lasts until the object aimed at has been completely attained both for the soul and matter; the lower aim being the disappearance of the shape of matter, except any such new formation as may appear desirable; the higher aim being the ceasing of the desire of the soul to learn what it did not know before, the insight of the soul into the nobility of its own being and its independent existence, its knowing that it can dispense with matter after it has become acquainted with the mean nature of matter and the instability of its shapes, with all that which matter offers to the senses, and with the truth of the tales about its delights. Then the soul turns away from matter; the connecting links are broken, the union is dissolved. Separation and dissolution take place, and the soul returns to its home, carrying with itself as much of the bliss of knowledge as sesame develops grains and blossoms, afterwards never separating from its oil. The intelligent being, intelligence and its object, are united and become one."¹ Abū Sa`īd Kharrāz, after careful consideration, defined Fānā in terms that make no reference to metempsychosis.² "If a man turns towards Allah and attaches himself to Allah and lives near to Allah and forgets his own self and everything except Allah—then if you ask him, 'Wherefrom are you and what is the object of your desire' there will be no answer for him except 'Allah.'" But opinions differed. "The same doctrine (of metempsychosis)" says Alberūnī, "is professed by those Šūfis, who teach that this world is a sleeping soul and yonder world a soul awake."³

² The Taḥḥarāt-‘u-l-Auliyyā of Shāikh Farīd-‘ud-dīn ‘Aṭṭār, No. 45, Newal Kishore text, p. 256.
4. Moksha.—Hindu and Muslim mystics have again and again tried to define Nirwana, Fanā or Moksha. The task is difficult, for as Shaikh Sa'dī points out that those who speak do not know and those who know do not speak; and even if the latter spoke, they could not succeed in making themselves intelligible. The real character of Moksha can only be explained by a man who has attained it to another man who has been equally fortunate. But in that case no explanation would be necessary. Be this as it may, Alberūnī attempts the following definition of Moksha with profuse quotations from the Patanjali and the Gita: “If the soul is free from matter, it is knowing; but as long as it is clad in matter the soul is not-knowing, on account of the turbid nature of matter.”¹ And further, “according to the Hindus, liberation is union with God; ... if you wish, say, liberation is the cessation of the functions of the three forces, and their returning to that home, whence they had come.”² “This doctrine of Patanjali,” Alberūnī says, “is akin to that of the Šūfī regarding being occupied in meditation on the Truth (i.e., God).”³ Abū Bakr aš-Shībīlī says: “Cast off all, and you will attain to us completely. Then you will exist; but you will not report about us to others as long as your doing is like ours.”⁴

5. The Nine Commandments.—Those who wish to tread the path of liberation must lead a life of renunciation, virtue and meditation. Hence the nine commandments thus summarised: “This goal is attained either in a single shape, i.e., a single stage of metempsychosis, or in several shapes, in this way, that a man perpetually practises virtuous behaviour and accustoms the soul thereto, so that this virtuous behaviour becomes to it a nature and an essential quality.”⁴

6. Human Equality.—At a time when the caste system was developing with rapidity, the better type of Hindu thinkers continued to believe in the doctrine of human equality defined not from the viewpoint of citizenship but

---

¹ Alberūnī’s India, Vol. I, p. 53.
² Ibid., p. 87.
³ Ibid., p. 53.
⁴ Ibid., p. 74.
from the view-point of salvation. "Hindus differ among themselves as to which of these castes is capable of attaining to liberation; for, according to some, only the Brahmana and Kshatriya are capable of it, since the others cannot learn the Veda, whilst according to the Hindu philosophers, liberation is common to all castes and to the whole human race, if their intention of obtaining it is perfect."  

7. Hindu Science.—"The religious books of the Hindus and their codes of tradition, the Puranas, contain sentences about the shape of the world which stand in direct opposition to scientific truth as known to their astronomers... They show much affection to their astronomers... For this the astronomers require them by accepting their popular notions as truth, by conforming themselves to them, however far from truth most of them may be, and by presenting them with such spiritual stuff as they stand in need of. This is the reason why the two theories, the vulgar and the scientific, have become intermingled in the course of time, why the doctrines of the astronomers have been disturbed and confused, in particular the doctrines of those authors—and they are the majority—who simply copy their predecessors, who take the bases of their science from tradition and do not make them the objects of independent scientific research."  

III

Though the India of the eleventh century had fallen far from the cultural standards of the era of Harsha, not to mention the Golden Age of the Guptas, it may be safely affirmed that it could boast of a finer culture. The researches of Alberūnī prove beyond doubt that Hindu philosophy and science, though not so progressive as in the preceding centuries, were living and vital. Even a solitary scholar, like Alberūnī, could collect the material necessary to reconstruct the metaphysical and ethical achievements of the past. This glorious heritage, however, was not the heritage of the Indian people but only of a very small section of the

1 Alberūnī's India, Vol. I, p. 104.  
2 Ibid., pp. 264, 265.
bourgeoisie classes. The overwhelming mass of the people were intentionally, purposely, maliciously left to wallow in degrading superstitions by "the preconcerted tricks of the priests." ¹ This can be best illustrated by a review of popular belief concerning those 'categories of thought' which we have already noted.

1. Polytheism and Idolatry.—The Vedic gods, if gods they may be called, are merely poetical personifications without images or temples. The origin of idol-making among the Hindus does not concern us here. But it is significant that Alberūnī, who spared neither money nor pains in obtaining instruction from the best Hindu teachers, repeatedly declares that educated Hindus had faith in God alone. "We shall now mention their ludicrous views; but we declare at once that they are held only by the common, uneducated people. For those who march on the path of liberation, or those who study philosophy or theology, and who desire abstract truth, which they call sara, are entirely free from worshipping anything but God alone, and would never dream of worshipping an image manufactured to represent him."² And again: "Such idols are erected only for uneducated, low-class people of little understanding; that the Hindus (i.e., the educated Hindus) never made an idol of any supernatural being, much less of God . . . the crowd is kept in thralldom by all sorts of priestly tricks and deceits."³ "When the ignorant crowd get a piece of good luck by accident or something at which they had aimed, and when with this some of the preconcerted tricks of the priests are brought into connection, the darkness in which they live increases vastly, not their intelligence."⁴ Some of the idols were famous and are noticed by our author in detail—the linga of Siva at Sumnath, the statue of the Sun-god at Multān, of Vishnu at Thaneswar and of Sarada at Kashmīr. The India of Alberūnī was predominantly Vaishnavaite. Sivaism, at the time, seems to have been more or

¹ Alberūnī’s India, p. 123. ² Ibid., Vol. I. pp. 112, 113. ³ Ibid., p. 122. ⁴ Ibid., pp. 122, 123.
less, a southern creed.

The more famous temples drew crowds of pilgrims and gathered fabulous wealth owing to the devotion of the rich and the poor. The pilgrimages, whether obligatory or not, had undoubtedly the effect of bringing the people of distant parts together and thus creating a common religious spirit. They were also centres of business and industry, and in some cases, particularly Nagarkut, the Brahmans had good reputation as bankers. The fault, however, in this lay with the kings, not with the nation. The kings made them an attraction for their cities, a bait of pleasures for their subjects, for no other but financial reasons. By the revenue which they derived from the business both as fines and taxes, they wanted to recover the expenses which their treasury had to spend on the army.

2. Reincarnation, Metempsychosis.—The doctrine of reincarnation, the sine qua non of Hinduism, as explained by the best Indian thinkers is essentially a doctrine of human dignity and human freedom. Divested of all needless technicalities, it means that man can only annihilate the phenomenal world (maya hijāb), first, by a virtuous life which removes the veil between him and his fellow-men and thus annihilates the individual consciousness by enlarging it into the social consciousness and, secondly, by contemplation (mushāhidah, dhiyan) which enables the individual consciousness to be absorbed into the Ultimate Reality which can only be the Supreme Consciousness (ʿulūm); for Reality without Consciousness is meaningless and the conscious alone can be considered real.

"We have already said," continues Alberūnī, "that the soul exists in these two places without a body. But this is only the view of the educated among them, who understand by the soul an independent being." The lower classes took, or were induced to take, a materialistic view of the whole thing. "They cannot imagine the existence of a soul without

1 Mahatma Gandhi, Hind Swaraj.
a body." 1 Hence the agony of death—a terrible thing for the onlooker—was attributed to the fact that the soul had nowhere to go to and so, willy nilly, had to stick to the decayed and useless body. Prayers were necessary and payments to the Brahman so that a tabernacle may be obtained for the soul of the dying relative. Popular tradition, moreover, postulated that every soul, regardless of its virtue or karma, had to put up for a whole year in a hastily prepared body—the ativahika—in which it stayed for a year (as a minimum period) "with the greatest pain, no matter whether it has deserved to be rewarded or punished." The theory made it necessary for the heir of the deceased to perform a series of rites during the year, and enabled the Brahmans to levy 'Death Duties' on all who were in a position to pay them, regardless of the virtues and vices of the deceased.

3. Popular Cosmology.—A man's outlook on the problems of practical and even spiritual life is very much conditioned by the conception of the material universe. The belief that matter, and human life so far as it is materially conditioned, is determined by scientific laws has certainly tended to eliminate superstition. While the labours of Brahmagupta and his Indian fellow-workers enabled the people of Khwārazm and Khurāsān and Baghḍād to obtain a healthier and saner idea of the physical universe which surrounded them, the popular weltanschauung of the Indians was left untouched. In India, the principles of science had to be explained away to suit the fantasies of the masses or for the purpose of exploiting them.

4. False Sciences.—This brings us to 'the false sciences' which 'preyed upon the multitude.' By far the most popular of these sciences was astrology. The average Muslim consciousness throughout the Middle Ages regarded astrology as something dark, forbidden, irreligious; it came into sharp conflict with his faith and reliance in Divine Omnipotence. The world is governed by Allah directly, not by the angels

1 Alberūnī's India, p. 63.
or the stars. 'And when He intends anything,' says the Qur-ān, 'He says, Be, and it is.' In India, on the other hand, astrology became the basis of popular religion; it was the lever by which Brahmanical scholars controlled and exploited the multitude and, incidentally, earned their own livelihood.

Other sciences which ‘preyed on the ignorance of the multitude’ also deserve a passing mention. Alchemy though known was not so popular as among the Mussalmans. On the other hand Rasayana—the art of restoring old men to youth and of prolonging life—was extremely popular. All sorts of herbs and concoctions were tried. Apparently this medieval science of ‘rejuvenation’ or ‘regeneration’ led to much evil, owing to the greediness of the Hindu princes. Then, as now, India was reputed abroad for all things strange from the tricks of her jugglers to the God-compelling mantras of her priests.

5. Cults and Sects.—About Hindu sects of the time two things deserve to be noted. Firstly, there was a constant tendency towards degeneration. The spiritual comprehension of the original movement was often lost and vulgar stories did duty for spiritual truths. This was balanced by a constant effort at reform, which in its turn took the form of new cults. The same phenomena are found in other religions but perhaps not to the same marked degree. For Hinduism, unlike Islam and Roman Catholicism, is not a creed at all but a civilization-process; almost every doctrine, good, bad or indifferent, could find a place within its ample folds. Secondly, the most remarkable phenomenon about Hindu religious movements is the almost complete absence of religious persecution. This may have been largely due to the Ahimsa doctrine, or to a genuine desire for tolerance, or to an impatient understanding among the governing classes that the more subdivided the community, the easier it would be to govern it. Be this as it may, a wide door was left open for the propagation of degrading cults and the construction of degenerate temples. The India of Alberūnī, though fallen
from its former high state, was culturally alive; its political collapse is to be explained not by the existence of a few degrading cults but to the shortcomings of the best politico-social conceptions of the day.

It is generally believed that the Hindus are divided into two principal sects, the Vaishnavites and the Shivaites. This in a sense is true. But these sects have not the remotest likeness to the division of the Shi’as and Sunni’s among the Mussalmans or Roman Catholics and Protestants among the Christians. No memories of past persecutions—no martyr’s memorials—embittered the relation of the two Hindu sects. Also, since Shiva and Vishnu have so many incarnations, and may, with their differently named wives, be worshipped under any number of forms, it is difficult to get to any concrete sectarian dogma with the seal of permanence upon it. The Hindus have a bad habit, as Alberūnī noted, of praising one god to the skies and then hinting mildly that there is someone greater behind him. And so, whatever god the votary begins to worship, he is brought ultimately, to the syllable ‘Om’—denoting the Supreme Being and connoting all qualities—or, possibly, none; for our human minds can never comprehend the real nature of the Absolute Reality.

IV

There were many elements of Hindu thought, the doctrine of Nirwana, for example, or the doctrine of non-violence. ‘Hindu nationalism’—there can be no other name for it—was aggressive and violent. “All their fanaticism is directed against those who do not belong to them—against all foreigners. They call them mleccha, i.e., impure, and forbid having any connection with them, be it by inter-marriage, or any other kind of relationship, or by sitting, eating or drinking with them, because thereby they think they would be polluted.”¹ No conversions to Hinduism

were permitted. "They are not allowed to receive anybody who does not belong to them, even if he wished it or was inclined to their religion. This, too, renders any connection with them quite impossible, and constitutes the widest gulf between us and them... In all manners and usages they differ from us to such a degree as to frighten their children with us, with our dress, and our ways and customs, and as to declare us to be devil's breed, and our doings as the very opposite of all that is good and right."¹ "The Hindus believe that there is no country but theirs, no nation like theirs, no kings like theirs, no science like theirs. They are haughty, foolishly vain, self-conceited and stolid. They are by nature niggardly in communicating what they know, and take the greatest possible care to withhold it from men of another caste among their own people, still much more, of course, from any foreigner."² As they never went beyond the frontiers of their own country as in earlier days, it was impossible for them to observe the progress made in other lands. "The Greeks, though impure, must be honoured, since they were trained in sciences and therein excelled others. What, then, are we to say of a Brahman, if he combines with his purity the height of science."³ From the Mussalmans even this condescending patronage was withheld. No Hindu would acknowledge that they were anything but barbarians. "Their haughtiness is such that, if you tell them of any science or scholar in Khurāsān or Persis, they will think you both an ignoramus and a liar."⁴

Now nationalism, whether cultural or political, is not a peculiar feature of the Hindus or the Indians; but, according to Alberūnī, is common to all nations towards each other.

There were, however, a number of political and other causes which contributed to increase the Indian’s dislike of foreigners. The advent of Islam crushed all Indian cults in northern Afghānīstān (Balkh), Māwarā-u’n-Nahr and Turkistan. There were constant frictions on the frontier, which

ultimately led Muḥammad bin Ḍāsim’s invasion of Sind. He marched to the frontier of Kashmir and was planning a campaign against Qannauj at the time of his fall. The young general was tolerant in religious matters, and the Chach Nāmah and Alberūnī both assure us that ‘he left the people to their ancient faith.’ But one great Hindu state was pulled down with surprising rapidity, others had been threatened; and at a time when the land-route to India through the north-western desert was extremely difficult, Muslim travellers and missionaries found a foothold in Sind. Later on, Subuktigīn built good roads through the north-western frontiers and they were utilised by Maḥmūd for his invasions. No Muslim was in a better position to estimate the effects of these invasions on the Hindus than Alberūnī. ‘Maḥmud utterly ruined the prosperity of the country, and performed there wonderful exploits, by which the Hindus became like atoms of dust scattered in all directions, and like a tale of old in the mouth of the people.’

V

The Indian social system of the eleventh century, as described by Muslim writers, was based upon three principles, not quite consistent with each other and giving rise to contrary practices—the principle of non-violence or ahimsa; the principle of division of labour, caste or varna; and the principle of hygiene or chhut. We should not, in a developed medieval society, expect these principles in their primitive simplicity; as very often happens in most societies at this stage of development, the fundamental principles of social life, not scientifically or critically apprehended by the multitude, were twisted out of their proper shape and extensively misapplied by the far-fetched explanations or tawils of the theologians. Concerning another feature of Indian Society—the war-cult of the Rājpūts—which is so obvious in the Persian

1 Alberūnī’s India, Vol. I, p. 22.
annals of the thirteenth century, Muslim writers before the period of Shihāb-u’d-din are silent. And this silence is not without significance.

There can be little doubt that an educated Hindu of the eleventh century if asked to formulate the basic doctrine of his creed, would have referred to the principle of metempsychosis. Now metempsychosis or salvation (Moksha, Nirwana, Fanā) through a life of virtue and contemplation (Akhāq and Mushāhidah, Karma) implies, first, the equality of man, for it places salvation within the reach of all, and, secondly, ahimsa, the avoidance of harm to all living creatures (Jīva hatya). The doctrine of human equality (as we shall see presently) was eliminated from Indian society owing to the growth of the caste-system. It was otherwise with the doctrine of ahimsa. The doctrines of metempsychosis and ahimsa were not invented by Gautama Buddha, but the Buddhist revolt is by far the greatest and the most effective protest, the moral feeling of man has yet made against the criminal methods of nature (himsa) which require, both among plants and animals, that the substance of the life of one creature should depend upon the destruction of another. The long prevalence of Buddhism in India as well as foreign countries enabled the doctrine to take very deep root; the decline and fall of Buddhism did not eradicate (either in India or elsewhere) the attitude of mind, Buddhism had created. Wherever we turn—from the Hindu avoidance of onion and garlic to the pacifist attitude of the Muslim mystics—we see the visible and profound influence of the ahimsa doctrine. So far as Indian society of the eleventh century was concerned, it may be confidently stated that, in spite of notorious exceptions, the acceptance or the non-acceptance of the doctrine of ahimsa created a sharp and quite visible dividing line between the civilized and the non-civilized sections of the community. The cult of physical and spiritual cleanliness, a distinct conception in the earlier ages, was in the eleventh century definitely identified in many matters with the ahimsa doctrine. Thus meat-
eating permitted to the earlier Aryans was, at the time of Sulṭān Maḥmud, forbidden to the Brahmans and permitted to the other castes under restrictions and as a matter of necessity. Both doctrines (ahimsa and chhut) were used by the Brahmans in guiding the affairs of the community as it suited their class-needs or the principles of their religious classes.

The caste-system of India as formulated in the classical literature from which it drew its intellectual sustenance has often been described by medieval and modern writers and exhaustive extracts will be found in Alberūnī.¹ We are here concerned with the system as it actually worked.

VI

Religion had become the exclusive monopoly of the Brahman class. It was not to be expected that all the members of a large hereditary class would be able to perform the extremely onerous duties that traditions required of them. "The Brahmans recite the Veda without understanding its meaning, and in the same way they learn it by heart, the one receiving it from the other."² The exclusion of low-grade intellects from the field of theological disputations is not a matter to be deplored, as, apart from the Brahmans, who dedicated their lives exclusively to religion or acted as purohīts for well-to-do families, the rest of the community obtained its livelihood by service in the government departments as tax-collectors and clerks or by helping society in managing its business. There is good reason for believing that its functions in the eleventh century were substantially the same. The highest office in the state—that of the Raja—was still within the reach of the Brahmans, and had not become the exclusive monopoly of the Rājputs.

Alberūnī's account of the ceremonies appertaining to consecration or the second birth—the investment of the Yajnopavita or the sacred cord and the pavitra or the

sealring and of bathing, rites of dining, etc., show that the external ceremonies prescribed by the Brahmanical texts were followed. Scrupulous care had to be observed in eating and drinking. Every Brahman was required to have his separate drinking vessels and eating utensils; if another man used them, they were broken. "I have seen," says Alberūnī, "Brahmans who allowed their relatives to eat with them from the same plate but most of them disapprove of this."¹ To a Mussalmān two things were the symbol of equality and brotherhood—standing shoulder to shoulder at the congregational prayers before the God who has created us all, and eating promiscuously from the same dishes and at the same table-cloth. Neither of these things were tolerated in India.

The four stages of the life of a Brahman who had dedicated himself to religion have been described by Alberūnī, probably from personal observation, though he refers to Vishnu-Purana as giving a different age for the various stages.

1. The first stage, that of the disciple (Brahma-charya) extended from the eighth year, the period of consecration, to the twenty-fifth year. "His duty is to practise abstinence, to make the earth his bed, to begin with the learning of the Veda and of its explanation, of the science of theology and law, all this being taught to him by a master, whom he serves day and night."²

The Miṣbāḥ-u’l-Hidāyat, the Persian summary of the famous Awārif-u’l-Ma’ārif of Shāikh Shihāb-u’l-dīn Suhrwardī will give the reader some idea of the relation of the Muslim Shāikh (guru or pīr) and the disciple (or murīd). "The disciple must have a firm belief in the Shāikh as being the best of all preceptors and divines, and must remain firm in his service. Further, he must submit to the Shāikh’s control over his life and property and be prepared to do as the Shāikh orders."³

2. During the second stage, from the twenty-fifth to the fiftieth year, the Brahman was to live as a householder (grihastha). "The master allows him to marry... but he is not allowed to marry a woman above twelve years of age... He marries, establishes a household, and intends to have descendants."¹ The Chishtī mystics of the thirteenth century while insisting upon the married state as the tradition of the Prophet, only permitted the disciple two means of livelihood—zamin-i-āhāyā, the produce of barren land which the mystic and his family had cultivated and futūḥ, gifts and presents which neighbours brought to his house unasked; begging was prohibited; service of the state was considered sinful,² and even private service as a teacher was depreciated. The Brahman of the eleventh century was fettered by rules comparatively lenient. "He gains his sustenance either by the fee he obtains for teaching Brahmans and Kshatriyas, not as a payment but as a present, or by presents which he receives from someone because he performs for him the sacrifices to the fire, or by asking a gift from the kings and nobles, there being no importunate pressing on his part, and no unwillingness on the part of the giver. There is always a Brahman in the houses of those people (i.e., the rich) who there administers the affairs of religion and the works of piety."³

3. The third period, extending from the fiftieth to the seventy-fifth was once more a period of abstinence. The Brahman "leaves his household and hands it as well as his wife over to his children, if the latter does not prefer to accompany him into the life in the wilderness. He dwells outside civilization, and leads the same life again which he led in the first period."⁴

4. "The fourth period extends till the end of life. He

¹ Miṣbāḥ-u'l-Hidāyat, Newal Kishore text, pp. 167, 168.
² The Chishtī mystics, and to a large extent also other silsilahs considered government service a sin. Cf. Manu, p. 142, Ch. IV, 86: "A king is declared to be equal (in wickedness) to a butcher who keeps a hundred thousand slaughter-houses; to accept presents from him is a terrible (crime)."
⁴ Ibid., p. 132.
wears a red garment... he strips the mind of friendship and enmity, and roots out desire and lust and wrath... He has no other business but that of caring for the path which leads to salvation, and for reaching Moksha, whence there is no return to this world."¹ The achievements of Indian Brahmins in the field of asceticism, whatever its moral or spiritual worth, could not fail to draw the attention of outsiders. The following extract from Abū Zaid will give an idea of a foreigner's impressions. "In India there are persons who, in accordance with their profession, wander in the woods and mountains, and rarely communicate with the rest of mankind. Sometimes they have nothing to eat but herbs and the fruits of the forest... Some of them go about naked. Others stand naked with the face turned to the sun, having nothing on but a panther's skin. In my travels I saw a man in the position I have described... sixteen years afterwards I returned to that country and found him in the same posture. What astonished me was that he was not melted by the heat of the sun."² Contemporary Muslim mystics had made travelling a speciality and stern rules were laid down for this peculiar discipline.³ In the four succeed-

¹ Alberuni's India, p. 133. "Let him not desire to die, let him not desire to live; but wait for his (appointed) time as a servant (waits) for the payment of his wages." (Manu, p. 207, Ch. VI, 49)
³ The following extract from the Mishā-‘u’l-Hidāyat pp. 119 to 122 will give some idea of the discipline prescribed for Muslim Khānqāhs and for Muslim mystics when travelling:—

"The people of the monastery may be divided into residents and sojourners. It is the convention of the ṣūfīs that they make it a point to arrive at monasteries before afternoon prayer, but if due to some unavoidable circumstances, they may reach there after the specified hour, they usually take their abode in some other quarter or mosque, and visit the monastery at sunrise next day. As soon as they enter it, they offer two raka’ts of Namāz, then shake hands with those present and make arrangement for board and lodging. Traditionally they do not stay for more than three days to accomplish their mission, and do not leave the monastery without the permission of the managers. In case they wish to stay more, they must perform the duties (that may be allotted to them); as a rule, even the non-mystic guests were to be accorded a proper recep-
ing centuries the travelling spirit was still further developed,
and the Muslim mystic became, as we shall see, the spearhead
of Muslim civilisation and culture in foreign lands.

There was, lastly, the fifth period or rather stage, not
within the reach of all—that of the Mahā-ātmā or great
Rishi, who was on the threshold of Moksha or had realised
it. On such a person the restrictions of caste were not
evenly binding nor the Puranic rules. Here we have
the equivalent of the Quṭb-u’l-Aqṭāb of the Muslim mystics.
The underlying idea and the verbal definition are the same in
both cases.

The Kshatriyas—Alberūnī never uses the term 'Rāj-
pūrt'—could learn the Veda but were not allowed to teach it.
Though not entitled to officiate as a priest, he was permitted
to perform the Puranic rites. The Kṣhatriyas had apparently
ceased to make any contribution to the progress or the pre-
servation of Indian culture. But their political prospects
were improving. “Their degree is not much below that of
the Brāhmans,” Alberūnī tells us, “he (Kṣhatriya) rules the
people and defends them for he is created for this task.”

“The Hindus relate that originally the affairs of govern-
ment and war were in the hands of Brāhmans, but the
country became disorganised, since they ruled according to
the principles of their religious codes,” whereupon Brāhman

tion and entertainment.

“... The residents of the monastery may be divided into three grades—
servants, associates and recluses. A fresher may rise successively from
one stage to another.

“In case the monastery is maintained by a charitable endowment
provision of food should be made in accordance with the conditions laid
down in the waqf. If the monastery is not supported by a waqf, the
presence of an enlightened Shaikh is essential to instruct the visitors to
beg or to work in order to maintain their livelihood. In the absence of a
Shaikh, any of the three methods may be adopted. So far as possible
there must be concord and friendship between the residents and not
discord. All frictions must be removed, and every error forgiven as
to represent a wholesome society of well-wishing and well-behaving
individuals.”
entrusted them exclusively with the functions which they now have, whilst he entrusted the Kṣattryiṣas with the duties of ruling and fighting." We must be grateful for the preservation of this item of popular tradition. The reference is obviously to Brāhmanical ruling families that preceded, and even followed, the Buddhist period. The rise of the Rājpūts is a later phenomenon.

These were the two twice-born castes, exclusive heirs to the spiritual and religious achievements of Hinduism. Between them and the two remaining castes—the Vaiśhyas and the Sūdras—there was a very sharp distinction, while the Sūdras and Vaiśhyas were very near each other. The duty of the Vaiśhya was to devote himself to agriculture, cattle-breeding and business, either on his own behalf or on behalf of a Brāhman. "There are," says Ibn Khurdadbhah, "seven classes of Hindus." "In all these kingdoms of India," says Abū Zaid, "the nobility is considered to form but one family. Power resides in it alone. The princes name their own successors. It is the same with learned men and physicians. They form a distinct caste, and the profession never goes out of the caste."¹

Now caste-spirit, stern in the extreme, laid down three different principles, two of which were enforced ruthlessly by the power of the state. The caste-system could only have been preserved and strengthened in an atmosphere of ignorance; had the lower orders been allowed access to the sacred books, they would have undoubtedly claimed equality. For we are at a fairly advanced stage in the history of mankind—eleven hundred years after the death of Christ and five hundred years after the advent of the Arabian Apostle. Elsewhere the doctrine of equality and common citizenship had been preached in no uncertain terms. Thrones had been smashed to bits, and hereditary aristocracies and priesthoods completely overthrown. The fall of the Sāsānian Empire must have caused some reverberations in the country. It is inconceivable that the educated upper

¹ Elliot and Dowson: History of India, Vol. I. p. 6.
classes of India were ignorant either of the political democracy of the Greeks or the social democracy of the Mussalmans. The latter, at least, had been their neighbours in Sind for at least three hundred years. But they preferred to attempt—and what governing classes would not?—a continuation of their power by further strengthening the bonds of a vicious system. First, the doors of knowledge were closed on all persons not belonging to the twice-born castes; and any attempt to cross the barrier was severely punished. "Every action," Alberūnī tells us, "which is considered the privilege of a Brāhman, such as saying prayers, the recitation of the Veda, and offering sacrifices to the fire is forbidden to him to such a degree that when, e.g., a Śūdra or a Vaishya is proved to have recited the Veda, he is accused by the Brāhman before the ruler, and the latter will order his tongue to be cut off." A non-caste person committing the same offence would have doubtless met a quicker and severer punishment. ¹ So while in the rest of Asia as well as in Europe the educated classes were desperately busy in carrying light and knowledge to the multitude—while elsewhere, under the shadow of the cathedral or the mosque the sons of weavers and farmers and shopkeepers were being collected together, 'thanks to the munificent endowments of the rich and the more precious benefactions of the poor, to learn whatever store of wisdom that age possessed at the feet of masters no better-born than themselves—the Brāhmans of India could think of no better plan for the preservation of knowledge than preventing the spread of education. Such a policy may, or may not, have been necessary in the period of the Rig Veda. But in the eleventh century—in the generation of Alberūnī, Avicenna and Sulṭān Maḥmūd—it was stupid, mad and suicidal; and the Brāhmans, themselves a rationalistic and highly enlightened group, were destined to pay a terrible price for the most unpardonable of social sins.

Secondly, it was not enough to keep the lower orders in ignorance; it was necessary to divide or subdivide them to

prevent their developing a corporate spirit similar to that of the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatratioyas. So the Vaishyas and Śūdras were offered amenities denied to the rest. They were offered the status of low, but regular castes. They were allowed to 'meditate on God' whom they had to comprehend not on the basis of the Vedas or other sacred texts but through such wild Puranic texts as filtered down to them by word of mouth. Also the Brāhmans would accept their aims. Finally, they were allowed to live within the city-walls. These favours, however effective they may have been in making an insuperable distinction between the lower caste and the non-caste people, did not, as the subsequent political history of the country was to show, attach them to Brāhmans and the Kṣatratioyas. They lived inside the city-walls. But they were not citizens, for they were excluded from that 'perfect life' which Aristotle declared to be only possible within the 'city' or the state.

It was difficult then—and it is equally difficult now—to give an account of the non-caste sections of the Indian people. Lacking cultural traditions and uniformity of organisation, they must have varied from district to district. They had only one thing in common—they were not allowed to live within the city-walls and could only enter, presumably after due notice, to carry on that work without which the city could not have existed. According to Alberūnī, whose remarks can only be considered generally correct of that part of the country which he had seen, the non-caste people were broadly divisible into sections—an upper or more fortunate section, called Antyjāya and a lower section without a recognised organisation or status. "These guilds live near the villages and towns of the four castes but outside them. There are eight classes (guilds), who freely intermarry with each other, except the fuller, shoe-maker and weaver, for no others would condescend to have anything to do with them.

*But there were limits. "A Śūdra, though emancipated by his master, is not released from servitude; since that is innate in him, who can set him free from it?" *—Manū, Vol. I, p. 326.
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These eight guilds are—the fuller, shoe-maker, juggler, the basket and shield-maker, the sailor, fisherman, the hunter of wild animals and of birds, and the weaver."¹ The lowest people are enumerated as the Hādi, Doma, Candala, and Bhadatau."² They are occupied with dirty work like the cleansing of villages and other services. They are considered as one sole class, and distinguished only by their occupations. In fact, they are considered like illegitimate children; for according to general opinion they descend from a Śūdra father and a Brāhmaṇi mother as the children of fornication; therefore, they are degraded outcastes... All other men except the Candala, as far as they are not Hindus, are called mlechcha, i.e., unclean, all those who kill men (i.e., hangmen) and slaughter animals, and eat the flesh of cows.³

Thirdly, the fearful doctrine of chhūt—theological contamination, to which we have already referred—was invoked to strengthen the fabric of the caste-system.⁴ Alberūnī is right in declaring that everything that falls into a state of impurity

² A Candala, a village pig, a cock, a dog, a menstruating woman, and an eunuch must not look at the Brāhmans while they eat. Māṇī, Chap. III, p. 119.
³ Alberūnī’s India, Vol. II, p. 137.
⁴ The following slokas of Māṇī will give some idea of the orthodox view-point about the lower orders and it may be safely assumed that in this matter the tide of public opinion among the ruling classes was running strongly in favour of Māṇī’s ideas:—

(i) The Brāhmaṇa, the Kāshṭriya, and the Vaishya castes (varna) are the twice-born ones, but the fourth, the Śūdra, has one birth only; there is no fifth (caste).

(ii) In all castes (varna) those (children) only which are begotten in the direct order on wedded wives, equal (in caste and married as) virgins, are to be considered as belonging to the same caste (as their fathers).

(iii) Sons, begotten by twice-born men or wives of the next lower castes they declare to be similar (to their fathers, but) blamed on account of the fault (inherent) in their mothers.

(iv) Such is the eternal law concerning (children born of wives one degree lower than their husbands): know (that) the following rule (is applicable) to those born of women two or three degrees lower. Māṇī, Ch. X, pp. 402 and 403.
strives, and quite successfully, to regain its original condition, which was that of purity. The sun cleanses fresh air, and salt in the sea-water prevents it from being corrupted. Had it been otherwise, life on this planet would have been impossible. But the Brāhmanic conception of theological contamination in the thirteenth century was only remotely connected with hygiene, which is necessary for physical health, or with that conception of *tabu* which modern investigators have found so prevalent in primitive races. It was a pseudo-spiritualistic conception, expressed in one thousand and one detailed regulations intended to preserve the separateness and the predominance of the governing classes. The food of a Mussalmān may or may not be considered unclean. That is a matter of opinion. But what about his fire? How can that be unclean? If a Brāhman’s house catches fire, it is purified by the flames thereof. But if that fire spreads to a Mussalmān’s house, the flames themselves become unclean, and you may not use them to light your hearth. Now the conception of theological impurity or *chhut* is an old idea and persists till to-day. But it seems to have reached its high-water mark in the eleventh century. The food of the *mlechchas*, as well as foreigners and their water as well as their fire, were considered unclean. The lower orders were thus prevented from associating with the twice-born castes, and were driven beyond the city-walls. The life of a caste-Hindu, and specially of the majority, who were probably inclined like the majority of men everywhere to take a mechanistic view of religion, may well have been one long struggle to avoid the physical contamination of their fellow-men. Later ages, from necessity if not from choice, were compelled to adopt artificial means of cleansing (e.g., bathing in the Ganges) from imaginary impurities like the accidental touch of a Mussalmān’s water-bucket. But in the thirteenth century this was not allowed. A person or a thing contaminated was damned for all time. “The Hindus never desire that a thing that has once been polluted should be purified and thus recovered.”¹ The principle is best explained by an

extreme and tragic case, what happened to a Hindu warrior, high or low, who having been captured by the Mussalmāns, of necessity partook of their food and drink, and then returned to his native land. Society, one might imagine, would have received the hero with open arms. No: he had lost caste. Though physically alive, he was legally and theologically dead. To the mother who had nursed him he was now filth and dirt, the son whom he had cherished would succeed to his property and shut the door of his own house on his face; his relations and friends, if he happened to meet them in one of the few streets on which he was allowed to walk, would turn away their faces. Such things indicate, to use Alberūnī's phrase, "an innate perversity of character." "I have (had) been told that when Hindu slaves (i.e., prisoners of war in Muslim countries) escape and return to their country and religion, the Hindus order that they should fast by way of expiation, then they bury them in the dung, stale and milk of cows for a certain number of days till they get into a state of fermentation. Then they drag them out of the dirt and give them similar dirt to eat, and more of the like. I have asked the Brāhmans if this is true, but they deny it and maintain that there is no expiation possible for such an individual, and that he is never allowed to return into those conditions of life in which he was before he was carried off as a prisoner. And how should that be possible? If a Brāhman eats in the house of a Südra for sundry days, he is expelled from his caste and can never regain it." The captives, as we know for a fact, seldom cared to return to the land of their birth. Since they had ceased to be Hindus owing to their reckless courage on the battle-field, was there any alternative for them but to accept the faith and the social equality offered to them by their conquerors? For while the Brāhmans strove to prevent the mass of the countrymen from taking the road to Heaven, the Mussalmāns were only too anxious to drive the multitude heaven-wards.

VII

It remains to examine the causes that led to the remark-
able success of the Turkish regime in India at a time when it had become the laughing-stock of Muslim Asia for its intrigue, lack of discipline and morale and military inefficiency. First Shihāb-u-dīn Ghūrī's army was annihilated by the Qarā Khitāt Turks at Andkhud, and most of his officers deserted him in the hour of misfortune; then 'Alā-u-dīn Muhammad Khwārazm Shāh fell upon his former overlords and friends, and the Qarā Khitāt power disappeared; lastly by a series of brilliant campaigns in 1219 and 1220, Chingīz Khān in his turn crushed the Khwārazmian Empire; and it seemed to Mussalmāns then living that Islamic civilisation itself was doomed and the Day of Judgment near at hand.

'Alā-u-dīn Aṭā' Malik Juwaynī writing in the days of Chingīz's grandson, Hulāgū Khān, briefly compares the military organisation of the Chingīzī Mongols and the Khwārazmian Turks ¹:

"The muster and the marking of the army have been organised in such a way as to dispense with the office of Review and dismiss its officers and deputies. The whole mass of the fighting people has been divided into groups of tens and one man out of every ten is appointed amīr over the remaining nine (amīr-i-dah). Out of ten such amīrs, one is named Amīr-i-ṣadah, and all the hundred men are placed under his command. This goes on till the (amīr of) thousand (amīr-i-hazārah), and over ten thousand men is placed an amīr known as Amīr-i-Tūmān. If there is a problem to face or men and things required, the matter is referred (by the supreme ruler) to the Amīr-i-Tūmān, who informs the Amīr-i-Hazārah in his turn till the order ultimately reaches the amīr-i-dah. Equity and justice are enforced in case one person is tormented by another, and no consideration is paid to outward status or position. If suddenly a force is required, it is ordered that so many thousands be present at such a time and place, and without a moment's hesitation or delay the order is carried.

The spirit of discipline and loyalty exists to such a degree that if an individual, he the commander of a thousand, commits wrong, and in spite of a distance of east and west between him and the Khān, a rider is despatched to carry out the punishment or to cut off his head or to exact gold as ordered. Quite unlike is the position of the ruler (of a Muslim country), who talks with fear with his own purchased slave, if the latter possesses ten horses in his stable, lest some evil should result from it. If an army is placed under his command, and he attains to a position of authority, he simply cannot be commanded. And often it happens that the officer himself rises in revolt (against the king) and whenever the king wishes to attack an enemy or an enemy wishes to attack, they take months and years to put the army in order and treasuries and territories are required for their salaries and pay. On traditional and ceremonious occasions they are present by hundreds and thousands, but at the time of war- and death-struggle the lines are broken and none turns up on the battle-field. There is a parable, which holds particularly true of their organisation. At the time of realising taxes, a revenue officer demanded a number of goats from a farmer. The farmer said, 'wherefrom?' The officer answered, 'in the records.' The farmer continued, 'yes, but there is none in the flock.' "The same is true of Muslim troops. The amīr shows that he has such a number of men under him in order to receive more than the legitimate pay, but at the occasion of review they practise deceit so as to make up the total."  

How did the Shansabāniyah state, so indubitably inferior to the Khwārazmian Empire, manage to secure such astounding success in Hindustan. The fact in itself is surprising. Unlike the British, the Turks had no overpowering superiority in the scientific instruments or the technique of warfare; nor a strong home-government to help them in times of need. Alexander inflicted a crushing
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defeat upon Porus only to be driven away from the country; Maḥmūd again and again captured strongholds, subdued the powerful Rājās, and demolished their sacred shrines, yet he was careful and circumspect in his marches and counter-marches and never attempted the impossible feat of subjugating northern India, and the world-conquering Chingiz gave up the idea of crossing the Indus, perhaps wisely. What these great masters of men, money, resources and genius failed to achieve, the obviously humdrum Mu'izzī Maliks accomplished and in an incredibly short time—fourteen or fifteen years as compared with the hundred years which separate the battle of Plassey from the Mutiny of 1857. But how? The problem is a perplexing and puzzling one.

Unfortunately for us no reliable record is available after Alberūnī, and the student has to fall back upon his guess-work, conjectures and the indications of undeniable facts. India at the time could not have been an isolated region cut off from the outside world; there were commercial, religious and cultural contacts between the Mussalmāns and the Hindūs long before the Turkish invaders entered upon the scene. Mystics, traders, and travellers from Muslim lands undertook a peaceful penetration of the country, and, as a matter of fact, Muslim colonies were to be found in every large Indian town. "The Muslims who came into India made it their home. They lived surrounded by the Hindu people, and a state of perennial hostility with them was impossible. Mutual intercourse led to mutual understanding. Many who had changed their faith differed little from those whom they had left."¹ This was, in a large part, the result of Mystic propaganda carried on by Khwājah Mu'īn-u'd-dīn Chishtī and his predecessors, like Shaikh 'Alī Hajwīrī, who had peacefully made the Mussalmāns a community of the soil long before it was subdued by the ruthless and tenacious efforts of Shihāb-u'd-dīn of Ghūr.

Dr. Tark Chand: Influence of Islam on Indian Culture, p. 137.
The Muslim social system could not have remained a mystery to the leaders of the Hindus, if not to the mass of the people. They had seen with their eyes the temporary subjection of their mother-land, the tottering of their local monarchies, the destruction of their strongholds, the demolition of their places of worship, and the ruin of their cultural and social heritage. They had, undoubtedly, a good knowledge of the disintegration of the 'Abbāsid power, and the rise of the Turks and the vigour of their forces, whom they met many a time on the field of battle. They witnessed the expansion of Muslim arms first in Afghānistān and later on in the Panjāb right up to the Rāvī. It was a period, they knew, of revolution and anarchy, intrigues, stratagem and military reorganisation. What could be the psychological or religious reaction of the Hindu community to this danger—to this foreign explosive and expensive body, whose outlook, law and social customs were entirely opposed to everything in popular Hinduism, but which none the less left no doubt of its virility and power. It was obvious that the Turks, quite unlike the Hindus, were progressing from success to success without the blessings of the Brāhmans and in spite of their contempt for all idols and images.

Human nature reacts similarly in similar circumstances. There were two courses open to the Hindu community—either the revolutionary step of reforming their society on the lines of their hated adversaries or a return to their sacred Šāstras and Smrities with the terrible cast-iron system they advocated. Consciously or unconsciously, for good or ill, Hinduism preferred the latter course. An enlightened study of the Muslim movement would have shown them that it brought monotheism, a hatred of superstitions, intensity of contempt for idols of wood and stone and above all its comparative homogeneity of social structure based upon the doctrine of human equality. But it was not to be. The drunkard, unable to face the struggle of life, takes to more drink, the opium-eater to larger doses of opium. Similarly a community, faced by a political
contest in which there was nothing mysterious—nothing beyond the power of human reason to analyse or reform—decided, apparently without much discussion, to hug deeper into its breast the scorpions that were stinging it to death. Paralysed by the inequality of the caste-system, it preferred to depress the valleys and to elevate the mountains. Worshipping false gods—false because they were the peg-points of rotten social fabric—it concluded that the fault was due not to the impotency of the idols but to the insincerity of the worshippers. There can be little doubt that everything which we would to-day consider reactionary and disastrous was strengthened at the expense of all that was fine, strong, vital and life-giving in that civilisation-process which we are wont to call Hinduism. There are sufficient symbolic evidences to prove this fact.

In the time of Mahmud the ruling dynasties were recruited from all the four traditional and orthodox castes, and the word 'Rajput' is never mentioned by the contemporary Persian chronicles. At the time of the Ghurian invasion, the Rajputs held a monopoly of power. The lower castes, it would seem, were completely shouldered out; hereafter in Hindu society, Brahmins and Rajputs alone count. The Vaishyas and Sudras had ceased to be citizens and we are driven to conclude that they had ceased to be patriots. This accounts for a revival of the old Brahmanic conception of society and the rigidity of the caste-system, about which much has been written in the preceding pages.

"Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's" and the Rajputs were specially commissioned with the sacred duty of ruling and protecting the country. The profession of arms became the glory and exclusive privilege of the Rajputs and henceforth the Rajputs and their Brahman allies became the actual, though temporary, sovereigns of Hindustan. Of all the mythologies of later Hinduism, the Agnikola myth proved to be the most disastrous.

Inevitably there was another set-back in their policy. The Rajputs evolved a new cult, and laid the foundation of purely military states. They devoted all their energies
to matters of war with a complete disregard and neglect of the functions of civil life. History has often shown that the pure military states, devoid of the resources which civil energies alone can provide, do not succeed even in that war for which they have sacrificed everything against a state which combines in itself functions both political and civil. Defeated in war, they thought war meant everything; the result was a 'murder cult,' internecine civil strife with its paralysing bitternesses. It was not enough, the rigidity of caste-system contributed considerably to the catastrophe. An imaginative reconstruction of the life in the rank and file of the Hindu armies is extremely interesting. The Moghul forces on march have been described as 'moving cities,' but the Indian army overridden by caste-system could not be anything but a display of soul-racking tabus. Maybe, a tenth part (or less) of the whole population was in arms, the remaining nine-tenths serving as menials in the fields and sleeping in the distant villages. Fighting along with the lower caste being regarded a disgrace, and association of people of one caste with the other being forbidden, individuals would cook and eat their meals separately according to their own special rites; and none except co-caste persons would join the funeral ceremony of one dead at home or killed in the field. To say nothing of the lower classes and the Mlechchas.

The Hindu Rājās were different from their Muslim adversaries, who were bred and brought up in the profession of arms. The chief characteristic of the Rājpūt army was its feudal character. There were no enlisted forces, and the required number had to be produced at a sudden call for the occasion. The feudal levies having no racial or national unity, and still less the art of marching, deploying and behaving as trained battalions were torn by dissension and internal desertion. Long and hazardous campaigns were out of the question against their adversaries only too familiar and accustomed to prolonged campaigning.
The records leave upon us the impression of brave—but amateurish and purple-born warriors—against men who though perhaps physically inferior in sheer quantity of bone and muscle and hailing from a land of malaria-swept and under-nourished population, were nevertheless professional soldiers, trained officers, seasoned veterans acquainted with all the tricks of state-craft and war that could be learnt from the traditions of the Turks and the military text-books of Rome. The success of the Rājpūts in pitched battles was highly improbable, and they often retired into their forts without wasting their men. The Ghūrīan conquest of Hindustan meant a series of sieges and sieges usually ended in one way. Cut off from the resources of the surrounding country, which came into the enemies' hands and shut up in their fortified walls, the garrison could always be reduced to the last straits. The lower classes and Mlechchas were left outside the fort at the mercy of the invaders to whom they always somnolently submitted. The mass of the people remained indifferent; to them change of masters was a matter immaterial and insignificant. Taxes would not be increased, peace would be better maintained, art, craft and industry would receive greater encouragement. What was there to worry about? To the non-caste, the success of the Turks meant a positive improvement. One oligarchy would succeed another. But the new oligarchy saw no earthly reason for excluding them from the village wells or the public streets. War increased their employment; there must have been a rise in the labourer's wages; and after war, public works—roads, forts, service in the commissariats. The Turks did not give the privileges of free citizens to the out-castes; in fact, they insisted on good birth. There can be little doubt that the Turkish conquest of India raised the non-castes from the status of pigs to the status of bullocks, not necessarily ill-fed. When the Rājpūt garrison closed itself within the four walls, the country-side seldom rose in its support. The high castes were left to stew in their
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own juice. Thus, inevitably, almost every war led to a siege, and almost every siege led to a Jauhar.

The opinion of Mr. C. V. Vaidya regarding the causes which led to the downfall of northern India may be summarised as follows:—

India at the time of Ghurian invasion lacked neither in armies nor in capable generals nor in kingly families. There was no superiority of physique or valour, nor any remarkable religious fervour on the side of the invaders. Certainly there was no difference in weapons. The foremost cause was that the Rājpūts were divided among themselves and fought against one another. Mutual hatred and jealousies have been the bane of the Rājpūts. Another cause was the rigidification of caste, which took place about this time. 'The social sympathy,' says Mr. Vaidya, 'which existed previously among the various sections of the Hindu people, was gone, and it was replaced by a feeling of aloofness and aversion.' It also resulted in the vast diminution in the fighting strength of kingdoms, and consequently there could be no national resistance or unity. Superstition, neglect of the study of the science of war and the Buddhistic sentiment of Ahimsa are enumerated as subsidiary causes. 'To conclude the disunion among the Rājpūts, the fighting arm of India, and the rigidity of caste by which nine-tenths of the people were made incapable or unwilling to resist foreign domination were the two main causes which led to the permanent enslavement of Northern India,'

The Hindu literature talks of the Turks, (not of Mussalmāns) as racial rulers and conquerors, and regards them as brutish, ruthless and hard-hearted. It may come as a surprise, but the fact is, nevertheless, true that the Turks were equally despised by the ordinary Mussalmān from their own point of view; taking service under a Turk was regarded degrading and a violation of personal self-respect. The Turks themselves lived in an atmosphere of fear and

mistrust, and built their family graveyards like forts. The Turks in the thirteenth century were not converting missionaries; they simply helped the movement which was carried on with great honesty and devotion by the various Mystic cults. A convert to the Muslim fold was a brother and equal of every other Mussalmān though not of the Turk.

Nevertheless, the other side of the shield should not be ignored. The Turks were a hardy people, they had suffered much from the vicissitudes of fortune in their own land and were fighting with their backs to the wall. Some had come in the conquering armies but most were refugees from Central Asia. No other country was left to them. They were not physically superior to the Rājpūts, nor there was any remarkable difference in their arms; but in detailed equipment the Turks were decidedly advanced. The main feature of the Indian army was the elephant, which being considered equal to 500 footmen, often proved a source of danger to its own army. In the art of swordsmanship the Indians probably surpassed their enemies, but this was of little avail to those confined within the walls of a fort. Munjaniās were used on both sides, but they could cause more harm to the besieged than to the besiegers. Medieval battles were not displays of swordsmanship, but massed cavalry attacks, and the Turks and the Tatars were noted for the latter. The number of troopers did not matter so much as their efficient handling, then always the central feature of the military art was discipline and organisation. Good horses were not available in India, and it seems that country ponies were useless in battle.

The story of Turkish conquest remains incomplete until supplemented by an account of some other factors—social and religious—which contributed immensely to the success of Muslim arms in the thirteenth century. Muslim society, being extraordinarily God-conscious, is permeated by a religious 'control,' which extends to every sphere of human conduct. Allah is everywhere, and a Mussalmān is never permitted to lose sight of his faith. Allah is the real
owner of sovereignty and bestows it upon whom he likes and deprives others accordingly. The ruler and the ruled are fastened together by means of ba'tt, which literally means contract or submission. Thus, the political authority in Islam depends upon the will of the Muslim brotherhood, which is free from all restrictions of caste, creed or colour, and that all believers are equal in the sight of God. No other religion (we should exclude short interludes) has so successfully succeeded in crushing and fusing all racial elements; the complete assimilation of the Turkish oligarchy in the Indian Muslim population is a good example. Islam—as Islam—will not under any condition tolerate anything like the cult of 'blood and soil'. "Ye are of one brotherhood", the Prophet said. Men are just men, the possession of will and reason is all that matters. "For the Lord we are and to the Lord we return." Language, race and tribe are just vanishing pin-points in the consciousness of the true Mussalmān.

The sovereignty of Allah is manifested in the Congregation. The Congregation is, therefore, supreme and the ruler and the ruled are both subject to its authority. It is the explicit duty of the subjects to obey God, then the Prophet, then those in authority from among them, and in case of difference of opinion they are required to turn back to Allah and His Apostle—i.e., the basic principles of the faith. The institution of authority, and submission to it is not one-sided; for the Imām is responsible for the welfare of the subjects, and has to act according to the dictates of the Qur'ānic law.

The revolutionary forces responsible for the rise of early Islam were the Qur'ānic conception of God and the practical brotherhood of Islam. No one will pretend that by the thirteenth century these ideals had declined; to a casual observer they may seem to have vanished. Never-
theless they remained there—a permanent beacon to all men—rulers and ruled alike. The Turkish slave-aristocracy stood a governing group apart and above all others. But apart from this grievous exception, all Mussalmāns were socially equal. The ranks of the higher bureaucracy and the army were exclusive Turkish privilege; but in all the other walks of life—in trade, industry and commerce, in literature and public life, apart from government service in the higher sphere and specially in the safest and most lucrative of all mediæval professions, religion—career was really open to the Mussalmān.

The existence of the Turkish bureaucracy should not blind us to the existence of a very real and very vital 'community spirit' among the Mussalmāns. At the beginning of our period it was this 'community spirit'—based on social equality enshrined in the mosque—which enabled the Turkish rulers to crush the caste-ridden, ultra-oligarchic Rājput States of Hindustan and at the end of our period it destroyed the Turks themselves. In the struggle of races it is not the patriotism of the few that counts; the strength of a people depends upon the element of social justice in its outlook, social laws and institution—and owing to this element of social justice secured to the Islamic peoples a pre-eminent place in the cultural and political affairs of the world for the first thousand years of its existence. The Afghan, Khājī, Tajik or Indo-Muslim soldier in the armies that marched from Ghaznī to the Brahmaputra in the course of fifteen years—about one-half of a soldier's working life—could not fail to be galled by the restriction he was surrounded. Army life was hard and toilsome; commissariat arrangements often failed; what was worse, the officers deprived him of his legitimate share of spoils and an army commission, whatever his record, would be denied on racial grounds. But that was all. When the takbir—Allah-o-Akbar—was uttered, his individuality was lost in a great movement, preordained, irresistible, divine. The movement was all that mattered. He marched forth, reckless of victory or death.
We are they who come faster than fate; we are they who ride early or late:
We storm at your ivory gate; Pale kings of the sunset beware:
Not on silk nor in samit we lie, not in curtained solemnity die
Among women who chatter and cry and children who mumble a prayer.
But we sleep by the ropes of the camp, and we rise with a shout and we tramp.
With the sun or the moon for a lamp, and the spray of the wind in our hair.
From the lands where the elephants are to the forts of Merou and Balghär,
Our steel we have brought and our star to shine on the ruins of Rûm
We have marched from the Indus to Spain, and by God we will go there again;
We have stood on the shore of the plain where the Waters of Destiny boom.
A mart of destruction we made at Yalulā where men were afraid,
For death was a difficult trade, and the sword was a broker of doom.
And the spear was a Desert Physician, who cured not a few of ambition,
And drave not a few to perdition with medicine bitter and strong.
And the shield was a grief to the fool and as bright as a desolate pool,
And as straight as the rock of Stamboul when their cavalry thundered along;
For the coward was drowned with the brave when our battle sheered up like a wave.
And the dead to, the desert we gave, and the glory to God in our song.\(^1\)

\(^1\)James Elroy Flecker's *Hassan*, pp. 104, 105.
And against them—what? The majority of the Indians were asked to defend the temples of gods to which they had been denied entrance for generations. They refused. They were asked to maintain the power and privileges of the Kshatriyas and Brāhmans by which they had been reduced to the condition of beasts. They felt no call to die in defence of such privileges. They were asked to defend a great and sacred literature, literature so sacred that they would be punished with death for acquiring it. Need we feel surprised at their indifference. Here lies the solution of the Turko-Muslim Conquest of India.
CHAPTER I

THE STATE-SYSTEM OF 'AJAM

After the death of the Arabian Apostle, his followers set forth from their desert-homes with the message of Islam to convert the rest of the world to their faith. The two great powers with which they had to tackle, were the Byzantines and the Sasanians. As against the Byzantines, the Arabs achieved only a partial victory, and the Roman Empire ultimately survived the Caliphate by over two hundred years. On the other hand, the kingdom of the Sasanians passed under the sway of Islam as a result of the Arab victory over Yazdajird, the last of the Chosroes. The old administration of Mesopotamia and Persia, however, remained intact specially under the Abbasids, the successors of Umayyads, who changed the seat of government from Syria to Baghdaäd, the old winter capital of the Sasanians.

Baghdaäd henceforth became the centre of Muslim Empire in the East. Yet the very accession of the first Abbasid Caliph saw the disintegration of the Empire. Within the short span of a century, the integral parts of the Caliphate were disunited. Spain fell off, and proclaimed an Umayyad Caliph at Cordova; Egypt was lost and passed under the Fatimid Caliphs; Syria, for the most part, followed in the footsteps of Egypt and Arabia was the debatable land between the two. Many provinces in the Further East became independent, but luckily for the Abbasids, no rival Caliphate was set up.

Before commencing the political history of 'Ajam, it is worth-while to sketch the vast tracts of land stretching from the desert of Central Asia and the mountains of Afgänistän to the limits of the Byzantine Empire, which remained to the last nominally, if not actually, subject to
the Abbasid Caliphate. The country under review was divided into various provinces, which formed part of the Abbasid Empire.

Asia is the largest continent covering a vast and diversified area, stretching from the Arctic Circle to the Equator, and including one-third land of the globe with half the population of the inhabited world. A continent of ‘extremes and contrasts’, Asia includes within its borders the hottest and coldest regions; the highest mountains and plateaus, also the deepest depressions; and extremely congested as well as the most sparsely populated tracts of the world.¹

The great lowland province, the gift of the two great rivers the Euphrates and the Tigris (the latter river in Abbasid time ran in a different channel), was called Mesopotamia by the Greeks. The Arabs divided the country into two provinces—Lower (i.e., ancient Babylonia) Al-'Irāq and the Upper, Al-Jazīrah. To the east of the Upper Mesopotamia was situated the province of Ādherbāijān, the ancient Atropatene, bounded on the north by the Araxes, and on the south by the Safid Rūd, both of which rivers flowed into the Caspian. To the south-east of Ādherbāijān, lay the rich province of Media, called by the Arabs Al-Jibāl (i.e., the Mountains), for its mountains overhang the lowlands of Al-Jazīrah, and stretched eastward to the border of the Great Desert of Central Persia. The western part of this province, under the Kurds, came to be known as Kurdistān. The province of Khuzistān was situated to the south of Media and east of Lower Mesopotamia. Bordering the Gulf and east of Khuzistān, lay the great province of Fars, the ancient Persia and the ‘cradle of the Persian monarchy’. Bordering the Great Desert and east of Fars, lay the less fertile province of Kirmān. North of Makrān and to the east of the lake of Zarāb, lay the province of Sijistān or Sīstān. The Helmund river along with many other streams flowed into the Great Lake. North-west of

¹See Introduction to Asia by Dr. Dudley Stamp.
the Zarāh Lake and on the border of the Great Desert, came the hilly province of Kuhistān (land of mountains). The three smaller provinces of Kumis, Tābaristān and Jurfān came next. The great eastern province of Persia was Khūrāsān, which, unlike the modern times, comprised the north-western part of Afghānistān under the Abbasids. The mediæval Khūrāsān was bounded on the east by Badakhshān, and to the north by the Oxus and the desert of Khwārazm. A number of smaller provinces stretched from Badakhshān westwards, and lay to the north on the right bank affluents of the Oxus.¹

The theme of the present chapter on the ‘state-system of ‘Ajam’ on the death of Shīhābu’d-Dīn of Ghūr comprises the forces working in Central Asia and Persia; they are (1) the disintegration of the Abbasid Caliphate and the Minor Dynasties, (2) the Khwārazmian Empire, (3) Qara Khiṭāl Turks, (4) Ghūr, (5) Chingiz Khān and (6) Ala’mūt.

From the rise of Islam to the conquest of Muslim Asia by Chingiz Khān, Islamic History may be divided into four parts:

1. The period of Expansion (622-748) resulting in the conquest of Arabia, ‘Irāq, Syria, Persia and Northern Africa under the ‘Pious Caliphs’ and the Umayyads;

2. The period of Abbasid Caliphate or “the period of Turkish Ascendancy” (749-900) is notable for its peace and prosperity with practically no conquest to its record;

3. The period of “Minor Dynasties” (900-1000) or the period of “Persian Renaissance” saw the decline of the power of the Caliph and the rise of small principalities instead; and

4. the period of the Turko-Persian Empires (1000-1220) including the reigns of the Ghaznavid, the Saljūq and the Khwārazmian dynasties.

¹ See Introduction to Lands of the Eastern Caliphate by Le Strange.
The disintegration of the Abbasid Caliphate

"The Khilafat1 is the Viceregency of the Prophet; it is ordained by Divine Law for the perpetuation of Islam and the continued observance of its laws and rules. For the existence of Islam, therefore, there must always be a Caliph, an actual and direct representative of the Master."1

The Abbasid Caliphs of Baghdaḍ, the most celebrated dynasty of Islam, descended from the uncle of the Prophet Al-'Abbās. His descendants multiplied under the 'Pious Caliphs and their Umayyad successors.' By degrees they entertained the idea of upsetting the Umayyads, and were backed, in this design, by the descendants of 'Alī. Little by little they threw off their power. Thus Al-Ṣaffāh's brother and successor Abū-Ja'far al-Manṣūr made Baghdaḍ the capital.2 The Abbasid Caliphate reached its zenith in the time of Māmūn, after whom the disintegration of the Empire followed. "The nature of the policy of the Abbasids is well known. The first representatives of the dynasty were the same worldly rulers as the Umayyads, and openly supported Greek Science and, chiefly under Māmūn, the rationalistic creed of the Mu'tazilites. They were distinguished from the Umayyads chiefly by their political aims. The latter were first and foremost representatives of the Arab nation; the Abbasids sought to create a state, in which both those provinces with a Persian and those with an Arab population, should enjoy equal rights."3

The "weakening of religious zeal has shown itself in all religions at various stages, and is painfully obvious in the history of Islam from the decline of the Abbasid Caliphate in

1 Khilafat literally means succession, and the person who succeeds is called the Khalifa. The word having assumed a religious significance, the Khalifa is looked upon as a person holding a religious office. But he was not Khalifa in the sense in which the Pope is regarded as a successor of St. Peter. The Khalifa in Islam had no power to frame new rules in religion.

2 The Spirit of Islam by Amīr 'Alī, pp. 124, 125.
4 Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion by W. Barthold (Translated by the author and H. A. R. Gibb), p. 197.
the ninth century to the Mongol conquest of Muslim Asia and the growth of mysticism in the thirteenth—it was a period of feverish political activity; empires were established and pulled down; cities were founded and destroyed. But it was a period of refinement and culture, of an alluring, materialistic civilization—not of faith.¹

"Historians are agreed that the downfall of the Caliphate was caused by the rivalries of opposing rulers, the growth of anarchical and distinctive sects, the falling away from their allegiance of remote provinces, and the increasing power and ambition of Turkish mercenaries, all of which are easily shown to date from the reigns of Mâmûn and Mu'taṣim."²

The various tribes of the Mongolian race—Turks, Tartars, Turkomans, Tibetans, Chinese and Mongols extended from Anātulia to the shores of the Pacific Ocean. With the extension of the Muslim frontier to the north and west of Persia, one Turkish tribe after another came under subjection, and attracted the attention of their conquerors by the bravery of their men and beauty of their women. Thus the period is marked by the ascendancy of Turks, who slowly and steadily replaced the Persians from the ordinary post of royal bodyguard to the highest offices, and, through sheer force of ability and warlike prowess, became the absolute masters of the Abbasid Empire.

Mu'taṣim (833-842) took the fatal step of introducing the Turkish element into the army, and he was the first Caliph³ to have Turkish slaves under his employment. The position of the Caliph became all the more precarious by the transference of the seat of government from Baghūdād to Samātra (situated on the left bank of the Tigris) in 836 A.D. The tyranny, lawlessness and power of the Turks went on increasing ⁴ The unscrupulous policy of religious persecution

---

¹ Maḥmūd of Ghazna by Prof. Moḥammad Ḥabīb.
² The Saracens from the Earliest Times to the Fall of Baghūdād by Arthur Gilman, p. 423.
³ Tārīkh-i-Guzīdah, p. 318.
⁴ Ibn Aṭhīr, VI, p 319.
followed by the Caliph Mutawakkil was responsible for the alienation of the sympathies of the subject races. His own son entered into a conspiracy with the Turks, which ended in the Caliph’s murder in 861. The Caliph Mu’taḍid (892-902) was unable to suppress the power of the Turks. The final decline of the Caliphate set in just after the murder of Muqtadir in 932 A.D. “The Turkish soldiers made and murdered Caliphs at their pleasure.” The various ambitious Turks fought for the mastery of Baghdād, and one of them, eunuch Munīs, the captain of the guard, held the post of Amīr-u’l-Umarā’. The Amīrs appropriated all the revenue themselves, and fixed a daily allowance for the Caliph. The temporal power of the Caliph was reduced to insignificance, but they still commanded the respect and good wishes of pious Muslims; and no one could openly defy their orders.

The last ruler of the Ṭāhirid Dynasty, Muḥammad bin Ṭāhir (862-872) was a pleasure-seeking monarch. The Kharijites had long resumed their activities, and a band of volunteers called Mut‘āwia, with Ya’qūb bin Laith as their leader, was formed to protect the people from the Kharijite propaganda. The Saffarid Dynasty was founded by Ya’qūb bin Laith al-Ṣaffār, which originated in Sijistān, and reigned in Persia for thirty-three years. Ya’qūb, a copper-smith by trade, became a brigand and rebelled against Dirham bin Naṣr. In 867 A.D. he was master of the whole of Sīstān. In 867 A.D. he captured Herāt and the government of Kirmān came under his control. In 870 A.D. he captured Balkh, Bāmiyān and Kābul and also Nishāpūr. He finally settled in Khurāsān.

---

2 Taḥaštī, pp. 1456-60.
6 The ruler of Khurāsān and Sijistān,
7 Gardizī, p. 10.
Ya'qūb secured a patent of sovereignty from the Caliph.¹ Both Ya'qūb and his brother proved the champions of the orthodox faith and faithful allies of the Caliphate. They, however, succeeded in sharing for the first time with the Caliph the two emblems of sovereignty. Ya'qūb introduced his name in the khūṭbah² and Amt's name was inscribed on the gold coin, and was not considered under any obligation to pay regular tribute to Baghdad. This marks for the first time a distinct transition from the status of governorship to substantial, though theoretically limited, sovereignty within the Caliphate. The weak rule both at the centre and in the provinces prompted them to contest the political supremacy of the Abbasids, but this should by no means be considered a "Persian revolt against Arab Domination." The Saffarids always fought against other Persian rulers, and several times allied themselves with the Caliph against them.³

The Samanid Dynasty descended from a certain Samakhdar, who traced his family back to the celebrated Bahrām Cubin i.e., to a noble family of Ray. His four grandsons played an important part in the reign of Al-Rashid. On the accession of al-Māmūn, they were given administrative posts. Tāhir bin al-Ḥusain, when he became governor of Khurasan, confirmed these appointments. The Samanids, thus, were a kind of sub-governors of the Tāhirids, after whose downfall they became paramount; and Ismā'īl is really the first independent prince.⁴ The Samanids had a direct and independent relationship with the Caliphate from 874 to 944 A.D. and an indirect and dependent relationship from 944 to 999 A.D., during which period the Caliphate remained under the tutelage of the Buwayhids⁵ till their defeat and decline at the hands of

¹ Gardizi, pp. 14, 15.
² Nasrkhābī, p. 79.
³ Vide Raufa't-u'z-Ṣafā, Vol. IV, pp. 710, 711.
⁵ The Caliphs being an abject puppet in their hands, vide Muhammadan Dynasties by Stanley Lane-Poole, p. 140.
Ghaznavids in 999 A.D. During the first period of their relationship with the Caliphate, they enjoyed three privileges—the inclusion of their names in the khatībah and on the coins along with the names of the Caliph and freedom from the payment of any dues to the Government of Baghdad. The Samanids, being staunch Sunnis, sought recognition from the Caliphate, and applied for a deed of investiture. They were independent in the internal administration of their territories, but remained loyal to the authority of the Caliph,¹ waged holy wars and suppressed the Karmathian heresy.

The founder of the Buwayhid Dynasty was Abu-Shuja Buwih who is said to have been a descendant of the Sasanian king, Bahram. As a chief of a warlike horde, he played a prominent part in the struggle between the "Alids and the Samanids." The real founders of the dynasty were, however, his three sons 'Alī, Ḥasan and Aḥmad; they preferred to be regarded as Shi'a. 'Alī was appointed governor of Karaj, and defeated Caliph Qādir's troops and occupied Isfahān. Shīrāz and Kirmān were taken by Aḥmad, who entered Baghdad in 945 A.D.; the Caliph al-Mustakfi had to create him Amir-u'l-Umarā, and gave him the title of Muizzz-u'd-Dawlah. 'Alī and Ḥasan received the titles of Imām-u'd-Dawlah and Rukn-u'd-Dawlah, respectively.²

By this time the temporal power of the Caliph had been taken over by the Amīrs. With the capture of Baghdad by the Buwayhids, who were Shi'as, and who considered the Abbasids as usurpers,³ still worse was to happen. To meet his political ends, Muizzz-u'd-Dawlah recognised the institution, chose an Abbasid Caliph Mut't, but caused the name of Amīr-u'l-Umarā, sometimes of his heir-apparent as well, to be conjoined with that of the Caliph in the khatībah at Baghdad. In the provinces directly governed by the Buwayhids, the names of other members of the Buwayhid family were sometimes mentioned along with

¹ Raudarī, Ṣafā, Vol. IV, pp. 715-16.
that of Amir-u’ll-Umarā. The epithet Amir-u’ll-Muminin after the name of the Caliph was omitted from the khuṭbah and the coinage. In short, everything depended upon the sweet will of the Buwayhid Amir, without whose consent the Caliph could not issue any patent of sovereignty or grant honours. Formal sanction, however, remained in the Caliph’s hands.

With the change of circumstances, the relations between the Caliphate and the Samanids also changed. The latter recognised the Caliph Muṭṭi’, but after two years they ceased to pay homage to him, and again recognised the old Caliph. The deposition of Caliph Ṣā’ī and the elevation of Qādir to the Caliphate brought about the final breach. The Samanids were, however, unable to rally any national support against either the Qarā-Khitāis or Maḥmūd of Ghaznāh, who put an end to their dynasty.

In his relation with the Caliphate, Maḥmūd was guided both by religious and political motives. He recognised Caliph Qādir, and applied for the Ėmirat of Khurasān and outlying provinces conquered by him. He was granted a patent of sovereignty, crown and the title of Yamin-u’d-Dawlah wa Amir-u’ll-Millah. He was further allowed to cause his son’s name inscribed upon the coinage minted at Nishapūr. But the Caliph stoutly refused Maḥmūd’s demand for Samarqand. Such recognitions of the Abbasid Caliphate by the Ghaznavids re-established the old prestige and authority of the Caliphate in Persia; and it was only due to the whole-hearted support of Maḥmūd that the Fatimids could not secure a footing in Persia. Both Maḥmūd and Mas’ūd entered into a treaty with the Caliph, by which

---

1 According to Tarikh-i-Guzdak, this title was conferred upon the elder brother of Mui’zz-u’d-Dawlah, vide Tarikh-i-Guzdak, p. 418.
2 Vide Caliphate and Sultanate by Dr. Amir Ḥasan Šiddiqī.
3 The dynasty was actually founded by Alptigin, a Turkish slave of the house of Sāmān at Ghaznāh, but its political significance began some fourteen years later on the accession of Maḥmūd’s father, Subuktigin, the slave of Alptigin, vide Literary History of Persia, by Prof. Browne, Vol. II, p. 94.
the latter was not to enter into direct relations with the Qarā-Khitāils.¹

On the appearance of the Saljūqs as a political power in Persia, "the empire of the Caliphate vanished."² Their origin is from the Turkish clan of 'qag' according to the Tārīkh-i-Guzīdah.³ They were a branch of the Ghazz Turks, who ruled over wide territories in Central and Nearer Asia from the eleventh to the thirteenth century. The following three dynasties are distinguished: the great Saljūqs, Saljūqs of 'Irāq, and the Saljūqs of Asia Minor. The ancestor of these rulers was Saljūq bin Duqāq. Political conditions in Transoxiana, where the Samanids and Qarā Khitāils were fighting for supremacy, were favourable to the development of the power of the Saljūqs, who took the side of the Samanids. But they went on furthering their own interests. After the death of Saljūq, Arsalān assumed the leadership. Maḥmūd of Ghaznīah took him prisoner, but the Ghazz still proved turbulent. Finally there was a war between the Ghaznavids and the Saljūqs, and Masʿūd himself was routed at Dandanqān.⁴

"The temporal power of the Caliph had been reduced to nullity by the Buwayhids and the Ghaznavids. The Saljūqs were recent converts and orthodox Muslims, and, consequently, had the greatest respect for the institution of the Caliphate. The new power swept away those insignificant and divided dynasties and once again united Islam under a single powerful sway, stretching from Turkistan to the Mediterranean Sea."⁵ After their conquest at Dandanqān (to the south-west of Merv) in 1040 A.D. against Masʿūd, they sent a letter to the Caliph; and Tughril himself visited Bāghdād in 1055 A.D.⁶ He was given a robe of honour and a turban,¹ and was addressed by the

¹ Bayhaqī, p. 559.
² History of Muhammadan Dynasties by Stanley Lane-Poole, p. 149.
³ Tārīkh-i-Guzīdah, p. 434.
Caliph as 'king of the East and West!' The title of Rukn-u'd-Dawlah was also conferred upon him. Thūṣ, the Turks "came to the rescue of a dying State, and revived it." The Caliph's name was mentioned in the khuṭbah in all the territories governed by the Saljūqs. After the defeat of Sultān Muḥammad by Sanjar, the latter was acknowledged suzerain at Baghdād. Henceforth Sanjar became the official Sultān, and his name was mentioned not only at Baghdād but in all other countries under his control. On the death of Sultān Muḥammad, the Caliph Mustarshīd (1118-35) got an opportunity of gaining some power, but peace was concluded on the condition that he would not again assemble forces and would not leave his place. Caliph Muktaft assumed a more independent attitude. In the last, "the Saljūq Empire succumbed before the attack of the Khwārazmīan State, in other places, it was supplanted by dynasties founded by Saljūq officers; but in Rūm it survived until the advent of the 'Uṯmānīli Turks in 1300."  

The Khwārazmīan Empire

With regard to the origin of the Khwārazmīan Empire, the author of the Tārīkh-i-Jahān Kushā', on the authority of Mashārīb-u't-Tajārib and Jwāmi-u'l-'Ulūm, says that "Bilkāṭīgīn, the Saljūq commander of Khurāsān, appointed his slave Nushtīgīn Gharjāh, the governor of Khwārazm, and the latter rose to eminence in the time of the Saljūqs." His son Quṭb-u'd-dīn Muḥammad received his education and training in Merv. Soon after Sultān Barqīāruq, son of Malik Shāh, the Amir of Khurāsān,

1 Muḥammadan Dynasties by Stanley Lane-Poole, p. 130.
2 Tārīkh-i-Guzīdah, p. 437
3 Ibn Aṭṭīr, XI. p. 16.
4 Muḥammadan Dynasties by Stanley Lane-Poole, p. 152.
5 And this is the reason, why he is called Khwārazm Shāh, vide Nişām-u't-Tawīrīkh by Qāḍī Nuṣīr-u'd-dīn Abu Sa'īd Abd-ullāh al-Baidāwī, p. 80; (Tārīkh Press, Hyderabad-Deccan).
6 Raūḍa't-u'ẓ-Safā, Vol. IV, p. 810.
appointed Quṭb-u’d-din Muḥammad the governor of Khurāsān in 1098 A.D. with the title of Khwārazm Shāh; and he served the Empire loyally for thirty years.¹ The author of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, on the authority of Malik Ṣajj-u’d-dīn Bīnāl-Tīḡīn,² says that “Malik Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak, the Turk, belonged to the tribe of Qipchāq and Qanqulī (situated to the north of the river Jaxartes) and came from the side of Suhārī towards Jand and Khwārazm, where he dwelt for a considerable period subject to the Khwārazm Shāhs, Abu Ja’far and Mumūn. As Quṭb-u’d-dīn was ‘a spirited, enterprising and high-minded chief’, he became the leader of the Maliks of Khwārazm. The ruler of Khwārazm died without leaving any heir but a daughter, who was married to Quṭb-u’d-dīn. The name of sovereign was assigned to that daughter, and the viceroyalty was conferred upon her husband. Having brought the territory of Khwārazm Shāh under his jurisdiction, Quṭb-u’d-dīn guarded the frontiers of the dominion from the infidels of Saqasīn (probably Saṅhānak), Bulghār and Qipchāq. Quṭb-u’d-dīn was succeeded, by his son Malik Ṣajj-u’d-dīn Muḥammad, and the latter ruled under the subordination of the Saljūq sovereigns.”³

Ṭaj-u’d-dīn Muḥammad was succeeded by his son Jalāl-u’d-dīn Aṭsiz.⁴ He was “cultured, learned, a poet and a fighter.”⁵ He served Sanjar loyally at first and saved him from a conspiracy of his slaves at Bukhārā in 1130 A.D.⁶ Owing to the Sultan’s favour his power increased, but the nobles grew jealous of him; and, consequently, during Sanjar’s cam-

² According to Minhaj-i-Sirāj, the author of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī Tāj-u’d-dīn Bīnāl-Tīḡīn belonged to the same family as the Maliks of Khwārazm, and was one of the maternal uncles of Sultan Khwārazm Shāh.
³ According to Ṭabīkh-i-Jahān Kūhā, Vol. II, p. 3 and Rauḍa’t-u’s-Safā, Vol. IV, p. 810 Aṭsiz was the son of Quṭb-u’d-dīn, but Ṭabīkh-i-Guzidah, p. 487 has Sultan Aṭsiz, son of Muḥammad Nushṭīqīn.
⁴ Ṭabīkh-i-Jahān Kūhā, p. 3.
⁵ Ibid., p. 4.
campaign against Bahram Shāh of Ghazni in 1134 A.D., he obtained leave to go to Khwārazm, where he rebelled. In 1138 A.D. Sanjar marched to Khwārazm; Atsiz fled, and his son Atīg was captured and put to death. Atsiz returned and drove away the Sultan's nephew Sulaymān Muḥammad, the Governor of Khwārazm, who sought help from the Qara Khitaibs and promised to pay them 36,000 dinars.¹ In 1141 A.D. Qara Khitaibs proceeded against Sanjar and, defeated him before Samarqand. Atsiz, thereby, got an opportunity of plundering Merv; and in 1142 A.D. he removed the name of the Saljuqs from the khutbah.² Sultan Sanjar twice laid siege to Khwārazm, but every time Atsiz submitted and on the second occasion himself came out to pay homage to the Sultan, remained on horseback and returned.³ He then treacherously put to death his own ally Kamāl-u'd-dīn, son of Arsalān Khan Muḥammad, ruler of Jand, and assigned that territory to his son Il-Arsalān. Sultan Sanjar fell into the hands of the Ghazz, and Atsiz, with the assistance rendered by the Sultan's nephew Rūkn-u'd-dīn of Nishāpur, intended to suppress the Ghazz, but failed to capture Amwiyya or Amūl (on the Oxus). Sultan Sanjar was, however, set free.

Atsiz died in 1156 A.D. and was succeeded by Il-Arsalān. He did not like to approach the Abbasid Caliphate for the grant of a deed of investiture, but immediately secured it from Sultan Sanjar.⁴ Qaraīghān chiefs sought refuge with Il-Arsalān, and incited him to invade the territory of the Khan of Samarqand, Jalāl-u'd-dīn, 'All. In 1158 A.D. the Gur Khan of Qara Khitaibs sent support to the Khan of Samarqand, and Il-Arsalān was compelled to make peace. Sultan Sanjar was succeeded by Sultan Muḥammad, but Mu'ayyid, an all-powerful noble, blinded and imprisoned him in 1162 A.D. Next year, Il-Arsalān besieged Mu'ayyid at

² Tarikh-i-Guzīdah, p. 487.
⁴ Caliphate and Kingship in Medieval Persia, by Dr. Amir Ḥasan Siddiqī, p. 152.
Shādbakh (the neighbouring suburb of Naisābur), but peace was concluded. İl-Arsalān showed reluctance in sending the tribute, which his father had promised to Qara Khiṭāís. As a consequence, the army of Khiṭā marched against him and defeated him. İl-Arsalān died in 1163 A.D.

Sultān Shāh, the younger brother of İl-Arsalān, ascended the throne, and his mother Malik-i-Ṭurkān took charge of the government. 'Imād-u’d-dīn Takash, the elder brother, fled to the Gūr Khān, married his daughter and promised tribute in case of succession to the throne of Khwārazm; and, through the help of the latter, drove away Sultān Shāh and his mother from Khwārazm. Yūnus bin Takash Khān sat on the throne in 1172 A.D. and, with the help of Sanjar, fought a battle against Takash, but was defeated. The same year, Takash ascended the throne and defeated Sultān Shāh’s ally Mu’ayyid, the governor of Khorāsān, at Suberly or (Saburghān below Andkhūd). Both the governor and Malik-i-Ṭurkān were put to death. In 1173 A.D. Sultān Shāh fled to Gūr. Takash established his power at Khwārazm, but Khiṭāl ambassadors came to exact tribute; their arrogance being intolerable Takash gave an order for their murder. Sultān Shāh haled this friction and approached Gūr Khān and, with his support, captured Merv, defeated Ṭughān Khān and established his power at Sarakhs (situated on the Hirāt river).

During the next ten years, a futile war was carried on between the two brothers. Takash marched to Khwārazm and laid siege to Merv and Shādbakh. Sultān Shāh attacked Subzwārī and proceeded towards Merv, but had to retire against Takash at Shādyākh. His son,
Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Malik Shāh, was appointed governor of Khurāsān in 1187 A.D. Peace was, however, concluded between the two brothers, but friction continued. In 1190 A.D. Qutlugh Inānch, a rebel governor, sought help from Takash against Sultān Tughrul Saljūqī. Takash marched to 'Irāq, alighted at Ray (in the Jībāl province), and captured Tabraq (modern Iṣfahān). Next year in 1191 A.D. he defeated Tughrul Saljūqī and, thus, the territory of 'Irāq came under his possession.

Sultān Shāh, along with some Sanjari slaves, like Bahā-u'd-dīn Tughrul, went on plundering the outlying districts of Ghūr. Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn and Shīhāb-u’d-dīn marched with the armies of Bāmiyān and Herāt and encamped at Marvar-rūd (situated on the river Merv). The Ghūrian army defeated Sultān Shāh, but peace was made. Soon after Sultān Shāh died, and his governor of Sarakhs, Badr-u’d-dīn Jaghar, handed over the place to Takash. The Sultān refused the Caliph Nāṣir-u’d-dīn-illāh’s demand for a part of 'Irāq. Therefore, the Caliph's Vizier collected 10,000 soldiers, but was signally defeated by the Khwarazmians and, thus, brought disgrace upon the Caliphate.

Iṣfahān was entrusted to Qutlugh Inānch, and Ray was placed under the charge of Yūnus Khān with Mīyānjīq as his 'atāliq'; but Yūnus Khān, owing to some eye-trouble, returned to Khwārazm. At the time, the army of Baghdād attacked 'Irāq, but capitulated after fighting for some days. Malik Qutb-u’d-dīn was appointed governor of Khurāsān, and he defeated Qarā Buqā at Jand. In 1198 A.D. the Sultān himself marched to 'Irāq and was ultimately exiled to Jand.

In the last years of his reign, the Sultān moved against

---

2 Tārīkh-i-Guzīdah, p. 492.  
3 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 73.
4 Tārīkh-i-Guzīdah, p. 494 gives quite the reverse statement.
the Assassins, and reduced the fort of 'Arsalān Gushā' after a siege of four months, but the Assassin's army was allowed to retreat to Alamūt.\(^1\) The Sultan returned to Khwārazm, and died at Chāh-i-'Arab in 1200 A.D.

The remaining facts about the Khwarazmian Empire are discussed elsewhere in relation to Ghūr, while the next section is devoted to the Qara Khitāt Turks, who played an equally important part in the history of 'Ajam'.

Qara Khitāt Turks

The first irruption of the Turks was that of Qara Khātā from the land of Khātā or Khitāi,\(^2\) which consisted of vast tracts of territories in the north-west of China. As regards their early history suffice to say that a person from the Jidān tribe, whom the Mongols call Qara Khitāi, seized the sovereign of Khīṭā, and himself assumed the royal authority. His descendants ruled for several generations, and the chief men among them in succession to one another were several persons—Imā Surīqam Arbaz Tūmā and Tayankū Tārāz, and their ruler is known as Gūr Khān or Khān-i-Khānān.

From their homelands in China, they issued forth into the confines of Qīrätz, Bāyamī\(^3\) and Bilāsāghūn,\(^4\) withdrew their allegiance from the sovereign of Tamghāch and, on, payment of fixed tribute to the Afrāsiyābī Malik,\(^5\) made the frontier tracts of these territories their dwelling-places and grazing grounds. At first they were few in number but, in course of time, they multiplied into 40,000

---

2. The designation of Khīṭā differs according to the different races, who speak of them. The Mongols call it Jāqūt, Indians call it Tibbet, and people of Transoxiana term it Khīṭā or Khitāi.
4. Bilāsāghūn was the capital of the Khāns of Turkistan during the 10th and 11th centuries. However, its exact site is unknown. It was somewhere near Kāshghar.
5. Musālmān sovereigns subject to the Saljuqī Sulṭāns.
families.\(^1\) The Amir of Bilāsāghūn, being unable to coerce the tribes of Qīrogh and Qanqu'll,\(^2\) sought help from the Gūr Khān. Thereupon, the Khītāi Amir captured the territory of Bilāsāghūn, subdued Kāshghār and Khutān and conquered the territory of Qīrqīz and Biśh-Bāljīgh. The Sулṭāns of Fargarān and Transoxiana became his tributaries. In order to suppress the rising power of the Qara Khītāis, Sулṭān Sanjar marched to coerce them, but the former, under Tayānku Tarāz, defeated the Sулṭān; and as a result of this victory, the pasture-lands of Turkistan and Bilāsāghūn along with other cities and towns were left in the hands of the Qara Khītāis. With the advent of the Ghazz tribe of Khāndān, the Sanjari dynasty declined, and the Qara Khītāis gained vast power and strength.\(^3\) The Malikṣs of Turkistan weakened their power by contesting for supremacy among themselves until the Qara Khītāis, who played off one against another, became the masters of Transoxiana and Turkistan.\(^4\)

Atsiz, the Sулṭān of Khwārazm, paid his homage and submitted to the Gūr Khān, and promised to pay an yearly tribute of 30,000 dinars.\(^5\) His son Īl-Arsalān showed reluctance in paying the tribute, and thus, became subject to the wrath of those formidable infidels. On the death of Īl-Arsalān, a civil-war broke out between his sons Sулṭān Shāh and Takhsh for the throne of Khwārazm. In the meantime, Sулṭān Shāh ascended the throne. The Gūr Khān despatched his Vizier Muḥammad Tāl to realise the annual tribute, which had been detained by the Sулṭān for more than two years. Sулṭān Shāh, being engaged in the invasion of Qipchāq, left the government of the territory to his mother, Türkān Khātūn. She welcomed the messenger politely and paid the tribute. Muḥammad

---

\(^1\) Ruḍvat-uṣ-Ṣafā, Vol. V, p. 924.
\(^3\) Ṭabaqāt-Nāṣirī, p. 328
Tāī returned, and said to the Gūr Khān, "The Sulṭān is ill-disposed towards you and will not pay tribute next time." The Gūr Khān was succeeded by his wife Konāyik and Takāsh fled to her, and, through her support, defeated Sulṭān Shāh and sat on the throne of Khwārazm. She demanded more than the stipulated tribute. Takāsh put her ambassador to death, and thus hostilities arose. Sulṭān Shāh hailed this friction and went over to the side of Qara Khīṭāīs, who did help him, but the success was only partial. The female Gūr Khān was killed and was succeeded by one of the living brothers of the late Gūr Khān.

Sulṭān Shāh sought an alliance with Sulṭān ʿUṭmān of Bukhārā against the Gūr Khān. The Amīrs of the latter also rose in open revolt in the East and Kuchluk, a subordinate officer, left the Khān's court on the pretext of collecting forces, and proved rebellious by handing over Samarqand to ʿUṭmān. Thereupon, the Gūr Khān captured Samarqand, but, upon reaching Tarāz, found Tānīko in revolt. Now the forces of Sulṭān Muḥammad and Sulṭān ʿUṭmān of Samarqand completely overthrew the forces of the Gūr Khān under I-lash Bānīko in 1210 A.D. The Qara Khīṭāīs, on their way, plundered Bilā-āghūn, and marched against Kuchluk, but suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of the latter.

To sum up, then, the armies of Qara Khīṭāī Turks had several times crossed the river Jāyhūn or Oxus and ravaged Khurāsān, Balkh, Tirmid, ʿĀmul, Tālqān, and Ghārjīstān as far as the frontier of Ghūr. With the exception of the Sultāns of Ghūr and Bāmiyān, all Transoxiana, Farghānāh, Khwārazm and some parts of Khurāsān used to send them tribute. On two or three occasions the Ghūrīan forces did inflict crushing defeats upon the forces of Khīṭā.

2 Ibid., p. 89.
3 Ibid., p. 91.
4 Their leader Bānīko was wounded and taken prisoner; this shows the decline of the Qara Khīṭāīs.
6 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 329.
Gūr Khān died leaving behind him a daughter of an Amir as heir-apparent. Kuchluk brought her under his subordination. After the death of Sulṭān Shihāb-u'd-dīn of Ghūr, Sulṭān Muḥammad Khwārazm Shāh acquired sway over the territories of Turkistan; and Ṭayankū Ṭarāz, being defeated, embraced Islam at the hands of the former.1

**Ghūr**

The province of Ghūr2 was bounded on its northern side by a region of lower hills known as Ghārjistān, by the province of Herāt in the west, by the Gīaznavīd provinces of Garmsir (now the province of Fars) and Nīmrūz in the south, and by Kabul and Qandhār in the east. The later princes of the dynasty had built the Palace fort of Firūz Kuh,3 in the valley of Zū-Mayandīsh, which has been occasionally, but incorrectly, referred to as Ghūr.

The early history of the dynasty is lost in myth and romance. Qāḍī Minhāj Sirāj,4 on the authority of Maulānā Fakhīr-u'd-dīn Mubārak Shāh of Farw-a'r-rūd, who has given in verse a description of the Sulṭāns of Ghūr, says, “after the decline of the power of Ḫūḥak's sons, a person Shanksab by name attained great power in the country of Ghūr, and it was with reference to his name that the dynasty was known as the Shanksānī. In all probability, this personage embraced Islam at the hands of 'Alī.”5 But the extinct volume of Imām Abu'l-Faḍl Bayhaqī's Ṭāriḵ-i-Āl-i-Subūktīgīn, written some two hundred years before the Tabaqāt-i-Nāširi gives no clue to the Ghūrīan prince

---

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāširi, p. 329.
2 The name of Ghūr was borne by the mountain region situated to the east and south-east of Herāt and south of Ghārjistān and Gurgān; the dialect of these mountaineers differed materially from that of Khurāsān, vide Turkistān Down to the Mongol Invasion, p. 338.
3 It was an immense fortress in the mountains of Ghārjistān, the position of which is not known.
4 He consulted the book in the sacred harem of the daughter of Sulṭān Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn vide Tabaqāt-i-Nāširi, p. 28.
5 Ibid, pp. 28, 29.
Muḥammad, son of Sūr, in the description of Maḥmūd’s
invasion of 1010 A.D. against the hill-chiefs of those districts.
Again, it was only after the death of Sulṭān Maḥmūd
that the inhabitants were gradually converted to Islam.

The fraternity of Ḏuḥāk has been traced up to Nūḥ. First
came Tāziunarsad, then his son Zanbakā, then the latter’s
son Arwand-asp, father of Ḏuḥāk. Buṣṭām, one of the
descendants of Ḏuḥāk, being driven away by Afrīdūn came
into the mountain-tracts of Ghūr, called Hazār-Chašmāh
(the thousand springs), where he established himself and
founded the dynasty.¹

The Sulṭāns of the Shansabānian dynasty have been
divided into four separate and distinct groups of the
Sulṭāns of Fīruz, Kuh or Ghūr, Ghaznīn, Bāmiyan and
Hindustan.² The principality of Ghūr was reduced to a
position of dependency by Maḥmūd, who is said to have
defeated Maḥmūd, son of Sūr, the prince of Ghūr. With
the advent of the Saljuqs as a political force in Persia, the
Ghūrīan prince had to pay homage and tribute to the old
as well as the new masters. ‘Aẓīz-u’ḍ-dīn Ḥasan, the ruler
of Ghūr and a contemporary of Sulṭān Bahrām Shāh of
Ghaznīn died, and left seven sons generally known as the
“seven stars.”

Malik Fakhr-u’ḍ-dīn Mas’ūd, the eldest son from a Turk-
ish mother³, was not permitted to ascend the throne. Saif-
u’ḍ-dīn, however, occupied the throne, made Āstīāh his
capital and divided his father’s dominions among his brothers:
the, territory of Warshād to Malik-u’l-Jibāl Quṭb-u’ḍ-dīn
Muḥammād, the founder of the city and fortress of Fīruz
Kuh; Mādīn to Malik Naṣīr-u’ḍ-dīn; the district of Sankah
to Bahā-u’ḍ-dīn Sūr; the district and castle of Wajīh to
‘Alā-u’ḍ-dīn and the territory of Kash (modern Kashān) to
Malik Fakhr-u’ḍ-dīn.⁴

¹ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, pp. 31, 33. ² Ibid.
³ This proves, among other reasons, that the Ghūrīan princes were not
Turks.
⁴ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 48. The geography of this immense region is
unfortunately a complete blank, for none of those towns and castles
However contention arose between Quṭb-u'd-dīn Muḥammad and his other brothers, and the former being indignant withdrew to Ghaznīn. Now Šultān Bahā-u'd-dīn Sūr established himself at Firuz Kuh. Quṭb-u'd-dīn Muḥammad was accused of having cast evil eyes upon the Sultan's harem and was, therefore, put to death by Bahrām Shāh, the ruler of Ghaznīn. On hearing the sad news of his brother's death, Saif-u'd-dīn Sūr marched with an army to Ghaznīn, captured it and himself occupied the throne. He made over the dominions of Ghūr to his brother Bahā-u'd-dīn Sūrī, father of Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn and Shihāb-u'd-dīn. The Ghūrian forces retired to their country and, on the approach of the winter season, means of communication stopped between Ghūr and Ghaznīn. Taking advantage of the situation, Bahrām Shāh made a night attack and defeated Sultan Sūrī. Sultan Sūrī and the treacherous Vizier, Sayyad Majd-u'd-dīn Mūsawi, were placed on two camels and paraded through the streets of Ghaznīn and ultimately hung from the bridge.¹

"Alone among the ruling dynasties of the East, the royal line of Ghūr is distinguished by the strength of its family affections and the absence of fratricidal conflicts."² Now Šultān Bahā-u'd-dīn Sūrī determined to wreak vengeance upon the inhabitants of Ghaznīn, but on his way fell ill at Qīdān and died. He was succeeded by his brother 'Alā-u'd-dīn ḽahān-suz, who undertook the expedition and thrice defeated Daulat Shāh, son of Bahrām Shāh. The city was taken by storm and put to fire for seven days and nights. "From the blackness of the smoke," says the contemporary writer, "these seven days continued as black as night, and from the flames of the fire these seven nights remained as bright as day."³ During these days and nights all sorts of cruelties, barbarities and massacre were carried on, and

mentioned in its history are known.

¹ Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 113, 114.
² Professor Muḥammad Ḥabīb’s article on Sultan Shihāb-u'd-dīn of Ghūr. (Muslim University Journal, 1930, p. 10.)
³ Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 57.
women and children were made captive. The graves of the Ghaznavids, with the exception of those of Maḥmūd, Masʿūd and Ibrāhīm, were dug out and burnt; and the tombs of Sultan Sūrī and Qūṭb-u'd-dīn were built.¹

On his accession, Sultan 'Alā-u'd-dīn Jahān-suz ordered his nephews Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn and Shihāb-u'd-dīn to be imprisoned and confined in the fortress of Wazīristan.² In course of time, he withdrew his allegiance and tribute to Sultan Sanjar. He was, however, defeated and taken prisoner by Sanjar. But 'Alā-u'd-dīn Jahān-suz was well known for his "wittiness of temperament and quickness of intellect." and, one day, the Sultan was so pleased by his verse that he set him free.³ He now established his power at Ghūr, married the daughter of Sher Shāh, one of the Maliks of Kharjistān, and, thus, brought the valley of the Murghāb river and its fortresses under his possession. Towards the end of his life, emissaries came from Ala'mūt, and he treated them with reverence.

'Alā-u'd-dīn Jahān-suz was succeeded by Sultan Saif-u'd-dīn, and the latter directed that Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn and Shihāb-u'd-dīn should be released from the fortress. Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn remained at the court of Firuz Kuh, but Shihāb-u'd-dīn went to his uncle Malik Fakhr-u'd-dīn Masʿūd at Bāmiyān. Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn continued in the service until the Sultan's death. The Ghūrian forces, being defeated by the Ghazz, fled towards Ghārjistān, and, when they reached Marawar-rūd, the Amīrs and Maliks gave their allegiance to Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn and placed him on the throne at Firuz Kuh.⁴

On receiving the intelligence of the accession of Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn, Malik Fakhr-u'd-dīn Masʿūd turned towards Shihāb-u'd-dīn and said, "Your brother has distinguished himself, when will you rise and do the like?"⁵ Shihāb-u'd-dīn hung his head and with his uncle's permission came to Firuz Kuh, where he was appointed Sar-i-Jāndār; and the

---

¹ Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 57. ⁶ Ibid., p. 59. ⁷ Ibid., pp. 60, 61. ⁸ Ibid., pp. 68. ⁹ Ibid., p. 114.
territories of Āstiāh and Kajūrān were entrusted to his charge. The two brothers were successful in putting to death Abu'l 'Abbās, who had murdered their cousin Sulṭān Saif-u'd-dīn. Their uncle, Malik Fakhṛ-u'd-dīn Mas'ūd, by virtue of his being the eldest of the 'seven stars', aspired for the throne of Fīrūz Kuh, and sought help from Malik 'Alā-u'd-dīn Qīmāj, a Sanjari Amīr and ruler of Balkh, and from Malik Tāj-u'd-dīn Yīldiz of Herāt. These forces marched towards Fīrūz Kuh; and the two brothers also proceeded to Rāgh-i-Raz. Yīldiz was defeated, and the army of Herāt took to flight. The following day Qīmāj was also put to death. Having received the news of this disaster, Malik Fakhṛ-u'd-dīn determined to retire; but the two brothers approached him, apologised most humbly and sent him back to Bāmiyān.

Girmsīr, Zamīn-i-Dawār and Herāt were liberated. Farār, Fiwār, Bāghshur, Tāltqān, Juzerwān and the territories of Qāliyūn and Gharjistān came under his possession. After serving for full one year, Shīhāb-u'd-dīn had proceeded to Sijistān, but was called back by his brother and Tīginābād was handed over to him. At that period, the Ghazz had wrested the territories of Kabul, Zāwul and Ghaznīn from the possession of Khusru Shāh and the latter's successor Khusru Malik had to contend himself with the kingdom of Lahore. Shīhāb-u'd-dīn was in the constant habit of making raids upon and harassing the territories of the Ghazz, until the year 1173 A.D. when Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn subdued Ghaznīn and there placed Shīhāb-u'd-dīn on the throne.

Shīhāb-u'd-dīn brought the territory of Ghaznīn under his sway, acquired Gardāiz, and in 1175 A.D. captured

---

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 69. Yīldiz is written as یلدیز.
2 Ibid., p. 71.
3 Qāliyūn and Fiwār were the strong fortresses ten leagues apart from each other, but their position is not known.
4 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 72.
5 Ibid., p. 36; Nisbat Nāmah of Fakhṛ-u'd-dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 19.
Multān from the hands of the Karamatians. The same year, the armies of Ghūr and Ghaznīn took possession of Herāt. In 1176 A.D. Shīhāb-u’d-dīn marched an army against the Sanqurān tribe and put most of them to the sword.¹

Shīhāb-u’d-dīn next proceeded to Uch.² He sent a messenger to the Rajah’s wife, “if you render help in conquering the city,” he promised, “I will marry you and make you my queen.” “I am too old,” she replied, “but I have a very beautiful and intelligent daughter . . . I will do away with the Rajah, if the Sulṭān agrees to marry her (i.e. her daughter).” The Sulṭān agreed to the proposal. The faithless wife murdered her husband and handed over the city to the Sulṭān. Shīhāb-u’d-dīn fulfilled his promise and returned to Ghaznīn after assigning the territories of Multān and Uch to ‘Ali Qirmāj.³

In the following year Shīhāb-u’d-dīn marched towards Nahrwālah (Gujarat) by way of Uch and Multān. Kelhana of Naḍol offered resistance in the way and⁴ the young Rai of Nahrwālah, Bhīm Div collected his Rajput veterans, and in 1178 A.D.⁵ defeated the army of Ghaznīn. Dharavarshe, the Parawara ruler of Ābū, was one of the commanders in the Rajput army.⁶

Not at all discouraged by the reverse, Shīhāb-u’d-dīn led an army to Furshor (Parshwar, Peshwar) and annexed it.⁷

In 1181 A.D. he marched on Lahore. Khusru Malik shut himself up in Lahore, and despatched his son Malik Shāh and one elephant to the Sulṭān. Thus, peace was concluded at least for the present.⁸

In 1182 A.D. the Sulṭān led an army towards Divāl or

¹ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 116.       ² Ṭabaqāt-i-Akkārī, p. 36.
³ Ṭarīkh-i-Firīshṭah, p. 56.
⁵ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 116. has : بمببديدو بمبسوديدو. The Hindu authorities mention Bala Mulraja (1178 A.D.) and not his successor Bhima II as stated above—Vaidya—History of Medieval Hindu India, Vol. III, p. 207.
⁷ Ṭabaqāt-i-Akkārī, p. 37.
⁸ Ibid., p. 37.
Dīpāl, and captured the whole of that territory lying on the sea-coast.¹

In 1185 A.D. he ravaged and pillaged the territory of Lahore, and on his departure gave directions for the restoration of the fort of Siyālkot. Hūsain, son of Khārmi, was installed there. Khusrū Malik now laid siege to the fort of Siyālkot with the help of the Gakkhars, but had to retire without accomplishing anything.²

Shīhāb-u’d-dīn outwardly showed an attitude of friendliness by despatching Malik Shāh to see his father Khusrū Malik, but gave orders to his officials to induce him (i.e., Malik Shāh) to drink as much wine as possible in order that he might proceed slowly and stop at several places on the way. Khusrū Malik, being rejoiced at the news of his son’s return, gave himself up to music and pleasure. Even before the arrival of Malik Shāh, Shīhāb-u’d-dīn appeared on the bank of the Rāvī with an army of twenty thousand horsemen. Khusrū Malik and his son Bharām Shāh were seized and confined within the castle of Balarwān in Ghurjistān and the fortress of Saif-rūd in Ghūr respectively until the year 1191 A.D., when both of them were killed. The Sipāh-Salār ‘Ali-i-Kar Makh was located at Lahore.

In 1191 A.D. Shihab-u’d-din marched with an army to the fortress of Tabarhindah,³ captured it from the officers of the Rae of Ajmer and installed there Malik Dīyā-u’d-dīn Tulak with a force of twelve hundred picked horsemen. The Rae Kolah (son of) Pithorā of Ajmer with his brother Khānday Rae, the ruler of Delhi, and a large number of Rajput chiefs arrived near at hand. The battle took place by the bank of the river Saraswati in the village of Tarāin, now known as Patrawari, at a distance of seven ‘ Karoḥs’ from Thanesar and forty from Delhi.⁴ The Sulṭān flew at Khānday Rae⁵

¹ Tabaqāt-i-Akbār, p. 37. ² Ibid., p. 117. ³ Or Sarhindah according to Tabaqāt-i-Akbār, p. 37, but Firighah, p. 57 has Bhātinah.
⁴ Cunningham thinks that the exact site was on the banks of the Raukshī river, four miles south of Tirauri and ten miles to the north of Karnāl—see Vaidya, Vol. III, p. 333. ⁵ Tabaqāt-i-Akbār, p. 38.
(the Ṭabaqät-i-Nāsirī calls him Govind Rae of Delhi) and struck him with a lance on his mouth so that two of his teeth fell out. The Rae in return inflicted a severe wound with his javelin on his shoulder, and the Sultān nearly toppled down from his horse that a Khalji footman supported him in his arms and carried him out of the battlefield. According to the Zain-u'l-Ma'āthir, it was only at night that a few slaves of the Sultān found him and took him to his camp.

The Rae Pithorā besieged Diyā-u'd-dīn Tulak in Tabarhindah, but the latter defended the fortress for over a year. In the following year the Sultān started from Ghaznīn with a force of one hundred and twenty thousand horse. On reaching Peshawar, an old man of Chūr asked the Sultān as to where he was going. 'Since my defeat in Hindustān,' the Sultān replied, 'I have not been to my wife nor have I changed my clothes, but passed the whole year in grief and anger. I have placed confidence in God alone and am going to Hindustan to seek revenge for my first defeat.' The Sultān appealed to the Amīrs to be firm in the forthcoming holy war. By this time, the fortress of Tabarhindah surrendered on capitulation, and Rae Pithorā had pitched his camp in the neighbourhood of Tarāin. On arriving at Lahore, the Sultān despatched his great official Qawām-u'l-Mulk Rukn-u'd-dīn Ḥamzā to invite the Rae of Ajmer to accept Islām and to make his submission.

Rae Pithorā sent back a harsh reply, appealed to all the Rajas of Hindustan for military support and himself marched with an army of three hundred thousand Rajput and Afghān horsemen. Kolah Rae, son of the Rae of Ajmer, also proceeded with a large army. The Rajput Rajas to the number of one hundred and fifty assembled on the battlefield on the banks of Saraswatī at Tarāin; and they jointly

---

1 Ṭabaqat-i-Nāsirī, p. 119.
2 Firīghtah, p. 57.
3 Tāj-u'l-Ma'āthir, p. 82.
4 Tāj-u'l-Ma'āthir, p. 86.

As quoted by Firīghtah on p. 57.
5 Ṭabaqat-i-Nāsirī, p. 119.
6 Firīghtah, p. 58.
sent a letter to the Sultān intimating that if the latter returned to Ghaznīn, they swore by their gods that they would not harass his retreat, otherwise they would crush him down the following day. The Sultān replied, “I am an appointee of my brother, and as such I must get his permission to conclude a treaty with you on the terms that Sarhind, Multān and Sind belong to me and the rest of Hindūstān remain under your sway.”¹ The Rajput leaders, being satisfied, went to sleep, but, early the next morning, Shihāb-u’d-dīn fell upon them; and, in the twinkling of an eye, the Rajput army was put to the rout. Khānday Rae and many other Rajas were slain, and the revolting Rae of Ajmer was taken prisoner, but proved hostile on the occupation of Ajmer and was, consequently, put to death.² The son of Rae Pithorā (Rainsi, son of Prithviraj), was appointed to the government of Ajmer. In 1192 A.D. Ajmer and the whole of the Siwālikh territory such as Hānsī, Sarsuttī, Sāmānah and other tracts were subjugated.³

The Rae of Dihlī, probably a relation of Khānday Rae, saved his city and fort by means of submission and a handsome tribute. The Sultān returned to Ghaznīn after entrusting the government of Kuhrām and Sāmānah to his slave Malik Qqūb-u’d-dīn.⁴

In 1192 A.D. in compliance with the command of Sultān Ghīyāth-u’d-dīn, Shihāb-u’d-dīn from Ghaznīn, Malik Shams-u’d-dīn from Bāmiyan and Malik Tāj-u’d-dīn Ḥarb from Sijistān, assembled their forces at Rūdbāar of Merv to repel Sultān Shāh, who was in the constant habit of making raids upon the frontier tracts of Ghūr. In the battle that ensued Sultān Shāh was defeated.⁵

During the Sultān’s absence from Hindūstān, Malik

¹ Fīrīghtah, p. 58.
² Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, pp. 96 to 109. Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 38 has: “Pithora was taken prisoner and put to death.” Hindu sources hold that it was Prithviraja, who was captured and beheaded—Pāidya, Vol. III, p. 335.
³ Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 120.
⁵ Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 74.
Quṭb-u'd-dīn occupied Mīrath and Dihlī, and in 1193 A.D. the fort of Koil. In 1194 A.D. Shihāb-u'd-dīn marched from Ghaznī, advanced towards Qannauj and Benares and overthrew Rāj Jai Chand in the vicinity of Chandwāl.¹

The death of Sultān Takash of Khwārazm in 1200 A.D. and the accession of his son 'Alā-u'd-dīn Muḥammad secured a golden opportunity for the two brothers to extend their power and dominion. 'Alā-u'd-dīn did his best to avoid conflict by making a promise to inscribe the name of Shihāb-u'd-dīn on his coin and to give him in marriage his mother Türkān Khatūn.² But Shihāb-u'd-dīn rejected the proposal, and the two Sultāns embarked on a futile and aggressive war. The advance-guard of their army proceeded to Merv, which place was left under the control of Muḥammad Kharang. They reduced and plundered Tūs and Shādyākh, held by Sultān 'Alā-u'd-dīn’s brother, 'Ali Shāh.³ The army of Khwārazm was severely treated and sent to Ghūr. Now the territories of Jurjān and Bistām came under the sway of the two brothers, and Malik Ḍiyā-u'd-dīn was appointed to keep Khurāsān under subjection. Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn then returned to Herāt, and Shihāb-u'd-dīn marched against the heretic forts of Kuhistān; but peace was concluded and he, too, returned to Herāt.

In September 1201 Sultān 'Alā-u'd-dīn Muḥammad laid siege to Shādyākh; the Ghūrians fled and sued for peace, and 'Alā-u'd-dīn showed the generosity of granting them honourable terms.⁴ He next marched towards Merv and Sarakhs; the Ghūrian governor, Hindū Kḥān, who was his own nephew, retired to Ghūr. But the Kotwāl of Sarakhs was captured. In the meantime 'Alā-u'd-dīn returned to Khwārazm by way of Merv.

In August 1202 'Alā-u'd-dīn Khwārazm Shāh alighted at the Marghāzārī Radkan, and marched against Herāt. The fortifications were demolished and 'Izz-u'd-dīn Marzāf, the

¹ And 'Iqtawah' according to Ṭabaqāt-i-Akhbārī, p. 39.
² Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 75, 76.
⁴ Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 49, 50.
Kūtwāl of Herāt, made his submission.\(^1\) Meanwhile the Sultān of Ghūr began ravaging the territory of Khurāsān with a view to prevent Khwārazm Shāh from continuing the siege of Herāt. Thereupon, ‘Alā-u'd-dīn marched back by way of Marvar-rūd, while Shihāb-u'd-dīn proceeded by way of Ṭāliqān. He was followed by the Ghūrīan forces, and at Sarakhs negotiations opened between the two parties. He, however, refused the Ghūrīans’ demand for some districts of Khurāsān and moved on to Khwārazm.\(^2\) Shihāb-u'd-dīn marched to Ṭūs and began harassing its inhabitants, when he received the sad news of his brother’s death.

Shihāb-u’d-dīn hurried to Bādghis of Herāt to perform the mourning ceremonies of his brother. He made over the city of Bust and the districts of Farāh and Asfīzār to his late brother's son Ghiyāth-u’d-dīn Maḥmūd; to Malik Diyā-u’d-dīn the throne of Firūz Kuh and the territory of Dawār and to Malik Naṣīr-u’d-dīn Alp-Ghāzī, his sister’s son, the city of Herāt. Muḥammad Kharang, a leading noble and a great champion, was appointed governor of Merv.\(^3\)

Kharang captured Abūward and marched against Ṣajjūd-dīn Khalji of Ṭarq (in the Jīböl Province) and the Amīr of Murgh, both of whom made their submission. The army of Khwārazm now marched to Merv,\(^4\) and Kharang flew to meet it; but suffered a crushing defeat and fell into the hands of the Khwārazmians.

In 1204 A.D. ‘Alā-u’d-dīn Khwārazm Shāh invaded Herāt. Alp-Ghāzī, the governor of Herāt, promised to pay a large ransom, and made peace with the Khwārazmians, but soon after two or three days he died.\(^5\)

The peace concluded by Alp-Ghāzī could not last long. Shihāb-u’d-dīn had been successful in India, but his ravages in the territory of Khurāsān resulted in utter failure, and not an inch of territory was gained. In 1204 A.D. Sultān Shihāb-u’d-dīn marched his forces into the Khwārazmian territory and defeated Sultān Muḥammad, but failed to

\(^{1}\) Tārīkh-i-Jahān Kushā, Vol. II, p. 50.
\(^{3}\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīr, p. 121.
capture the city of Khwārazm.\(^1\) Having been placed in an awkward position, Sulṭān Muḥammad Khwārazm Shāh appealed to his overlord, the Gūr Khān, and to the Sulṭān-u’s-Salāṭīn of Samarqand, for help. On receiving the intelligence of the arrival of the forces of Qarā Khīṭāīs under the command of Tāyankū Tāraz and of Sulṭān-u’s-Salāṭīn of Samarqand, the Ghurian forces foresaw their defeat and began to decamp.\(^2\) Khwārazm Shāh pursued Shihāb-u’ddin, defeated him at Hazār Asp and, with the booty thus obtained, returned to Khwārazm.\(^3\)

The Qarā Khīṭāīs blocked up the route to Balkh, and attacked the camp of Shihāb-u’ddin at Andkhud. The Ghurian advance-guard, led by Ḩasan Kharmīl, the governor of Khwārazm, drove them away. The leader requested the Sulṭān to attack the retreating infidels immediately, but the latter hesitated and Ḩasan Kharmīl, being dejected, withdrew from the Sulṭān’s service.\(^4\) The remaining hundred horsemen and Turkish slaves with a few elephants tried to protect the life of their Sulṭān against the Qarā Khīṭāīs; and finally, a Turkish slave Ayyāh Jūqī by name caught hold of his bridle and urged it to fly to the fort of Andkhud.\(^5\)

The Qarā Khīṭāī Turks surrounded Andkhud, and began to mine the walls. The Sulṭān-u’s-Salāṭīn sent a message to Shihāb-u’ddin, “Out of regard for Islam, it is not my wish to see you fallen into the hands of the infidels, who are sure to murder you. I advise you to give up all your men, elephants and horses for the sake of your personal security, and I will intercede for you with the infidels.”\(^6\) The Sulṭān acted accordingly and secured his freedom. Soon afterwards Khwārazm Shāh sued for peace and Shihāb-u’ddin accepted it. Thus, peace was concluded between the two Sulṭāns.

---

\(^1\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāširī, pp. 121 and 122.  
\(^3\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāširī, p. 122.  
\(^4\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāširī, p. 122.  
\(^5\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāširī, p. 122.  
\(^6\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāširī, pp. 818.
Shihāb-u'd-dīn’s defeat at Andkhud was responsible for a general revolt in his dominions. Yildiz, the governor of Ghaznīn, adopted an independent attitude. Aibak became one of the most confidential servants of the Sulṭān, fled to Multān, assassinated its ruler Amīr Dād Ḥasan and spread the news that the Sulṭān was dead.¹ He succeeded in convincing the people by producing a forged firman containing an order for the imprisonment of the ruler and his own appointment in his place. The tribes of Gakkhars, under their leaders Bakar and Sarka, rose in open revolt, and caused much sedition and turbulence between the rivers Sodra and Jhelum.² Quṭb-u'd-dīn, the viceroy of Hindustan, however, remained loyal.

To suppress the rebellion of the Gakkhars, the Sulṭān marched from Ghaznīn to Hindustan and informed Quṭb-u'd-dīn accordingly. The Gakkhars were completely routed and put to the sword, and much booty fell into the hands of the victors.³ The fortress of Jūd was captured. Thus, within a short period of a year and a half, he restored his empire to its former strength and glory. 'I have determined', he wrote to the ruler of Bāmiyān, 'to wage a holy war against the infidels of Turkistan'. Accordingly in February 1206 he started from Lahore, but was not destined to lead the campaign. He stopped on the way and fixed his camp into the borders of Dhamik (probably Daniya). While engaged in the evening prayers, he was assassinated by an Ismā’īlī devotee.

It is difficult to find out a political theory for the kingdom of Ghūr on the death of Sulṭān Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn. "It was neither unitary, nor federal, nor feudal—neither satrapy of the Achemenian nor an empire of the Roman type."⁴ The three kingdoms of Ghūr Ghaznīn and Bāmiyān were linked together. Both the brothers were Sultāns, there was no superior title to distinguish one from the other and no tribute

¹ Taṭi-u'l-Ma'āthīr, pp. 468, 470.
² Ibid., pp. 472 and 473.
³ Ibid., p. 497.
⁴ Professor Muhammad Ḥabib’s article on Shihāb-u'd-dīn of Ghūr published in the Muslim University Journal, January 1930, p. 33.
was fixed. In their relations with foreign powers both the Sultāns were regarded as one. Nevertheless, Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn was an autocrat, Shihāb-u'd-dīn did decide most important questions on his own responsibility, but had to bow his head even before the trifling orders issued from Ghūr. The empire of Hindustan was his own creation, his peculium, and as such would go to his descendants or slaves.

The two brothers were indeed remarkable. Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn was a prudent and far-sighted monarch. He was moderate in pleasures of life, but was fond of chase and good company. He had no love for administrative work and hated the toils of long campaigns. Both the brothers were brought up in the Kitābi faith, but they changed it afterwards. Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn became Shāfi'ī and Shihāb-u'd-dīn a Ḥanafī. The younger brother was a man of another stamp. He accomplished, through sheer force and repeated efforts, what Māhmūd of Ghaznah won by genius and ability. Shihāb-u'd-dīn was a great adventurer, but he undertook tasks, which were beyond his strength to accomplish. "He adorned the world with justice," says Fakhr-u'd-dīn Mubārak Shāh of Marvar-rud, "and made it flourish by his nobility and strengthened the government with wise enactments. He indulged in holy wars, overthrew the infidels, the evil-doers and the assassins." ¹

Chingiz Khān.

In 1206 A.D. the year in which Sultān Shihāb-u'd-dīn died, the Mongols² rose up in the kingdoms of Chīn and

¹ Tārīkh-i-Fakhr-u'd-dīn Mubārak Shāh, pp. 19, 20.
² They were Turks and were descended from Yafṣḥ bin Nuḥāh, whom the Mongols themselves call Yafṣḥ Abū Lujjāl Khān. The family of Yafṣḥ bin Nuḥāh ruled for one thousand years. In the time of Faridūn Bāshrash Tūr fought against them, and massacred them. Only two men Nāmahān Nikūz and Qiyān, with their women and children, escaped to a cave where they settled and multiplied. They then fought against Tartārs and captured the neighbouring lands. And this tribe is known as Mongols—Tārīkh-i-Guzidah, pp. 558 and 559.

The name 'Mongol' first came into use as the name of a dynasty and
Tamghāch. The nature of the outburst of the Mongols is best described by D’Ohsson, who asserts that “in its suddenness, its devastating destruction, its appalling ferocity, its passionless and purposeless cruelty, its irresistible, though short-lived, violence, this outburst of savage nomads, hitherto hardly known by name even to their neighbours, resembles rather some brute cataclysm of the blind forces of nature than a phenomenon of human history.”[1] The learned author Ibn-u’l-‘Athîr also asserts that “Islam and the Muslims have been afflicted during this period with calamities, wherewith no people hath been visited.”[2] The following pages describe the destruction of the powers of the Qarâ Khitāis, Khwārazm Shāh and Ghūr by Chingiz Khān; while the next section links up the thread up to the fall of the stronghold of Alamūt and the capture of Baghīdād by Hūlāgū.

Chingiz Khān, the founder of the Mongol world empire was born in 1155 A.D. on the right bank of the Onon in the district of Dūlūn-Boldaq, which is now in the Russian territory.[3] His father, the Tatār Tamuchin, surnamed Tughrul, belonged to the “black Tatārs,” and was the chief of the Mongol tribes. He and another leading Turk were subject to the family of Altan Khān of Tamghāch, and were treated with contempt and ruthless cruelty by the latter.[4] Chingiz Khān remained in the service of the Wang Khān for seven years and served him faithfully and loyally; and his status increased day by day, until he was proclaimed his son.[5] But when he himself became the chief of his tribe, after his father’s death, he collected his forces, defeated the

kingdom under Chingiz Khān, and later came to be used as the name of a people . . . the ruler of which had risen against the then dynasty ruling in North China.—See Encyclopædia of Islām, Vol. I, p. 856.

Wang Khan and brought his territory under his subjection. Sanqun, son of Wang Khan, fled to the territory of Tayanak Khan, but was assassinated by the latter's Amirs. Chingiz Khan's next step was to subdue the territories of Tayanak Khan and Tuqtä Beg of Mekriat, which he soon accomplished. Kuchluk, son of Tayanak Khan, with the assistance of Tuqtä Beg, fled to Auresh, which place Chingiz Khan assaulted. Tuqtä Beg was killed in the battle, and Kuchluk sought refuge with the Gür Khan. The forces of Altan Khan had long been molesting the Mongols, who had forced their way into the pasture-land of Kalran. The Mongols assailed and acquired dominion over the countries of Taghar Tingit and Tamghách. The city of Tamghách was captured after a constant warfare for four years, and Altan Khan fled. Chingiz Khan now ravaged the territories of Khiṭā and, during two or three years' time, he conquered most of the lands of Khiṭā. He, thus, became the master of Khiṭā, Mughlistān and Turkistan. In short, "when he marched with his horde, it was over degrees of latitude and longitude instead of miles; cities in his path were often obliterated, and rivers diverted from their courses; deserts were peopled with the fleeing and dying, and when he had passed, wolves and ravens often were the sole living things in once populous lands."

"The wealth of China had always attracted the Muslims, and it was natural that, after the victory over the Gür Khan, the Khwārazm Shāh should begin to dream of the conquest of China. At this period rumours reached him that the Mongol conqueror had forestalled him. His desire to verify the rumours and to receive accurate information on the active forces of the conqueror was, according to Jūzjānī, the reason for the despatch of a Khwārazmian embassy to

2 Chingiz Khan Namah, pp. 55 onward.
4 Ṭabaqāt-i-Naṣirī, pp. 332 to 334.
5 Chingiz Khan, by Harold Lamb, p. 13.
Chingiz Khan.\(^1\) Consequently, an embassy under Sayyad Babā-u'd-dīn Rāzī was despatched to the Court of Chingiz Khan in Pekin, in 1215 or 1216 A.D. But the authors of Rauḍat-u'ś-Ṣafā and Chingiz Khan Nāmah assert that it was Chingiz Khan himself, who sent an embassy to Khwārazm Shāh, sought an alliance with him and did not listen to Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Altad, the Caliph of Baghdad, who requested him to invade the territory of Khwārazm Shāh.\(^2\) Chingiz Khan despatched a number of rarities and offerings to Sultān Muḥammad Khwārazm Shāh with the message “I am the sovereign of the east and thou the sovereign of the west.”\(^3\) But when the ambassador reached Utrār, Qadr Khan, the governor of the place, slaughtered the whole of the emissaries and travellers with the Sultān’s previous permission.\(^4\) When Chingiz Khan heard of this disaster, he collected the forces of Turkistan and Ţamghāch, and resumed his march to the frontier of Utrār. “Although the disaster of the Mongol invasion could not, probably, have been averted, it was undoubtedly facilitated and provoked by the greed, treachery, and irresolution of Alā-u'd-dīn Muḥammad, king of Khwārazm—it needed the gallant deeds of his son Jalāl-u'd-dīn to save from ignominy the memory of the once mighty empire of Khwārazm.”\(^5\)

In 1220 A.D. the Mongols emerged on the frontiers of Utrār, massacred its inhabitants, captured the city and fortress of Bukhārā and occupied Samarqand.\(^6\) The Khwārazm Shāh returned towards Nīshāpur, but was pursued by the Mongol army and had to retire into the mountains of Māzindarān leaving behind Atsiz, the Ḥājīb, to repel the Mongols to Damghān (in the province of Kumis) and Ḥarāc. Prince Ruḵn-u'd-dīn Ghūrī-i-Shamsī fell into the hands of

---

\(^1\) Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion, p. 393.
\(^3\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 336.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 337.
\(^6\) Rauḍat-u'ś-Ṣafā, pp. 928, 931.
the Mongols and was killed. The Shāh made over the different forts of Tirmid Bālkh, Bāmiyān, Sankān of Ghur, Naṣīr Kuh, Ghurjistān and the city of Herāt to different Amīrs.¹

Chingiz Khān himself advanced from Samarqand and captured the fortress of Tirmid. Then the Mongol forces marched towards Khurāsān, Ghur and Ghaznīn, ravaged Garmsīr and entered into an accommodation at Āstiāh; but failed in their attempt to capture the city of Fīruz Kuh.² This time Chingiz Khān proceeded towards the fort of Naṣīr Kuh of Ṭālqān, destroyed the fortress and massacred its inhabitants.

Malik Ikhtiyār-u’d-dīn Muḥammad and Prince Jalāl-u’d-dīn Mangbānī bravely defended Ghaznīn, and the latter thrice defeated the Mongolian forces under the command of Noyon Figū, son-in-law of Chingiz Khān.³ Thereupon, Chingiz Khān himself marched against the prince, and defeated him on the banks of the river Sind; and the latter escaped by swimming the river.⁴ The fortress of Bālkh⁵ and Fiwār of Qadus were also captured.

Chingiz Khān had four sons—Jūchī, Jaghatay, Uguday and Tūluy. Jūchī and Jaghatay were despatched towards Khwārazm, Qipchāq and Turkistan. Tūluy was ordered to proceed towards Khurāsān; while Chingiz Khān and Uguday kept behind. Tūluy succeeded in capturing Merv, Nishāpūr and Herāt. Chingiz Khān despatched Uguday to Ghaznīn, and the latter plundered it and occupied the fortress of Gibārī⁶ and the territory of Kuh-pāyā.⁷

Chingiz Khān now despatched intendants and bodies of troops under the command of Uguday into the territories of Ghur, Khurāsān and Sistān. After the capture of the fortress of Herāt, the Mongol army was divided into sec-

¹ Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, pp. 342, 343.
² Ibid., p. 345.
³ Ibid., pp. 347 to 349.
⁶ Gibārī—of which no trace remains at the present day.
⁷ Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 355.
tions; one marched into Sistān and the other attacked the fort of Kalyūn. In 1222 A.D. the stronghold of Kalyūn and the fortress of Fīwār Qādus were captured (the actual position of both these places is unknown).

Having effected his escape from the clutches of Chingiz Khān, Jalāl-ud-dīn was left to himself. His son aged seven or eight years was taken prisoner and killed by the Mongols; and his mother, wife and other women were drowned into the river by his own orders to prevent their falling into the hands of the enemy. Jalāl-ud-dīn now collected the remnants of his army to the number of two thousand men and in 1222 A.D. retreated towards Dihlī. Its ruler Shams-ud-dīn Iltutmish despatched splendid gifts, and hinted that the climate of Hindustan would not suit his health. Jalāl-ud-dīn, perforce, retraced his steps and invaded Sind, Uch and Multān. Thereupon, Sultān Iltutmish marched with an army from Dihlī, and Jalāl-ud-dīn had to return to Persia.

In the meantime Uguday attacked Fīruz Kuh and captured it. One by one Tūlāq, Ashiyār and other fortresses of Gharjistān fell into the hands of the Mongols. But in 1223 A.D. the Mongol forces suffered a crushing defeat near the fortress of Safid-rūd. After the capture of Bibārī, Chingiz Khān despatched envoys to the Court of Sultān Iltutmish at Dihlī entertaining the design of conducting his forces through Hindustan and returning to Chin by way of Lakhnawī and Kāmrūp. But the territories of Chin, Ṭamghāch and Tingit were in a state of open revolt; he had to return by way of Lāb and the country of Tibbet. Chingiz Khān seized and murdered the Khān of Tingit, and after three days, he himself passed away in 1227 A.D.

In 1223 A.D. Jalāl-ud-dīn returned to Persia, traversed Makrān and reached Kirmān with only four thousand men. Burāq Ḥājib, formerly an official of the Qarā Khīṭāts, was

---

1 Turkestan Down to Mongol Invasion, p. 446.
4 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 355 and 375.
besieging the capital. The inhabitants of the city opened its gates upon Jalāl-u'd-dīn, and Burāq Ḥājib yielded. After spending a month at Kirmān, he marched westwards into Fārs and married the daughter of Atābag Sā'd. He now established his power as Shāh of Khwārazm and snatched Khurāsān, Māzindarān and 'Īrāq from his younger brother Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn. He then proceeded towards Shīrāz, Iṣfahān and Tabrīz and attacked the Caliph Nāṣir, an enemy of his father. He gained a decisive victory against the Caliph, but did not attempt to capture Baghdād and moving to the north, occupied Ādharbāijān. In 1226 A.D. he captured Tiflis, and beat a Mongol force at Damghān to the east of Rāy. The Mongols then appeared in a greater number and attacked Iṣfahān, the headquarters of the Sultān, but they had to retreat with heavy losses. Jalāl-u'd-dīn also defeated the Georgians, and in 1229 A.D. made peace with the Caliph.

Alamūt.

By his will Chingiz Khān divided his immense empire among his four chief sons or their families; and the third son Uguday was nominated Khāqān or 'Supreme Khān'. The line of Uguday ruled the tribe of Zangaria till their extinction by the family of Tūluy. Their successors, the family of Tūluy, formerly rulers of the homeland of Mughalāstān, remained Khāqāns till the Manchu Supremacy. The Persian branch of the family of Tūluy, Hūlāgū and his successors were the Īl-Khāns of Persia. The line of Jūch'i ruled the Turkish tribes of the Khanate of Qipchāq and finally became the Khāns of Khīvā and Bukhārā. The line of Jāghatay ruled Transoxiana.

On his nomination as Khāqān by the Diet of the nobles.

1 Tarīkh-i-Guzidah, p. 499.  7 Ruṣdāt-u'ṣ-Safā, p. 829.
3 It is the name of a mountain-fortress north-west of Kāzwin, which owes its fame to its having been the seat of the Grand-Master of the Assassins from 1090 to 1256—See Encyclopaedia of Islam, Vol. I, p. 249.
Uguday fitted out three military expeditions in 1229 A.D.; the first under Jurmaghūn to attack Jalāl-u’d-dīn, a second to conquer Central and Southern Russia and a third under his own command for the conquest of Northern China. ¹

The expedition against Jalāl-u’d-dīn alone concerns Persia directly. The Mongol army under Jurmaghūn found Jalāl-u’d-dīn unprepared, and the latter effected his escape with great difficulty. Since then his rôle was that of a fugitive; he held Ganja for a time and, after escaping once more from the Mongols, he was ultimately killed by a Turkish tribesman. "Thus ended the brilliant career of the bravest and most enterprising soldier who ever lived."²

The Mongols by this time had captured the fortress and city of Rukn in Sijistān. Uguday despatched an army towards Khurāsān; ʻIrāq, the mountain tracts of Arrān, Ādharbāijān, Gīlān as far as the Caspian gates and Tabaristan or Mā’īndarān, were conquered. Kābul, Ghaznīn and Zābulistān received Mongol intendants.³ In 1223 A.D. Khurāsān was conquered; in 1241 A.D. the Mongol forces advanced to Lahore, and plundered and ravaged it.

After the death of Uguday the Mongol tribes drew their swords upon each other several times. Uguday was succeeded by Jaghatay, and the latter by Kyuk, son of Uguday. The Mongolian army was ordered to march into Chīn, Irān, Hindustān, Khurāsān and ʻIrāq.⁴ In 1245 A.D. a Mongol army under the command of Mangūtah invaded Uch and Multān in the reign of Sulṭān ʻAlā-u’d-dīn Mas’ūd Shāh of Dihlī. Malik Saif-u’d-dīn Ḥasan the Qarluq abandoned the fortress and city of Multān and proceeded to Dipāl and Sindustān, destroyed its environs and retired.⁵

Kyuk was succeeded by Mangū Khān⁶ son of Tū’iuy, who in 1251 A.D. ascended the throne of Chīn and Upper Turkistān, and exterminated the race of Jaghatay. He fitted out

² Ibid., p. 166. ³ Tabaqat-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 387.
⁴ Ibid., p. 399. ⁵ Ibid., pp. 399 and 400.
⁶ Minhāj-Siruj says that Mangū Khān had embraced Islām but this fact is not mentioned by other writers.
two great expeditions, one under his next brother Kubilay to China and the other under a younger brother Hulagü Khan to Persia. Hulagü was ordered to proceed to Tajyak\(^1\) with instructions to crush the Assassins\(^2\) and to extinguish the Caliphate. At Ush he was met by Arghän,\(^3\) who was accompanied by the future historian Aţā Malik Juwaynī, the famous author of the Tārīkh-i-Jahān Kushā.

Now a word about the Assassins,\(^4\) their origin, their philosophy of religion and their organisation. The religious differences that exist today in the Muslim world are very old. "To the orthodox Mussalmān ‘Alī was only the fourth and last of the four orthodox Caliphs and neither greater nor less than his predecessors, Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān. But to the Shi‘ā he was, by virtue alike of his kinship and his marriage connection, the sole rightful successor of the Prophet ... From a very early time there was a tendency to magnify ‘Alī’s nature until it assumed a divine character, and even at the present day the ‘Alī—Ilāhīs’, ... regard ‘Alī as neither more nor less than an Incarnation or ‘Manifestation’ of God."\(^5\) It was a tendency of some of the Persian converts to read into the new faith the two Persian doctrines of ‘the divinity of kinship’ and ‘incarnation’. They believed in the doctrine that the Divine Being always manifests itself in a human form to guide the

---

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 39.  
\(^4\) The great scholar Sylvestre-de-Sacy showed that the word was variously corrupted by the crusaders into Assassini, Assessini, Assissini and Heissessini; but, most accurately, it stood for the Arabic Hashisha—a name given to the sect because of the use, which they made of the drug Hashish.  
\(^5\) Assassins is the name given to those Ismā‘ilīs, who at the time of the Crusades, occupied fortified hill-fortresses in Syria and other Muhammadan countries, and were wont to rid themselves of their opponents by means of assassination. The Fidāis were selected by the spiritual leaders of the Assassins to carry out any important mission, e.g., an assassination, and, therefore, they were urged to use of the Hashish in order that they might, as volunteers, be ready for any deed.—Encyclopædia of Isām.

\(^\) Professor Browne’s Literary History of Persia, Part II, p. 194.
people of the world, and, consequently, they regarded the prophets of 'Izrā'il, the Arabian Prophet, Ḥaḍrat 'Ali and the Imāms as divine incarnation.

Ḥaḍrat Jā'far Ṣādiq, the sixth Imām, nominated his younger son, Imam Mūsā Kāẓim as his successor, instead of his eldest son Ismā'īl. About the latter, the Imām is said to have said, "Ismā'īl is not my son, but an incarnation of Satan."¹ The nomination was assented to by a majority of the Shi'ās;² but the extremists would not accept it, and this caused a definite breach between Aḥnā Ashāriyās and the heretic incarnationists, afterwards known as Ismā'īlīs.

The Ismā'īlīs planned their secret propaganda, and kept the Imām veiled.³ Subordinate to the great agent, there was a set of provincial representatives. The higher grade comprised the 'Dā'-i-i-Duat' or Grand Master, 'Dā'-i-i-Kabīr, or superior propagandists and 'Dā'-īs' or ordinary propagandists. The lower grade included the 'Rafīqs'—companions, the 'La'īqs'—adherents and lastly the 'Fidā'īs'—volunteers, 'who made kings tremble on their throne.'

It is rather difficult to define the creed of the Ismā'īlīs. "In essence, their inner doctrine was philosophical and elective." It was dominated throughout by the mystic number seven; there were seven Prophetic Periods—those of Ādam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Muhammad and Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl, each of whom was succeeded by seven Imāms. The latter were followed by twelve Apostles (Naqīb) each. The sixth of the seven Prophetic cycle, that of the Prophet Muḥammad ended with the seventh Imām, Ismā'īl.⁴ According to the Ismā'īlīs, the Imām was a 'divine incarnation' and, as such, could modify and change the shari'at and commandments of the Qur'ān. The final authority in interpretation and adjustment lay with the public opinion of the believers. The Imām not only granted dispensations

² Ibid., p. 57.
³ Ibid., p. 58.
⁴ Professor Browne's Literary History of Persia, Part II, p. 197.
for past sins, but even ordered their commission.\textsuperscript{1}

For several centuries after the decline of the Abbasid Caliphate, the Ismā’īlī propaganda was violent and bitter from east to west.\textsuperscript{2} “The political importance of the Ismā’īlīs began in the tenth century with the foundation of the Fatimid dynasty.” A certain person Muḥammad 'Ubaid-u’llah claimed descent from 'Alī and Faṭmah, established his power at Mahdiyah near Tunis and laid the foundation of the Fatimid Caliphs—the serious rivals of the orthodox Caliphs of Baghdaḍ.

Ḥasan bin Ṣabbāḥ, a resident of Rāy would not allow his followers to record his pedigree saying, “I would rather be the Imām’s chosen servant than his unworthy son.” In fact he belonged to the Aḥnā Ašhariyyā\textsuperscript{3} sect, but his intimate friend Amīr Ḍarāb and Abū Najm Sirāj\textsuperscript{4} initiated him into the mysteries of the Ismā’īlī sect.

Ḥasan paid a visit to Egypt, and was honourably received by Mustanṣir. Suddenly dispute arose over the question of succession; the Amīrs supported Musta'il, the younger son of Mustanṣir, but Ḥasan backed up the eldest son Nażar.\textsuperscript{5} Consequently, he had to fly from Egypt. He brought a female slave from there, and represented to the people saying, “she is pregnant by Mustanṣir of Egypt; I have saved her from her enemies. She is going to beget the Imām-i-Ākhir-i-Zamān (the last Imām).”\textsuperscript{6}

Ḥasan captured the impregnable fort of Alamūt\textsuperscript{7} in the Jibāl Province to the north of Kāzwīn. The forts of Gird Kuh and Lambasār were also added to his princi-

\textsuperscript{1} Professor Ḥabīb’s article on the “Lord of the Assassins” published in the Muslim Review, Calcutta, pp. 4-6.
\textsuperscript{3} Raʿdat-u’s-Ṣafā, Vol. IV, p. 367.
\textsuperscript{4} Tārīkh-i-Jahān Kushdā, Vol. III, p. 70.
\textsuperscript{5} Raʿdat-u’s-Ṣafā, Vol. IV, p. 766.
\textsuperscript{6} Tabeqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 413.
\textsuperscript{7} Originally Alūh-amūt, a name correctly explained by Ibn-u’l-Aḥṭir X, p. 110 as ‘ṭarīlm-u’l-uqāb’, the Eagles’ teaching. It is very often, but inaccurately, known as the Eagles’ Nest.
pality, and Alamut now became a regular state. In May 1124 A.D. he died, and was succeeded by Kiā Buzurg Úmid, who ruled for twenty-four years. Kiā Buzurg was succeeded by his son Muḥammad, who ruled for twenty-five years. In 1173 A.D. Muḥammad’s son Hasan ascended the throne, but was killed and was succeeded by his son Jālāl-u’d-dīn. The new ruler put a stop to all the Ismā’īlī propaganda, and enforced the šari‘at of the orthodox. After his death, his son ‘Alā-u’d-dīn came to the throne at an age of nine. He was a man of vulgar tastes, and, thus, the affairs of the state fell into disorder. He was, however, murdered by his son Rukn-u’d-dīn Khūr Shāh, who ascended the throne in 1255 A.D.

During the next ten years, or so, Hūlagū captured the whole of the cities and fortresses of the Assassins, and put them to the sword. Misūr-Noyon, the Mongol governor of Hamdān advised Rukn-u’d-dīn Khūr Shāh to dismantle his forts and make his submission before Hūlagū, but he hesitated. Hūlagū himself advanced, besieged the fort of Maimūm Dāz and made Khūr Shāh captive. Lastly, the fort of Alamut was plundered and razed to the ground, and with the exception of children in the cradle, a general massacre was carried out by the orders of Mangū Khān. “Even at the present day the remnants of this once powerful body are widely, though sparsely, scattered through the east, in Syria, Persia, East Africa, Central Asia and India, where the Āghā Khān, a lineal descendant of Khūr Shāh . . . is still honoured as the titular head of the Ismā’īlis.”

“The extirpation of the Assassins won for Hūlagū Khān the applause of the orthodox Muḥammadans, but his next procedure was a summons to the Caliph al-Mustā‘sim-billah to surrender himself and Baghdād, for five centuries the metropolis of Islam, to the Mongols.”

---

2 Ibid, p. 93.  
3 Ibid p. 53.  
4 Ibid., p. 52.
5 Professor Browne’s Literary History of Persia, Part II, pp. 210, 211.
6 Ibid., p. 460.
at Hamdān, Hūlāgū set out against Baghdaḍ in 1257 A.D. The Caliph Mustāṣim-billah had a Shi‘a heretic Aḥmad Alqamī as his vizier, and the latter intimated to the former that peace was made with Hūlāgū.¹ The vizier then despatched the Kurd troops and forces of ‘Irāq in different directions. In the meantime, the Mongol forces took Najf, and defeated the forces of Sulaymān Shāh and Ḩisām-u’d-dīn Khalīl.² Now the Malik스 informed the Caliph of the arrival of the Mongol forces, but the Caliph still placed confidence in his vizier. Resistance was, however, offered at Takrit, but the Mongols made a night attack and, thus, only a few fugitives escaped to Baghdād. The treacherous vizier advised the Caliph to move out of the city. and present himself before Hūlāgū.³ No sooner did the Caliph reach the Mongol camp than he was seized, and killed. "The sack of Baghdaḍ was a more terrible event than that of Merv or Herāt, inasmuch as the city was the centre of the Muslim world; and the irreparable injury to its civilisation by the extinction of the Caliphate more than six centuries after the foundation of Islām, by the destruction of priceless literary and artistic treasures, and by the massacre of all classes, defies description."⁴

¹ Ṭabaqāt-i- Nassirī, pp. 424, 425.
³ Ṭabaqāt-i- Nassirī, p. 428.
CHAPTER II

THE MU'IZZĪ MALIKS

On the death of Sultān Shihāb-u'd-dīn of Ghūr, the empire of Ghaznīn and Hindustan devolved upon his slaves, known as the Mu'izzī Malikī.¹ It is said that the Sultān was very fond of purchasing and training Turkish slaves. As he had no other issue excepting a daughter, a bold courtier said to him once, "To a sovereign like you, sons are necessary to succeed to your vast empire." "Other kings have only a few sons", the Sultān replied, "but I have several thousand sons, namely my Turkish slaves, who will rule my kingdom in my name after I am dead and gone."² The Sultān's forecast proved true, and his slaves Tāj-u'd-dīn Yildiz, Nāšir-u'd-dīn Qabāchah and Qutb-u'd-dīn Aibak rose to power and command in the Afghan mountains, on the Indus and at Delhi respectively.

Tāj-u'd-dīn Yildiz (1207-1216 A.D.)³

He was a pious, kind-hearted and benevolent monarch.⁴ He was of a tender age, when Sultān Shihāb-u'd-dīn purchased him. Being endowed with a virtuous disposition and handsome exterior, he was favoured above the other slaves by the Sultān, who soon elevated him to a position of distinction and honour. He was created an Amir,⁵ and

¹ Maliks of Sultān Mu'izz-u'd-dīn. Shihāb-u'd-dīn was styled Mu'izzu'd-dīn after his conquests in Khurāsān. See Tabaqat-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 69.
² Ibid., pp. 131, 132.
³ Yildiz=بُلدز (Turkish), a star, the north wind or quarter of the horizon. On the obverse of his coin is found a horseman to the right, and a Star, sometimes crescent or bird below.—The Sultāns of Delhi—Their Coinage and Metrology—H. N. Wright, p. 13; also—Chronicles of the Pathan Kings—Thomas, p. 31. Yildiz died in 1216 A.D. and the Tabaqat-i-Nāṣīrī on p. 135 says he ruled for nine years. Therefore, his career as a ruler began in 1207.
⁴ Tabaqat-i-Nāṣīrī, pp. 131, 132.
⁵ Firīshṭāh, p. 63.
the government of the districts of Sanqarān and Kirmān was entrusted to him. Whenever the Sultan marched on an expedition against Hindustan, he always stopped at Kirmān on the way; Yildiz entertained the Sultan’s Amirs and Maliks, presented them with a thousand ‘hoods and gowns’ and showered silver and gold upon the whole retinue.

Yildiz had two daughters, and by the command of Sultan Shihāb-u’d-dīn one of them was married to Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak and the other to Nāṣir-u’d-dīn Qabāchah. He had, likewise, two sons; one of them was studying under the supervision of a preceptor, who, one day, by way of chastisement and correction, struck the boy with an earthen vessel over the head. The boy died instantly from the blow. On receiving the intelligence, Yildiz gave the teacher his travelling expenses and advised him to fly away as quickly as possible, lest the boy’s mother, becoming aware of her son’s lot, should wreak vengeance upon him. This anecdote fully illustrates the good nature and exemplary faith of Sultan Tāj-u’d-dīn Yildiz.

Towards the close of his reign and on his last expedition to Hindustan in 1205 A.D., Sultan Shihāb-u’d-dīn halted at Kirmān. Yildiz welcomed the Sultan in the usual manner by offering a thousand suits, out of which one was selected by the Sultan for himself. The Sultan was pleased to grant Yildiz a special robe of honour and a black standard for his troops, thus signifying his wish to make him his heir-apparent to the throne of Ghaznīn. After the assassination of the Sultan, Yildiz aspired for the kingdom of Ghaznīn, but

---

1 Firīṣta, p. 63 has شیوران while Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbar, Firīṣta’s main source of authority, agrees with Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī. It is, therefore, Sanqarān or Sanqān in Kuhistān.

2 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 132, 133.

3 Firīṣta, p. 63 has کورج ‘whip’.

4 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 133.

ملک تاج دین یلدرم آن مرد کار که بودست پسر خواند شهیر یار

Fulūḥ-u’s-Salāfīn edited by Dr. Mehdi Ḥasan, p. 99.
the Turkish Malik̲s and Amīrs sent an invitation to Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sultān Ghiyāth-u’d-dīn Muḥammad, at the Court of Fīrūz Kuh, representing “the Sultāns of Bāmiyān” are making desperate attempts to obtain possession of Ghaznīn. You are the heir to the dominion. Kindly come down from the confines of Garmstr and occupy your uncle’s throne at Ghaznīn. We are prepared to gird up our loins in your service.” Sultān Maḥmūd replied by saying, “To me my father’s heritage—the kingdom of Ghūr with its capital at Fīrūz Kuh—is most desirable.” He further sent Yildiz a robe of honour with a letter of manumission, and assigned him the throne of Ghaznīn. As a matter of fact, the empire of Hindustan was Sultān Shihāb-u’d-dīn’s own creation, his peculium, and, as such, its sole inheritors were his own slaves. Sultān Maḥmūd could only succeed to his father’s heritage.

By virtue of this mandate, Yildiz hastened to Ghaznīn, subdued the Malik̲s of Bāmiyān and ascended the throne of Ghaznīn; and finally brought the whole territory under his subjection. He, however, twice lost but regained the kingdom of Ghaznīn until after some time, he was defeated by Sultān Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak on the confines of the Punjab in the year 1206 A.D. Sultān Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak, then, advanced to Ghaznīn, remained there for a period of forty days and gave himself up to pleasure and revelry. The affairs of government fell into disorder; the Turkish Amīrs awaited their opportunity and secretly summoned Yildiz to Ghaznīn. The news of his arrival so terrified Sultān Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak that he fled to Hindustan by way of Sang-i-Surkh.

1 Here a reference to Bahā-u’d-dīn Sām’s sons.
2 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 133.
3 Furtūk-u’s-Salāṭīn edited by Dr. Mehdi Ḥasan, p. 99.
4 Some copies, according to Major Raverty, have the Punjāb-i-Sind, the five rivers of Sind, which means practically the same thing. Fīrūghtah, p. 64, says that Yildiz himself advanced towards Hindustan with a view to conquer Lahore, which is quite probable.
5 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 135.
After having occupied Ghaznīn for the third time, Yildiz despatched armies on several occasions towards Ghūr, Khurāsān and Sijistān under the command of renowned Malikis. On one occasion, he sent a force to help Sulṭān Mahmūd against Ḥusain Kharmīl, the Malik of Herāt, who had conspired with and had gone over to the side of Sulṭān Muḥammad Khwārazm Shāh; and the Malik fled before the armies of Ghūr and Ghaznīn. On another occasion, Yildiz led an expedition into Sijistān, and besieged the city of Sīstān, also called Nīmrūz, but retired after concluding a peace treaty with its ruler Malik Tāj-uʿd-dīn Ḥarab. On his way back to Ghaznīn, Malik Nāṣir-uʿd-dīn Ḥusain, his Amir-i-Shīkār (Chief huntsman) proved hostile towards him, but was defeated in an engagement and driven away towards Khwārazm. After some time Nāṣir-uʿd-dīn Ḥusain returned to Ghaznīn, but was put to death along with the Khwājah Muʿayyid-uʿl-Mulk Muḥammad ‘Abd-uʿl-lāh Sanjārī, the vizier, in a conspiracy devised by the Malikis and Amils of Ghaznīn.

All of a sudden, Sulṭān Muḥammad Khwārazm Shāh marched from Ghaznīn, and his troops seized the frontier route leading to Hindustan by way of Gardaiz and the Karāhah-Darrāh (pass), Yildiz fled by way of Sang-i-Surkh and reached Lahore. His fight with Sulṭān Shams-uʿd-dīn Iltutmīsh and his catastrophe in the year 1216 A.D. are described elsewhere in Chapter IV.

Nāṣir-uʿd-dīn Qabāchah (1206-1228 A.D.)

Nāṣir-uʿd-dīn Qabāchah was another Turkish slave of Sulṭān Shihāb-uʿd-dīn of Ghūr. Being endowed with 'great intelligence, sagacity, efficiency, skill, foresight and experience', he had passed his life in the service of the Sulṭān in various capacities, and was thereby fully acquainted with

---

1 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 134. 2 Ibid., p. 135. 3 Ibid., p. 135.

4 Qabāchah (Turkish) = A small garment. Qabāchah was defeated in 1228 A.D., and the Ṭabaqāt says, he ruled for 22 years. Therefore, his career began in 1206.

5 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 142
the intricacies of civil and military affairs. By the elder daughter of Quṭb-u'd-dīn Aibak, he had a son named Shāikh ‘Alā-u'd-dīn Bahram Shāh, a prince of excellent disposition and handsome appearance but addicted to pleasure and amusements.

When Malik Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Aitum, the feudatory of Uch and Mūltān, was slain in an engagement at Andkhud, which took place between Sulṭān Shihāb-u'd-dīn and the forces of Gūr Khān of Khīṭā and Sulṭān ‘Uthmān, ruler of Samarkand in 1203 and 1204 A.D., the government of Uch was assigned to Malik Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Qabāchah. He was, however, placed in a position of subordination to Quṭb-u'd-dīn Aibak by the Sulṭān. Qabāchah always remained on good terms with Quṭb-u'd-dīn Aibak, and on several occasions, visited Delhi to pay his homage to him. After the death of Sulṭān Quṭb-u'd-dīn Aibak in 1210 A.D. Qabāchah proceeded to Uch, captured the city of Mūltān, Siwistān and Dīpāl as far as the sea-coast, and occupied all the cities and forts of Sind. He, thus, brought the whole territory under his sway, assumed a canopy of State, and extended his dominion eastwards as far as Tabarhindah, Kuhrām and Sursut. Sulṭān Tāj-u'd-dīn Yıldız was anxious to annex a part of Qabāchah's territory, and marched several times against

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī. The text runs thus:—

لشنكر داري و ملک بوری و توفق قاسم یافته

Major Raverty wrongly translates it as "and had acquired great influence," which is quite incorrect.

2 Bada’uni in his Muntakhab-u’t-Tawāriḥ, p. 56 makes a nice blunder—"One daughter was given in marriage to Yıldız and the other, to Quṭb-u'd-dīn Aibak."

3 The Tāj-u’d-Ma’āthir calls him ‘Alā-u’d-dīn Muḥammad.

4 The printed text does not, as Major Raverty says, contain ‘and Mūltān’ but Bada’uni’s Muntakhab-u’t-Tawāriḥ, p. 56, has ‘Uch and Mūltān’; it is, in fact, afterwards that Qabāchah conquered Mūltān.—See Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 142.

5 Ibid., p. 142 and Elliot’s translation, Vol. II, p. 302 have ‘Hindustan’. It is in fact Siwistān or Sindustān.

6 The text of the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 142 has وچترین گرفت which Major Raverty translates as "assumed two canopies of State." It must be one instead of ‘two'.
him from Ghaznīn; but Qabāchah was always successful and Yildiz had to retire discomfited from the Indus. Qabāchah occupied Lahore several times, but was overthrown by the Khwājah Muḥammad b. Aṣṭān ‘Abd-ullāh Sanjari, the vizier of Yildiz in 1215 A.D. and he retired towards Sind.¹

The Court of Qabāchah was adorned by the presence of a number of nobles and great men, who, as a result of the inroads and devastations of the Mongols, had fled from Khurāsān, Ghūr and Ghaznīn; all of whom were patronised and favoured by Sultān Nāṣir-u’d-dīn Qabāchah.² Multān at the time was a great centre of Muslim learning and culture; and a number of distinguished ‘ulama and eminent scholars were to be found there.³ The position of the Sultān became all the more precarious by the defeat of Sultān Jalāl-u’d-dīn, son of Sultān Khwārazm Shāh, at the hands of Chingiz Khān on the banks of the Indus in 1221 A.D.⁴ Sultān Jalāl-u’d-dīn entered Sind, and proceeded towards Dīpāl and ‘Mikrān. After the capture of Nandanaḥ in 1224 A.D.,⁵ the forces of Tūlūy,⁶ the Mongol Noyon or prince, invested the strong fortress of Multān for a period of forty days;⁷ during which contest, Qabāchah showed much gallantry and benevolence, and conferred numerous benefits upon his subjects. It is related in the Siyār-u’l-

¹ The Tāj-u’l-Ma’āṣir places this event in 1215 A.D., which may be probable. According to Mi’rāt-i-Jahān-Nūmā several engagements were fought for the occupation of Lahore.
² Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 143.
³ Siyar-u’l-Auliyyā (Urdū Translation, p. 67).
⁴ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 143;¹
⁵ The name of a district and a fortress in the Sind-Sagar Doab of the Panjāb.
⁶ According to Badā’uni’s Muntakhab-u’l-Tawārīkh, p. 56—1214 A.D., which is quite improbable.
⁷ The printed text, p. 143 has تری (تری) تری.
Major Raverty has Turtī. It is in fact Tūlūy.
⁸ The printed text of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī has چهل روز forty days; but Major Raverty converts it into forty-two days.
Auliya that Shaikh Quṭb-u’d-dīn Bakht-yār, Shaikh Bahā-u’d-dīn Dhakariyā and Shaikh Jalāl-u’d-dīn Tatrīzī visited Multān at the time. Qabāchah approached them, and sought their assistance in averting the danger. Shaikh Quṭb-u’d-dīn handed over an arrow to Qabāchah to throw at the enemy and, curiously enough, the infidels disappeared the next morning. Qabāchah was a patron of letters, but he was disliked by the mystics. There is a story about Shaikh Bahā-u’d-dīn Dhakariyā and the Qāḍī conspiring against him. Minhāj-Sirāj, like many others, deserted him, because his power had suffered a good deal owing to Mangubirnī and Jaghatay rebellion.

At the beginning of the year 1226 A.D., the Maliks of Ghūr made a common cause with Qabāchah against the Mongols, and at the close of the same year, a body of the tribe of Khalj under Malik Khān, formerly a part of the Khwārazmian army, acquired supremacy over the districts of Manṣūrah in Siwistān. Qabāchah proceeded to repel them, and in an engagement that followed between him and the Khalj forces, the Khalj Malik was slain and Qabāchah returned triumphant to Uch and Multān.

The details regarding the constant contention that went on between Qabāchah and Sulṭān Shams-u’d-dīn Īltutmīsh and the ultimate defeat and end of the former are given in Chapter IV.

Malik Bahā-u’d-dīn Tughrul (1195-1200)

Malik Bahā-u’d-dīn Tughrul was an old slave of Sulṭān

1 Siyār-u’l-Auliya (Urdū Translation), pp. 56, 57.
2 Probably the commander of the left-wing of Sulṭān Jalāl-u’d-dīn’s army in the battle on the Indus.
3 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 143.
4 Ibid., p. 144.
5 Bayānah was conquered in 1195, and Gwalior came under possession in 1200 A.D. According to Tārikh-i-Fāhr-u’d-dīn Muhārak Shāh, pp. 23, 24. Bahā-u’d-dīn started his career with the conquest of Bayānah and ended with the final subjection of Gwalior.
6 Tughrul with short ‘u’ before the final ‘t’ is the name of a bird of prey like falcon, eagle, etc.
Shihāb-u’ud-dīn of Ghūr, who had given him a high degree of training and raised him to a position of distinction and honour. He was endowed with many praiseworthy qualities. A Malik of excellent disposition, impartial, generous and a ‘patron of the poor and strangers,’ Bahā-u’ud-dīn Tughrul would have earned a name, had he lived longer.

When Sulṭān Shihāb-u’ud-dīn and Quṭb-u’ud-dīn Aibak captured the fortress of Thankar, in the territory of Bayānah (an ancient town in Bharatpūr State, and about 25 miles south-west of Bharatpūr City), as a result of an engagement with its Rāj, the place was made over to Bahā-u’ud-dīn’s charge in 1195 A.D. From different parts of Hindustan and Khurāsān, nobles and merchants flocked to Bahā-u’ud-dīn Tughrul, who was kind enough to provide them with dwelling-houses and other necessities of life, so that they settled there. The territory of Bayānah, thus, became flourishing and prosperous through the noble efforts of Malik Bahā-u’ud-dīn Tughrul.

After the conquest of Thankar, Sulṭān Shihāb-u’ud-dīn marched towards Gwalior. The Gwalior fort, one of the most famous in India, stands on an isolated sandstone hill, about 300 feet above the old town and measuring 14 miles long, and 2,800 feet broad. The date of its foundation is uncertain. According to the inscription relating to the fort,

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 144.
2 The contemporary historian, Minhaj-Sirāj, says in the reign of Shihāb-u’ud-dīn that Quṭb-u’ud-dīn Aibak subdued Nahrwālah, Thankar, Gwalior and Badā’un. The Tabaqāt-i-Akbari, pp. 38, 39 Haft Iqtim and Badā’unī’s Mustakhab-u’t-Tawārikh, p. 57 repeat the same. Mir’at-i-Jahn Numā does not mention Thankar. But the author of the Tāj-u’l-Ma’ṣūhīr on p. 368 says, that both Shihāb-u’ud-dīn and Quṭb-u’ud-dīn captured Thankar, which is quite correct.

3 Badā’unī’s Tarikh, p. 57 has ‘Bhanker’, which is incorrect.
4 Ibid. has ‘Bhisyānah’, which is a mistake for Bayānah. It was Samarjit, son of Parwal, who was ultimately killed by Binae-u’ud-dīn (a mistake for Bahā-u’ud-dīn Tughrul), who was placed in charge of Bayānah—Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengāl; 1881, Part I, pp. 29-31. Dr. Ray is of opinion that it was Trilokoya-Varman and not Samarjit—Vol. II, p. 722.
5 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 145.
it is called Gopāgīrī, Gopādrī and Gopā Chālā. As a result of the overthrow of the Gupta power in the sixth century, Gwalior passed into the hands of the Huna adventurers, Toramana and his son Miharakula, the first masters of Gwalior. In the ninth century, it belonged to Raja Bhoja of Kanauj. The Kachwaha Rajputs held it from the middle of the tenth century till about 1128 A.D. But Gwalior was too strong to be captured by assault, and the Sultan decided to invest it and starve out the garrison. The Raja, frightened at the Sultan's intention, came out to offer his allegiance with many presents, so much so that he prevailed on him to raise the siege. Sultan Shihāb-ud-dīn retired from the fort of Gwalior and said to Malik Bahā-ud-dīn, "if this stronghold ever falls, it will be yours."

The fortress of Thankar was not a suitable place of residence for Bahā-ud-dīn and his troops; he, therefore, founded, in the territory of Bayānah, the city 'and fort' of Sultan-Kut. Having established himself there, Bahā-ud-dīn Tughrul used to make raids upon Gwalior, but his attempts failed to achieve the desired object. So he constructed another fort at a distance of one league from Gwalior, established himself there with all his troops, and succeeded in reducing the garrison to straits within the period of one year. The Parihars, the defenders of Gwalior, despatched emissaries to Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak, and surrendered the fort to him in 1200 A.D. The acceptance of surrender by Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak caused bitter enmity between him and Bahā-ud-dīn Tughrul. Both sides prepared for war, but Bahā-ud-dīn's timely death brought the struggle to an end.

1 Imperial Gazetteer, Vol. XII, p. 440.
2 Firīghtah, p. 64.
3 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 145.
4 'And fort ' is added by Firīghtah, p. 64.
5 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 145.
6 The contemporary historian, Minhāj-Sirāj, gives no date of surrender, but, according to Major Raverty, it must have happened just before or immediately after the death of Sultan Shihāb-ud-dīn.
8 Firīghtah, p. 64, the Tazkara-dat-ull-Mulūk says that Bahā u'd-dīn died while the emissaries were being defeated.
without a blow being struck. Both Quṭb-u'd-dīn and Bahā-u'd-dīn were slaves of Sulṭān Shihāb-u'd-dīn, and independent of each other from the very beginning. About this time, the Sulṭān and his brother Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn embarked on a futile and aggressive war against the Khwarazmians and, consequently, the former had no leisure to look after the affairs of Hindustan. The fort of Sulṭān-Kut, however, may be regarded as a monument to the memory of Bahā-u'd-dīn Tughrul.

The old city of Gwalior is now a decaying town—a desolate-looking collection of half empty, dilapidated, flat-roofed stone houses, deserted mosques and ruined tombs. The town is entirely Muslim in character. It has a fine main street and a collection of fine buildings.

Muḥammad Bakht-yār Khalji (1201-1205 A.D.)

The first Muslim invader, who conquered the Eastern Hindustan, was Muḥammad Bakht-yār Khalji. He was descended from the Khaljī tribe of Ghūr and the territory

---

1 Firūzhāh, p. 64. Minhāj-Sirāj on p. 145 says, "Consequently, there existed some vexation between Bahā-u'd-dīn and Quṭb-u'd-dīn" and further states, "and he died."

2 Badaʾūnī's Mustakhab-u't-Tawāriḥh, p. 57 calls him Muḥammad Bakht-yār Ghūrī. He was never a slave of Sulṭān Shihāb-u'd-dīn.

---

Futūh-u's-Solāfig, p. 94.

The Khaljī was a Turkish tribe, which 'settled in the Garmsir between Sīstān and Ghāznī'—as is clear from the famous history of Jāmi'u't-Tawāriḥh. Introduction to the Zafar Nāmah and Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī. European writers confound them with the Aḡhānī tribe of Ghalzī. In fact, they were a Turkish tribe, which migrated from Turkistān at a period which cannot be precisely ascertained, and settled in Western Afghānistān. What Ḥūṣain Barānī means by his phrase—'they came of a race different from that of the Turk'—most probably is that they did not belong to the Iblīs tribe of Turkistan as was the case with the early Turkish rulers. The contemporary historian, Minhāj-Sirāj, in connection with the conquest of Lakhnavatī writes as follows: 'A number of Brahmans approached the Rāj, and informed him that in the book of yore it is stated that the country will fall into the hands of the Turks.' The conqueror of
of Garmsir, and was endowed with many laudable qualities. He was, in the words of Qaḍī Minhāj-Sirāj, "impetuous, enterprising, intrepid, brave, generous, sagacious and clever." He came to the Court of Ghaznīn in the time of Sultān Shihāb-u’d-dīn, and presented himself before the Minister of the Diwān-i-’Arḍ (Military Department), who rejected him, for his personality was not striking or imposing. From Ghaznīn\(^1\) he proceeded towards Hindustan and reached the capital Delhi; there, too, he was disqualified for the same reason. At length, he came to Bada’in, and its feudatory Sipāh-sālār Hazbar-u’d-dīn Ḥasan-i-Adīb\(^2\) fixed a certain stipend for his maintenance\(^3\).

After the famous battle of Tarāin (now Tarāwari), 1191 A.D. in which Rae Pithora\(^4\) was defeated, ‘Aṭī Nāgaurī, a military officer of Sultān Shihāb-u’d-dīn and the feudatory of Nāgaur (a ‘historic town in Jodhpur State), employed Muḥammad Mahmud, the paternal uncle of Muḥammad Bakht-yār, in his service and when he became the feudatory of Kanauj, he assigned him the fief of Kashtmandī.\(^5\) On the death of his uncle, Muḥammad Bakht-yār Ḥaljī became feudatory in his place.

After some time, Muḥammad Bakht-yār approached Malik Ḥisām-u’d-ṭīn Aghilbek\(^6\) the ruler of Oudh, who, having noticed his wonderful activities and gallant deeds, conferred upon him two fiefs between the Ganges and the Lakhnautī was Bakht-yār, and, therefore, a Turk. Further, Fakhr-u’d-dīn Mubārak Shāh in his Tārīkh, p. 37, while enumerating different Turkish clans mentions Ḥaljī, which is a definite proof of their being Turk.

---

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 146.
2 Bada’Uni’s Muntahhab-u’t-Twārīkh, p. 57 says that "his company did not please Sultān Qutb-u’d-dīn at Lahore", which is quite possible.
3 This chief as well as others, who are mentioned afterwards, were quite independent of Qutb-u’d-dīn’s authority.
4 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 147.
5 The printed text of the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 145, has ‘Kolah’, who was the son of Pithora of Ajmer.
6 Or Kashtmandī but the printed text p. 146 has ‘Kashtmandī, which was situated, then, in the territory of Kanauj.
7 Aghilbek in Turkish means ‘Lord of the Fold’.
Son. Having established himself there, Muḥammad Bakht-yār was constantly engaged in raiding the territory of Bihār and Munīr. As a result of his military operations, all the requisites of power in the shape of horses, arms, men and money came into his hands, and the Khāلجī warriors, who had been scattered throughout Hindustan, flocked to him. The fame of his enterprise, bravery and spoils became ‘noised abroad’, and Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak sent him a robe of honour, and † other insignia of nobility.\(^3\)

Thus strengthened and honoured, Muḥammad Bakht-yār carried on his depredations into that territory for a period of one or two years (1201-1202 A.D.), until he suddenly fell upon the fortified city of Bihār with a force of two hundred horsemen in defensive armour. The province of Bihār is well known from very early times. The ancient kingdom of Magadha had its capital at Rājgīr. It was in Magadha, where Buddha and Mahāvīra developed and propagated their religions. In the fourth century A.D., the Gupta Dynasty rose to power and established their capital at Patna. In the ninth century, the Buddhist Dynasty founded by Gopāl held its sway over Bihār. The last of this line was defeated by Muḥammad Bakht-yār Khāلجī, who destroyed the capital at Odantapūrī. Bakht-yār’s

---

\(^1\) The printed text of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 147, has ‘Sihlat and Sibl’—not traceable. Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 47, and Badā’uni’s Mustakhab-u’t-Twāriḵ, p. 57, have ‘Kanpāla and Patišāh’. Kampil is a village in Furruhābād District, U.P. The siefs of Bhuγwat and Bhiwāli, according to Major Raverty, were situated between the Ganges and the Karmāhnsah to the eastward of Chunārgarh, but this is not Oudh. The siefs probably lay between the Ganges and the Son.

\(^2\) The printed text of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī has ‘Ikhlāş’—plural of Ḫaljī’.

\(^3\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 147.

\(^4\) Imperial Gazetteer, Vol. VII, pp. 208, 209. Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 42 has 1193, which is not probable. Most writers agree that Bihār was conquered in 1197. This date is also too early. Unfortunately Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī is silent on this point. However, another contemporary authority, Ḥasan Niẓāmı, writes that Bakht-yār approached Quṭb-u’d-dīn after the conquest of Kālinjār, which occurred in 1202 A.D. (See Tāj-u’l-
lieutenants, Niẓām-u’d-dīn and Shams-u’d-dīn,1 the two brothers of Farghānāh displayed great heroism, captured the fortress2 and acquired immense booty. Muḥammad Bakht-yār put a large number of inhabitants, mostly Brahmans with their heads shaven,3 to the sword, and destroyed the library. It was soon discovered that the fortified city of Bihār was a great centre of Hindu learning, and in the language of the east ‘Bihār’ precisely meant a college.

After this victory, Muḥammad Bakht-yār started for Delhi in the year 1202 A.D. with innumerable presents to pay his homage to Qūṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak. He was received with great honour, and the distinction, accorded him, roused the enmity of his rivals. Bakht-yār was a Khalj, a free man and probably uneducated. How could he be regarded a proper officer? They always ridiculed him in the royal assembly, and, one day, represented to the Sultān, that Muḥammad Bakht-yār pretended that he could fight a mad elephant. Qūṭb-u’d-dīn was at first reluctant to put Bakht-yār’s life in danger, but his associates induced him to join in the intrigue. One day, when a public assembly was held in the white castle, Bakht-yār’s enemies brought4 an elephant before him. “An elephant strong enough to stand the onslaught of this brute,” they said, “is not to be found in

Ma’āthīr, p. 461 and Tārīkh-i-Fābh-r-u’d-dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 24). Consequently, the conquest of Bihār must have taken place sometime about 1202 A.D.

“Mahindrapala is mentioned in the inscriptions as the last king, and is identified with Indradumna of local tradition, who is said to have been conquered by Bākh-yār Khaljī. (See Vaidya, Vol. III, p. 229).

1 Ṭabaqāt-i-Naṣīrī, p. 147, has ‘Shamsām-u’d-dīn’ which is rather improbable.

2 Minhaj-Siraj on p. 147 says that he acquired all knowledge regarding the surrender of the fortified city of Bihār from Shams-u’d-dīn, the lieutenant of Muḥammad Bakht-yār in 1243 A.D., many years after the actual conquest of the place.

3 ‘With shaven chins and upper lips’—according to Firīshkāh.

4 This anecdote is differently related by the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akhbārī, p. 47, which says ‘that Qūṭb-u’d-dīn had a white elephant, which Bakht-yār was made to encounter’. Marshman in his History of India makes him fight with a lion.
Hindustan." Quṭb-ud-dīn turned to Bakht-yār and inquired, if he wished to fight the elephant. Bakht-yār was too courageous and exceedingly modest; he, at once, jumped into the arena, and struck his mace so forcibly on the elephant’s forehead that it screamed and fled discomfited. The audience was thunder-struck; even his rivals raised their voices in praise. Quṭb-ud-dīn bestowed upon him a robe of honour and other valuable presents, all of which he gave away to the servants of the court, and set out towards Bihār wearing his robe of honour. Next day, he received a firmān assigning him Bihār and Lakhnautī and along with it a red pavilion, a banner and a drum. Long before the advent of the Musalmāns, Lakhnautī, an old name of Gaur, had been the capital of the Pala Dynasty in the ninth and tenth centuries and of the Senas in the twelfth century.

The fame of his intrepidity and valour spread throughout the territories of Lakhnautī, Bihār and Bangāh. The district of Kāmpūp originally formed part of the ancient Hindu kingdom of Kamarupa, which included the whole of the Brāhmaputra valley. Bakht-yār now strove hard to conquer Lakhnautī and Bengal, which were governed by Rae Lakhmaniah, or Lakshman Sen, the last of the dynasty,

1 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 148 has j. which means ‘mace’ and not a battle-axe as in Elliot, Vol. II, p. 306.
2 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 148.
3 Firīshtākh and Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 47. But Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī does not mention this; and, therefore, the above statement is rather incorrect. Such an honour, in those days, meant all the insignia of royalty and Quṭb-ud-dīn could not bestow these honours in Shīhāb-ud-dīn’s lifetime.
4 The correct name is Lakhmanawārī from Lakhmana, the son of Dāsarath—Watī means home, country, therefore, Lakhmanawātī is equal to the ‘country of Lakhmana.’
5 Ancient name for a tract in Bengal, now a province.

A curious anecdote is related about the birth of the Rae by the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī that, at the time of the birth of the Rae, astrologers prophesied that it would be exceedingly unfortunate if the child was born.
whose seat of government was the city of Nadiah. The town of Nadiah or Nabaddwip, meaning 'new island' has a very ancient history. A group of Brahmans and astrologers represented to the Rae, "It is foretold in our ancient books that this kingdom will fall into the hands of the Turks, and the time of its fulfilment has drawn near. The Turks have subdued Bihār, and, next year, they are bound to invade our country. It would be most expedient for the Rae to agree to our suggestion that we should all emigrate from this land to escape the Turkish trouble."¹ "Tell me," asked the Rae, "what are the distinguishing features of the conqueror." They replied, "Certainly, the indication is that when he stands erect with his arms hanging down, the tips of his fingers reach the calves of his legs."² The Rae sent his confidential servants to make investigations, and they discovered that Muḥammad Bakht-yār did possess those particular characteristics. This caused great apprehension, and most of the Brahmans and other inhabitants hurried towards the province of Sankanāt,³ the cities and towns of Bangah and Kāmrūp; but the Rae refused to emigrate with the running population.

Next year in 1203 A.D.,⁴ Muḥammad Bakht-yār started from Bihār, and suddenly appeared before the city of Nadiah with no more than eighteen horsemen; while his regular troops followed after him. Muḥammad Bakht-yār did not molest any one, but pressed on in such a manner that the people thought they were dealers in horses, until

---

¹ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 150. ² Ibid., p. 150. ³ With the exception of two, says Major Raverty, the best and oldest copies have Sankanāt. Zubdat-u't-Twārīq also has Sankanāt. Ṭaṣkārat-u'l-Mulk and Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 48 have Jagānāth (probably Jagannāth). Firīghat has Jagannāth and Kamrūd. ⁴ It cannot be 1202 as Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 46, has, for Bakht-yār had gone to Qutb-u'd-dīn in the year 1202 A.D. (See Tāj-u'l-Ma'dāthīr, p. 461). The 'next year' of Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī would mean 1203 A.D.
he reached the entrance of the palace, drew his sword, and commenced his onslaught. The Rae was at table, and before he could know the cause of the tumult at the gateway, Muḥammad Bakht-yār dashed forward into the palace and put several persons to the sword. The Rae, taken by surprise, fled bare-footed by a postern door towards Sankanāt and Bangah, where he died of a broken heart soon after. The city of Nadiah with its treasures, elephants and a vast amount of booty fell into the hands of the victors. Muḥammad Bakht-yār razed the city of Nadiah to the ground, and made Lakhnauti the seat of government. He subjugated the whole territory, and "instituted, in every part, the reading of the 'Khuṭbah' and the coining of money". A number of mosques, colleges and monasteries were founded, and a large portion of the booty was sent to Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak.

After some years in about 1205 A.D., Muḥammad Bakht-yār entertained the idea of seizing the territories of Turkistan and Tibet, and for that purpose organised an army of 10,000 horse. At the same time, he provisionally

---

1 Perhaps morning meal or breakfast.
2 'The Rae,' it is said, 'escaped in a boat to Bikrāmpūr about 8 miles south-east from Dḥākah'—Account of Dīla’ Dināpur, Calcutta, 1832, as quoted by Major Raverty.
3 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 151. According to Munṣhī Shīyām Prasād’s Account of Gaur, Bakht-yār took Nadiah in 1096 A.D., which is impossible.
4 Probably in the name of Sultan Shīhāb-u’d-dīn, for Quṭb-u’d-dīn was yet a slave. Badā’ūnī’s Muntakhab-u’t-Tawārīkh, p. 58 and Firāqīyah say that Bakht-yār caused his own name to be read in the Khuṭbah and to be inscribed on the coin. This is rather improbable, as the contemporary authority, the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī does not mention a word about it.
5 Having assumed that Lakhnauti was conquered in 1203 A.D., 'some years after' of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī would mean 1205, the year of Bakht-yār’s death.

---

The Arab Geographers were never definite in their description of India. They divided India into Hind and Sind. The land beyond the Indus was little explored by the Arabs in the eighth century, and the position of China was vague. In all probability, Bakht-yār invaded Northern Bengal or Assam, but he actually imagined he was invading Turkistan.
appointed Muḥammad Ṣhirān and Aḥmad Ṣhirān governors of Lakhnauti and Jājnagar. A certain ʿAlī, the Mech, who had embraced Islam at the hands of Muḥammad Bakht-yār, agreed to act as a guide, and conducted the latter to a city named Burdhan Kut founded by the Persian Shāh Gushtāšip. A vast river Beg-matī, which falls into the Gandak river flowed by the side of the city, and it took ten days to cross it. They, however, reached a bridge of hewn-stone supported by twenty arches, and after crossing it, Muḥammad Bakht-yār installed a Turkish slave and a Khalji Amir to guard the bridge until his return. The Rae of Kāmrūp (or Assam) sent a message to Muḥammad Bakht-yār, representing, "It is not advisable to invade the territory of Tibbet without ample preparations. It is better to postpone the idea until some time later, when I myself will precede you with my troops." Muḥammad Bakht-yār did not like the suggestion, but continued his march into the territory of Tibbet.

For fifteen days, they travelled among high mountain peaks; on the sixteenth day, they descended to a level plain, and found themselves in a happy and prosperous land. The

1 Between the territories of Tibbet and Lakhnauti, there dwelt the three races of people—Koch, Mej or Mech and Tibārī (Kachāri) all having countenances like the Turks—See Tabaqāt-i-Nāširi, p. 152.
2 The Tazkarat-ul-Mulūk has Burdhan twice. Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī has only Burdhan. Bādāʿuni’s Muntakhab-u’t-Tawārikh, p. 58 has ‘Brahman’. Probably it is Birhāmpūr or Dharampūr in Nipāl.
3 The printed text of the Tabaqāt-i-Nāširi, p. 152 has ‘Garsaghip Shāh’. Bādāʿuni, p. 58 calls him ‘Garghasb’.
4 The printed text of the Tabaqāt-i-Nāširi, p. 152 has ‘Brahmanputra’ or ‘Brahmkaḍi’, and which, probably Bakht-yār did not reach. Beg-matī is a river, which rises in Nipāl and falls into the Gandak river, but it does not seem to be such a vast river as to cross it in ten days. It is, in all probability, Brahmaputra.
6 Qāḍī Minhāj-Sirāj in his Tabaqāt-i-Nāširi, p. 153 says that he received the above information regarding the invasion of Tibbet from Mu’tamad-u’d-Daulah, a trusted vassal of Muḥammad Bakht-yār at a place, in the territory of Lakhnauti, between Diwkut and Bangaun in 1244 A.D. Bangaun has been turned into Bekanwan by Major Raverty.
Muslim army reached a strong fort and began ravaging the countryside. But the people of the fort rushed forth in a body, fought a fierce encounter from morning till sunset, and wounded and disabled most of the invaders. The whole of their defensive arms were made of pieces of spear bamboo; their cuirasses and body armour, their shields and helmets were all slips of it, crudely fastened and stitched with raw silk. They were all archers and carried long bows. However at night, a number of prisoners were brought forward and, on investigation, it was found out that at a distance of five leagues from that place, there was a city called Karam Batan, where dwelt about fifty thousand valiant Turkish archers, who had been summoned and were bound to arrive the next morning.

The Muslim army had been worn out by the fatigues of the journey, and had been defeated in the day’s battle; to meet a force like that of Karam Batan was beyond its power. Muhammad Bakht-yar studied the situation carefully and consulted his Amir. They all decided to break the camp and to retreat, in order that they might make ample preparations to invade the country next year. The people of Tibbet had moved off and set fire to the fields on the line of their march, so that not a ‘blade of grass nor a stick of firewood’ could be found. Provisions were

1 Zubdat-u’t-Tawarih and Firighah assert that the Musalmans surrounded and attacked the fort. Minhaj-Siraj in his Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 153 simply says that ‘they reached a place, where there was a fort’.
2 Badauni’s Muntakhab-u’t-Tawarih, p. 59 holds that the people of the place were the descendants of Gushtasb, who had founded that fortress. But he gives no authority for the statement.
3 Karam Batan was a city of great size; its walls were of hewn stones, and its inhabitants were Brahmins and Nunis or Buddhist monks. The people held the pagan-faith, ‘and were governed by their Lord. At daybreak, about one thousand five hundred horses were sold, and all the horses that were brought to Lakhnauti came from there—See Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 154.
4 Firighah turns them into so many ‘horsemen’ instead of archers—Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 154 has تک شجاع تیمر اندارز
5 The Zubdat-u’t-Tawarih states that ‘they obstructed and destroyed the roads as well’, which is quite probable.
scare; soldiers killed their horses and ate them, and it was after suffering many hardships that they at last reached the country of Kāmrūp.

Unfortunately the two Amīrs, who had been deputed to guard the bridge, had quarrelled and departed,1 and they found to their astonishment that the arches of the bridge had been destroyed by the Hindus of the Kāmrūp territory. Muḥammad Bakht-yār found no way of crossing the river, and boats were not procurable. They all agreed to halt and to construct boats and floats. In a state of ‘excitement and bewilderment’ they sought shelter in a strong and lofty temple nearby,2 and devised means to obtain wood and rope for the construction of boats and rafts. When the Raе of Kāmrūp received the intelligence of Bakht-yār’s reverses and helplessness, he was emboldened into issuing a general command to his subjects, who gathered together in large numbers and surrounded the temple.3 They planted, wove and stitched the spiked bamboo and its slips in such a way that it looked like a wall all around.

The Muslim army finding itself in a state of insecurity, represented to Muḥammad Bakht-yār, “If we remain here in this condition, we are sure to fall into the hands of the Hindus. It behoves us to devise means to effect our escape.”4 All of them decidedly rushed forth, unitedly attacked one point in the wall and succeeded in making a way for them and descended the open plain. The Hindus pursued them, but the Muslim army reached the riverside

1 The Zubaḍat-u’t-Tawārīḥ states that ‘the two Amīrs, on account of spite and mutual jealousy, abandoned guarding the bridge, and each went his own way’. Badā’ūnī’s Muntakhab-u’t-Tawārīḥ, p. 59, says that ‘they first fought and afterwards abandoned the bridge.
2 ‘In which were deposited numerous idols of gold and silver and one great idol weighed about two or three thousand mithqāl—See Tabaqdt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 155.
3 Firūḥshah says not a word about this project of planting the spiked bamboos around the temple, but simply asserts that they were ordered to ‘make a united attack and close up the gates of the temple.’
4 Tabaqdt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 155.
and encamped there. Everyone, to the best of his ability and effort, sought means to cross the river. Suddenly a soldier urged his horse into the river, and up to the distance of an arrow-flight, found the river fordable.\(^1\) The Muslim army, out of the fear of the enemy’s onslaught, jumped into the river, but on reaching the deep water of the mid-stream, they all perished with the exception of Muḥammad Bakht-yār and about a hundred other soldiers.\(^2\) Through the assistance rendered by ‘Alī, the Mech and his kinsmen, Muḥammad Bakht-yār reached Diwkut safely. It was the greatest disaster that had yet befallen the Muslim army in India.

On reaching his own territory, he fell ill on account of excessive grief and disappointment that oppressed his mind.\(^3\) He did not ride forth again, for when he rode, men, women and children dishonoured him and reproached him bitterly; and this added to his illness. “Some calamity must have befallen Sultān Shiḥāb-u’d-dīn”, he used to say constantly during that adversity, “that my fortune has turned.” In fact, about the same time, Sultān Shiḥāb-u’d-dīn had been assassinated. These sights further depressed his drooping spirits, and he breathed his last in August 1205 A.D. Some have related on this wise, that ‘Alī Marādān Khaljī, the feudatory of Nārānkūṭ\(^4\) on hearing

\(^1\) Fīrīshtāh says that he ‘swam to the other side, and the Musalmans thought the river was fordable.’ Minhāj-Sirāj in his Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 156 says that ‘a cry arose in the force that they had found a ford and all of them plunged into the river’, which alone can be taken as true.

\(^2\) Bada‘ūnī’s Muntakhab-u’t-Twārīkh, p. 59 states that “those who remained on the river bank, were killed by the Hindus, and out of the whole army about 300 or 400 reached Diwkut.” Bada‘ūnī gives no authority, whatsoever, for his statement, but seems to copy from the Ṭabaqāt-i-Aḥbarī, which he usually does.

\(^3\) The Zubdat-u’t-Twārīkh agrees with Qādī Minhāj-Sirāj in these details. The Rauḍat-u’s-Ṣafā, Vol. IV, p. 889 says “his mind gave way under his misfortunes; and the sense of the disaster, he had suffered, resulted in hopeless melancholy.

\(^4\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 156 has only ‘Konī.’ The other manuscripts,
Bakht-yär’s discomfiture, hastened to Diwkut (Debkot is the modern district of Dinajpur). In some way or other, he managed to approach Muḥammad Bakht-yär, whom no one had seen for three days, lifted up the sheet from his face and assassinated him with his ‘heart-cutting dagger.’

The Khalji Maliks of Lakhnauti (1205—1227 A.D.)

During his absence on the expedition into the mountains of Kamrup and Tibber, Muḥammad Bakht-yär had despatched Muḥammad Shīrān and his brother Aḥmad Shīrān with a small contingent towards Lakhnauti and Jājnagar, in the year 1205 A.D. When the news of the catastrophe of Muḥammad Bakht-yär reached Muḥammad Shīrān, he instantly returned to Diwkut, performed the mourning ceremonies, and proceeded towards Nārankūi, the fief of ‘Alī Mardān. Muḥammad Shīrān seized ‘Alī Mardān, and retaliated his cruel deed by taking him prisoner and making him over to the charge of the kotwāl named Bābā Kotwāl Iṣfahānī. He then returned to Diwkut, according to Major Raverty, have

Bada’uni’s Muntakhab-u’l-Tawārīkh, p. 59 has “Nār nol”, which is impossible, for it is in Patiala State. The place is uncertain and untraceable.

1 He may be regarded as a quasi independent sovereign. The conquest of Lakhnauti is rightly accounted among the victories of Sultān Shihāb-u’l-dīn, as Qūṭb-u’l-dīn was still a slave, and had not attained sovereign powers.

3 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 156.

2 In fact Muḥammad-i-Shīrān was the son of Muḥammad Shīrān. He was a man of excellent disposition and great intrepidity. At the time of the sack of the city of Nadījah by Muḥammad Bakht-yär, he remained absent for three days from the army; but returned after seizing some eighteen elephants along with their drivers to the presence of the Sultān—See Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 157. The Tabaqāt-i-Akhbār, p. 51 styles him Šerwān.

4 The printed text of the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 157 and the Paris copy of the text, according to Major Raverty, have Lakhnauti and Jājnagar. In his translation, he has turned Lakhnauti into Lakhnor—a fief lying in the direction of Jājnagar.
and held an assembly of all the Amīrs, who paid their homage to him as the head of Khaljī Amīrs.

'Ali Mardān entered into a compact with the kotwāl and devised means to effect his escape, and went off to the court of Delhi. Sultan Shīhab-u'd-dīn had died. The Khaljīs were not his slaves or heirs to his empire, and consequently, his successor, Sultan Qutb-u'd-dīn was not entitled to Bihar. However, 'Ali Mardān requested Aibak to despatch Qāīmāz, the Rūmī, the governor of Oudh, towards the territory of Lakhnautī with his commands to locate the Khaljī Amīrs at some suitable fiefs. His petition was granted, and Qāīmāz was ordered to proceed to Lakhnautī. Malik Ḥisam-u'd-dīn Iwaḍ Khaljī, formerly the feudatory of Kankūrī in the time of Muḥammad Bakht-yār, welcomed Qāīmāz with great honour, and received Diwktut as his fief. Thereupon, Muḥammad Shīrān and other Khaljī Amīrs assembled together and determined to march upon Diwktut. Qāīmāz, who was on his way to Oudh, returned again, and broke the confederacy of Khaljī Amīrs by inflicting a crushing defeat upon them. Subsequently, disagreement arose between the Khaljī Amīrs themselves, and in an engagement that ensued Muḥammad

1The Jākān Ārā does not mention 'Alī Mardān at all, calls Muḥammad Shīrān cruel and blood-thirsty and, thus, confounds him with 'Alī Mardān.

2Zubdat-u't-Tawālīkh clears up the meaning by saying that Qāīmāz was ordered to proceed to Lakhnautī in order that he might locate the Khaljī Amīrs to suitable districts as their fiefs. Further on, the work wrongly asserts that in the battle, which took place between Qāīmāz and the Khaljī Amīrs, Muḥammad Shīrān was killed.

3Out of the four best copies of Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, according to Major Raverty, two have Gangorī or Kankorī; the other two have Gasguī and Kaskūrī. The printed text p. 158 has Kanktorī. The Ṭabaqāt-i-Akhbārī, p. 52 has 'Kalwā'ī, which is uncertain. There is a place Kūkūrī in Oudh, which is not meant here.

4The Rašdat-u's-Safā, Vol. IV, p. 889 says that 'Muḥammad Shīrān was involved in hostilities with a Hindu ruler and was killed in a conflict, which took place between him and the Raja. It is not a trustworthy account.
Shirān was slain in the vicinity of Maksidah and Santūs.  

In the meantime, ‘Alī Mardān had accompanied Sulṭān Qūṭb-u’드-dīn Aibak towards Ghaznīn in the year 1206 A.D., but had fallen captive into the hands of Sulṭān Tāj-u’د-dīn Yıldız. It is said that one day, on a hunting expedition, he asked permission from Amīr Sālār Zafar Khaljī to shoot Yıldız with an arrow and to make him sovereign instead. Sālār Zafar got rid of ‘Alī Mardān by presenting him with two horses and despatching him towards Hindustan. Sulṭān Qūṭb-u’드-dīn Aibak received him cordially, conferred upon him a robe of honour and assigned him the territory of Lakhnautī. ‘Alī Mardān proceeded towards Diwakur and crossed the river Kosi. Malik Hisām-u’د-dīn ‘Iwād Khaljī made his submission. In a short time, he brought the whole territory of Lakhnautī under his sujektion.

When Sulṭān Qūṭb-u’드-dīn Aibak died in 1210 A.D. ‘Alī Mardān (1211-1213 A.D.) assumed a canopy of state, and caused his name to be read in the Khūtbah and was styled Sulṭān ‘Alā-u’د-dīn. He was energetic, intrepid and brave, but was, at the same time, hard-hearted, cruel and blood-thirsty. His own associates and favourites were reduced to extreme poverty through his oppression, tyranny and lawlessness.

---

1 According to Major Raverty the four best copies of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī have Maksidah and Santūs with slight variations. The Ṭabaqāt-i-Akkāri, p. 52 has ‘Tus’ only.

2 According to Ṭabaqāt-i-Akkāri, p. 52 and Zubdat-u’t-Tawrīḥk ‘he was taken prisoner by Turks or Turkomans, and was carried off to Kashghar. However, he managed to reach Hindustan, proceeded to Delhi and presented himself before the court of Sulṭān Qūṭb-u’드-dīn.

3 This account creates doubt as to whether he was at all taken prisoner. It is true that he unexpectedly fell into the hands of Yıldız.

4 The printed text of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī has ‘Kos’ but Major Raverty turns it into ‘Kons’. It is probably Kosī, river of Nīpāl and North Bengal.

5 According to the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akkāri, p. 53 and Bāḏawīnī’s Muntakhab-u’t-Tawrīḥk, p. 60, he also coined in his own name—a statement, which is not supported by the contemporary authority.

6 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī see pp. 158 and 160.
He despatched armies in different directions and, in order to suppress the aristocratic lawlessness, put a large number of Khalji Amirs to the sword. The Raes of adjacent territories, being terrified, regularly paid the tribute, and offered innumerable presents. He became 'haughty, foolishly vain and self-conceited;' he used to talk rubbish and nonsense, and was, in fact, on the verge of madness. He began granting investitures of the different parts of Hindustan, Ghaznīn, Khurāsān and 'Iraq. A curious anecdote is related by Qāḍī Minhāj-Sirājī in this context. A certain indigent merchant approached 'Alī Mardān, and solicited favour from him. 'Alī Mardān asked him his native place and, on understanding that he was a resident of Iṣfahān, granted him an investiture of the same place. No one among the courtiers had the courage to say that Iṣfahān was not under his jurisdiction. And if ever a bold courtier brought to his notice that such and such place was not included in his dominion, he would foolishly reply, "I will reduce it." However, on the recommendation of his associates and courtiers, the helpless merchant was granted a large sum of money for his travelling expenses as governor-designate of Iṣfahān.

His haughtiness, oppression and cruelty went on increasing, until at last, a party of the Khalji Amirs conspired against him, slew 'Alī Mardān and elevated Malik Ḫisām-u'd-dīn Iwaḍ to the throne. 'Alī Mardān reigned for about two years.  

Malik Ḫisām-u'd-dīn 'Iwaḍ Khaljī (1214-1226 A.D.)

---

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 159, 160.
2 Ṣafavān = Iṣfahān, and the latter word is used
3 Tabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 53 says 'two years'; while Badā'ūnī p. 60 has 'three or two years'. Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī pp. 159 and 160 says he ascended the throne after the death of Aibak and ruled for two years 'or more or less than that'. In all probability, he reigned for two years and some months after the death of Sultān Quṭb-u'd-dīn. Therefore, 'Alī Mardān might have ruled from 1211 to 1213 A.D.
4 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī p. 164 says that Ḫisām-u'd-dīn ruled for twelve
belonged to the Khaljī tribe of Ghūr and the territory of Garmsir. He was endowed with many praiseworthy qualities; he was a man of excellent disposition and exemplary piety, exceedingly handsome, munificent, just and merciful. Under his benevolent rule, the army and the subjects enjoyed such happiness and prosperity as they had never experienced before. He founded many mosques and conferred stipends upon the theologians, priests and 'descendants of the Prophet.'

It is related about his early life that once he was conducting a laden ass on the border of the mountain-tract of Ghūr towards the eminence, called Pugštah Afrūzā (the Burning Mount), within the limits of the territory of Zabulistan. On the way, he met two darvishes, who asked him for bread and drink. Ḥisām-u’d-dīn granted their request and served them cheerfully. The darvishes in return, blessed him with their prayers and advised him to proceed towards Hindustan. Accordingly, he came to Hindustan, and joined Bakht-yār’s service until he rose to a position of power and sovereignty as described previously. He made the city of Lakhnautī the seat of government, caused his name to be read in the Khūṭbah and to be inscribed on the coin under the title of Sūltān Ghiyāṭh-u’d-

years, and on p. 163 states that Lakhnautī was finally conquered by Nāṣir-u’d-dīn in 624 H (end of 1226 or the beginning of 1227 A.D.) 1226–12 =1214. Therefore, he ascended the throne of Lakhnautī in about 1214 after the death of ‘Alī Mardān, which occurred at the end of 1213 A.D.

1 Ţabaqt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 161.

* One of the oldest and best copies (according to Major Raverty) and the Zubdat-i-Tawārikh have 'Puśht' for ‘Puśhtah.’ Puṣht is in the territory of Kuhistan. Ţabaqt-i-Akhbarī, p. 53 has 'Puśhtah Fīrūz.' Ţabaqt-i-Nāṣirī says that Puśhtah Afrūz was situated within the limits of the territory of Zabulistan.

3 Ţabaqt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 160; but Major Raverty turns it into Walištān.

4 According to Āṭīn-i-Akhbarī, Lakhnauiti styled as Gaur is named Jannatābād. According to the Haft Iqām, Gaur was the capital of Bengālah, and Jannatābād was the name of a district in which Gaur was situated. The Khulāṣat-u’t-Tawārikh states that Lakhnautī or Gaur was a very ancient city and the first capital of the country. The Ţārīkh-i-
dīn and founded the fortress of Ḥasankut. The territories of Tirhut, Kāmṛūp, Bangah and Jājnagar became his tributaries.

The territory of Lakhnauṭī extended to both the sides of the river Ganges. On the western side called ‘Rārh’, was situated the city of Lakhnur; and on the eastern side known as Barbandah lay the city of Diwkut. Sultān Ghiyāth-u’d-dīn constructed an embankment extending from the vicinity of Lakhnauṭī on the one side to the city of Diwkut on the other, a distance of ten days’ journey. When Sultān Shams-u’d-dīn Iltutmīs marched upon the territory, of Lakhnauṭī to suppress the sedition of Malik Ikhtiyār-u’d-dīn Balkā Khaljī, in the year 1230 A.D., he was pleased to behold the monuments of Sultān Ghiyāth-u’d-dīn.

The rest of the events of his reign are described in the account of Sultān Shams-u’d-dīn Iltutmīs in Chapter IV.

Firūz Shāhī says Lakhnauṭī acquired the by-name of Balghākpūr—a place of great sedition.

1 Copies of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri differ

2 It is perhaps Ḥasankut’ in conformity with the name of its founder.

3 Badā’uni’s Muntakhab-u’t-Tawāriḥ, p. 60 has ‘Bangālah’.

4 Copies of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri differ

5 It is in fact Rārh, ancient name of a portion of Bengal, west of the Bhagirathi river, corresponding to the modern districts of Burdwan, Bunkurā, west Murshidābād and Hooghly.

6 The printed text of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 162 as followed in Elliot is ‘Lakhnauṭī’—which is totally impossible, since, it lay east, not west of the Ganges. It is ‘Lakhnur’.

7 The printed text of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 162 has بربند-بَرَانِد. It is in fact Barbandah. Major Rawerty calls it ‘Barandā’. 
CHAPTER III

SULTAN QUTB-U'D-DIN AIBAK

Character

The first Muslim sovereign, who ascended the throne of Delhi and laid the foundation of Muslim rule in India, was Sultan Qutb-u'd-din Aibak, a slave of Sultan Shihab-u'd-din of Ghur. He was adorned with many laudable qualities of heart and soul, and surpassed his contemporaries both in the East and West in his liberality, beneficence and gallantry. "His valour, bravery and enterprise are such", says the author of the Tarikh-i-Fakhru'd-din Mubarak Shah, "that if Rustam were alive, he would have taken pride in having been his Hajib (Chamberlain)." He was well-acquainted with the principles of civil administration, and an expert in military affairs. A monarch of lofty courage and pure faith, Qutb-u'd-din was worthy of

1 It is not Ibak as Major Raverty states, but Aibak. "Ai" in t' Turkish language means 'moon' and 'bak' means 'Lord': 'Aibak', therefore, means "moon-Lord." On the gateway of the Qutb Mosque is clearly given—أي بكي—See list of Mohammadian and H. d. u Monuments—Vol. III, p. 9. But Qadi Minhaji-Siraj clearly asserts that his little finger was broken, and, therefore, he was styled as 'Aibak-i-Shal.' Shal" meant "maimed in the hand"—Tabaqat-i-Nasiri p. 138. The statement is supported by Firighah, p. 60 Lubu-n't-Twarikh, p. 8; Tabaqat-i-Akbari, p. 41; Khulasat-u't-Twarikh, p. 188. These later authorities, however, give the impression that Qutb-u'd-din was called 'Aibak-i-Shal', because his little finger was broken. The fact is that شل (disjoined or maimed) is the epithet, and Aibak the name. Therefore, اي بكي شل means 'Aibak' of the maimed hand.

2 Tabaqat-Nasiri, p. 137.

Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, p. 13.

3 Tariikh-i-Fakhru'd-din Mubarak Shah, p. 49.

4 Firighah, p. 60.
the kingdom and suitable to the throne of sovereignty.\textsuperscript{1} Being a zealous Musalman, he bitterly hated idols and idolators; replaced the former by building mosques and schools and destroyed the latter\textsuperscript{2} during his conquests; but the state was never used as a machine for proselytisation. He was, however, a justice-loving monarch, and held the \textit{Ulemā} and the learned in the highest esteem. The news of his personal accomplishments, strength and bounty was spread far and wide, so that his bitterest adversaries were reduced to submission\textsuperscript{3}. \textit{Tārikh-i-Fakhru'd-din Mubārak Shāh} expresses the same idea by saying that "Quṭb-u'd-din with his liberality, generosity and open-handedness converted a hundred thousand free men into slaves."\textsuperscript{4} His terror of slaughter, fame of intrepidity and the hope of beneficence brought his deadliest enemies\textsuperscript{5} to his side. "The turbulent and rebellious land of Hindustan", poetically describes the contemporary chronicle, "was reddened with the blood of the enemy’s hearts."\textsuperscript{6} His bounty and slaughter, however, went hand in hand as the \textit{Imām Bahā-u'd-dīn Ushi\textsuperscript{7}} observes:

"The Sulṭān’s bounty scattering gifts of \textit{lacs},
Has of the mines their precious treasure cleared;
The earth bleeds, envious of his generous hands;
So in her heart the ruby has appeared."

\textsuperscript{1} MSS. \textit{Taj-u'l-Ma'āthīr}, p. 116.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., pp. 5 and 119.
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., p. 118.
\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Tārikh-i-Fakhru'd-din Mubārak Shāh}, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī}, p. 138. The following lines of the \textit{Tārikh-i-Fakhru'd-din Mubārak Shāh} convey the same idea:

\begin{quote}
ديستان بلف و تربیت و نواخت فرامبندر شندند- شیخان بقهور تیغ دران- و بیبک پران و ناون- جانسوز و سنان دلبر و ناجع تیر بر وگرز گردن شکن مستگنگ کشتند-
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{6} MSS. \textit{Taj-u'il-Ma'athīr}, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{7} One of the most distinguished poets of Quṭb-u'd-dīn’s assembly, who composed the following verses:

\begin{quote}
ای دیشتشک تو لک بچهان آورده- کافرا کف تورک بچان آورد\textsuperscript{8}
از رشک کف تو خون گرفت، دل کان- بس لعل مهابه درمیان آورده
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{8} One of the most distinguished poets of Quṭb-u'd-dīn’s assembly. who composed the following verses:
“During his reign of peace and tranquillity”, says the
author of the Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, “treasury required no guard;
the flock needed no shepherd—so much so that the wolf
and sheep drank water side by side out of the same pond.
The very mention of thieves and theft was out of
question.”\(^1\) “He established justice and equity with such
strict foundations,” says the author of the Tārikh-i-Fakhru-
uddin Mubārak Shāh, “that in spite of the large number of
troops gathered round his banner—consisting of Turks,
Ghūrīs, Khurasanians, Khaljīs and Hindustanis, no one dared
to take by force a blade of grass, or a morsel of bread, a
goat from the fold or a bird from the sown or to lodge
with a peasant.”\(^2\) In short, he possessed all the excellent
qualities and virtues, requisite for a king of those days,
but lacked in outward comeliness. His little finger was
broken and, therefore, he was styled as ‘Aibak-i-Shal’\(^3\)
which meant ‘Aibak of the maimed hand.’

Early Life

In his childhood, he had been brought from Turkistan
to Nishāpūr, and was sold to Qādī Fakhru’d-dīn ‘Abdu-
ul ‘Azīz Kuft, a descendant of the great Imām Abū
Hanīfah and the governor of the province of Nishāpūr\(^4\)
and its dependencies. Fortune favoured him, and along
with the Qādī’s sons, he learnt to read the Qur’ān, ac-
quired the art of horsemanship, riding and archery, so that
he became adorned with all the accomplishments of the
age.\(^5\) In a short time, he became famous for his manly

---

\(^1\) MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, pp. 338, 399.
\(^2\) Tārikh-i-Fakhru’d-din Mubārak Shāh, p. 33.
\(^3\) Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 138.
\(^4\) Lubb-u’t-Twāriḵ, p. 7 incorrectly says ‘Peshāwar.’ See Tārikh-i-Fakhru-
uddin Mubārak Shāh, p. 2.
\(^5\) Firishtah, p. 60.
bearing; and when he became young, certain merchants\(^1\) brought him to Ghaznīn, and sold him to Sulṭān Shihāb-
ud-dīn of Ghūr.

Sulṭān Shihāb-ud-dīn occasionally indulged in convivial assemblies, and one night, in the course of an entertain-
ment, he bestowed gifts upon his slaves.\(^2\) Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak, who had been the object of particular favour dis-
tributed his share among the servants of the court. The Sulṭān was very much pleased with his action, and elevated
him to a position of distinction and honour.\(^3\) Qutb-ud-
dīn served the Sulṭān with loyalty, and his status rapidly
increased until he became Amir-i-Akbūr (Lord of the
Imperial Stable). At the time when the Sulṭāns of Ghūr,
Ghaznīn and Bāmiyān advanced towards Khurāsān to repel
Sulṭān Shāh,\(^4\) Qutb-ud-dīn, at the head of the escort of
the foragers, used to go everyday in quest of fodder.\(^5\)
During one of these excursions, he found himself face to
face with the enemy’s cavalry.\(^6\) Qutb-ud-dīn displayed
great heroism and activity in the battle which ensued, but
as his party was small, he was taken prisoner. Later on,
when Sulṭān Shāh was defeated, the victorious officers
placed the iron-cage of Qutb-ud-dīn on a camel and
brought him in that condition to the presence of Sulṭān
Shihāb-ud-dīn of Ghūr. The Sulṭān received him with
great honour and showered many gifts upon him.

\(^1\) According to the Lubb-u’t-Twāriḵā, p. 8 ‘he was purchased by a
merchant from the Qāḍī’s sons.’ The Rauḍat-u’r-Ṣafā, Vol. IV, p. 888
agrees with the above-mentioned authority. The Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 41
and Firīstāh, p. 60 assert that “after his purchase from the Qāḍī’s son, he
was offered to Sulṭān Shihāb-ud-dīn of Ghūr, who purchased him for
a consideration.” The fact is that Tārīḵ-i-Mubārak Shāhī alone follows
the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī very closely.

\(^2\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 138.

\(^3\) Firīstāh, p. 61 says that first of all ‘he was created an Amīr.’

\(^4\) Not the ‘Khwārizm Shāh’ as Dr. Ishwārī Persībūd (Medieval India,
p. 164) wrongly states, but his brother Sulṭān Shāh.

\(^5\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 139 also p. 84.

\(^6\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 41 and Firīstāh, p. 61 say that Qutb-ud-dīn
pushed up the river-bank of the Murghāb, towards Merv, when ‘he
unexpectedly fell into the hands of Sulṭān Shāh.’
Conquests

After reducing the fort of Ajmer, Sultan Shihab-u’d-din of Ghur marched towards Delhi in the year 1191 A.D. A fierce battle ensued in the neighbourhood of the city; but the Rae, probably a relation of Khânday Rae, out of fear, submitted and promised to pay the tribute in future. The Sultan then returned to Ghaznîn and entrusted the government of Kuhram¹ and Samanah (now in the Patiala State) to Malik Quṭb-u’d-din as his lieutenant in 1192 A.D.² The fort of Kuhram was strengthened by the establishment of a well-equipped army.³ The hordes of people and chiefs came in, and acknowledged his supremacy, and Quṭb-u’d-din received them with great honour, as if there was no distinction between the ruler and the ruled.⁴ The people were freed from undue oppression and tyranny, and a reign of peace and tranquillity began.

In September 1192 A.D.⁵ Jitwân, a dependant of the

¹ Tārîkh-i-Fabhr-u’d-din Mubarak Shâh, p. 22. Tabaqât-i-Nâsirî, p. 141 says:

"میت مرکب اواز اول فقیه دهلی تابدان وقت بیست سال دید
Quṭb-u’d-din died in 607 H. (Tabaqât-i-Nâsirî, p. 140) hence the date of the first conquest of Delhi is 587 H.≈1191 A.D.

² جوی از سال تاریخ پانصد گروسته برای پانصدافوزد هشتاد ادوبیتو روو گوست مکه مرام شد حسگهاءه اسلام میصر شد
Futūh-u’s-Salāṭīn, edited by Dr. Mehdi Hasan, p. 81.

³ MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’âthîr, p. 120. Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 41 incorrectly calls Kurām as ‘Guhram’.

⁴ MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’âthîr, p. 120.

⁵ Firûsttâh, p. 61 has 1193 A.D. Vaidya in his History of Medieval Hindu India, says that: ‘Jitwân is plainly a misreading or miswriting for ‘Chauhān’ in Persian.’ But the MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’âthîr on p. 138 has وکار ازآم پچوانو کشتیو اور جنگ اکت بیست ویکو شیطان در دماغ گرفت اکت است

‘the accursed Jatwân having admitted the pride of Satan into his brain’. According to "Major Raverty” another account is (no authority is mentioned) that after being installed at Kuhram Quṭb-u’d-din from there marched against Mirat and Delhi. These are given later by the Tāj-u’l-Ma’âthîr.
Rae of Nahrwālah, declared his independence and, with a large army, appeared before the walls of the fort of Hānsī (modern Ḫisār). Malik Naṣrat-u’d-dīn, the commander of the fort, was obliged to shut himself up within the walls of the fort and sent information to Delhi, Qūṭb-u’d-dīn instantly hurried to his assistance. The enemy, hearing of his approach, decamped; but was closely pursued on the borders of Baqar (probably Bukkar, a fortified island in the river Indus) and was completely overthrown. Jitwān was slain in the battle, and the victorious army received immense booty. Qūṭb-u’d-dīn then, marched towards Hānsī, repaired the fort and retired towards Kuhrām. The news of the defeat of the enemy and the victory of his forces was conveyed to Ghaznīn.

Qūṭb-u’d-dīn was now free to lead expeditions into the neighbouring parts of Hindustan. He marched from Kuhrām to invade Mīrat, one of the celebrated forts of Hindustan, having a deep and broad ditch all around. The fort was, however, captured in 1192 A.D. and a large number of people embraced Islam. The idol temples were converted into mosques. Qūṭb-u’d-dīn, thereafter, marched.

---

1 Firīghtā, p. 61, ‘under the leadership of Jitwān, a dependant of the Rae of Nahrwālah but Raverty, p. 516 converts Jitwān into an ‘army of Jats’ which is impossible.

2 It was the Guhial principality of Asīka or Hānsī, established by the Cahsmana of Sakanbharī—Ray—Dynastic History of Northern India, Vol. II, p. 1203.

3 MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma‘āthīr, p. 139.

4 Ibid., p. 154.

5 Firīghtā, p. 61 asserts that “the leader retired to Nahrwālah of Gujrat.” In fact, he was slain in battle as the contemporary authority narrates.

6 MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma‘āthīr, p. 169.

7 Ibid., p. 169.

8 Ṭābaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 139. Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 41, has 1193 A.D. which is not probable. Vaidya in his History of ‘ Hindu Medieval India gives 1193 A.D., on the authority of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī. But the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 139, 140 says 587 H.—a mistake for 588 H.—i.e. 1192 A.D. Professor Vaidya has, therefore, misread the date.
against the fort of Delhi,\(^1\) (the walls of this city may still be traced for a long distance round the Quṭb Minār), which was finally captured. Here, too, the idols and idol-worshippers were destroyed and mosques were raised.\(^2\)

The chief Šadar, Qawām-u’l-Mulk Rukn-u’d-dīn Ḥamzā sent information from Ranthambhor\(^3\) that Hari Raja,\(^4\) brother of the late Rae Pithora, had broken out into rebellion; Rainsi, the son of Pithora, styled as Kolah, a tributary of Malik Quṭb-u’d-dīn, was in great danger, and that the rebel was advancing against Ranthambhor itself.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) The MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir does not give any date in this connection; but the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 139, 140, says ‘In the year 587 H. (1191 A.D.) a mistake for 588 H. (1192 A.D.).’ (For it further says the same year i.e., 588 H.), Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak captured Mirat and the same year 588 H. (1192 A.D.) invaded Delhi and captured it, 1191 is not possible, for 1191 is the year of the battle of Tarāin, and Quṭb-u’d-dīn could not capture Mirat before that time. Further, the Tārīkh-i-Fakhr-u’d-dīn Mubārak Shāh of Marwar-rūd, p. 22, another contemporary and reliable authority, clearly states that “Quṭb-u’d-dīn conquered Delhi in 588 H. i.e., 1192 A.D.” Under the arch of the eastern entrance to the Quṭb Mosque, an inscription reads as follows, “Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak conquered the fort and built the mosque in the year 587 or 9 A.H. (1191 or 1193 A.D.).” General Cunningham (Archæological Report, p. 28) reads it as nine while Syed Aḥmad Khān and Mr. Thomas take it as seven. In view of the statement of Minhāj-Sirāj:

""مُدَت مَلِك أَوَّل فَاتِح دِيْلِي تَا بَدِين وَقْتَ بَيْسَت سَال دُوُّد""

Twenty years before the death of Quṭb-u’d-dīn in 607 H. (Tabaqat-i-Nāṣirī, p. 140) the date of the first conquest of Delhi is 587 H. i.e. 1191 A.D. The view of Sir Syed Aḥmad is, therefore, correct. The later date i.e. 588 H. = 1192 as given by the Tārīkh-i-Fakhr-u’d-dīn Mubārak Shāh is the year of final subjugation of Delhi.

\(^2\) MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, pp. 174 and 177.

\(^3\) Situated on an isolated rock, 1,578 feet above sea level and surrounded by a massive wall strengthened by towers and bastions. The remains of the place, a mosque, tomb of a saint and barracks are still seen within the enclosure.

\(^4\) Also written Bhirāj, and Bhurāj, who is called Hiraj in some important copies of the Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir. Firgātah calls him Hemrāj, while some name him Hamīr—See Raverty’s translation, p. 517. Hiraj of the MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir is in fact Hari Raja. Ray, Vol. II, p. 1093.

\(^5\) MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, p. 179.
On having received the intelligence of the revolt, Quṭb-u’d-dīn immediately entrusted the affairs of government to Sābih-u ’l-Mulk Naṣr-u’d-dīn, who was created his deputy during his absence from the capital; and himself proceeded to Ranthambhor.¹ Hartī Raja, on hearing of his arrival, was so terrified, that he offered no resistance, but ‘fled like the wind’ with his army.² The son of Rae Pithora was favoured with a robe of honour, and he, in return, presented valuable offerings including three golden melons.³ About this time, when Quṭb-u’d-dīn was away from Delhi, its former Rae⁴ raised a strong army to snatch the capital from the Musalmans. Quṭb-u’d-dīn hurried to Delhi and pursued the Rae. The rebel was, however, taken prisoner, and beheaded.⁵

When the news of his exploits reached Sulṭān Shihāb-u’d-dīn of Ghūr, he summoned Malik Quṭb-u’d-dīn to Ghaznīn in 1193 A.D., received him with great honour and conferred splendid gifts upon him.⁶ Quṭb-u’d-dīn remained

² Ibid. p. 183.
³ The text of the MSS. Taj-u ’l-Ma’āthir, p. 185 is: “ग्रीनेच जरैन” which Major Raverty, p. 517 translates as kettle-drums in the shape of melons. Tārīkh-i-Fakhr-u’d-dīn Mubarak Shāh, p. 22 says “four golden melons weighing 300 maunds.”
⁴ Probably a relation of Khānday Raṣ and not himself, for the latter was killed in the battle of Tarāin.
⁵ MSS. Taj-u ’l-Ma’āthir, pp. 185 and 186.
⁶ Minhāj-Sirāj in his Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 168 describes this journey in the reign of Sultān Shams-u’d-dīn Itutmīsh—that Quṭb-u’d-dīn, after the conquest of Nahrwālah and Gujarāt went to Ghaznīn along with Malik Naṣir-u’d-dīn Ḥusain. The Futūh-u’s-Salāṭin, p. 84 also describes this event at this very stage. Tārīkh-i-Fakhr-u’d-dīn Mubarak Shāh p. 25 places this event in 601 H., i.e. 1204 A.D. 1204 is not possible, for the Taj-u ’l-Ma’āthir says that Quṭb-u’d-dīn and Itutmīsh both invaded Kālinjar in 1202 A.D. Itutmīsh was purchased by Quṭb-u’d-dīn after his visit to Ghaznīn, and if it occurred in 1204, how could Itutmīsh be present in 1202 A.D.? It is, however, probable that Quṭb-u’d-dīn would have gone to Ghaznīn after the conquest of Nahrwālah (1196 A.D.), for the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 168 further states that Itutmīsh was created Amir of Gwalior after the conquest of the fort in 1200 A.D. Further, the visit as described by Tārīkh-i-Fakhr-u’d-dīn Mubarak Shāh may be a later one. But Fakhr-u’d-dīn Mubarak Shāh mentions only one more visit in 1201 A.D.,
in Ghaznin for some time. Unluckily, at the end of the winter season, he fell dangerously ill, but subsequently recovered and was permitted to return to Hindustan, and the government was again conferred upon him.\textsuperscript{1} And when he arrived at Kirmān, Malik Tāj-u’d-dīn Yīldiz welcomed him with great honour and gave him his daughter in marriage.\textsuperscript{2} Qūṭb-u’d-dīn, then, returned to the capital Delhi, and laid the foundation of Adīnah Mosque or Jumā Masjid in 1193 A.D.\textsuperscript{3} The material obtained by the destruction of temples was freely used in the building of the mosque, which was covered with inscriptions in toghrā, containing the divine commandments.\textsuperscript{4} The mosque consists of an outer and inner courtyard with eleven magnificent arches; originally a thick coat of plaster concealed the "profuse idolatrous ornamentations", but it has now fallen away, which reveals the delicate workmanship of the Hindu artists. "The probability seems to be that the entire structure was rearranged in the form we now see it by the Muḥammadans".\textsuperscript{5} The Qūṭb Mosque is a large quadrangular court 142’ by 108’ enclosed by colonnades of grey stone pillars; the prayer chamber is 147’ by 40’ and contains five rows of pillars. The frontage of the prayer chamber is formed by the great arched facade with inscribed bands of

when Qūṭb-u’d-dīn was ordered to retrace his steps towards Delhi and, therefore, he did not reach Ghaznin. The probable date is 1193 A.D.

\textsuperscript{1} MSS. Tāj-ul-Ma’thur p. 213.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibīd, p. 214. Fīrāṣṭāh describes this event in 1195 A.D., which is impossible; for according to the contemporary authority the Tāj-ul-Ma’thur, Qūṭb-u’d-dīn returned to Delhi and from there marched towards Koil in 1194 A.D.
\textsuperscript{3} Qūṭb-u’d-dīn’s mosque was commenced, according to the inscription on its entrance gate, immediately after the capture of the city in 1192 A.D. It was completed in 1196 and enlarged during the reign of Ḫūṭumshīr.

\textsuperscript{4} MSS. Tāj-ul-Ma’thur, pp. 264 and 265.
naskh lettering. The mosque was built by Quṭb-u’d-dīn; but subsequent extensions of the original mosque enclosure and of the great arched screen were made by Īltutmīsh in 1230 A.D.¹

The Quṭb Mosque (Masjid Quwwat-u’l-Islām) is situated immediately to the north-east of the Quṭb Minār. The inscription on the inner lintel of the eastern gateway states: “This fort was conquered and this Jāmi’ Masjid was built in the year 587 (1191 A.D.) by the Amīr—the commander of the army Quṭb-u’Daulat Waddīn, the Amīr-u’l-Umara Aibak Sultānī. The material of twenty-seven temples was used in the construction of this mosque.” On the arch tympanum of the eastern gateway is mentioned that the mosque was built by Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak.² On the arch tympanum of the north gate it is stated that the building was erected by the order of Sultān Mu’izz-u’d-dīn (Shihāb-u’d-dīn of Ghūr) in 592. On the south pier of the central arch of the great screen the year 594 is mentioned. On the south end pier of the southern arch of Īltutmīsh’s southern extension of the great screen the year 627 is given. On the pillar of one of the arches of Aibak’s prayer chamber is given the name of the supervisor Faḍl bin Abīl Ma‘ālī.³ The Quṭb Minār, another celebrated monument of the early Turkish Sultāns, stands in the south-east corner of the outer courtyard of the mosque, 238 ft. high, 47 ft. at the base and 9 ft. at the summit. The building consisted of five storeys, enclosing a spiral stair-case, crowned by a cupola, which fell in the earthquake of 1803. It was completed by Īltutmīsh, whose tomb along with a heap of splendid ruins including the unfinished mināret of ‘Alā-u’d-dīn lies around the mosque.

After remaining a short time at Delhi, Quṭb-u’d-dīn marched towards Koil (modern ‘Alīgarh)⁴ in the year 1194

² قطب الدین ای بک (Monuments of Delhi, Vol. III, p. 9).
⁴ According to a popular legend Koil owes its origin to one Kogharab, a Kshatriya of the lunar race, who called the city after his own name and
A.D.¹ After crossing the river Jumna,² Qutb-u'd-din invested the strong fort of Koil, which fell into his hands after an obstinate resistance on the part of the enemy.³ A large number of the garrison was put to the sword, but the rest were converted to Islam; and the victorious army acquired vast booty including one thousand horses.⁴ It was after the capture of Koil that Delhi was made the seat of government.

About the same time 1194 A.D.⁵ Qutb-u'd-din received intimation that Sultan Shihab-u'd-din of Ghur was marching on an expedition against Rae Jai Chand of Benares.⁶ He, consequently, proceeded some stages in advance to receive him⁷ and to do him honour, bearing with him rich offerings of hundred horses and an elephant⁸ laden with silver and gold and other valuable presents. Qutb-u'd-din mustered a force of fifty thousand horse, and was ordered to lead the advance guard of the army.⁹ Qutb-u'd-din, along with the Sultan and the Sipah-Salār (commander of

that its present designation was named by Balarāma, who subdued the neighbouring regions of the Doab and slew the great demon Kol. According to another tradition the district was held by the Dor Rajputs before the first Muhammadan invasion, and continued occupied by the Rajas of Baran until the close of the twelfth century.

¹ Tarikh-i-Fahhr-u'd-din Mubarak Shāh, p. 23 has 590 H, i.e. sometimes after December 27, 1193 i.e. 1194 A.D.,
² The text of the MSS. Tāj-u'l-Ma'athir, p. 267 has "جُون". It is decidedly جون or Jumna.
³ MSS. Tāj-u'l-Ma'athir, p. 270.
⁴ Ibid. pp. 271, 272.
⁵ Ibid. p. 273. Tarikh-i-Fahhr-u'd-din Mubarak Shāh, p. 23 and Tabaqat-i-Nāṣiri, p. 140 both have 590 i.e. 1914 A.D.
⁶ The ancient name of the city was Varana, and the name of the city of two small streams confining the modern city. It is popularly known as Kaśi.
⁷ Fir-iṣṭah, p. 61 has the word پخشواقل which means 'conducting or welcoming a superior' but Dow and Briggs, translate it into Peshāwar; so that Qutb-u'd-din went up to Peshāwar.
⁸ Fir-iṣṭah, p. 61 says that 'Qutb-u'd-din took with him two elephants, one laden with silver and the other with gold', which is contrary to Hasan Niẓāmi's account.
⁹ MSS. Tāj-u'l-Ma'athir, pp. 277, and 279.
troops) 'Izz-ud-din Husain, son of Kharmil, another leader of the van of the army, fell upon the enemy on the confines of Chandwār, defeated and overthrew him. The enemy attempted to block the advance guard, but they were reduced to such an extremity that they withheld from fighting. At last Rae Jai Chand himself appeared in the battlefield near Chandwār or Chandanwah on the Jumna river (a place now in the Etawah District); but in the thick of the fight a fatal arrow pierced his eye-ball and he instantly fell down from his elephant. The Rajput forces were scattered, and no one knew of the Rae’s death till his body was found among the dead, and identified owing to gold-bands, by which on account of old age, his weak teeth had been tied. His head was cut off and carried on the point of a spear. Having obtained an immense booty including three hundred elephants, the royal army marched towards and took possession of the fort of Asnī (ruined fort near Jaunpur), where his treasures were deposited. The victorious army took possession of precious spoils of all kinds including a hundred elephants, and then pushed on to Benares, the second capital of Gahadavala. There a thousand temples were destroyed and mosques were raised instead. Thus, the whole territory up to the border of Bengal was brought under subjection and its government was entrusted to one of the most trusted officials. Sultan Shihab-ud-din, after completing his victory, returned to Ghaznī.

Quṭb-ud-din marched towards Koil, and there installed

---

1 Taβagāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 140.
2 MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma‘āthīr, p. 290.
3 Ibid., p. 304.
4 Firīżtāh, p. 61. Professor Vaidya (Vol. III, p. 343) disagrees with the above statement and holds that Jaichand drowned himself into the river, and further adds, he came to the throne in 1169 A.D. when young and died in 1193 A.D. (1194 A.D.) after 25 years’ reign.
5 MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma‘āthīr, p. 317. It is not Asī as Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 43 has. It is in fact Asnī, the ruined fort near Jaunpur.
6 MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma‘āthīr, p. 317.
7 Tārīkh-i-Fakhr-u’d-dīn Mubārah Shāh, p. 23.
8 MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma‘āthīr, p. 318.
9 Ibid., p. 323.
Malik Ḥisām-u'd-dīn Aghulbak, who carried on his depredations into the neighbouring parts of the territory and destroyed a turbulent but very powerful tribe in the vicinity. Shortly afterwards, Quṭb-u'd-dīn received the intelligence in the year 1194 A.D. that Harī Raja had marched on Ajmer from the hills of Alwar, defeated Kolah, son of Rae Pithora and driven him away from Ajmer to Ranthambhor. He had, however, despatched his army under the command of his lieutenant Jhet Rae to Delhi, and the latter began ravaging and plundering in the neighbourhood of the city. Quṭb-u'd-dīn made a firm resolve to face the situation, and having selected a force of 2,000 horse marched to encounter him. Jhet Rae, hearing his arrival and finding himself too weak to oppose him, fled to Ajmer. Quṭb-u'd-dīn refused to relax the pursuit and followed him there. Harī Raja had no other alternative but to draw up his forces outside the city of Ajmer. However, a fierce battle ensued, the city fell and Harī Raja, perforce, retired within the walls and there ascending the funeral pyre perished. Ajmer, the most celebrated fort of India, once more, fell into the hands of Musalmans in 1194 A.D.

The text of the Tāj-u'l-Ma'āthīr, p. 327 has Ṣefībek while Firīgītah, p. 61 has 'Aghbek' and Raverty converts it into Aghulbek. It is possible that the first littera has been omitted by mistake by the copyist.

His right-hand man, Jethav or Jhet Rae of Firīgītah, p. 61 'hastened to Delhi.' Jhet Rae is not Harī Raja as Vaidya, p. 341 says, but his lieutenant. It is also wrong to think that Jhet Rae is Jitwān, for the latter was killed in battle long before in 1192 A.D.
governor in charge of Ajmer and himself returned to Delhi.

The mosque at Ajmer seems to have been commenced in the year 1200, and completed during the reign of Iltutmish. Traditionally it was finished in two days and a half; hence it is known as the Arhāī din kā Jhoprā. The pillars, if they were taken down by Musalmans, have certainly been re-erected exactly as they were originally designed to stand. It is only the west side, with its nine domes, that is now standing, and the cloisters on the other three sides are in ruins. "What remains, however, is sufficient to show that it must originally have been a singularly elegant specimen of its class." The glory of this mosque is the screen of seven arches with which Iltutmish adorned the courtyard. The central arch is 22 ft. 3 in. wide; the two on either side 13 ft. 6 in., and the outer one at each end 10 ft. 4 in. In the centre the screen rises to a height of 56 ft. and on it are the ruins of two small minārets 10½ ft. in diameter. "It is neither, however, its dimensions nor design that makes this screen one of the most remarkable architectural objects in India, but the mode in which it is decorated. Nothing can exceed the taste with which the Cufic and Togra inscriptions are interwoven with the more purely architectural decorations .... Nothing in Cairo or in Persia is so exquisite in detail and nothing in Spain or Syria can approach them for beauty of surface-decoration."

Firishtah, at this stage, gives an account of the following event, which is neither supported by the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī nor by the Ta'āj-u'l-Ma'āthir, two of the three contemporary authorities for the period under review. "In the year 1195 A.D. Qutb-u'd-din invaded Nahrwālah; Jitwān, the commander-in-chief of Rae Bhīm Diw, who had encamped in front of Nahrwālah, fled at his approach. But when Qutb-u'd-din followed in pursuit, Jitwān turned back desperately,

2 Fergusson, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture.
3 Ibid., p. 513.
but was slain in the battle which ensued. On hearing this dreadful news, Rae Bhīm Diw fled to the remoter part of his principality. Having acquired enormous booty, Quṭb-u’d-dīn marched back to Hānsī, repaired the fort and returned to Delhi.¹

In the year 1195 A.D.² Quṭb-u’d-dīn fitted out an expedition against Thankir,³ now known as Biyānah (an ancient town in Bharatpur State), when intimation reached that Sūltān Shīhāb-u’d-dīn of Gūr was marching towards Hindustan.⁴ He went as far as Hānsī to receive his master, who presented him with an Arab horse and a robe of honour.⁵ They marched in concert against Thankir, which was invested and captured. Rae Kunwar Pāl⁶ of Thankir begged for the safety of his life. The Sūltān was gracious enough to pardon him, but he lost his kingdom.⁷ The fort of Thankir was assigned to Malik Bahā-u’d-dīn Tughrul,⁸ a Turkish slave of Sūltān Shīhāb-u’d-dīn of Gūr.

In the year 1195 A.D., the royal army marched against Gwalior and invested the fort, which, the author of the Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir describes as ‘a pearl in the necklace of Indian

¹ Firīshṭah, p. 62. The same event and actually the same details have been given by the Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, at a very early stage on pp. 139, 154 and 167.
² MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, p. 368 gives 1196 A.D.; while Tabaqat-i-Nāṣirī, p. 140, 1195 A.D.; and Alfi gives 1194 A.D. The correct date is 1195 A.D.
³ Tāriḥ-i-Fahār-u’d-dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 23 gives the same date, while Tabaqat-i-Nāṣirī has a wrong date 591 H. i.e., 1194 A.D. According to the A’in-i-Aḥbari Biyānah was the capital of a province. and possessed the large fort containing many ‘buildings and subterranean caverns and a very high tower,’ also a tomb of Abū Bakr Qandhāri, who successfully stormed the fort in the eleventh century.
⁴ MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, p. 368.
⁵ Firīshṭah, p. 62.
⁶ He was not ‘the commander of Bhīm’s army’ as Cambridge History of India, p. 43 says, but the Rajah of Thankir. See also Vaidya, Vol. VI. p. 299.
⁷ MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, pp. 373-374.
⁸ For his early life and career see Chapter 2.
castles.\footnote{1} Alarmed at the strength of Muslim forces, Rae Solankhpala\footnote{2} of Gwalior sued for peace, and while agreeing to pay regular tribute in future made an immediate offering of ten elephants.\footnote{3} He was, however, left unmolested and was allowed to retain the fort. Sulṭān Shihāb-u’d-din then returned to Ghaznī, and Quṭb-u’d-din proceeded towards Delhi. About this time, the Juma’ Masjid of Delhi, the foundation of which was laid by Quṭb-u’d-din in the year 1193 A.D. was completed.\footnote{4}

At the close of the year 1196 A.D.,\footnote{5} when Quṭb-u’d-din was at Ajmer, information was brought to him that a party of seditious Mehrs\footnote{6} were in a state of open revolt. In fact, all the Rajput princes had combined together with the Rae of Nahrwālah in an attempt to wrest Ajmer from the Musalmans.\footnote{7} They despatched emissaries to Govinda-rāja, the Rae of Nahrwālah, asking him to join them against the Musalmans, who were few in number.\footnote{8} On becoming aware of their intention, Quṭb-u’d-din made a resolve to face them; and although it was the height of the hot season, early one morning he fell upon the rebels,


\footnote{3} MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, pp. 382, 383.

\footnote{4} Firīghtah, p. 62.

\footnote{5} Ţabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 140. gives 1196 A.D. The copy of the MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, p. 396 has 1194 A.D. which cannot be correct on account of the date, which it subsequently gives i.e., 1196 on p. 140. A wrong date is given by Firīghtah, as 592 H. i.e., 1195 A.D. The correct date given by all the contemporary authorities including Tāriḵh-i-Fakhr-u’d-din Mubārak Shāh, p. 23 is 593 H. i.e., 1196 A.D.

\footnote{6} The text of the Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, p. 396 has Bhatttrans. Firīghtah, p. 62 calls them راهبان نتران Natrān Rajahs. Major Raverty p. 520 and Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 44 turn them into Mers or Mairs. It may perhaps be Bhattach, originally Bhattī Rajputs, who held the fort of Bhatner, which was captured by Maḥmūd of Ghaznī about 1004 A.D.

\footnote{7} Firīghtah, p. 62.

and kept up a conflict with them the whole day.\(^1\) Next day, the army of Nahrwâlah appeared upon the scene and a tough fight ensued. Instantly some of the valiant generals were slain and Quṭb-u'd-dîn's horse was fatally wounded, which brought him down to the ground. The unexpected reverse greatly disheartened his troops, who, with great difficulty, managed to mount him on another horse and carried him off to Ajmer.\(^2\) Emboldened by the success, the rebel Hindus, along with the troops of Nahrwâlah, pursued Quṭb-u'd-dîn and his forces up to Ajmer, took up their position at a short distance from it, and for several months they shut up Quṭb-u'd-dîn within the walls and carried on hostilities.\(^3\) A confidential messenger was sent to Ghaznîn to explain the situation. When Sultân Shihâb-u'd-dîn of Ghûr heard of it, he immediately despatched a strong force under the command of several Amîrs—Jahân Pahlâwân, Asad-u'd-dîn, Arsalân Qalî,\(^5\) Naṣîr-u'd-dîn Husain, 'Izz-u'd-dîn, son of Muwaiyid-dîn Balkh, and Shârîf-u'd-dîn Muḥammad Jarrah.\(^6\) But before the reinforcement arrived at Ajmer, the Hindu forces made a retreat. Finding himself thus strengthened, Quṭb-u'd-dîn resolved upon taking vengeance on the Rae of Gujarât; and in the beginning of January 1196 A.D.,\(^7\) he began his march towards Nahrwâlah.\(^8\) When he reached the forts of Pati and Nadul,\(^9\) he found them abandoned and

---

1 MSS. Tâj-u'l-Ma'âthîr, pp. 400 to 402.
2 Ibid. p. 407.
3 Firîštâh, p. 62.
4 Firîštâh, p. 62 adds to this list the name of IFAIL KÂN.
5 Most probably KIFALJ as Firîštâh. p. 62 states.
6 Elliot, II, p. 229 has “Jarrah”, which seems quite correct, as against ‘Jark’ of the Tâj-u'l-Ma'âthîr.
7 Târîkhu-Fahhr-u'd-dîn Mubârak Shâh, p. 23 has 593 H. i.e., 1196 A.D.
8 MSS. Tâj-u'l-Ma'âthîr, p. 411.
9 Firîštâh. p. 62 has هنالک بزرگ. The Tâj-u'l-Ma'âthîr has TAKT and Nadol and Major Raverty on p. 520 turns them into PÂlâ and Nadol. Vaidya, Vol. III, p. 301 and Ray, Vol. II, p. 1121. Nadol was the former capital of the Chauhân Rajputs, now a village in Desûrî district of the Jodhpur State. Parîî fort is situated about 6 miles west of Satârâ town, Bombay, and was built by one of the kings of Delhi in the thirteenth century. There is also an old Pattî fort situated in the Kastîr tahsil of...
vacated. The enemy, under their leaders Rai Karan and Dharavarsha, had taken up their position at the foot of the Mount Ābu, where the Muslim army did not dare to attack them, as it was deemed inauspicious to commence fighting on the same spot, where Sultān Shihāb-u'd-dīn had been previously wounded. Noticing their hesitation, and misunderstanding it as cowardice on the part of the Muslim army to withhold from fighting, the enemy abandoned the pass and advanced to encounter it in the open field.

The Muslim army faced the enemy for some time, until on February 3, 1196 A.D., a severe battle ensued from dawn to midday, and ended in the complete overthrow of the Hindus. Rae Bhīm Diw, however, managed to effect his escape. Nearly fifty thousand captives were put to the sword, and more than twenty thousand slaves, twenty elephants, cattle and arms fell into the hands of the Muslim army. Nahrwālāh (Gujarat) was surely shaken but was not subjugated till a century later. Quṭb-u'd-dīn plundered

Lahore district, Punjab. Palī is an old fort in the district of Jodhpur. Ojah expresses the opinion that the conflict at Nadol was not with the Turuskas, but with the Jāvalipura Cahamana Udayasinha—History of Rajputana, Vol. II. pp. 461-62.


8 Ibid, rightly says "the fort of Ābūgarh in the territory of Sirahi" Rajputana.

8 MSS. Tāj-u'lı-Ma'āthir, p. 413.

4 Firīghtah, p. 62 says that "Quṭb-u'd-dīn entered these defiles and scattered the Rajput ranks."

5 MSS. Tāj-u'lı-Ma'āthir, p. 422.

6 Ibid., has گدین راز کریں، "Rae Gardān—Rae Dah-wila"—rather obscure. Tabaqat-i-Nāṣiri, p. 140 has 'Rae Bhīm Diw', which is quite correct. Bhimia II according to Dr. Ray, Dynastic History of Northern India, Vol. II, p. 1122.

7 MSS. Tāj-u'lı-Ma'āthir, p. 424.

8 Both Khyūru and Diyā Barani in connection with the conquests of 'Alī-u'd-dīn Khaljī, describe Gujarāt as "an un ravished bride, which no Muslim hand had touched." Ram Chandra (1271-1309) was the last of the independent Hindu sovereigns of the Dekkan. The Musal-
the capital and the neighbouring country and then returned to Delhi by way of Ajmer; and offerings of precious jewels and handsome male and female captives and "thirty-two elephants" were despatched to Ghaznī. Quṭb-u'd-dīn was overjoyed on his brilliant success; he showered many favours upon his Malikṣ and Amīrs and increased their ranks.²

It is surprising to note that neither the Tāj-u'l-Ma'āthir nor the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī mentions any more operations until the year 1202 A.D.—a period of about six years. But the Tārikh-i-Fakhr-u'd-dīn Mubārak Shāh, another contemporary authority, fills up the gap as follows: In (594 H.) 1197 A.D., Quṭb-u'd-dīn conquered Bādān, probably from Lakshmanapala³ and destroyed the idol temple of Benares. In (595 H.) 1198 A.D., he subdued Qannauj and took the province of Siruhī. In (596 H.) 1199 A.D. Mālwah and its neighbouring territories were subjugated. In (597 H.) 1200 A.D. Gwalior was finally conquered and next year in 1201 Quṭb-u'd-dīn started to pay his homage to Sulṭān Shihāb-u'd-dīn.⁴ but was instructed to return to Hindustan.

In the year 1202 A.D., Quṭb-u'd-dīn and Shams-u'd-dīnILTUTMISH girded up their loins, and undertook an expedition against Kālinjar,⁵ an ancient fort of Bundelkhand.

³ Tārikh-i-Fakhr-u'd-dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 23.
⁴ MSS. Tāj-u'l-Ma'āthir, p. 429.
⁵ He belonged to a branch of the Rashtra Kutas, which ruled in Badasun-Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I, p. 64. Also Vaidya,—History of Medieval Hindu India, Vol. III, p. 300.
⁶ Tārikh-i-Fakhr-u'd-dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 23.
The Rae of Kālinjar of the Paramalah race named Paramardideva gathered together a large army and offered a desperate resistance in the battlefield; but in the twinkling of an eye, he fled back to the fort to take refuge. Quṭb-u’d-dīn then laid siege to the fort; but shortly after the Rae agreed to submit to him, and promised to make a regular payment of tribute and an offer of elephants. 'While engaged in collecting the tributes,' the Rae died all of a sudden before fulfilling his obligation. His Mehta or Diwān by name Ajapala relying upon an ever-flowing spring, that arose above the fort, determined to resist the Musalmans; but it so happened that the spring dried up within a few days. On April 4, 1203 A.D., the garrison was compelled to call for quarter; they came out of the fort and surrendered it to Quṭb-u’d-dīn's officers. As a result of this victory, fifty thousand slaves, elephants, cattle and countless arms fell into the hands of the Muslim army. The idol temples were demolished and converted into mosques.

After completing the conquest of Kālinjar, Quṭb-u’d-dīn marched to the city of Mahoba, the capital of the ter-
crown of the hill is a plateau. The horizontal strata of sandstone make it difficult to ascend. The existing name is rendered from the local worship of Sīwā under the title of Kālinjarā or 'He who causes time to grow old'. According to the local traditions, it was strongly fortified by Chandra Bhīm or Varmma, the legendary founder of the Chandella dynasty. Imp. Gaz., Vol. XIV, p. 311.

1. The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 47 has 'Parmal, the Chandel Rāja of Kālinjar,' but gives a wrong date i.e., 1202. 'Paramandi' according to the stone inscription at Kālinjar—Ray, Dynastic History of Northern India, Vol. II, pp. 718, 719.

5. MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthīr, p. 450 also Firīghtah, p. 62.
9. The name is derived from the great sacrifice or Mahorsava, as performed by Chandra Varmma, the traditional founder of the Chandella
ritory of Kālpī (now in Hamtrpūr district) subdued it, and conferred it on Hazabru’d-dīn Ḥasan Arī. Qutb-u’d-dīn then returned to Delhi by way of Bada’un, which he also occupied in 1203 A.D. About this time, Malik Ikhtiyār-u’d-dīn Muḥammad Bakht-yār came to offer his homage at Bada’un, and presented twenty elephants, treasure and priceless jewels to Malik Qutb-u’d-dīn, who bestowed upon him a robe of honour, and gave him a firman for the extension of Muslim frontiers to Lakhnautī and Bengāl. Qutb-u’d-dīn returned to Delhi shortly afterwards.

In the year 1204 A.D. Qutb-u’d-dīn went to Ghaznīn to pay his homage to his master at Barshūr, and was received with great honour and then returned to Delhi. Sultan Shihāb-u’d-dīn’s defeat at Andkhūd in the year 1204 A.D. was responsible for a general revolt in his dominions. Yildiz, the governor of Ghaznīn adopted an independent attitude. Aibak-bak, one of the most confidential servants of the Sultan and an officer of high rank in the army, fled from the battlefield and hurried to Multān. He interviewed Amir Dād Ḥasan, the ruler of the place, and deceitfully told him that he had come for the purpose of imparting a royal command in private.

dynasty. Mahoba stands on the banks of the Madansāgar-lake constructed by Madan Varmma, the fifteenth king of the dynasty. Architectural antiquities abound in the neighbourhood: the fort is now almost entirely in ruins but commands a beautiful view over the hills and lakes.

1 Firīghtah, p. 63, Kālpī is still a tahsil of the Jalaun district, U.P.
2 MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, p. 460.
3 According to the local traditions Bada’un owes its origin to one Buddha, an Ahar prince, the founder of the city in the tenth century. At the time of Muslim conquest, it was held by the Rāthor Lakhanasapala, eleventh successor of Chandra, the founder of the dynasty. Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I, p. 63.
4 MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, pp. 461, 462.
5 See Muḥammad Bakht-yār’s account in Chap. II.
6 MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, p. 467 gives a wrong date 609 H. i.e., 1203.
7 Andkhūd in modern maps.
8 The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 42 has 1193, which is quite incorrect. Tāriḵ-i-Faḵhr-u’d-dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 25 has 601 H. i.e., 1204 A.D.
9 MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthir, p. 468.
The ruler consented to retire into his chamber, where Aibak-bak easily got an opportunity to kill him.\(^1\) He thus occupied the fort of Mulțan and spread the news that the governor had been imprisoned by the royal command, but the truth could not remain concealed for a long time. The tribe of Gakkhars,\(^2\) under their leaders Bakan and Sarks, considering that such things would never have happened had the Sulțân been alive, rose in open revolt, and caused much sedition and turbulence between the rivers Sodra and Jhelum.\(^3\) When their ravages exceeded all bounds, Bahā-u’d-dīn Muḥammad, governor of Sagwān,\(^4\) (or Sahwān) on the river Indus, along with his brothers and chiefs marched against the rebels and captured most of them and put them to death.\(^5\) Another general Sulaiyımān had to retire before the onslaught of the rebels. At length, the news were conveyed to Sulțân Shihāb-u’d-dīn, who despatched his confidential servant, the Amīr-i-Hājīb (Lord Chamberlain), Sirāj-u’d-dīn Abū Bakr to inform Malik Quṭb-u’d-dīn of his intention to annihilate the Gakkhars.\(^6\) Sulțân Shihāb-u’d-dīn marched into Hindustan in 1205 A.D.\(^7\) Accordingly Quṭb-u’d-dīn marched from Delhi the same year\(^8\) and joined the royal camp on the bank of the river Jhelum. Shams-u’d-dīn ʿĪtutmish also accompanied

---

\(^1\) MSS. Tāj-u’l-Maʿāthīr, p. 470.
\(^2\) Tārīkh-i-Fāḥīr-u’d-dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 26. The Janguas (pure Rajputs) and Jāts (their degenerate descendants) along with other tribes holding the Salt Range and northern plateau respectively were, perhaps the earliest inhabitants. The Gakkhrs seem to form an early wave of conquest from the west, and they still live in the east of the district. They were the dominant race at the period of Muslim conquest, and had long succeeded in retaining their independence both in the Jhelum and the neighbouring district of Rawalpindi. Imp. Gaz., Vol. XIV, p. 152.
\(^3\) MSS. Tāj-u’l-Maʿāthīr, pp. 472, 473.
\(^4\) It is probably Sahwān situated on the river Indus near Manchhār Lake.
\(^5\) MSS. Tāj u’l-Maʿāthīr, p. 474.
\(^6\) Ibid. pp. 476, 477.
\(^7\) Tārīkh-i-Fāḥīr-u’d-dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 27, and Futūh-u’s-Salāṭīn, p. 97.

جو تاریخ در ششصد و یکم رسید زغونی دگر به شکر کشید
\(^8\) Tabaqūt-i-Nāṣīrī p. 140.
him with the troops of Badāʾun. As a result of the war, which ensued, the Gakkhrs were completely routed and more than 200,000 infidels were put to the sword; and much booty fell into the hands of victors. Shortly afterwards, the fortress of Jūd was captured. Quṭb-u'd-dīn, accompanied the Sultān up to Lahore and then asked permission to return to Delhi. The Sultān conferred upon Quṭb-u'd-dīn the title of Malik and made him heir-apparent of Hindustan.

On his way back to Ghaznīn on February 25, 1206 Sultān Shihāb-u'd-dīn pitched his camp within the borders of a place called Daniya, a little to the west of the Jhelum river. While the Sultān was engaged in the evening prayer, an Ismā'īlī heretic attacked him, and inflicted five or six desperate wounds upon him. The Sultān died instantly on March 15, 1206, and his dead body was carried to Ghaznīn.

After the assassination of Sultān Shihāb-u'd-dīn, the situation was vague and confused. His nephew Sultān Maḥmūd was passed over in favour of Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn's son-in-law, Diyā-u'd-dīn. So Maḥmūd would not have a right

1 Ţabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 169 and MSS. Tāj-u'l-MA'ĀTHIR, p. 493.
2 Tārīkh Fakhr-u'd-dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 28.
3 MSS. Tāj-u'l-Ma'āthīr, p. 497.
4 The Gakkhrs occupied the Jhelum and the neighbouring district of Rawalpindi and as such the hill and fortress of Jūd lay somewhere roundabout Rawalpindi, which is enclosed by a long range of hills from all sides. The exact hill and fortress are not traceable.
5 MSS. Tāj-u'l-Ma'āthīr, p. 499.
6 Tārīkh Fakhr-u'd-dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 28.
7 MSS. Tāj-u'l-Ma'āthīr, has Dhāmik: it is Daniya, a little to the west of the river Jhelum. Futūḥ-u's-Salāṭīn, p. 97 has Dāmyak.
8 یکی از یکی ملکحله بیدریغ یوز رفسی شما گی بار تیغی
Futūḥ-u's-Salāṭīn, p. 97.
9 MSS. Tāj-u'l-Ma'āthīr, pp. 513, 516 and 520. Tārīkh-i-Fakhr-u'd-dīn Mubārak Shāh does not give any account as to how the Sultān was murdered.

شستصد و دو سال Bahon afzous گشت. که از دار فلئی سفر پاژ گشت
Futūḥ-u's-Salāṭīn, p. 98.
to Shihāb-u'd-dīn's inheritance. As the slaves were the real partners as well as inheritors of his empire, Maḥmūd bestowed the title of Sultān on Qūṭb-u'd-dīn, sent him a canopy of state and other insignia of royalty along with a letter of manumission.¹ Qūṭb-u'd-dīn proceeded to Lahore to receive the royal gifts, and there ascended the throne on 17th March, 1206 A.D.² Sultān Qūṭb-u'd-dīn Aibak returned to Delhi shortly after the ceremony was over.

Ṭāj-u'd-dīn Yildiz now entertained the idea of conquering the Punjab and marched from Ghaznīn to Lahore; drove out the governor, and took possession of the city. Soon after, hostilities arose between him and Sultān Qūṭb-u'd-dīn Aibak, who advanced towards Lahore from Delhi. In the year 1206 A.D.,³ Yildiz was defeated in the battle and he fled to Kuhistān.⁴ Sultān Qūṭb-u'd-dīn proceeded to Ghaznīn, ascended the throne and then gave himself up to pleasure and amusements⁵ for a period of forty days.⁶ The people of Ghaznīn availed of this opportunity by inviting Sultān Tāj-u'd-dīn Yildiz, who appeared in the neighbourhood of the city. Sultān Qūṭb-u'd-dīn was so terrified by his approach that he fled by way of Sang-i-Surkh to Hindustan,⁷ and since then fixed up his residence at Lahore, and made it the capital of Hindustan.⁸

The whole of the country of Hindustan from Peshāwar to the shores of the Ocean, and in other direction from Siwistān to the borders of the hills of Tibbet, came under his domination.⁹ He caused his name to be read in the

---
² Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 140. Ṭabarqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 140. Ṭārīkh-i-Fakhr-i-U'd-dīn Mubārak Shāhī, p. 31.
⁴ 报业 39, Sāy-9, rūf 39, Kāin. 9, Shād, Hūr, Dār, 9, Ḥusn, Shāhīn, Shāhīn, 9, 39, 39, 39, 39.
⁵ Fiṣīḥ-u's-Salāṭīn, p. 100.
⁶ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 135.
⁷ Ṭārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 15 says 'four days'.
⁸ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 136.
⁹ MSS. Ṭāj-u'l-Maʿthārī, p. 532.
ⁱ Ḏab., pp. 530-31.
Khutbah\(^1\) and to be inscribed on the coin.\(^2\) Unfortunately he could not long enjoy the fruits of his labours and one day, while playing Chaugān\(^3\), he fell down from his horse and the raised pommel of the saddle pierced into his ribs. He died instantly and was buried at Lahore\(^4\) on November 4, 1210 A.D.

**Estimate**

Sūltān Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak is the first Muslim sovereign, who ascended the throne of Delhi and laid the foundation of Muslim rule in India. A typical product of his time, Aibak stands as a prominent figure among his contemporaries, who rose, through sheer dint of merit and strenuous efforts, to positions of power and glory. He lacked in outward comeliness,\(^5\) but was beneficent, liberal and unrivalled in bravery and enterprise.\(^6\) A cautious general, born with

---

   Ibn Baṭṭūtah in his list of the Muslim sovereigns of Delhi does not mention the name of Quṭb-u’d-dīn, for the latter ascended the throne at Lahore and not at Delhi.

2. MSS. Ṭāj-u’l-Ma’āthīr, p. 531.

3. Thomas (Chronicles of Pathan Kings, pp. 37-39) says that Aibak’s fellow-Sipāhsālār Baḵt-yūr seems to have uttered no coin; Yıldız abstained from an independent issue; the assertions of contemporary chroniclers, therefore, came only in the conventional association of the right to coin. Further the change of capital may have had to do with the non-appearance of money.

4. Though we are told that Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak did coin money in his own name, none but a few little copper pieces of the rayed circle type, which most probably were issued from Kurāmān, have come to light"—The Sultāns of Delhi.—Their Coinage and Metrology, p. 69.

5. On the four copper coins Ref. R. (Lahote) pp. 5801. 2. 3. 4, the obverse has a standing bull to left and reverse ɑ in rayed circle (Ibid. pp. 14, 15).

6. A description of Chaugān is given elsewhere in the reign of I ṣīz-u’d-dīn Kāsīqūbād.

7. MSS. Ṭāj-u’l-Ma’āthīr, pp. 532, 543 and 544.


indomitable resolution, he was an example of how to live and labour. He was not a man to shrink from an adventure of any kind; the wilder and more daring it seemed, the better he liked it; and without a moment’s hesitation or self-distrust he led many a triumphant though laborious campaign. He accomplished through severity and beneficence—his two great weapons—what others achieved by tact and diplomacy. The terror of his punishment and the hope of his bounty brought his deadliest enemies to his side and largely contributed to the establishment of a strong and stable government.

No fainéant slave of his great Lord, Quṭb-u’d-dīn was held in the highest esteem by Sultān Shihāb-u’d-dīn of Ghūr. The Tārīkh-i-Fakhr-u’d-dīn Mubārak Shāh repeats about the Sultān that “no other sovereign ever had such a slave (like Quṭb-u’d-dīn), nor has anybody seen the like.” His rivals envied his position and his liberality had won him the name of Lakh Bakhsh. He had, however, neither the purity of character nor the semblance of piety. Like many a great warrior, he was a patron of letters, had a cultured court and a society of educated men. He had received a good education, knew how to command an army and to lead expeditions. It would be a mistake, however, to measure Quṭb-u’d-dīn by his luxury and revels. He was a justice-loving monarch, a good administrator and an illustrious conqueror. The most remarkable feature of his career is the loyalty of the man to his master. The defeat of Ghūr at Andkhud was re-

2 Tārīkh-i-Fakhr-u’d-dīn, Mubārak Shāh, p. 21.
3 Ibid. p. 51.
4 Tabaqat-i-Nāṣirī, p. 135.
5 Fakhru’d-dīn Mubārak Shāh, the author of Tārīkh-i-Fakhr-u’d-dīn Mubārak Shāh and the Sultān’s own slave Ḥiṣām-u’d-dīn Aḥmad ‘Alī Shāh, a great general of royal forces, were his courtiers. Tārīkh-i-Fakhru’d-dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 25.
sponsible for a general anarchy in the state; everywhere the tribes and governors\(^1\) rose in open revolt, but Aibak remained loyal to his master. The reason is obvious: Sultan Shihab-u'd-din of Ghur had no son to succeed to his vast empire, and his slaves were the natural heir to the dominion of Hindustan.

Sultan Qutb-u'd-din Aibak is a great conqueror of the Early Turkish Empire. A stirring and successful outset with Qutb-u'd-din and the strengthening and consolidation of the Empire by his successors are no more legendary than is the history of the thirteenth century. Full of the example of his own master, Aibak was never content with his conquests. During a period of 20 years he expanded his sway over Mtrat, Delhi, Koir, Ranthambhor, Benares, Ajmer, Thankir (Biyānah), Nahrwālah, Badā'un, Qannauj, Mālwā, Gwalior, Kālinjar, Budor and Mahoba, which covered practically the whole of Northern India. No Muslim army had ever before pushed so far east as the forces of Bakht-yār, who subdued Bengal in his time. Qutb-u'd-din could not long enjoy in comparative peace the fruits of his victories, and died before he could accomplish any larger scheme.

The gallant example of Sultan Shihab-u'd-din of Ghur bred heroic followers. Qutb-u'd-din Aibak not only inherited the Empire of Hindustan from his master, but also the latter's chief characteristics. A great warrior, a man of infinite courage and indefatigable energy of mind and body, Aibak was no constructive or far-seeing statesman. He accomplished through daring adventures and sustained and persevering efforts, what others gained by genius and diplomacy. He, however, kept allied the different dynasties by means of politic marriages, kept in tact the Empire of Hindustan by encouragement and support for his colleagues, patronage of his subordinates and suppression of his rivals. He married the daughter of Yildiz, the Sultan of Ghaznin, and gave his two daughters\(^2\) in succession to Sultan Nāṣir-

\(^1\) MSS. Taj-u'l-Ma'athir, pp. 472-474.
\(^2\) Țabaqat-i-Nāṣirī, see pp. 136, 142.
u’d-dīn Qabāchah. He gave all possible encouragement
to Muḥammad Bakht-yār Khaljī in the extension of Muslim
domination in Bengal, and granted him a robe of honour
and a canopy of state;¹ but he could not tolerate the
growing power of his rivals and, consequently, he did not
surrender the fort of Gwalior to Malik Bahā-u’d-dīn
Tughrul,² although it was promised to him by his master,
Sultan Shihāb-u’d-dīn of Ghūr. However, it goes to the
credit of his successor Sultan Shams-u’d-dīn Īltutmish to
free the country from rivals like Tāj-u’d-dīn Yildiz, Nassir-
u’d-dīn Qabāchah and Sultan Ghiyāth-u’d-dīn ‘Iwāḍ of
Lakhnauti.

Sultan Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak was a soldier of fortune,
an architect of empire and the founder of Muslim rule in
India. Before him no conqueror dreamt of occupying
Hindustan, and even the most decisive victories in the
battle-field never implied the subjugation of the country.
Quṭb-u’d-dīn aimed at a permanent conquest, and overran
the whole of Northern India from the Indus to the Ganges
and from the Himalayas down to the Vindya range. His
conquests in Hindustan were wider, real and far more
permanent than any of his predecessors. The dynasty of
Ghūr relapsed into the insignificance of a small kingdom,
but the empire founded by Quṭb-u’d-dīn was not lost to
Islam. Muḥammad Bakht-yār added the land of Bengal to
the long catalogue of kingdoms subdued by Quṭb-u’d-dīn
Aibak. Since then up to the Indian Mutiny, the throne
of Delhi was invariably occupied by a Muslim king. Quṭb-
u’d-dīn cut off India from foreign suzerainty, and estab-
lished an independent empire free from any outside
control. He was recognised as Sultan of Delhi by Maḥmūd,
the successor of his master Sultan Shihāb-u’d-dīn, and his
position was strengthened by virtue of his conquests and
his capacity to enforce obedience from the subjects.
He ruled not from an outside capital but in India itself.

¹ See Muḥammad Bakht-yār’s history in Chap. II.
² Vidē Bahā-u’d-dīn’s account in Chap. II.
He was the first to be prayed for from the pulpits and commemorated on the coinage. It is, however, unfortunate for him that he could not long survive to reap the fruits of his labours, but succeeded in leaving a centralised and powerful Muslim state in India; and the standard of Islam remained for centuries in the land where he had planted it.
CHAPTER IV

SULTĀN SHAMS-U'D-DĪN ĪLTUTMISH

Sultān Ārām Shāh

On the sudden death of Sultān Qutb-u'd-dīn Aibak at Lahore, the Amirs and Malikṣ elevated Ārām Shāh to the throne of Delhi. The new Sultān was neither son¹ nor brother to Sultān Qutb-u'd-dīn Aibak who, as Qādī Minḥāj-Sirāj says, had only three daughters, two of whom were married in succession to Sultān Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Qubāchah and the third to Shams-u'd-dīn Īltutmish.² Sultān Ārām Shāh, therefore, might have been a Turkish Malik, whom his colleagues and friends raised to the throne with a view to retain peace, tranquillity, order and government, as also on account of the fact that the probable heir Shams-u'd-dīn Īltutmish was not available on the spot and the throne could not remain vacant so long as he took to return to Delhi. In fact there were no hard and fast rules governing the devolution of the crown. In spite of the fact that monarchy

¹ The heading of the chapter on Ārām Shāh in Ţabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 141, has - أرام شاه بن سلطان طمب الدين - but further the text itself says that Sultān Qutb-u'd-dīn had only three daughters. Lubb-u't Twāriḵk, p. 9, says that he was Qutb-u'd-dīn's son. Ţabaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 55—than whom he had no other son'. Tārīḵ-i-Ghūrī, p. 13 'the eldest son of Qutb-u'd-dīn.' MSS. Intikhab-u'l-Muntakhib, p. 170 'after his father's death ascended the throne.' Khulāṣat-u't-Twāriḵh, p. 189 and MSS. Chahār-Gulshan rightly assert the so-called son of Qutb-u'd-dīn. Abu'l Faḍal makes the astonishing remark that he was Qutb-u'd-dīn's brother. Tārīḵ-i-Mubārak Shāhi, p. 16 also calls him son. Tārīḵ-i-Jahān Kushtā, Vol. II, p. 61, gives the most, appropriate expression that 'Qutb-u'd-dīn had no son, but a slave known as 'Īltutmish' and he became heir-apparent to the throne. Cambridge History of India, p. 51, incorrectly asserts—'sometimes described as Aibak's adopted son, but usually believed to have been a son of his body.' Ārām Shāh was, in fact, no relation of Qutb-u'd-dīn. No coins of this sovereign are known or found—see H. N. Wright: The Sultāns of Delhi—Their Coins and Metrology, p. 69.

² Ţabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 141.
has had a long and varied existence in the Muslim state, to the Shari'at, however, it has always remained a non-legal institution. As there was no place for Sultanate in the Islamic political theory, there was consequently no provision for the devolution of the crown. The result was an interminable wars of succession, and an appeal to arms was the only possible remedy to solve the riddle. Sultan Quṭb-u'd-dīn had no son to succeed him. However, a son was presented to be an heir; but the final choice lay with the Malik and Amīrs. They could choose from among the relations of the ex-king or select a new man altogether. Aṛām was selected for his weakness to play the part of a mere puppet. Election by the officers meant that they exacted favours as pre-condition of their support.

On receiving the intelligence of Aṛām Shāh's succession to the throne of Delhi, Sultan Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Qabāchah proceeded to Uch1 (meaning high place, situated 38 miles south-east of Bahāwalpur State, Rajputana) and Multān2 and captured Bhakkar and Shewān. The Khalji rulers revolted in Bengal and some independent Rajas on the frontier also rose in hostility.3

In the meantime, Amir 'Ali-i-Ismā'īl,4 the Sipāh Sālār (Commander of Forces) and Amir-i-Dād (Chief Judge) in concert with other chiefs and officials despatched an invitation to Malik Shams-u'd-dīn Īltutmīsh at Badā'īn to hasten to Delhi and to assume sovereignty. In fact, Quṭb-u'd-dīn had called Īltutmīsh his son, and had conferred upon him the fief of Badā'īn, thus signifying his wish to make him his heir-apparent. Īltutmīsh5 accepted the proposal. He came with

1 After its capture by Shihāb-u'd-dīn of Ghūr, Uch became the chief city of Upper Sind under Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Qabāchah, and was burnt by Jalāl-u'd-dīn Khwāzm Shāh in 1223 A.D. It was, afterwards, taken by Īltutmīsh. Uch was a great centre of Muslim learning at the time.
2 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 141.
3 Firighah, p. 64.
4 Ibid. has أصبر داد وعليمي Badā'īnī, p. 61 says "Īltutmīsh came from Hardwār and Badā'īn to Delhi."—Where Hardwār where Badā'īn !
5 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 141.
all his forces, captured the city and fort of Delhi and subjugated the whole country around. Thereupon, Sultan Ārām Shāh summoned the Quṭbī Amīrs and Malik to his assistance and gathered a strong force from Amroha and other parts of the dominion. Having taken possession of the capital, Īltutmīsh rushed towards the bank of the river Jumna. The rival forces encountered each other, and after a feeble resistance on the part of Ārām Shāh’s troops, his army was put to the rout and ‘its leaders Aqsanqar and Farrukh Shāh were slain.’ The contemporary historian says, “the decree of destiny reached Ārām Shāh,” but in all probability he was put to death by his rival. Thus ended the short-lived career of Ārām Shāh, which is said to have been terminated within a year.

Īltutmīsh had long before obtained the government of Badā’un, which he now exchanged in 1210 A.D. for the throne of Delhi. Under his successors Badā’un ranked as a place of great importance; and in 1236 its governor Rukn-u’d-dīn became another emperor of India. The Jumā’ Masjid Shamsī built by Rukn-u’d-dīn still adorns the city. Sultan Shams-u’d-dīn Īltutmīsh built the Shamsī Īdgāh during his governorship at Badā’un. It is a massive brick wall 300 feet in length with ornamental lines at the top. The inscription on the mehhrāb has been plastered over and only a few letters are visible.

The Jāmi’ Masjid of Badā’un is one of the largest Muslim buildings in India. The superstructure of the old masjid is entirely of brick, but the central dome contains many blocks of kankar; the outer face of the entrance

---

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 141.
2 Firīghtah, p. 65.
3 Ārām Shāh Rā Qustāli Aḥlāl Dr. Rāsidī Ārām Shāh Rā Qustāli Aḥlāl Dr. Rāsidī Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 141.
5 Imperial Gazetteer, Vol. IX., p. 35.
6 The Monumental Antiquities and Inscriptions in the N. W. Provinces and Oudh by Dr. A. Fuhrer, p. 20.
gateway is built of sandstone. The outer opening, in an inscription of two lines, gives the date of the building in 1223 during the reign of Ilutmish.\(^1\) To the same period belong the dargāh of Miranjī with an Arabic inscription of Ilutmish, the masjid of Alḥam Khāndān, built by Rukn-ud-dīn; the house of Bundiwālā in Mohalla Sorah with an Arabic inscription of Ilutmish; the dargāh of Sultānī with an inscription of Nasīr-ud-dīn Mahmūd (A.H. 620 = 1229 A.D.), the tomb of Alham Shahīd with an Arabic inscription of Ilutmish, and the masjid of Dādā Ḥamīd built by Nasīr-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh in A.H. 648 = 1250 A.D.\(^2\)

Hindustan now became subdivided into four parts—the territory of Sind, comprising Sind, Multān and Siwastān, was occupied by Sultān Nasīr-ud-dīn Qābāchah; the dominion of Delhi belonged to Sultān Shams-ud-dīn Ilutmīsh; the territory of Lakhnawī was appropriated by the Khaljī Maliks and Sultāns, and the state of Lahore was to be seized upon sometimes by Qābāchah and sometimes by Ilutmīsh until the defeat and extinction of the former at the hands of the latter in the year 1227 A.D.\(^3\)

**Character of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn Ilutmīsh.**

The next sovereign,\(^4\) who came to the throne of Delhi was Sultān Shams-ud-dīn Ilutmīsh,\(^5\) a slave and son-in-law of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak. He was decidedly the greatest sovereign of the 'Early Turkish Empire of India,' and almost excelled all the Sultāns of Delhi in his fitness as a king and in his excellence as a man. He was, in the words of Qādī Minhāj-Sirāj, 'just, benevolent, impartial, a zealous

\(^1\) *The Monumental Antiquities and Inscriptions in the N. W. Provinces and Oudh* by Dr. A. Fuhrer, p. 20.
\(^3\) *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, pp. 141, 142.
\(^4\) Ilutmīsh is not the first Muslim sovereign as Dr. Tripāthī (*Some Aspects of Muslim Administration*, p. 24), states.
\(^5\) It is differently pronounced and written as [fartumsh - ایلتمنو], [fartumsh - ایلتمنو], [fartumsh - ایلتمنو], [fartumsh - ایلتمنو] and [fartumsh - ایلتمنو] *Firāqṭaḥ* p. 64, MSS. *Lubh-uṭ-Tawārīḥ*, p. 10; *Tabaqāt-i-Akhbār*, p. 56, *Khulāṣat-uṭ-Tawārīḥ*, p. 130 and the printed text
warrior and hero, patron of the learned, the dispenser of justice, possessor of pomp like Farîdûn, disposition like Qubâd, empire like Alexander and majesty like Bahram. He was further endowed with laudable qualities; he was handsome, intelligent, sagacious and of excellent disposition and manners. ‘Never was a sovereign so virtuous, kind-hearted and reverent towards the learned and the divines’, says the author of the Ṭabqaqī-i-Nâṣirî, ‘sat upon the throne.’ Ilutmish was very particular about saying his prayers, and went to the Jumâ’ Mosque every Friday.

of the Ṭabqaqī-i-Nâṣirî, p. 165 all have “Altamash”—MSS. Intikhâb-ul-Muntakbîh, p. 171, Ra’gat-u’s-Safâd. Vol. IV, pp. 887, 889 and Târîkh-i-Mubârak Shâhî, p. 16, all have أيلتمش. But Târîkh-i-Jahan Kuska, Vol. II, p. 61, rightly calls him Ilutmish meaning world-grasper. Badâ’uni, p. 62, says that he was called Altamash, because he was born on a night during an eclipse. There is, however, no doubt that it is Ilutmish for Minhâj-Sîrâj, the contemporary historian, has at several places written as such. In praise of Sulṭân Bahram Shâh he says:

اكبر سلطاني هنداست ارث دوده شمسي
بجدادته زرنشدان تولى التتمش الثاني

Again in praise of Sulṭân Nâṣir-u’d-dîn he says:

آن شهنشاه که حاضم بذل و رستم کوشش است
ناصر الدنيا و دین معصوم بن التتمش است

It is clear from the composition of the verses and the rules of poetry that it cannot be Altmash but Ilutmish, for the metre requires double t. Further, Delhi inscriptions read as أيلتمش. The inscription on the second storey of the Quṭb Minâr clearly bears the title of Shams-u’d-dîn as أيلتمش. On the doorway is also mentioned أيلتمش العظيم—See List of Muhammadan and Hindu Monuments, Calcutta 1919, 1922, Vol. III, p. 5. Again on the third storey is written أيلتمش السلطان (Ibid. p. 6).

“The two ‘t’s’ are given clearly in the Nâţri transliteration on the reverse of coin No. 121. . . . As regards the first syllable the numismatic evidence is strongly in favour of the long initial i”. The Sulţâns of Delhi—Their Coins and Metrology, by H. N. Wright, p. 70.

These writings, inscriptions and coins, being contemporary, are decisive evidence of Shams-u’d-dîn’s title being Ilutmish (أيلتمش).
Out of the illārī tribe of Turkistan, he was, Joseph-like, sold and delivered over to merchants, until after some time he rose to power and sovereignty by his sheer dint of merit and virtues. His sovereign power was mainly responsible for the propagation and development of Islamic faith in his time. He surpassed his master Sulṭān Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak in munificence, and was, according to the contemporary chronicle, a hundred times more benevolent. His liberality and benefactions were universally showered upon all classes of people from the highest official to the street beggar. The Sulṭān lavishly spent about ten millions yearly upon eminent doctors of religion and law, venerable Sayyids, nobles and notables. The fame of his unbounded liberality and numerous grants and, above all, the turmoil and calamities caused by the irruption of the ‘infidel’ Mongols in 'Ajam led the renowned warriors and men of letters to migrate to the capital Delhi, which came to be regarded as grand and as magnificent as that of Maḥmūd or Sanjar. A contemporary of the kings of Egypt, Īltutmīsh was regarded as an equal among the sovereigns of Egypt, Khurāsān and Khwārazm. But praises of people, who were in the Sulṭān’s pay, must be taken with many grains of salt. However, it

rare authority in the reign of Raḍiyah: “The heretics of Delhi, led by one Nūr decided to assassinate the Sulṭān. One Friday, they drew their swords and slew many people, but, as God willed, Īltutmīsh escaped.”

It is related in the Table Talk of the Khwajah Quṭb-u’d-dīn Bakht-yar Kākī, that Sulṭān Īltutmīsh was anxious to construct a tank and in consultation with the Khwajah went about to find a suitable spot. Having been overtaken by night, he went to sleep at a place, where the Ḩauḍ-i-Shamsī exists today, and dreamt that the Prophet ordered him to construct a tank at a place, where the Prophet’s horse struck its foot. He did accordingly. Ḥauḍ-i-Shamsī (Shamsī tank) is situated opposite the Jharna on the west side of the Gurūṣūn Road. The tank was built by Shams-u’d-dīn Īltutmīsh in 627 (1229-30 A.D.). It is said that it was originally lined with red sandstone, none of which now remains. Except during the rainy season, it seldom contains water. (Monuments of Delhi, Vol. III, p. 66).

1 Tabaqat-i-Naṣīrī, p. 166.
2 Ibid.
3 Diyar Barānī—Tārīkh-i-Firuz Shāhī, p. 27.
may be concluded that İltutmış is the real founder of the City and Empire of Delhi.

The Sultān was a great friend of the mystics and divines. Shaikh Bahā-u’d-dīn Dhakariyā and Khwājah Qutb-u’d-dīn Bakht-yār Kākī were his personal friends. It is related in the Siyar-u’l-Auliyā, that Khwājah Qutb-u’d-dīn once unexpectedly visited the court of the Sultān, who was wonder-struck; for, in spite of his repeated requests, the Khwājah never condescended to come to the court. The Khwājah became so popular in the city, that the people would not let him go to any other place. Once Khwājah Bakht-yār started for Ajmer with Shaikh Mu’in-u’d-dīn Sanjarī, but the citizens, being grieved, requested the Sultān to intervene for them, and Shaikh Mu’in-u’d-dīn ultimately assented to Khwājah Bakht-yār’s stay at Delhi.

Early life

Shams-u’d-dīn İltutmış belonged to the noble tribe of Ilbari in Turkistan. His father, İlham Khan was famous on account of the large number of dependants, relatives and followers, who were under his employment. İltutmış was, from his early childhood, remarkable for his beauty, intelligence and sagacity, so much so that his own brothers grew jealous of his attainments, and like Joseph of old enticed him out of the security of their parents’ home under

---

1 The grave of Khwājah Qutb-u’d-dīn Bakht-yār Kākī (635 A.H.) is almost in the centre of the Dargah of Qutb Sahib. The grave is of earth only and bears no ancient inscription (Monuments of Delhi, Vol. III, p. 42).

2 In the Dargah of Qutb Sahib, at the south-east corner of the platform there is a grave measuring 1’9” by 1’0” by 10” high. Tradition assigns it to a son of İltutmış who apparently died as a child (1210 1235 A.D.) (Monuments of Delhi, Vol. III, p. 42).

3 Siyar-u’l-Auliyā, (Urdu translation), p. 60.

4 Ibid., p. 61.

5 In variance to the contemporary authority Firīṣṭah, p. 64 and Lubb-u’t-Tuwāriḥ, p. 10 say “from Qara Khitāni Turks.”

6 The printed text of Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 166 and Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 56 have “Aylam Khan.” یل‘Ilam’ is a Turkish word meaning pain suffering, grief, anguish, etc.

7 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 166.
the pretence of going to see a herd of horses. They represented by saying, "Father, why dost thou not entrust Joseph to us, for we are his sincere friends? Send him along with us tomorrow morning, so that he may indulge in amusement and sport in the pasture, and we are responsible for his safety." When they brought him to the herd of horses, they, and according to another account, his cousins, forcibly sold him to a certain merchant, who brought him to Bukhārā and sold him to a relation of the Ṣadr-i-Jahān (the Chief Ecclesiastic) of the city. He remained in that family for some time, and received nourishment like a son. Íltutmish himself related that, on a certain occasion, a member of that illustrious family gave him a piece of money to purchase some grapes. He went to the market, but on the way lost the coin. Being of a tender age and out of fear, he began to weep. Suddenly a Durvish appeared, who took him by the hand, and purchased some grapes for him. The Durvish took promise from him that when he attained to wealth and dominion he would take care of and respect the faqīrs and divines.

1 *Fīrīshāh*, p. 64 has شکار حانوران 'hunting animals', while *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbari*, p. 56 and *Badā`uni*, p. 62 say "he was taken by his brothers to some garden, under pretence of going thither for recreation and diversion."

2 *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, p. 167.


4 Another story is related by *Fīrīshāh*, p. 67 and *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbari*, p. 62—" while a slave in Baghādād, his master called a majlis of Durvishes for the recitation of mystic songs. With the lamp in his hands, Íltutmish passed the whole night in their service. Thereupon, Qādir Ḥamīd-u'd-dīn. Nāẓūrī, president of the majlis, blessed him. When Íltutmish became Sulṭān, Qādir Nāẓūrī came to Delhi and held majlisas. Maulvi 'Imād-u'd-dīn and Jamāl-u'd-dīn protested against it. The Qādir replied, "It is permitted to the mystic and forbidden to the orthodox," and reminded the Sulṭān of his early life and his service during that particular night. The Sulṭān was much pleased to allow those ceremonies, and himself joined them.

5 *Futūḥ-u's-Salāṭin*, pp. 112-15. The same is related with some variations in the *Akbhār-u'l-Akhyār*, pp. 33, 37.
After some time, a merchant named Ḥāji Bukhārā purchased him from that noble and distinguished family. He was next purchased by Jamāl-u’d-dīn Muḥammad, Chust Qabā (of the Tight Tunic), who brought him to Ghaznīn. As no other Turk so handsome, intelligent and virtuous had for a long time appeared in the market, the news of his arrival was at once conveyed to Sultān Ṣhibāb-u’d-dīn of Ghūr. The Sultān offered a thousand gold dīnārs for ʿĪtutmīsh and another slave named Aibak; but the Khwājah declined to sell them. The Sultān, in retaliation, issued an order prohibiting the sale of the two slaves. After staying at Ghaznīn for a period of one year, Khwājah Jamāl-u’d-dīn took the slaves to Bukhārā, where he remained for three years. Later on, he returned to Ghaznīn, and stayed there for another year, but no one, on account of the Sultān’s orders, could venture to purchase them. When Malik Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak came to Ghaznīn after the conquest of Gujarat, he solicited permission from the Sultān to purchase the slaves. “Since I have already prohibited it,” the Sultān replied, “it will not be proper to purchase them in Ghaznīn. Take them to Delhi, and purchase them there.”

Quṭb-u’d-dīn left his Vizier Nizām-u’d-dīn Muḥammad at Ghaznīn for the settlement of certain affairs, and directed

1 Bada’īnī, pp. 68-69, relate the following story—the Emperor Akbar told a story, which was orally traced to Sultān Ghīyāsh-u’d-dīn Balban. The curious anecdote is that ʿĪtutmīsh loved tenderly a Turkish slave girl in his ārem, but was unable to effect his object. One day, he got his head anointed with oil by the same girl, who noticing something in his head, began to weep. The Sultān inquired the girl of the cause. She replied, “my own brother had the same sort of bald-head”. On making further inquiries, it was found that the slave girl was his own sister. This story, like many others, also seems to be manufactured.

2 Lubb-u’t-Tawārīḫ, p. 10, gives the reverse statement—“sold by Jamāl-u’d-dīn Chust Qabā to Ḥāji Jamāl-u’d-dīn, who brought ʿĪtutmīsh to Ghaznīn.” Being contrary to the contemporary account, it is not correct.

3 Bada’īnī, p. 62 says one lac of tankahs.

4 Fīrūzštābī, p. 65 says, “along with Nāṣir-u’d-dīn Kharmīl”, which is quite probable.

† Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 168.
him to bring Chust Qabā along with him to Hindustan. The Vizier did accordingly; and when the slaves reached Delhi, Quṭb-u'd-dīn Aibak purchased them for a hundred thousand jītals. Aibak's name was changed to Tamghāch, and he was made Amīr of Tabarhind or Bhatindā, but was slain in the battle fought between Tāj-u'd-dīn Yildiz and Quṭb-u'd-dīn. 'The other slave was styled as Īltutmīsh.'

Shams-u'd-dīn was created Sar-i-Jāndār (Chief of the Royal Bodyguards), and Quṭb-u'd-dīn honoured him by calling him his son. His rank and status went on increasing until he became Amīr-i-Shīkār (Chief Huntsman). After the fall of Gwalior, he was made its Amīr. He was next promoted to the governorship of Barān and its dependencies. Some time later, when he displayed intrepidity and valour, the territory of Bādā'īn was entrusted to him.

When Sulṭān Shihāb-u'd-dīn of Ghūr returned from Khwārazm, after being defeated at Anōkhud at the hands of the Qara Khiṭā'īs, the Gakkhar tribes broke out into rebellion, and the Sulṭān marched from Ghaznī to suppress them. Quṭb-u'd-dīn led the forces of Hindustan, and Shams-u'd-dīn joined him with the army of Bādā'īn; the two advanced to the Punjab to support the Sulṭān. Īltutmīsh displayed extraordinary courage in the battle that ensued,

1 Lubb-u't-Twārīkā, p. 10, says "thirty thousand jītals." There is a good reason for supposing that the tankāh represented a told as Fīrūghtāh tells us in connection with the tankāhs of 'Alā-u'd-dīn. Further an equation of 48 jītals to the tankāh is more probable. Jītal then be taken as equivalent to two raties of silver, a three jītal piece or sixteenth of a tankāh is equivalent to the modern anna. Therefore, one lakh jītal= Rs. 2,083/5/ (modern). Ref. Sulṭāns of Delhi—Their Coinage and Metrology—by H. N. Wright, pp. 72 to 75.

2 Fīrūghtāh, p. 65 has Bhatindah, which is the same as Tabazhindah. Sirhind is often confused with Bhatindā or Tabarhind.

3 Fīrūghtāh, p. 65.

4 Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī, p. 169.

5 Bādā'īn, p. 62 and Lubb-u't-Twārīkā, p. 10 state that "Baran and its dependencies were added to his fief of Gwalior."

6 Fīrūghtāh, pp. 59, 60 states long before the occurrence of this event, that the Gakkhrs were converted to Islam in the time of Maḥmūd. It is probable that a part of them were converted to Islām.
plunged his horse into the river Jhelum, overcame the resistance of the enemy and put ten or twelve thousand men to the sword. In the height of battle, the Sulṭān’s eye fell upon him and, witnessing his splendid exploit, distinguished him by conferring upon him a special robe of honour. The Sulṭān further ordered Qūṭb-u’d-dīn ‘to treat Īltutmīsh well, for he would distinguish himself by doing great deeds.’ Qūṭb-u’d-dīn, on the Sulṭān’s order, manumitted him and ‘created him Amīr-u’l-Umarā.’

On the sudden death of Sulṭān Qūṭb-u’d-dīn and the accession of Ārām Shāh, the Sipāh-Sālār (Commander of Troops) Amīr ‘All-i-Īsmā’īl, Amīr-i-Dād (Chief Judge) of the capital city, in consultation with other Malikīs and Amīrs, despatched an invitation to Īltutmīsh at Bādur to hasten to Delhi and to assume sovereignty. Īltutmīsh accepted the proposal, and he came with his forces and occupied Delhi in the year 1210 A.D.

Rivals and their overthrow

Sulṭān Shāms-u’d-dīn Īltutmīsh succeeded in winning over most of the Turks and Quṭbī Amīrs by conferring splendid gifts and high favours upon them; but some of the Turks and Mu’īzzī Amīrs ‘under Sar-i-Jāmdār (Head of the Royal Bodyguards) Turkī’ joined hands against him, left the capital city with a strong force and broke out into rebellion

1 Firīghtah, p. 65.  Ṭabaqāt-i-Naṣīrī, p. 170.
2 Firīghtah, p. 65, has “Amīr Da’d, the Dilāmī”. Lubb-u’t-Twārīkā, p. 10 “Mīr ‘Ali Ismā’īl and Amīr-i-Dād of Delhi.” Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 57 “Sipāh-Sālār ‘Īsmā’īl and Amīr-i-Dād of Delhi. And is not correct here, and should be omitted.

4 Khulāsat-u’t-Twārīkā, p. 190, has “the year 1211.” Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 51 also has 1211: but the contemporary authority has 607 H. i.e., 1210 A.D.
Futūk-u’s-Salāṭīn, p. 104, agrees with Minhāj-Sirāj.
5 Firīghtah, p. 65, says:

الإسراّر جامع الداران يغنى خاصّة خليل كي مرد ترکی بود
Sardār-i-Jāmdār or Sar-i-Jāmdār is not a proper name as in Elliot, Vol II, p. 237, which has “Sar-i-Jāmdār Turkī”. Sar-i-Jāmdār means “the Head of the Royal Robe-bearers.” Sar-i-Jāmdār is meant here.
in the vicinity. The Sultān was so overwhelmed with terror that he refrained from suppressing the rebellion for several days. At last he gathered together a large army, headed by valiant leaders like 'Izz-u'd-dīn Bakht-yār, Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Mardān Shāh, Hazbar-u'd-dīn Aḥmad Sūr and Iftikhār-u'd-dīn Muḥammad 'Umar, and marched to face the rebels. The rival forces encountered each other in the plain of Jūd. ILTUTMISH was victorious, and he put most of the leaders to the sword. Sar-i-Jāndār and others fled, while Aqsanqar and Tāj-u'd-dīn Furrukh Shāh, two of the famous Turkish leaders, were slain. Some time later Udaisa, the ruler of Jalor, rebelled, and refused to pay customary tribute. The Sultān marched against Chauhān Udai Singh, the Rae of Jalor (town and fort in Jodhpur State), who, hearing of his arrival, shut himself up within the walls of the fortress and implored for forgiveness. The Sultān pardoned him, and restored the fortress to him. The Rae, in return, presented hundred camels and twenty horses as the tribute due.

It was but a remnant of the large dominion, which ILTUTMISH inherited from his master as a result of his victory over Āram Shāh. But the whole of Hindustan was in a state of utter confusion; 'Alt Mardān in Bengal, Qabāchah in Multān and Sind and Yildiz in Ghaznī were all powerful and independent; and it goes to the credit of ILTUTMISH,

1 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 170.
3 Firīghtāh, p. 65. The Zubdat-u't-Twārīkh says, "the defeated Āmīrs were put to death at different times."
4 On a hill to the south of Jalor stands the famous fort 800 by 400 yards built by Paramara Rajputs. Its walls are composed of huge masses of cut-stone. It was ruled by the Paramaras till the twelfth century, when Chauhān Rao Kirthī Pāl of Nadol took it, and made it his capital. It was his grandson Udai Singh, who surrendered the fort to ILTUTMISH, 'Udayasinha'—Dr. Rey—Dynastic History of Northern India, Vol. II, p. 1130.
5 Tāj-u'l-Maʾāthir; Elliot, Vol. II, p. 238 also Firīghtāh, p. 65.
who consolidated and strengthened the whole empire.

Sultān Tāj-u'ād-dīn Yildiz purchased his safety for the time being by entering into a compact with Īltutmish and despatching a canopy of state and a Dūr-bāshā (a kind of spear with two horns to keep away the people). This, however, does not mean that Sultān Shams-u'ād-dīn Īltutmish acknowledged his supremacy over him. Soon after, Yildiz was defeated by the Khwarazmians and he fled to Lahore, where he made an attempt to build up his power as an independent monarch. In the year 1215 A.D. he succeeded in conquering the Punjab up to Thanesar (a town in Karnāl District, Punjab, situated on the banks of the Saraswātī), and sent a message to Īltutmish to acknowledge him as an independent sovereign. The Sultān could never tolerate the establishment of Yildiz's power in the Punjab. He marched against his rival, and reached Samand (most probably Sāmānāh) in the month of January 1216 A.D. The rival forces met at Tarāin, and a great battle ensued. Fortune once more favoured Īltutmish; Tāj-u'ād-dīn Yildiz was 'wounded by an arrow shot by the Mu'āyyid-u'āl-Mulk, and was captured along with many of his chiefs. He was first brought to Delhi and then sent a prisoner to Bada'ūn, where he died and was buried. Upon several occasions, the Amīrs and Malikṣ rose in hostilities in different parts of Hindustan, but all of them were put down and defeated.

1 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 170.
2 Fīrūzkhā, p. 65, states that "Īltutmish accepted a canopy of state and a standard from the Ḥākim of Ghaznīn to honour the latter."
3 Fīrūzkhā, p. 65.
4 Tāj-u'āl-Ma'āthīr; Elliot, Vol. II, p. 239. It is, in all probability, Sāmānāh and not 'Samand'. The event happened in 1216 and not 1215, as Dr. Ishwārī Prasād (Medieval History, p. 170) states.
5 Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, correctly describes it as Tārāwārī. Bada'ūnī, p. 63, has also the same. Tārāwārī is modern Tarāin.
6 Tāj-u'āl-Ma'āthīr, (Elliot, p. 239).
7 Minhāj-Širāzī is silent on this point: Ṭabaqāt-i-Akhbārī, p. 58, says that 'he was kept at Bada'ūn until he died. Tāj-u'āl-Ma'āthīr is also silent. In all probability he was killed.
8 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 171.
Sultān Shams-u'd-dīn Iltutmish, thus, brought the different parts of his dominion under subjection like Bada'ūn, Oudh, Benares and the Siwālik territory, between the Biās and the Ganges.

There was a constant state of warfare going on between Sultāns Iltutmish and Naṣīr-u'd-dīn Qabāchah for the possession of Lahore,1 Tabarhindah and Kuhrām. Mu'ayyid-u'l-Mulk Muḥammad Junaydī, the Vizier, informed the Sultān of the refractory attitude of Qabāchah, who had refused to pay any tribute. In the month of September 1216 A.D., Iltutmish marched with a large army towards Lahore. Sultān Naṣīr-u'd-dīn Qabāchah decamped. On the 24th January, 1217, Iltutmish left Lahore and reached the fortress at the village of Chambā (now capital of Chambā State, Punjab, situated on the right bank of the Rāvī). Qabāchah was frightened to hear of the arrival of the royal forces, and he fled towards Lahore.2 Iltutmish did not relax pursuit and, in a short time, reached Lahore. In the year 1217 A.D., the rival forces encountered each other in the vicinity of Manṣūrah by the side of the river Chināb on the frontier tract of Lahore, and Qabāchah suffered a crushing defeat.3

In the year 1218 A.D., Qabāchah defeated in battle the Khaljī Malik of Ghaznīn, who were in the habit of plundering the outlying districts of Sind.4 The Khaljīs fled for protection to Sultān Shams-u'd-dīn Iltutmish, who marched against Qabāchah, defeated and drove him back to his kingdom.

In the year 1221 A.D.,5 Sultān Jalāl-u'd-dīn Khwārazm Shāh, being pursued by Chingīz Khān marched further east

---

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāsīrī, p. 143.
3 Firīghtah, p. 65. Badā'ūnī, p. 64 and Tahākirat-u'l-Mulūk both drown him at this stage.
4 Firīghtah, p. 65.
5 Tarīkh of Nizām-u'd-dīn Aḥmad Bakhshī states that the invasion of Sultān Jalāl-u'd-dīn happened after Naṣīr-u'd-dīn Qabāchah was drowned. But this is quite incorrect for Jalāl-u'd-dīn fought many skirmishes with Qabāchah on his way back to Kirmān.
with the intention of crossing the Indus. He was, however, surrounded by the Mongol troops on the bank of the river. He saw the flashing sword before him and the ferocious river behind. Yet with a courage that would have excited the envy of Rustam, he spurred his horse to battle and fought many skirmishes bravely. But, as the situation became desperate, he turned his horse and galloped towards the riverside. He, at length, succeeded in crossing the river with his seven companions, and pitched his canopy on the other side. "A father should have such a son", Chingiz Khan said to his sons, as he saw Jalal-ud-din sitting in his glory on the opposite bank.

Jalal-ud-din now mustered a force of one hundred and twenty horsemen and, several times, defeated and routed the local forces. Chingiz Khan, on hearing of these events, sent some of his great Amirs against Jalal-ud-din. Jalal-ud-din perforce fled to Lahore\(^1\) and marched towards Delhi. He sent a messenger to Sultan Shams-ud-din Iltutmish with the request that if out of friendship he could condescend to help him, he would win back his ancestral kingdom from the enemy. Sultan Shams-ud-din Iltutmish could not allow a foreign sovereign to have a footing in his dominion. So he sent him valuable presents with the reply "the climate of this place will not suit such a high-born prince", and himself marched against him with a large army, and Jalal-ud-din, unable to oppose him, retreated\(^2\) towards Siwastan and Sind. After fighting some skirmishes with Qabachah, he reached Kirmân\(^3\) by way of Makran.\(^4\)

**Conquests**

Getting rid of his rival Yildiz and subduing Qabachah,

\(^1\) *Kulâsat-ut-Taurîkh*, p. 190, states that Jalal-ud-din actually invested Lahore for some time, which is not possible.

\(^2\) *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. III, p. 52, states that the envoy was killed by Iltutmish*, without stating any authority whatsoever. It is in fact *Firîshtah*s version and, therefore, not reliable.

\(^3\) *Bâdây",* p. 64.

Shams-u'd-din Îltutmîsh turned his face towards Lakhnauti. Previously, on several occasions, he had despatched forces to invade the territory, completely subjugated Bihâr and installed his own Amîrs there.¹ In the year 1225 A.D., however, Îltutmîsh made a firm resolve to occupy the territory of Lakhnauti.² Accordingly, he marched from Delhi, and Sulṭân Ghiyâth-u'd-dîn moved his vessels up the river. But a treaty was concluded, and Sulṭân Ghiyâth-u'd-dîn submitted by presenting thirty-eight elephants³ and eighty lakhs of treasure; and the name of Sulṭân Shams-u'd-dîn Îltutmîsh was inscribed on the coin.⁴ Îltutmîsh then withdrew⁵ from Lakhnauti leaving behind Malik 'Izz-u'd-dîn Jânî and his own son Malik Nâşir-u'd-dîn Muḥammad as his lieutenants in Bihâr.⁶ No sooner had the Sulṭân retired than Sulṭân Ghiyâth-u'd-dîn 'Iwaḍ marched into Bihâr and occupied it.⁷

In 1226 A.D., the Sulṭân marched from Delhi and occupied the celebrated strong fort of Ranthambhor, which had been previously attacked in vain by seventy kings but was never subdued.⁸ The famous fort of Ranthambhor lies in the south-east corner of Jaipur State, Rajputana, on an isolated rock 1,578 ft. above sea-level, and surrounded by a massive wall strengthened by towers and bastions. The remains of a mosque, a tomb of a saint and barracks are

¹ Tabaqât-i-Nâširi, p. 163.
² Ibid., p. 171.
³ Badā'i, p. 60, has "seventy thousand tankâhs". Firâqta, p. 66 and Tabaqât-i-Akbarî, p. 59 have 38 elephants.
⁴ Ibid., pp. 163 and 171. As early as 1217 and 1220 A.D. tankâhs "have been struck by the Governor of Bengal in acknowledgment of the claims of Îltutmîsh to the Sulṭanate." H. N. Wright—The Sulṭânîs of Delhi—Their Coins and Metrology, p. 71.
⁵ Tabaqât-i-Akbarî, p. 54, says that "the two Sulṭânîs did encounter each other in battle;" but the contemporary authority, Minhâj-Siraj, does not refer to it at all, and therefore, the statement of Tabaqât-i-Akbarî, is not reliable.
⁶ Tabaqât-i-Nâširi, p. 163.
⁷ Ibid., p. 163.
⁸ Ibid., p. 172.
found within the enclosure. The place is said to be held by a branch of the Jādon Rajputs until they were expelled by Prithvī Raja in the twelfth century as a result of the Chaухān supremacy. Īltutmish besieged the fort, but held it only for some time.¹ Valanadeva (most probably Vallana, grandson of Prithvī Raja) ruled under the Sultān’s authority.²

In 1227 A.D., Īltutmish marched against the fort of Mandor³ within the limits of the Siwālik territory (now a declined town in Jodhpūr State), and conquered it from Kirtipala.⁴ The place is of great historical importance, for it had been the capital of the Paribhā Rajputs till 1381, and subsequently the seat of government of the Rāthor Rajputs till 1459, when Jodhpūr city was founded. The old fort, built by a Buddhist architect, is now in ruins. About the same time, i.e., the beginning of the year 1227 A.D., Malik Nāṣir-u’d-dīn Muḥammad Shāh, the eldest son of Sultān Shams-u’d-dīn Īltutmish, and ‘Īzz-u’d-dīn Malik Jānī assembled the forces of Hindūstān and marched from Oudh to Lakhnautī.⁵ Luckily Sultān Ghiyath-u’d-dīn Iwaḍ had led an expedition into the territories of Kāmprūp and Bangah

¹Imperial Gazetteer, Vol, XXI, p. 235.
²According to the inscription of Mārwār published in the Indian Antiquities, Vol. XLI, p. 87. In one of these raids, Īltutmish must have overrun Mewār as Ojha thinks that ‘Milac-Chikāra’ of Jayasinha is a Sanskritisation of ‘Amīr-i-Shāhīr, title conferred on Īltutmish by Aibak. History of Rajputāna, Vol. II, p. 467. ‘Malaya Varma Deva,’ according to Thomas—Chronicles of Pathan Kings, p. 72.
³The oldest copies, according to Major Raverty, have Mandor, but others have Mandū and Mandūr. Ṭabqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 59 has Mandū. Ṭabqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 59 has Mandawar. Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 19 has Mandūr and Ajmer. Mandū is in Mālwa, which place Īltutmish never reached. It is, in fact, Mandor, a ruined town in Jodhpur State and not Mandaur eight miles north of Bijnor held by Rahapan Agarwāl Banyā as Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 53 states.
⁴Vaidya, Vol. III, p. 302: Rev.; Vol. II, pp. 1130-31 have Udayasinha. The famous poet Amīr Rūḥānī composed the following verse on the victories:

के आज बलद मुलाके शहीद एसलम, कश्मीर बार दारक उस हैला आम
Firāzī, p. 66 and the Ṭabqāt-i-Akbārī, pp. 59-60.
⁵Ṭabqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 163.
and had left Lakhnauti undefended.¹ Malik Naṣīr-u'd-dīn availed of this opportunity by capturing the fortress of Ḥasankut and the city of Lakhnauti.² Sultān Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn 'Iwaḍ, perforce, retired from his expedition, and fought an engagement with the victors, but was defeated and his Khaljī Amīrs were taken prisoners.³ Sultān Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn 'Iwaḍ was immediately put to death after a reign of twelve years. The territory of Lakhnauti now fell into the hands of Malik Naṣīr-u'd-dīn, who proved to be a benevolent, intelligent, energetic and sagacious ruler.⁴

Having extended his sway over Bihār and Lakhnauti, the Sultān, in the year 1227 A.D., invaded Sind with the intention of overthrowing Qabāchah,⁵ who was the only rival now left. Accordingly, he made ample preparations, and Sultān Naṣīr-u'd-dīn Qabāchah also stationed his forces before the gateway of the town of Amrūt⁶ (Amrī) along with his fleet and boats. It was soon discovered that Malik Naṣīr-u'd-dīn Aitum,⁷ the governor of Lahore had appeared before the walls of Multān and Iltutmish himself set out by way of Tabarhindah towards Uch. The intelligence of these news so terrified Qabāchah that he at once retired towards the strong fort of Bhakkar, and directed his Vizier the 'Am-u'l-Mulk Ḥusain-i-Ash'arī to convey all the

¹ Ṭabaqāt-i-Naṣīrī, p. 164.
² Ibd., p. 180.
³ Ibd., p. 164.
⁴ Ibd., p. 180.
⁵ Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 58 and Badāwī, p. 64 leave out this expedition against Qabāchah and drown him in the year 1217 A.D., about ten years before his actual defeat and death.
⁶ It is variously known as ٍهروت - ٍهروت - امروب - امروب
It is perhaps Amrī situated below Sahwān on the river Indus in Sind.
⁷ Aitum was a slave of Malik Bahī-u'd-dīn Tughrul, from whose heirs Iltutmish purchased him. The sief of Lahore was assigned to him, and subsequently, in return to his services in the acquisition of Multān, the Siwālik territory along with Ajmer were made over to him. He was, however, drowned into a river in an expedition against the Hindūs of the Bündī (now a native state in the south-east of Rajputana) territory—See Ṭabaqāt-i-Naṣīrī, pp. 236-37.
treasures from Uch to Bhakkar. 1 Sulṭān Shams-u’d-dīn Īltutmīsh pushed forward his advance-guard under the command of the Amīr-i-Hāji (Lord Chamberlain) Malik ‘Īzz-u’d-dīn Muḥammad Sālārī and Gazlak Khān Sanjar-i-Sulṭānī, 2 the Malik of Tabarhindah; and, four days after, himself reached the fort of Uch on the 9th February, 1228 A.D. Īltutmīsh now laid siege to the fort of Uch, and despatched the Vizier Nizām-u’l-Mulk Muḥammad Junāīdī 3 with other Maliks towards the fort of Bhakkar in pursuit of Qabāchah. For about three months, hostilities went on at the fort of Uch, and the enemy was reduced to extremities until on June 5, 1228 the fortress surrendered on terms of capitulations. 4 On becoming aware of the fall of Uch, Qabāchah sent his son ‘Alā-u’d-dīn Mas’ūd Shāh along with many presents to Sulṭān Shams-u’d-dīn Īltutmīsh to sue for peace. He was received with all the outward marks of kindness, but was not permitted to depart. 5 In consequence, Qabāchah was much alarmed, and before a reply could come, the garrison of Bhakkar was reduced to the last strait. Qabāchah desperately threw himself into the river Sind and got into a boat hoping to find refuge in some island, but in the

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 173; Firīshah, p. 66 has Thankar, which is impossible.

2 Gazlak Khān was purchased by Sulṭān Shams-u’d-dīn from Khwājah ‘Alī and brought up under the protection of Prince Nāṣir-u’d-dīn Majmūd. Soon after, he was made Lord of the Stable. Subsequently, he became Amīr of Multiān, Kuhrām and Tabarhindah one after another. After the defeat of Qabāchah the fort, city and dependencies of Uch were made over to him—Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 232-35.

3 Kampal Ġimidī وزیره غزین - کس بود است هم عاقل و هم آمیزه

4 Rawdat-u’s-Safā, Vol. IV, p. 888 says that on the flight of Qabāchah from Uch, Īltutmīsh left his Vizier Nizām-u’l-Mulk Abu-Sa’īd to carry on the investment of Uch. The Vizier, after capturing it marched towards Bhakkar. The account narrated by Rawdat-u’s-Safā is against the contemporary authority, and, therefore, unreliable.

5 Tabaqat-i-Náṣirī, p. 173. Not in 1227 A.D., as Dr. Ishwari Prasad (Medieval India, p. 177) states.

6 Ibid., p. 144.
middle of the stream his boat capsized and he was drowned. Thus ended the chequered career of a warlike monarch after a reign of twenty-two years in the lands of Sind, Uch and Multān. After a few days, the treasures were taken possession of, and the remaining forces of Qabāchah were enlisted into the Royal army. The country of Sind as far as the ocean was acquired, and Malik Shihāb-u'd-dīn Ḥabsh, the ruler of Dipālpūr and Sind presented himself before and paid homage to the Sulṭān. Being satisfied with the conquest of Sind, the Sulṭān started for Delhi. 'According to some account', says Qāḍī Minhāj-Sirāj, 'the city and fortress of Multān and its dependencies were conferred upon Izz-u'd-dīn Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz, and was entitled Kabīr Khān-i-Mangirī. After some time, he was succeeded by Malik Ikhṭiyār-u'd-dīn Qarāqash Khān-i-Aitkin as governor of Multān.

1 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 144 and 173.

2 The printed text of Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 173 has "Shihāb-u'd-dīn Ḥabgh" while Major Rawerty turns it into Chatisar or Jatis in conformity with the oldest copies.

3 It cannot be Dewāl for it lies in the Bisalpur tahāil of Pilibhit District. It must be Dipālpūr, situated on the old bank of Biās, and the decay of the town is to be attributed to the shifting of the river.

4 A Rūmī Turk of Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Hūsain, the Chief Huntsman of Ghazānī, whose son Sher Khān-i-Surkh sold him to Itutmīsh. He was given Multān and Palwāl (now in the Gurgaon District of the Punjab) in his reign. He was a party to the hostile element against Sulṭān Rukn-u'd-dīn Firuz Shāh. Raḍiyah made him the governor of Lahore and its dependencies. Multān was again entrusted to his charge, and he assumed sovereignty on the invasion of Mongols. He died in the year 1241 A.D. Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 234-35.

5 Aitkin belonged to the Qara Khātā Turks and was one of the oldest slaves of Itutmīsh. First he became Ṣāqi-i-Khāṣ (Personal Cup-bearer) and acquired the sīf of Barihūn and Dārangān (perhaps Dargān). The two sīfs must have been situated in the north-western region. Subsequently, he became the Superintendent of the Crown-province of Tabarhindah. Then Multān became his sīf. He became governor of Lahore and then of Bigānah in the reign of Raḍiyah. He conspired
In the month of August, 1228 A.D. Sulṭān Shams-u’l-dīn Īltutmīsh reached the capital city. About this time, the ‘Arab messengers reached the frontier of Nāgore with splendid robes from the ‘Abbasid Caliph, and on February 18, 1229 A.D. they reached the capital. The Sulṭān received them with great honour, and respectfully accepted the robes of distinction. There was a great demonstration in the city, which was decorated; and gifts were bestowed upon the royal princes, Maliks and Amīrs. The Firmān, in political theory, was the only process, which could legitimise a monarchy not known to the shari‘at. Sulṭān Shams-u’l-dīn Īltutmīsh was, therefore, extremely pleased on his recognition as the Sulṭān of Hindustan by the ‘Abbasid Caliph, but he could not enjoy it long as the sad news of the death of Prince Nāṣīr-against Bahrām Shāh, but afterwards became Amīr-i-Ḥājīb. During Sulṭān Nāṣīr-u’l-dīn’s reign, he was killed within the limits of Kach (Kachch, now a state in Bombay). Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, pp. 250-51.

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 174. The “three groups of tankahs issued by the Sulṭān have on their obverses the names respectively of the Khalīfahs Al-Nāṣīr-u’l-dīn Allāh, Al-Ẓahir, and his successor Al-Muṣṭañṣīr-billāh” –Sultāns of Delhi—Their Coinage and Metrology—by H. N. Wright, p. 71. Group IV contains a rare coin, which records only the name of Khalīfah. This seems to commemorate the arrival of the Khalīfah’s diploma of investiture in 1228 A.D. Thomas—Chromes of the Pathān Kings, p. 46.

3 “A year and a half afterwards he was afflicted with disease and weakness and he died.”—Tabaqat-i-Nasirī, p. 181. The tomb of Nāṣīr-u’l-dīn Māḥmūd Shāh, better known as Sulṭān Ghārī, the eldest son of Sulṭān Īltutmīsh, is situated about one mile to the east of the village Malikpūr Kohī and four miles west of Mehrauli. It was built in 629 A.H. (1231 A.D.) by the order of Sulṭān Īltutmīsh, according to the inscription on the gateway. (List of Monuments of Delhi, Vol. IV, p. 55). The tomb lies in the centre of an enclosure, measuring 77’-6” square, stands on a rubble plinth, and is constructed of greystone. On the east is a gateway containing a flight of steps. The outside archway of the gate is enclosed by the inscription quoted above. The enclosure contains an open courtyard, and the tomb chamber, octagonal in plan, is sunk in the centre of the court. A low and narrow door on the south leads to the chamber, which contains four graves. The grave of Nāṣīr-u’l-dīn probably lies against the west wall.—List of Monuments, Vol. IV, p. 56.
u'd-din Maḥmūd was conveyed to him. Bālkā Malik Khalīj, son of Ḥusām-u'd-dīn Ḳwaḍ broke out into rebellion in the territory of Lakhnautī. In the year 1230 A.D. he marched against him with a strong force, quelled the disturbances and captured the rebel. The Sultān conferred the throne of Lakhnautī upon Malik 'Alā-u'd-dīn Jānī, and himself returned to the capital in the month of February 1231 A.D. Soon after Malik 'Alā-u'd-dīn Jānī was deposed and was succeeded by Malik Saīf-u'd-dīn Aibak-i-Yughān Tat as governor of Lakhnautī.

In the year 1231 A.D., Sultān Shams-u'd-dīn Īltutmīsh marched from Delhi to capture the stronghold of Gwalior, which the Musalmans had lost since the days of Quṭb-u'd-dīn. The Rae Malik Deo4, son of Basīl, offered strong resistance and began war. The Sultān continued fighting, and remained under the walls of the fort for a period of eleven months. In the month of March 1231 A.D. Qāḍī Minhāj-Sirāj, the famous author of Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, came to the royal presence from Delhi and obtained audience. He was ordered to deliver discourses ordinarily three times a week, but daily during the holy month of Ramaḍān. The two great prayers of 'Īds were said at

---

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, pp. 163 and 174.<br>2 Firīṣṭah, p. 66, Tabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 60 and Badā'īnī, p. 67 all have Ḳhānī'.
3 Malik Saīf-u'd-dīn was a Khīṭāī Turk and was purchased by Īltutmīsh from the heirs of Īkhtiyār-u'd-dīn Chust Qābā. He became Amīr-i-Mājlis (Lord of the Assembly) and then the chief of Sursutī (Ṣaraswati, a chief lying along the Saraswati river, which rises in Sirmūn state close to the borders of Ambālā District) was bestowed upon him. The territories of Bihār and Lakhnautī were entrusted to his charge one after another and he died in the year 1233 A.D.—See Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, pp. 238-39.<br>4 The best Petersburg copy, according to Major Raverty, has مملکہ دور Ḫubbat-u't-Twāriḥk has Mangal Div. Tabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 60 has مسند دور ملک دور ملک دور بسیل. Mīrāt-i-Jāhān Numā has دور ملک دور ملک دور. Tadhkīrat-u'l-Mulūk. Firīṣṭah, p. 60 has دور ملک دور. It is in fact Malik Deo son of Basīl.
three different places in the army of Islam and, at one of these places at the front of the Gwalior fort, prayers were conducted by the said Qādī. The fortress was, however, kept under investment until on December, 12, 1232 A.D. it was captured.¹ The garrison was reduced to straits and, in the course of night, its chief, Mangal Diw fled away and evacuated the fort.² Many of the defendents were captured, and about eight hundred³ of them were put to death.

Just after this great victory, the Sulṭān was pleased to make promotions in the ranks of Amīrs and Malikṣ. Majd-u’l-Mulk Ṭiyā-u’d-dīn Muḥammad Junaidī was appointed Amīr-i-Dād (King’s Judicial-Deputy) Sipāh-Sālār Rashīd-u’d-dīn ‘Ali became Kutwāl and Qādī Minhāj-Sirāj was created Sadr-i-Jāhan (Chief Ecclesiastic of the State).

In the year 1232 A.D., Malik ‘Īzz-u’d-dīn Tughrul-i-Tughān Khān⁴ was made governor of Badā’in; the office of Amīr-i-Ābār (Lord of the Stable) thus vacated was assigned to Malik Qamr-u’d-dīn Tamar Khān-i-Qirān.⁵

¹ Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 175.
² Malik Tāj-u’d-dīn Raiz composed the following verses on the victory:

هر قلعته كه سلطان سلامين بگرفت
از هون خدا و نصرت دین بگرفت
بن قلعه جوالیار و حصن و حصن
در ستما مستادین بگرفت

⁴ Firużah, p. 66 has only ‘three hundred’ means ‘to put to death’ and not ‘to receive punishment’ as in Elliot, Vol. II, p. 327.
⁵ Malik Tughrul-i-Tughān Khān, a Qara-Khita Türk Turk was purchased by Shams-u’d-dīn ʻĪtutmīšh, who made him his Saqī-i-Khāṣ (Personal Cup-bearer) then Daswat-Dār (Keeper of Writing Case), Chashmahīr (Controller of the Royal Kitchen) and then Amīr-i-Ābār (Lord of the Stable). In the year 1232, he was made governor of Badā’in and in 1233, the feudatory of Lakhnautī. For further details see the reigns of Rādiyah, Muťiz-u’d-dīn Bahrūm Shāh and ʿĀlī-u’d-dīn Mas‘ūd ʿShāh. Ultimately, he was killed in an engagement against Aur Khān, the Ruler of Lakhnautī—See Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 242.
⁶ Tamar Khān-i-Qirān, a Türk of Qipchāq was purchased by
Hindū Khān, Mihtar-i-Mubārak, held the office of Khāzin (Treasurer) throughout the reign of Sultān Shams-u’d-dīn Iltutmish. In the month of April 1233 A.D., the Sultān reached the capital.

In the year 1233 A.D., Malik Tughān Tat died, and was succeeded by Malik Tughrul-i-Tughān Khān as governor of Lakhnautī.

In the year 1234 A.D., Sultān Shams-u’d-dīn Iltutmish invaded Mālwa, and captured the fort and city of Bhilsā from the Paramara King Devapala (1218-36 A.D.). The town still stands on the Betwā river and the existing buildings are entirely Muslim in character. The whole town has 'an air of departed grandeur'. An idol temple to the height of one hundred and five yards and which was constructed in the course of three centuries, was razed to the ground by the imperial orders. The Sultān then marched from Mālwa to Ujjain Nagrī against Devapala Deva (1216-1240 A.D.), and demolished the famous idol temple of Mahakal-Diwā. Among other things, which fell

Iltutmish on payment of 50 thousand dinārs to Asad-u’d-dīn Mankalī. He was created Naṣīb-Amīr-i-Aḥhūr and then Amīr-i-Aḥhūr. During Rdiyāh’s reign, he was a governor of Qanauj and was sent to Gwalior and Mālwa as a leader of forces. The territories of Karnāl (district in the Delhi Division) and Oudh were afterwards entrusted to him. In the year 1244 A.D. he proceeded to Lakhnautī and fought against Malik Tughrul-i-Tughā Khān for two years and then died—See Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 247-48.

1 Hindū Khān was a Hindū convert. He joined the service of the Sultān when he was Malik as Yusbān (Keeper of the Hunting leopards) and, subsequently, Shu’la-Dūr (Keeper of the Torch). On his accession to the throne, Iltutmish made him Treasurer. During Sultān Mu’īz-u’d-dīn Bahram Shāh’s reign, he died in the territory of Jalandhar, which was under his charge then.—See Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 248-49.

2 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 176; Futūḥ-u’s-Salāfīn, p. 121. See also Ray, Vol. II p. 907.

3 Badā’īnī, p. 67. gives the astonishing account that the temple was built in the course of 66 years.

4 The temple was converted into a mosque, which was again converted into a Hindu temple of Mahakala in the days of Ranoji Scindia.
into the hands of the victors, was a statue of Bikramajita, a sovereign of Ujjain about thirteen centuries back, and from whose reign they date the Hindu era. A tremendous quantity of stones and a number of statues were brought to the capital and buried before the gate of the Jumā‘ mosque for the people to tread upon.

In the year 1234 A.D., the Sulṭān entrusted Biyānah and Sulṭān-Kut to Malik Naṣrat-u’d-dīn Tayāsī.1 The contingents of Qannaui, Nahīr and Mahāun2 were placed under his charge to make an inroad into the territories of Kālinjar and Chanderī. The town and fort of Chanderī are picturesquely situated in a great bay of sandstone hills, entered by narrow passes. The old town occupies a considerable area and is full of beautiful mosques, dwelling-houses and other buildings now in a dilapidated condition. The old fort stands 230 ft. above the town; a palace inside is the only building of interest. The same year, the Sulṭān fell upon Trailokyavarman3, the Rāj of Kālinjar, put his army to the rout, and obtained a vast booty. On his return, the Rana of Ajār,4 Chāhar by name, blocked up the road against the Muslim forces. But Tayāsī defeated the Hindu forces and put them to the rout.5

The present high pinnacled temple of Mahakala was built by the Shenvī Diwān of Rānoji Scindia, Ramā Chandra Bābā (1745 A.D.).

1 A slave of Sulṭān Shihāb-u’d-dīn of Ghūr. He was short-sighted but was adorned with many praiseworthy qualities. His career in Īltutmīsh’s reign has been described above. Rādliyāh conferred the territory of Oudh on him, but when he advanced from there against Malik ʿAlī-u’d-dīn Jānī and Saif-u’d-dīn Kūch, he was taken prisoner and he died of a sickness, which afflicted him.

2 Mahāun is in the district of Rohītak and is a place of antiquity. Mahīr is probably Mahet or Set-Mahet, a vast collection of ruins lying partly in the Gonda and partly in the Bahārīch district of Oudh, U.P. on the south bank of the Rāptī.

3 Ray—Dynastic History of Northern India, p. 727.

4 Ājarīnī, Ājarī probably Achārjī, a Brahman sect in Hisār District, Punjab.

5 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, pp. 239-41.
In 1235 A.D. the Sultān led his forces towards Bunyān, a place within the territory of Sind to subdue the rebellion of Gakkhrs, but, on account of serious illness he was forced to return to the capital, and on April 30, 1236 A.D. he breathed his last. "At the north-west corner of the Quṭb Mosque is the tomb of Shams-u'd-dīn Iltutmīsh. It is stated by Furgusson that it is one of the richest examples of Hindū art applied to Muhammadan purposes that old Delhi affords, and is extremely beautiful". The tomb consists of a chamber internally 29' 6" square "built of red sandstone; elaborately carved, and is sparingly relieved with marble." It is now without a dome. In the interior on the west there are three mihrābs. The entire surface of the interior is fretted with arabesque ornament, and the upper parts of the walls are adorned with diapered design. The tomb has been repaired from time to time.

The same year Khwājah Quṭb-u'd-dīn Bakht-yār Kākī, a fast friend of the Sultān and a great mystic of the age expired. About this time, Malik Saif-u'd-dīn Aibak, the governor of Uch, defeated in battle Malik Saif-u'd-dīn Hasan Qarlukh, who had come from Bunyān and invested the fort of Uch. The reign of Sultān Iltutmīsh extended over a period of twenty-six years. In addition to his extension of the Delhi kingdom to Sind in the west and...
Bengal in the east, he is famous as the continuer of his master's Quṭbī mosque and its beautiful tower (Minār).

The Quṭb Minār is a tapering shaft 234 feet high, the first three storeys of which are built of red and buff sandstone, while the fourth and fifth of marble. It has five storeys, each of which terminates into a decorated balcony inscribed with foliated designs. The basement storey is a polygon of 24 facets; the second storey is decorated with semi-circular fluting, and the shaft of the fourth storey is circular and devoid of fluting. The fifth and last storey is also circular with alternate bands of red sandstone and marble.

According to the inscriptions of the Minār, it can be alluded that the lowest storey was begun by Sulṭān Quṭb-u'd-dīn Aibak, the building was completed by Īltutmīsh, and repairs and alterations to the fifth storey were subsequently made by Firūz Shāh Tughlaq. Furgusson proves that it is the work of the Musalmans, though its earlier storeys were built by Hindu masons. "It was not designed as a place from where the Muizzin should call the prayers, though its lower gallery may have been used for that purpose also, but as a Tower of Victory—an emblem of conquest." The Quṭb Minār stands about the centre of the Lāl Kūt. The only inscription of historical importance on the basement storey is:

"The Amir, the commander of the army, the glorious, the great" apparently refers to Quṭb-u'd-dīn Aibak. On the second band the name of Mui'izz-u'd-dunyā wad-dīn (Shihāb-u'd-dīn of Ghūr) is mentioned. On the fourth band the name of Ghiyāth-u'd-dunyā wad-dīn (brother of Shihāb-u'd-dīn) is given.

On the entrance doorway the name of Shams-u'd-dunyā


2 Furgusson, p. 506.

3 "الإمبريالا سيجاوناء الإجل الكبير"

4 Delhi Monuments, Vol. III, p. 3.
**Sultān Shams-u’d-dīn Ilutmish**

*Wad-dīn* (Shams-u’d-dīn Ilutmish)\(^1\) is given, and it is stated that during the reign of Sikandar Shāh, son of Bahlul Shāh, the upper storeys of the Mīnār were repaired. The inscription on the second storey clearly bears the title of Shams-u’d-dīn as Ilutmish\(^2\).

On the doorway is written "Ilutmish, slave of Qutb-u’d-dīn".\(^3\) On the third storey is mentioned "Sultān Ilutmish" and on one side of the door is given the name of Muḥammad Amīr Kuh, who supervised the completion of the building.

The inscription on the fourth storey clearly mentions that "the erection of this building was ordered during the reign of... Sultān Ilutmish."

On the doorway to the fifth storey it is written that Sultān Fīrūz "built this portion of the edifice."\(^4\)

"Much speculation has been wasted as to the origin of the Qutb Mīnār, whether it is a purely Muḥammadan building, or a Hindu building altered and completed by the conquerors. The latter is undoubtedly the common belief of the people..."\(^5\) Mr. Cooper... states... that it 'remains an open question whether this magnificent pillar was commenced by the Hindus or Muḥammans.' I must confess, however, that I am myself quite satisfied that the building is entirely a Muḥammadan one, both as to origin and to design; although, no doubt, many, perhaps all, of the beautiful details of the richly decorated balconies may be Hindu..." The arguments are as follows:

(1) Why is there only one Mīnār and not two? The practice of building two Mīnārs goes back to three and a half centuries only, and that at the time under review it was the practice of the early Muḥammans to build a

---

\(^1\) *Dehli Monuments*, p. 4.

\(^2\) "ایلتمشیشی


\(^5\) "ایلتمشیش السلطان


single tower such as the Minârs of Ghâznîn and Koil.¹

(2) The slope of the Minâr being singularly greater is attributed to the peculiar characteristic of the architecture of the Pathans.

(3) Syed Aḩmad argues that, if the Minâr had been intended as a Mazinâh to the great mosque, it would have been erected at one end of it, instead of being at some distance from it. I reply . . . I can point out to the Koil Minâr, which occupies exactly the same detached position. . . . Both of them are placed outside the south-east corner of the respective masjids.

(4) 'Muhammadans place the door facing the east', says Sir Syed Aḩmad, but the door faces the north. In the Koil Minâr the entrance door is to the north, exactly as in the Quṭb Minâr.

(5) "It is customary that . . . Muhammadans always erect their buildings upon a raised platform," says Sir Syed. The early Musalmans, however, did not place their buildings on raised terraces as is shown by the mosques in Syria, Persia, Minâr at Ghâznîn and the tomb of Ilutmish.²

(6) That bells, used in Hindu temples, are found sculptured on the lower part of the basement storey.³ The fact is that, where Muhammadan mosques have been built of the materials . . . of Hindu temples, such portions of architectural ornament as were free from figures . . . were inevitably made use of by the conquerors."⁴

"I may remark, incidentally, with reference to the much-debated question as to the assumed Hindû origin or secondary adaptation by the Muhammadans of the partially prepared Quṭb Minâr, that General Cunningham's arguments tending to prove the independent inception of the design by Quṭb-u'd-dîn Aibak are to my mind conclusive."⁵

² Ibid., p. 191.
³ Ibid., p. 192.
⁴ Ibid., p. 193.
⁵ Thomas—Chronicles of the Pathan Kings, p. 24.
Estimate

There was no peace or stability in the central government under Ārām Shāh. Foreign government is the most ugly of political facts, and the vanquished Rajas and Ranas could no longer lightly bear the galling Turkish yoke. The rest of Hindustan was divided into contending rivals. Such was the time when Sultan Shams-u'd-dīn Īltutmīsh came to the throne of Delhi, saved the empire from being torn to pieces and by restoring order made the realm happy and prosperous.

Sultan Shams-u'd-dīn Īltutmīsh is decidedly the greatest sovereign of the Early Turkish Empire, and almost excelled all the Sulṭāns of Delhi in his fitness as a king and in his excellence as a man. "Never was a sovereign, so virtuous, kind-hearted and reverent towards the learned and the divines," says the author of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, "sat upon the throne of Delhi." Oriental praise is apt to be somewhat high flown, but making every allowance for the exaggeration of the court chronicle, Īltutmīsh really deserved the high admiration which has been lavished upon him. His accession was hailed with satisfaction on all sides. His handsome presence, and princely bearing, joined to a singular grace of manners and acknowledged powers of mind, made him generally popular. His career is an interesting example of what pluck, talent and gallantry could accomplish in a Muslim State of those days when the road to power was open to genius, however humble the beginning of a Turk might be. His character was as noble as his presence was commanding. Possessed of surpassing abilities, intelligence and high moral qualities, Īltutmīsh was a man of sagacity and progressive views. He did many a gracious and beautiful act. He proved to be a just, high-minded and virtuous king. A man of benevolent character and signal piety, his life was also temperate. As an enlightened sovereign, Īltutmīsh believed in the supreme leadership of the peers.

The combination of a high degree of intellectual
culture with soldierly quality is one of the commonplaces of history. Sultan Shams-u'd-din Ilutmish excelled most as a patron of letters. His court was as grand and magnificent as that of Mahmud or Sanjar. The poets, priests, courtiers and eminent scholars of foreign countries began a peaceful penetration of the country, and made his capital a centre of learning and culture. The Sultan was a man of broad views and perfectly tolerant of philosophical speculation. Religious studies were respected, tolerance was extended to men of secular learning and handsome allowances were granted to poets, who composed verses as nicely as they were paid. His reign is, consequently, marked by great achievements in literature and art.

"Bravery is the heritage of the Turk," says Stanley Lane-Poole, and Ilutmish was no exception to the general rule. The fighting spirit of the Turk was inherent in his nature, and his rapidity of action had long before earned him the title of Ilutmish (world-conqueror). A renowned warrior, no less famous and valiant than his master, Ilutmish by and by grew in power and military prestige. Even in the fatal moment of disaster, Ilutmish rose fresh, vigorous and invincible, and displayed the signs of valour and generalship in the memorable suppression of the Gakhras. Once inside the campaign, he refused to come out unsuccessful. But he never threw caution aside, for caution brought success and success brought glory. His martial vigour, physical strength and dashing courage combined with statesman-like qualities and diplomatic moves placed him on the pinnacle of renown. His conquests, however, were not his sole achievements. The Sultan's personal character and no less the policy of his government are matters of interesting speculation. With his reign of peace and prosperity, soiled with no breath of dishonour, and his marvellous mixture of boldness with caution, Ilutmish will always be looked upon as a model of a great king.

What Aibak had been to Ghuri was the reverse of what Ilutmish was to Aibak. Quṭb-u'd-dīn had at his
disposal the support of an empire, while iltutmish inherited but a remnant of his master's vast dominion, a disorganised army and an empty treasury. Quṭb-u'd-dīn, however, succeeded in keeping allied the different dynasties by means of politic marriages, and kept intact the empire of Hindustan by encouragement and support for his colleagues, patronage of his subordinates and suppression of his rivals. Full of the example of his master, Quṭb-u'd-dīn had brought a vigorous mind to bear upon the problems of government, but iltutmish possessed the ideal of a man of trained intellect and tutored imagination, and was a constructive statesman. To the daring and restlessness of his master, he added diplomacy and tact. In politics, he was a 'realist of the modern type'. It goes to his credit that he consolidated and strengthened the empire by far-sighted statesmanship, and constructed a machinery of imperial administration on permanent and durable foundations.

Before iltutmish came to the throne of Delhi, the empire of Hindustan was in a state of utter confusion. The territories of Sind, Multān and Swistān were occupied by Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Qabāchah; the dominion of Delhi belonged to Ārām Shāh; the territory of Lakhnautī was appropriated by the Khalījī Maliks and the state of Lahore and Ghaznīn was ruled by Yıldız. Again there were Hindu Rajas and chieftains, who were trying to regain their lost freedom. iltutmish recognised his position very well. First of all he conquered Ārām Shāh. His next step was to reorganise the army with a remarkable speed and to engage himself in a deadly struggle with his rivals. One by one all the hostile elements were eventually swallowed up in the empire of Delhi, and iltutmish rapidly gained the mastery and triumphed over his adversaries. He defeated and captured Yıldız at the battle of Tarāīn in 1216 A.D. For a time he was content with repelling his enemies, but soon made up his mind to face the most determined foes of the empire. Consequently, iltutmish attacked Qabāchah
in the heart of his kingdom, obtained a fatal hold upon his capital and, not satisfied with the humiliations to which his rival had submitted, finally demanded a surrender of his dominion in 1221 A.D. Jalāl-u’d-din Khwārzm Shāh flying a helpless fugitive to an inhospitable land of Hindustan received a cold greeting from Iltutmish, and he was obliged to retire towards Swistān and Sind. Next followed the conquests of Bihār, Ranthambhor, Māndā, Gwalior, Mālwā and Bīyānah. Bengal, which had attained a position of almost entire independence now recognised the sovereignty of Delhi, and formed part of the Turkish empire. Iltutmish next invoked the shade of a great name by attaining the sanction of the Abbasid Caliphate to his title as the Sultān of Hindustan, and received the mantle and diploma of investiture. Whatever may be said against the degeneracy of the Caliphate, it was still considered to be the fountain-head of all political authority and public sentiment regarded it with deep respect.

The historians with reason hold Iltutmish as the real founder of the Early Turkish Empire. At the very outset of his career, Iltutmish clearly grasped his position and realised that his policy must be steady consolidation rather than expansion. With no apprehension, he prosecuted his scheme of conquest, exterminated the rivals and substituted his own sway over all the petty dynasties. A clever man with a clear eye to his own profit, Iltutmish fought with Hindus and Muslims alike for the consolidation and extension of his empire. His reign was thus a perpetual series of efforts towards the expansion of an originally small territory. The acuteness with which he unravelled a complicated situation and the restless activity with which he maintained the integrity of his dominion and consolidated the empire are the finest achievements of his military genius. Iltutmish may rightly be called the greatest statesman of the Early Turkish Empire; there was a "blessing in his arms and a glory in his crown." He had a firm will and a stern sense of duty. The reign of
İltutmish forms the climax of Turkish rule in India; the next reigns that remain to be described consist of one long decline, relieved of course by a temporary rise of the old war-like spirit of the Turk under the reign of Balban, but nevertheless a steady and inevitable fall of the empire.
CHAPTER V

SUCCESSORS OF SULTĀN SHAMS-U’D-DĪN ĪLTUTMISH

Sultān Rukn-u’d-dīn Firūz Shāh.

On the death of Sultān Shams-u’d-dīn Īltutmish, his son Rukn-u’d-dīn Firūz Shāh was elevated to the throne of Delhi. The new Sultān was a benevolent and handsome sovereign, endowed with gentlemanliness and excellence of disposition. But no other sovereign at any time proved so extravagant and ‘open-handed’ as Sultān Rukn-u’d-dīn Firūz Shāh. ‘The evil spirit of lavishness,’ says the contemporary chronicle, ‘sprang from his inordinate addiction to sensuality, pleasure and amusement.’ He had entirely given himself up to debauchery and dissipation, so that his best gifts went to musicians and buffoons. Some idea of his excessive waste of money may be gathered by the fact that he, in a state of intoxication, used to drive forth his elephant through the bāzār scattering gold coins over the people. He was very fond of riding elephants, and all the elephant drivers became the object of special favour and were greatly benefited by his bounty. It was not his nature or disposition to hurt any creature, and this tenderness of heart was mainly responsible for the downfall of his empire.


2 ملتم آت بود has been incorrectly rendered into ‘but his misfortune was’ by Major Raverty, p. 636.

3 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 184. “No gold coins of this Sultān are known and but few of his silver tankas . . . It will be noticed that both Firūz and Rādiyah sought to enhance the security of their tenure of the throne by invoking the aid of their father’s name on their coins, giving him the higher title إلائمة while retaining for themselves the inferior المعظم—H. N. Wright—Sultāns of Delhi—their Coins and Metrology, p. 75.
The first charge that the late Sultan confided to him in the year 1288 A.D., was the fief of Badā‘ūn, which was granted to him along with a green canopy as a token of honour.\(^1\) The ‘Ain-u’l-Mulk Husain-i-Ash‘arī, formerly the Vizier of Sultan Nasīr-u’d-dīn Qabāchah, now joined his service in the same capacity. After the conquest of Gwālior, his prestige was further enhanced by his appointment as governor of Lahore,\(^2\) the capital of Khusrū Malik, the last of the Ghaznavids. On his return from his last expedition from the Indus and Būyān,\(^3\) Sultan Shams-u’d-dīn Iltutmish brought him to Delhi, for ‘the hopes of the people rested with him’ as heir-apparent, being the eldest son of the Sultan since the death of Nasīr-u’d-dīn Maḥmūd.\(^4\) But it seems rather doubtful, as the author of the Ṭabaqāt asserts at another place that the late Sultan had made his daughter Raḍiyah his heir-apparent.\(^5\) However, on the death of Sultan Shams-u’d-dīn Iltutmish, the Malikīs and other officers of the state raised Rukn-u’d-dīn to the throne of Delhi on

---

\(^1\) But it never meant that he was styled as Sultan at this stage as Qāḍī Minhāj-Sirāj states. Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 182. Red and black canopies together were regarded as an insignia of royalty, while green or red canopies were bestowed upon others.

\(^2\) Though tradition attributes the founding of Lahore or Lohwara to Lava, the son of Rām, but it is not probable that it was founded before the 1st century A.D. as the place is not mentioned in connection with the invasion of Alexander. The first historical record has been given by Hieuen Tsiang. Alberūnī speaks of Lahore as a province, whose capital was Mandhukur; while Al-Mas‘ūdī makes no mention of Lahore. In 988 A.D., the Brahman Jaipāl was defeated by Sabuktīgīn, and again by Maḥmūd in 1001 A.D. Lahore seems to have been the capital of the Punjab for the first time under Anangpāl. The earlier capital was Waihind (Und). At length in 1036, Lahore was made the capital of the Ghaznavids, from whom it was taken by Ghurī in 1186 A.D. In 1206, it became the capital of Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak.

\(^3\) Firūštah, p. 67 and the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 64 have Siwistan, which is not meant here.

\(^4\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 182. Badā‘ūnī’s Muntakhāb-u’t-Tawārīkh states that he was heir-apparent, which is not correct.

\(^5\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 185.
April 30, 1236 a.d.¹ The state officials offered presents to the Sultān and poets recited qaṣīdahs and ghazals in his praise and were duly rewarded.³

No sooner had the Sultān ascended the throne than he gave himself up to pleasure and dissipation, and never troubled himself about the affairs of the state. Most of the treasure, which Qubṭ-u’d-dīn and Shams-u’d-dīn İltutmīsh had left behind, was lavishly spent and exhausted.³ The result was a state of utter confusion and disorder in all the departments of government, and the execution of royal orders became faulty. His mother Shāh Turkān, the chief wife of the late Sultān’s harem,⁴ now assumed the royal powers and directed the affairs of government on her own responsibility. During her husband’s lifetime, she was despised and envied by her colleagues; now that she was all-powerful, gave vent to the jealousy she had harboured for many years and killed some of them. The more influential of the Turkish slave-girls were subjected to ruthless cruelty and unspeakable degradation.⁵ In addition

¹ Two copies of the text, one an old one, according to Major Raverty, have Tuesday the 29th of Shā'bān or 8th May. Taḥqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 64 and Firīghtah, p. 67 have Saturday 633 H. Tarīkh-i-Mubārah Shāhī, p. 21 has 22nd Shā'bān and Khulāṣat-u’t-Twārīkh, p. 131 gives 636 H.
³ One of the poets Taj-u’d-dīn Raizā composed a long Qaṣīdah, some verses of which are:

МБАКИДАВ МЕЛКИ ЧАВДАНИ
МЕЕН ЕЛДОРН ИРОН ДАМАМ
Drupal

Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 64, Firīghtah, p. 67; and Badā’īnī, p. 69.
⁵ Firīghtah, p. 67.
⁴ Taḥqāt-i-Nāsirī, p. 181 calls her “the chief of the royal harem,” but on p. 185 Raḍiyyah’s mother is described as “the head of the Sultān’s harem.” The status of both cannot be the same, and consequently Raḍiyyah’s mother must have been the chief of the Sultān’s harem. One was first or earliest wife; the other principal wife, and, consequently, conflict under the circumstances was inevitable.
⁵ Taḥqāt-i-Nāsirī, p. 182.
to these acts of barbarity, prince Qub-u'd-din, a younger son of Sultan Shams-u'd-din Ilutmish was blinded and put to death by her orders. This was the immediate cause of a general and passive disaffection which soon developed into active hostility.

Malik Ghiyath-u'd-din Muhammad Shah, a son of the late Sultan and younger than Ruknu'd-din Ftrau Shah, commenced hostilities in Oudh by seizing upon the treasure of Lakhnauti, which was being conveyed to the capital, and sacked and plundered several towns of Hindustan. In another direction, Malik Izz-u'd-din Muhammad Salar, governor of Bada'un revolted. Next Malik Izz-u'd-din Kabir Khan-i-Ayaz, governor of Multan; Malik Saif-u'd-din Kochi, governor of Hansi; and Malik Ala-u'd-din, governor of Lahore, conspired together and broke out into rebellion. With a view of suppressing the rebels, Sultan Ruknu'd-din marched out of the capital with a large army; but his Vizier Nizam-u'l-Mulk Muhammad Junaidi, being frightened by the strength of the rebels, deserted the Sultan and fled from Kilkheri to Koil and joined Izz-u'd-din Muhammad Salar of Bada'un. These two, afterwards, allied themselves with other conspirators Malik Jani and Malik Kochi at Lahore. There must have been, therefore, some co-ordination in the movements of the rebels. The plan of all aristocratic revolts about this period was to

1 Lubh-u't-Twarik, p. 11 says that he was the youngest son of Ilutmish; Ibn Battuta, Elliot III, p. 592, names him as Mu'izz-u'd-din.
2 Tabaqat-i-Akbari, p. 64 calls him Malik Izz-u'd-Din Kabir Khan thus confounding him with the governor of Multan.
3 Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, p. 22 has Izz-u'd-din Kabir Khan and Bada'uni. p. 70, Kabir Khan-i-Sultani.
4 Firighah, p. 67 has Kochi. Salar is turned into Salur; Ala'u'd-din Jani into Sher Khan; Kabir Khan into Kabir Khan and Izz into A'izz.
5 Firighah, p. 67 rightly asserts that the Sultan marched to Kilkheri; and it is not a mistake as Major Raverty writes, for it was from Kilkheri that his Vizier fled. See Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 183.
6 Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 183.
7 This is the first reference to, the latter is the corrector form.
paralyse the Sultan by a simultaneous revolt in all directions. If he left Delhi, the city, through a revolt, would fall into their hands.

Sultan Rukn-u’d-din Firuz Shah, considering the importance of the revolt in the Punjab, led his forces towards Kuhiram. Unfortunately the Turkish Amirs and other slaves serving as royal body-guard at the centre followed the example of the rebels and, in the vicinity of Manşūr-pur and Tarain, they killed the Tāj-u’l-Mulk Maḥmūd, the Dabīr (Secretary) and Mushrif-i-Mumālik (the examiner of records); Bahā-u’d-dīn Ḥasan-i-Asīrī; Karīm-u’d-dīn-i-Zāhid; Dīyā-u’l-Mulk, the son of the Nizām-u’l-Mulk Muḥammad Junaidī; Nizām-u’d-dīn Sharqānī; the Khwājah Rashīd-u’d-dīn Malkānī; Amīr Fakhr-u’d-dīn, the Dabīr; and a number of other Tāzik officials. The Turkish slave families considered themselves the heir of Shihāb-u’d-dīn and later on of Quṭb-u’d-dīn and Ilutmish. Consequently the appointment of non-Turkish officers, e.g., the Tāzik was resented, and they were individually and collectively, the victims of many conspiracies. The ringleaders in this insurrection were Malik Ikhtiya’r-u’d-dīn Yūzbak-i-Tughrul Khān and Malik ’Izz-u’d-dīn Balban-i-Kishlu Khān.

1 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 183 has which means ‘yielded’ but the fact remains, that they also rose in open revolt.

2 The printed text of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 183 has and not ‘son of’ as Major Raverty translates.

3 The text on p. 183 is while in Elliot, vol. II, p. 331, the Tāzik officials are made the ‘killers of the Tāzik.’ The Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 65, Firīṣṭah, p. 67 and Badā’īnī make a terrible blunder by stating that these persons, who were killed, ‘separated themselves from the Sultan’s army, went off to Delhi and joined Raḍıyah.’ Tāzik is used for the territory round about Kabul. There is also a Tājikistān Republic in U.S.S.R. Here it means non-Turks and therefore worthy of extermination.

4 For his early life see the reign of Mu’izz-u’d-dīn Bahā’īn Shāh.

5 A native of Qipchaq (the desolate region, north of the Caspian inhabited by the Turks), was purchased by Sultan Ilutmish before the fortress of Mandaur in 1226 A.D. At the outset of his career he became
In the meantime, Turkân Khâtûn conspired against Raḍiyah, the eldest daughter of the late Sultan, to seize her and to put her to death. In the month of November, 1236 A.D., Raḍiyah embarked on a hostile war with the mother of the Sultan at Delhi. Rukn-u'd-dîn, perforce, retired towards the capital. Raḍiyah was the full sister of the martyred prince Mu'izz-u'd-dîn. One Friday, she ascended the terrace of the Old Palace, called Daulat Khânah, close to the Jumâ' mosque, and addressed the people thus, “the Sultan has killed my brother and wants to kill me also.” The audience was greatly moved and the people of the city attacked the royal palace, seized Turkân Khâtûn and imprisoned her. The Turkish Amîrs and the centre contingents of the royal body-guards all joined Raḍiyah, and placed her on the throne. By this time, Sultan Rukn-u'd-dîn had arrived at Kilâkherî, and he found to his astonishment that the rebellion had broken out and his mother was thrown into prison. Raḍiyah sent an army of Turks and body-guards to Kilâkherî to imprison Sultan Rukn-u'n-dîn. The Turkish Amîrs and Maliks brought him to the presence of Sultan Raḍiyah, who ordered, 'the slayer must be slain'; and on November 29, 1236 he was, in all probability, put to death. His reign extended over a period of six months and twenty-nine days.

‘cup-bearer’ and then ‘Shorâbdâr’ (keeper of drinkables). Afterwards, the fief of Barhâmû and Baran were assigned to him one after another. In the reign of Rukn-u'd-Dîn, he was imprisoned for his misconduct as a rebel, but was afterwards released and treated with honour—Tābaqât-i-Nâsîrî, p. 268.

1 Tābaqât-i-Nâsîrî, pp. 183-184.

2 Daulat Khânah is İltutmîsh's 'White Palace'. قصر سیبید or کوشک سیبید. Later palaces were built of red sand-stone, brought from some distance. ‘White Palace’ was probably constructed of the ordinary stone found at Delhi. The site is not known.


4 Tābaqât-i-Nâsîrî, p. 184 and Badûnî's Muntakhab-u't-Twârîkh, p. 70.

5 Firûzhâkh, p. 68, says '28 days' and copies from Tābaqât-i-Akhbâr, p. 65, MSS. Intâkhab-u't-Muntakhab, has 'seven months.' Badûnî's
Sultān Raḍiyah.

The next sovereign who came to the throne of Delhi and succeeded Sultān Rukn-u’d-dīn Fīruz Shāh was Sultān Raḍiyah, the daughter of the late Sultān Shams-u’d-dīn Ilutmīsh. She was decidedly one of the ‘great monarchs’

Muntakhab-u’t-Tawārikh, p. 70, ‘six months and some days’. Tawārikh-i-Mubārak Shāhi, p. 23, ‘six months and eight days’. But Khulāsāt-u’t-Tawārikh, p. 192, astonishingly remarks ‘one year, 6 months and 8 days.’ Major Raverty incorrectly renders it into ‘28 days’. From April 30 to November 29, there are exactly 6 months and 29 days. Dr. Ishwārī Prasād (Medieval India, p. 170) says that Ilutmīsh died in 1235 A.D. and on p. 183 states that Sultān Rukn-u’d-dīn died on November 9, 1236 A.D., which means he ruled for about a year. But Dr. Ishwārī Prasād astonishingly adds ‘after a period of a little less than seven months’, which is correct, but does not tally with his previous statements. Near the tomb of Sultān Ghārī lie the two tombs of Rukn-u’d-dīn Fīruz Shāh and Mu’izz-u’d-dīn Bahram Shāh. One of these which is a domed chhatris is in good condition, the other is ruined. The remaining tomb is an octagonal domed Chhatris, with a Chhajja and pillars of dressed stone. The plastered dome is the work of Fīruz Shāh Khilji who records that he restored both the tombs. (List of Delhi Monuments, vol. IV, p. 57).

*Major Raverty converts Raḍiyah into “Raḍiyat”, contending that Raḍiyat has a meaning while Raḍiyah has no meaning. But it is not necessary that the proper noun should have a meaning; and in the absence of its having no meaning, it must be converted into something meaningful. Further, no authority, contemporary or later, calls her ‘Raḍiyat’. Sultānah would mean king’s wife; this phrase is never used—ُخداوند فامَ穆خترم جهان=His Majesty and مخدومه جهان=Her Majesty. The title of all Sultāns ended in Al-Dīn; the title was broken up, e.g.

شمس الدين والدين - مثلالدين والدين. رضيالالدين والدين

to show that they were in charge of religion as well as the state. Raḍiyat- u’d-Dunyā wad Din was the official designation of the queen. Ordinary citizens were not allowed to extend their names thus; but Shaiihīs could do so, or else others did it for them, e.g.

قطب الحمل و الحق والدين-

“No gold coins of Raḍiyah are traceable ... Her silver tāṅkāhs are of three types—all very scarce.” On one of these Raḍiyah uses her father’s name to the exclusion of her own; the other type mentions both the names jointly السلطان الظالم شمسالدنيا والدين السلطان المعظم - رضيالالدنيا والدين.
of the 'Early Turkish Empire of Delhi.' She was endowed with all the laudable qualities befitting a sovereign; she was "prudent, just, benevolent, benefactor to her kingdom, a dispenser of justice, the protector of her subjects and a great warrior."  

She was very good at reciting the Qur'an, and as the court of İltutmış was a centre of culture and learning, she must have been well-educated as Firıştaḥ states. "Of what advantages," says the author of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāširi, "were all these attributes unto her, when she was born a woman?" It was during the latter part of her reign that Sultan Rađiyah came out of seclusion, set aside the female dress and assumed the male attire: rode an elephant and appeared before the public.

The greatest breach of decorum alleged against her by the authors of the Futūḥ-u's-Salāṭin and Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbari and repeatedly asserted by other later authorities is that she allowed the Abyssinian Yağūt to lift her on to her horse—a horse, she never rode but an 'elephant'. The contemporary authority, Qāḍī Minhāj Sirāj, gives testimony to the statement that Sultan Rađiyah rode an 'elephant'. Further, there was no 'master of horse' in those days, and Yağūt

The third type has also variations.—Sometimes بنت السلطان (daughter of the Sultan) is given along with the name of İltutmış, while on other coins she appears السلطان اهتم رضية الدنيا والدرين H. N. Wright—Sultāns of Delhi—their Coins and Metrology, p. 76.

1 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāširi, p. 185.
2 Firīṣṭāḥ, p. 68. Lubb-u's-Twārīḵh, p. 8.
3 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāširi, p. 185.
4 According to Firīṣṭāḥ, p. 68 'in 1236 A.D.'
5 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāširi, p. 188.
6 Futūḥ-u's-Salāṭin edited by Dr. Mehdi Hasan, p. 129.

ş六年 غلاه زجنس حبش بدى در سواري بر مر كيش
گرفته بيك دست بارونغ وو گو

Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbari, p. 67. Badā'īn, p. 84, MSS. Intākhab-u'l-Muntakhab, p. 171. Khulāṣat-u't-Twārīḵh, p. 192, mention no such incident and Zuhdat-u't-Twārīḵh makes no reference to the Abyssini an whatsoever.
was the *Amīr-i-Aḥhūr* \(^1\) (Lord of the Royal Stable). It was customary in those days that the *Amīr-i-Aḥhūr* assisted the sovereign to mount, but Major Raverty observes that 'what is applicable to male sovereigns may not be applicable to female sovereigns.' \(^2\)

Rādīyah's solitary love-affair is a later invention. It cannot, however, be deduced from the contemporary account that her fondness towards Yāqūt \(^3\) was criminal. Qāḍī Minhāj Sirāj gives Yāqūt a good character and at one place remarks that he "acquired favour in attendance upon the Sultan"; and this was resented by the Turkish Maliks and Amīrs, \(^4\) for he was a non-Turk. *Firīshṭah*, in this context, observes, "Men of wisdom will not fail to see from what direction blew the storm that withered the flower of her garden. What has an Abyssinian slave \(^5\) to do with the office of 'premier noble' —a base-born man with the guidance of such a queen?" \(^6\) This is, however, a later-day rubbish, when the seclusion of sexes had become a part of religion. Persian literature shows that the later-day inten-

---

1 On p. 261 of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī* Minhāj Sirāj says that when Sultan Raṣīlah came to the throne, Malik Ikhṭiyyūr-u’ddin Yūzbak-i-Tughrūl Khān was made Amīr-i-Aḥhūr. Consequently, Yāqūt must have been raised to that office or deposed and again elevated.

2 Raverty—*Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, see pp. 642 and 643.

3 He was not a slave as Dr. Ishwarī Prasād (*Medieval India*, p. 186) states. Thomas characterises this invented affair as "wayward fancy pointed in a wrong direction"—*Chronicles of Pathan Kings*, p. 106.

4 *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, p. 188.

5 It cannot be said with authority that he was a slave; for Qāḍī Minhāj Sirāj does not refer to it but calls him Amīr Jamāl-u’ddin Yāqūt.

6 *Firīshṭah* quotes no authority for the statement that he was made amīr al-’amara (premier noble).

7 *Firīshṭah*, p. 69 writes as follows:

"فارغان دور انديش دائم که بإن باد اد بار از كدام صاعرا 
برخاست - و گل دولت رضيه را كدامي كنداب از بين بركند آري 
فلام حبشي را با امیرالامراء دهدلي چه نسبت - و مرن دون چندين 
رم به پيشواري چنان ملكه تاجدار چه كار".
sity of the Purdah system was due to the horror of the Mongol invasion. Laws, really military measures, were passed in Persia to enforce it. But Rađiyah lived before this period. Maulānā Ghizālī's monograph on Purdah shows that in spite of priestly opinion the Purdah system was more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Sulṭān Rađiyah was obviously a powerful, manly and hafty Tartar woman, and possibly unmarriageable. The fact that, in spite of the universal custom; her father never had her married is very significant. The fiction was that Rađiyah was a Sulṭān, 'a man'. Her behaviour as a normal Sulṭān might have been more than a fiction for the people, who knew that she, unlike Elizabeth, made no pretentions to feminity. Other queens, when entering politics, preferred to intrigue from within the harem. Rađiyah's public appearance was intended to impress upon the people and the Turkish officers that they had not to deal with a pale and delicate beauty. Growing up as a tom-boy, Rađiyah seems to have been a complete stranger to the normal female reactions in man's society. Her misfortune, however, was the same as that of other Turkish rulers, her predecessors and successors. Like them, she had to face the power and the intrigues of the Turkish bureaucracy, and likewise she tried, though unsuccessfully, to form a non-Turkish group upon whom she might rely.

As regards her early life, suffice to say, that she was the daughter of the late Sulṭān Shams-u'd-dīn Iltutmish from his most respected and favoured wife, the chief of the royal harem, who resided in the Kūshk-i-Fīrūzī (Fīrūzī Castle). Even in her father's lifetime, she used to interfere in the affairs of the state, and exercised great authority and in-

1 Dr. Tripāchī (Some Aspects of Muslim Administration, p. 28) says: "They (the Turks) could not easily reconcile themselves with the idea of a woman ruling over them. It was a daring innovation". Probably the learned author forgets that among Turks women held a high status, and one of the Gūr Khāns of the Qarā Khitāns was a woman. Dr. Ishwarī Prasād (Medieval India, p. 184) says, "The ministers of the Sulṭān felt scandalized at the elevation of a woman to royal dignity", which may also be criticized on the same ground.
fluence. The late Sultan noticed 'in her countenance indications of sovereignty and heroism,' and admired her wonderful sagacity. On his return from the conquest of Gwalior, the Sultan ordered the Tāj-u'll-Mulk Maḥmūd, the Mushrif-i-Mumālik (Secretary of the State) to draw up a decree appointing her as his heir-apparent. Before the execution of the order, the officers of the Sultan represented to him saying, "What is the policy of your Majesty in nominating a daughter, when you have able and grown up sons?" My sons," replied the Sultan, "are engrossed in the pleasures of youth and none of them has the capacity of conducting the business of the state and, in fact, they will not be able to carry on the government. After my death, it will be found out that none but my daughter shall be worthy of the kingdom. Radīyah is far better than her brothers; although in the form of a woman, she is a man in intellect and sagacity." What the Sultan had predicted came to pass.

The most important event, which happened at the outset of her career, was the revolt of the heretics under their
leader Nūr Turk, who collected together his disciples from different parts of Hindustan such as Gujarāt, Sind, the environs of the capital and the banks of the Jumānā and the Ganges. All of them jointly conspired against Islam, incited the people to defy the Ḥanafi and Shāfiʿī doctrines, and called the Sunnī 'Ulemā Nāṣībī (the enemies of 'Alī) and Murjī (procrastinators). On March 4, 1237 A.D., an armed body of heretics and Karmāthians to the number of one thousand men, entered the Jumā Masjid from two directions, and attacked and killed a great number of Mussalmans. Thereupon, the warriors of the city such as Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Aiytum, the Bālāramī and Amir Imām Nāṣir, the poet and others, all armed with weapons, surrounded the heretics from all sides and put all of them to death.

On her accession to the throne of Delhi, Sulṭān Raḍiyah followed most of the traditions of her father, and renewed the laws and regulations of the past, which had been neglected in the reign of her predecessor Sulṭān Rukn-u'd-dīn Firūz Shāh. About this time, Malik Tughrul-i-Tughā Khan, governor of Lakhnauti, made an inroad into the territory of Tirhat (former district of Bengal, now divided into Muzaffarpūr and Darbhanga) and acquired vast booty, and consequently he was dignified with a canopy of state and a standard.

(b) Arabian—Fatimid Caliphate. The Arabian Ismāʿīlīs had conquered Multān, but were subdued by Maḥmūd and Shihāb-u'd-dīn. Sulṭān Maḥmūd used to cut off their hands and feet, while 'Alī-u'd-dīn Khaljī had them sawed into two. Heresy in India came from 'Ajam across the sea via Sind and Gujarāt. The Borahs and Khojahs are a mixed population partly Arab and partly Indian and are still very influential.

1 Siyar-u'l-Auliyyā', p. 69, styles him as Maulānā Nūr 'Alī Turk.
2 Tabaqat-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 189.
3 The doctrines of the Ismāʿīlīs are explained in Shahrastānī's Kitāb-ul-Milal wal Nahl, an authoritative book written by a contemporary of Shihāb-u'd-dīn.
4 Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 24, says, "To the number of two thousand men."
5 Tabaqat-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 190.
6 For his early life see the reign of Īltutmīsh.
7 Tabaqat-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 243.
Once more a reign of peace and tranquility began, but the Malikṣ and Amīrs would not let it go smoothly. The Vizier of the kingdom, the Nizām-u’l-Mulk Muḥammad Junaidi refused to acknowledge Raḍiyah as sovereign and summoned Malik ‘Alā-u’d-dīn Jāni, Malik Sāif-u’l-dīn Kūchī, Malik ‘Izz-u’d-dīn Kābir Khān-i-Ayāz and Malik ‘Izz-u’d-dīn Muḥammad Sālārī from different parts of Hindustan, who conspired together against the queen, and commenced hostilities before the gate of the city of Delhi. Malik Naṣrat-u’d-dīn Tayāsī, the governor of Oudh, on her imperial command, started for Delhi to subdue the insurrection; but the rebel Malikṣ succeeded in capturing him after he had crossed the Ganges; and he died in a short time of an illness which had overtaken him. Malik ‘Izz-u’d-dīn Balban-i-Kishā Kūn was also taken prisoner by the hostile Malikṣ, but was soon released and treated with great honour by Sulṭān Raḍiyah. The Sulṭān now had no other alternative but to issue forth from the city and to pitch her tents on the bank of the river Jumna. Several conflicts took place between the opposite parties, and at last peace was effected. Raḍiyah’s clever and timely policy had sown the seed of discord among the lawless Malikṣ and they had to scatter in different directions. Malik ‘Izz-u’d-dīn

1 Firīṣṭah, p. 68, incorrectly calls him “Sher Khānī.”
2 Firīṣṭah, p. 68. “Kochī,” Tabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 66, has “Kojī.”
3 For his early life see the reigns of Iltutmish and Rūkn-u’d-dīn Fīrūz Shāh.
4 Tabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 66, calls him ‘Izz-u’d-dīn Hānsī! For his early life see the reign of Iltutmish. He had been created governor of Oudh by Sulṭān Raḍiyah after the rebellion of Ghīṭāgh-u’d-dīn Muḥammad Shāh was quelled.
5 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 186.
6 It is wrong to say that “she was not strong enough to give or accept battle”. Cambridge History of India, vol. III, p. 58.
7 Firīṣṭah, p. 68 and Tabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 66. These authorities and also Bādūnī’s Mundkāh-ch-u’t-Twārisīḥ, p. 84 assert that it was Sulṭān Raḍiyah who by her tactics and diplomacy succeeded in upsetting and confounding the rebel Malikṣ. It was, in fact, due more to the disunion among the conspirators that Raḍiyah succeeded in bringing the two Malikṣ to her side.
Muḥammad Sālārī and Malik 'Izz-u'd-dīn Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz secretly went over to the side of the Sultān, and presented themselves before her Majesty on the stipulation that Malik Jānī, Malik Saif-u'd-dīn Kūchī and the Niẓām-u'l-Mulk Muḥammad Junaidī were to be summoned and imprisoned. On receiving the intelligence of this treacherous act, the other Malik s fled from the field, but were pursued by the royal forces. Malik Saif-u'd-dīn Kūchī and his brother Fakhr-u'd-dīr were captured and killed in prison. Malik 'Alā-u'd-dīn Jānī was slain at Nakwān within the limits of Pāyāl (Pāil is now Šāhibgarh in Patiālā State, Punjab) the Niẓām-u'l-Mulk Muḥammad Junaidī retired towards the hills of Sirmūr and there died shortly afterwards.

The position of Sultān Raḍīyāh was now secure, and she had leisure enough to reorganize the affairs of the state. She assigned the Wizārat to Khwājah Muḥazzab-u'd-dīn who had formerly acted as deputy to Niẓām-u'l-Mulk Muḥammad Junaidī, and gave him the title of Niẓām-u'l-Mulk. The title of Qutluq Khān was bestowed upon Malik Saif-u'd-dīn 'Ibad-i-Bhaqī, who was appointed minister of war. Malik 'Izz-u'd-dīn Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz, who had submitted to

1 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 187.
2 Ibid., p. 187, and FIRĪGHĀH, p. 68, have 'Šābīl'. The Cambridge History of India, vol. III, p. 58 has Pāil. In fact it is Pāil, the name of a very old place (now Šāhibgarh in Patiālā State)—as supported by Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Šāhī, p. 26, and Ṭabaqāt-i-Akhbarī, p. 66.
3 The printed text of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 187 has 'Kuh Bārdār'. There is no Bārdār Hill but Būrdā hills in Kāthiāwār, Bombay. Sirmūr is now a hill state lying on the west bank of the Jumāna and south of Simla. The southern border of the state runs along the crest of the outer Siwaliks.
4 Elliot, II, p. 334, translates the proper name Muḥazzab-u'd-dīn into "an upright officer," and accordingly Vizier's name has been converted into 'virtue', which he little possessed. A unique inscription of Khwājah Jahān has recently been discovered at Aligarh and runs as follows:—

"بنا ایسی مقام خداوند کے لئے سلطان پاڑشاہ اسماء شمس الدنیا والدین کے لئے ایمان اور نبیت ایالت خداوند

خواص سمجھاں دستور صاحب قرآن نظام المنک ملکوک (الورانی)".
5 The word is written 'Bhaq '; and Bhattī and seems rather doubtful.
Sultàn Raḍiyah, was made governor of Lahore. Throughout her reign Malik Hindū Kháñ, Mihtar-i-Mubārak, held the office of treasurer, and the territory and fortress of Uch was entrusted to his charge. Malik Saif-u’d-dīn Aibak, the Shamsì ‘Ajamì was appointed Sahm-u’l-Hasham (Marshal of the Retinue). Once more peace and tranquillity reigned supreme, and all the Malikà and Amīrs made their submission throughout the territories from Lakhnautì to Diwāl or Dīwalpūr.

Suddenly Malik Saif-u’d-dīn Aibak Bhaq died, and was succeeded by Malik Quṭb-u’d-dīn Husain, son of Al-Ghūrī. The new minister of war was appointed to relieve the garrison of Ranthambhor, which was, since the death of Sultàn Íltutmish, invested by the Hindus. Malik Quṭb-u’d-dīn marched to Ranthambhor with a large army, rescued the Mussalmans, destroyed the fortification and returned to the capital. About this time, Malik Ikhtiyār-u’d-dīn Aikin was elevated to the post of Amīr-i-Hājīb.

Malik Jamāl-u’d-dīn Yāqūt continued as Amīr-i-Aḥhūr

---

1 For his early life see the reign of Íltutmish. With the possible exception of ‘Imād-u’d-dīn Raihān, Hindū Kháñ is the only officer of Indian birth mentioned.

2 A native of Qipchāq; originally a slave of the renowned merchant, the Khwājah Shams-u’d-dīn the ‘Ajamī, who sold him to Sultàn Íltutmish. He held many important offices in the reign of Sultàn Raḍiyah and became the Marshal of the Retinue. He became Chief Judge in the reign of Mu’iz-u’d-dīn Bahram Shāh, and Sultàn Naṣir-u’d-dīn entrusted the siefe of Palwāl and Kāmāh (there is Kamālī, a town in Montgomery district of Punjab) to his charge and then Baran and Kasrak (there is Kasū, now a subdivision in Gorakhpūr district, U.P.) were given under his charge one after another. The two names of Kamāh and Kasrak are untraceable.

3 Ţabaqāt-i-Ākhārī, p. 66, adds ‘Darband’ as well. It is, in all probability, Dīpālpūr in Montgomery district of Punjab.

4 He is styled both as Husain and Ḥāsan. Fīrāqtaḥ, p. 68, Ţabaqāt-i-Ākhārī, p. 67, and Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 26, all call him ‘Ḥāsan’.

5 It is, therefore, incorrect to say that “she aroused the resentment of the nobles by the appointment of an African named Jamāl-u’d-dīn Yaqūt to the post of the ‘Master of the horse’. In fact such a post did not exist
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(Lord of the Imperial Stable) and Malik Ikhtiyār-u'd-dīn Aitkin was created Amir-i-Hājib (Lord Chamberlain). This aroused jealousy on the part of other Maliks, but Sultān Raḍiyah controlled them with an iron-hand and came out of seclusion and appeared in public.

Shortly afterwards, Sultān Raḍiyah ordered her forces to proceed to Gwalior. Malik Tamar K̄hān-i-Qīrān and Malik Tāj-u'd-dīn Sanjarī Qutluq, the feudatories of Qannauj and Baran, respectively, were also directed to join the expedition. Both the Maliks rendered valuable services, and were duly rewarded. On the death of Malik Naṣrat-u'd-dīn Tayāsī, Oudh and its dependencies were made over to the charge of Malik Tamar K̄hān-i-Qīrān. Having established himself in Oudh, he led expeditions into the neighbouring parts of the territory as far as Tirhut, several times plundered the territory of Bhagelkhand at that time. Refer to Cambridge History of India, vol. III, p. 59. The text of the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 188, runs as follows: "Amīr Jāmāl-u'd-dīn Yaqūt, who was Amīr-i-ĀMūr (Lord of the Royal Stable) acquired great influence at the royal court.

1 Malik Ikhtiyār-u'd-dīn Aitkin was a Qara Ḳhitṭā Turk. Amīr Ibaq Sanṭī sold him to Sultān Shams-u'd-dīn Iltutmīsh, who elevated him to the position of Sar-i-ENCILār, and entrusted to his charge Mānṣūrpūr, Kūjah and Nandānah (in the Jhelum district, Punjab) one after another. He became Amīr-i-Hājib in Raḍiyah's reign and the Naib of the Sultān Mu'izz-u'd-dīn Bahram Shāh, in whose reign he was assassinated.—See Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 252, 253.

2 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 188.

3 For his early life see the reign of Sultān Iltutmīsh.

4 A native of Qipchaq, Malik Tāj-u'd-dīn was purchased by Sultān Iltutmīsh from the Khwājah Jāmāl-u'd-dīn Karimān. He started his career as Jāmāddār (Keeper of the Royal robe) and, subsequently, as Shāhnah (Superintendent of the Stable). During the period under review, he became feudatory of Baran and Saraswāṭī. In the reign of 'Alā'u'd-dīn Mas'ūd Shāh he became governor of Bādā'īn and in 1242 A.D., he overthrew the independent Hindu tribes of Kather (old name of Rohilkhand). However, a certain party grew jealous of his position and poisoned him—See Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 256, 257.

5 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 247.
in Central India), and extracted tribute from the Raes and Ranas of that part of the country. Malik Tāj-u'd-dīn Sanjart Qutluq received the district of Saraswatī as his fief for the excellent service he rendered during the Gwalior expedition.\(^1\) The author of the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, Qāḍī Minhāj, Sirāj, the Majd-ul-Umarā Ḍiyā-u'd-dīn Junaidī, Amir-i-dād (Chief Justice) of Gwalior and other notable persons, in obedience to her royal commands, came out of the fort on March 19, 1238 A.D., and started for Delhi. Soon after Qāḍī Minhāj Sirāj was given the charge of the Naṣiria College at the capital along with the Qāḍīship of Gwalior.\(^3\)

From this time onwards, Sulṭān Raḍiyah was involved in conspiracies and rebellions, which ultimately ended her life. Malik 'Izz-u'd-dīn\(^5\) Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz, governor of Lahore, broke out into rebellion, and Sulṭān Raḍiyah marched against him. But 'Izz-u'd-dīn considered a loyal submission more politic, and at last an accommodation took place. The province of Multān, which was held by Malik 'Alā-u'd-dīn Qaraqash\(^4\) was assigned to Malik 'Izz-u'd-dīn, in addition to his governorship of Lahore.\(^5\) Sulṭān Raḍiyah then returned to the capital on March 16, 1240 A.D.\(^6\)

About the same time, Malik Ikhtiyār-u'd-dīn Altūniah,\(^7\) governor of Tabarhindah,\(^8\) grew sick of Yāqūt's\(^9\) pre-eminence, and raised the standard of revolt. Sulṭān Raḍiyah marched against him with a large army on April 4, 1240 A.D.

\(^1\) Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 256.  
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 183.  
\(^3\) Firīghāt, p. 68, wrongly styles him as Ā'iz-u'd-dīn.  
\(^4\) For his early life see the reign of Ilūtmīs.  
\(^5\) Firīghāt, p. 68.  
\(^6\) Elliot, vol. II, p. 335, turns ' Shāh-bān ' into ' Ramaḍān '.  
\(^7\) Malik Ikhtiyār-u'd-dīn Altūniah was a slave of Sulṭān Shams-u'd-dīn Ilūtmīs. He was made Sharbat Dār (Superintendent of Liquors) and subsequently Sar-i-Chatr Dār (Head of the state-canopy bearers). During the period under review, he became feudatory of Baran and of Tabarhindah afterwards. For the latter history of his life see Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 251.  
\(^8\) Firīghāt, p. 68, has Bhatindah. Badā'īnī, p. 84, has Tabarhindah in conformity with the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī. Bhatindah and Tabarhindah are the same.  
\(^9\) Rauḍat-u's-Ṣafā, vol. IV, p. 889, says that 'Yāqūt was Amīr-i-Lashkār (Commander of troops)' which is quite incorrect.
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But when she reached the territory of Tabarhindah, the Turkish Amīrs revolted, put the Abyssinian Yāqūt to death and sent Raḍiyah prisoner to the fort of Tabarhindah. While she was in prison, Malik Altūniyah espoused her, and brought her out of captivity. Her marriage to Altūniyah must have been forced due to the latter’s futile ambitions. Though the chief rebels had been cast aside by his fellow-conspirators, such a marriage could have had no place in Raḍiyah’s programme as it was sure to alienate the mass of the Turkish officers. Now both of them led a strong force to regain possession of Delhi, and were soon joined by Malik 'Izz-u'd-dīn Muḥammad Sālārī and Malik Qarāqshāh. In the meantime, Sultān Mu'izz-u'd-dīn Bahrām Shāh was elevated to the throne, Malik Ikhtiyār-u'd-dīn Aitkin had been slain and Bahā-u'd-dīn Sanqar-i-Rūmī succeeded him as Amir-i-Hājib. In the month of September 1240 A.D., Sultān Mu'izz-u'd-dīn Bahrām Shāh, son of Sultān Shams-u'd-dīn Iltutmish, led an army against his opponents and defeated and put to rout the combined forces of Sultān Raḍiyah and Altūniyah on Oct. 12, 1240 A.D. The remaining forces deserted the flying queen at Kaithal, (town in Karnāl district of the Punjab). Raḍiyah and Malik Altūniyah both fell into the hands of Hindus, who put them to death on Oct. 13, 1240 A.D. Thus ended the brilliant career of heroic Raḍiyah after a reign of three years, six months and six

1 And 'not on the way' as in the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 67 and Firīghtah, p. 68.

2 Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 67, and Firīghtah, p. 68, seem to know better than the contemporary authority, when they assert that "within a short time, she had collected a large army of Jāts and Gakkhrs and was joined by most of the local zamindars and some Amīrs."

3 Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 68, and Firīghtah, p. 68, say that "the Sultān despatched Malik Ā'izz-u'd-dīn Balban or Malik Taqīn-i-Khurd, a son-in-law of Iltutmish at the head of a large army against Sultān Raḍiyah.

4 Firīghtah, pp. 68, 69, makes the parties fight twice—one at Bhatindah, where 'Izz-u'd-dīn Balban was successful and then at Kather. Badehūni, p. 85; also repeats the same.

5 Ibn Baṭṭūţah, Elliot, III, pp. 592, 593, makes Nūsir-u'd-dīn the successor of Sultān Raḍiyah. "Raḍiyah, on account of fatigue and hunger, begged for food, and a cultivator gave her a bit of bread. She then went to sleep on the
days.\(^1\) Her grave is said to be in New Delhi, which was then a wilderness.\(^2\)

\textit{Sultān Mu'izz-u'd-din Bahārām Shāh.}

Sultān Mu'izz-u'd-din Bahārām Shāh was ‘a victorious monarch, fearless, intrepid and blood-thirsty’.\(^3\) Still he possessed some rare virtues; he was unassuming, straightforward and of excellent disposition and charming manners. His way of life was simple, and he never had a liking for gorgeous attire, jewels or other insignia of royalty.

When Sultān Raḍiyah was imprisoned in the fort of Tabarhindah, Mu'izz-u'd-din Bahārām Shāh was elevated to the throne of Delhi by the Maliks and Amīrs on April 23, 1240 A.D.\(^4\) The Maliks and Amīrs and the military officers pledged their allegiance to his sovereignty within the Da'ulat Khānāh\(^5\) (White Palace) on May 6, 1240 A.D.,\(^6\) on the stipulation that Malik Ikhtiyār-u'd-dīn Aitkin\(^7\) was to be appointed Nābī (Regent)\(^8\) of the Sultān.

ground. The cultivator caught sight of her tunic studded with gold and pearls. He, consequently, killed her and walked away with the valuables." It is a story and is often repeated about others as well.

\(^1\) \textit{Tabaqāt-i-Nāシリ}, p. 190.
\(^3\) \textit{Tabaqāt-i-Nāシリ}, p. 191. "No gold coins of this Sultān have been found and his silver tankāh of three varieties are scarce... Bahārām’s staters are of several types." He is usually styled on the coins as

\begin{center}
\begin{quote}
السُلطان أعظم ممّاز الدُنْيَا والدِينِ أبو الفَخْدُور بِهِرَام شاه ابن السلطان ناصر امیر الموسَمِئين
\end{quote}
\end{center}

H. N. Wright—\textit{Sultāns of Delhi—their Coins and Metrology}, p. 76.
\(^4\) \textit{Khulāṣat-u't-Twārīkh}, p. 193, gives only the year.
\(^5\) According to Dīyā Bārānī, p. 177, Jalal-u'd-dīn Khaljī's enthronement took place in the Da'ulat Khānāh (White Palace) even after Balban had constructed the larger Red Palace. The term White Palace must have come into use after the Red Palace had been constructed. Da'ulat Khānāh is the older name.

\(^6\) \textit{Tarīḫ-i-Mubārah Shāhī}, p. 28 gives "17 Shavval" in place of 11 of the \textit{Tabaqāt-i-Nāシリ}, the only contemporary authority.

\(^7\) For his early life, see the reign of Sultān Raḍiyah. \textit{Firāštah}, p. 69, calls him 'Alptīfīn.'

\(^8\) Regent—whose duty was to perform the functions of the Sultān on his own authority.
Malik Ikhtiyār-u’d-dīn Aitkin, the Regent, in conjunction with the Vizier, Nizām-u’ll-Mulk, the Khwājah Muḥazzab-u’d-dīn ‘Īwāḍ, the Mustaufi (auditor), assumed the direction of the affairs of the state, and married a widowed sister of the Sultān, formerly the wife of Qāḍī ‘Ikhtiyār-u’d-dīn,’ son of Qāḍī Nāṣir-u’d-dīn. Further, he assumed a triple naubat and stationed an elephant before his gate—a set of special privileges, which the sovereigns alone could enjoy in those days. This aroused suspicion on the part of Sultān Mu’izz-u’d-dīn Bahram Shāh who commissioned two of his confidential Turkish slaves to pretend madness and to assassinate both the Regent and the Nizām-u’ll-Mulk. On July 29, 1240 A.D., the two Turks, like the notorious Ismā’īlī Assassins, entered the Qasr-i-Sufaid (the White Palace) and began to behave like lunatics. Thereupon, Malik Ikhtiyār-u’d-dīn scolded them, and ordered them to behave properly. This gave them their opportunity; they drew their daggers, and slew him then and there. Next turning to the Nizām-u’ll-Mulk they inflicted two wounds on him, but he managed to escape. To keep up discipline the Sultān sent the two Turks to prison, but released them shortly afterwards. On his recovery, the Nizām-u’ll-Mulk assumed the charge of his duties as usual.

Malik Badr-u’d-dīn Sanqar succeeded Malik Ikhtiyār-

1 This name is given by Firighat, p. 69, Lubb-u’t-Tuwārīkh, p. 13, and Tabaqāt-i-Abhari, p. 68; while the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 192, say ‘the son of Qāḍī Nāṣir-u’d-dīn.’
2 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 192.
3 The Tārīikh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 29, says that ‘Altūniya married Raḍivah as late as 638 H. or 1240 A.D.’ which is quite improbable.
4 It is not قصر سعفید نام but قصر سعفید دام. The former has been translated by Elliot, vol. II, p. 338, “the palace of the white roof.”

The ground-floor was used as the Court and for office accommodation and the upper floor or floors (پام) was royal residence. This is proved by the oldest of the existing Palaces—that of Muḥammad Tughlaq.

5 Firighat, p. 69. Badā’īnī, p. 86, makes both of them killed at this stage.
6 Malik Badr-u’d-dīn Sanqar was a Rūmī by birth, and had, by accident, fallen into slavery. He was purchased by Sultān Shams-u’d-dīn Ilutmish, who made him طشتدار (Ewer bearer) برهنده دار (Bearer
u'd-dīn as Amīr-i-Ḥājīb (Lord Chamberlain), and carried on the government without consulting the Sulṭān and sought to dominate over the Vizier, the Niẓām-u'l-Mulk. In a spirit of retaliation, Muḥazzab-u'd-dīn along with other Amīrs and mischief-makers managed to alienate Badr-u'd-dīn from the Sulṭān. Becoming suspicious of the Sulṭān, Badr-u'd-dīn conspired to set him aside and to elevate one of his brothers to the throne. Consequently, on August 27, 1241 A.D., he convened a meeting of the chiefs and Ṣadrīs such as the Qāḍī-i-Mumatīk Jalāl-u'd-dīn Kāshānī, Qāḍī Kabīr-u'd-dīn, Shaikh Muḥammad Shāmī and others at the residence of the Ṣadr-u'l-Mulk (Chief Ṣadr or Judge) Syed Tāj-u'd-dīn 'Alī Musavī,\(^2\) the Mushrif-i-Mumatīk (Secretary of the State). In order to draw the Niẓām-u'l-Mulk into the conspiracy, the Ṣadr-u'l-Mulk\(^3\) went to call him to the meeting.\(^4\) The Vizier acted tactfully and concealed a royal servant, who happened to be present on the spot, in a corner, wherefrom he could easily overhear their talk. The Ṣadr-u'l-Mulk laid down, before the Vizier, the proposed scheme of change in the government of the state, to which the latter replied by saying that he would follow him soon.

of the royal purse), Superintendent of Badā'ūn (an office same as that of Ser-i-Vandār) one after another; until he rose to the position of Naʿīb-i-Amīr-i-Akbar (Deputy to the Lord of the Imperial Stable). During Sulṭān Raḍīyāh's reign, the sīf of Badā'ūn was entrusted to him, and subsequently he was made Amīr-i-Ḥājīb. For the latter history of his life see as above. \(^{\text{2}}\) Tābaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, pp. 254, 255.

\(^{\text{3}}\) Tāriḵh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 29 has صدر الملك بِنِ اسم موسى Firīghtah, p. 69, has موسى (Mūsā). It is in fact Mūsāvī as the Tābaqāt states.

\(^{\text{4}}\) Tābaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 68; Firīghtah, p. 69 and Lubb-u't-Tawārīkh, p. 14 give quite a different statement. They say, "But Ṣadr-u'l-Mulk immediately sent a messenger to the Sulṭān to enjoin him of the affair and then taking a confidential officer of the Sulṭān in disguise he went to Niẓām-u'l-Mulk's house, and placed the officer in a corner, wherefrom he could hear all that passed."—It is therefore doubtful whether Firīghtah ever saw Minhāj Sirāj's work, but seems to copy from the Tābaqāt-i-Akbarī.

\(^{\text{5}}\) Tābaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 193.
The Vizier then sent the information to the Sultan through the confidential officer with the request that the Sultan should immediately hasten to Sadr-ul-Mulk’s house, and scatter the conspirators. The Sultan acted promptly and reached the spot to the amazement of the disaffected party. From considerations of expediency, Malik Badr-u’d-din was sent away as governor of Bada’un, and Qadi Jalal-u’d-din Kashi was dismissed from his office. Qadi Kabir-u’d-din and Shaikh Muhammad Shami were banished from the capital. After a period of four months, Badr-u’d-din returned to Delhi, but was ordered to be imprisoned and beheaded along with Syed Taj-u’d-din Ali Musavi. Qadi Shams-u’d-din, the Qadi of Mahrara (now a town in Etah district, U.P.) at the instigation of a dervish named Ayyub, was thrown under the elephant’s feet. These acts of barbarity and hard-heartedness increased the fear and terror of the Vizier and Malik, who now thought of rising against the Sultan.

While the affairs of the state were in such a perturbed condition, Ugyuday despatched an army of ‘infidel Mongols’ from the direction of Khurasan and Ghaznin under Tayir who laid siege to the city of Lahore. The governor of the place, Malik Ikhtiyar-u’d-din Qaraqash, who was, by nature, warlike, enterprising and brave, offered resistance; but as he was not supported by the people, he left the city.

1 According to the wrong statement of Firighat, p. 69, and Tabaqat-i-Akbari, p. 69, the Sadr-ul-Mulk sent the information to the Sultan.

2 This Malik was the patron of Ghiyath-u’d-din Balban, subsequently Ulugh Khan-i-A’zam. Through his patronage and kindness, Balban was raised to the position of Amir-i-Akbar (Lord of the Imperial Stable).

3 Tabaqat-i-Akbari, p. 69, turns it into Sujji.

4 This is a statement taken from Firighat, p. 86, and Tabaqat-i-Akbari, p. 69, while the contemporary account Tabaqat-i-Nasiri is silent on this point. Qadi Shams-u’d-din does not seem to have been involved in the conspiracy and consequently it is rather doubtful whether he was killed at this stage. The case of Qadi’s death is related elsewhere by the Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 195, when it asserts that the Qadi was thrown under the feet of an elephant at the instigation of a dervish named Ayyub.

5 Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 194.

6 Ibid., pp. 194 and 392.
at midnight and started for Delhi. The Mongol army pursued him, but he escaped in safety to the capital, where he, along with Malik Ikhtiyar-u'd-din Yuzbaki-Tughrul Khan rendered valuable services to the Sultan. Aqsanqar, the Kutwul and Muhammed, the Amiri-Akhur (Lord of the Stable), however, continued fighting with the Mongols and put most of them to the sword. Unluckily the Kutwul was killed in the battle of Lahore, and Takhir the Mongol general also expired. When the city was left without a ruler, the Mongols occupied it on December 22, 1241 A.D., sacked the city and captured a large number of the citizens.

No sooner had the Sultan received this dreadful news, than he summoned the people in the Qasr-i-Sufaid (White Palace), and ordered Qadi Minhaj Siraj to deliver discourses in his support. The Sultan, then, nominated Malik Qutb-u'd-din Husain 'Ali Ghuri, and the Vizier Nizam-u'l-Mulk at the head of the royal forces against the Mongols.

The Turkish Maliks and Amirs had lost all confidence in the Sultan, and were, consequently, slow in obeying his commands in assembling their followers; and the arch-rebel Khwaja Muizzab-u'd-din, even after the army reached the river Beas, instead of pushing on towards Lahore, was

1 A native of Qipchaq and a slave of Sultan Iltutmish, Malik Ikhtiyar-u'd-din acted, during the investment of Gwalior, as Nadiib-i-Chaghaniyir (Deputy Controller of the royal kitchen). He became Amiri-Hajib (Lord Chamberlain) and subsequently Shaikh-i-Pil (Superintendent of elephants) in the time of Sultan Rukn-u'd-din Firuz Shah. He was elevated to the position of Amiri-Akhur (Lord of the Stable) during Sultan Ra dyeja's reign, and sided with Sultan Mu'izz-u'd-din Bahram Shah against the rebels. Tabarindah and Lahore were entrusted to his charge by Sultan 'Allu'd-din Mas'ud Shah. Afterwards, he became governor of Qannauj, Oudh and Lakhnauti one after another. See Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, pp. 261 to 265.

2 Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, pp. 385, 394.

3 Firuzah, p. 69, calls him Chief Minister or Regent.

4 The Tabaqat-i-Akbarn, p. 90, say that the Sultan despatched Nizam-u'l-Mulk along with other Amirs to repel the Mongols.

5 Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 195.
occupied in awful intrigues against his master. "These Turks and Amirs, a body of traitors, who are sent with us," represented the Vizier in writing to the Sultán, 1 "are not likely to become loyal. The best course for your Majesty is to despatch an edict empowering us to kill them." 2 The Sultán, without any hesitation, sent the required order, which the unfaithful Vizier instantly showed to the Maliks and Amirs. This caused a general upheaval in the army; and the Maliks and Amirsrose in open revolt against the Sultán. On having received the intelligence of the sedition, Sultan Mu'tizz-ud-din Bahram Shāh, with great difficulty, prevailed on the Shaikh-u'l-Islām, Syed Qutb-ud-din 3 to go and pacify the Amirs, but he sided with the rebels and the latter refused to submit. Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-din Qarāqаш, however, succeeded in establishing his power at Lahore. 4

The army returned to the Capital without accomplishing anything, and commenced fighting against the Sultán on the 22nd February, 1242, A.D., and besieged the capital city until the month of May 1242 A.D. The reason of this protracted hostilities was, that a certain Mihtar-i-Farrāsh 5 (Chief of carpet-spreaders) Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shāh Farrukhī by name had acquired ascendancy over the Sultán's mind, got an order for the imprisonment of Maliks Yūzbak and Qarāqаш, 6 and persistently refused to yield to any

1 Firīštah, pp. 69, 70, describes this event in a different manner—"The body of traitors, your Majesty has sent with us, will be able to achieve nothing. The trouble will not be removed unless you come here in person." The Sultán replied, "These people deserve death and will meet their punishment in due time; meanwhile you keep on good terms with them for a few days." Tabaqāt-i-Akbari, p. 70, has the same.
2 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 195, 196.
3 Firīštah, p. 70 and Tabaqāt-i-Akbari, p. 70, have Shaikh-u'l-Islām Khwaja Qutb-ud-din Bakhhtiyār Ushī, who is not meant here. Shaikh-u'l-Islām was a popular designation and meant the chief mystic.
4 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 395.
5 Firīštah, Tabaqāt-i-Akbari and Raũdat-u'ş-Safā do not at all refer to this 'Farrāsh'.
6 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 261.
accommodation. The Vizier, on the other hand, offered 300 Jittals to a body of loafers to kill Qâdi Minhâj Sirâj on May 9, 1242 A.D., but the latter narrowly escaped.\(^1\)

On May 10, 1242 A.D., the rebels took possession of the city and captured the Sulṭān. Mubârak Shâh was taken prisoner, and killed. On the night of May 19, 1242 A.D., the Sulṭān was also assassinated. His reign lasted for two years and one and a half months.

*Sulṭān ‘Alâ-u’d-dîn Mas‘ûd Shâh.*

On Bahram Shâh’s death, Malik ‘Izz-u’d-dîn Balban-i-Kishlû Khan,\(^2\) mounted the throne within the Daulat Khânah (Royal Residence), and proclaimed his sovereignty throughout the city.\(^3\) But the Malikis and Amîrs would not consent to his accession. They brought all the three princes, Malikis Nâsîr-u’d-dîn and Jalâl-u’d-dîn, sons of Sulṭān Shams-u’d-dîn Ìltutmîs, and Malik ‘Alâ-u’d-dîn Mas‘ûd Shâh, son of Sulṭān Rukn-u’d-dîn Fîrûz Shâh, out of the Qaṣr-i-Sufaïd (the White Palace), where they had been imprisoned, elevated the latter to the throne of Delhi on May 10, 1242 A.D.\(^4\)

*Sulṭān ‘Alâ-u’d-dîn Mas‘ûd Shâh* was endowed with

---

2. For his early life see the reign of Sulṭān Rukn-u’d-dîn Fîrûz Shâh. He was one of the ringleaders in the outbreak against Sulṭān Mû’izz-u’d-dîn Bahram Shâh. He is not Ghiyâsh-u’d-dîn Balban, afterwards Ulugh Khân, whom the *Tabaqât-i-Akbarî*, p. 71, and *Firîshih*, p. 70, and Bâda’înî, p. 87, calling as Malik ‘Izz-u’d-dîn, the elder Balban, confounded with Malik ‘Izz-u’d-dîn Balban-i-Kishlû Khân. Balban seems a tribal name or surname. Kishlû Khân is a title. Malik Chhajjû was also styled as Kishlû Khân.
3. *Tabaqât-i-Nâsirî*, p. 197. Only a solitary gold coin of this sovereign is found. Mas‘ûd is styled as “السلطان اسم علاء الدين والدين ابوالظفر مسعود شاه ابن السلطان”. The gold coin as well as silver coins bear the name of the Khalifah Al-Musta’ṣir-bîllah. The name of Al-Musta’ṣîm is mentioned in later coins. H. N. Wright —Sûltân of Delhi—their Coins and Metrology, p. 77.
4. *Kulâqat-u’t-Twârîk*, p. 134, has 1246 A.D., Bâda’înî, p. 87, has 1243 A.D. and *Târîk-h-i-Mubârak Shâh*, p. 33, has 8th Dhiqâdîh.
many praiseworthy qualities; he was beneficent, kind-hearted and of excellent disposition. But during the latter part of his reign, all his excellent qualities were perverted, and he entirely gave himself up to sensuality, pleasure and the chase, on account of which the business of the state fell into disorder.

The new Sultan took a keen interest in the affairs of government, set them in order and pacified the people. Malik Qutb-ud-din, son of 'Ali Ghuri, was appointed Na'ib-i-Mulk (Deputy Regent), the Nizam-u'll-Mulk Khwaja Muazzam-ud-din continued as Vizier, and Malik Ikhtiyar-ud-din Qaraqash became Amir-i-Hujib (Lord Chamberlain). The different provinces of the Empire were distributed among the various Amirs and Malik. Malik 'Izz-ud-din Balban-i-Kishlu Khan received the provinces of Nagore, MANDOR and Ajmer, and the territory of Badahan was entrusted to Malik Taj-ud-din Sanjar-i-Qutluq. Now that the Amirs were victorious, and the arch-rebel Khwaja Muazzam-ud-din was still in power, Qadi Minhaj Siraj, the author of the Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, who belonged to the opposition, was forced to resign from his office of Qadi ship, which was entrusted to Qadi 'Imad-ud-din Muhammad, the Shaquirqani on June 5, 1242 A.D.

The political career of Qadi Minhaj Siraj deserves a close study. His principle, like all other Qadis, was to join the winning party. He deserted Qabachah, for his power was waning. Again he joined the rebels against Sulthan Ra diyah. This time he misunderstood the situation and backed up the

1 Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 197.
2 There is not a word about 'drinking' in the text on p. 201 as Major Raverty has in his 'translation'.
3 Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 201.
4 Firighat, p. 70, wrongly calls him Ghayath-ud-din the younger Balban.
5 Tabaqat-i-Akhbar, p. 71 and Firighat, p. 70, have 'Sind' in place of MANDOR.
6 Firighat. p. 70, styles him as Malik 'Taj-ud-din Turk.'
7 Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 198.
wrong horse. The result was his dismissal from the post of Qāḍī. He was in the pay of the Turkish aristocracy and, consequently, he does not condemn their rebellions.

The Khwājah Muḥazzab-u’d-dīn acquired complete control over the government of the country, and appropriated the district of Koil as his appanage. He had, previously, established the Naubat and stationed an elephant at the gate of his mansion.1 Now that he wished to have the supreme power exclusively in his own hands, he deprived the Turkish Amīrs of their official functions. The Amīrs could not tolerate it, they conspired against him and put him to death in the plain of Ḥauḍ-i-Rānī (Rānī’s Reservoir) before the capital city on October 28, 1242 A.D.2 The ringleaders in the insurrection were Malik Tāj-u’d-dīn Sanjar-i-Kirat Khān3 and Malik Nuṣrat Khān Sanqr, the Ṣūfī,4 the latter became Amīr of Koil, and subsequently acquired other fiefs.

After the death of Khwājah Muḥazzab-u’d-dīn, the Ṣadr-u’l-Mulk Najm-u’d-dīn Abū Bakr became Vizier; Ghīyāth-u’d-dīn Balban was appointed Amīr-i-Ḥājjīh (Lord Chamberlain) and Malik Saif-u’d-dīn Iḥāk, the Shāmst,5

---

1 These were the exclusive privileges of the Sultāns in those days; and Malik and Amīrs could not enjoy them.
2 Ṣafaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 198.
3 A Turk of Qipchaq, of great strength and intrepidity, had no equal in horsemanship, archery and the chase. He became, after the assassination of Khwājah Muḥazzab-u’d-dīn, Superintendent of elephants and Sar-i-Jāndar. For his latter history see as above. It is strange to note that he is the only Malik among the twenty-five Maliks of Sultān Shams-u’d-dīn Tītutmīsh, who is not a slave.
4 A Rūmī by birth and a slave of Sultān Tītutmīsh. He continued in service in different capacities during the reign of his successors. In the reign of Sultān Nāṣir-u’d-dīn, he proceeded with a force from Dīnā (in Sāngor district, Central Provinces) to face Balban-i-Kīghlū Khān, in 1258 A.D. Tābūr Hindah, Sinūm, Ḵhajhar, and Lakhwāl were conferred upon him and his title became Nuṣrat Khān. See Ṣafaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 214. There is a place Ḵhajhar in Bengal, but it is not meant here. Lakhwāl is not traceable.
5 For his early life see the reign of Sultān Raḍiyah.
held the office of Amīr-i-Dād (Chief Justice of the Realm). Malik Sanjar-i-Kirat Khān was first appointed Shāhnah-i-Pil (Superintendent of Elephants) and then Sar-i-Jāndār (the Commander of the Royal Body-guards). The territories of Baran and Oudh were entrusted to him one after another; and he undertook many expeditions into the neighbouring parts of the territory, achieved wonderful exploits and reduced many independent Hindu tribes. From Oudh he proceeded into Bihār and plundered that territory, but the enemy struck him with a fatal arrow and he died.²

After completing wonderful exploits in the territory of Karah, Malik 'Izz-u'd-dīn Tughrul-i-Tughān Khān returned to Lakhnautī and deputed the Sharf-u'l-Mulk Ash'arī to convey the news to the Sultān at Delhi. Sultān 'Alā-u'd-dīn Mas'ud Shāh was pleased to despatch a red canopy and a robe of honour through Qāḍī Jalāl-u'd-dīn Kāshānī, the Qāḍī ⁴ of Oudh, who, on reaching Lakhnautī on September 28, 1243 A.D., bestowed the royal gifts upon Malik Tughrul-i-Tughān Khān.⁵

One of the noblest acts, which the Sultān did about this time was to release his two uncles, Malik Jālāl-u'd-dīn and Nāṣir-u'd-dīn, who received the territories of Qannauj and Bahraich, respectively, and both of them ruled wisely and well the places assigned to their charge.⁶

In the month of March 1244 A.D., Malik Tughrul-i-Tughān Khān invaded the territory of Jājnagar. On April 17, 1244 A.D., an engagement took place at Biktāsīn (on the north bank of the Mahānādī). The Muslim army succeeded in crossing over the first two ditches, and put the

¹ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 776.
² Ibíd., pp. 258, 259.
³ Ṭabaqāt-i-Akhbārī, p. 71, gives the name correctly but Firīghtah, p. 70, turns it into ‘Sankuri’.
⁴ Ṭabaqāt-i-Akhbārī, p. 71, call him “Ḥākim” (ruler) instead of Qāḍī”.
⁵ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 199.
⁶ Nāṣir-u'd-dīn was born about 1228 A.D. He was at this stage hardly sixteen and, therefore, not old enough to rule wisely and well.
enemy to the rout. The Mussalmans could not long enjoy their victory, when, at midday meal, they were caught unawares by the enemy, who attacked them and defeated them. Malik Tughrul-i-Tughan Khan, however, managed to escape to Lakhnauti, and sent Sharf-u’l-Mulk Ash’art to the capital for assistance. The Sultan ordered Qadi Jalal-u’d-din Kashani to proceed to Jahnagar.\footnote{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 244.} It was, however, left for Malik Ikhtiyar-u’d-din Yusuf-i-Tughrul Khan\footnote{For his early life see the reign of Mu’izz-u’d-din Bahram Shab.} to inflict a severe defeat upon the Rae of Jahnagar.\footnote{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 262.}

In a spirit of retaliation, the army of Jahnagar\footnote{Tabaqat-i-Akbari, p. 72, and Firighat, p. 70, also Badawi, p. 88, assert that the Mongol armies invaded Lakhnauti, apparently advancing from the same route, by which Muhammed Bakht-yar Khalji had invaded Tibet and Khita. The MSS. Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, according to Major Raverty, is clear on the point. Kfar Jilajaf, Buder-Lukdhwati, Kandilli. The printed text of the Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 199, has Kfar Chinak, Khan, which is quite improbable as Chingiz Khan died eighteen years before this invasion. Thomas places Jahnagar in Tipperah—Chronicles of Pathan Kings, p. 121.} invaded the territory of Lakhnauti in the year 1245 A.D. The enemy first occupied Lakhnor, and killed its ruler Fakhr-u’l-Mulk, Karim-u’d-din Laghri and his dependents. But on hearing the arrival of the Muslim army, the Hindu forces began their retreat.\footnote{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 245.} On the 30th March, 1245 A.D., Malik Tamar Khan-i-Qiran\footnote{Badawi, p. 88, has Qara Beg. The Tabaqat-i-Akbari, p. 72, turn him into ‘izz-u’d-din Tughan Khan, and make him quarrel under the title of Malik Qiran.} arrived at Lakhnauti with a large army, and put the enemy to the rout. But no sooner had the army of Jahnagar withdrawn than Maliks Tamar Khan-i-Qiran and Tughrul-i-Tughan Khan fell to quarrelling. However, on the 5th April, 1245 A.D., an accommodation took place.\footnote{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 200.} Malik Qiran occupied Lakhnauti, and Malik Tughrul-i-Tughan Khan, along with Maliks Qarraqash Khan, Taj-u’d-
dīn Sanjar and others returned to Delhi. In the month of Nov. 1245 A.D., the territory of Oudh was assigned to Malik Tughrul-i-Tughān Khān.¹

Through the patronage of Ghiyāth-u’d-dīn Balban, the Amīr-i-Akhūr (Lord of the Stable), Qāḍī Minhāj Sirāj was again received with favour, and was given the charge of the Nāshiriyah College, the Qāḍīship of Gwalior and the lecturership of the Jāmi’ Masjid.

In the month of March, 1246 A.D., the Mongol forces under the leadership of Mangūtah, a prince of Turkistan, marched from Tālqān and Qinduz and laid siege to the fort of Uch. On the death of Uguday, the Mongolian Empire broke into two groups, the Khāns and the Anti-Khāns. It is the latter group, which is constantly invading India hereafter. The Sultān marched rapidly against them in person, and was joined by Malik Balban-i-Kishlu Khān from Nāgora.² Malik Saif-u’d-dīn Bat Khān-i-Aibak, the Khīṭāl,³ was appointed to march in advance at the head of a large army to take possession of the territories of Uch and Multān.⁴ But when the Sultān reached the river Beas the Mongols raised the siege of Uch and returned towards Khurāsān.⁵ The Sultān returned triumphant to Delhi and ordered Malik Ghiyāth-u’d-dīn Balban to march to the banks of the river Sudrah en route to the capital to display the valour of the

¹ Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 246.
² Not 1245 A.D., as Dr. Iqhwarī Prasūd (Medieval India, p. 190) observes.
³ Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 269.
⁴ A slave of Sultān Shams-u’d-dīn Iltutmīsh, in whose reign he acted as Sar-i-Jāmandār (Head keeper of the Royal Robe). In the reign of Sultān ‘Ala-u’d-dīn Mas’ūd Shāh, he became Sar-i-Jāndār and Khurāsān and Sāmānīh were assigned to him. Afterwards, he obtained the fief of Baran. In the next reign, he became Vakil-i-Dar, but in the Santūr expedition he suddenly sustained a fall from his horse and was killed—See Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 289.
⁵ Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 259.
⁶ Ibid., p. 200. Khurāsān was used in a very indefinite sense, i.e., all territories north-west of the Persian desert. Thus, northern Afghanīstān and even Māwara-u’n-Nahr are, at times, reckoned as part of Khurāsān.
Muslim army in order to frighten away the enemy.

About this time, a party of vulgar people gained access to the Sultan and, as a result of their society, Sultan 'Ala-ud-din Mas'ud Shâh became avaricious and cruel; and killed most of the Turkish Maliks and Amîrs. The Maliks and Amîrs could not tolerate such a regime and, consequently, they despatched a secret letter to Malik Naşir-ud-dîn inviting him to assume sovereignty. On the 10th June, 1246 A.D., Sultan 'Ala-ud-dîn Mas'ud Shâh was taken prisoner and killed. He reigned for a period of four years, one month and a day. ¹

Estimate.

The vigorous and martial achievements of Quţb-ud-dîn and the genius and skilful administration of Îltutmîsh had brought the Empire to the height of renown. The very nature of government demanded energy and wisdom to ensure its continuance. A power founded upon military predominance requires for its existence competent rulers and an efficient army. But the line of weak and vicious Sulţâns, which succeeded to the vast dominion, presented the reverse of the glittering shield. The army deprived of their valiant patrons lost all respect for the new rulers, who preferred the ignoble luxury of the harem to the fierce joys of war. When a strong repressive force is withdrawn, the consequence is always anarchy and civil war. The death of Sultan Shams-ud-dîn Îltutmîsh was interpreted by the Maliks as the signal for a holiday of lawlessness and relief. Relieved from the powerful regimes, the 'Forty' rapidly pushed their way to the front through their capacity for intrigue and war. Delhi remained a scene of a series of tragedies, and it was noticed with sadness that inch by inch the Turks were losing ground. The civil wars reduced the empire to a mere shadow of its former extent. The prestige of the emperor of Delhi vanished for some time to come. And monarchy was new; it was elective. The

¹ Tabaqât-i-Nâşiri, p. 201, Bada'înî, p. 89, has 'four years and one month only.'
divinity that hedges a king was still in the process of growth. Though the term 'Delhi Sulṭānate' is not used; yet the terminology of empire (Bādshāhat) is that of a city-state of Rome.

The weakling of the Sulṭān is a vice, which the Maliks and people together abhorred, and they regarded a most powerful sovereign as a solution of their political and administrative problems. And internally, the political and racial unity of the Turks was being gradually undermined by the forces of disintegration.

The effiminate Sulṭāns, incompetent officers and corrupt administrators marked the gradual dwindling of the Turkish Empire into its narrow limits. The period is innocent of administrative achievement. Neither laws were formulated nor attempts were made at legislation. Sulṭān Rukn-u'd-dīn Firuz Shāh was extravagant, and exhausted the treasury in his pursuit of amusement and revelry. His selfish pleasure-loving disposition ruined the empire. Alone among the successors of Sulṭān Shams-u'd-dīn Iltutmish, Raḍiyah stands as a great monarch endowed with prudence, justice, benevolence, patronage and gallantry. However, her innocent fondness of Yāqūt, a non-Turk, incited the self-seeking conservative Maliks to rise against her. It is rightly asserted that "the task which lay before the queen would have taxed even her father's powers."¹ Raḍiyah met their opposition with strength and courage, and checked for a while the disastrous tendencies of the empire. In the hope of restoration, she lost no opportunity of exciting the jealousy and irritability of the rival Maliks, and sowed disaffection among their rank. Wrapped in political intrigues, her art still lulled to rest the watchful suspicions of the rebel Altiniah, whom she married at the critical juncture. It was, however, a pitiful cowardice on the part of the Maliks to crush the dauntless queen; but nothing could exceed the heroic determination of the defeated Raḍiyah, touted again and again, she rose with fresh heart from the disaster. The

successors of iltutmish were, one by one, pulled down with bewildering rapidity, and the heroic radiyah gave up her life in a vain attempt to subdue the ‘spirit of aristocratic lawlessness.’ Her successor sulṭān muʿizz-u’d-dīn bahrain Shāh was a monarch of simple tastes, fearless, intrepid, but vicious and blood-thirsty. During the latter part of his reign, sulṭān ‘alā-u’d-dīn masʿud Shāh turned his excellent qualities into debauchery and dissipation, for which he lost his head.

With the exception of radiyah every other sovereign left the care or neglect of the empire to his nāʿib or Regent. Shāh Turkān, the mother of sulṭān rukn-u’d-dīn firuz Shāh held undisputed sovereignty of the empire. Malik ikhtiyār-u’d-dīn aitkin and Malik qutb-u’d-dīn, son of alī Ghūrī, the Regent of sulṭān muʿizz-u’d-dīn bahrain Shāh and sulṭān ‘alā-u’d-dīn masʿud Shāh enjoyed undisputed sway. Unmindful of their great responsibilities, Turkān Shāh with her ruthless and brutal policy of assassination, the ambitious designs of Malik ikhtiyār-u’d-dīn aitkin and the humble submission of qutb-u’d-dīn ‘alī Ghūrī to the will of vizier muhazzab-u’d-dīn often changed the government to anarchy; and an approach to a strong and stable administration was out of the question. The throne could not remain safe by kind words and mild measures. None of the sulṭāns was equal to the task of preserving his dominion, and his power was almost constantly defiled by rebellious governors and insubordinate officials.

The impotency of the sulṭān and mismanagement of the Regent excited formidable rebellions. There was no supreme or sovereign power to suppress the ambitions of the Turkish Malik. The shifty and unprincipled amirs, involved in their favourite jealousies, plunged into persistent and pernicious intrigues. In a society so demoralized, there was no element of opposition to a resolute rebel. There was a general revolt of Malik against the mismanagement of Shāh Turkān in the reign of sulṭān rukn-u’d-dīn firuz
Shah. Radishah with great difficulty subdued the confederacy of the Nizam-u’l-Mulk Muhammad Junaidi. Again Altmunia grew sick of Yaqut’s pre-eminence and raised the standard of revolt. Malik Badr-u’d-din Sanqar sought to dominate over the Vizier Muhazzab-u’d-din in the reign of Sultan Mu’izz-u’d-din Bahrâm Shah. Party spirit ran high; irritation and friction were certain and the state became a prey to the feuds between various Maliks and Amirs. They wasted their strength in ruinous struggles, and each revolution brought fresh crop of horrors.

There was no class of people upon whom the crown could rely. Non-Turkish officers appointed to support the Sultan were quickly suppressed. Thanks to the military spirit of the Turk, there ensued an era of futile and purposeless intrigues. ‘Fighting capacity was considered a great blessing, not a painful process for the attainment of peace.’ The extraordinary ascendency of Muhazzab-u’d-din was painful to other Maliks, who killed him in the plain of Haud-i-Rani. Yaqut met the same fate. Malik Ikhtiyar-u’d-din Aitkin was murdered by the Sultan’s order. Yet the significant fact of the history of the period is that sovereigns were selected only out of the family of Ìitutmish. Nevertheless, till the time of Akbar, the royal dynasty, in spite of many efforts, did not succeed in obtaining a status, which was unquestioned.

Headed with a strong desire for political change, the disaffected Maliks set up and deposed Sultans at their pleasure. The waging of civil war left small leisure for attending to anything but the attacks of the Maliks and Amirs. Each time acute differences arose on the question of succession with an intensity hardly conceivable. The throne depended upon the allegiance of an ‘aristocracy of rapacious and turbulent Maliks.’ Incompetent sovereigns played their sorry part, and their luxurious profligacy left a shattered empire and a rebellious people. The revolutions, however, were not serious enough to shake off the stability of Muslim rule or the burden of the Turkish yoke. On the
other hand, the Indian Mussalmān was considered low and contemptible. He and his leaders had no place in the framework of the state. It was not till the Khaljī Revolution that they obtained a share of political power.
CHAPTER VI

SULTĀN NĀṢIR-U'D-DĪN MAḤMŪD SHĀH

Early life and character.

Sultān Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Maḥmūd Shāh was born at the capital Delhi after the death of Malik Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Maḥmūd Shāh I, the eldest son of Sultān Shams-u'd-dīn Īlūtmīsh. Out of affection for the deceased, the Sultān distinguished the young prince by conferring upon him the same title and name. He was sent along with his mother to the royal castle at the town of Lūnī, a few miles north of Delhi. He was educated under the fostering care of his mother, and became endowed with many laudable qualities. He also secured training in the art of government and politics. But in spite of this high training and education, he

---

1 His title is Qasim-i-Amir-u'l-Muminīn, but the Tābaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 206, and at other places, gives a different title, i.e., Yamin-i-Khalīf-ullāh Nāṣir-i-Amir-u'l-Muminīn. He is, however, styled on the coinage as Nāṣir-i-Amir-u'l-Muminīn. H. N. Wright—Sultāns of Delhi, their Coins and Metrology, p. 53. Elphinstone makes him grandson of Īlūtmīsh, while Firuzshāh, p. 70, asserts that he was the youngest son of Sultān Īlūtmīsh. In fact, the child Qub-u'd-dīn, who was put to death by Shāh Turkān, mother of Sultān Rukn-u'd-dīn Firuz Shāh was the youngest of all sons.

2 Malik Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Maḥmūd Shāh was the eldest son of Sultān Shams-u'd-dīn Īlūtmīsh, and was endowed with many praiseworthy qualities. In 1226 A.D., the territory of Oudh was conferred upon him, and from there he attacked Lakhnawtī and conquered it from Sultān Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn in 1227 A.D. A year and a half afterwards he became afflicted with a disease and died in about 1229 A.D.

3 Tābaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 201. Lūnī is also mentioned by the A'in-i-Akkārī in the Sīkār of Delhi.

was a king in name only, and remained under the tutelage of his Regent Ulugh Khan-i-Ā'zam, who wielded supreme power during the twenty years of Sultan Nasir-ud-din's reign.

The contemporary historian, Qâdi Minhâj Sirâj, gives him all the attributes befitting saints, prophets and rulers; according to him, the Sultan possessed "humility, purity, gentleness, piety, faith, abstinence, clemency, beneficence, impartiality, forbearance, vigour, manliness, and regard for the ecclesiastics and men of letters." Minhâj-Sirâj assumes that the Sultan was a great ruler and actually describes him as such, though the facts related by him prove otherwise. Even later-day authorities, including Diya Barani, the author of the famous Târikh-i-Firuz Shâhi, bears testimony to his accomplishments, at the same time deploring his weakness as a ruler. He was 'a gentle, kind-hearted and pious king.' He was very particular about fasting, prayer and the perusal of the Holy Qur'an and earned most of his living by the transcription of the same. The author of the Tabaqât-i-Akbari says that he completed two copies of the Qur'an in each year, and the proceeds of their sale were his only means of subsistence. It is said that the Sultan had only

1 Târikh-i-Firuz Shâhi by Diya Barani, p. 26. 
2 Tabaqât-i-Nâsirî, p. 207. 
4 Tabaqât-i-Akbari, p. 77, and the Lubb-u't-Twârîkh, p. 16.

Ibn Battûta says that he was shown a copy of the Qur'an written by Sultan Nasir-ud-din by Qâdi Kamâl-ud-din. It is a clear proof that the Sultan did copy the Qur'an and sold them for his subsistence. Elliot III, p. 593. Although the Tabaqât does not mention it, Minhâj-Sirâj must have omitted or added certain things in order to represent a flattering account of the reign for Nasir-ud-din's own perusal. Whatever success
one wife, who, one day, implored him, 'My Lord, it is a pity that my hands get burnt in baking the bread. It will be very kind of you, if you could manage to purchase a slave-girl to do the work.' 'The Bait-u'l Māl (the Public Treasury) belongs to the people of God,' replied the Sulṭān, I have no money to purchase a slave-girl. Be patient and God will reward you for your sufferings on the Day of Judgment."

In personal character, the king was admittedly superior to his immediate predecessors, but as a king he did not rise above their level. Like them, he lacked strength to control the Turkish aristocrats, who were the real governors of the country; and this accounts for the failure of all his undertakings and enterprises. His reign may be judged by the perusal of the following pages, which are nothing more than a dull description of the ever-recurring risings of the noble men, insurrections of the Rais, and the inroads of the Mongols, and the partial loss of the territories of Sind, Multān and Lāhore.

During his early life, his predecessor and nephew Sulṭān 'Alā-u'd-dīn Mas'ūd Shāh had released him from the prison, and assigned him the territory of Bahrāīch. There he led attended the reign of Sulṭān Nāṣir-u'd-dīn was due to the ability of Balban, and Qāḍī Minhāj attributes that success to the king. He naturally praises the king as he was more or less a courtier and in his service. ḌiyāBarānī rightly dismisses Nāṣir-u'd-dīn as a nominal king (دلیل آورا همچنان شونده داشته -) and his remark is very significant. According to him, the weakness of the Sulṭān's empire was due to "his own humility and impotence."

1 Badā'īnī, p. 90; Khulāṣat-ut Tawārikh, p. 196, and Tabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 77. Firīghtah, p. 74, says that "Once a man came to see the Sulṭān and asked him to correct a word of the Qur'ān. The Sulṭān drew a circle round it but when the visitor went away, he erased the circle with a pen-knife. A bold slave asked the reason. The Sulṭān replied, 'It is easier to erase a circle on paper than to remove the effects of a disappointed heart.'"

2 Vide the previous Chapter on the 'Successors of Sulṭān Shams-u'd-dīn Iltutmīsh,' particularly the reign of Sulṭān 'Alā-u'd-dīn Mas'ūd Shāh.

3 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 208.
many successful expeditions and the fame of his government and the flourishing condition of the province led the Malik and Amir, who were disgusted with the rule of Sulṭān ‘Alā-u’d-dīn Mas‘ūd Shāh, to despatch a written petition to him to assume sovereignty at Delhi. In fact, he was selected because he was weak and that he would remain in the hands of the intriguers, who could place him on the throne. His mother, Malikah-i-Jahān, a very tactful and clever woman, placed the young prince in a litter and represented to the people that her son was going to the capital for treatment. The party reached the capital secretly and confidentially, and on the 10th June, 1246 A.D., he ascended the throne within the Qasr-i-Sabz (the green castle). The Malik, Amir, Sadr, ‘Ulemā and grandees all acknowledged his supremacy and paid homage to the new sovereign. On the 12th June, 1246 A.D., the Sulṭān held a public assembly in the Daulat Khānah or the audience hall of Kūshk-i-Firūz (the Firūzi castle), and all the people publicly pledged their

1 Tahqīq-i-Nāṣirī, p. 209.
2 Tarikh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 35, has Qaṣr-i-Sufaid or the white castle. Qaṣr-i-Sabz or Kūshk-i-Sabz (the Green Palace) was probably built soon after the Kūshk-i-Firūz (the Firūzi castle). Qaṣr-i-Sabz is for the first time mentioned here in the reign of Sulṭān Nāṣir-u’d-dīn. Later, the ambassadors of Hūlāgū were also received at this place. Tahqīq-i-Nāṣirī, p. 319. Firūz Šāh incorrectly places these occurrences in the Qaṣr-i-Sufaid. About half a century later, Prince Ruḵn-u’d-dīn Ibrāhīm, the youngest son of Sulṭān Jalāl-u’d-dīn Khālji, was raised to the throne in the Kūshk-i-Sabz after his father’s assassination by ‘Alā-u’d-dīn Khālji. It, however, continued as a public place for the reception of Amir and messengers, and when Žafar Khān visited Khān-i-Jahān in the reign of Sulṭān Firūz Shāh Tughlaq, he was entertained in this very palace.

3 Kūshk-i-Firūzi was evidently built by Sulṭān Shams-u’d-dīn-īltutmish and is described as Daulat Khānah, or the Royal Residence. As stated before, Turkān Khātun, Sulṭān Raḍiyah’s mother, resided in the Firūzi Castle, and ‘Alā-u’d-dīn Mas‘ūd Shāh was brought here from the Qaṣr-i-Sufaid (the white castle) and enthroned. Sulṭān-Nāṣir-u’d-dīn, as stated above, held his first court in this castle. Its situation, however, is not known. Mr. Baglar’s excavation at the back of the Quṭbī Mosque yielded a large quantity of green enamelled tiles, and these ruins may be identified with those of the Kūshk-i-Firūzi.
allegiance to him.\footnote{Tabaqat-i-Nāṣirī, p. 208.}

The Mongol Invasion.

Soon after his accession, the Sulṭān received the intimation of a Mongol invasion on the frontier tract of Hindustan. There is no reference to the invasion in the Persian history of the Mongols. The Tabaqāt says, 'the Mongols came from Turkistan.' On the death of Uguday, the Mongol Empire was being divided up. The Jaghatay and Uguday lines, who ruled in Māwara-u'n-Nahr and Turkistan are ignored by the Persian historians, as they were the enemies of the Khān or Khaqān. These invasions were due to them. In the month of December 1246 A.D., the Sulṭān accompanied by Ulugh Khān, marched with his army towards the bank of the river Indus and Multān\footnote{The printed text of the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 209, and Firīghtah, p. 71, have 'Multān,' while Major Raverty converts it into 'Banyān.' Multān is right, if the Mongols came by the Bolan Pass, which is not stated in the text.} to repel the Mongol forces.\footnote{Tabaqat-i-Nāṣirī, p. 209.} No encounter, however, took place with the Mongols, who, after having extorted large sums of money from Multān and Lāhore and captured some hundred captives, retreated. On the 10th March, 1247 A.D., the Sulṭān crossed the river Rāvī, and ordered Ulugh Khān to lead an expedition to the Jūd hills and around 'Nandānāh' to wreak vengeance on the Rana of these hills, who had acted as a guide to the Mongol army.\footnote{Ibid., p. 290, see Ulugh Khān's account. The Jūd hills were, therefore, situated between Jhelum and Indus rivers. The Jūd hills are the Salt Range in the Punjab. Nandānāh was 'situated at the junction of the two spurs of the Salt Range.' Imperial Gazetteer, Vol. I, XVIII, p. 349, and Tabaqat-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 334-9.} The Sulṭān himself hailed at the bank of the river Sodrā and Ulugh Khān, after ravaging the Jūd hills, the Jhelum and the Indus and subduing the Khokhars,\footnote{And still Firīghtah, pp. 59 and 60, in his account of Sulṭān-Shihāb-u'd-dīn of Ghūr says that the tribe of Khokhars were converted to Islam.} along with other tribes joined the Royal
camp on the 3rd April, 1247 A.D. The Royal troops then set out towards Delhi. During this expedition, a number of old Amirs, who had held jāgīrs\(^1\) in the provinces of Lāhor and Multān since the days of Sulṭān Quṭb-u'd-dīn, failed to perform their duty and did not join the Sulṭān's army. The Sulṭān, acting on Ulugh Khān's advice, dismissed them all and transferred their jāgīrs to their sons and younger relations. This step made the political and revenue arrangements of the Punjāb more regular, and in a measure strengthened the power of the Sulṭān as well.\(^2\)

In the month of October 1247 A.D., the Royal army at that early stage. It is probable that a part of the tribe would have been converted to Islam, as even now the Khokhars are divided between the two religions. The Khokhars consider them to be a Rājpūt tribe. Most of them in Central Districts of the Punjāb have so returned themselves; many of them in the western and frontier districts have been returned as Jāts: while in the Rawalpindī and Multān divisions they are exactly known as the Khokhars. In the eastern Punjāb, the Khokhars appear to be admittedly of Rājpūt origin, but in the west, they claim to have descended from Maḥmūd, the eldest son of Quṭb Shāh of Ghāznī. The Khokhars, are however, very widely spread and have been at one time or another very powerful. They are most numerous along the valleys of Jhelum and Chināb, and specially in Jhang and Shahpūr districts. Report on the Census of the Punjāb, pp. 257 and 258.

\(^1\)The word jāgīr does not signify any official designation but the transfer of landlord rights. Persian 'Jā'-place; and 'Gīr' occupying. Jāgīr was a common tenure under the Muslim rule. It meant that the public revenues of a given tract of land were made over to a servant of the state, together with some requisite powers enabling him to collect and appropriate such revenue and administer the general government of the district. The assignment was either conditional or unconditional; in the former case some public service such as maintenance of troops or other specified duty was engaged for, the latter was entirely left to the disposal of the grantee. The assignment was either for a specified period or more usually for the lifetime of the holder, lapsing on his death to the state. It was sometimes converted into a perpetual and transferable estate. A jāgīr was also liable to forfeiture on failure of performance of the stipulated conditions or incurring the displeasure of the Emperor. Sometimes a jāgīr was held by military chiefs on condition of service—See Wilson's Glossary of Indian Terms, p. 224.

\(^2\)See Firāqṭah, p. 71. These facts are not verified by the contemporary historian, Minhāj Sirāj.
reached Pānilpat, but disturbances in the East forced him to return to Delhi and to march towards the Doāb. There was a strong fort of Talsandah within the limits of the district of Qannauj, which had become a place of refuge for the Hindus. For two days the conflict went on, until the rebels were captured and put to death. On the 21st February, 1248, the fort was captured. The Royal army then marched towards Karrah, which they reached on the 10th March, 1248 A.D. Some time before Ulugh Khān was sent on an expedition into the neighbouring mountain-tracts, the Ranas of which places Dalkī and Malkī were strong.

1 Badā'īnī, p. 90, says that 'Miwār' was occupied, but Miwār is not there.

2 Firīghah, p. 71, has 'Bazta'; while Tārikh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 35, has 'Balsindah.' The printed text of the Tabaqāt-i-Nāshirī, p. 210, has 'Talindah' or Nandanah, which is in the Punjāb. There is Tilsurah about 12 miles S.S.W. of Qannauj and Thuttea and Tissuq about 8 and 10 miles south-west, respectively. The first mentioned name may, however, be identified with Talsandah. According to Major Raverty, all the copies have Talsandah excepting two, where it is Talandah and Talbandah.

3 Major Raverty incorrectly translates two into ''ten'' misreading '20' for '2'.

4 The printed text of the Tabaqāt-i-Nāshirī, p. 211, has 'three days before this,' while some copies, according to Major Raverty, have 'thirty days.'

5 The text of Tabaqāt-i-Nāshirī, on p. 211, has Dalkī Malkī Firīghah, p. 71, also has the same. But all other copies of the text, according to Major Raverty, have between the words. Minhāj Siraj in his account of Ulugh Khān does not mention Dalkī only. Tārikh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 35, has Dalkī Malkī and Tabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 74, has Dalkī Malkī. Supposing there is no it would be read Dalkī of Malkī—Rae Dalkī of the land or country Malkī, or Mahalkī (Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 67). During the first half of the twelfth century the Bhars had risen in southern Oudh on the fall of Qannauj and their chiefs Dalkī and Malkī or Dal and Bal were crushed in 1247 by Ulugh Khān. It is clear, therefore, that Malkī or Mahalkī is not the name of any place but of the Rana—Imperial Gazetteer, Vol. XXIV, pp. 150, 151. Cunningham identifies it with Trailokyavaman and reads the name as Tilakī Wama Deo—Archaeological Survey Report, Vol. I, p. 457. Tabaqāt-i-Nāshirī, p. 211.
monarchs and possessed a vast and well equipped army and strong fortresses. It seems that the status of the Ranas is needlessly magnified by the contemporary historian in order to make a noise about the conquest. Ulugh Khan devastated their territory and captured the Rais. The extent of booty obtained by the victors may be judged by the fact that about one thousand and fifteen hundred horses of one description fell into the hands of Ulugh Khan. After this exploit, Ulugh Khan joined the Royal camp at Karrah, and on the 12th March, 1248 A.D., the Sultan started for Delhi. On the way, Malik Jalal-u'd-din Mas'ud Shah, the governor of Qannauj, presented himself before the Sultan and performed the ceremony of kissing the sublime hand.

The Sultan reached Delhi on May 19, 1248 A.D. At the beginning of the year Malik Jalal-u'd-din Mas'ud Shah was appointed the governor of Sambhal and Badaun, but out of the fear of Ulugh Khan, he proceeded towards Lahore by way of Sirmur Hills. The prince, like Sultan Nasir-u'd-din, was the son of the late Sultan Shams-u'd-din Iltutmish and a possible candidate for the throne of Delhi. An ambitious and self-seeking man like Ulugh Khan could not have done anything but remove the obstacles in his way by appointing the prince the governor of Sambhal and Badaun. Malik Jalal-u'd-din Mas'ud Shah, on his part, had no other alternative but to fly for life towards Lahore and join the Mongols. The Sultan delayed the pursuit and remained at the capital.

1 It cannot be 9th March or 11 Dhiqadh, for on the previous page it is 10th March, when the Sultan reached Karrah.
2 Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 212.
3 Firíghtáh, p. 72, says that Malik Jalal-u'd-din fled to Chitor. But it is said that he joined the Mongols.
4 The printed text of the Tabaqät-i-Nasiri, p. 212, has بعضرت ""پیشی"" returned to the capital." But Major Raverty says that the best copies contain one line more—as translated above. There was no cause of alarm about the districts of Sambhal and Badaun as Elliot translates. In fact, the Malik fled from his assigned province out of the fear of the growing power of Baiban and proceeded towards Lahore. This is the reason why the royal army followed him.
for about seven months. It was too late to follow the rebel-prince in the month of November 1248 A.D., when the royal troops moved out of the capital and proceeded to the banks of the river Beas. The Sultan found himself quite unable to accomplish anything and returned to the capital after nominating his Amir's to lead expeditions into the different parts of the territory. The Sultan reached the capital on the 23rd February, 1249. Nevertheless, the royal army continued its march to the mountain tracts of Ranthambhor.¹ During the siege of the fort and the Sultan's stay at the capital, two important events happened. On the 24th March, 1249, Qâdî Jamâl-u'd-din Shafurqâni was dismissed from his office and on the 27th March, 1249, was killed by Ḥimâd-u'd-din Raihân. On 26th March, 1249 A.D., Malik Bahâ-u'd-din Aibak was slain by the enemy near the fort of Ranthambhor,³ the Rajah of which place was Bâhada-deva.⁴ This shows that the Câhamanas, being aided by the weak rule of the successors of Iltutmîsh, had again consolidated their power at Ranthambhor.

On the 18th May, 1249 A.D., Ulugh Khan-i-Ā'zam returned triumphant to the capital and on the 2nd August, 1249, his daughter⁵ was married to the Sultan with the concurrence of the Malik's and Amir's of the realm. On the 20th September, 1249, A.D., Qâdî Jalâl-u'd-din Kâshânî returned to the capital from Oudh and was appointed Qâdî of the State.⁶ The Sultan now had leisure enough to make fresh appointments.

¹ Tabaqat-i-Nâsîrî, p. 212.
² The Tabaqat-i-Akbarî, p. 74, has "Qâdî Ḥimâd-u'd-din Shafurkhâni."
³ Tabaqat-i-Nâsîrî, p. 213.
⁵ Qâdî Minhâj-Siraj says that his daughter became the Malikah-i-Jahân (Queen of the Universe). He simply means that the daughter of Ulugh Khan was married to the Sultan. The Tabaqat-i-Akbarî, p. 74, clearly mentions as follows:

'Sultan Dâxtr-al-g Xân Ra Dar-Ḥabâlî Nâqîh Dar Awrûd.'

⁶ Tabaqat-i-Nâsîrî, p. 213.
Nā’ib-u’l-Mulk Ulugh Khān-i-Ā’zam.

On October 12, 1249 A.D., Sultan Nasir-u’d-din Mahmūd appointed Malik Ghiyāth-u’d-dīn Balban, 1 a slave of Sultan Shams-u’d-dīn Īltutmish as the Nā’ib 2 which meant that Nasir-u’d-dīn was even formally deprived of power. The title of Ulugh Khān-i-Ā’zam was also conferred upon him and was given a canopy and baton. 3 “I have appointed you my Regent,” Nasir-u’d-dīn is said to have said to Ghiyāth-u’d-dīn Balban, when investing him with this high office, “I am entrusting the direction of government to your charge; take care not to do anything for which you may have to feel ashamed before God, the Almighty.” 4 Ulugh Khān performed his duties so tactfully that he acquired the supreme power in the state, and none else had the courage to meddle with him. His cousin Sher Khān was created Khān-i-Mu’azzam, and was appointed the governor of the Punjab and Murtān to keep a watch over the activities of the Mongol armies, encamped at Ghaznīn, Kabul, Qandhār, Balkh and Herat. 5 On the 15th October, 1249 A.D., his brother Malik Saif-u’d-dīn Ibak-i-Kishlu Khān 6 became Amir-i-Ḥājib (Lord

1 Badā‘ūnī, p. 89, and Firīshṭah, p. 71, incorrectly call him the younger Balban; Lubā-u’t-Tuwārīkh, p. 16, has  بدلین خوردن  a different name. 2 Rauqat-u’ṣ-Safā, Vol. IV, p. 890, has “Ulugh, Khān-i-Tigīn”. Not in the beginning of the reign as Firīshṭah asserts but at this stage, i.e., in 647 H. (See  Ṣabaqṣāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 293), Balban was entitled Ulugh Khān. 3  Ṣabaqṣāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 294. Na’ib-i-Mulk or Malik Na’ib is not “Deputy” as some writers think but Regent. The Na’ib-i-Mulk had royal insignia—canopy and baton—and could give orders for the king. The position of the Na’ib corresponded with that of the Vizier with unlimited powers under the ‘Abbasids. The grand Vizier under the ‘Abbasids practically exercised the powers and prerogatives of the sovereign... He could make any arrangement he considered necessary, without preliminary sanction—See “Orient under the Caliphs” by S. Khudā Bakhsh, pp. 221, 222. 4  Ṣabaqṣāt-i-Akhbarī, p. 73.

5 Badā‘ūnī, p. 89, and Firīshṭah, p. 71.

6  Ṣabaqṣāt-i-Akhbarī, p. 73, and Firīshṭah, p. 71.

Malik Saif-u’d-dīn Ibak-i-Kishlu Khan belonged to the Khāns of Ilbarī, who had to decamp before the onslaught of the Mongol forces on
Chamberlain) and Malik Tāj-u’d-dīn Sanjar-i-Tez-Khān was appointed Na‘ib-Aмир-i-Ḥājib (Deputy to the Lord Chamberlain). Malik Ikhtiyār-u’d-dīn Aitkin, the long-haired, became Amir-i-Aḥhūr (Lord of the Imperial Stables) in place of Malik Saif-u’d-dīn Aibak-i-Ḵishlu Khān, and the Malik-u’l-Ḥujjāb (Head of the Chamberlains) ‘Alā-u’d-dīn Ayāz, the Juzjānī was created Na‘ib-i-Wakil-i-dar (Deputy Representative of the Royal Court). On the 30th November, 1249 A.D., the royal forces marched out of the capital, and on 10th January, 1250 A.D., crossed the river Jumna with a view to lead expeditions against the rebellious Hindu chiefs of these tracts. The result of these expeditions is not mentioned by the contemporary historian who simply asserts that the Sulṭān returned to the capital on the 30th March, 1250 A.D. On receiving letters from the sister of Qāḍī Minhāj Sirāj, the famous author of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, the Sulṭān was pleased to confer upon her an honorary robe, forty captives as slaves and hundred mules loaded with royal gifts, which the Qāḍī was ordered to convey to his sister in Khurāsān. On the 4th April, 1250 A.D., the Qāḍī proceeded to Multān enroute to Khurāsān. On the 15th May, 1250 A.D. he interviewed Malik Sher Khān on the bank of the river Beas, and on the 8th June, 1250 A.D., arrived at Multān. On the same day, Malik ‘Īzz-u’d-dīn Balban-i-Ḵishlu Khān came from Uch to their invasion of the territory of Turkistān and Qipchak and, therefore, Kishlu Khān fell into the hands of the victors. Fortunately for him, a merchant purchased him and was ultimately sold to Sulṭān Itutmish. He became Deputy Sar-i-Jāndār (commander of the royal body-guard) in the reign of Sulṭān Raḍiyah and Sar-i-Jāndār during the reign of Sulṭān Mu‘izz-u’d-dīn Bahrām Shāh. He became Amir-i-Āḥhūr (Lord of the Royal Stable) in the reign of Sulṭān ‘Alā-u’d-dīn Mas‘ūd Shāh; later he became Amir-i-Ḥājib (Lord Chamberlain). Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 278, 279.

1 The son of Qāḍī Minhāj Sirāj Juzjānī, the author of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī.
2 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 293.
3 Ibid., p. 213.
4 Ibid., p. 214.
5 Elliot, Vol. II, p. 350, calls him “Lashkar Khān,” which is quite wrong. For his early life see the reign of Sulṭān Rukn-u’d-dīn Firūz Shāh.
recapture Multān from Malik Saif-u'd-dīn Ḥasan Qurlukh, who had previously captured the place and the Qādi sought an interview with him also. The Malik failed to conquer Multān and had to retire towards Uch.1 In the month of January 1251 A.D., Malik Ikhtiyār-u'd-dīn Gurez2 captured a large number of the 'infidel Mongols,' and sent them to Delhi. The last event of the Hijri year was the death of Qādi Jalāl-u'd-dīn Kāshānī on the 10th February, 1251, A.D.

Malik 'Izz-u'd-dīn Balban-i-Kishlū Khān was ambitious and afraid of the power of Ulugh Khān. He rebelled against the Sultan and was too strong to be punished. In the year 1251 A.D., he rebelled in the territory of Nāgore, but on the approach of the royal forces he made his submission and the same territory was again entrusted to his charge. The Sultan then returned to the capital. Soon after, Malik Sher Khān3 marched from Multān to invade Uch. Thereupon, Malik 'Izz-u'd-dīn Balban-i-Kishlū Khān pressed on from the Nāgore towards Uch, but was taken prisoner and detained.4 He, however, purchased his safety by surrendering the fort of Uch to Sher Khān, and himself retired towards the capital, where he reached on the 10th July, 1251 A.D. The Sultan was gracious enough to pardon him and assigned him the territory of Badā’un. Qādi Minhāj Sirāj did not go

1 Firżah, p. 72, described the above details in the following manner—

"The Sultan marched towards Multān. Sher Khān, the governor of Multān and Lāhor, joined him with twenty thousand men on the bank of the Beas. After staying a few days at Multān, the Sultan permitted Malik A'izz-u'd-dīn, the elder Balban, governor of Nāgore and Uch, to go back to his territory, while the Sultan himself returned to Delhi"—an unauthorized version.

3 Perhaps بُکدُز, a sub-tribe of Oghuz—Tārīkh-i-

Fakhr-u'd-dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. XV.

4 Firżah, p. 72, adds to the account by saying that Sher Khān took Ghaznī from the Mongols, read the Khutbah and coined money in the name of Sultan Nāṣir-u'd-dīn.

The text on p. 215 "بشير خان پبوست و مانخود شد" has been incorrectly rendered by Elliot, Vol. II, p. 351, into "but he was captured in his encounter with Sher Khān and quickly surrendered the fort." The fact is that no encounter took place as the contemporary authority states.
beyond Multān and returned to the capital. On the 1st August, 1251 A.D., he was appointed the chief Qādī of the State.

On the 13th November, 1251 A.D., the Sultān led an expedition against the territories of Gwālior, Chandirī, Narwar¹ (the historic fort of Gwālior State) and Mālwhah. He advanced as far as Mālwhah, and defeated the most powerful Rana of the place, Chahada Divā by name, who had under his command a well-equipped army of five thousand cavalry and two hundred thousand infantry. Ulugh Khān alone displayed great gallantry and heroism in the expedition and conquered the fort of Balwar and Narwar.²

On the 3rd June, 1251 A.D., the Sultān reached the capital, and remained there for a period of seven months. On the 26th December, 1252 A.D., he marched³ towards Uch and Multān⁴ with the intention of subduing Sher Khān, who

¹The text of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 215, has زوال. There is no doubt that it is Narwar. The Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 74, has زور and Firishtah, p. 72, has ناری: Badā’īnī, p. 91, has also زور. Narwal is a Tehsil in Cawnpore district, U.P., while Narwar is a historic town and fort in Gwālior State. Jalāl Khwājah was appointed governor of this part of the country by Ḥīsām-u’d-dīn, the Commander of royal force under Sultān Mahmūd, who subdued Bundelkhand. Epigraphica Indica, Vol. XII, pp. 44-47.

²The printed text of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 296, has جاہب the Rae of Ajārī, Firishtah, p. 72, has Jāhīr Div and Badā’īnī, p. 91, and the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 74, also have the same. In fact Chahada Diva, the Rajah of Chanderī and Narwar (Archaeological Survey Report, Vol. II, pp. 314-16, also Epigraphica Indica, Vol. XII, pp. 221-24,) was the most powerful Hindu chieftain in Mālwhah. See also Ray—Dynastic History of Northern India, Vol. II, p. 834, foot note 1.

³Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 297, Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 36, has جاہب دیو which is quite correct. Balwar is not traceable.

⁴""In the vicinity of Kathel, the Sultān bestowed upon Qādī Minḥāj Sirāj a special robe of honour and a horse at the time of bidding farewell," See Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 216.

⁵Eliot, Vol. II, p. 352—proceeded towards Lāhore and Ghaznīn on the way to Uch and Multān—which is absurd. Where Lāhore and where Ghaznīn and where Multān? Perhaps the word زخم has been turned into Ghaznīn.
had captured the fort of Uch and had driven away its ruler Malik 'Izz-u'd-din Balban-i-Kishlu Khan towards the capital. In all probability, Sher Khan rebelled to support Ulugh Khan, whose differences with the Sultan must have been growing for some time. As a matter of fact, the growing power of Ulugh Khan was a source of danger both to the Sultan and his Maliks and Amirs. Malik Qutluq Khan and 'Izz-u'd-din Balban-i-Kishlu Khan were no friends of Ulugh Khan, whose power as Malik Nā'īb might have been deeply resented by the Turkish aristocracy. All the Khāns, Maliks and Amirs joined the royal army in the expedition and Qutluq Khan from Biyānah and Malik 'Izz-u'd-din Balban-i-Kishlu Khan from Badā'ūn accompanied the Sultan with their forces up to the river Beas. At this juncture, 'Imād-u'd-dīn Raiḥān grew jealous of Ulugh Khan's supremacy and wanted to pull him down. He along with other Amirs sowed the seed of discord between Ulugh Khan and the Sultan, which yielded the desired effect. The Sultan finding himself helpless, tried to reassert his power, but he was too weak to accomplish anything. He could not rely on the Turkish aristocracy, and like his predecessors vainly sought to create a non-Turkish group. He, however, found in Raiḥān a fit person to lead the opposition.

Wakil-i-dar 'Imād-u'd-dīn Raiḥān.

On the 3rd March, 1253 A.D., the Sultan issued an order to Ulugh Khan to retire to his fiefs of Siwālik and Hānsī, and the latter obeyed the royal command and reached Hānsī by way of Rohtak. The Sultan then returned to the capital, and directed his attention towards the reorganiza-

---

1 Tabaqat-i-Akbari, p. 75, has سحسوان and Firighah, p. 72, has سحسوان which is not meant here.

2 Firighah, p. 72, incorrectly calls him همادالدين رییانی.

3 Tabaqat-i-Nāsiri, p. 216.

4 The printed text of the تابعت-i-Nāsiri, p. 217, has راهنگ while the different copies, according to Major Raverty, have میرس - یابنک - سحسوان - نجیدو - لیدر - هر -
tion of the affairs of the state. 'Imād-u'd-dīn Rāihān made use of this opportunity to remove all the officials connected with Ulugh Khān, and prevailed on the Sultaḥ to make drastic changes in the machinery of the state. In July 1253, A.D., the 'Ain-u'l-Mulk1 Nizām-u'l-Mulk Junaidī became Vizier, and 'Imād-u'd-dīn Rāihān was appointed Wakīl-i-dar (Superintendent of the Court and Palace). Ulugh Mubārak-i-Barbak, brother of Ulugh Khān, was deprived of his office of Amīr-i-Ḥājīb (Lord Chamberlain) and was ordered to proceed to the territory of Karraḥ. On the 22nd September, 1253 A.D., Qāḍī Shams-u'd-dīn of Bahrāich succeeded Qāḍī Minhāj Sirāj as the Chief Qāḍī of the State.4

Not yet satisfied with the change of government he had brought about, 'Imād-u'd-dīn Rāihān induced the Sultaḥ to march against Ulugh Khān, and to deprive him of his fiefs. On becoming aware of the Sultaḥ's intention, Ulugh Khān left Hānsī, retired towards Nāgore and 'led his troops towards the territories of Ranthambhor, Bundī and Chitor.'5 During this expedition, he was, however, successful in overthrowing the Rae of Ranthambhor, Bahada Divā6 by name. The Sultaḥ, being frustrated in his designs, conferred the territory of Hānsī together with the office of Amīr-i-Ḥājīb

1 Meaning the 'eye of the state'—may be taken as a title.
2 A wakīl is a person, who is authorized to act in place of another—a substitute—therefore, a representative in Durbar. Wakīl-i-dar variously designated as Rasūl-i-dar or Ḥājīb-u'l Irāsāl was appointed to perform the secretarial functions of the Court. ˋتربیت ادیان در امر اشغال.' Barāni—Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 576. In addition to his secretarial work, he was also in charge of the keys of the Palace and superintended the closing of the gates (Diya Barāni—Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 405). Wakīl-i-dar was a confidential assistant or Ḥājīb of the Wāli (Governor) under the Minor Dynasties of Persia—Levy—Sociology of Islam, Vol. II, p. 224.
3 Firīshṭah, p. 72, adds 'and Manakpūr,' which is quite possible.
4 Ṭabarānī—Nāṣirī, p. 217.
5 Ibid., p. 299—see Early life of Balban. It is not Chitor but Chitor, former capital of Mewār. Its old name was Chitrakut.
(Lord Chamberlain) upon Prince Rukn-u'd-dīn Firuz Shāh and the post of Nā'īb-i-Amīr-i-Hājib (Deputy to Lord Chamberlain) upon Malik 'Izz-u'd-dīn Balban-i-Kishlu Khān and himself returned to the capital in the month of October.

Early in December 1253 A.D., the Sūltān again set out from Delhi to subdue Uch, Multān and Tabarindhah. On reaching the river Beas, he despatched a force towards Tabarindhah. Previous to this, Malik Sher Khān had withdrawn from an engagement with the Mongols and retired towards Turkistān. On the 16th February, 1254 A.D., the territories of Uch, Multān and Tabarindhah were wrested out of the hands of Sher Khān's dependents, and placed under the charge of Arsalān Khān Sanjar-i-Chast.

1 One of the Sūltān's offsprings as given by the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 206. He was not a son from the daughter of Ulugh Khān; for as yet she had borne him no offspring. See Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 227.

2 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 299.

3 Malik Sher Khān was the cousin of Ulugh Khān. In the reign of Sūltān 'Alī-u'd-dīn Mas'ūd Shāh, the fortress of Tabarindhah and the whole of its dependencies were entrusted to his charge. He fought several battles with Malik 'Izz-u'd-dīn Balban-i-Kishlu Khān. He made a common cause with Malik Jalāl-u'd-dīn Mas'ūd Shāh, son of Sūltān Ilutmish, but the latter retired disappointed. At the time of the history under review, he returned from Turkistān, but failed to capture Tabarindhah and presented himself at the court. Tabarindhah was, however, entrusted to his charge, but was again ordered to proceed to the capital. Later the different territories of Koil, Bayānāh, Bālārām in Oudh, Jalesar (now a town in Etah district, U.P.), Gwalior and others were placed under his charge one after another—See Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 276—278.

4 The best Parsi MSS. and a few modern copies, according to Major Raverty, have كنار سنده evidently a mistake for كنار سنده.

5 A slave of Sūltān Shams-u'd-dīn Ilutmish, in whose reign he became Jāmā-Dār, (keeper of the Royal Kitchens). In the reign of Sūltān Raḍiyah he became Chāghāni-gir (controller of the Royal kitchen) and, after some time, obtained the sief of Bālārām in Oudh. In the reign of Sūltān Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Bahram Shāh, Siyānāh and Tabarindhah were made over to his charge one after another. For further details see above. Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 265—268.
Sultan then retired from the banks of the river Beas.

In February 1254 A.D., the Sultan crossed the river Jumna, gained many victories and obtained immense booty in the vicinity of the mountain tracts of Bardar and Bijnore.¹ On March 9, 1254 A.D., the royal army crossed the river Ganges in front of Miyapur, and continued its march as far as the banks of the river Râhâb (modern Râm Gangâ). During these expeditions, Malik Radî-u-l-Mulk 'Izz-u-d-dîn Durmashî² was killed³ at Tilka Bânî⁴ on the 6th April, 1254 A.D. Next day, the Sultan inflicted an exemplary punishment upon the 'infidels of Katheț,'⁵ and then departed towards Badâtûn. On the 26th April, the Sultan was pleased to appoint for the second time the Sadr-u-l-Mulk Najm-u-d-dîn Abû Bakr the Vizier of the State, and on May 10, 1254 A.D. Qâdi, Minâhâj-u-d-dîn was honoured with the title of Sadr-i-Jâhân.⁶

The Sultan reached the capital on May 16, 1254 A.D., and remained there for a period of five months. Learning that a number of Maliks and Amirs along with Malik Jalâl-u-d-dîn Mas'ud Shâh, the Sultan's brother, had formed a confederacy and had broken out into rebellion; he marched towards Sunâm and Tabarhindah in the month of October.⁷ The Turkish aristocracy had already been disgusted with the ascendancy of Ulugh Khân; they could much less bear

¹ Bada'tî, p. 91, has بدار Bardâr is not traceable, but may be Hardwar.
² A native of Durmash. The Tabaqât-i-Akbarî, p. 75, and Firûghtâh, p. 72, wrongly write درمستی (in intoxication).
³ The Tabaqât-i-Akbarî, p. 75, and Firûghtâh, p. 72, say that he was "killed by the Zamindârs of Kaithlal and Kuhram."
⁴ The printed text of the Tabaqât-i-Nâsîrî, p. 218, has تنکان بانی The place is rather uncertain. Major Raverty’s conclusion is that it is Tigree-Barchnee in the territory of Kather.
⁵ The Tabaqât-i-Akbarî, p. 75, adds 'and Kuhram,' which is not meant here at all.
⁶ Tabaqât-i-Nâsîrî, p. 218.
⁷ Ibid., p. 219.
the burden of a non-Turkish yoke. Raiḥān\textsuperscript{1} was an Indian Mussalman, and belonged to a Hindu family previously converted to Islam. The fact that all the \textit{Maliks} and \textit{Amīrs} were Turks and Raiḥān was an Indian gave rise to jealousy. Now the \textit{Amīrs} of different districts appealed to Ulugh Khān to destroy the tyranny of 'Imād-ud-dīn Raiḥān and to undertake the management of affairs as before.\textsuperscript{2} There were two \textit{coup d'états} working. Ulugh Khān had fallen from power, but a pretender was available for his party in the person of Malik Mas'ūd Shāh, who was put forward by him. He, therefore, acceded to the applicants' wishes, and along with Malik Taj-ud-dīn Arsalān Khān Sanjar-i-Chast of Tabarhindah, Malik Saif-ud-dīn Bat Khān-i-Aibak, the Khiṭāl and Malik Jalāl-ud-dīn Mas'ūd Shāh assembled his forces 'in the vicinity of Tabarhindah. Hence the second \textit{coup d'état}, which accounted for Ulugh Khān's return to power. The Sultān advanced from Sunām to Hānsi, and the rebel Maliks retired to Kuhrām and Kaithal.\textsuperscript{3} The Royal army pursued them there. A number of Amīrs now interposed between the opposite parties; Ḥusām-ud-dīn Qutluq Shāh represented the Sultān's side, the \textit{Sipāh-sālār} (Commander of the \textit{Sarḵīl}s : a \textit{Sarḵīl}—Commander of 10 horsemen or footmen) Qarah-Jamāq was on the other side, while Malik Quṭb-ud-dīn son of 'Alī the Ghūrī became a mediator between the two. However, an accommodation took place on the explicit condition that Malik 'Imād-ud-dīn Raiḥān was to be dismissed from his office.\textsuperscript{4} Consequently, on December 5, 1254 A.D., 'Imād-ud-dīn was removed from his office of \textit{Wakil-i-dār} (Representative in Court),

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{Firīshṭāh} styles him Raiḥānī. Raiḥān is a popular name among the Mussalmāns of Egypt, but Raiḥānī, according to Major Raverty, means a Seller of Flowers, and perhaps Raiḥānī's father followed such an occupation.  

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Firīshṭāh}, p. 72.  

\textsuperscript{3} The \textit{Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī}, p. 76, has confused Kaithal for Kather. Baddānī, p. 92, has Kather. See \textit{Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī}, p. 219, Kather is the modern form of Rohilkhand, which is not meant here.  

\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī}, p. 301.
and he hatched a conspiracy to kill Malik's Bat Khan-i-Aibak and 'Izz-u'd-din Balban i-Yuzbakt, who had reached the royal camp for reconciliation, but failed to accomplish 1 anything. Shortly after, 'Imad-u'd-din Raihan was ordered to proceed to Badā'ūn, which was entrusted to his charge. Malik Jala' u'd-din Mas'ud Shāh was made governor of Lāhore,2 and Sher Khan obtained the territories of the Bhatti Rajputs of Dipalpūr, Multān, Bhatnair (a town and fort, now known as Hanumāngarh) and Bhatindah.3 Henceforth the Sultān is absolutely powerless, and Ulugh Khān's clique finally triumphs.

Change of Government and Ulugh Khān's Regency.

In the year 1255, A.D., the Malikah-i-Jahān married Qutlugh Khān, which alienated the sympathies of the Sultān from his mother. On the 16th February, 1255 A.D., the Sultān ordered them to proceed to Oudh,4 which was

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāşiri, p. 302.
2 Ibid., p. 219.
3 Firāq, p. 72, brings Malik Sher Khān upon the scene here, but he seems to have nothing to do with this matter.
4 Tabaqāt-i-Nāşiri, p. 303; Badā'ūni, p. 76, says 'to Bahraich', which is not possible. In the high ground of the Bābā Qilā at Koil stood formerly the great masār (so called) of Ghūrāth-u'd-din Balban. It was pulled down by the orders of Mr. G. Edmonstone, Lt.: Governor in 1862. (The Monumental Antiquities and Inscriptions in the N. W. Provinces and Oudh by Dr. A. Fuhrer, p. 2). The inscription is now preserved in the Nizām Museum, Muslim University, 'Aligarh, and runs as follows:

هذا العبارة في عهد مملكة السلطان الأعظم مالك رقاب الا مماليك الأندلسيين والدين سلطان الإسلاميين وذى الأمان لاهل الإيام وارث ملك سلبيان صاحب المنام في منى العالم ابي الامام محمد بن السلطان خلدائه ملكه وسلطانه الملك العالم الكبير المعلم فتقلع من بها الفرق والدينين ملكه ملك الشرق واليمنيين في جميع المسامع في أيام ايايلا بأمر مخلة الوالي من رجب سنة 530 هـ.

It is clear from the inscription that it belongs to Bahsh-u'd-din Qutlugh and not to Balban. Vide our article on the so-called "Balban Inscription of Koil" published in the Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, Lāhore, 1940.
assigned to them as their fief. Qutlug Khan still proved hostile to the Sulṭān and several times disobeyed the royal mandates.¹ The significance of the marriage is difficult to ascertain, but this much seems certain that Qutlug was setting himself up as a rival of Ulugh Khan. And the same seems to be the object of his repeated rebellions. When the king is weak, the Regent is strong. A change in the government saw a corresponding alteration of its personnel. Ulugh Khan returned to power with his own party of favourites.

On May 2nd, 1255 A.D., Qāḍī Minḥāj-Sirāj was again elevated to the post of the chief Qāḍī of the state. On May 31 Malik Quṭb-ud-dīn Ḥusain² was arrested and killed for high treason against the Sulṭān. On July 14, the province of Mīrath was assigned to Ulugh Khan’s brother Malik Kishlā Khān Ulugh ʿĀṣam-Bārbak-i-Sulṭān,³ and on August 18, the office of Shaikh-u’ll-Islām was conferred upon Jamāl-ud-dīn the Buṣṭāmī. In the same month, Malik Tāj-ud-dīn Sanjar,⁴ who was detained and imprisoned by Malik Qutlug Khan, managed to escape from Oudh and ousted ‘Īmād-ud-dīn Raiḥān from Bahārāch, but soon died there. The Sulṭān issued an order to Malik Qutlug Khan to leave the province of Oudh and to proceed to the territory of Bahārāch, but the latter did not obey the order. The Sulṭān was very much displeased with his action and despatched a force under the command of Malik Ibrāhīm Ruknī and Tāj-ud-dīn Sanjar-i-Tez Khān to expel him from Oudh.⁵ The rival forces met within the limits of

¹ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 304.
² Perhaps Quṭb-ud-dīn Ḥusain acted as Na’īb or Regent of the Sulṭān, when Ulugh Khan was sent to Nāgore.
³ Malik Kishlā Khān was Ulugh Khan’s brother and his titles were continued to his son - “شَهِرُ عَلَيْهِ الْدِينُ اللَّهُ يَا تَجِيدَ مَعْطَمَ بَارِيِّ يَكِ”
⁴ Firighat, p. 73, turns him into Tāj-ud-dīn the Turk. The Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 304, styles him as Sanjar-i-Mah-i-Peshānī (of the moon-like brow.)
⁵ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 221.
Sihrämū (or Serā-Mow, a place west of the Goghrā river) in the vicinity of Badāʿūn. Malik Baktamur Ruknī was killed in the battle that ensued, and Tāj-u’d-dīn Sanjar-i-Tez Khān, perforce 'retired to the capital and the province of Oudh was assigned to him'.

On Dec. 1, 1255 A.D., the Sulṭān marched with his army from the capital, and pitched his tents at Tilpat. As the contingent-forces from his own sīf delayed in approaching the royal army, Ulugh Khān set out from Hānsī on Dec. 18 to superintend the military organizations of Siwālik, Sursutī, Jind, Barwālah and Mewāt (an undefined territory to the south of Delhi) territories. After completing his preparations, he reached the capital along with his forces and on January 19 joined the royal camp. In February 1256 A.D. the royal forces reached the frontier of Oudh. On receiving intelligence of the Sulṭān's arrival, Malik Qutlugh Khān retired towards Kālair. Ulugh Khān

1 Ibid., p. 260. Sihrämū or Serā Mow of the Indian Atlas in Lat. 28° 19', Long. 80° 24'.
2 Malik Tāj-u’d-dīn Sanjar-i-Tez Khān was a slave of Sulṭān Shams-u’d-dīn Ilutmīsh. In the reign of Sulṭān Mu’izz-u’d-dīn Bahram Śah, he became Amīr-i-Āḥār (Lord of the Royal Stable). In the reign of Sulṭān Nāṣir-u’d-dīn Maḥmūd Śah, he was made Nā’īb Amīr-i-Hājīb, (Deputy to Lord Chamberlain). He became feudatory of Jhanjhanat, Kasmandī, Mandīnārāh and Baram one after another. For later history see as above—see Tabaqūt-i-Nāsirī, p. 250.
3 Tabaqūt-i-Nāsirī, p. 260.
4 About 13 miles SSE of the modern city of Delhi. It is a place of great antiquity, and is included in the southern Parganah of Delhi.
5 The Barwālah of the Indian Atlas in Lat. 75° 59', Long. 28° 22'. The Āṭā-i-Āḥārī, while enumerating the different Sarkārs, mentions in the Sarkār of Ḥīṣār Fīrūzāh. The same is meant here; for Jind is near to Ḥīṣār.
6 Tabaqūt-i-Nāsirī, p. 305.
7 Ibid. According to Major Raverty the most trustworthy copies of the text have یک. The printed text of the Tabaqūt has Kālinjar, which is too far. It cannot be Gwalior for the same reason. There is, however, a place Kaliyar (یک), a few miles north-east of Rurkee, and is the remains of an ancient city. It is probable, though not certain, that the place referred to here is Kaliyar.
was ordered to pursue the rebel Malik, but failed to capture him and rejoined the royal camp on May 1, 1256 A.D., when the Sultan reached the capital.1

In the year 1256 A.D., Malik Tāj-u’d-dīn Sanjar-i-Tez Khān was appointed Wakil-i-dar (Superintendent of the Court and Palace) and the territory of Badā’ūn was placed under his charge. Malik Qutlugh Khān made encroachment upon the territories of Karah and Mānakpūr but was defeated by Arsalān Khān Sanjar-i-Chast, and being frustrated in his designs, fled in the direction of Santūr6 to 'take refuge with Rāna Rāmpāl.'6 On January 9, 1257 A.D., the Sultan marched towards Santūr (or Santūrgarh) to quell the sedition. The Hindu forces of the mountain accompanied by Malik Qutlugh Khān and several other Amirs4 failed to withstand the onslaught of the royal army and fled in despair. Ulugh Khān completely devastated that hill tract and pushed on through passes and defiles to Sirmūr, and put a large number of the rebels to the sword.7

On March 24, 1257 A.D., Malik Saif-u’d-dīn Bat Khān-i-Aibak, the Khīṭāī8 died of a fall from his horse, and on May 13,9 the Sultan reached the capital. About this time,

---

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 221.
2 The text on p. 221 is "عقله كودون گرفت". While Major Raverty translates it as "began to appropriate," it must be translated as 'made encroachments upon.'
3 Or Santūrgarh below Mussoorī.
4 The word موص tả meaning fellowship or rest or neighbourhood is turned into 'high lands' in Elliot, Vol. II, p. 355. The Tabaqāt-i-Akbārī, p. 76, has مواس سندخو which means the neighbouring tracts of Santūr. It is in fact Sirmūr.
5 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 306, has رانده راہ پال but Firīzhah, p. 73, has راحہ حیدر پاگی.
6 The text on p. 222 has از امیرائی اسلام پھرمی کو خاندان بودند while Elliot, Vol. II, p. 356, translates as 'a party of nobles in the royal army.'
7 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 222.
8 For his early career see the reign of ‘Alā-u’d-dīn Mas’ūd Shāh.
9 May 12, in the account of Ulugh Khān.
Malik 'Izz-u'd-Din Balban-i-Kishlu Khān advanced as far as the banks of the river Beas with the armies of Uch and Multān and Malik Qutugh Khan joined the new rebel in the vicinity of Manṣūrpūr (below Tarāin) and Sāmānah. Malik Qutugh and 'Izz-u'd-dīn Balban-i-Kishlu Khān both were desperately ambitious, and the latter had even proclaimed himself king. They were arch-rebels against Ulugh Khān's power, but could not join Raḥān, for he was a non-Turk. The two adventurers obviously represented the extreme aristocratic parties, and their success meant the paralysis of the already weak central power. They were, however, supported by a Hindū Rāja, who like his other contemporaries was ready to help the rebels.

On May 31, the Sultān appointed Ulugh Khān at the head of the royal army to advance against the rebels. But when the two armies came face to face, a seditious party of the Shaikh-ul-Islām Jamāl-u'd-dīn Bushtāmī, Syed Qutb-u'd-dīn and Qāḍī Shams-u'd-dīn of Bahrāich sent secret letters from the capital to Malik Qutugh Khān and Balban-i-Kishlu Khān urging them to come and to capture the city; they further assured them that on their arrival, they would throw open the gates and incite the people to pledge their allegiance to the movement. Certain loyalists informed Ulugh Khān of the conspiracy, and the latter imparted the news to the Sultān requesting him to issue a mandate to the partisans of Qutugh Khān to betake themselves to their respective fiefs. Accordingly, on June 17, the mandate was issued to the Shaikh-ul-Islām Qutb-u'd-dīn and Qāḍī Shams-u'd-dīn of Bahrāich to proceed to their assigned territories.

1 The text on p. 222 has منصوره سامان،. Sāmānah is in Patiāla, Manṣūrah is in Sind and is, therefore, unlikely. It is Manṣūrpūr below Tarāin.

2 Fīrūshṭah, p. 73.

3 Ṭabaqāt-i-Naṣirī, p. 223.

4 According to the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 76, Ulugh Khān also went to Delhi from Sāmānah, which is not supported by the contemporary account.
Being ignorant of this misfortune, Malik Qutlugh Khan and Balban-i-Kishli Khan pushed on towards Delhi, and on June 21, 1257 A.D., they alighted at Bagh-i-Jud ¹ (the gardens on the bank of the river Jumna). Early the next morning, they made a circuit of the walls, and at night pitched their camp in the vicinity of Delhi between the Bagh-i-Jud, Kilkorkhri and the city.² But they soon discovered to their disappointment that the disaffected party had been exiled from the city, and consequently the fulfilment of their promises was out of the question. Besides, the gates of the city were closed by the royal orders and as the army was absent from Delhi, the Sultan commanded the Amir-u’l Hujjâb, (Head of the Chamberlains) ³ ‘Alâ-u’d-Din Ayâz Juzjani, the Na’ib Amir-i-Hâjib, the Ulugh Kutwâl Bek ⁴ (the superintendent of police) Jamâl-u’d-Dîn Nishâpuri and the Diwân-i-‘Arâd-i-Mumâlîk (the Ministry of War) to organize the remaining forces and to defend the capital. On June 22, 1257 A.D., the rebel Maliks and the Sultan’s mother Malikah-i-Jahân all made up their mind to retreat and they dispersed in various directions. The greater part of their forces, however, remained encamped near the city, tendered their submission to the Sultan and ultimately joined the royal service.⁵

In the meantime, Ulugh Khan with his forces pressed on towards the capital, but on reaching the city on June 25,

1 Bagh-i-Jud has been translated by Elliot, Vol. II, p. 357, as the ‘gardens on the Jumna’ and ‘gardens (outside the city).’ The former is correct.

² Major Raverty is wrong in thinking that ‘Alâ-u’d-Dîn Ayâz had succeeded Malik Saiif-u’d-Dîn Aibak-i-Kishli Khan, for, in the first place, the two offices of Amir-i-Hâjib and Amir-u’l-Hujjâb or Malik-u’l-Hujjâb are quite different: the first being all powerful, the other quite subordinate. In the second place, Ayâz was not newly created Amir-u’l-Hujjâb but he was appointed as such along with Malik Saiif-u’d-Dîn Aibak-i-Kishli Khan, who was appointed Amir-i-Hâjib—See Tabaqat-i-Nâshirî, p. 293.

³ & (Bek)=Beg=Bay. The Turks do not seem to pronounce the &. Also in those days & and & were written in the same way. Bek is safer.

⁵ Tabaqat-i-Nâshirî, p. 224.
1257 A.D. found the rising quelled. On September 19, 1257 A.D., Dīyā-u'l-Mulk Tāj-u'd-dīn was appointed Vizier of the Kingdom, and the title of Niẓām-u'l-Mulk was bestowed upon him.

**The Mongol Invasion of 1258 and after.**

At the end of the year, an army of Mongols marched from Khorāsān and reached the territory of Uch and Multān. Malik 'lzz-u'd-dīn Balban-i-Kišlī Khān entered into a compact with their leader the Noyon Salīn, and accepted the Mongol intendant in his territory. The Mongol forces, however, continued their march and dismantled the defences of the citadel of Multān.

On January 13, 1258 A.D., the Sulṭān marched with his army to repel the Mongol forces, and appointed the Maliks and Amīrs to the command of the army stationed at different parts of the territory. But Malik Tāj-u'd-dīn Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjār in Oudh and Qutlugh Khān Mas'ūd Jānī from Lakhnawī rebelled and delayed in joining.

---

1. *Fīrīstah,* p. 73, adds, "Through the recommendation of Ulugh Khān, Kišlī Khān was again entrusted with the charge of Sind, and Qutlugh Khān is heard no more."
3. The *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī,* p. 77, describes the invasion in a few words—"At the end of the year an army of Mongols invaded the territories of Uch and Multān. The Sulṭān marched to repel them; but both the parties retired without fighting." *Fīrīstah,* p. 73, confuses the name of the leader with the name of a place and says the Mongol forces came to Sārī.
4. The name ʿlzz-ul-Mulk: it was equal to marshal in the modern sense.
6. On January 16, 1258 A.D., the caliph Musta'sim-billah obtained a temporary success over the Mongol forces. *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī,* p. 225, and *Bāḍāʾīnī,* p. 93, place the event of Sulṭān's march a year earlier, i.e., 1257 A.D.
7. In some of the best copies of the text, according to Major Raverty, he is styled as Shāh. In the text of the Nāṣirī Maliks he is called Jalāl-u'd-dīn Kulīkh Khān, son of the late Malik 'Altul-dīn Jānī, who is certainly styled Shāh-zādah of Turkistan. At other places, however, he is called Malik Qutlugh Mas'ūd, son of Jānī, and also Kulīkh Mas'ūd, son of Jānī.
the royal camp. Thereupon, Ulugh Khān marched against them, but they made their submission and were pardoned, and the territories of Lakhnawtī and Karah were entrusted to the charge of Qutlugh Khān Mas'ūd Jānī and Arsalān Khān-i-Sanjar, respectively. On September 1, 1258 A.D., the centre-contingents of the royal army returned to the capital, where they remained for a period of four months.

On January 10, 1259 A.D., the Sultān made another attempt to march against the Mongols. On February 17, the territories of Biyānāh, Koil, Bālārām, and Gwalior were placed under the charge of Malik Sher Khān-i-Sunqar, and the Malik-u'n-Nawāb Aībak was ordered to proceed against the fort of Ranthambhor and the Sultān returned safely to the capital without accomplishing anything.

On May 29, 1259 A.D., Malik 'Īzz-u'd-dīn Balban-i-Yūzbakī despatched two elephants and some treasure to the capital, and, in consequence, the territory of Lakhnawtī was bestowed upon him. It is very unlikely that the Sultān's power was so strong as to permit a rapid change of governors in his own discretion. Malik Yūzbakī must have ousted Qutlugh Khān Mas'ūd Jānī from Lakhnawtī, and the Sultān merely sanctioned revolution in that country. During the next few months, a series of deaths occurred. On May 31, the Shāiğh-u'l-Islām Jamāl-u'd-dīn Busṭāmī died, and on June 18, Qāḍī Kabīr-u'd-dīn

---

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 311.
2 Ibid., p. 312.
3 Firīzhah, p. 73, gives the following account— 'The Punjāb was entrusted to Sher Khān, and Biyānāh, Koil, Jalesar (perhaps being interchangeable with Bālārām near Koil) and Gwalior to Malik Khishī Khān.' The Sultān did not possess Punjāb, for the Mongols had over-run it.
4 For his early life see the reign of Sultān 'Alā-u'd-dīn Mas'ūd Shah.
5 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 313. On one of the coins of their reign "the word یوزکی is decipherable" after the Sultān's name, which shows the Yūzbak, the governor of Bengal, when mediating independence, struck his name in addition to that of the Sultān. H. N. Wright—Sultāns of Delhi, Their Coins and Metrology, p. 78.
also breathed his last; their offices were transferred to their sons. In the month of July, Malik Saif-u'd-dīn Aibak-i-Kishlū Khān expired, and the office of Amir-i-Ḥājīb (Lord Chamberlain) was assigned to his son Malik 'Alā-u'd-dīn Muḥammad. On August 22, the Imām Ḥamīd-u'd-dīn of Margālah1 (in the Punjāb) departed, and the royal grants devolved upon his sons.2 On September 19, however, a son was born to the Sulṭān from the daughter of Ulugh Khān, but did not survive.

In obedience to the royal commands, Malik Tāj-u'd-dīn Sanjar-i-Tez Khān reached the capital with an organized force in the middle of October, 1259 A.D.3 On January 29, 1260 A.D., Ulugh Khān marched with a large army of 10,000 horse to put down the rebel inhabitants of Mewāt, who, under their leader Malik, robbed and plundered the property of Mussalman and devastated the district of Hāriānāh (in the eastern half of Ḥiṣṣār district, Punjāb) and the territories of the Siwālik and Biyānāh.4 On account of the ever-growing apprehension from the side of the Mongols, who went on harassing the frontier tracts of Hindūstān, some delay was caused in the chastisement of the rebels. In the meantime, the emissaries of Huiāgū proceeded from Khurāsān to Hindūstān, but they were not allowed to march any further, and were detained at Barūtah5 so that a proper reception might be made. Ulugh Khān suddenly resolved upon an advance into the mountain-tracts of Mewāt,6 plundered and devastated the

---

1 Of Margālah in the Punjāb.
2 Ṭabaqāt-i-Naṣīrī, p. 226.
3 Ibid., p. 227.
4 Ibid., p. 313.
5 Styled as al-Ṭūrānī, about 4 miles to the south-east of Jagdiāhpūr on the way to Sūnīpāt from Delhi.
6 Ṭabaqāt-i-Naṣīrī, p. 314. The Mewāris occupy the hilly country of Alwar, Gurgāon and Bharatpur, known as Mewāt. They are now all Mussalman. In Alwar alone they are divided into 52 clans. During the Muslim period, they were very powerful and notorious for their turbulence. They claim a descent from the Rājpūts, though many of them
whole territory and put a large number of the inhabitants to the sword.\footnote{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 227.} As a result of this expedition, immense booty fell into the hands of the victors; 250 persons were taken prisoners, about 142 horses were captured and sixty bardahs (bags) of 35,000 tankahs each (all amounting to about 21 lakhs of rupees) were extorted from the Rānās and Raes of that territory.\footnote{Ibid., p. 315. The text runs "36 bardahs of 35,000 tankahs," which means a very small sum. The probability is that each bag contained 35,000 tankahs. The total amount then would rise to about 21 lakhs—not a very large sum to be extorted from several Raes.} Having accomplished this wonderful exploit, Ulugh Khān returned triumphant on February 18, 1260 A.D., the Sultān held a public assembly at the Juddhards, and the captives were put on gibbets over the gateways of the city.\footnote{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 316.} In short, an example of punishment was set up at the plain of Ḥauḍ-i-Rāni (Rāni’s Reservoir).

On March 24, 1260 A.D., the retinue of the Sultān moved to the Kūshk-i-Fīrūzī (the Fīrūzī Castle) and Ulugh Khān-i-Azām ordered Šāhib-i-Diwān-i-ʾArq-i-Mumālk (Minister of War) to station a well-equipped army of 200,000 footmen and 50,000 horse from the new city of Kūlkhārī to the Royal Palace in order to display the strength of the kingdom to the Mongol ambassadors, who had arrived at the capital.\footnote{Ḥauḍ-i-Rānī was situated in the suburb of Qil’ah Raе Pithorā, below and outside the Juhān-panāḥ (a fortified city near the old fort) of Muḥammad Shāh Tughlaq. A postern gate leading to the Old Fort was named Ḥauḍ-i-Rānī Gate.} On both sides of the road, twenty lines of spectators and officials stood in their order of status and rank; and the sounds of drums and trumpets, the roaring of elephants, the neighing of horses and the flashing of arms created an

sprang from the same stock as the Mīnās. As agriculturists they are inferior to their Hindū neighbours. Their women do not observe purdah (veil) and are very industrious—\textit{(Report on the Census of the Punjab, p. 261).} The Hindū Meos or Mīnās claim to be Rajpūts, while the Muslim Meos call themselves Mewātīs.
inspiring scene.\(^1\) The Mongol emissaries were then conducted to the Royal Palace, which was decorated with an infinite variety of carpets, cushions and articles of silver and gold. The Royal throne and round about it two canopies—one red, and the other black—were adorned with priceless jewels, and the Maliks, Amīrs, officials and eminent personages all stood with folded hands before the throne.\(^2\)

The arrival of these emissaries requires some explanation.\(^3\) Malik Ḥasan, the Qurlukh, the ruler of southern Sind,\(^4\) contemplated a matrimonial alliance with Ulugh Khān by giving his daughter in marriage to the latter's son, and consequently he sent a Khaljī, styled the Ḥājīb-Ajal (most worthy Chamberlain), Jamāl-u'd-dīn 'All to the presence of Ulugh Khān.\(^5\) But when he reached Uch, Malik 'Izz-u'd-dīn Balban-i-Kishī Khān detained him and did not allow to proceed any further. Thereupon, the tactful Ḥājīb 'All declared before the Mongol Commissioner that he was an ambassador from Delhi, and was going on a mission to the Mongol Court. He was then released, and approached his patron, who dictated letters on behalf of Ulugh Khān and despatched him towards 'Irāq and Ādharbajjān.\(^6\) Hūlāgū received him with great honour and conveyed his orders through the Commissioner of Bamiyān, the son of Amīr Yaghrash,\(^7\) to the Mongol forces under the command of Sārī, the Noyon, saying, "If the hoof of your horse enters the dominion of Sultān Naṣīr-u'd-dīn, all the four legs of the horse shall be cut off."\(^8\) These were the emissaries sent by Hūlāgū to the court of Delhi.

\(^1\) Firīghtah, p. 73.
\(^2\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 318.
\(^3\) The Cambridge History of India and Dr. Iśhwari Prasād's Medieval India do not explain the arrival of the emissaries.
\(^4\) Sind in those days consisted of two parts: (1) the territory of Thatta, Brāhmanābād and Manṣūrah—southern Sind, (2) Multān and Uch—northern Sind, which is now part of the Punjāb. In old books Sind includes Multān and Uch.
\(^5\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 320.
\(^6\) Ibid., p. 321.
\(^7\) The intendant seems to be a 'Mussalman.'
\(^8\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 322.
On July 6, 1260 A.D. Ulugh Khān, for the second time, started against the rebel inhabitants of the mountain-tracts of Mewāt, who again rose in revolt, infested roads and 'shed the blood of the Mussalāms.' Ulugh Khān succeeded in capturing their strong-hold and in massacring 12,000 persons, and then returned to the capital.¹

Sultān Nāṣir-u'd-dīn fell ill in the year 1264 A.D. and died on February 18, 1266.² All the contemporary and later³ authorities suddenly stop at the year 1260 A.D. and since then upto his death in 1266—a period of six years—no event is narrated. The author of the Tābaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, who died in the next reign mentions not a word after the year 1260, and his significant silence leads the later historians to suspect that either the Sultān was poisoned by Ulugh Khān or the inroads of the Mongols were so furious that the writer of the famous chronicle had no victory to relate. But the facts were otherwise. Minhāj Sirāj had come to India about 1222 A.D. He was an old man by 1260—too old, probably, to continue his history, and Ḍiyā Barānī was too young. Later writers, therefore, had no means of filling up the gap. Even if the Sultān was poisoned, Minhāj would have overlooked the fact. On the other hand, the Mongol invasions, if any, did not result in conquests and no after-effects are to be seen.

Estimate:

Book-worms seldom make good rulers, they care more for manuscripts than for campaigns. The invincible clemency

¹ Tābaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 323.
² Firīżtāh, p. 74. Most writers agree with Firīżtāh. The Tārīḵh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 39, Zuḫdat-u't-Twārīḵh and Tābaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 77, make the reign one year less, i.e., 19 years and some months which is incorrect.
³ The Tābaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 77, relates no event after the year 657 H., i.e., 1259 A.D. Badāʾīnī goes as far as Qāḍī Minhāj Sirāj does. Firīżtāh, p. 74, manages to spin out his tale to the same date. Even Ḍiyā Barānī, who says he began his history from the period Qāḍī Minhāj Sirāj left, gives no account of these six years.
and humility of the Sulṭān forms no ideal of kingship for an eastern world. They resented his simplicity of life; what they wanted was a gallant sovereign, equitable in his judgments and unsurpassable in his pomp. Sulṭān Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Maḥmūd Shāh, on the other hand, was the mildest king that history knows of. He reigned for a pretty long period, but could not rise above the level of the successors of Sulṭān Shams-u'd-dīn Īṣītūmish. A model of all virtues, he was endowed with a supreme gift of sympathy and tenderness and renowned for justice and clemency. A noble king with his boundless store of reading, pre-occupied with preparations for the next world, and possessing not even a particle of cruelty, could never have the personal charm of individual acts of heroism. Religion induced him to abjure the pleasures of the senses; he copied the Qur'ān twice every year in his fine calligraphy and the proceeds of their sale were his only means of subsistence. His mystical exaltation, devout piety and exemplary life gave him the aspect of a saint. His character, in short, attracts but never dominates the imagination of the reader.

It was not possible for Sulṭān Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Maḥmūd Shāh to rest upon his father's laurels, and to enjoy his studious tranquillity. Fortunately for him he had a capable Regent in Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn Baibān entitled as Ulugh Khān to carry on the affairs of government. The first in rank and status was Ulugh Khān, whose majestic bearing bespoke the soldier-king. In him vested the supreme power, and the Sulṭān was a mere puppet in his hands. The internal prosperity of the kingdom increased under his wise guidance, and the empire endured for an unexpected but considerable length of time. Sulṭān Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Maḥmūd, on his part, was, no doubt, enterprising and alert, but lacked diplomacy and far-sighted statesmanship. His reign was one long series of revolts; while one insurrection was being crushed, another sprang up at the end of his dominion.

Overflowing with an extreme degree of human kindness, it was characteristic of the merciful and pious disposition of the Sulṭān to lead a peaceful life and to abhor the glories of
conquest. He seldom led expeditions, but always commissioned Ulugh Khān or other Malikṣ to carry on war operations, and himself halted somewhere on the way or returned to the capital. Qaḍī Minhāj Sirāj, who sang his glory and chronicled his reign, makes use of obscure phrases such as 'returned triumphant' or simply 'returned.' Further he 'revelled at the table, when he ought to have been in the saddle.' He delayed the pursuit of the Mongol army in the year 1259 A.D. for about seven months and remained at the capital.

The policy of Sultān Nasīr-u'd-dīn Maḥmūd was shifty and temporizing; he alternately tried the effects of force and conciliation with the usual consequence that both the policies failed. He was apt to act according to the wishes of new favourites, and in 1253 A.D., he dismissed Ulugh Khān on the instigation of Malik 'Imād-u'd-dīn Raiḥān. The affairs of the state fell into disorder, and he found himself unable to restore the prosperity of the devastated realm. His attempt to assert his power by the dismissal of Balban failed. The Turkish officers would have compelled him to share the fate of his brothers. Ulugh Khān was, however, pardoned and came to power for a second time. The rebellions were really contests between Balban and the opposite faction to control the king. The Sultān's conciliatory disposition and his peaceful but aimless policy incited the Malikṣ to rise in revolt against him, but they were often forgiven by their too-forgiving sovereign. Malik 'Izz-u'd-dīn Balban-i-Kishlū ungratefully seized an opportunity to act in a refractory manner at Nagore in the year 1251 A.D., but the Sultān, naturally kind, forgave him when he should have punished. Again the Sultān was incapable of dealing with the numerous sources of danger, which then menaced the kingdom. The lawless character of the Malikṣ was mainly responsible for creating a perpetual state of warfare. The Sultān unable to oust the rebel Malikṣ, reaffirmed their possessions; those rising at the centre were granted distant provinces only to revolt in comfortable ease at the remote corners of the empire. In the year 1257 A.D. the Sultān's
own mother, Malikah-i-Jahān in concert with Qutlugh Khān rebelled in Oudh, but the Sulṭān, on account of personal attachment and the tender tie of relationship, took half-hearted measures. Never was forbearance, perhaps, more cruelly tried. Such was the Sulṭān, who ascended the throne of Delhi in 1246 and died in 1266 A.D. Sulṭān Nāṣir-u’d-dīn was a king in name only, and remained under the tutelage of his Regent.

The problem, in fact, may be stated thus. To whom did the Empire of Shihāb-u’d-dīn Ghūrī belong? Shihāb-u’d-dīn had no son, and his nephew Sulṭān Maḥmūd had given up his rights. Shihāb-u’d-dīn Ghūrī fortunately had a number of capable slaves, and was naturally succeeded by them. They, the ‘Chahelgānī’ Turks, were joint inheritors, i.e., partners of the king. The Sulṭān could formally be regarded as the head of the state, but the institution of kingship was new in India. The dynasty was a hybrid growth and not enshrined in the hearts of the people. It was foreign and consequently unpopular. In short, the power of the monarch was really in permanent commission.
Chapter VII

SULTĀN GHIYĀTH-U'D-DĪN BALBAN

Early Life

Sultān Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn Balban was one of the forty Turkish slaves of Sultān Shams-u'd-dīn Īltutmish, better known as Chahelgānī or the 'Forty.' He claimed descent from the illustrious line of Afrāsiyāb; his great-grandfather Abar Khān belonged to the renowned Ilbari tribe of Turkistan and was the chief of a clan of ten thousand families. In the prime of youth, Balban was brought captive to Bāghdād by the Mongols, who had conquered the Qara-Khitāis, and dominated the whole of central Asia and Persia. The Khwājah Jamāl-u'd-dīn of Bāṣrah, a man celebrated for his honesty and fair-dealing, purchased him from the Mongols, fostered him like his own son and along with other slaves brought him to the capital city of Delhi in

1 Balban in the Turkish language means a 'lion.' The word Balban occurs very often. It must have been a totemic pastoral symbol, for most Turkish tribes were named after animals. Balban is styled on his gold coin as

H. N. Wright—Sultāns of Delhi, Their Coins and Metrology. p. 58.

2 Tārīkh-i-Firuz Shāhī of Ḍiyā Barani, p. 26, and Firīghtah, p. 75. The number 'Forty' is supposititious—they were really the highest official Turkish families.

3 Ibid., p. 37. Balban's emphasis on his good birth leads one to suspect it, and as a matter of fact, his claim to high birth rested on shaky foundation.

4 Firīghtah, p. 75, incorrectly says his 'father.' Qāḍī Minhāj Sirāj on p. 281 says "the father of Balban and Malik Nasrāt-u'd-dīn Sher Khān were the descendants of Abar Khān." Some copies of the text have

5 The author of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī learnt all these details regarding the early life of Balban from Malik Kuret Khān-i-Sanjar.
the year 1232 A.D.¹ Sulṭān Shams-u’d-dīn Iltutmish purchased the whole lot of Turkish slaves, and appointed them to different posts.² Balban started his career as a Khāṣahdār (King’s Personal Attendant), and later on his position was strengthened by the appointment of his brother Kāshfī Khān as Amir-i-Hājib (Lord Chamberlain). However, as a later addition to the official circle, Balban would not have the same claim as the families, who had helped Shihāb-u’d-dīn to conquer India.

Balban’s early career is that of a restless, unprincipled intriguer, who might terrorize but could not win the respect of his contemporaries. Indiscipline and factiousness for personal gain seem to have been his main motives. In the reign of Sulṭān Rūkn-u’d-dīn Fīrūz Shāh, he joined the conspirators against the Sulṭān; but on the accession of Sulṭān Raḍiyah, their alliance broke up, and they dispersed in different directions; Balban himself being captured and thrown into prison.⁴ He was, however, released and continued as Khāṣahdār (King’s Personal Attendant) until he became Amir-i-Shīkār (Head of the Royal Huntsmen).

In the time of Sulṭān Mu’izz-u’d-dīn Bahram Shāh, the

¹ Tabaqāt-i-Nāḍirī, p. 282.
² The text of the Tabaqāt-i-Nāḍirī, p. 282, runs as follows:

"جَلَدَهُ أَنْ تَرَكَنَ دَرَ بِعَمَّ امْنَدَنَ..."
وَبَنْدَغُي بَيْسُغَتْ مَخْصُوسًا غَشَتَنَدُ.

which has been wrongly translated by Major Raverty as “the whole of these Turks were disposed of, and he (i.e., Balban) was honoured with an office before the throne.” Ibn-Baṭṭūṭah confuses the anecdote regarding Iltutmish and attributes it to Balban, that the latter entreated the former to purchase him for the sake of God.’

³ Ibn-Baṭṭūṭah’s Travels, Elliot III, pp. 594, 595, says that Balban started his career as a water-carrier. One day, an astrologer prophesied to the Sulṭān that one of his water-carriers would succeed him as Sulṭān of Delhi. The Sulṭān wanted to identify him, but at the fixed time of interview Balban was absent—and thus he was saved. It is not likely that Iltutmish believed in astrologers and consequently, the story is not reliable.

⁴ Tabaqāt-i-Nāḍirī, p. 282.
office of Amir-i-Akhūr (Lord of the Imperial Stables) was assigned to him. Fortune favoured him, and Malik Badr-u’d-dīn Sunqar the Şūfī, the Amir-i-Ḥājīb (Lord Chamberlain) raised him to a still higher position. The sief of Riwārī,¹ (now a Tehsil in Gūrgān District, Punjāb) was entrusted to his charge, where he chastised and subdued the rebellious tribes of the Kūh Pāyah or the foot of ² the Himalayas (i.e., the Tarāī), and established his reputation for leadership and enterprise.³ He, along with other Maliks, rebelled against the Sultan and, after the capture of the city of Delhi by them, the sief of Hānsī was made over to his charge. Day by day his power increased until the year 1244 A.D. he became the Amir-i-Ḥājīb (Lord Chamberlain) of Sultan ‘Alā-u’d-dīn Mas’ūd Šah. Accompanied by the Sultan, Balban marched on an expedition into the Doāb of the Ganges and the Jumna, where the rebels of Jalālī and Chātroli⁴ were pursued and severely punished. The same year, the Mongol leader Mangūtāh led an army from the broders of Tālqān and Qunduz into the territory of Sind and invested the fortress of Uch.⁵ When the intimation of the Mongol irruption reached the capital, the royal army advanced towards the river Beas, and after crossing it reached the river Rāwī of Lāhore. Balban⁶ sent forward messengers bearing letters from the Sultan to the garrison of Uch intimating the approach of the royal forces. Some of these letters fell into the hands of the Mongols, who were

¹ Firīstāh, p. 74, incorrectly adds Ḥānsī also, which Balban received hereafter.
² Firīstāh, p. 74, has كفار میوادت ‘the infidels of Mewāt.’ It is in fact ‘Meos’ or the Mewān of the Text.
³ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, pp. 285, 286.
⁴ The different copies of the text according to Major Raverty have وکیلي و تولی و جلی و حراوی. Jalālī and Chātroli were old places near ‘Allīgarh in the Doāb of the Ganges and the Jumna.
⁵ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 297.
⁶ He did not as yet receive the title of Ulugh Khān, but at this stage he was Malik Ghiyāth-u’d-dīn Balban only. Consequently, Minhāj Siraj is wrong to entitle him Ulugh Khān so early.
so terrified that they raised the siege and retreated.\(^1\)

On June 10, 1246 A.D., Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn ascended the throne of Delhi; but he was a king in name only—and remained under the tutelage of his Regent Ghiyāth-ud-dīn Balban, in whom resided the supreme power during the next twenty years of his reign. As a matter of fact, the events of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn’s reign constitute the details of the early career of Ghiyāth-ud-dīn Balban as Na’īb of the Sultān, which have been discussed at length in the previous chapter. They are, however, summarized as follows:—

In the year 1246 A.D., Ghiyāth-ud-dīn Balban led an expedition into the Jnd hills and wreaked vengeance upon the Rāna of the territory.\(^3\) In 1247 A.D., he captured the fort of Talsandah\(^3\) in the Doāb, and then subdued the Rānahs Dalkī and Malkī in the year 1248 A.D. In the following year he proceeded towards Ranthambhor,\(^4\) and ravaged the Kuh-pāyah (skirts of the hill) of Mewāt and the territory of Nahr Diw. On August 2, 1249 A.D., Balban’s daughter was married to the Sultān, and on October 12, the Sultān assigned to him the posts of Na’īb-u’l-Mulk (Regent) and the commander of royal forces with the title of Ulugh Khān-i-Ā’zam.\(^5\) In 1251 A.D., Ulugh Khān overthrew Jāhir, the Raies of Ajārī, and captured the fort of Narwaī.

In 1252 A.D., ‘Imād-ud-dīn Raihān grew jealous of Ulugh Khān’s power and achievements, and on instigation the Sultān ordered the latter to proceed to his fiefs of Siwālik and Hānsī.\(^6\) Having reached there, Ulugh Khān retired towards Nāgor, and invaded the territories of Ranthambhor, Bāndī and Chitor. In 1253 A.D., the Maliks

---

\(^1\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 288, 289.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 290.

\(^3\) The text on p. 291 has ‘नल्लनि दृवे नदेि’; Nandānāh is in the Punjāb, and Talsandah is the correct name.

\(^4\) Ranthambhor was conquered by Sultān Shams-ud-dīn Ilutmīsh in the year 1226 A.D., but after his death, the Hindus had captured it, and during Sultān Kašīyāh’s reign the garrison was withdrawn and the fort was destroyed.

\(^5\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 294.

\(^6\) Ibid., p. 298.
and Amirs revolted against ‘Imād-u’d-dīn Raiḥān,¹ and as a result of it Ulugh Khān again came to power in the year 1254 A.D. He was then ordered to pursue the rebel Malik Qutlug Khān, who had fled to Santūr, which place Ulugh Khān devastated and put a large number of the inhabitants to the sword.²

In 1257 A.D., Malik Qutlug Khān joined hands with Malik ‘Izz-u’d-dīn Balban-i-Kīshlū Khān, and a party of Turkish Amirs also conspired against the Sulṭān at Delhi.³

On June 17, 1257 A.D., the disaffected Maliks were exiled from the capital, and were ordered to proceed to their respective fiefs. In 1258 A.D., Ulugh Khān marched against Malik Tāj-u’d-dīn Arsalān Khān Sanjar and Qutlug Khān Mas’ud Jānī, but the latter made their submission.⁴

On September 19, 1259 A.D., a son was born to the Sulṭān from the daughter of Ulugh Khān, but did not survive. Shortly after, Ulugh Khān resolved upon an advance into the hilly tracts of Mewār, and plundered and devastated the whole territory. The Sulṭān was pleased on his wonderful exploit, and held a public assembly at Jūdgardens, where the captives were put on gibbets.⁵

In 1260 A.D., the Mongol emissaries arrived at the capital, and were received with great honour. The reason being that Malik Naṣir-u’d-dīn Muḥammad,⁶ son of Malik Hasan the Qurlukh, the ruler of Sind, had contemplated the betrothal of his daughter with Ulugh Khān’s son, and consequently he despatched the Ḥājib Jamāl-u’d-dīn ‘Alī to the capital Delhi. But when the messenger reached Uch, he was detained by Malik ‘Izz-u’d-dīn Balban-i-Kīshlū Khān, but was soon released on the pretext that he

¹ Who had been created ḫalīl-i-dār, an important household officer, who was in charge of the Palace-gates, and also performed secretarial functions at the Court.
² Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, pp. 222 and 307.
³ Ibid., pp. 308 and 309.
⁴ Ibid., p. 311.
⁵ Ibid., p. 311.
⁶ He seems to have succumbed to the dominion of his father.
was an emissary from Delhi and was going on a mission to the Mongol Court. Ḥājīb ʿAlī then approached Hūlagū with forged letters from his patron Malik Nāṣir-ud-dīn Muḥammad. These were the emisaries sent by Hūlagū to the court of Delhi. In the same year Ulugh Khān, for the second time, started against the rebel inhabitants of Mewāt, captured their strongholds and massacred about 12,000 persons.

The contemporary as well as later authorities suddenly stop at the year 1260 and do not mention any event up to 1266, when Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-dīn died. With his extinguished the family of Sulṭān Shams-ud-dīn Īltumīrsh, and the Khāns, Malikṣ and Aṃīrs unanimously elevated Ghiyāth-ud-dīn Balban to the throne of Delhi.

Character.

Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn Balban was a wise and sagacious ruler, endowed with many rare virtues and talents. He was an experienced hand in the art of government, and directed the affairs of the state with discrimination and judgment. It goes to his credit that he passed through all the stages of authority, those of Aṃir, Malik and Khān and ultimately attained sovereignty and kingship. While yet a Khān, Balban was notorious for his convivial assemblies and drinking, but after his accession to the throne, he never indulged in these vices, and made it a point to dine with the ‘Ulemā. He gave himself up to worship, fasting and nightly prayers whether at home or abroad, and kept awake at places of pilgrimage. He assiduously attended all con-

---

1 Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 321.
2 Ibid., p. 323.
3 MSS. Intīkham-ʿal-Muntakhab of ʿAbd-ul-Shukhrī, p. 171; Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 78, and Badāʾīnī, p. 127, give one year earlier, i.e., 1265, and Khulāṣat-uṭ-Tawārīkh, p. 197, a year after, i.e., 1267—all of which are wrong.
4 He was a king having an experience of forty years at the time of his death—Ṭārīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī of Ḍiyā Barānī, p. 58.
5 Tārīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī of Ḍiyā Barānī, pp. 45 and 46.
6 The above and the following account regarding Balban has been narrated and learnt by Ḍiyā Barānī from his forefathers, who held important posts in the reign of that great sovereign.
gregational prayers and was never without his ablutions. After attending to Friday prayers, he used to visit the tombs of saints and took a round to see mystics and scholars like Shaikh Burhān-u’d-din Balkhi, Maulānā Sirāj-u’d-din Sanjari, Qāḍī Sharf-u’d-din Valvajī and Maulānā Najm-u’d-din Damaşqi, whom he held in the highest esteem. He always attended the funeral ceremonies of ecclesiastics and distinguished personages and, with a profusion of tears in his eyes, presented robes of honour to the sons and relations of the deceased and bestowed stipends for their maintenance. With all his kingly dignity and magnificence, he used to alight from his horse, when he saw or heard people saying their prayers, sat amidst his subjects and listened to religious sermons. All this was more for show as Ḍiyā Baranī half implies. It did not sanctify Balban’s character.

Sulṭān Ghiyath-u’d-din Balban decorated the court and palace after the manner of the kings of Persia, and attached much importance to the pomp and dignity of the court and of the riding procession. The sight dazzled the spectators, and rebels of distant lands became submissive and loyal. He maintained the royal dignity by issuing strict orders for the observance of etiquette, and himself followed the essential traditions of kingship. In thus reinstituting the forms of pagan Persia, Balban’s object was to raise the status of the king above the nobles, to hide the defects of his physical personality and of his low origin and to maintain the authority of the central government. He took the greatest possible care regarding his behaviour in public and in private as to how he ate, drank, sat, stood and rode. His private servants never saw him without being properly clad in the palace. He himself never laughed, nor allowed anybody else to laugh before him. All this was a symbol of inferiority complex, for true leadership does not require such pretences.

1 Bada’uni’s Ma’ntakhab-u’t-Tawārīkh, p. 128.
2 Tārīkh-i-Firuz Shāhī of Ḍiyā Baranī, p. 46, and Firīghtah, p. 76.
3 Ibid., p. 47.  
5 Ibid., p. 83.
Balban was equally stern and persevering in the enforcement of justice. He was quite different from other kings in anger, kindness, indignation, mildness, excitement and affection. Even in delicate situations he inflicted severe punishments upon the fearless and disobedient persons, while he was always kind and sympathetic in the case of obedient, submissive and fearful people. In matters of justice he showed no favour or partiality towards relatives, confidants and trustworthy persons. Balban was relentless in his punishments of all rebels and disturbers of public peace, Muslim or non-Muslim. He never stopped to consider whether his actions were sanctioned or prohibited by the Shari'at, but ruthlessly killed, flogged and imprisoned people for what he considered to be the welfare of the kingdom. Many descendants of Sultan Shams-u'd-din Ilutmish were publicly beheaded. He gave an order of the execution of Malik Baqbaq, Sar-i-Jándăr (Commander of the Royal troops at the centre), who had killed his personal servant in a fit of intoxication; and his corpse was hung on the gate of Badā'īn. On another occasion, he inflicted five hundred lashes upon Malik Haibat Khān, the governor

---

1 Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhi of Diya Barani, p. 39. Ibn Battūtah—Elliot, III, pp. 593-94, says that Balban had built a house named the 'Abode of Security'—all debtors, who entered it had their debts discharged, and if a murderer fled there for refuge, the friends and relations of the deceased were offered handsome presents and money to forego their claims.

2 The Shari'at does not really recognize rebellion as a crime. Its rules of evidence make proof impossible, and the punishments prescribed are alternately too lax or too severe.

3 Firūzshāh, p. 76.

4 Ibid., p. 76, has 'ملکی نعيیت پسر جاندار' which would mean son of Jándar, and as such it is incorrect.

5 Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhi of Diya Barani, p. 40.

6 Father of Malik Qirān-i-Alamī, an associate of Balban—Tabaqat-i-Akbār, p. 79: Diya Barani Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhi, p. 40, has Malik Qara Bek ملکی بی قیا پدر ملکی قیا بیگ که بنده سلطان پدین و سر جاندان و ملقب درگه آو بود Sar-i-Jándar was the head of the Royal bodyguards. Many Sar-i-Jándars acted as governors, which could only be possible, if they performed this office through a deputy.
of Oudh, for having beaten a person to death. With apologies and tears, the Malik purchased his safety by offering one thousand tankahs to the widow of the deceased. The desire to maintain the public peace often led Balban to destroy a whole army or sack an innocent town in retaliation for the treason of a single individual. Consequently, no one could have the courage to defy his orders, and the laws of the state, which had been ignored and violated during the past years, were once more enforced to the hilt.

Balban employed in his service only such persons as were of high birth and noble lineage, and never allowed the low-class people to meddle with it. He was extremely particular about the social status and descent of his officers, and inquired about it very diligently; if, even after appointment, any of them was found wanting in character or birth, he was immediately dismissed. Among Mussalmans high birth, generally; is defined not with reference to wealth but with reference to a particular group—in this case, the Turkish aristocracy. This high-birth doctrine meant the exclusion of the Indian Mussalmans from the high offices till the Khalji Revolution, when the wheel turned full circle. A certain Kamāl Mahyā was recommended to him for the post of governor of Amrohā, but on investigation it was found out that he was a convert and that Mahyā was his father's name. Thereupon, the Sultān strictly forbade such appointments, and at the same time dismissed a number of other officials for the same reason. During his twenty-two years' reign Balban never condescended to talk to any ordinary or low-born person, and never admitted any buffoon to his assembly. An officer named Fakhr-i-

1 Firīštah, p. 76, and Khulāṣat-u't-Tawārīkh, p. 199.
2 Tārīḵ-i-Firūz Shāhī of Ḍiyā Barānī, p. 29.
3 He was recommended by Malik 'Alī-u'd-dīn Kāshlī Khān and Malik Nizām-u'd-dīn Buzghālāh.
4 Tārīḵ-i-Firūz Shāhī of Ḍiyā Barānī, pp. 36 and 37.
5 Ṭabaqāt-i-Aḥkārī, p. 78.
Bāuni, who had been in the service of the state for years, asked a noble of the court for an interview with the Sultān, and promised a substantial present. But the Sultān refused. "He is an officer of the Market (Amīr-i-Bāzāriyān)," Balban replied, "granting him an interview would reduce the status of the king in the eyes of the common people and diminish the prestige of the thorne."*

Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn Balban took great pleasure in hunting campaigns; the 'royal huntsmen,' therefore, attained to great dignity during his reign. In spite of pressure of work, he often spent whole days in hunting; he welcomed the winter season and anxiously awaited its return. Game was preserved in the land twenty Krohs round Delhi, and Balban came out of the Qaṣr-i-Lāl (Ruby Palace) in the early hours of the morning and proceeded towards Riwāri, and did not return till late at night. A thousand horsemen and a thousand archers on foot started with him at the beating of the kettle-drum; their food and drink being provided by the government. Hulagū Khān at Baghdad commended Balban's devotion to hunting. "Balban is a wise and experienced ruler," he remarked, "it might appear that he is merely enjoying a game, but Balban's real object is to exercise his horsemen and to keep his troops in order." Balban made ample preparations before fitting out an expedition, and informed the Revenue and Military depart-

---

1 Khulāsāt-u't-Twārīkh, p. 197, has فتح ازمی; Badā'īnī, p. 127, has فتح ازمی. A real Hindū equivalent of this name is difficult to find.

2 Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhi of Diwā Barani, p. 33.

3 The hunting excursion was an old custom, and was very popular among the Turks. It was really equivalent to modern manoeuvres. Balban's hunting was on a small scale as compared to the hunting expeditions described by Jahān-Kushā and Raudat-u't-'Ṣafā.

4 Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhi of Diwā Barani, p. 33.

5 Balban had replaced the Qaṣr-i-Sufaid (White Palace) by the Qaṣr-i-Lāl (Ruby Palace). But the former was still used for the coronation ceremony.

6 Khulāsāt-u't-Twārīkh, p. 201, and Tabaqät-i-Akbari, p. 83.
ments accordingly. But he kept matters confidential and until a few hours before his actual departure nobody, not even the Amir-i-Ḥājib (Lord Chamberlain) had any knowledge as to which part of the territory the Sultān was going to invade.

Balban's Court.

"It was a sufficient glory for Balban," says the Mulḥisāt-i-Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī written by Shaikh ‘Ain-u’d-dīn of Bijāpūr, "that apart from the kings and princes, who had sought refuge in India during the reigns of his predecessors, no less than fifteen princes of Turkistan, Māwarā-u’n-Nahr, Khurāsān, ‘Irāq, Ādharbājān, Fārs, Rūm and Syria, whose power had been shattered by the Mongols, fied for safety to Balban’s court at Delhi. They were appointed to offices of dignity and power, and stood with folded hands before his throne; only two of them were granted the privilege of sitting at the foot of the throne, because they belonged to the ‘Abbasid dynasty." Balban allotted a separate portion (mohalla) of the city to each of them, and fifteen such quarters grew up in Delhi, viz., the ‘Abbasī, Sanjari, Khwārazm Shāhī, Dīlāmī, ‘Ālīvī, Arābaktī, Ghūrī, Chingizī, Rūmī, Sunqarī, Yemīnī, Mosulī, Samarqandī, Kāshgārī and Khītāī. As all the leading men of the pen and the sword, musicians and singers and artisans collected together at Balban’s Court from every quarter of the globe, it was naturally ranked above the Courts of Maḥmūd and Sanjar. Mystics and scholars, it is said, congregated at the palace of the Sultān’s elder son known as the Khān-i-Shāhīd, while musicians, wits, story-tellers and buffoons found an asylum with the younger son Bughrā Khān.

The Court of Balban was adorned by the presence of a

---

1 Tarīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī of Dīyā Barānī, p. 60.
2 Ibid., p. 61.
3 As quoted by Firākhī, p. 75.
4 Ibid., p. 75.
5 Ibid., p. 75.
large number of eminent nobles and notables. From the
family of Syeds, the Shaikh-ul-Islam-i-Shahr Quṭb-u'd-din, Syed Muntakhib-u'd-din, Syed Jalāl-u'd-din, son of Syed Mubārak, Syed 'Aziz, Syed Mu'in-u'd-din of Sāmānab, Syeds of Kardaz, Kathel, Biyānab and Badā'ūn; professors like Maulānā Burhān-u'd-din Malik, Maulānā Najm-u'd-din, Qādī Raft-u'd-din and Qādī Shams-u'd-din and others; saints and mystics such as Shaikh Sheukh-ul-'Ālam Farīd-u'd-din Mas'ūd Quṭb-i-'Ālam Shaikh Șadr-u'd-din, son of Shaikh-ul-Islām Bahā'u'd-din Dhadariya, Shaikh Badr-u'd-din Ghaznavi, Khalifā Shaikh Quṭb-u'd-din Bakhtyar, Shaikh Malikīyār Pārān, Daibī Sām, Saidī-Maulā, and others; and rare physicians and philosophers like Maulānā Ḥamīd-u'd-din Muṭrāz, Maulānā Badr-u'd-din Damashqī and Maulānā Ḥisām-u'd-din Bazghālah.

Among the great officials and servants of the court was 'Alā-u'd-din Kashī Khān, the Sultān's cousin, who was famous for his generosity and munificence and was unrivalled in archery, spearmanship and hunting. Hearing of his liberality, scholars and poets came in expectation of his favours from the remoter parts of the world and went back with a happy and contented heart. Sultān Balban confirmed him on his father's post as bārbak (or Amīr-i-Ḥājib) and the governorship of Koil was also conferred upon him. The Khwājah Shams-u'd-din Mu'in composed a number of verses in his praise, and was duly rewarded.

1 Tārīḵ-i-Fīrūz Shāhī of Ḍiyā Barānī gives this list of names on pp. 111 and 112.
2 It is related by Ḍiyā Barānī on p. 114 that Hūṣūn sent a dagger as a present to Malik 'Alā-u'd-din for his excellence in archery, spearmanship and hunting and called him to his presence with the promise that he would make him governor of Ināq. The message did not please the Sultān.
3 Tārīḵ-i-Fīrūz Shāhī by Ḍiyā Barānī, p. 113. Some qaṣīdahs in praise of Khwājī Khān, generally known as Malik Chhajjū, are found in Khustū's printed Diwān:—

"چرخ را گفتتم که خورشیدت کچها استم
آسمان روی ملکی چرخ چین ام"
The other famous Malik 'Imād-u'l-Mulk Rāwat-i-'Arḍ (the Minister of War), formerly a slave of Sultan Shams-u'd-dīn Īltutmish, was an intimate friend of Sultan Ghīyāth-u'd-dīn Balban. He was a pious and kind-hearted Malik, and never accepted any bribes.\(^1\) He organized the affairs of the army with tact and energy, and had parental affection for his subordinate officials; at times he used to invite the whole retinue to dine with him and conferred robes upon Khāns, Malikhs and Amirs.\(^2\)

The other Malik worthy of mention is Malik-u'l Umarā Fakhr-u'd-dīn Kūtwal (Superintendent of Police). His father and grand-father were also Kūtwalās of Delhi. Not only that he rendered valuable services in his official capacity, but his private life was also remarkable. He had under his employment twelve thousand reciters of the Qur'ān, one thousand of whom were ever engaged at every hour of the day. He wore new clothes and used fresh bed-steads and carpets every day, all of which was given in charity the next day.\(^3\) He further made provision for the marriage of about a thousand poor girls every year. All this was done from his personal pocket.

Another Malik of renown was Malik Amīr 'Alī Sar-i-Jāndār (Commander of the Royal body-guards at the centre), son of the Sultan's preceptor. He was entitled Ḥātim Khān by the Sultan and Amīr Khusrū composed Aṣp-nāmah in his praise, for he was a very liberal man.\(^4\) "I hear, you are bounteous while in a fit of intoxication," said the Sultan one day, "be liberal at a time, when you are sober." The Malik was greatly touched and since then he abandoned wine and proved all the more beneficent. He was later on appointed governor of Oudh.

The Sipāḥ sālār (commander of troops) Ḥisām-u'd-dīn Wakil-i-dār was another illustrious Malik of Sultan Balban's Court. He was a maternal uncle of Diyyā Barani, the

\(^1\) Tāriḥā-i-Frūz Shahi of Diyyā Barani, p. 116.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 115.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 117.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 118.
famous author of the noted Tārīḵ-i-Firūz Shāhi.¹ He too did not lag far behind the time; for it was a period when the Malikṣ and Amirs tried to supersede one another in matters of liberality, generosity and munificence, and had consequently run into debts.

**Balban’s theory of kingship and government**

'Excluding the functions of a prophet,' it is solemnly declared, there is no work as great and noble as the task of government.'² Balban's theory of kingship or his political ideas regarding the institution of kingship had their origin in Persian paganism and may be described as follows. Kingship is a great blessing and the highest office of the world. Kingly office is the creation of God and is received from Him alone. A king is a representative of God on earth, and the heart of king reflects the glory of God.³ The Creator inspires him with His commandments for the created. A king, therefore, must feel the importance and significance of the glory and grandeur thus conferred upon him, and must be grateful to God for this great honour. An ungrateful king soon loses his position; incompetent and worthless persons take charge of his government and this ends his political career. A grateful king is sheltered under 'the canopy of God’s protection.'⁴ A king, therefore, must seek God’s pleasure by doing the approved and virtuous deeds, which is really a means of salvation.⁵

A king must be brave, enterprising, just and benevolent. He should be neither sweet-speaking nor very harsh. To retain kingship he must maintain his prestige. Kingship has got a dignity, glory and grandeur of its own, and when these disappear on account of friendship and familiarity, there remains no distinction between the ruler and the ruled; subjects become impious and rebellious and the result is

¹ Tārīḵ-i-Firūz Shāhi of Diya Barani. p. 119.
² Ibid., p. 27.
³ Ibid., p. 70.
⁴ Ibid., p. 71.
⁵ Scholars hold that for a king salvation is difficult, if not impossible. The King’s claim to ‘ilmām’ can only be a non-Muslim idea.
vice, immorality, and sinning throughout his dominion,¹ and the execution of orders becomes faulty. Only those kings can command respect and dignity who have been descendants of the noble line of illustrious sovereigns. It is necessary, therefore, for a king to abstain from such undertakings either by words or deeds as may cause injury to his prestige.² Mere mildness, indignation, harshness and anger cause a general condemnation of the king's activities,³ but kingly dignity and terror of authority contribute more than mere chastisement to the establishment of a good and stable government. His society should be composed of the virtuous, faithful, wise, skilled and sagacious people, but he should not grant audience or give posts to the worthless, humble or low-born persons.⁴ A king should not degrade his dignity by mean and undeserving actions or by admitting the mean or unworthy people into partnership.

The primary duty of a king is to maintain peace and order in his dominion. He must protect and patronize the faith, and if he himself is weak and powerless, other religions flourish at the expense of Islām. He must minimize vice, immorality and crimes by means of penal restrictions.⁵ His rule must facilitate his subjects in leading a happy and virtuous life. The execution of the orders of the Shari'at should be entrusted to the learned, pious and God-fearing officers. Not only he but his officials, judges and generals must administer absolute justice and equity. A king must pitch his ambitions high, for kingship and aspirations go hand in hand. He should never grant interviews to spies and revenue officers, for their familiarity and frankness will terrify the obedient and trustworthy servants.⁷ He must keep himself well-informed of the conditions of his provinces and the doings of his governors, and to incite them to noble and virtuous actions. Before organizing

¹ Tahāk-i-Firuz Ṣāhā of Ḏiyā Barānī, p. 34.
² Ibid., p. 71.
³ Ibid., p. 29.
⁴ Ibid., p. 43.
⁵ Ibid., p. 79.
⁶ Ibid., p. 42.
⁷ Ibid., p. 78.
an expedition he should consider its consequences and make ample preparations. He should not proclaim his motives, but at the same time must not indulge in any war without seeking advice from his courtiers and confidants. A king should not allow negligence in looking after his relations; but he must be more cautious about his personal security and keep his generals, guards and police officers satisfied. There should be no hesitation in suppressing the power of the nobles and chiefs, for their degradation and dishonour strengthens his own position and gives a new vigour to his government. Balban’s theory was to be moderate in matters of chastisement, but he was fearless in slaying rebels. At the same time, he never exercised meaningless cruelty or oppression. Balban tried neither to please nor to displease his subjects and was always moderate in levying taxes.

The three essentials of kingship are the army, treasury and nobles. The means of success are justice, beneficence, pomp and show. The stability and permanence of the government rest upon the establishment and maintenance of a well-disciplined and a well-equipped army. The ruler should not hesitate to allot a larger portion of the revenue for the upkeep of the army, he may appropriate half of it, but the other half must go to the treasury. If the king observes negligence and carelessness in this respect, there is anarchy and confusion in the state, and the army loses its strength and stability; re-establishment and reconstruction after dissenion and disorganization are not possible. A king must have under his command ten Khāns, each Khān having ten Malik under him, each Malik ten Amirs, each Amir ten Sipāh Sālārs (commanders of troops), each Sipāh Sālār ten Sar-Khil (Generals) and each Sar-Khil ten

1 Tārikh-i-Firuz Shāhī of Dīya Barani, p. 97.
2 Ibid., p. 78.
3 Ibid., p. 77.
4 Ibid., p. 79. According to the shari‘at, the share of the Ul-ul-amr (chief of the Muslim State) was the same as that of a soldier.
5 Tārikh-i-Firuz Shāhī of Dīya Barani, p. 97.
horsemen or footmen.¹

Since the beginning of his reign, Sultān Ghiyāth-u’d-dīn Balban decorated the court and palace after the manner of the kings of Persia, and attached much importance to the pomp and glory of the court and of the riding procession.² The Sultān with his bright face and white beard sat upon the throne with an air of dignity and authority. Behind the throne stood the Malikhs, Amirs, Chamberlains, Police-Officers, Head Executioner, Commanders of forces, sergeants, Head-swordsmen, proclaimers, wrestlers and horses and elephants glorifying the right and left wings of the army.³ The Raes, Ranas, princes, messengers, and Muqaddams (Head village-men) came to perform the kissing ceremony at the threshold of the Court. The brightness of the Sultān’s face, the glittering of the swords and the noise produced by the commands of generals, sergeants and proclaimers kept the spectators spell-bound, and the rebels of distant lands became submissive and loyal.⁴ The dignity of the carriage was enhanced by the presence of a large number of Sisrānī wrestlers, who accompanied the Sultān with open swords. For miles on both sides of the road stood eager spectators to witness the glory of the riding procession. On occasions of festivals, grand assemblies were held in the royal palace, which was decorated and furnished with embroidered carpets, variegated dresses and cloth, gold and silver vessels, brocade curtains, gardening of various kinds, divergent fruits, food, drink and betel-leaf. The

¹ This organization of the army comes to 1,000,000, which is not possible, considering the fact that Khān is often called Amīr-i-Tamān (10,000). If it is presumed that a Khān was the commander of 10,000, the whole army must come to 100,000, which is alone possible, if the Sipāh Sālār is eliminated. It seems that Sipāh Sālār is a high title along with Malik. It was the title of Quṭb-u’d-dīn, who was Malik as well.
³ Ibid., p. 20. There was generally a high wall behind the Moghul throne. In pre-Moghul days horses, elephants and officers stood behind the throne and the space was left unpaved as for example Muḥammad Tughlaq’s palace at Vijaya Mandal.
⁴ Tārīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī of Dīvān Barānī, p. 31.
Sultân remained seated in the middle, and the Khāns, Malikṣ and Amīrs passed before him and offered valuable presents and poets recited Qaṣīdahs in his praise.¹

According to Sultân Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn Balban, the salvation of a king lay in the observance and fulfilment of the following four duties—firstly, to protect religion and to execute the provisions of the šarī'at; secondly, to crush or to minimize vice, immorality, sinning and crimes; thirdly, to appoint pious, God-fearing and noble officers and, fourthly, to administer justice and equity.² As to how far the Sultân himself followed these rules and theories can be best illustrated by his own statement—"All that I can do is to crush the cruelties of the cruel and to see that all persons are equal before law. The glory of the state rests upon a rule which makes its subjects loyal and disciplined, but does not make the rich prosperous or the indigent happy—a cause of sedition and rebellion."³ Justice and impartiality secure the permanence of the throne; a tyrannical king is like an open light in a high wind."⁴

Condition of the State and Balban's Reforms

Sultân Shams-u'd-dīn Īltutmish had forty Turkish slaves, who held positions of responsibility and command during his reign, and were generally known as the 'Chakelgānī' or the 'Forty.'⁴ The dignity of the state had withered away during the thirty years' government of the successors of Īltutmish due to their addiction to pleasure, weak rule and mal-administration.⁵ There was no money in the royal

---

¹ Tārīkh-i-Firuz Shāhi of Ḍiyā Barāni, p. 32.
² Ibid., p. 43.
³ Ibid., p. 100.
⁴ Firistah, p. 75, calls them ترکان خواجہ ٹاش (Turkish fellow-servants). All of them made a common cause, and on principles of cooperation and good-will, they called themselves Turkish-fellow-servants. However, no evidence of any such union exists. They fought third parties and outsiders and also one another. They could only be excluding non-Turks. Consequently, Firistah's account is erroneous.
treasury and no horse in the imperial stable. The 'forty' had set aside the old Khâns and Malik, themselves took their places and, dividing the sources of income, each held a separate court with great pomp and dignity. Nevertheless, they soon fell out; none would obey the other and each of them aspired to be the sole master. In their 'proud vaunts and boasts' every one said to the other, 'what art thou that I am not; and what wilt thou be that I shall not be.' Thus, the period under review is marked by the ascendancy of Turkish slaves, who had become the virtual masters of Hindustân.

Ghiyâth-u'd-dîn Balban was one of the 'forty.' The Assassin's dagger, he thought, was the only remedy to restore peace and order. Soon after his accession, he overthrew his principal colleagues, whose existence was dangerous to the continuance of his power; and had his own uncle's son, Sher Khân, the greatest of them, poisoned during his illness. Thus he cleared Hindustân of all rivals, and the surviving Turkish slaves were obliged to make their submission. Now he became the sole master of Hindustân and was revered as a great king.

Sultân Ghiyâth-u'd-dîn Balban decorated the court and palace after the manner of the kings of Persia and himself followed the essential traditions of past kings. He reorganized the affairs of the state, and strengthened the various departments of government. He took drastic measures to restore peace and order, and brought the high and low under his subordination by means of strict rules and penal restrictions. The dignity of the court, the magnificence of the riding procession, and above all his indignation, impartiality and justice contributed to the establishment of a
strong and stable government.¹

At the very outset of his career, Balban directed his attention towards the reorganization of the army. The cavalry and infantry, both old and new, were placed under the charge of experienced officers, who were granted different fiefs for his maintenance.² Balban's next measure was to exact treasure, elephants and horses, the sources and strength of the state, from the different parts of Hindustān.

**Pacification of Hindustān**

In the first year of the reign 1266 A.D.,³ Tatār Khān, son of Arsalān Khān, despatched sixty-three elephants⁴ to Sulṭān Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn Balban from Lakhnawtī. The Sulṭān interpreted this act of Tatār Khān as a token of submission and loyalty and, in its honour, held a public court on the Nāsirī platform outside the Badā'un-Gate. The Malikīs and Amīrs offered valuable presents and were duly rewarded by the Sulṭān. The Capital-city was decorated, and there was a general rejoicing among the people.⁵

Towards the close of the year 1266 A.D., the Sulṭān was engaged in harrying the dense jungle in the vicinity of Delhi and in routing out the Meos,⁶ who had embarked on a career of loot and plunder.⁷ They waylaid the travellers,

¹ The Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 79, says that 'on account of his terror and chastisement, no body had the courage to defy his orders.'
² Tārīkh-i-Firuz Shāhī of Diya Barānī, p. 29.
³ Ibid., p. 53, gives 1263 A.D., which is quite impossible, considering the fact that Sulṭān Nāsir-u'd-dīn died in 1266 A.D., and Balban, therefore, could not ascend the throne before that time. Barānī's dates are seldom accurate. He might have put them in when compiling his book from earlier notes. Curiously enough, Firuzah, p. 77, gives 1265 A.D., which is also impossible.
⁴ Tārīkh-i-Firuz Shāhī of Diya Barānī, p. 53.
⁵ Ibid., p. 54. Firuzah says 'Mewātīs.'
⁶ Meos inhabited an ill-defined territory lying south of Delhi and including parts of the districts of Mutttra and Gurgōn and most of Alwar and a little of Bharatpur State. It derived its name from the Meos, the same as the Minās of Rajpurana. The Hindu Meos and Minās claim to be Rajputs, while the Muslim Meos call themselves Mewātīs.
⁷ Tārīkh-i-Firuz Shāhī of Diya Barānī, p. 55.
broke into the houses and repeatedly sacked the suburbs of the city. The exit and entrance of traders was barred, and the gates of the city were closed at the time of the evening prayer. Considering the suppression of the Meeos as his first duty, the Sulṭān marched\(^1\) against them, and put a large number of them to the sword. It took full one year to clear off the jungles. Balban took the precautionary measures by building a fort at Gopālgīr\(^2\) and by establishing several posts in the neighbourhood of the city under the charge of responsible officers.

Next year, 1267 A.D., Balban undertook the suppression of the insurrectionaries of the Doāb, who had laid waste the territory and caused much tumult and sedition. The province was assigned to powerful officers, who were directed to slay the rebels, to crush all risings and to suppress all lawlessness. The Sulṭān himself twice rode to Kampil (in Farrukhābād district) and Patiālī\(^3\) (in the Etāb district) the head-quarters of the rebels; there he remained for about five or six months and put several thousands of them to death, while great spoils and captives were brought to the capital. Thus the way from Hindūsṭān to Jaunpūr, Bihār and Bengāl\(^4\) was cleared. The Sulṭān built strong forts and magnificent mosques at Kampil, Patiālī and Bhojpūr (in Farrukhābād district) repaired the fort of Jalālī and garrisoned them with Afghān regiments.

Soon after, the rebels of Kather\(^5\) acted in a refractory manner, and ravaged and plundered the districts of Bada‘ūn

---

1 The Ṣāriḥ-i-Mubārāk Shāhī, p. 40, says, he proceeded towards Koyalākār and after suppressing the revolt marched to the Kuḫpāyāh of Santūr.

2 Ṣabqaṭ-i-Ākbārī, p. 84, has Kawalkār and Ṣāriḥ-i-Mubārāk Shāhī, p. 40, has Makar Kajūrī. It is perhaps Gopālgīr, somewhere roundabout Jaipūr.

3 Ṣabqaṭ-i-Ākbārī, p. 84, has Kathel and Patiālī. Fīrūzābād, p. 77, while agreeing with the contemporary authority adds Bhojpūr also. So does Bada‘ūnī, pp. 128, 129.

4 Ṣabqaṭ-i-Ākbārī, p. 85.

5 Ibid., p. 85, and Bada‘ūnī, p. 129, have Kather, modern Rohīlkhand.
and Amroha, the governors¹ of which places conveyed the news to the Sultan. Balban immediately retired to the capital, and marched with a strong army to subdue the rebels. On reaching the spot, the Sultan ordered a wholesale massacre of the inhabitants of Kather excluding women and children.² The extensive forests were cleared, and the territories of Badã'un, Amroha, Sambhal and Gannaur³ were purged of robbers and continued safe from their violence and assaults.⁴

After staying a few days at the capital, the victorious Sultan marched to the foot of the Judd-hills, (now the Salt Range) and devoted the following years, 1268 and 1269, in the annihilation and suppression of the rebels.⁵

Two years after the Judd expedition, the Sultan marched to Lahore in the year 1271 A.D., and ordered the reconstruction of the fort, which had been destroyed by the Mongols during the reign of his predecessors.⁶ On his return to the capital, the Sultan was informed that a large number of soldiers, who were granted lands by Sultan Shams-u'd-din Itutmish, still continued on the rolls, and on account of their old age failed to perform their military duties; they gave large sums of money in bribes to the Ministry of War, and obtained exemption from attendance and service. Balban at once ordered the confiscation of lands, and assigned 20 to 30 Tankahs' pensions for the infirm or old officials, while the young soldiers were allotted fixed allowances. The measure caused a great upheaval⁷ in the army. Some of the leaders went to the house of Malik Fakhr-u'd-din the

¹ Ṭabaqat-i-Akhbar, p. 85, names the governor as Zubuní.
² Ibid., p. 85, says that every child attaining the age of 8 was also killed.
³ The text has ‘Kanwari.’ In all probability it is Gannaur as the Cambridge History of India, Vol. III. p. 77, has.
⁴ Tārīḵ-ī-Firuz Shāhī of Ḥiṭā Barani, p. 60.
⁵ Ṭabaqat-i-Akhbar, p. 85, says that the number of horses captured by the Sultan during the expedition was so great that the price of a horse lowered down from 40 to 30 Tankahs.
⁶ Tārīḵ-ī-Firuz Shāhī of Ḥiṭā Barani, p. 61.
⁷ Ibid., p. 61.
Kutwāl, with presents and requested him to plead for them. Fakhr-u'd-dīn would not accept their presents. "My words," he explained, "will carry no weight if I accept any bribe from you." But he went to the Diwān, and stood at his usual place with a sad and melancholy face. The Sultān naturally asked him the reason of it. "I have heard," he replied "that old men are being dismissed by the Ministry of War. It makes me gloomy to think of my own fate, if on the Day of Judgment old men were to be expelled from the favour of the Almighty God." The Sultān understood Fakhr-u'l-Mulk's hint, revised his order and reconfirmed lands to the applicants.¹

The Frontier and the Mongols

It is said that when Balban's government had become firm and stable, his generals 'Ādil Khān and Timar Khān and several other Aμirs represented to the Sultān, "Your Majesty's power is at its height. It will be most expedient for the Sultān to agree to our suggestion that we should now establish our authority over Gujarāt, Mālwhā and other provinces of Hindustān, which were under the sway of Aibak and İlturmish."² "It will not be an act of wisdom," Balban replied, "to leave Delhi and to go on distant campaigns in these days of turmoil and insecurity, when the Mongols have occupied all the lands of İslām, devastated Lāhore, and made it a point to invade our country once every year."³ The Sultān further added, "If I move out of the capital, the Mongols are sure to avail of this opportunity by sacking Delhi and ravaging the Doāb."⁴ Maintaining peace and consolidating our power in our own kingdom is far better than invading foreign territories, while our own dominion is insecure. Further, the newly conquered areas require competent officers and well-equipped armies, which

¹ Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhi of Ḍiyā Baraṇi, pp. 63 and 64.
² Ibid., p. 50.
³ Ibid., p. 50.
⁴ Ibid., p. 51.
I am unable to spare at the present juncture.\(^1\) I have, therefore, made up my mind to face the Mongols with strong and organized forces; but if I get an opportunity I shall undoubtedly subdue the rest of Hindustān and extend the frontiers of my kingdom.\(^2\)

Two years after the Jūd-expedition, the Sulṭān marched to Lāhore in the year 1270 A.D., and ordered the reconstruction of the fort, which had been destroyed by the Mongols during the reigns of his predecessors.\(^3\) About this time, the Sulṭān's cousin\(^4\) Sher Khān, a distinguished Khān and a great barrier to the Mongol inroads, was poisoned by Balban, and the territories of Sāmānah and Sunām were made over to the charge of Timar Khān,\(^5\) the most respected of the 'forty.' The other territories were assigned to various Amīrs. But the Mongols, who were held in check by Sher Khān, now began ravaging the frontiers once more. Finding himself helpless, Balban appointed\(^6\) his elder son Muḥammad Sulṭān, who bore the title of Qaān-u'l-Mulk and is popularly known as Khān-Shahīd (the Martyr Prince),\(^7\) the governor of Multān, Sind, Dipālpūr and

\(^1\) *Turāz-i-Fīrūz Shāhi of Diya Barani*, pp. 51 and 52.


\(^3\) Sher Khān founded the city and fort of Bhatner and erected a high tower there. Since the days of Sulṭān Nāṣir-u’d-dîn, he held the districts of Sunām, Lāhore, Dipālpūr, and other territories, and had successfully withheld the Mongols from invading Hindustān. See *Diya Barani*, p. 65.

\(^4\) *Firīṣṭah*, p. 78, has ِتَصَمِّّمَر سُطَّانُ ِتَحَدِّثُ ’

\(^5\) *Tabaqāt-i-Ahkār*, p. 87, *Firīṣṭah*, p. 78, and *Bāḍā‘un*, p. 130, all wrongly assert that at the very outset he was made heir-apparent; while *Diya Barani* says that on his last visit, Khān Shahīd was formally proclaimed heir-apparent.

\(^6\) During the early part of the reign, the prince held the territory of Koīl. He was regarded dearer than other children by the Sulṭān, and was adorned with many rare virtues and talents. His court was graced by scholars of the greatest eminence and poets of the highest order like Amīr Khursūd and Khwājah Ḥasan. At Multzān, a great mystic of the age ‘Uṣhrān Tirmizi visited the Prince, but refused to stay at the court any longer. Among other saints, Shaikh Ṣadr-u’d-dîn Qadōh, son of Shaikh Bahā-u’d-dîn Dhakariya, attended the court. *Diya Barani*, pp. 67, 68.
Lāhore, and sent him to Multān with all the requisites of war and a body of experienced counsellors. After establishing his power in his territories, the Prince came to see his father every year with treasure and valuable presents. On his last visit, Balban proclaimed him his heir-apparent and gave many counsels.\(^1\) The Sultān despatched his younger son Bughrā Khān, entitled Nāṣir-u'd-dīn, to the territories of Sāmānah and Sunām and advised him to make fresh recruitment in the army as a precautionary measure against the Mongol invasions.\(^2\) The Sultān further forbade the use of wine to Bughrā Khān, and appointed spies to look after him and to report regarding his behaviour.\(^3\)

Soon after in 1279 A.D., the Mongol troops crossed the river Beas, and Balban despatched against them Khān-Shahīd from Multān, Baghrā Khān from Sāmānah and Malik Mubārak Bektars from Delhi. The combined forces marched to the Beas, repulsed the Mongols and obtained several victories over them; and since then the Mongols dared not to cross the river and invade Hindustān.\(^4\)

**The Rebellion of Tughrul**

At length news was brought that Tughrul,\(^5\) the governor of Lakhnawtī, and one of the Sultān's Turkish slaves, had broken out into rebellion in the year 1279 A.D.\(^6\) The Sultān had long before appointed him governor of Lakhnawtī and Bengālah. The rebel had a reputation for generosity, courage and cleverness, and led his army from Lakhnawtī to Jājnagar, and obtained many elephants and vast treasures by defeating the Rāe of that place. Balban was old; his sons

---
\(^1\) Tārīḵ-i-Firūz Shāhī of Ḍiyā Barānī, p. 69.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 80.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 81.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 81.
\(^5\) Tārīḵ-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 40, makes a nice blunder here. The author asserts that "after the death of Sher Khān, Amīn Khān became governor of Lakhnawtī and Tughrul became his deputy." The same historian, p. 41, and Badāʾīnī on page 129 further state that "Tughrul fought with Amīn Khān and came out successful." Dr. Ishwāri Prasād (Medieval India, p. 208) wrongly styles him as 'Abtīgin.'
\(^6\) Tārīḵ-i-Firūz Shāhī of Ḍiyā Barānī, p. 81.
were engaged in a fierce struggle with the Mongols, and Tughrul, who wished to make himself king of Lakhnawti, refrained from sending the spoils of Jajnagar. 1 Tughrul ventured too far; he assumed a canopy of state, caused his name to be read in the khutbah and to be inscribed on the coinage, and proclaimed himself king of Lakhnawti with the title of Sultan Mugith-ud-din. 2

When the Sultan was informed of the persistent rebellious character of his most cherished slave Tughrul, he despatched Malik Alptigin Mūsī-d-darāz (long-haired) entitled Amīn Khān at the head of a large army towards Lakhnawti along with a number of other officers such as Timar Khān Shamsī, Malik Tāj-ud-din, son of Quṭlūgh Khān Shamsī 3 and 'Jamal-ud-din Qandhārī. 4 Amīn Khān crossed the river Sarayū or Sarjū (modern Gogrā) 5 with his army, and Tughrul came forward to face him; but when the two forces were face to face, many Amirīs and soldiers of Amīn Khān deserted to Tughrul owing to his lavish gifts, and the former was defeated in battle. The army of Amīn Khān was put to the rout, and during their flight they were severely dealt with by the Hindū tribes. Having heard of the defeat, which his army had sustained, Balban ordered Amīn Khān to be hanged by his neck to the gate of Oudh. 6 Next year in 1280 A.D., another army was fitted out under ' Malik Tarmatī, the Turk." 7 but Tughrul inflicted a crushing

1 Tarīkh-i-Furūz Shāhī of Diya Baranī, p. 82.
2 Ibid., p. 83.
3 Tabāqat-i-Akbārī, p. 92. has 'son of 'Ali Khān Shamsī.'
4 This name is added by Fīrishtah, p. 79, and Tarīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 41. makes a whole sweep of affairs—according to it the generals were Amīn Khān, Tughrul, Jamāl-ud-din Qandzī and Abrigīn Mūsī.
5 The Sarjū formerly joined the Gogrā in Gondā; but early in the 19th century it diverted its course into an old bed.
6 Tarīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 41. asserts that Tughrul now went towards Bihār and imprisoned Aīkhīn, Jamāl-ud-din Qandzī and Amīn Khān at Narkelā.
7 The name of the general is given by Fīrishtah, p. 80; Tarīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 41, calls him Malik Tarmatī. The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 79, wrongly styles him as Targhī.
defeat upon him as well. Ėuriḫ-i-Mubārak Shāhi says that “Ţughrul attacked Tarmatā unawares; the latter being defeated fled to Oudh.” The Sulṭān then ordered Malik Shihāb-u’d-dīn of Oudh to lead the campaign and to hang Malik Tarmatā on the gibbet. He acted accordingly, but was defeated by Ťughrul.”¹

Balban was perplexed and worried at this turn of affairs, and determined to march in person. He ordered the construction of a large number of boats on the Jumna and the Ganges, while he himself went on a hunting expedition to Sunām and Sāmānāh.² The governorship of Sāmānāh was transferred to Malik Sirāj,³ Sar-i-Jāndar⁴ (Commander of the Royal body-guards at the centre), and Bughrā Khān was directed to accompany the Sulṭān with his troops. Balban marched from there to the Doāb and appointed Malik-ul-Umarā Fakhr-u’d-dīn Kūtwāl to act as his Regent at Delhi during his absence; and, regardless of the rainy season, he crossed the Ganges and moved towards Lakhnawtī by continued marches. While his movements were inevitably delayed by the difficulties of the season, Ťughrul gathered together his forces and intended to move with his elephants, treasures and army to Jājnagar⁵ to conquer it. So long as Balban was at Lakhnawtī, Ťughrul proposed to remain at Jājnagar, when the Sulṭān returned to Delhi, he would occupy Lakhnawtī once more. He was frustrated in his designs, for, when Balban reached Lakhnawtī, he entrusted it to the charge of Sipāh Sālār (Commander of troops) Hisām-u’d-dīn, Wakil-i-dār, Malik-i-Bārbak⁶ (the officer in charge of the court), grand-father of the author of the

¹ Ėuriḫ-i-Mubārak Shāhi, pp. 41 and 42.
² Ėuriḫ-i-Firūz Shāhi of Ḍiyā Barani, p. 85.
³ Ibid., has Mulk Sāmānāh while Firūštāh, p. 80, names him as Sirāj, which is most probable.
⁴ Firūštāh, p. 80, has which is quite incorrect.
⁵ Ibid., has Jājnagar; but Ėuriḫ-i-Firūz Shāhi of Ḍiyā Barani, p. 86, has Ḥājji Nagar. Here Firūštāh is right.
⁶ Mulk Bārbak is an office; Mulk Bahri is a title conferred on the Amir-i-
Hājib.
Tārikh-i-Firuz Shāhi and himself advanced towards Jajnagar in pursuit of Tughrul. The Rae of Sunārgāon (near Dacca) came to offer his homage, and promised to bar the rebel’s passage in case he tried to fly to the sea.

The Sultan moved forward restlessly, but no information regarding the whereabouts of Tughrul could be obtained from anyone. Balban refused to relax the pursuit, and ordered Malik Bārbak Bek Barlas at the head of seventy or eighty horses to march ten or twelve koses in advance of the main army, but his most vigilant search revealed no trace of Tughrul.

At length one day, Malik Muhammad Sher-Andāz and his brother Malik Muqaddar and a person later on known as Tughrul Kush (slayer of Tughrul) were appointed to march ahead with thirty horsemen. They suddenly came

---

1 Tārikh-i-Firuz Shāhi of Diya Barani, p. 87. Thomas places Jajnagar in Tipperah, east of Dacca, Chronicles of Pathan Kings, p. 121.
2 Tabaqat-i-Akbari, p. 93, has a word for Firuzah, p. 80, has a word for Badanil, p. 129, has a word for Tārikh-i-Mubarak Shāhi, p. 42, has a word for Sunārgāon. It is in fact Rae Bhoj; the possibility of discovering anything about him is remote.
3 Tabaqat-i-Akbari, p. 93, and Badanil, p. 129, have a word for Sunārgāon while Firuzah, p. 80 has a word for Badanil. Sunārgāon is near Dacca.
4 Tārikh-i-Mubarak Shāhi, p. 42, gives an interesting account—"on the advice of Bekars, the Sultan sat upon the throne, and the Rae prostrated before him."
5 Diya Barani’s printed Tārikh has a word for Firuzah, p. 80, has a word for Badanil, p. 129—Malik Ikhtiyar-ud-dīn Bek Barlas. Barlas is a well-known Turkish surname as for example Junaid Barlas, Bāber’s governor of Jaunpur.
6 Tārikh-i-Firuz Shāhi of Diya Barani, p. 88.
7 Tabaqat-i-Akbari, p. 94, has a word for an official and governor of Koil. The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 80, wrongly styles Muqaddar as Tughrul Kush following the Tabaqat-i-Akbari and Firuzah. Dr. Ishwari Prasad (Medieval India, p. 210) also has ‘the chief of Koil and his brother Malik Muqaddar,’ but does not mention Tughrul Kush.
across a group of corndealers, and tried to frighten them to find if they knew anything about Tughrul. They professed ignorance, but when the heads of two of them were chopped off by Malik Sher Andāz, the rest cried with one voice, “We are prepared to tell you his whereabouts, but spare our lives.” “We carried our corn to Tughrul's camp, and are just returning from there,” added the corn-dealers. “His camp is only half-a-farsang (about a mile) from near a stone-built reservoir.”

Malik Muḥammad Sher-Andāz sent the corn-dealers to Malik Bārbak Bektars, and requested him to come immediately, lest Tughrul should march off to Jānjagar and disappear in the neighbouring forests. He then went on an eminence and caught a sight of the rebel’s camp—Tughrul's pavilion had been pitched, his army was resting with a sense of security; the horses and elephants were feeding. It was a unique opportunity and Sher Andāz determined to avail himself of it. On reaching the rebel's camp, they shouted the name of Tughrul, drew their swords and dashed into the pavilion. Tughrul slipped out of his bath-room, jumped on an unsaddled horse and flew to a river nearby. Malik Muqaddar pursued him and Tughrul Kūsh shot an arrow, which struck him in his side and brought him down from his horse. The Malik instantly alighted from his horse, and cut off Tughrul's head, and cast his body into the river. But as Tughrul's men were wandering everywhere in search of their master, Muqaddar buried the head in the soft earth by the river-side, then he took off his clothes, and was busy washing them. A little later, Malik Bārbak Bektars arrived, and he despatched Tughrul's head with a message of victory.

1 Tabaqīt-i-Akbarī p. 94, hasجند نخر از لشکر طغرول'some soldiers from Tughrul's army,’ which is contrary to Diya Barani's account.

2 Tarīkh-i-Firuz Shāhī of Diya Barani, p. 89.فسنج فرسنج and فرسنج are equivalent, and mean a league. In modern Persia, however, Farsakh is a space travelled by a donkey in one hour, that is to say, four miles. Ibn Batūtah's Travels (Urdu Translation by Muḥammad Ḥusain) on p. 398 has "700 farsangs=2,400 miles" i.e., 1 farsang=about 3½ miles.

3 Tarīkh-i-Firuz Shāhī of Diya Barani, pp. 90 and 91.
to the Sultān. Next day, he himself reached the royal camp, and gave a verbal account of what had happened. The Sultān felt angry at the rashness displayed by Šer-Andāz and his brother; but ultimately promoted their ranks and bestowed special favours upon them. The man, who shot the arrow, was given the title of Tughrul-Kush, and Malik Muqaddar who cut off his head was awarded a robe of honour.

On Balban's return to Lakhnavut, a regime of terror and chastisement began. He ordered a row of gibbets to be erected on each side of the market for more than two miles in length, and all the friends, supporters and relations of Tughrul were impaled upon them. Among the captives, who were executed, was one Qalandar Shāh, whom Tughrul held in high esteem and had given him three mans of gold. The remaining soldiers of the rebel's army, who formerly belonged to the environs of the capital, were reserved for punishment at Delhi.

The Sultān assigned the territory of Lakhnavut to his younger son Bughrā Khān, and granted him a canopy of state and other insignia of royalty. Bughrā Khān took up his residence in the royal mansion near the great Bāzaar. One day, the Sultān asked him, “Maḥmud: didst thou see?” The prince was thunderstruck and was quiet. The Sultān repeated a second time, but received no reply. Balban said a third time, “Didst thou see my chastisements in the Bāzaar?” “I saw,” replied Bughrā Khān, and bowed low. The Sultān continued, “If ever designing and ingenious persons induce you to break away from Delhi and throw off its authority, remember the vengeance and chastisement

---

1 Firīṣṭāh, p. 81, asserts that the Sultān ordered that “Tughrul may henceforth be called Tughrul-i-Namak-Ḥaram.”
2 Tārīḵ-i-Fīrūz Shāhī of Diya Baranī, p. 91.
3 Firīṣṭāh, p. 81, adds that 'he was permitted to strike the coin, and have the khusbān read in his name'; but Diya Baranī, who is a better authority than Firīṣṭāh does not mention it. Further, the Sultān definitely asserted that Bughrā Khān's position was inferior to that of the sovereign of Delhi.
inflicted by me on Tughrul and his companions.\textsuperscript{1} He further forbade the use of wine to Bughra Khān, and advised him to observe moderation in levying taxes, to decide political affairs in consultation with his sincere and genuine counsellors, and to be very particular about prayers and fasting.\textsuperscript{2} The Sultān strictly told him that he should remain obedient and loyal to the Sultān of Delhi, and must despatch reliable messengers and a number of elephants every year to the capital. And if the Sultān of Delhi invaded Lakhnawtī, he should never face him but fly to a distant land—a lesson Balban learnt from Tughrul. After completing his counsels, the Sultān bade farewell to Bughra Khān, and continued his march towards Delhi.

After crossing the river Sarāyū, Balban reached the capital after three years, and the people welcomed their sovereign with congratulations and offerings.\textsuperscript{4} Balban showered many favours on Malik-ul Umarā Fakhr-u'd-dīn Kūtawāl, who had performed distinguished services during his absence, presented him with the cloak he was wearing and gave him the title of 'brother.'\textsuperscript{5} Charities were distributed to the poor and the needy. The Sultān went to visit the tombs of saints, interviewed the leading scholars and mystics of the day, and set a large number of prisoners free. Balban then ordered the erection of stakes in the market of the city, so that the captives of Tughrul's army, who had fled from Delhi and joined the rebel at Lakhnawtī, may be impaled on them. Many of the prisoners were relations of the citizens, and sounds of wailing and weeping arose from them. The Qādī of the army, one of the most pious men living, went to the Sultān and softened his heart with touching words. Balban granted his appeal for mercy, and

\textsuperscript{1} Türḳḥ-i-Fīrūz Shāhī of Ḏiyā Barānī, pp. 92, 93.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., pp. 97 to 102.
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., pp. 95 and 96.
\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., pp. 106 and 107.
\textsuperscript{5} Fīrūzshāh, p. 81 i.e. 'made him the second man in the kingdom.'
forgave them all.¹

The death of Sultan Muhammad and last days of Sultan Balban

At this juncture, Prince Muhammad arrived with many presents and horses from Multan, and the Sultan was delighted to receive him. Before his departure, Balban called him to a private interview and gave a number of counsels to him.² The Prince then retired to Multan.

During his stay at Multan, Muhammad had cleared his territories of the Mongols, and put a large number of them to death. In a spirit of retaliation, Timar Khan, a great Chingizide noble and governor of Herat and who belonged to the Anti-Khan of Mawarak-un-Nehr, invaded Sind with an army of twenty thousand men. At length the catastrophe approached. In the year 1285 A.D., Muhammad proceeded to Multan and Dihalpur to repel the Mongols.³ One morning, Sultan Muhammad, hearing that the enemy was quite near, arranged his forces on the borders of Sarirghard on the bank of the river Ravi, which then used to flow to Multan, at a place named Mandi Kilapi.⁴ The place was safe and secure; but Timar Khan, who had encamped on the other side, unexpectedly crossed the river at mid-day and began fighting. In the fierce battle that ensued many Mongol officers were killed and Timar Khan was defeated. Muhammad, who had not said his zuhr (mid-day) prayers, alighted by the side of a large pond near-

¹ Diyā Barānī, p. 108. An inscription of Balban is discovered engraved in the walls of the Jamī' Masjid at Gurmukhisar (Meerut District):

١١٢٨٥

ثامنین و ستمایة

Thomas—Chronicles of Pathān Kings, p. 136.

² These counsels have been summarized in a previous section of the chapter—'Balban’s theory of kingship and government.'

³ Ṭārīkh-i-Firuz Shahī, of Diyā Barānī, p. 109.

⁴ Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 98, and Badā'ūnī, p. 132. The place is rather uncertain.
by and with a small contingent began to pray. Meanwhile a Mongol officer, who had been lying in ambush, arrived at the spot and considered it a good opportunity for attacking Muḥammad's party. The Mongols succeeded in breaking the lines; but Muḥammad courageously mounted with his friends, and rashly pushed forward to check the onslaught of the enemy. In the thick of battle, a fatal arrow struck Muḥammad, and the heroic prince instantly breathed his last. The Turkish army fled with full speed. Amīr Khusru, a celebrated poet of Muḥammad's court, was captured by the Mongols along with other soldiers and Amirs, but he soon effected his escape.

The martyrdom of Muḥammad was a severe blow to Sulṭān Balban, who dressed himself in mourning clothes and lamented the irreparable loss of his son for several days. Kai-Khusru, the son of the Martyr Prince, was appointed governor of Multān with a canopy of state and other insignia of royalty. Balban, an old man of eighty, 'his heart broken and his back bowed,' kept up an unperturbed appearance throughout the day, but at night, and when he was alone, he lost his self-control and wept bitterly. Sadness and despair overpowered him and he fell dangerously ill. He summoned Bughrā Khān from Lakhnawtī, and said to him, "The loss

---

1 Bada‘īnī, pp. 133 and 134.
2 Ibid., pp. 135 and 136.
3 Both Amīr Ḥasan and Amīr Khusru composed Marthiyahs on the death of Muḥammad. The Marthiyah of Amīr Ḥasan is given by Bada‘īnī in his Muntakhab-u‘t-Tawārikh. Amīr Khusru's famous verses are:

"تاجه سامت بن که شاه از مولتان لشکر کشید تیخ کافر کش برازه کشتی کافر نشید آنچه حاضر بود لشکر لشکری دیگر ندهشت زانه را رستم را نشاید منت لشکر کشید شاه لشکر به ترتیب صف واشین جنگ می‌دانید اشیب قبال ما تا می‌دوید روز چون باقی نبود آن افتاد بخت را روز باقی بود چون یکه کافثاب افتاده بود"

4 Tārīkh-i-Firuz Shahī of Dīya Barani, p. 120.
of your brother has ruined me. I see, my death is near, you are my only heir, and it is not advisable for you to leave me at such a stage. Your son Kaiqubād and your nephew Kai-Khusru are young and inexperienced and are not capable of government."¹ Bughra Khān was a heedless prince. He remained at the capital for about two months, but soon found a pretext to leave for Lakhnawī.

No sooner had Bughra Khān left Balban, than he sank under sorrow. He fell dangerously ill, and three days before his death, he summoned the Malik-u'l Umarā, Haḍrat Khwājah Hasan Baṣrī, the Vizier, and a few other officials to his presence, and said;² "Bughra Khān has left for Lakhnawī, and the throne cannot remain vacant. My death is near, and I, therefore, appoint Kai-Khusru as my heir-apparent." Balban died³ at the close of the year 1287 A.D. after a reign of 22 years. The Malik-u'l Umarā was not on good terms with Khān Shahīd. He, therefore, sent Kai-Khusru to Multān, and placed Kaiqubād on the throne with the title of Sultān Mui'zz-u'd-Dīn.⁴

¹ Tārīkh-i-Firuz Shāhī of Diya Barani, p. 120.
² Ibid., p. 121.
³ The Khulāṣat-u't-Twārīkh, p. 142, says 'Balban ruled for twenty years and three months'—a wrong version. Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī and the Tabaqat-i-Akbari, p. 103, 22 years and some months. Firuzkāh, p. 83, correctly says 22 years. From 1256 to 1287, it is a period of about 22 years. The tomb of Balban is situated some three hundred yards to the east of the mosque of Jamālī. It measures 38' square and is built of rubble. It has an arched opening in each of its four sides, but the dome has disappeared. Adjoining it on the east is a ruined compartment 24' 6" by 19' 8", where the Khān Shahīd, Balban's son, is buried (Monuments of Delhi, Vol. III, p. 94.)
⁴ Tārīkh-i-Firuz Shāhī of Diya Barani, p. 122. Ibn Baṭṭū타 states, The Malik-u-l-Umrā drew up a document and forgéed the signatures of the Chief Amir, testifying that they had taken the oath of allegiance to Muizz-u'd-dīn. He showed it to Kai-Khusru and advised him to fly to Sind. He opened the gates of the city and Kai-Khusru left the capital." Elliot, Vol. III, pp. 595, 596. Diya Barani, p. 122, says that the Malik-u'l-Umarā and Khān Shahīd had quarrelled about women. It may, therefore, be inferred that the character of the Prince was not so excellent as depicted by historians in respect for his martyrdom.
Estimate

A kingdom is held to be one and indivisible; chance, intrigue, the will of the deceased monarch or the accidents of civil war may take it to anyone. The successors of Sultan Šams-u'd-din Ïltutmisht, were, one by one, set up and pulled down with bewildering rapidity by the all-powerful Malik and Amir. The dignity of the state withered away during the thirty years' government due to their addiction to pleasure, weak rule and mal-administration. There was no money in the royal treasury and no horse in the imperial stable. The revenues of the state were divided among the 'Chahelgâni' Turkish slaves of Sultan Šams-u'd-din Ïltutmisht, who sought equality in every respect and in their proud vaunts said to one another, 'what art thou that I am not, and what wilt thou be that I shall not be.' Thus the previous reigns were very much disturbed by the rivalries and insubordination of the Malik and Amir. War was a prevailing madness; all was blood, horror and confusion. Such was the chaotic condition of the kingdom of Delhi, when Balban ascended the throne. Apparently the Turkish rule had been shattered beyond the possibility of reconstruction. The power was considered to have fallen for ever, and its doom had been pronounced, but still it survived. The position of Balban was insecure from rivals, revolts and the hostility of his own family, but he knew how anarchy was to be averted with severe measures of repression. To reform the corrupt condition of the kingdom and to infuse fresh vigour in the crown, Balban resolved upon devising more effective schemes. Only strong measures could restore tranquillity to the distracted empire. Balban decorated the court and palace after the manner of the kings of Persia, set in order the affairs of the state and re-organized the army. For the rebellious Malik and Amir, he thought, the Assassin's dagger was the only remedy possible. He got rid of most of the 'forty' by poison or murder, and in order to reduce the rest to a sense of their inferiority, he made them stand motionless in his presence with folded arms and vexed them with petty rules of etiquette. Frequent executions and even
massacres restored the loyalty of the people and their governors. The rebels were punished with unsparing severity. The result was that the state slowly recovered from its ruinous condition. Balban's inflexible yet just severity restored order in all parts of the Empire, and the Turkish rule once more rose stronger and vigorous. Surrounded by all the pomp and magnificence that oriental imagination could devise, Balban was admired and cherished by his courtiers and subjects with a feeling of horror and bewilderment. At length peace, prosperity and a profound tranquillity reigned. Never was a strong will better obeyed than during this epoch, and never was the state so triumphant over disorder, or the power of law widely felt and respected. The restoration of Delhi from the hopeless depth of misery to the height of power had been effected by the intellect and will alone of Balban. Few, in fact, have realised the high ideal of kingly greatness. Out of chaos and vision of imminent destruction, Balban had evolved order and prosperity, and the people welcomed the new regime cheerfully.

Sultān Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn Balban was an experienced hand in the art of government. He had experienced too horribly the ups and downs of the state, and had tasted enough of the joys and sorrows of empire. At the time of his accession he was 'forty' but full of hope and ambition, and had already inaugurated the sway of his sword in the days of his youth. The old soldier did not belie his reputation and turned out to be a just, high-minded and vigorous king. His martial powers were considerable, and to these he added the advantage of great physical energy and courage. Gifted with administrative as well as military talents, Balban's ability and wisdom are unquestioned. Endowed with a gift of strong will, dignified bearing and unbending resolution, Balban commanded the respect of his Maliks, subordinates and the people, all of whom were terrified by his achievements and held their breath in fear. His private life was simple and austere. The rites of religion found full observance with him, and he was very strict in matters of worship,
fasting and nightly prayer. He never failed to pay a visit to saints of renown and 'Alims of eminence on every Friday. He was, in short, the most accessible though the most stately of monarchs. Prompt and decisive in action, troubled by few scruples, terribly severe and perfidiously diplomat, Balban possessed an ambition of greatness and ruthless sway. He was terrible in anger and intolerant of opposition, and the series of tortures and executions as adopted by Balban makes one's blood run cold. He, however, administered an even-handed justice throughout the length and breadth of his vast dominion, and even his relations could not escape his ferocity. He was stern and uncompromising, but his authority was just, enlightened and tolerant. In the hour of dismay as well as in the moment of triumph, Balban was master of the situation. It goes to his discredit that he poisoned Şer Khan—a sign of weakness—and this really deprives him of the title of the hero to which many of his brilliant qualities almost attain.

Sultan Ghiyath-u'd-din Balban ruled for a period of 22 years, but could not broaden the borders of his kingdom on account of the swift and irresistible inroads of the Mongols. His Amir's dream of world-wide conquests, but he was content with the occupation and good government of his own dominion. Ambition brings its own dangers, and the newly conquered territories required a fresh army and a large number of officials and attendants, which Balban was unable to spare at the time of crisis and confusion. His aim was not further conquest, but organization and consolidation of his dominion, and consequently he directed his attention towards the affairs of the state. He believed in the 'divine Right of Kings,' and attached much importance to the pomp and dignity of the court and palace and of the riding procession. The sight dazzled the spectators and rebels of distant lands became submissive and loyal. Kingly dignity and terror of authority, he rightly thought, contribute more than mere chastisement to the establishment of a strong and stable government. Strict in etiquette, brutal in massacres, and fearless in punishment, Balban took delight in diminish-
ing the failing power of the Maliks, and employed in his service only such persons as were of high birth and noble lineage. He kept the Turkish nobility in severe repression, and his attitude even to his most trustworthy allies was one of distant respect. As regards his subjects, Balban thought they would never become submissive until they were reduced to poverty. He, however, did not believe in the time-honoured theories, and his memorable remark may be cited to give an insight into his policy—“All that I can do is to crush the cruelties of the cruel, and to see that every one is equal before law. The glory of the state rests upon a rule, which makes its subjects submissive and loyal, but does not make the rich prosperous or the indigent happy—a cause of sedition and rebellion.”

Balban’s government enjoyed a profound tranquillity, broken by one rebellion of political importance. His most cherished slave, Tughrul, became infected with the spirit of rebellion, and raised the banner of revolt in Bengal. The ambition of powerful governors to make their own dynasties independent of the central authority is a well known feature of Oriental History. Tughrul received powerful support from the sentiment of local patriotism, and, strengthened thus, manifested great fierceness and defiance. The duty of revenging a wrong did not sit lightly upon, Balban’s conscience, and it was only a matter of time for his arms to penetrate into Bengal. The two repeated invasions had made his life uncomfortable, and he now resolved to drive matters to a final issue. His indignation knew no bounds, and it was a striking picture of the vigorous old age that he became filled with a burning desire to subdue the rebel. Tughrul proved a menace to Bengal, surprised and carried away the entire population towards Jālnagar, but his ill-considered plan failed miserably. Balban converted the insurrection into a wholesale massacre, the horrible memory of which never faded from the imagination of the people. Balban gazed with satisfaction at the gibbets, and emerged stronger and more triumphant than ever.
The Muslim realm was often menaced by greater dangers than those of internal anarchy. The Mongols were a standing danger, and a repetition of their horrible raids brought desolation and tyranny in their wake. The physical strength of the invaders and their unrivalled brutality carried fire and sword through the land wherever they went. Balban took the fatal step of murdering Malik Sher Khan, who had successfully checked the progress of the ‘infidel Mongols’ for a long time. It was no easy job to resist their unprovoked invasions, and, in order to ward off their attacks of his territory, Balban had to appoint his own dear son, prince Muhammad. However, the Mongols broke loose from time to time, but the Prince checked their advance, and kept a vigilant watch on the frontier. It was an evil day for the Prince, when he was hard beset near Multan by the Mongols, rapidly gained the mastery, but suddenly the fortune of the day was reversed. The battle ended with an irreparable loss of Muhammad. The Sultan was shocked to hear of his son’s death, and mortal illness seized him. Though invincible by man, Balban was no proof against death. The strain of sorrow and anxiety was too much for him, and he could not brook disappointment. The world seemed comfortless and gloomy to him, and, left in mournful solitude, the gallant old Sultan met his death with the courage of despair. Balban was one of those unfortunate people who leave no competent successor. On his part he left almost undisturbed possession, but no fit heir to carry on the government. The larger part of his reign he spent in the saddle in the vain attempt to found his own dynasty, but the effort was foredoomed to failure. It was, however, under Balban that the Turkish domination was destined to revive, but a rapid decline set in just after his death. Revolution and anarchy succeeded him, but his commanding influence was felt sometimes after his death.

It was a transient dictatorship depending upon the ability and ferocity of one man. The Turkish officers merely bowed their heads and waited for their chance.
Balban aimed at the suppression of the military and official oligarchy, and tried to derive his power from the inherent vitality of the Crown. According to him, sovereignty was mainly based upon force. The doctrine of might, combined with 'sound and fury signifying nothing,' could not survive any longer. He had no idea of administrative reorganization. Balban, as a statesman, lacked both ability and vision. His precepts are common-place, and if 'Alā-u’d-dīn is to be believed, there was neither a proper system of local government nor of land-revenue. The exclusion of non-Turkish elements from the state continued. The Khalji Revolution was the outcome of the hollowness of Balban’s policy—to his incapacity to bring the state into touch with the people by the elimination of the 'muqaddams' and the establishment of a 'ryotwārī' system. India had still to be conquered and reorganized.
CHAPTER VIII

SULTĀN MU'IZZ-U'D-DĪN KAiquéBĀD

Character.

On the death of Sultān Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn Balban, Kaiqubād, son of Nāsir-u'd-dīn Bughrā Khān, ascended the throne of Delhi with the title of Sultān Mu'izz-u'd-dīn in the year 1287 A.D. He was king by virtue of three descents—Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn Balban was his paternal grand-father, his mother was the daughter of Sultān Nāsir-u'd-dīn Maḥmūd; while his father Bughrā Khān had a daughter of Sultān Shams-u'd-dīn for his mother. A young man of seventeen

1 Diya Barani, the author of the Tārikh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī, was a child in the reign of Sultān Mu'izz-u'd-dīn Kaiqubād, and whatever he has recorded about the events of this reign, he has learnt from his father Muyyid-u'l-Mulk and his preceptors, who were men of letters, in his reign. Not men of note as in Elliot, Vol. III, p. 124, for the text is "هلمه روزگار"; Diya Barani, Tārikh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 127.

2 Ibid., incorrectly has 1286 A.D., while Qirān-u's-Sa'dain, p. 35, a contemporary and, therefore, more reliable, authority, says 1287 A.D., 686 H.

3 Qirān-u's-Sa'dain, p. 22, refers to this fact as follows:—

The Delhi coin of this sovereign bears the same date, i.e., 686 H.=1287 A.D. H.N. Wright, Sultāns of Delhi, their Coins and Metrology, p. 63.

The same date is given by the Khulāṣat-u't-Tawāriḥh, p. 206.
or eighteen,¹ Kaiqubād possessed a handsome exterior, a cultured mind and a benevolent disposition.² Since his early childhood till the day of his accession, he had been brought up and educated under the severe supervision of his grandfather. The strict guardian and tutors, in whose hands he had been placed, never allowed him to satisfy a youthful desire or to entertain the idea of indulging in any pleasure. Out of the fear of the Sultan, his preceptors never permitted him any opportunity "to cast his eyes on any fair damsel or to taste a cup of wine." His tutors instructed him in calligraphy, science, literature, archery, the game of Chaugān³ and spearmanship; while his austere guardians delivered lessons in refinement and culture, and spared no pains in the teaching of good manners and virtuous acts.⁴ And when suddenly, and without making any effort whatsoever, the unexpected favour of fortune placed him on the throne, he immediately forgot the lessons of wisdom and self-restraint, and yielding to the hitherto suppressed desires of his

¹ Diyi Barani, Tārijh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 127, says 'seventeen or eighteen,' while the Tabaqāt-i-Akbari, p. 103, and Fīrīshṭah, p. 83, have eighteen.

² Diyi Barani, Tārijh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 127.

³ The word is ٌ-ٌٍِل-ٍٍٍ—which means the game of Chaugān. A’in-i-Akbari, pp. 173, 174, describes the game as follows: "Chaugān was an excellent method of training both the man and his horse. When Akbar entered the ground, he took a stout man to be his adversary, and ten others were selected and then divided into pairs by the cast of the die. Each couple played for twenty-five minutes. The game was, however, played after several manners. Firstly, one of the parties placed the ball in the hollow of his bat and trundled it slowly towards the Jāl or pit, which is called Rowl. Then the adversary skilfully caught hold of the ball into his bat, and flung it away forcibly before the other could approach him. This process is called Beylah, which is performed in several ways either by throwing the ball towards the right or to the left, and the other person frequently snatched it from between his horse’s leg and from under his body; and when the ball came to the front, he caught it upon the pit, a kettle-drum was beaten, signifying the end of the game; and the victory of the person, who threw the ball into the pit. Balls of Pallūs were used to play the game at night."

⁴ Diyi Barani, Tārijh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 128.
youth, gave himself up to debauchery and dissipation of every kind.\(^1\)

When the terror of cruel chastisement, glory of the state and, above all, the high-handedness of Sulṭān Balban disappeared, and a pleasure-seeking monarch, handsome, mild and of excellent disposition sat upon the throne, the business of story-tellers, jesters, jokers, musicians, organizers of convivial meetings, sweet-hearts and buffoons became brisk, and they flocked to the capital to find their fortune. "A beauty appeared under the shadow of every wall," says Ḍiyā Barānī, "a good looking face peeped from the upper storey, and musicians and reciters of Ghazals could be seen in every lane."\(^2\) His ministers, likewise, the Malikās and Amīrs of his court also took to pleasure and dissipation; and the various classes of people, high or low, acquired a taste for wine, music and amusements.\(^3\)

Vanity constrained the pleasure-loving Sulṭān to change his abode. He gave up residing at the Kushk-i-Lāl\(^4\) (the

---

\(^1\) Ibn Battūṭah says "I have heard a person, who lived at this period, describe the happiness, the cheapness of provisions and the liberality and munificence of Mu'izz-u'd-dīn. It was he who built the minaret of the great Mosque at Delhi...An inhabitant of India informed me that Mu'izz-u'd-dīn was much given to the society of women and to drinking ..."—Elliot, Vol III, p. 597. It is an amusing misstatement of Ibn Battūṭah that "Kaiqubād built the Qub Minār of Delhi, and that the passage leading to the top was wide enough to admit an elephant." In fact, Qub-u'd-dīn Aibak was the founder of the basement storey, and it was Ilutmish, who completed the Minār. Vide Aṭḥār-u's-Ṣanādīd, p. 55. For further details consult the reign of Sulṭān Qub-u'd-dīn Aibak. Ibn Battūṭah seems to confound Mu'izz-u'd-dīn Sām with Mu'izz-u'd-dīn Kaiqubād.

\(^2\) Ḍiyā Barānī, Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 84.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 129.

\(^4\) The Red-Palace was built by Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn Balban in the year 1255 A.D. and its mention is made by Ḍiyā Barānī in his Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, on p. 54. But the Aṭḥār-u's-Ṣanādīd, (Vol. I, p. 45) incorrectly states that the building was erected by the Khaljīs. However, very little of the history of this place is known. Firūz Shāh Khaljī is said to have visited it after his coronation at the White Palace. Sir Syed is again wrong to think that the palace was built near the tomb of Ḥaḍrat Nizām-u'd-dīn Auliya, and that the ruins of Lāl-Maḥal make its side.
Red Palace) at the capital and began constructing a splendid palace and the laying out of a fine garden on the bank of the river Jumna at Kilukhtri. The new capital, however, could not save the Sultan from the prying eyes of the public or the gallling yoke of the Turkish aristocracy. The Maliks, Amirs, officials and attendants of the court followed the Sultan, and began building palaces and dwelling houses there. The news of the Sultan's revelry and amusements reached every quarter of the Empire, and filled his Majlis (Assembly) with beautiful girls and witty courtiers. And the Sultan continued devoting his days and nights to luxury and enjoyment, and showered gifts right and left. The famous clowns and sweet-speakers like Diya Jhajji and Hisam Durvish and renowned musicians became the object of Sultan's special favour, and were regarded as his confidants and friends. "Vice and immorality prevailed everywhere,"

Barani, as above, says, "Kaiqubad gave up residing in the city and left the Red Palace." By city is meant Old Delhi, for, when Balban provisioned the fort of Rae Pithorai, it is unlikely that he would have built his own residence outside the defences of the fort. See Stephen Carr's Archaeological Remains of Delhi, p. 79. Again, references to the Red Palace of Old Delhi are of constant occurrence in the texts.

1 Diya Barani (Tariikh-i-Firuz Shahi, p. 176) says that Sultan Jalal-ud-din ordered the completion of the Kilukhtri Palace, of which the foundation was laid by Kaiqubad. Kilukhtri كليمoghفي or Kullughari كليمoghفي was a place of importance even before the time of Kaiqubad. Qudi Minhaj Siraj, in the reign of Sultan Nasir-ud-din, relates that a well-equipped army was stationed from the new city of Kilukhtri up to the Royal Palace to receive the Mongol emissaries. (Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, p. 317). On the one side of the Palace was the river and on the other a beautiful garden (Qir'ain-u's-Sardain, p. 56). The palace must, therefore, have overlooked the river; for the Sultan's body was overthrown into the river from the halls of mirrors. Very shortly it came to be known as Nayai Shehr, and Qila'h-i-Rae Pithorai was called Old Delhi. At present no traces of the Kilukhtri-palace are visible; yet at the same spot, where the tomb of Humayun stands, the town of Kilukhtri still exists—see Ishar-u's-Sanadid, Vol. IV, p. 5. List of Monuments, Vol. IV, p. 13.

2 Diya Barani, Tariikh-i-Firuz Shahi, p. 131.

3 Ibid., p. 130.
says Diya Barani, "mosques were empty of worshippers and the wine-shops flourished."1 Barani's accounts must be taken with many grains of salt. The habits of a lifetime could not be overthrown so easily, and it was not possible for every one to fall into dissipation all of a sudden. There seems to have been quite enough of immorality in Balban's days, and the slackness of government could have only increased immorality or rather its public manifestation in a part of the public. On account of the luxury prevailing at the court, immorality was more open and less restrained. In short, Kajubad was an easy-tempered and an easy-going monarch, and possessed no kingly dignity or authority, which was an essential of sovereignty in those days.

The Na'ib-'ul-Mulk Malik Nizam-u'd-din.

Malik Nizam-u'd-din, nephew and son-in-law of Malik-`ul-Umar Fakhr-u'd-din Kutwai, was legally created Dād-Bak3 (Judicial Secretary, whose duty was to enforce the

1 Diya Barani, Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi, p. 167. Amir Khusru, in his Qir'ân-u's-Sa'dain, p. 26, vainly attempts to prove his (Sultán's) sense of justice and terror of chastisement by saying:—

عدل تو بر بست به گردن ده تیره روکش گردن ده گرگ بیک مولک خوشیش

(Your system of justice has bound the heads of ten wolves with one hair of sheep).

(Your terror accompanied by a sword of chastisement has attacked the very hearts of fierce lions).

The duties of Dād-Bak, Bārbak and Wakil-i-dar are confusing, and require explanation. Diya Barani (Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi, p. 131) calls Nizam-u'd-din, Dād-Bak, and further, on p. 148, styles him as Mīr-i-dād. Consequently, Dād-Bak is the same as Mīr-i-dād. Bārbak is described by Amir Khusru as the "tongue of the Sultán"

بازیک که لسان السلطانین است

A'ījz-i-Khusraw, Vol. I, p. 125. His duty was to convey the petitions of the people before the royal throne, when the Sultán held his court:

ملکی ناشب باربک از وفور مرجعیت خدائی در هر مکلی که پیش تالیت مہدی میرسد. حاجات حمادتمندان به بسم اشرف افیلی
attendance of high-placed offenders) but in reality acted as *Nā'ib-i-Mulk* (Regent or Chancellor in the German sense) and directed the affairs of government on his own responsibility. Malik Qawām-u'd-dīn, the *'Ilaqah-Dabīr* (Chief Secretary), a very competent and accomplished man, was appointed *Nā'ib-i-Wakil-i-dar* (Deputy Superintendent of the Court and Palace), and the title of *'Umdat-u'l-Mulk* was bestowed upon him. Malik Shāhīk was created *Amīr-i-Ḥājib*

مرسند، وملتستس بندگان خدایی از بندگی حضرت حکم

می ستاند.

According to *Ibn Battūṭah*, *Mir-i-dād* was a judicial officer, whose duty was to enforce the attendance of high-placed offenders; he sat by the side of the Qādi (*'Aja'ib u'l-Asfār*—Translation by Muḥammad Ḥusain, Vol. I, p. 217).

*Wakil-i-dar*, variously designated as *Rasūl-i-dar* or *Ḥājib u'l-Irsāl*, was appointed to perform the secretarial functions of the court.

*Schulg und Kyndler* ك افضل الاشعال دركة است (*Diya Baranī, Tārikh-i-Firuz Shāhi*, p. 576). The same author on p. 405 says that Qādi *Diya-u'd-dīn* was incharge of the keys of the Palace and superintended the closing of the gates *کلیددار درهاِ خوشک* بدست او بوده (*Ibn Battūţah*, p. 80) styles him *کلیددار* (keeper of royal keys).

The following is therefore the conclusion:

The Ḥājib introduced the visitor to the hall of audience, and handed over his petition to the Bārbak (a title conferred upon a person who held the office of Amīr-i-Ḥājib), who took it to the throne. After the Sulṭān retired from the court, the Ḥājib handed over the papers to the *Wakil-i-dar*, who disposed of them according to the Sulṭān’s order.

*Elliot*, Vol. III, p. 126, has not translated but omitted the words در باطن and در ظاهر but simply says “He became Dūd-Bak and *Nā'ib-i-Mulk*.” The correct translation is as above.

*Malik* does not mean ‘noble’ as in *Elliot*, Vol. III, p. 126. The position was higher than Amīr and subordinate to a Khān. Each *Malik* had ten Amirs under him, and each Khān ten Malikhs. Malik Qawām-u'd-dīn had also served Balban, and had verified the details of the conquest of Bengal and the assassination of Tughrul in a book known as *'Fateh-nāmah*” or ‘A Book of Victory’—Barani’s *Tārikh*, p. 91.

*Tārikh-i-Firuz Shāhi* of *Diya Baranī*, p. 131. *Badā'uni* calls him Qayām-u'l-Mulk. *Lubbû'-Twâriḳh*, p. 22, and *Fīrishtah*, p. 84, have *نابل وكيلدر*
(Lord Chamberlain), and was entitled Wazīr Khān¹; Malik Jāvarjī was made Sar-i-Jāndār² (Commander of the royal body-guards); and Khwājah Khāṭır-u'd-dīn received the title of Khwājah-i-Jahān. The territory of Sāmānah was entrusted to the charge of Malik Chhajjū, the governor of Karrah and Mānakpūr; and Sultān Mu'izz-u'd-dīn Kaiqubād married his daughter.³

Malik Niẓām-u'd-dīn was very clever, exceedingly cunning and crafty. When he saw that the Sultān's devotion to his pleasure passed all limits, he began to aspire for the throne.⁴ His ambitious designs greatly offended the Balbanī Maliks and Amīrs who, however, out of expediency, remained submissive to him. Niẓām-u'd-dīn imagined that their obedience was the result of sincere devotion to him; but they soon grew dissatisfied with his attitude, and divided themselves into opposing schools and contending parties. Niẓām-u'd-dīn now had a full control over the Palace; but he could not, all of a sudden, make an attempt on the king's life, unless all the impediments in his way were removed. Any officer in charge of the government would find, like Balban, that the Turkish officers were an obstacle in his path, for they defied the central authority. In crushing the Turkish aristocracy, Niẓām-u'd-dīn was also continuing the work, which Balban began and 'Alā-u'd-dīn completed. Association and conservatism induced Baranī to sympathize with the Turkish aristocracy and to paint Niẓām-u'd-dīn too dark. Sultān Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn Balban, Niẓām-u'd-dīn said to himself, an experienced⁵ and warlike monarch was no more, his most capable son Khān Shahīd died in his life-time. Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Bughrā Khān was contented with Lakhnawī, and Kaiqubād was lost in dissipation. Now Kai-Khusru was

the only obstacle. If he got rid of him, and succeeded in
winning over some of the old Malikṣ, the realm of Delhi
would easily fall into his hands.1 With such cruel designs in
his mind, Niẓām-u'd-dīn approached the Sulṭān and repre-
sented by saying, "Kai-Khusru is a claimant to the throne.
He is endowed with many rare virtues and excellent
qualities; the Malikṣ are bent towards him, and regard him
as heir-apparent of Sulṭān Balban. If no steps are taken in
this connection, the Malikṣ are bound to get you aside and
raise him to the throne. The best procedure, therefore,
would be to summon him from Multān and get rid of him
on the way."2

The treacherous suggestion was approved by the drunken
Sulṭān, and messengers were despatched for Kai-Khusru.
It is stated in several histories and Firīštah himself quotes
from the Tārīkh of Ḥājī Muḥammad Qandhārī and the
Futūḥ-u's-Salāṭīn that on receiving the intelligence of this
design, Kai-Khusru sought an alliance with the Mongol
Timar Khān, who was at Ghaznīn, for help to conquer
Hindustān; but was disappointed in his expectations. The
unfortunate prince sent a message to Kaiqubād intimating,
"I feel confident, that you personally have a great affection
and kind regard for me. But there are selfish intriguers
who wish to create mischief and are constantly occupied in
alienating your mind from me and are bent upon snatching
Multān, the only heritage of my father, from me. It shall
be an act of kindness, if you reckon me among the well-
wishers of the Crown." "The past is over," replied

1 Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī of Diyā Barānī, p. 132. Amīr Khurṣu (Qir'ān-
u's-Sa'dān, p. 204) also suggests that Niẓām-u'd-dīn was an ambitious
man:

2 Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī of Diyā Barānī, pp. 132, 133.
3 Luḥbūr-Twārīkh, p. 23, Khuḥṣat-u't-Twārīkh, p. 145, and Firīštah
p. 84.
4 Firīštah, p. 84.
5 In which a poet, named 'Aẓmī, has versified the history of the
Sulṭāns of Delhi.
Kaiqubād, "do not let any suspicions crowd your mind. I have a strong desire to see you, and promise to send you back in all honour to Multān."\(^1\) The innocent prince started for Delhi, but as fate had destined, he was murdered by an appointee of Niẓām-u’d-dīn in the district of Rohtak.\(^2\)

The cruel deed of Kai-Khusru’s murder excited great horror in the minds of the Malikṣ, whose power had been shattered and reduced to nullity. Niẓām-u’d-dīn’s next step was to bring a charge against the Vizier-i-Mulk (The Vizier of the kingdom) Khwājah Ḫaṭṭīr,\(^3\) and ordered him to be placed on an ass and paraded through the streets. He further arrested several Malikṣ, and confined them in distant forts.\(^4\) Such punishments increased the fear and misapprehensions of the officers. After a period of six months from his accession, the Sulṭān held a public assembly at Kilukhrī, and Niẓām-u’d-dīn deceitfully forged a document in the name of the governor of Multān intimating the triumph of the Sulṭān’s forces over the Mongols and summoned all the Malikṣ and Amīrs to offer their congratulations on the occasion. When they presented themselves at the court, Malik Bak Sāriq, Amir-i-Ḥājī (Lord Chamberlain); Malik Ghazi, Waktī-dar (Secretary of the Court); Malik Karīm-u’d-dīn, Na’īb-i-Bārbak; and Malik Bahrām, Akhūr Bak, (Lord of the Stable); were all seized and killed. While Malik Jāvarjī, (probably Abājī of Balban’s reign) Sar-i-Jāndār, (Commander of the Royal body-

\(^1\) Firīghtah, p. 84.
\(^2\) Tārīḵh-i-Firūz Shāhī of Diya Barani, p. 133.
\(^3\) ملک نظام الدين مستوفی تر شد - و بر خواجته خطیب رک و وزیر ملک معز الدين بود - جنرال بهانه فرمایان اورده او را فروخت تا بر خر نشاند... 

Tārīḵh-i-Firūz Shāhī of Diya Barani, p. 133. Thus, the reason of Khwājah’s disgrace is not known. Whatever his influence, the official position of Niẓām-u’d-dīn was lower than that of the Khwājah. Khwājah Ḫaṭṭīr was the Na’īb-i-Vizier (Deputy Vizier of the Empire) in the reign of Sulṭān Ghiyāḥ-u’d-dīn Balban.

\(^4\) Tārīḵh-i-Firūz Shāhī of Diya Barani, pp. 133, 134.
guards), and Malik Mughlatī, Mushallidār were exiled. Fresh appointments were made; Malik 'Alā-u’d-dīn Shāhīk, the Amir of Multān, and a renowned Malik of Balban’s reign became Amir-i-Hājib (Lord Chamberlain), and was given the title of Hazbar Khān. Amir ‘Allī, who was Sawār-i-Jāndār (Commander of the Royal body-guards) of Sultān Balban, was reinstalled to the same post; Ḥāmid Fakhhr, probably Fakhr-u’d-dīn, Vizier of Balban, the Wakil-i-dar; Malik Tamāchī, Na’īb-i-Amir-i-Hājib (Deputy Chamberlain); Malik Turghi, Āʿīd (Minister of war); ‘Alī Shāh, Kūh-i-Jūdi, and his brother Khusrū became Sultān’s favourite; and Malik Shābān Sablīq, Shāhnah-i-Bārgāh, (Superintendent of the Court). ¹

The Mongol Invasion and after.

About this time, the news⁴ arrived that a large army of Mongols under the command of Timur Khān had invaded the frontier tracts of Hindustān, and had swept all over the country from Lāhore⁵ to Multān. The Sultān, in his proud vaunts, foolishly remarked, “I am the sovereign of Hindustān and extract tribute from the dependent Raes and Ranas. I receive gold from Gujarāt and Deoghr, swift horses from Talingānāh and vigorous elephants from Bengal. My treasures are deposited in Mālwhah and Jājnagar. How can a foreigner dare to attack my kingdom?”⁶ These facts are

¹ Diyā Baranī, p. 134, and Ṭabarqāt-i-Aḥbārī, p. 105, have Malik Shāhīk; but Firīshah, p. 85, has Malik Niẓām Bak.
² Tārīkh-i-Mubdrak Shāhī, p. 53.
³ Ibid., p. 54.
⁴ شہب پچھین فصل برس گوند شاد مغل آواز بعالم افتاد (The king was thus enjoying the pleasant season when the report of a Mongol invasion fell upon the earth)—Qirān-u’s-Sa’dain, p. 62.
⁵ قوت آن سبل کر ایشان رسید اب زهابور به ملکان رسید (It cannot be Ḥāpur, for the place is so near Delhi, and the Mongols did not reach the capital. It is in all probability, Lāhore. The Rāvī then flowed from Lāhore to Multān, and the Mongols were in possession of the western branch of the river.)—Qirān-u’s-Sa’dain, p. 63.
quite incorrect. No tribute or gold came from such parts of Hindustān. The Qir'ān-u's-Sa'dain is a book of official qaṣidahs, and as such is to be interpreted with care. Very often, the conversations, contained in Khusrū's work, are also fictitious. After he had finished his speech, the Minister of war summoned the royal troops, and appointed Khān-i-Jahān the Bārbak to lead the expedition against the Mongols.

No sooner had the enemy learnt the news of the arrival of Muslim forces than they fled ‘swifter than an arrow from a bow.’ Their leaders, Timur, Sarmak, Kīlī, Khajlak and Bāīdū all turned their backs and retreated. Khān-i-Jahān pursued the flying Mongols, put most of them to the sword, and captured the rest. The vast amount of booty, which fell into the hands of the victors, was presented before the Sultān; and the captives were put to the slaughter. Amīr Khusrū’s description of the Mongols is rather interesting. According to him, the Mongols were clad in cotton, and wore on their shorn heads caps of sheep-skin. Their body was steel-like, their faces like fire with narrow and piercing eyes, flat noses, broad nostrils, long mouths, sullen cheeks, overgrown moustaches and scanty beards about their chins. Their bodies were covered with lice, their skin was as rough

1 (At the head of the army was appointed the swordsman Khān-i-Jahān, the Bārbak, the destroyer of armies)—Qir'ān-u's-Sa'dain, p. 64.

Dr. Ishwārī Prasād (Medieval India, p. 280) makes “Prince Khīḍr Khān, the amorous hero of Amīr Khusrū’s famous poem, the Qir'ān-u's-Sa'dain.” The learned author does not seem to have ever consulted the book, and, therefore, he confuses “Diwal Rābī Khīḍr Khān” with the Qir'ān-u's-Sa'dain, which describes the details of the meeting of father and son—Sultān Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Bughrā Khān and Mu'īzz-u'd-dīn Kāiqbūd.

2 Tabāqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 105, and Firighāt, pp. 84, 85, state that a ‘great battle was actually fought in the vicinity of Lāhore, in which the Mongols were defeated.’ But the Ta'rīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 54, agrees with the contemporary chronicle Qir'ān-u's-Sa'dain in stating that the Mongols ‘fled without any battle.’

3 Qir'ān-u's-Sa'dain, p. 65.

4 Ibid., p. 90.

5 Ibid., p. 95.
as leather, and they devoured dogs and pigs with their nasty teeth.¹

Niẓām-u'd-dīn once more resorted to deceitful measures and said to the Sulṭān, "The Mongol Amīrs, who embraced Islam in the time of Sulṭān Balban and had joined his service, form a united community. They have large troops, attendants and relations and intend to rise in revolt against you." With such crafty words, Niẓām-u'd-dīn gained favour of the Sulṭān, who, in a state of intoxication, issued an order to slay the Mongol Amīrs.² The 'new Muslims' or Mongol converts were persecuted both by Niẓām-u'd-dīn and 'Alā-u'd-dīn Khālji. They had been taken into service at the choice of the Sulṭān himself, but they were more or less like mercenaries and might be compared to the Turkish guards of the 'Abbasids. They could not, however, be depended upon, and there was a danger that they might join their blood-brothers, who were constantly in the habit of invading Hindustān. Their persecution by Niẓām-u'd-dīn is a part of the general drive against the non-Turkish element in the State. Some of the Balbants Maliks, who were their friends and associates were to meet the same lot.

Soon after Malik 'Alā-u'd-dīn Shāhik and Malik Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Tuzkī, the governor of Baran,³ the two important personages of Balban's reign, were both put to death through Niẓām-u'd-dīn's stratagem. He had obtained such an ascendancy over the Sulṭān's mind that if any one, through sincere loyalty and devotion ventured to speak of his designs, the Sulṭān immediately informed him, arrested the person and handed him over to Niẓām-u'd-dīn. His wife, the daughter of Malik-u'l-Umarā Fakhru'd-dīn Kūṭwāl, an equally influential person, was the directress of the Royal Ḥarem and the Sulṭān addressed her as 'mother'. Being

¹ Qirāʾ-ʾū's-Saʿdān, pp. 93, 94.
² Tarīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī of Ḏiyā Barānī, p. 133.
³ Ḏiyā Barānī, p. 134, and Taḥqīqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 105, both have Malik Yūzktī; while Firūzah, p. 85, and Tarīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 54, have Malik Turkī.
over-awed with his power, the Malikṣ and Amīrs placed themselves under his protection and sought to be reckoned among his adherents.¹

When Malik Fakhṛ-u'd-dīn, an old man of ninety, came to know of Niẓām-u'd-dīn's arrogant pride and futile ambitions, he called him to a private interview and vainly sought to convince him of his folly by wise and intelligent arguments. Ḍiyā Baranī, here, seems to compose discourses after the manner of Livy, the famous Roman Historian; yet they contain a core of truth in them. Fakhṛ-u'd-dīn said, "Niẓām-u'd-dīn: I have brought you up and educated, and you are my son. My father started his career as a king's personal attendant,² and rose to the position of Kūtvāl, which we have held for about eighty years. It is our highest achievement; the success being due to the fact that we never meddled with the affairs of the state. Kindly banish the vision of royalty from your mind, for royalty has no relation with us. Kingship befits those who are endowed with rare virtues and excellent qualities by God, the Almighty and we possess none of them.³ You have not the courage to throw a stone at a jackal or thrash a grocer with an onion leaf. Supposing you succeeded in killing the drunken Sulṭān by some villainous contrivance, the infamy of this barbarous act will remain fresh till the Day of Judgment. And take it for granted, you made your way in mounting the throne of Delhi, you would but ruin the kingdom, for you do not possess any of the essentials of sovereignty.⁴ You have but handsome buffoons and worthless persons to regard them as your confidants and well-wishers. Sulṭān Shams-u'd-dīn Īltutmīsh had such accomplished and illustrious Malikṣ that he, very often remarked that they were

¹ Ḍiyā Baranī, p. 134.
² 1288–89=1289—then Shihāb-u'd-dīn is the king intended. Niẓām-u'd-dīn's family, consequently, would by right be one of the senior families.
³ Ḍiyā Baranī, Tārīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 135.
⁴ Ibid., p. 136.
thousand times better than himself.¹ Sultan Balban, during his forty years' career as a Malik and Khān, had gathered together a large number of trustworthy friends and associates, upon whom really depended the strength of the Empire. For God's sake, give up the idea of royalty and do your work."

The old Kūtwāl did not believe that the throne of Delhi was the monopoly of Balban's family; nor he objected to Niẓām-u'd-dīn's birth but to his personal qualities. The uncle never regarded the nephew as a fit candidate for the throne. He, therefore, pointed out that the party, on which Niẓām-u'd-dīn was relying, was a broken reed and that security and prosperity could alone be contrived by remaining in administration but out of politics. Both the uncle and nephew misapprehended the situation. A revolution in the state was ripe, and they misunderstood its purport, its significance and its direction. The Sultan was engrossed in dissipation, the Khalji power was in progress, and the Turkish aristocracy was being crushed by Niẓām-u'd-dīn. The Nā'ib's adherents were few and weak, and their loyalty rested upon fear and awe. Niẓām-u'd-dīn committed a blunder in suppressing the one party without seeking alliance with the other; he could not, as an administrator, keep himself aloof from politics, but at the same time it was unwise for him to aspire for the throne.

The short-sighted politician would not take the warning to heart. "What you have said is perfectly true," Niẓām-u'd-dīn replied, "but I have made the people my enemy. They have discovered what I am after, and if I now refrain from prosecuting my scheme, they will strike at me." Malik Fākr-u'd-dīn was disgusted and said, "Then consider ourselves, our families and children dead and destroyed." The nobles, however, praised the Kūtwāl for his advice and greatly appreciated his desire for peace. Niẓām-u'd-dīn profited nothing by the counsels, but continued removing the Khalji Maliks, whom he thought impediments in his

¹ Ḍiyā Barani, Tārīkh-i-Firuz Shāh, p. 137.
way of attaining sovereignty. He had already made an attempt to destroy the Turkish Maliks; now he turned towards the Khaljis, whose greater number and the permanent position, as occupied by their leader Jalâl-u'd-dîn, offered an opportunity for Niżâm-u'd-dîn to strike them. Even the Sulṭân became aware that Niżâm-u'd-dîn wanted to get rid of him.

Sulṭân Niżîr-u'd-dîn’s advance from Lakhnawtî.

On receiving the intelligence of Kaiqubâd’s succession to the throne of Delhi, his father Bughrâ Khân assumed the title of Sulṭân Niżîr-u'd-dîn, and caused his name to be read in the Khuṭbah and to be inscribed on the coinage at Lakhnawtî. And when he heard of his son’s devotion to pleasure and of Niżâm-u'd-dîn’s designs for the acquisition of royalty, he repeatedly sent a number of letters full of paternal advice to Kaiqubâd and hinted at the danger of his deceitful enemy. Mu’izz-u'd-dîn paid no heed to his father’s letters and counsels which deeply aggrieved Sulṭân Niżîr-u'd-dîn. Baranî and Khusru are at variance about Bughrâ Khân’s designs. According to the Qir‘ân-u’s-Sa’dâin, Niżâm-u'd-dîn marched from Lakhnawtî to conquer Delhi. When Kaiqubâd heard that his father had reached

1 Diya Barani, Târikh-i-Firuz Shahî, p. 138.
2 The text is

"فلكي رهش وسیت نظام الدين خام طمع خنديدها مي زد..."

which has been incorrectly rendered by Elliot, Vol. III, p. 129 into

"Fate, however, divided these crude designs and smiled upon the Khaljis.”

The correct translation is as follows: "Fate, however, smiled upon the success of the crude designs of Niżâm-u'd-dîn, and offered congratulations to the Khaljis.”

3 Diya Barani, Târikh-i-Firuz Shahî, p. 139, and Firightah, p. 85.
4 Ibid., p. 141, states that Kaiqubâd first of all marched with an army to see his father; and when Niżîr-u'd-dîn heard of his arrival, he, too started with a large army from Lakhnawtî. The facts are otherwise stated by the contemporary authority Qir‘an-u’s-Sa’dâin, p. 100, onwards; Ibn Battûta—Elliot, Vol. III, pp. 596, 597, Lubb’u’t-Twârikh, p. 24 : Tabaqât-i-Akbarî, p. 107, and Târikh-i-Mubârak Shahî, p. 54.
SULTĀN MU'IZZ-U'D-DĪN KAIQUBĀD

Bihār, he also collected his army, placed it under the charge of two hundred Amīrs and the Bārbak, and marched eastwards. Malik Chhajjā with several thousand horses from Karnāl and Khān-i-'Iwaḍ from Oudh joined the imperial army on the banks of the river Sarāyū (Gogrā). Barānt, however, asserts that Kaiqubād took the initiative and started with a large army to see his father. Khusru’s work is contemporary and official and has to adopt the viewpoint of the king and his ministers. Barant’s account on the other hand, is later, and had, therefore, no one to please but himself.

Having reached so near to his son, Bughra Khān gave up all pretentions of conquering Delhi, and simply asked for peace and meeting. He sent Shams-u'd-dīn, the Dābir (Secretary) with the message “The kingdom of Delhi is mine, but if it has passed to my son, he should not contend with his father. For me, the kingdom of Lakhnawtī, the heritage of my father is most desirable.” Kaiqubād replied by saying that he only preserved the throne for his father from its occupation by the Mongols. The next day, Nāṣir-u'd-dīn sent his chamberlain to deliver a message to his son, but when his boat reached the middle of the river, Kaiqubād hit an arrow at it, and the messenger was obliged to return to his master. Thereupon, Nāṣir-u'd-dīn conveyed another message, “My son: banish the idea of revolt from your mind. I am the heir to the throne, and you can only obtain it through me, you are inexperienced and unlessoned. Do not try to make encroachments upon my kingdom.” Kaiqubād was irritated and replied “Do not be proud of your ancestry, for none inherits kingdom unless he fights for it. I can better claim the throne by virtue of three descents—Īltutmīsh, Nāṣir-u'd-dīn and Balban.” Sultān Nāṣir-u'd-dīn felt grieved at the words and advised his son not to appeal to arms for he had vigorous elephants and a well organized

1 Qur'ān-u-Sa'dain, p. 101.
2 Ibid., p. 102.
3 Ibid., p. 112.
4 Ibid., p. 111.
5 Ibid., p. 104.
6 Ibid., pp. 113, 114.
7 Ibid., p. 118.
army. The son replied, "I, too have some elephants and horses beyond number. If you resort to peace, I agree; but kindly do not frighten me with proud vaunts."¹

At length, Nāṣir-u'd-dīn wrote an affectionate letter in his own hand. "My son: I have a great longing to see you. My patience is giving way and I cannot bear separation any more. It will interfere neither with your royal pretensions nor your round of pleasures, if you will permit your loving father, whose eyes have been afflicted like Jacob's, to have a sight of your handsome face. Though paradise be a fine place, there is no joy seeing one's beloved."² The request of interview was granted by Kaiqubād. The 'king of the East' sent his youngest son Kaikā'ūs to Kaiqubād with a present of jewels and elephants, while the latter sent his own son, Kayūmarth to his father's presence.³

The Meeting of father and son.

Kaiqubād was deeply touched; he gave up all warlike intentions, and wished to go all alone⁴ to meet his father. But Niẓām-u'd-dīn prevented him, and prevailed on him to stay with royal pomp and dignity. The Sulṭān accepted the Malik’s advice and directed the army to be ready and equipped. However, it was arranged that in order to preserve the dignity of the king of Delhi, Bughrā Khan would cross the river Sarayū, and attend his court by kissing the hand of the Sulṭān. Bughrā Khan, accordingly, crossed⁵ the river and proceeded towards Kaiqubād's camp. At the

¹ Qir‘ān-u’s-Sa’dain, pp. 123, 124.
² Gāzār, Firdawsi Maqamat Khwosh Ast, pp. 141, 142.
³ Diya’ Barani, Tāriḵ-i-Firūz Šāhī, p. 140.
⁴ Diya’ Barani, p. 141, has در حرم يحيدگی which means 'all alone' and not with haste as in Elliot, Vol. III, p. 597.
⁵ Ibn Baṯṣūṭah says, "Each of them entered a boat and met in the middle of the river"—Elliot, Vol. III, p. 597, which is not reliable.
door of the royal pavilion he alighted and performed the ceremony of kissing the ground three times. When he approached nearer, Kaidu found the situation unbearable; he descended from the throne and fell at his father's feet. They embraced each other and shed tears, the eyes of the audience were also full of tears at the touching sight. Each invited the other to ascend the throne, and for a long time neither complied. At length Bughra Khan took his son's hand, and after seating him on the throne stood before him with folded hands. The father said, "My one desire is now fulfilled that I have seated my son on the throne during my lifetime." My father has instructed me to remain loyal and faithful to the Sultan of Delhi. I will, therefore, fulfil all the requirements of etiquette." Kaidu shortly after descended from the throne and approached his father. The officers of the state scattered jewels upon them, and at length the astrologers fixed up an auspicious hour for interview. Bughra Khan rose, and crossed the river to his own camp. Both parties began sending costly presents to each other, and it was settled that they would meet again the next evening.

A large number of festivities occurred; Bughra Khan presented a jewelled crown, a throne covered with gold plate and an elephant to his son. Kaidu put on the crown, and both of them sat upon the throne. Nasir-ud-din then returned to his camp as usual, and the next morning Kaidu despatched the white canopy and the black hat of Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din Balban as a present to his father.

In the evening Bughra Khan again embarked on a boat to interview his son. During the conversation that followed,

1 Qiran-u's-Saidain, p. 149.  2 Ibid., p. 150.
3 Diya Barani, Tarih-i-Firuz Shahi, p. 142.
4 Qiran-u's-Saidain, p. 151.  5 Ibid., p. 153.
6 Ibid., p. 157.
7 Ibid., pp. 189-190.
8 The head-dress of the period under review was syls (Kalilah), which means hat. Formerly, it had a brim, which seems to have disappeared with conversion to Islam.
Sultān Nasir-u’d-dīn referred to his own education and training, which he received under the patronage of his father, Sultān Balban. He studied books like Ādāb-u’s-Salāṭīn, Ma’āthir-u’s-Salāṭīn, and other works on the history and accounts of saints from Khwajah Tāj-u’d-dīn Bukhārī. He quoted from the Ādāb-u’s-Salāṭīn that Jamshed said to his sons, “A king must have under his command ten Khāns, each Khān having ten Malikīs, each Malik ten Amīrs, each Amīr ten Sipah-Sālārs (commander of troops), each Sipah-Sālār ten Sar-Khīl, each Sar-Khīl (general) ten horsemen or footmen." A ruler, who has not enough wealth in his treasury to come to the rescue of his subjects at the time of famine and to protect him from his enemy, has no right to be called a king. He is not a king whose subjects and soldiers starve in time of crisis and famine. He is alone a king, under whose dominion not a single individual sleeps hungry or naked." "Tell me," asked Bughrā Khān, "how long will you remain addicted to pleasure and dissipation and disregard the sayings of prudent and sagacious sovereigns of the world?" And as the time of departure approached, Kāiqbād requested his father to advise him on matters of good government and administration. “My sole object in coming over all the distance,” said Nasir-u’d-dīn, “has precisely been the same.”

However, the day of departure approached; early that morning Bughrā Khān held a private assembly and summoned Malikīs Nizām-u’d-dīn and Qawām-u’d-dīn to listen to his counsels. First he wept bitterly and then said, “I was delighted, my son, when I heard that you had ascended the throne of Delhi; it was as good as my own accession. But for the last two years, I have been shocked to learn that you are absorbed in luxury and pleasure, and have been neglecting the affairs of the state." I have been mourning for you

---

1 Dilā Baghī, Tahāk-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 144.
2 Ibid., p. 145.  
3 Ibid., p. 146.  
4 Ibid., p. 147.  
5 Ibid., p. 148.  
6 Ibid., p. 149.
as well as for myself, and wonder how you remained safe on
the throne till now. The end of the kingdom of Delhi and
Lakhnawtī seems to me very near, specially from the day
I heard that you slew so many loyal Maliks and Amirs. Their fate has shattered the confidence of others. You
perhaps do not know that the sweetest thing created by
God in the Universe is this pretty world, and the loveliest of
the lovely kind is kingship or sovereignty. The unexpected
favour of fortune has placed you on the easy throne, and,
therefore, you attach no value to it. My elder brother
Muḥammad was the heir-apparent, but he died in the life-
time of my father; and his son, who equally deserved the
throne, you have killed at the instigation of traitors. And
if they set you aside as well, the empire of Delhi will fall
into the hands of some ignoble family who will leave no
trace of us on the earth and God above knows what may
happen to our families, children and attendants. Beware
that the terror and dignity of Sulṭān Balbān has left too
crushing an impression upon your opponents to think of any
serious retaliation. My father said, 'The five essentials of
kingship are justice and benevolence; the establishment of
army and the protection of subjects; a full treasury; trust-
worthy associates and faithful allies; and lastly a capacity
to distinguish between friends and foes.' Bughrā Khān
seemed fond of reciting what he remembered from text-books.
The advice that he gave was not practical or practicable, for
Kai-Khusru was certainly a rival to the throne, and the
Turkish aristocracy was undoubtedly a paralysing force.

"My first advice to you, therefore," Bughrā Khān con-
tinued, "is this. Consider empire as dear but your own life
dearer; for if life is in danger, what is the use of this world.
The possible remedy is to refrain from indulging in excessive
dissipation." Secondly, hesitate in killing your Maliks and

1 Firawštah, p. 86. 2 Ṭabaqāt-i-Akhbarī, p. 110.
3 Dilār Barānī. Tārīḵ-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 150. 4 Ibid. p. 150.
5 Ibid., p. 151. 6 Qirān-u's-Sa'dain, p. 206.
Amirs, but convert your enemies into friends by means of liberality, sagacity and kindness. These two, Malik Niẓām-u'd-dīn and Qawām-u'd-dīn, are men of ripe experience; associate with these two other capable persons from among your Amirs and strengthen the 'castle of sovereignty' by these four 'pillars of the state.' Each of them should be placed at the head of a separate department such as Revenue (Diwān-i-Wizārat), War (Diwān-i-'Ard), Local government (Diwān-i-Inshā) and Appeals (Diwān-i-Risālat). The rank of the vizier is superior to others, but you should not allow any of them to predominate over the other. Thirdly, whenever you have to reveal a secret of the state, do so in the presence of all the four, do not take one of them exclusively in your confidence to the extent of alienating the others. Equip yourself with all the possible information regarding the behaviour of your officials and servants, and act upon the principles adopted by your grand-father in the administration of the country. Justice and equity are the basis of peace and tranquillity. But remember you cannot accomplish anything unless you abandon excessive drinking. Fourthly, say your prayers, and keep your Ramadān fast, so that you may not be disgraced in either world, and lay faith in such scholars as are not the slaves of worldly ambition and have abandoned the love of this world for the next." After finishing these counsels, Bughrā Khān wept with loud sobs, and pressed his son to his bosom to bid him farewell; and while doing so, he whispered into his ears, "Get rid of

1 Qirān-u's-Sa'dain, p. 204, and Ḍiyā Barānī, p. 152.
3 Ibid., p. 153.
4 Qirān-u's-Sa'dain, p. 205.
5 Ibid., p. 206.
6 Ḍiyā Barānī, p. 154. This would mean the 'Ulemā-i-Rabbānī as distinguished from the 'Ulemā-i-dunyavī. Since the former refused to have anything to do with the secular state, the king had perforce to depend upon the latter among whom were the Qādīs.
7 Qirān-u's-Sa'dain, pp. 212, 213.
Malik Niẓām-u'd-dīn as soon as you can.”¹ He then returned weeping to his camp, and said to his friends, “I have bid my last adieu to my son and the kingdom of Delhi.”²

The last days of Kaiqubād.

After parting with his father, Kaiqubād marched through the territory of Oudh for Delhi. Malik Shāhik, Kẖān-i-Jahān, was appointed governor of Oudh, and was directed to remain there.³ Out of regard for his father's advice, Kaiqubād refrained from indulging in his sensual engagement. But a number of lovely girls and sweet-hearts appeared before him on the way, and addressed lines of poetry.⁴ The Sultān was fascinated by their charms, but checked his passions, till one day an exceedingly handsome girl,⁵ well dressed and mounted on a green horse, with amorous playfulness, a thousand blandishment and graces, met the Sultān on the road, and dismounting from her horse, addressed the following verse:

“If you wish to put your feet upon my eyes, I will take out my eyeballs to place them before you to tread upon.”⁶

The Sultān, who was deeply addicted to such a company in his love for her, could not resist and asked her to recite on.

“You go to the wilderness (with the gracefulness of a

¹ Qirān-u's-Sa'dain, p. 204.
² Gārja jehān ghadh hawaa kast hām bēn fīn khar kē dr-rāh kast (Although the whole world is in your favour, but you should put out that thorn, which is an impediment in your way).
³ Diya' Barani, Tāriḵ-i-Firuz Shāhī, p. 156.
⁴ Qirān-u's-Sa'dain, p. 221.
⁵ Diya' Barani, Tāriḵ-i-Firuz Shāhī, p. 157.
⁶ A section of the capitalists had invested money in the education and training of dancing girls, an old and highly specialized profession—Diya' Barani, p. 157. If the demand for them at the central and provincial courts decreased, the money spent upon them would yield no return.
⁷ Gār jām bī chāshī ma jāwāhī seghād dihā dr-rāh mīn tā mī rodi
cypress and a shamshād," she continued her singing:

"But good promise-breaker, you go without me."

The Sultān was lost in her alluring beauty and her movements of infinite grace, and forgetting his father's advice, once more indulged in his usual convivial assembles, drank to the satisfaction of his heart and bestowed enormous gifts upon the lovely girls and buffoons. Thus, the whole journey from Oudh to Delhi was one round of dissipation and pleasure. At length, he alighted at the Kilıkhrī Palace, and entered the capital to witness the public rejoicing celebrated in his honour, but soon returned to enjoy his pleasures.

The Sultān was unable to give up the vicious habits of his youth, and was so engrossed in debauchery and dissipation that his rule would not have endured for a single week but for the skilful management of the government by Maliks Niẓām-u'd-dīn and Qawām-u'd-dīn, the old and renowned Maliks of Sultān Balban. "It was a matter of a thousand pities," says Diyā Barānī, "that the excellent qualities of Niẓām-u'd-dīn were spoiled by his ever-increasing ambition for royalty." The people followed their king; they became heedless, drank openly and held convivial meetings. 'Sadness, and sorrow disappeared from their hearts,' records Fīrīshṭāh, 'for thoughtfulness had overcome discretion.' After sometime had passed in this way, Sultān Mu'izz-u'd-dīn Kāiqbād, who had grown feeble and pale, suddenly fell ill, and be-thought himself of his father's advice about Niẓām-u'd-dīn. But as he was incapable of any diplomatic move, he haughtily ordered Niẓām-u'd-dīn to go to Multān to settle the affairs of that place. The Malik discovered that the Sultān wanted to get rid of him, and therefore, delayed his departure on various pretexts. The Sultān's officers heartily

1 Diyā Barānī, Tārikh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 159.
2 Ibid., p. 160.
3 Ibid., pp. 164, 165.
4 Ibid., p. 169.
5 Diyā Barānī, p. 170.
6 Ibid., pp. 160, 162 and 163.
7 Ibid., p. 168.
8 Fīrīshṭāh, p. 8
welcomed the unexpected change in the attitude of the Sultān, and poisoned Niẓām-u'd-dīn. Immediately after his murder, people fell out of employment, and flocked to the gate of the Palace for peace and security.  

The Sultān summoned Malik Jalāl-u'd-dīn, the governor of Sāmānāh and Sar-i-Jānār (Commander of the Royal body-guards) and appointed him Minister of war and governor of Baran with the title of Shā'istah Kān. Malik Aitmar Kachchan was made Bārbak or Amīr-i-Hājīb and Malik Aitmar Sarkhā obtained the office of Wakil-i-dar (Superintendent of the Royal Court); both of them were led away by ambitious designs and struggled for supremacy in the affairs of the state. The Sultān was down with paralysis and was confined to his couch; the leading Maliks aspired for the throne, and a worse chaotic state of affairs was never witnessed before.  

The Maliks and Amīrs were now divided into opposite camps. The Khaljīts were united under the leadership of Malik Jalāl-u'd-dīn Shā'istah Kān at Bhārpūr, while Malik Aitmar Sarkhā led the party of Turkish Amīrs. In order to preserve the family of Balban and to safeguard the interests of Turkish domination, Maliks Kachchan and Sarkhā elevated Kaiqubād's son, Kayūmarth, a prince of tender age, to the throne of Delhi at the Nāshrī platform (Chabūtrah-i-Nāshrī) with the title of Sultān Shams-u'd-dīn the Second.  

Sultān Mu'izz-u'd-dīn Kaiqubād was lying sick and powerless at the Kīlākhri Palace. Malik Jalāl-u'd-dīn Shā'istah Kān, 'Ārid-i-Mumālik (Minister of War), was busy inspecting the royal forces at Bhārpūr. He came of a race different from that of the Turks, so that neither laid confidence in the other. It was natural for disturbances to

---

1 The Maliks Azbar Kān, Shāhāb-u'd-dīn and Daulat Shāh Hasbānq all fled towards Kuh-pāyghā. After some time Malik Azbar Kān returned, but he was taken prisoner and killed. Malik Turkī met the same lot soon after—Tarikh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 56.  
2 Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī, p. 115, had Bāhpūr.  
3 Ibid., p. 115, and Firīshtah, p. 87.
arise; the Turkish Maliks devised a conspiracy to get rid of all the Khaljis, and drew up a long list of them, at the head of which was the name of Malik Jalāl-u’d-dīn Shā’istah Khān. On being informed of the plot by Malik Aḥmad Chap, the Nā‘ib-i-Amīr-i-Ḥājid (Deputy Chamberlain), Malik Jalāl-u’d-dīn strengthened his heart, collected his Khaljī Amīrs together and succeeded in winning over many other Maliks to his party. He further wrote to his uncle Malik Ḥusain to be ready with his forces at Ghiyāthpur to repel the Mongols, who had come down to Sāmānāh; and summoned his brother Malik Khāmūsh and cousin Malik ‘Īzz-u’d-dīn to stay with him. One morning Malik Aitmar Kachchan repeatedly despatched a number of messengers to invite Malik Jalāl-u’d-dīn to the Court, but the latter refused to comply with his request. At length Malik Kachchan himself mounted and approached Jalāl-u’d-dīn, but as soon as he alighted from his horse, he was seized and killed. Jalāl-u’d-dīn’s sons were equally reputed for their bravery and enterprise; they made a sudden attack on the Turkish camp with only a force of fifty horse, and succeeded in capturing Kayūmarth and bringing him to Bharpur along with the sons of Malik-u’l-Umarā Fakhri-u’d-dīn Kūtwāl. Malik Aitmar Sarkhā, who tried to pursue the Khaljis, was defeated and slain.

1 The references to the Khaljis in earlier works show them to be living round the lower part of the Helmand—south of Ghūr, East of Sīstān—in the part where the Ghilzāis live now. In the time of Bābar (see his Memoirs) Khalji and Ghilzāi are equivalent terms. This would mean that they belonged to the southern Afgān block. Nevertheless, they represented the mass of the Indian Musalmans. The Khalji Empire unlike the kingdom of the Lodīs and Sūris was not based upon the exclusive predominance of a group of Afgān tribes. It incorporated the imperial not the tribal principles. The great officers of the Khalji Empire were men of Indian birth.

2 Šīyā Baranī, Tāriḵh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 172.
3 Tāriḵh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 56.
4 Ibid., p. 56.
5 And not ‘500’ as in Elliot, III, p. 134. The text of Šīyā Baranī’s Tāriḵh p. 172, has ‘syaqiq’.

The entries of the Khaljis in earlier works show them to be living round the lower part of the Helmand—south of Ghūr, East of Sīstān—in the part where the Ghilzāis live now. In the time of Bābar (see his Memoirs) Khalji and Ghilzāi are equivalent terms. This would mean that they belonged to the southern Afgān block. Nevertheless, they represented the mass of the Indian Musalmans. The Khalji Empire unlike the kingdom of the Lodīs and Sūris was not based upon the exclusive predominance of a group of Afgān tribes. It incorporated the imperial not the tribal principles. The great officers of the Khalji Empire were men of Indian birth.
To the people of Delhi, however, the ascendancy of the Khaljits appeared intolerable; they came out of the city and gathered together before the Badā'ūn Gate with the intention of marching against Jalāl-u'd-dīn and rescuing Kayumarth from his clutches. But Malik Fakhir-u'd-dīn fearing for his sons, who were confined in the opposite camp, induced the people to return to city, and they accordingly withdrew.¹

Shams-u'd-dīn Kayumarth was nominally proclaimed Sultān at Bharpūr, but Jalāl-u'd-dīn acted as his Nā'ib (Regent), and himself directed the affairs of the state.² He appointed his uncle Malik Ḥusain the governor of Tabarhindah, Dipālpūr and Multān, and the latter proceeded towards those territories. Malik Chhajju, the nephew of Sultān Balban and a claimant to the throne was pacified by entrusting the territory of Karnāl to his charge.³ The Miftāh-u'l-Futūḥ of Amīr Khusrū records the rebellion of the Malik and his ultimate defeat by Jalāl-u'd-dīn.⁴

After a short period of a month or two, Malik Jalāl-u'd-dīn imprisoned the young prince, and put him to death. Now tables were turned: many of the Turkish Malikīs and Amīrs went over to the side of Malik Jalāl-u'd-dīn and vowed allegiance to him. Two days later, Jalāl-u'd-dīn sent a Malik, whose father had been killed by Kaiqubād, to seize the Sultān in the Kilakhrāt Palace and to finish him there and then. The Malik wrapped the dying Sultān in a blanket, gave him⁵ a few kicks and threw him into the Jumnah. Mu'izz-u'd-dīn reigned for a little more than three

¹ According to Firighah, p. 88, this event happened in the year 1288 A.D., while Badā'ūnī, p. 164, has 1289 A.D. It cannot be 1288 or 1289, but 1290 is the last year of Mu'izz-u'd-dīn's reign. Kaiqubād ascended the throne in 1287 and died in 1290 A.D.⁶

² Badā'ūnī, p. 159. He is styled on the coinage as

³ He is styled on the coinage as


⁵ Miftāh-u'l-Futūḥ, pp. 22, 25, 26, 30 and 37.

⁶ Diya Barani, Tarikh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 173.
years.¹

Malik Jalāl-u’d-dīn now assumed the title of Sultān Jalāl-u’d-dīn, sat upon the throne at Kīlākhrī and fixed his residence there. The people of Delhi were opposed to him, and through fear of the populace, Jalāl-u’d-dīn for a long time could not venture to take his seat upon the old throne.

By the death of Sultān Muḥizz-u’d-dīn Kaiqubād and his son Shams-u’d-dīn Kāyūmarth, the Early Turkish Empire of Delhi came to an end in the year 1290 A.D. “Thus kingship,” concludes Firīṣṭah, “was transferred from the Turks, who had been the successors of Sultān Shiḥāb-u’d-dīn of Ghūr, to the Khalif.”²

Estimate.

The powerful rule of Quṭb-u’d-dīn, the enlightened and glorious reign of Iltūtμish and the iron-hand of Balban all had vanished. The Early Turkish Empire, developed with marvellous rapidity, began to decline with the same degree of suddenness. The easy-going and pleasure-loving Kaiqubād followed in the brilliant foot-steps of his grand-father, and received a comparatively tranquil inheritance. The healthy and vigorous attempt of Balban to found his own dynasty was doomed to failure. The danger of a sudden collapse was more imminent than ever, and signs of decay were visible everywhere. The new reign was the beginning of many catastrophes; the overwhelming power of the Empire was waning and separate states were springing. The sudden decline of the Turkish Empire after Balban is the most unhappy feature of the Early Medieval History. Yet so overwhelming was the awe, the late Sultān had inspired, so universal the sentiment of his crushing power, that the Maliks could no longer venture to assume the role of king-makers.

¹ Tārīḵā-i-Mubarak Shibīḥ, p. 59, Bada’īni, p. 164, Firīṣṭah, p. 88, and Ṭabaqat-i-Akbari, p. 116, all agree in stating that ’Kaiqubād reigned for a little more than three years’; while MSS. Instihāb-u’l-Muntakhab, p. 172, says ‘three and a half years,’ which is quite incorrect.
² Firīṣṭah, p. 88.
Sultān Mu'tizz-u'd-dīn Kaiqubād was a pleasure-loving, mild, cultivated and humane prince. He gave himself up to the pleasures of the senses, indulged in gross vices and never shook off sloth and luxury. He possessed none of the energy and ambition of Balban, and was in fact unequal to the task of ruling an empire. The burden of the state interfered with his enjoyment, and his vices represented a strange contrast to the virtues of his predecessor. Deprived of any chance of real power, deluded by the exaggeration of poets and the servile flatteries of his courtiers, Kaiqubād set in ignominy and shame. With the unfortunate lack of scruples on his part and acting under the influence of the grossest provocation, Mu'tizz-u'd-dīn committed the heinous crime of murdering his cousin Kai-Khusru.

His regent Malik Niẓām-u'd-dīn made enough profit out of the unlucky prince, and enjoyed a comfortable plurality of posts. By and by he succeeded in usurping the supreme control of affairs, but carried on the work of government with sagacity and skill. What Balban was to Sultān Nāṣir-u'd-dīn, Niẓām-u'd-dīn was to Sultān Mu'tizz-u'd-dīn Kaiqubād. A new influence, however, appeared upon the scene of Niẓām-u'd-dīn's activity; he vainly sought to reap an advantage from the Sultān's state of drunken revelry by aspiring for the throne of Delhi. Niẓām-u'd-dīn, henceforward, became an exceedingly dangerous factor in politics; and in the pursuit of his evil design, he proposed to raise his adherents. The reign was marked by violence and treachery, and the tyranny of government merely served to increase the resentment of the oppressed. The Sultān, under a false sense of security, showed no symptoms of rebelling against the tutelage to which he was subjected by his deputy and, as a matter of fact, he did not know how to cope with the latter's aggressions. Malik-u'l-Umarā Fakhr-u'd-dīn Kūṯwāl tried to restrain his son-in-law, Niẓām-u'd-dīn in the vulgar strife of politics. On the other hand, Sultān Nāṣir-u'd-dīn Bughrā Khān condoled with Kaiqubād on his unhappy fate and drew him the sad picture of his future. But both the parties failed to achieve their aims;
neither did Niẓām-u'd-dīn abandon his dream of sovereignty, nor Kaiqubād restrained himself from his passionate addiction to wine and women. The only counsel which Kaiqubād translated into action was the murder of Malik Niẓām-u'd-dīn. 'It was but the last gleam before the final setting of the sun,' and the rest was a state of anarchy and confusion.

The Turkish power rapidly declined and the last glimpse of the empire conveyed but a faint impression of its once magnificent extent. The Malikīs had abandoned any pretence of submission to the Sultan's authority, and the Turks yielded to none in their national vanity. However, a number of loyal officers, anxious to preserve Delhi for the lawful sovereign, called in the help of their friends and colleagues. An irresistible sympathy drew the loyalty of the Turks to the family of Balban. The Turk's devotion to his clan was boundless, and he was prepared for any worse—a fact to which the history of mankind supplies very few parallels. The Turkish Amirīs, though divided in many groups were unified by a common hatred of the Khalījīs, whose racial distinction rather than heroic character excited the frantic intolerance of their adversaries. To the proposed insensate persecution of the Turks, the Khalījīs replied with the Assassin's dagger—a weapon which is always found in the hands of a determined minority. They openly challenged to destroy the Turkish rule. The feeble representation of once mighty empire of Delhi offered an easy prey to the hardy warriors of the Khalījī clan. One by one the Turkish Malikīs were assassinated, and Sultan Mu'izz-u'd-dīn Kaiqubād, down with paralysis, 'wrapped in gloomy thoughts and distracted by bloody memoirs, was murdered in the Kīnkhī Palace. With him the Dynasty came to an end. The Early Turkish Empire built up with so much skill and bravery crumbled to dust before the Khalījīs. Firīshītah pathetically concludes by saying 'and the kingdom of God is alone eternal.'
CHAPTER IX

CENTRAL ORGANIZATION OF THE EMPIRE
OF DELHI (1206—1290) I

Origin and Theory of Kingship.

In spite of the fact that monarchy has had a long and varied existence in the Muslim State; to the Shari'at, however, it has always remained a non-legal institution. In theory Islam knows no kingship; the word Amīr or Ul-ul-amr (meaning one, i.e., a chief or lord to whom an order is given) is often found in the Qur'an.¹

The Muslim State in Medieval India has been popularly but inaccurately described as a theocracy. Nothing can be more misleading; the blunder arises from a misconception of the meaning of 'theocracy' and an utter ignorance of the true character of the Empire of Delhi. In order to explain the degeneration from the theocratic 'Khilāfat' to the autocratic rule of the Muslim sovereigns, a reference is to be made to the Islamic political theory and ideal.

The Muslim State, being extraordinarily God-conscious, is permeated by a religious control, which extends to every sphere of human conduct. Allah is everywhere, and a Muslim is never permitted to lose sight of his faith. He is the real owner of sovereignty. He bestows it upon whom He likes, and deprives others likewise.² The idea of sovereignty in Islam is one of the most prominent factors of Islamic Political Theory. According to the Muslim theology, political authority rests with the Muslim brotherhood, which may confer supreme power upon any bona fide Muslim. The ruler and the ruled are fastened together by means of bai't, which literally means 'contract' or 'submission.' It signi-

¹ Qur'an, 5: 8. ² ملك الملكی-Qur'an, 3: 3.
fies an offer of fidelity and allegiance on the part of the subjects, and its acceptance by the ruler.\footnote{Qur'ān, 26:2. Also 26:3.} The bond of Muslim society, therefore, rests on implied contract or consent, without which none has any right to exercise authority. Thus, the political authority in Islam depends upon the will of the Muslim brotherhood, which is free from any restriction of caste, creed, race or colour, and that 'all believers are equal in the sight of God'.

The Shari'at, i.e., the path of virtue or the divine code of ethical and social laws, is supreme; and politically the Amīr, the Caliph, and even the Prophet—being members of the Muslim community and subject to the same laws—were never regarded immune or absolute. Thus, the supremacy of the law is one of the fundamental tenets of Islamic politics, and the ruler as well as the ruled have to submit to the Shari'at for their guidance considering it as the will and command of Allah.

The Muslim law imposes upon the individual the duty of obedience to the Imām. "Obey God, the Apostle, and those in authority from among you;"\footnote{Qur'ān, 5:8.} and in case of difference of opinion, to turn back to Allah and his Apostle—the basic principle of the faith. The one-sided emphasis on the duty of the individual without any corresponding obligation on the part of the Amīr would be meaningless. It has been, therefore, expressly provided that the person in authority is accountable and responsible to God for the welfare of the subjects.\footnote{The Apostle is ordered thus: "Go on inviting...and say, 'I believe in what Allah has revealed of the Book, and I am commanded to do justice between you; Allah is our Lord and your Lord: we shall have our deeds, and you shall have your deeds; No plea need there be between us and you. Allah will gather us together and to Him is the return' "—Qur'ān, 25:2.} The interests of the state are prior to the interests of the individual\footnote{Ibid., 9:3—'and know that your property and your children are a temptation, and that with Allah is the immense reward.'} and that it is the duty of
the ruler not to betray his trust.

The Muslim nation is a politico-religious unity (Millat). The Islamic conception of nationalism or patriotism is not based on geographical or racial considerations. Islamic polity has borrowed the terms Ummah and Millah as also Khalifah and Imām from the Qur'ān. It goes without saying that Islam makes no distinction on account of place, birth or lineage, but teaches a practical brotherhood unparalleled in the history of mankind. The Holy Qur'ān says, "the believers are naught else but brothers." Islam lays down the basis of a vast brotherhood in which all men and women, of whatever tribe or nation, have equal rights as if members of the same family. The slave is to be clothed with the clothing and fed with the food of his master, and is not to be treated harshly. "Your wives," says the Qur'ān, "have rights against you, as you have rights against them."

The ruler is to conduct the affairs of the state in consultation with counsellors; and according to the injunction of the Qur'ān, "and consult with them upon the conduct of affairs; and when thou art resolved, then put thy trust in God." The political ideal of Islam is to make human beings capable of acting together in the service of God as well as of one another, and to build up institutions by consent and consultation so as to encourage right conduct and justice. "So that it (wealth) may not circulate (only) among the rich," is the key-note of the Islamic policy regarding the national wealth. Hence the distribution of wealth among all classes has been emphasized by the institution of

---

1 Qur'ān, 9:4—"Oh believers: be not unfaithful to Allah and the Apostle nor be unfaithful to your trusts, while you know."

2 Qur'ān, 25:1

3 Ibid., 23:2

4 Ibid., 2:28.

5 Ibid., 1:15

6 Ibid., 26:1.
a property tax (zakāt), restrictions on the power of testamentary disposition, laws of inheritance and the prohibition of usury.

Islam did not provide as to who would succeed the Prophet when he died. A successor to the Apostle was soon considered to be an unavoidable necessity; such a leader or chief (Imām) must be absolutely just, selfless, wise, and virtuous. After the Prophet, there sprang up Caliphate, which was based upon election; but as the empire expanded, the system was changed to a mere ceremony of bai't or submission. The circle of electors was reduced gradually from the leading men of the town to eleven, five, and even one, so much so that the sovereign could appoint his own successor. In order to reconcile the theory with practice, Māwardī tried to justify this conclusion, and the relaxation in the principle of election led to the recognition of the right of the sovereign to inherit. However, the idea of the ultimate sovereignty of the Muslim people did survive.

The first rulers were divine kings such as the Sasanians, who were regarded as 'God among men.' A full fledged Sultanate, however, began with the Khwarazmian Empire, and Maḥmūd of Ghaznah was, perhaps, the first to assume the title of Sulṭān. The non-recognition of the institution of monarchy bred curious but natural results. In the first place all distinction between the king de facto and the king de jure was lost. Secondly, as there was no place for Sultanate in the Islamic political theory, there was, consequently, no provision for the devolution of the crown. The state could not be regarded as the property of the Sulṭān. The result was the interminable wars of succession, and an appeal to arms was the only possible remedy to solve the riddle. It was customary for the Sulṭān to nominate his heir either in his lifetime or on his death-bed, but the king's

1. "And give away wealth out of love for Him to the near kin, the orphan, and the needy, the wayfarer and the beggar, captives and keep up prayer and pay Zakāt" (Qur'ān, 2 : 22).

nominee was almost always rejected. A strong hand, of course, could, with little difficulty, find his way to the throne, and the Khâns, Maliks and Amirûs perforce made their submission, while the weak successors fell a prey into the hands of the so-called electors only to be set up and pulled down with the inevitable result of losing their necks. A formal ceremony of bai‘t was, however, followed in each case.

The division of the state between Ghiyâth-u’d-dîn and his brother Shâhâb-u’d-dîn was neither sanctioned by the Islamic law nor supported by any precedent. However, it evolved a principle that the state was a private property of the ruler. Mu‘izz-u’d-dîn died without leaving any son to rule over his empire, and his Turkish slaves were the only heirs. On the other hand, the ruler of Fîrûz Kâb found himself unable to impose his sovereignty over the powerful Turkish Maliks. The death of Shîhâb-u’d-dîn left the puzzle unsolved. The sovereigns were required to form new theories or to reaffirm the time-honoured ideas regarding the institution of kingship.

The ruler was looked upon with awe and reverence, and kingship as an indispensable institution. There was a choice between monarchy and anarchy, and the people wisely chose the former. The Muslim society had undergone a great change, and it was a period of an ‘alluring materialistic civilization and not of faith.’ The Muslim law or Shari‘at came to be regarded as impracticable. With the fall of Mâdâin, and the transfer of the seat of government to Baghîdâd, Persian ideas began to flow in, and in course of time completely changed the face of Islam. The conquerors fell an easy prey to the culture of the conquered, and the old doctrine of Persian Imperialism crept in the body-politic. Persian ideas and institutions were adopted wholesale;

---

1 Quţb-u’d-dîn Aibak nominated İttutmîshh to the throne of Delhi; but the Maliks elevated Arâm Shâh. Sultan İttutmîshh made Râdîyâh his heir-apparent, but the Maliks raised Rukn-u’d-dîn Fîrûz Shâh to the throne of Delhi. Again Balban nominated Kai-Khusrû, but Kaiqubâd succeeded him at the instigation of the Maliks.
the government of the empire, the administration of the various departments, the personality of the ruler, the state ceremonials, the dress and the royal symbol were modelled upon Persian lines. These ideas spread from Baghdād to Ghaznīn and other parts of the Muslim world, and likewise made their way into the Indian plains. Of all these ideas, the most significant was the theory of the Divine Right of the Persian Kings. The virtue of divinity\(^1\) was associated with the office rather than with the person of the Sultān. "Excluding the functions of a prophet," it was repeatedly asserted that "there is no work as great and noble as the task of government."\(^2\) Kingship, a great blessing and the highest office, is the creation of God, and is received from Him alone. A king is a representative of God on earth,\(^3\) and the heart of the king reflects the glory of God. "The Creator displays his inner richness by raising at every stage a person from among the created, endows him with all the accomplishments befitting sovereigns and entrusts him with the task of government, so that the people may lead a happy and prosperous life under his just and equitable regime."\(^4\) A king must, therefore, feel the importance and significance of the glory and grandeur thus conferred upon him and must be grateful to God for this great honour.\(^5\) "He must seek God's pleasure by doing the virtuous acts, which consist in administering absolute justice to the people—a means of the strengthening of the

\(^1\) It is related about Humāyūn that on the occasion of public assembly, a curtain was hung between him and the audience; and when it was drawn, the gathering exclaimed with one voice, "Behold the illumination of the Divine Being." Abū-l Faḍl made Akbar "Insān-i-Kāmil"—perfect man.

\(^2\) Tārīḳh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī of Dīyā Barānī, p. 27.

\(^3\) جوين تو شدي سایه يزدان پاک
سایه فشنان ناش بری مسئت خاک

Amīr Khusru in his Qur'ān-u's-Str'dain, p. 205, addresses the Sultān as 'Shadow of God.'

\(^4\) Siyāsat-Nāmah, p. 6.

\(^5\) Tārīḳh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī of Dīyā Barānī, pp. 70, 71.
empire and a way for his own salvation.\textsuperscript{1}

A king must be brave, enterprising, just and benevolent. He should be true to his army, benevolent to the subjects, kind to the oppressed, courteous to the virtuous and an abstainer from the evil-doers.\textsuperscript{3} He should be neither sweet-speaking nor very harsh. To retain his kingship he must maintain his prestige. Kingly dignity disappears on account of friendship and familiarity; and the result is vice, immorality and sinning throughout his kingdom.\textsuperscript{5} Kingly glory and terror of authority contribute more than mere chastisement to the establishment of a strong and stable government. His society should be composed of the virtuous, faithful, wise and sagacious people. He should never grant audience or give posts to the humble or low-born people.\textsuperscript{4} The primary duty of a king is to maintain peace and order in his dominion and to protect and patronize the faith.\textsuperscript{6}

He must keep himself well-informed of the condition of his provinces and the doings of his governors.\textsuperscript{6} But he should be all the more particular about his personal security, and keep his guards and servants satisfied. 'My first advice to you,' said Bughra Khān to his son, 'is this: Consider Empire as dear but your own life as dearer; for, if life is in danger, what is the use of this world?\textsuperscript{7} Secondly, hesitate in killing Malik and Amīrs, but convert your enemies into friends by means of liberality, sagacity and kindness.\textsuperscript{8}

The three essentials of kingship are the army, treasury and nobles,\textsuperscript{9} the means of success are justice, beneficence,

\textsuperscript{1} Siyāsat-Nāmah, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{2} MSS. Ādab-u'-l-Ḥarb, p. 50a.
\textsuperscript{3} Tāriḥ-i-Firūz Shāhī of Diya Barani, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., p. 29.
\textsuperscript{5} دولت دنیا مسلم ترا است حانباب دنیا کوشش که ای هم ترا است
\textsuperscript{6} Qirān-u's-Sa'dain, p. 206.
\textsuperscript{7} Diya Barani, Tāriḥ-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 97, and Qirān-u's-Sa'dain, p. 205.
\textsuperscript{8} Qirān-u's-Sa'dain, p. 152.
\textsuperscript{9} با زلزل مشاهيت پرداز پایی صبحت الوه، رها کن بطاطک
\textsuperscript{10} Qirān-u's-Sa'dain, p. 208.
pomp and show. A king must have under his command ten Khâns, each Khân ten Malik, each Malik ten Âmîrs, each Âmir ten Sipah-Śalārs, each Sipah-Śalâr ten Sar-khâls (generals) and each Sar-khil ten horsemen or footmen. The assumption of a canopy of state, and to cause one’s name to be read in the Khutbâk and to be inscribed on the coinage were regarded as the insignia of royalty. The army should, in no case, be allowed to molest the subjects, and the latter must not encroach upon the rights of the former.

Such was the theory and practice during the Medieval Period. The position was not acceptable to a number of true followers of Islam such as theologians and sufis, who broke away from the monarchy and disassociated themselves with the corrupt condition of the Muslim society. The Sulṭân of Delhi was an autocrat, bound by no laws and subject to no control; the subjects had no rights but obligations. The Hindu theories of Dharma and Karma, teaching contentment and the rule of the upper classes over the lower, in a way, strengthened rather than weakened these ideals; and, as a matter of fact, the Hindu political system gave way at the first approach of the Muslim arms.

The state was based on force; the sovereign upheld his power in the face of grave dangers; all land belonged to the crown; and the imperial treasury was the personal property of the Sulṭân. Formally the ruler showed respect for religion, and employed under his service some theologians (Dastâr-bandân) as Qâdis and Shaikh-ul-Islâm. Institutions such as Bai’t, Khutbah, Waqf (endowment) and Khairât (charities) marked outward shows; mosques were built and Jihâds were waged. Yet the unfailing power of the Malik, the force of local customs and traditions, and above all the

1 Dîvān Barâni, Tarîkh-i-Firzâ Şâhâ, p. 445 — there is obviously some mistake as explained before. An army of 100,000 is possible only if Sipah-Śalâr is eliminated. Sipah-Śalâr was a high title conferred upon Âmîrs.

2 Ibid., p. 83.

3 MSS. Ādâb-u’l-Harb, p. 50b.
powerful influence of mystics and divines kept the sovereign in alarm. The ambitions of the Sulṭāns of Delhi, like the Sasanian monarchs of Persia, were to build lofty and magnificent palaces, to hold grand assemblies, to conquer the world, to accumulate vast hordes of treasure, to bestow gifts over their favourites, to carry on war to uphold their supremacy and to maintain a large establishment of attendants and ḥarem. The position of the Sulṭān was so secure that ʿAlāʾ-uʿd-dīn and Muḥammad Tughlaq contemplated founding a religion, and Akbar actually created a new faith. Acts of cruelty, tortures, and even massacres were practised by dictates of policy, extravagant and wasteful expenditure became the rule, the Shariʿat was neglected, and the will of the sovereign became the law of the state. Such was the un-Islamic nature of the Empire of Delhi.

The Emperor.

The safety of the Empire rested upon an efficient management of the central government. The working of an autocracy mainly depended upon the personality of the autocrat. The personal character of the sovereign largely contributed to the success or failure not only of the administrative system but to the stability of the empire as a whole. He ruled only so long as he succeeded; one little disaster, a chance-defeat, an unexpected disloyalty on the part of his Amīrs, and the whole fabric of the state broke down. The royal throne was no bed of roses; the iron-hand alone could maintain its hold; while the weak rulers were set up and pulled down with the inevitable result of losing their necks. Such was the case with the successors of Sulṭān Shams-uʿd-dīn ʿIltutmīsh. Sulṭān Rukn-uʿd-dīn Firuz Shāh gave himself up to debauchery and dissipation, and was ultimately assassinated by the Malikīs.¹ The next successor Sulṭān Radīyah though endowed with many laudable qualities had to meet the same lot.² Sulṭān Muʿīzz-uʿd-dīn Bahrām Shāh proved to be an unassuming,

¹ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 184.   ² Ibid., p. 185.
straightforward but blood-thirsty sovereign, for which he lost his head. Sultān 'Aā'-u'd-dīn Mas'ūd Shāh was beneficent and kind-hearted but addicted to sensuality, pleasure and chase; the consequence, however, could not be otherwise. The imperial throne was insecure. Dangers beset it on every side, and the Sultān had to live in an atmosphere of perpetual suspicion and distrust. The Assassin’s dagger, palace intrigues and the disloyalty of his officers and close relatives kept the king alarmed. The heretic leader Nūr Turk conspired against Islam in the reign of Sultān Raḍiyah.¹ The Nā‘īb-i-Mulk Malīk Ikhtiyār-u’d-dīn aspired for the throne, and was consequent-
ly put to death by Sultān Mu’izz-u’d-dīn Bahrām Shāh.² The same sovereign had to face another conspiracy of state officials, and an attempt to subdue it resulted in the making of an open revolt against the Sultān.³ The Vizier Muḥaz-
zub-u’d-dīn also entertained high ambitions by establishing the naubat and stationing an elephant at the gate of his mansion, but his designs were foredoomed to failure.⁴

The position of a strong ruler, was, nevertheless, impregnable. An autocrat of unbounded energies, born with indomitable resolution, could successfully hold in check the forces of anarchy and confusion. “The one great virtue the subjects admired in their ruler was strength; the one fault, they could never forgive him was weakness.”² The great and powerful monarchs of the ‘Early Turkish Empire’ were Quṭb-u’d-dīn Aibak, Shams-u’d-dīn ʿİltūtmış and Ghiyath-u’d-dīn Balban, each of whose reign was marked by achievements of far-reaching importance as regards the founding, consolidating and the strengthening of the Empire.

Immediately below the sovereign came his Malik and Amīrs. They usually supported the Sultān in case he was powerful, but usurped his functions when he was weak, and played the rôle of ‘king-makers.’ A noble usually started

¹ ʿTabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 190. ² Ibid., p. 193.
³ Ibid., p. 194. ⁴ Ibid., p. 198.
⁵ Professor Muḥammad Ḥabīb (The Third Oriental Conference, Madras, 1924, p. 311).
his career as a slave of the Sulțan or of any other noble, and on a graduated scale of promotion rose to the position of Amir. His life, titles and royal grants were at the mercy of the reigning monarch. The official status of a noble was determined by his shughl (office), khitab (title), Aqta (land) or Maratib (privileges at the Court). The state could not tolerate his independence; he could either remain as an ally of the Crown or else a rebel. The Turkish aristocracy helped a great deal in upholding the Turkish domination, yet when the sovereign was weak, they played off one against the other.

The Emperor\(^1\) was the fountain of all authority. The theory of the 'Divine Right of Kings' was still in the making. He was regarded as the ‘shadow of God’ on earth (Zil-Il-Lah)\(^2\) or Lord’s Deputy (Naitib-i-aizad)\(^3\) and was ascribed to possess divine qualities and an ‘inspired mind.’\(^4\) The emperor was, in actual practice, the supreme ruler of the state, the highest court of appeal, the supreme legislator, and the commander-in-chief of the royal forces. There was a wide gap between theory and practice; the Shariat was to be his guide, but actually his word was law. The Sulțan may not have been a believing Musalman, yet in his public life he had to maintain at least an outward show of respect for the fundamentals of Islam. Balban impressed upon his subjects to be a ‘pious Musalman,’ which enhanced his prestige as a ruler.

The rulers of the ‘Early Turkish Empire’ could not, as a matter of fact, depend upon a prestige of an imperial family,\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Diya Barani, Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi, p. 70. Mu’izz-u’d-din Bahram Shah was styled ‘An ally of the lord of the faithful.’

\(^2\) Tughaq Namak of Amir Khustu, p. 79.

\(^3\) Khizr Khan Diwal Rani of Amir Khustu, p. 17.

\(^4\) Amir Khustu, Khazain-u’l-Furuz, p. 186.
high birth or noble lineage. They had sprung from the people, all of them were men of humble origin, and detached from their families in their tender ages were even ignorant of their parentage. They rose to positions of power and sovereignty through sheer force of merit, strenuous efforts or through the slow gradations of office; and their sole claim to the throne lay in their power to hold it in the face of clever rivals. To strengthen their position, attempts were made to secure patents of sovereignty from the 'Abbasid Caliphs. The principle that the crown should be confined to the members of the royal family was applied to the Persian House of Sāsān, but the case was different in Medieval India. Sulṭān Īltutmīšh and Balban, however, made attempts to monopolize the imperial throne for their respective families; nevertheless, kingship remained a competitive and elective office. Ambitious and enterprising persons did aspire for the throne at the cost of their lives, if they failed to achieve their ends. And history provides numerous instances of this kind.

The people, however, regarded monarchy as a necessary and desirable institution for the solution of their social and political problems. Medieval India knew no rules of succession. It was customary for the Sulṭān to appoint his successor, but his nominee was almost always rejected by the Malikṣ and Amīrs, who chose the new sovereign by means of a direct or indirect election or by an appeal to arms. The ceremony of vowing allegiance (ba'īs) had survived from the Ummayyad Caliphs, and the people played an important part at the time of succession. They approved the candidature and paid submission to the new ruler. They even used their collective power in case of need, and when Raḍiyyah appealed to them for assistance against Sulṭān Ruka-u'd-dīn, the people responded to her call by capturing the Daulat Khānah and killing Shāh-Turkān, the Regent of the Sulṭān.¹ Again the Malikṣ, Amīrs, Sardārs,

¹ See  Ḍiyā Baraṇī,  Tārīḵ-i-Firūz Shāhī, pp. 120-123.
'Ulemā' and grandees had all acknowledged Nāṣir-u'd-dīn as their sovereign, yet the people publicly pledged their allegiance in a public assembly held at Kushk-i-Fīrūzī (the Fīrūzī castle). The foundation of Muslim kingship in India and the principle of election along with a unanimous recognition of one house to rule are perhaps the greatest heritage of the Early Turkish Empire of Delhi. However, it is certain that they failed to evolve a definite principle of succession; yet succeeded in establishing the idea that the Turk was a legitimate ruler of men and 'sovereignty was his monopoly.'

Administrative duties of the Emperor.

The Emperor was the centre of all authority; in him resided the supreme powers of the state, and consequently his administrative duties were multifarious. He was the supreme legislator, the highest court of appeal and the leader of his forces. It was physically impossible for the Sultān to look after the business of government all by himself, and the burden of the state could only be lessened by delegating to his subordinate officers such powers as might conveniently be exercised by them on his behalf. The Sultān, however, kept a vigilant watch over the affairs of the state, so much so that no important work could be done without his approval or knowledge. Out of necessity, he established an efficient system of spies to equip himself with all the information regarding the behaviour of his subjects, governors, Maliks, Amirs and officials. It is interesting to recall how a slave of the Sultān served under every Amir to watch his activities and to inform his master accordingly. "Curious as it may seem, the fact is, nevertheless true, that medieval governments interfered more with the life of the people, than any government is likely to do today."

1 Ṭabaqāt Nāṣirī, p. 208.
2 Ibn Baṭṭūṭah (Urdu Translation, Muḥammad Ḥusain), pp. 179 and 241.
3 Professor Muḥammad Ḥabīb, (The Third Oriental Conference, Madras, 1924, p. 312).
The Sultân was expected to be munificent, liberal and enterprising, well-versed in horsemanship and archery; and also noted for his commanding presence and manly bearing. He was further supposed to be the patron of letters and a benefactor of his subjects. He conferred upon his Maliks and officials titles such as Fâkhr-u’l-Mulk, Sharf-u’l-Mulk, and Qaân-u’l-Mulk.¹ The highest title was Khân. Next came the titles of Malik, and lastly Amîr. Below them were the military ranks of Sipah-Sâlîr and Sar-Khîl. The poets recited Qasîdahs in his praise² and received handsome rewards; and foreign travellers expected a hearty reception at his court. The Sultân gave all possible assistance to the people in times of famine.

A strong and efficient Sultân was certainly an absolute despot. But the reigns of weak successors were marked by the rivalry of opposing Maliks, who desperately quarrelled for power and predominance, and held a regime of blood and terror. The annals of Early Medieval India are discoloured by a state of constant contention and strife between the Turks and non-Turks. The pre-eminence of Yâqût, a non-Turk, aroused jealousy on the part of other Maliks in the reign of Sultân Ra’diya. Again her own Turkish Maliks rose in open revolt in her invasion against Altîniah.³

The Imperial Council (Majlis-i-Khâş).

A strong family likeness marks the administrative organization of all the autocratic states. The central government of India in those days was modelled on the lines of the 'monarchies of Persia,'⁴ which were, in their turn, deeply influenced by the Roman conceptions of government and law. Many resemblances are, therefore, noticed between the governments of the Roman emperors and Sultâns of Delhi.

¹ 'Qaân'—a title of the Emperor of China—vide Târikh-i-Firûz Shâhî of Diya Baranî, p. 66.
² See Tabaqât-i-Ahbarî, p. 64; Fîrîghât, p. 67, and Baddî’ûnî, p. 69.
³ Tabaqât-i-Nâşirî, p. 188.
The Sultan was the final executive authority for all state-affairs. Yet, in obedience to the time-honoured custom, he summoned a council of the highest officers and allies (Majlis-i-Khāṣ) to discuss the more important problems such as executive, legislative and financial. The Council had no constitutional or legal powers, but was merely a consultative body and its meetings were held in secret. Nobody could attend it as a matter of right, the Emperor summoned whomever he liked. Nevertheless, it was a thing of reality, and indirectly held in check the great powers of the autocrat. The Sultan was bound to act according to its unanimous verdict on a certain question, and its joint advice went a great way in moulding the policy of the Emperor. A monarch, who kept matters confidentially, was naturally looked upon with an eye of suspicion.

Side by side, there was another Council called Majlis-i-Khilwat (Privy Council) to which only the most trusted officials and servants were invited. The four ministers generally attended and informed the Sultan about the affairs of their respective departments. The Sultan took a keen interest in such matters as affected the welfare of the subjects and prosperity of the empire.

The Sultan frequently held Majlis-i-'Aish (Convivial Assembly), to which persons of his taste were alone invited. The class of courtiers or Nadims consisted of refined and cultivated persons. Their principal occupation was to

---

1. Wazir Sāhib Tadbīr-Molk Rā'īn Zan Rā'īn Zan Rā'īn Hażrā.


3. "پرِش کار از همه کس کن و لیکی" Zan Humān Kohna Sowāistān Wīkā.

Amīr Khusru's Nihā Sipāhr, p. 165.

4. It is different from the Majlis-i-Khāṣ as described above. Journal of Indian History, Madras, April 1935, p. 97, confuses the Majlis-i-Khilwat with Majlis-i-Khāṣ.

entertain the Sulṭān in his leisure hours and to add to his pleasure and sport. As a rule, they did not hold any official position within the state. Here the Sulṭān indulged in luxury and amusements, and witnessed games such as elephant-fight, flying and wrestling matches. Such royal festivities were arranged and supervised by the Bārbak (Master of Ceremonies) or Amir-i-Majlis\(^1\) (Lord of Assembly). The minor officers and servants attached to the assembly were as follows:

\textit{Khaṣah-dār}\(^3\) (personal attendant); \textit{Saqī-i-Khaṣ}\(^3\) (personal cup-bearer); \textit{Tasht-dār}\(^4\) (keeper of royal basin); \textit{Sharāb-dār}\(^5\) (keeper of drinkables); \textit{Jāmah-dār}\(^6\) (keeper of the royal robe); \textit{Dawāt-dār}\(^7\) (keeper of writing case); \textit{Chāshnīgīr}\(^8\) (Controller of the royal kitchen); \textit{Naʿib-i-Chāshnīgīr}\(^8\) (Assistant controller); \textit{Shuʿlahdār}\(^10\) (keeper of the torch: he supervised the lighting arrangement of the Palace); \textit{Yūzān}\(^11\) (keeper of the hunting leopards); \textit{Bāzād}\(^11\) (Falconer); \textit{Sarp-i-Chatr-dār}\(^12\) (Head of the state canopy-bearers); \textit{Bahlah-dār}\(^14\) (bearer of the royal purse); \textit{Mehtar-i-Farrāsh}\(^15\) (chief of carpet spreaders); \textit{Mussāllidār} (keeper of the royal carpet for saying prayers) and \textit{Muhir-dār}\(^16\) (keeper of the royal seal: he fixed seals upon food and drink).

\textit{The Imperial Court (Majlis-i-Ām or Bār-i-Ām)}.

The custom of holding courts or \textit{durbārs} is very ancient among the royal traditions of Persia, and it came to be established with the advent of Muslim rule in India. \textit{Majlis-i-Ām}\(^17\) was radically different from the Imperial Council. It

\(^1\) Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 238, 239.  
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 282.  
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 254.  
\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 256, 257.  
\(^5\) Ibid., p. 242.  
\(^6\) Ibid.  
\(^7\) Ibid.  
\(^8\) Ibid., pp. 250, 251.  
\(^9\) Ibid., p. 266.  
\(^10\) Ibid., p. 261.  
\(^11\) Ibid., pp. 248, 249  
\(^12\) Ibid., p. 251.  
\(^13\) Ibid., pp. 254, 255.  
\(^14\) Ibn-Bāṭātah (Urdu translation by Muḥammad Ḥusain, p. 163).  
\(^15\) Diyāʾ Barani, Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 30.
was a public Court and not a consultative or private assembly. It was the highest administrative organ, where the Sultan transacted all the business of the state. The Emperor sat upon the throne with an air of dignity and authority *Chatr* (royal parasol) and *Därbāš*¹ (royal baton) were regarded as symbols of royal power. Red and black canopies were together regarded² as an insignia of royalty and ‘elephants’ and *naubat*³ (beating of drums)⁴ were the exclusive privileges of the Emperor. The name of the sovereign was read in the *Khutbah* and inscribed on the coinage. Green or Red canopies and robes of honour⁵ were bestowed upon the *Maliks* and *Amirs* as a token of personal distinction. When Firūz Shāh returned after the

¹ The Indian *därbāš*, like its Persian predecessor, was a wooden staff branching at the top and plated with gold. It was used to keep people at a distance.

² Sultan Naṣir-ud-dīn had two canopies—one black and the other red. See Tabaqat-i-Naṣirī, p. 318. The standards of Ilutmīsh were black and red. Tabaqat-i-Naṣirī, p. 179. ‘Ala-ud-dīn also had a black canopy.

³ ‘Naubat’ does not mean ‘music’ (see Journal of Indian History, April 1935, p. 99).

⁴ Rukn-ud-dīn Firūz Shāh was granted the fief of Badā’īn along with a green canopy. Malik Tughrul-i-Tughān Khān was dignified with a canopy of state and a standard in the reign of Sultan Raḍīyāh. See Tabaqat-i-Naṣirī, pp. 182 and 243. Sultan ‘Ala-ud-dīn Mas’ud Shāh despatched a red canopy and a robe of honour to Malik Tughrul-i-Tughān Khān. See Tabaqat-i-Naṣirī, p. 199.
capture of Lakhnawti, Khān-i-Jahān Maqbūl welcomed him with numerous flags (abraq), which practice did not exist in the previous reigns.

The Sulṭān sat upon the throne on a high-raised platform. Behind him stood a body-guard of slaves with drawn swords, police-officer, head-executioner, royal purse-bearer, commander of forces, sergeants, head-swordsmen, wrestlers, and lastly horses and elephants glorifying the right and left wings of the army.¹ In front of the throne stood the Amīr-i-Ḥājib (Lord Chamberlain), who maintained law and order in the court. The Amīr-i-Ḥājib was assisted by Naʿib-i-Amīr-i-Ḥājib² (Deputy to Lord Chamberlain) and an army³ of Chamberlains called Ḥuṣjāb, Malik-u'll-Ḥuṣjāb or Amīr-u'll-Ḥuṣjāb (Head of the Chamberlains),⁴ Ḥājib-u'll-Ḥuṣjāb (Chief of the Chamberlains), and Ulugh-i-Khāṣ-i-Ḥājib (the Chief Royal Chamberlain).⁵ Sulṭān Muḥammad Tughlaq held a special court twice a week to decide cases. On these occasions only four servants were present—Amīr-i-Ḥājib, Khāṣ-Ḥājib, Syed-u'll-Ḥuṣjāb and Sharf-u'll-Ḥuṣjāb—who were stationed at different gates to take down the complaints of the people.

The ceremonies of the court were ‘humiliating and servile.’ Sijdah (prostration) and Nadḥar (an offer to the Sulṭān) were regarded as essentials of etiquette. Nithār was, however, a different ceremony; it consisted in taking platefuls of gold or silver coins or other precious jewels, and after being passed over the head of the sovereign a number

¹ Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī of Ḍiyā Baranī, p. 30.
² Malik Tāj-u'd-dīn Sanjar-i-Tez Khān was Amīr-i-Ḥājib in the reign of Sulṭān Ṣāfīr-u'd-dīn. See Tabaqāt-i-Ṣāfīrī, p. 260.
³ صفهراه حاجیان کے ایک مزاحم کشیدہ اند
⁴ صفهراه حاجیان کے ایک مزاحم کشیدہ اند
⁵ Qaṣā'īd of Badr-i-Chāch, p. 52.
⁶ Aḥṣ-u'd-dīn Ayāz Guzānī was appointed Malik-u'll-Ḥuṣjāb or Amīr-u'll-Ḥuṣjāb. See Tabaqāt-i-Ṣāfīrī, p. 293.
⁷ Tabaqāt-i-Ṣāfīrī, p. 302.
of times, was scattered over the indigent and needy crowds. Access to the Sulṭān was generally granted and every one was allowed to lay his application in person before the Sulṭān through the Amīr-i-Hājib or Ḥājib-i-Khāṣ, one of the greatest administrative officers. When officers and fief-holders came to pay their homage to the Sulṭān, they brought with them beautiful slaves, dressed and ornamented in the most splendid style, priceless horses, fine elephants, valuable garments, vessels of gold and silver, arms, camels and mules. Foreign travellers when seeking an interview with the Sulṭān offered presents, and generally received three-fold from the court. A special officer (Shaḥnah-i-Bārgāh) was appointed to see that provisions of behaviour and forms of presentation were scrupulously observed. The programme of the day was drawn up beforehand, yet the sittings of the court were long and tiresome. The Sulṭān sat as a chief judge, decided cases and reviewed appeals from the Qāḍī's Court. He further received envoys, granted interviews to governors, Raes, Ranas, princes, Muqaddams (head village-men) and other officials, and transacted other business of the state. Amīr-i-Hājib read out the application to the Sulṭān for his verdict, and then the Muḥr-dār (keeper of the Royal Seal) fixed the seal on the royal orders. The applications were ultimately handed over to the different Dabīrs (Secretaries) such as Dabīr-i-Khāṣ (general secretary) for their final disposal. In criminal cases, the judgment was enforced there and then by a number of Jallāds (executioners). Provincial administration was; however, separately dealt by the various ministries.

1 Tārīḵ-i-Fīrūz Shāhī of Ḍiyā Baranī, p. 202
2 Tārīḵ-i-Fīrūz Shāhī of ʿAffī, p. 268.
3 Ibn-BoṭṬāf (Urdu translation by Muḥammad Ḥussain, p. 4).
4 Tārīḵ-i-Fīrūz Shāhī of Ḍiyā Baranī, p. 31.
5 Tārīḵ-i-Fīrūz Shāhī of ʿAffī, p. 224.
The Regent.

An extraordinary office of Nā'ib-u'l-Muilki or Malik Nā'īb (Regent) was created on special occasions either on account of the minority of the monarch or his weakness. The Regent stood in the Sultān’s place, and carried on the government on behalf of the Sultān. When Sultān Muḥammad invaded Thatta, Malik Kabīr acted as his Nā'ib. He summoned Malik Mujir, a feudatory, who came but paid no homage to the Nā'ib. Malik Kabīr got angry and said, “I am in command of affairs for Sultān Muḥammad, and am empowered to issue orders in the royal absence.” The Nā'ib was sometimes ordered to lead expeditions. Sultān 'Alā-u'd-dīn's Nā'īb acted as commander-in-chief of the imperial forces. He was, in fact, above the ministers, and his position was greater than that of any other servant of the crown. Being a representative of the Sultān, he stood for his royalty; while the highest civil officer was the Vizier. Several Nā'ībs were appointed in different provinces. The office of Regent, however, proved a great menace to the personal security of its holder as well as to the integrity of the empire. The high position of the Nā'ib, on the one hand, provoked bitter enmity on the part of other officers, while, on the other hand, it incited the Regent to aspire for the throne.

The Regent always struggled for political supremacy, and his mismanagement and cruel administration was often
responsible for the spread of a general revolt in the empire. Shāh-Turkān, the mother of Sulṭān Rukn-u'd-dīn acted as his Regent, and assumed the charge of government. She was, however, put to death for her acts of barbarity. The Maliks elected Mu'izz-u'd-dīn Bahārām Shāh on the condition that Malik Ikhṭiyār-u'd-dīn Aitkin would act as his Regent. He assumed triple naubat, and stationed an elephant before his gate—a set of special privileges, which the sovereign alone could enjoy in those days—for which he lost his neck. Quṭb-u'd-dīn, son of 'Alī Ghūrī was appointed Nā'b-i-Mulk to Sulṭān 'Alā-u'd-dīn Mas'ud Shāh. Again Sulṭān Nāṣir-u'd-dīn found himself unequal to the task of government; he, therefore, made Balban his Nā'īb. Malik Niẓām-u'd-dīn was the Regent of Sulṭān Mu'izz-u'd-dīn Kaiqubād, and he aspired for the throne at the cost of his neck. Shams-u'd-dīn Kaikā'ūs had Shāista Khān as his Nā'īb. It is obvious from the above that only weak rulers had Regents to carry on the government, while the strong sovereigns like Quṭb-u'd-dīn Īltutmish, Raḍiyya and Balban kept no such office under their charge. A strong monarch like 'Alā-u'd-dīn employed his Nā'īb as the commander of his forces.

---

1 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 182.  
2 Ibid, p. 192.  
3 Ibid., p. 198.  
4 Ibid., p. 294.  
5 Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī of Diya Barani, p. 131.  
6 Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 166.
CHAPTER X

CENTRAL ORGANIZATION OF THE EMPIRE OF DELHI (1206—1290) II

The four Ministries.

In accordance with a well established principle as borrowed from Persia, the Sultān was assisted in his executive work by a cabinet of four ministers. There were five principal departments under Maḥmūd of Ghaznah—Diwān-i-Wizārat (Finance Department); Diwān-i-‘Arḍ (Military); Diwān-i-Risālat (Correspondence); Diwān-i-Vikālat or Waklālat (Household Department)\(^1\) and Diwān-i-Shughlā-i-Ishrāf-i-Mamlūkāt (Secret Service Department). The central government of India was divided into several departments, the heads of four of which enjoyed the status of ministers. Under the direct supervision of the Emperor, the business of the state was carried on by the four traditional ministries—Diwān-i-Wizārat (Revenue or Finance); Diwān-i-‘Arḍ (Military); Diwān-i-Inshā\(^2\) (Local Government) and Diwān-i-Risālat\(^3\) (Ministry of Appeals). Būghrā Khān, while advising his son said, "Do not fail to form a cabinet of four ministers, 'the pillars of the state,' and discuss all the confidential secrets of the state in the presence of all the four. Though the rank of the Vizier is higher, but you should not allow any of them to predominate over the other." Each ministry was under the charge

---

\(^1\) 'Maḥmūd of Ghaznah' by Dr. Nāṣim, p. 130.

\(^2\) Not the 'Department of Correspondence' as in the Journal of Indian History, Madras, April 1935, p. 101.

\(^3\) Not 'Diwān-i-Riyāsat,' which does not seem to possess a high status and as such should not be reckoned among the four ministries—see 'Third Oriental Conference, Madras,' 1924, p. 313. Even in the reign of Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Khālji, Diwān-i-Riyāsat (Ministry of Markets) is not mentioned among the four ministries. See Barānī, pp. 153, 337 and 374.
of a minister (Şahib-i-Diwân)\(^1\) or a deputy minister (Nā'ib-i-Diwân)\(^2\) or both. The powers and functions of these ministers widely differed at different times. The procedure of work also changed, and, along with it, their duties were also transferred from one to another. However, much depended upon the personality of the Emperor and the character of ministers. A confidant of the Sultān like Niẓām-u'd-dīn the dādbak could easily be entrusted with the powers of a Regent, while an active and powerful sovereign like Balban regarded the ministers as mere executive officers to carry out his orders.

**Dīwān-i-Wizārat (Ministry of Revenue).**

The ‘Abbasid Vizier was the Prime Minister and received the title of al-Ṣadr-u'll-A'ẓam or al-Vizier-u'll-A'ẓam.\(^3\) The Vizier of Delhi was not the chief minister and was styled as Muayyid-u'll-Mulk (Helper of Realm); ‘Āin-u'll-Mulk\(^4\) (the eye of the state); Niẓām-u'll-Mulk\(^5\) (administrator of the realm); Fakhr-u'll-Mulk (pride of the land); Ṣadr-u'll-Mulk (chief of the kingdom); Diyā-u'll-Mulk, (light of the empire); Wāzir-i-Mulk\(^6\) (Vizier of the kingdom); Qawām-u'll-Mulk;\(^7\) Khwājah Jahān;\(^8\) Tāj-u'll-Mulk\(^9\) and Khān-i-Jahān.\(^10\)

---

\(^1\) Seirat-i-Firūz Shāhī, Bānkipore MSS., p. 72.

\(^2\) It is incorrect to say that a ministry was under the minister (Dīwān or Nā'ib-i-Diwān) and that there was no deputy minister. Sultān Ghiyāth-u'd-dīn Tughlaq appointed Bahā-u'd-dīn as ‘Ārīd and Malik Taj-u'd-dīn as Nā'ib-i-Ārīd. See Barani’s Ṭarīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 423. Again, when Khusru Khān was the vizier of Mughal Khālji, Fadl-ullāh and Mughith-u'd-dīn acted as his Nā'ib-i-Viziers. (Barani, Ṭarīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 379). In some reigns such as that of ‘Alī-u'd-dīn, the ministries were entrusted with the charge of Nā'ib-i-Waṣīl-i-dar, Dabr-i-Mumālīk, Nā'ib-i-Vizier, and Nā'ib-i-Ārīd. The old system was, however, revived by Firūz Shāh. See Barani, p. 237. It may be concluded that ministries were either under the charge of Dīwān (Şahib) or Nā'ib-i-Diwān, and sometimes both.


\(^4\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, pp. 135, 173. \(^5\) Firīṣṭah, p. 67.

\(^6\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, p. 183. \(^7\) ‘Aṣif, Ṭarīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 395.

\(^8\) Ṭarīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 142. \(^9\) Ibid., p. 147.

\(^10\) The title of Khān-i-Jahān was, for the first time, bestowed upon the Vizier—MSS. Seirat-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 17.
The Vizier or Dastūr was the minister of revenue, and enjoyed precedence over his colleagues, but the latter were not his subordinates in any way. The principle of joint responsibility did not exist in those days, and each minister was directly responsible to the Sultān. The Ministers were not his courtiers; they were the officers of the state, and as such their personal relation with the emperor was not very intimate.

'The Vizier occupied the highest office that a man of letters (Ahl-i-Qalam) could hold,' and held the supreme status that a civilian could enjoy. The Vizier Khān-i-Jahān Maqbūl of Sultān Fīrūz Tughlaq was illiterate, while Qutlugh Khān. Vizier of Sultān Ḥusain, was the most learned man of the time. The Vizier was the chief adviser of the Sultān, who often held secret consultations with him. The Ādāb-u'l-Ḥarb of Fakhr-u'd-din Mubārak Shāh regards the Vizier as an ideal man well-versed in the art of government and notes a number of qualifications befitting a Vizier. Accordingly he must be 'learned, experienced, God-fearing, bold, social, prudent, and well read in Shari'at.' According to Nizām-u'l-Mulk Ṭūsī, the Vizier should in addition be 'the protector of subjects and strong-handed.' So long as the Vizier was able to crush rebellions of a serious nature, his position was impregnable.

The Vizier was the head of the Revenue Department. He collected revenue, checked the accounts of provincial

---

1 Khazā'īn-u'l-Futūh of Amir Khusru, p. 84.
2 وزیر درم بادیشانع است و کار او دشوار تر بود
Zafar Nāmah, edited by Ch-Schefer—Paris 1883.
3 MSS. Ādāb-u'l-Ḥarb, 60b. Asiatic Society of Bengal Manuscript.
وزارت را قلم برکارش أسود وزیر چون حسن شد پیشی مبخوم
Tughlaq Nāmah, p. 18.
4 'Affīf, Tārīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 395.
5 Ṣabaqūt-i-Akbarī, p. 157.
6 MSS. Ādāb-u'l-Ḥarb, p. 60b. Asiatic Society of Bengal Manuscript, pp. 55, a, b ; 56b ; 57a.
7 Siyāsat Nāmah, p. 21.
governors and realized balances. The accounts of all the departments were audited by the Ministry, and the Vizier himself examined all the schedules of receipts and disbursements every day. He exercised a considerable jurisdiction over the Military Department. The early Muslim rulers made no distinction between the civil and military duties, and the Viziers of ʻIlutmish and ʻAlā-u’d-dīn conducted military campaigns as well. The Vizier of Muḥammad Shāh acted as Nā‘īb during the Sulṭān’s absence from the capital. When the Sulṭān is weak, the Vizier must necessarily be strong, otherwise the affairs of the state are bound to fall into disaster. The fall of the Vizier meant the domination of military leaders. However, in the struggle for supremacy between the king and the Vizier, public opinion generally supported the former. The weakness of the Vizier, on the other hand, resulted in the predominance of the military leaders, which exactly is the case during the latter part of the Early Turkish Rule. Ulugh Khān and his brother were the actual rulers, the Sulṭān and the Vizier simply reigned.

The Vizier paid the army and all the other servants of the state, and granted allowances to holy persons, widows and orphans. The mint, the building department, the horse, camel and stables, intelligence and post departments, agriculture, charitable institutions, and Kārkhānahs (factories) were all under the charge of the Vizier. The Nā‘īb-i-Vizier-i-Mumālik (the Deputy Vizier) did not enjoy a high status, and, unlike the Vizier, was not allowed to sit in the Sulṭān’s court.

The Vizier was assisted by a number of high officials—Muṣṭrif-i-Mumālik (Accountant-general of income),

1 ʻAffī, Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 339.
2 Ibid., p. 397. 3 Barānī, Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 252.
4 Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p. 152.
5 MSS. Ādāb-u’l-Ḥarb, p. 56a.
6 ʻAffī, Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, pp. 346, 347.
7 Ibid., p. 333. 8 MSS. Ādāb-u’l-Ḥarb, p. 56a.
8 Ibid., p. 55b. 9 Ibid., p. 56b.
10 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī, pp. 183, 193.
Mustaufi\(^1\) (Auditor-general of expenditure)\(^2\) and Majmū'ahdār\(^3\) (who kept the record of balances). The controversy that arose between Khān-i-Jahān Vizier and 'Ain-u'l-Mulk Mushrif-i-Mumālik at the time of Sultan Firūz Tughlaq explains the duties of the three great officers. The Vizier contended that the Mushrif had nothing to do with the detailed account of expenditure, for he was an examiner of items of income, and the duty of the Mustaufi was to check the details of expenditure. 'Ain-u'l-Mulk differed from this view, and referred the matter to Sultan Firūz, who finally decided the matter thus, "a detailed account of income and total expenditure was to be given to the Diwān-i-Ashrāf, and a detailed account of expenditure plus total income to the Diwān-i-Istīfa, and a detailed account of both the income and expenditure to the Diwān-i-Wizārat."\(^4\) Thus, the three branches of accounts, i.e., income (Jama'), expenditure (Kharg) and balance (Bāqī), were under the charge of three responsible officers. The Treasurer was called the Khāzin.\(^5\) Apart from these officers there was an army of clerks and minor officials attached to the Department. The Vizier occupied the ministerial chair, the Nātb-i-Vizier sat on his left; below him sat the Mushrif-i-Mumālik (Accountant-general of income), who checked the income of the empire, examined the records, and saw that the public money was not misappropriated. The Mushrif also drew decrees appointing the heir-apparent.\(^6\) Next came the Barid-i-Mumālik (Commissioner of Inte-

\(^1\) Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 192. 'Affī, Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 308.

\(^2\) وظيفه مستوفي چيست تادر خروجيهائي مملکت...

\(^3\) احتياط كند با قسم جمع و باق كار ندارد.

\(^4\) 'Affī, Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 458.

\(^5\) Ibid., p. 92.

\(^6\) Ibid., p. 409.

\(^7\) Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 248. Hindū Khān, the Treasurer.

\(^8\) هندو خان مبارک الخاکان السلطانی.
gence), Mustaufi (incharge of expenditure), and Wuqûf (who verified items of expenditure) and Nâ‘ib-i-Wuqûf. The Mushrif-i-Mumâlik was assisted in his work by the Nâ‘ib-i-Mushrif (Deputy to the Accountant-general), the Nâ‘zir or the examiner of receipts and the Nâ‘ib-i-Nâ‘zir.

In addition to his duties as the Emperor’s chief adviser, the Vizier, as related above, supervised the working of the Diwan-i-Wizârat (Revenue Department). The Vizier of Muhammad Tughlaq was assisted by four Deputies called Shak, who received from 20,000 to 40,000 tankahs per annum; four Dabirs (secretaries), each of whom received the revenue of a large town; and each Dabir had under him 300 clerks, the lowest salary of a clerk being 10,000 tankahs. The Vizier was the head of the Department, and could recommend to the king for appointment or dismissal of any officer. The Sultan’s orders were sent to the Vizier for execution, and Qâdî-i-Shahr and Khâtib accordingly inflicted punishments upon the criminals. ‘Oriental Empires,’ Sir Henry Maine rightly observes, ‘were tax-paying institutions.’ Yet the task was most delicate and most baffling. Everything depended upon an efficient working of the Diwan; good government, stability of the Empire, peace and tranquillity could only be possible in case the treasury was full. It was the duty of the Vizier to provide money for the expenses of the administration; he, therefore, had to keep a vigilant watch over the local governors and their accounts. The land-tax was the principal source of revenue. Land revenue assessed from the Khâlsah Iqtâ‘, and other classes of lands, Khiraj from subordinate Hindu chiefs, Khams or one-fifth of the war booty, and other revenue derived from Zakât and abvâb were the chief sources of revenue.

1 Afift, Tarikh-i-Firuz Shâhi, p. 419.
2 Ibid., p. 320

"ناظر فرجوع نظره كنّه - وقف في خرجهالى مملكت وافقت قرود"

4 Afift, Tarikh-i-Firuz Shâhi, p. 414.
5 Ibn Bâfûmah (Urdu translation by Muhammad Husain, p. 166).
Quṭb-u'd-dīn abolished all taxes except those of the Șharî'at, which meant one-tenth or one-fifth,¹ i.e., the tithe land and the Șadaqah. However, the system prevailing in the country and most akin to the Muslim Law must have been adopted. İıtutmış made no changes, and Balban, too, could affect no change in the Iqṭā' system. The ‘Early Turkish Empire’ was too weak to establish anything like a regular and systematic organization for the assessment of revenue. The achievements in financial matters were practically nil, and the Early Turkish rulers followed the Muslim theories of finance and the policy of the Ghaznavids. Under the Ghaznavids, the Șâhib-i-Diwân (or provincial revenue minister), the ‘Āmīl or a collector, and the Raīs were all appointed by the Sulṭān. The provincial officers were bound to deposit the revenue into the royal treasury, and in case of delay an agent or Rasūl was appointed by the central government to exact payment. It all depended upon the strength of the central government. With the establishment of an independent Muslim State in India, the state of affairs naturally changed. Sulṭān Muʿizz-u'd-dīn entrusted the charge of different territories to his slaves, while his successors distributed tracts of land (Iqṭā's) to their own trustworthy and loyal officials known as muqṭā's. But the system had no permanent basis, nor the muqṭā's possessed hereditary rights of succession. The Iqṭā' holder collected the revenue and deducted from it the amount granted to him; and the balance went to the central government. Besides the Iqṭā', there existed other grants known as Khālīsah or Mumlakat, which were the property of the state, and were probably managed through the agency of 'Āmils. Another class of land was that which was entirely left into the hands of the original owners on condition of payment of revenue. The revenue officers, perforce, entered into contracts with the Rajas, Rawats,² Chaudhries and

¹ Tārīkh-i-Fakhr-u'd-dīn Mubārak Şāh edited by Sir Denison Ross, pp. 33, 34.
² Miftāḥ-u'l-Futūḥ, p. 59.
Muqaddams\(^1\) or any other pre-existing authority, who were permitted to collect the land-tax on behalf of the state on submitting a deed called the *Khūṭ* to the local officers. Free lands, *Milk* or *In'am* also existed. The plan proved an utter failure. Although the intermediate officers were paid due allowances, yet they kept armed retainers and considered themselves to be absolute masters of the soil. Thus 'non-payment of tax became a general rule.'\(^*\) However, it goes to the credit of Sultan 'Alā-u'd-din Khalji to reorganize the affairs of revenue assessment.

**Diwān-i-'Ārid-i-Mumālik** (the Ministry of War).

The *Ṣāḥib-i-Diwān-i-'Ārid-i-Mumālik*\(^2\) (the minister of war) styled as *'Imād-u'l-Mulk*\(^3\) (the pillar of the state) was the head of the Military Department. Sultan Raḍiyyah had bestowed the title of *Kutluğ Khān* upon Malik Saiif-u'd-din, the minister of war.\(^4\) In Balban's time, the 'Ārid was known as *Rawat-i-'Ārid.*\(^5\) There was another important officer called *Sahm-u'l-Hasham* (Marshal of the Retinue)\(^6\) to assist the Minister in the management of the Department. The 'Ārid had nothing to do with the direction of war-operation and policy, which were exclusively dealt with by the Sultan himself. In some reigns, however, the 'Ārid was called upon to lead expeditions.\(^7\) There was no commander-in-chief in those days, for such an office would have been too dangerous for the monarchy. As a matter of practice, the com-

\(^1\) *Khāzā'in-u'l-Futūḥ* of Amir Khosru, p. 88.

\(^2\) *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī* p. 224; *Khāzā'in-u'l-Futūḥ*, p. 127.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 317, and *Seirat-i-Firuz Šāhi* (MSS.), p. 72.


\(^5\) *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, p. 187.


\(^7\) *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, p. 276.

\(^*\) *Khazā'in-u'l-Futūḥ*, p. 50; MSS. *Miftāh-u'l-Futūḥ*, p. 56; and MSS. Nūḥ Sipīhr, p. 58.
mander ‘Sar-i-Lashkar’\(^1\) of every campaign was appointed for the occasion, and the governors of different provinces were ordered to despatch their troops to join the imperial forces at the appointed places.\(^3\) The Sultan personally led all military operations, or else he directed them from the capital; but the commander (Sar-i-Lashkar) alone conducted all negotiations with the enemy. It is, however, noteworthy that Malik Husain Al-Ghūrī, the Minister of war, was appointed to relieve the garrison of Ranthambhore in the reign of Sultan Raḍiyah,\(^3\) while Sultan Balban had appointed Malik Bārbak Bektars-i-Sultanī (the Sultan’s A.D.C.) at the head of a small contingent of horsemen to march in advance in search of Tughrul.\(^4\)

The ‘Arid was a distinguished officer of the state, and was responsible for the administration of the army. He was the most influential member of the war-council, which advised the commander in matters of military operations.\(^5\) What was expected from him was a general organizing capacity and a fair knowledge of military affairs. He held reviews\(^6\) once a year, recruited men for the army,\(^7\) and examined soldiers, horses and arms. The highest qualifications for a soldier were to possess a good physique,\(^8\) to be a good archer and an excellent rider. An efficient horseman had two horses, the price of whom along with that of arms was paid by the government. Those who fled from the

---

\(^1\) Diyā Barānī, Tarikh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 231.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 489.
\(^3\) Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 187.
\(^4\) Diyā Barānī, Tarikh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 88.
\(^5\) Khazā’īn-u’l-Furūḥ, pp. 118-120.
\(^6\) Ibid., p. 120.
\(^7\) Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 146. Barānī, Tarikh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 326.

---

"خواجہ حاجی نامہ محمد مسالمی را برائے کار فرمائے حشمت و گرددو اور دن اموال و پیلات و غنائم...روان کردند".

\(^8\) It is interesting to note how Bakhtyar Khalji, the conqueror of eastern Bengal, was refused military employment for the simple reason that his personality was not striking and imposing. Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri, p. 146.
field were killed by the Sulṭān’s order. The ‘Ārid formally did not enjoy the power of dismissing or promoting his subordinate officers; but, in fact, he made recommendations to the Sulṭān. Balban had, however, expressly conferred all powers upon his ‘Ārid. The whole army, whether stationed at the capital or in the provinces, was under the direct control of the central government, and was paid in cash; revenues and lands were rarely assigned for military services till the reign of Sulṭān Fitrūz Shāh. In times of war, the ‘Ārid had to fulfil some extra duties, i.e., the organization of the commissariat and the collection of spoils. The šarı’at had allotted four-fifths of the spoils to the army and one-fifth to the state, but the rule was intentionally broken, for the army received regular salaries. The Ministry, as a rule, fixed the price of food-stuff and other necessaries, and the Mahājans and Sāhukārs were directed to provide all requisites on the line of the army’s march.

Medieval India was not feudal as it is generally believed. The blunder arises from a misconception of the word ‘feudalism’ and an ignorance of the true character of the government under the ‘Early Turkish Empire.’ Pastoral tribes, when they settle down, normally organize themselves on a feudal plan. The great leader of the horde becomes their king; the chiefs become his feudatories and the heads of the families become landlords, from whom the tenant or the farmer gets the land. A distinguished feature of such a society is its divided allegiance; there is a gulf of separation between the ruler and the tiller of the soil, connected, of course, through a series of intermediate officers. Military service becomes an incident of land tenure. All offices are hereditary, and every one is succeeded by the eldest

1 Ibn Batṭūṭah. (Urdū translation by Muḥammad Ḥusain), p. 145.
2 Ḍiyā Barānî, Tārīkh-i-Fitrūz Shāhī, p. 115.
3 ‘Aṣīf, Tārīkh-i-Fitrūz Shāhī, p. 300.
4 Ibid., p. 298.
5 Ḍiyā Barānî, Tārīkh-i-Fitrūz Shāhī, p. 89.
6 See Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 45, which describes the organization of central government as feudal.
son. Thus 'status, not contract, is the basis of society.' But the Empire of Delhi was a territorial state of modern type; the sovereign was supreme over all causes—military, administrative and judicial. All land was the property of the state. The country was divided into provinces, capitals and cities, the governors of which were known as Ḥābīm, Amīr-u’l-Umarā and Amīr, respectively. The rural areas were entrusted to the charge of Muslim officers, who worked under the 'Āmils.¹ The governors were not feudatories, but servants of the crown, appointed and dismissed at its pleasure, and their offices, too, were never hereditary. Sulṭān Fīrūz Tughlaq, for the first time, ordered that when a servant grew old, he was to be succeeded by his son, son-in-law and slave in the order of preference.² In 1247 A.D., Sulṭān Nāṣir-u’d-dīn, on the advice of Ulugh Khān, dismissed the Jāgīr-dārs of Lāhore and Multān, for the latter did not join the Sulṭān’s army against the Mongol Invasion.³ The army, too, was not feudalized; the soldiers were directly recruited and enrolled in the registers of the State by the ‘Ārid or by governors on behalf of the Sulṭān, and paid out of the royal treasury.⁴ The Ḥākim (governor) of Multān was also Bahāshī (paymaster) of the army.⁵ The Regents (Nā’ibs), Wālis (governors), revenue officers (Mutaṣarrīf) and assistants (Kārkunān) had to submit a statement of income and expenditure to the Diwān-i-Wizārat regularly.⁶ It is interesting to recall how Qūṭb-u’d-dīn after the conquest of Thangir (Biyānah) divided the people into Mussalmans, Ḥarbīs (soldiers) and Dhimmīs (tributaries).⁷

The court and palace of the Sulṭān were modelled on Persian lines, while the administration of the army followed the

---

¹ Ibn-Baṭṭūṭah (Urdu translation by Muḥammad Ḥussain), p. 33.
² ‘Affī, Tārīḵ-i-Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 303.
³ Fīrīštāh, p. 71.
⁵ Ibn Baṭṭūṭah (Urdu translation by Muḥammad Ḥussain), p. 1.
⁶ Diyyā Banarī, Tārīḵ-i-Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 468.
⁷ MSS. Tāj-u’l-Ma’āthīr, p. 375.
Turkish system of military classification. Bureaucratic grades were based upon the decimal system. Ten soldiers, footmen or horsemen, were placed under the charge of a Sar-i-Lashkar or Sar Khil; ten Sar Khil were commanded by one Amir, ten Amirs by one Malik, ten Maliks by one Khan, and it was expedient to have ten Khans in the kingdom. Thus, a Khan or Amir-i-tumän was the commander of a body of 10,000; a Malik or Amir-i-Hazarah, commander of 1,000; an Amir or Amir-i-Şadah, commander of 100; Amir-i-Punjah, commander of 50; and a Sar Khil or Amir-i-dah, commander of ten. With the conquest of Northern India in the thirteenth century, military officers were burdened with civil duties, so much so that administrative work became a moral duty of most of the military officers. Sipah-salâr (commander of troops) held an important position in the army; he was often the leader of the van of the army, and sometimes acted as governor of some province or chief justice of the Empire in addition to his military services. Very often the Sultan himself led expeditions, and supervised the organization of the army, which was divided into right and left wings (mainmanah and maisarah), and centre (qalb). Each portion of the army was under a separate commander known as Sar-i-Fauj. In front of the divisions of the army stood elephants.

Most titles like Sultan, Khan, Malik and Amir illustrate an unfortunate process of a slow and gradual degradation. Amir in Arabic means a ruler, commander or a supreme

---

1 Diyâ Barâni, Târikh-i-Firuz Shâhi, p. 83.
2 Ibid., p. 219.
3 Ibid., p. 219 "يكدو اميروان هزاره و جند امير صده"
4 Ibid., p. 376.
5 Sipah-salâr 'Izz-ud-din Husain, son of Kharmil, was the leader of the army (Tabaqat-i-Nâşiri, p. 140).
6 See Ibid., p. 146.
7 Amir 'Ali-i-İsmâ'îl, the Sipah-salâr was also Amir-i-dâd of the capital city of Delhi. See Tabaqat-i-Nâşiri, p. 170.
8 Diyâ Barâni, Târikh-i-Firuz Shâhi, p. 260.
9 'Affî, Târikh-i-Firuz Shâhi, p. 201.
ruler, and consequently the second Caliph was styled as Amir-u’l-Muminin (commander of the faithful). After the decline of the ’Abbasid Caliphate, the kings of ’Ajam assumed the title of Amir; but with the invention of the title of ‘Sultan’ by Mahmud of Ghaznah, Amir came to be meant only an important officer. ‘Malik’ originally meant chief, ruler or king. The pre-Muslim emperors of Persia styled themselves as Malik-u’l-Muluk (king of kings). The term Malik, however, was not abused and continued maintaining a high dignity. Again Khân or Qaân, a Turkic-Chinese word, meant the great over-lord of all the Turkish tribes; and was the title of Chingiz Khân and his successors. The semi-independent princes of Turkistan were known as Khân-i-Khânân in the ninth and tenth centuries, but after the conquest of Turkistan by the Mussalmans, the title of Khân was given to the highest officers of the state. The premier Khân was styled Ulugh or Alf (first Khan), a title given to Balban by Sultan Nasir-u’d-din; while the premier Amir was called Amir-u’l-Umarâ.

Dîwân-i-Inshâ (Ministry of Local Government).

The Şâhib-i-Dîwân i-Inshâ was the Minister of Local Government, variously called as Dabir-i-Mamâlik, Dabir Khân or Sar-i-Dabir (all meaning chief secretary of the state) and styled as ‘Umdat-u’l-Mulk (pillar of the state) or Tâj-u’l-Mulk (crown of the state). The Minister was the proper channel of correspondence between the central and local governments, in other words, between the king and provincial governors, and as such he was expected to be a ‘man of letters.’ Sultan Ghiyath-u’d-din Tughlaq called for the Dabir-i-Khâq, and dictated messages to the governor.

1 Tabaqat-i-Nâsîrî, p. 289. 2 Barâni, Târikh-i Firuz Shâhi, p. 247.
3 Malik ’Issz-u’d-din was appointed Dabir-i-Mamâlik in the reign of Sultan ’Ala-u’d-din, and held the charge of Dîwân-i-Inshâ.
4 Tabaqât-i-Nâsîrî, p. 183.
6 دیبیر خاص خصر و را از واهب این خطاطیب اسم که لطف عارف می‌ماند تاجوییات ارکامشیر Qâṣa‘îd of Badr-i-Châch, p. 11.
nors of various provinces intimating the murder of Sultān Mubārak Shāh. It was his duty to lay before the Sultān the petitions of governors and local officers for his orders, and to convey the same to the applicants. Matters, which directly concerned the particular ministries, were referred to them for opinion and disposal. The Minister himself drafted all firmāns in a 'pliable and courtly style,' and observed all legal forms. The various records and documents were carefully kept for future reference by his subordinate officers in office. He was assisted in his work by a large staff of Dabīrs or Secretaries.

Diwān-i-Risālat (the Ministry of Appeals).

Diwān-i-Risālat was the highest court of appeal. It was like the Diwān-ul-Mażālim of the 'Abbasids (Board for the Redress of Grievances). The Ministry received complaints from the subjects, and either granted redress in the capacity of the king's agent (Rasūl) or else submitted to the Sultān for his final orders. 'Every day,' says Shams-i-Sirāj 'Aftī, 'a number of applications were submitted to the Diwān-i-Risālat, asking for money, allowances and stipends.' The Ṣāhib-i-Diwān entitled Wakil-i-dar and Bahā-ull-Mulk entertained all complaints against governors, ministers, government officials and even members of the royal family, and decided such cases as fell within his jurisdiction. An appeal from the Qādī's Court lay to the Sultān, who presided over the Ministry.

Diya Barānī describes the four Ministries as follows:

Malik Ḥamīd-u’d-dīn Nāšir-i-Wakil-i-dar, Malik ‘Īzz-u’d-

1 Barānī, Tārikh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 337.
2 Malik Qawām-u’d-dīn was ‘Ilāqah-Dabīr in Kāiqubād’s time. See Diya Barānī, p. 131. Shams-u’d-dīn, the Dabīr, was sent to Sultān Mu’izz-u’d-dīn Kāiqubād by Sultān Nāṣir-u’d-dīn with a letter of message. See Qir’ān-u’s-Sa’da’īn, p. 102.
4 Barānī, Tārikh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 558.
5 Ibid., p. 337.
6 Ibn-Battūṭah (Urdu translation by Muḥammad Ḥusain), p. 218.
din Dabir-i-Mamālik, Malik Aṣhraf Qānīnī Nā'ib-i-Vizier and Khwājah Hājī Nā'ib-i-'Arḍ were each incharge of one department during the reign of Sultān 'Alā-u'd-dīn. The four traditional Ministires were Diwān-i-Wizārat, Diwān-i-Arḍ-i-Mumālik, Diwān-i-Inshā and Diwān-i-Risālat. Baranī further notes that by the removal of Malik Ḥamīd-u'd-dīn and 'Izz-u'd-dīn and the murder of Sharf Qānīnī, the glory of Diwān-i-Risālat, Diwān-i-Inshā and Diwān-i-Wizārat withered away.1 It is clear therefore, that the Wakil-i-dar was incharge of the department of appeals (Diwān-i-Risālat).

Wakil-i-dar variously designated as Rasūl-i-dar or Ḥājīb-u'l-Irsāl2 was appointed to perform the secretarial functions of the court,3 and was incharge of the Diwān-i-Risālat. He received a pay of 24,000 dinārs or a Jāgīr yielding an equivalent income.4 The practice was like this: the Ḥājīb introduced the visitor to the Hall of audience and handed over his petition to the Bārbak (a title, conferred upon the Amīr-i-Ḥājīb), who took it to the throne. After the Sultān retired from the court, the Ḥājīb handed over the papers to the Wakil-i-dar, who disposed of them according to the Sultān's orders.

Departments of the State.

Besides the Ministries, there were certain other departments (Masnads or Imārats), which, however, occupied a lower status. The most important of these was the Department of Justice (Diwān-i-Quḍā-i-Mumālik or Diwān-i-Shara5 or Diwān-i-Quḍā).6 The Department has been defined by Qāḍī Minhāj Sirāj in his Introduction to the Šabaqāt-i-Nāširī as Diwān-i-Muẓāhir wa muqām-i-Faṣl-i-Khuṣūmāt wa Qaṭ'i-Dā'wān7 (Board for the redress of the oppressed,

1 Baranī, Tārīḵh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 337.
2 Ibn-Bešṭūrah (Urdu translation by Muḥammad Ḥusain), p. 218.
3 Baranī, Tārīḵh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 576.
5 Sevāvat-i-Firūz Shāhī, Bankipore MSS., p. 123.
6 Khazā'in-u'l-Futūḥ, p. 7. 7 Introduction—Šabaqāt-i-Nāširī, p. 3.
decision of disputes and settlement of claims). It was presided over by the Chief Qāḍī variously known as the Qāḍī-i-Mumālīk (Chief Justice of the State) or Qāḍī-u'lj-Quddār (Judge of judges) and styled as Șadr-u'lj-Mulk (Chief Șadr or judge), Șadr-u'ş-Şudūr (Judge of the judges), Șadr-i-Jahān (Judge of the realm), Șadr-u'ş-Şudūr-i-Islām (Chief Șadr of Islām), Șadr-u'ş-Şudūr-i-Jahān (Judge of the judges of the world) and Qāḍī-i-Şadr-i-Jahān (Chief judge of the realm). He was expected to be a man of learning and piety. He was the highest judicial authority below the king and exercised both civil and criminal jurisdiction. The Qāḍī-i-Mumālīk was the Chief Justice of the realm and sometimes also acted as the city Magistrate of Delhi. He decided cases of murder and injury. The Qāḍī of Qub-ud-din Mubārak Shāh was also Kalid-dār, (in charge of the keys of the Palace gates). The Kalid-dār had about a thousand persons under his command; about 500 of these guarded the Palace, and stood armed in two rows from the outer door to the inner door. Their officers and Munšis patrolled and took attendance. The Chief Qāḍī conducted the Nikāh ceremony of the Sultan’s relatives and high officials of the state. He was assisted in his judicial work by the Na'ib-i-Qāḍī-i-Mumālīk and a number of Qādis. Every city and almost all the bigger towns had their separate Amir-i-dād (Judges) entitled as Majd-uًlmāra (most glorious Amir while special Qādis were

---

1 Ţabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 193.
3 Ţabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 193.
4 MSS. Tāj-u'lj-Ma'dthīr, p. 178.
5 Ţabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 167 and 218.
6 Masālik-u'lj-Aṣbūr (Elliot and Dowson), p. 578.
7 Barāni, Tāžākh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī, pp. 247, 248.
8 Ibid., pp. 24 and 126.
9 Ţabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 215.
10 MSS. Seirat-i-Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 123.
11 Ibn-Bāṣṭūfah (Urdu translation by Muḥammad Ḥusain), p. 80.
12 Ibid., p. 137.
13 Diya-ud-din Junaydī was the Amir-i-dād of Gwalior. See Ţabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 188.
14 Ibid., p. 188.
appointed for the army under the direct control of the Qāḍī-i-Lashkar (the Qāḍī of the Army). Unlike other officers, Qāḍīs were generally appointed for life.

Criminal law in the Middle Ages was very strict, and punishments were severe. The aggrieved party reported the matter to the Qāḍī, who heard and decided the case. The murderer was handed over to the relatives of the murdered, by whom he was put to death. If a person committed an offence of entering the Royal Palace by force, he received the capital punishment.¹ In case a Mussalman drank wine, eighty whips were inflicted upon him, and was further detained in a cave for three days.² It is related in the Futūḥat-i-Firuz Shāhī that in former reigns the Sultāns shed the blood of Mussalmans, and employed an infinite variety of tortures such as cutting off hands and feet, ears and nose, putting out the eyes, pouring molten lead into the throat, crushing the bones of hands and feet, burning the body with fire, piercing iron bars into hands, feet and chest, to draw skin of the body, to inflict lashes with iron nails and sawing the criminal into two.³

During the reign of Balban and Kaiqubād, the Amir-i-dād⁴ or Dādbak⁵ (Superintendent of the Qāḍī’s Court) was attached to the Chief Qāḍī’s Court, and his duty was to enforce the attendance of high officials and to enforce the decisions of the court.⁶ He received a salary of 50,000 rupees per annum, or held a Jāgīr yielding an equivalent income.⁷ There was a Na‘īb-i-Dādbak as well to assist the Dādbak in his work.

¹ Ibn-Batṭūtah (Urdū translation by Muḥammad Ḥusain), p. 135.
² Ibid., p. 278.
³ Futūḥat-i-Firuz Shāhī, p. 3.
⁴ Ḍu‘ā Barani, Tārikh-i-Firuz Shāhī, p. 148, has Malik Niẓām-u’d-dīn Amir-i-dād.
⁵ Ibid., p. 131. Malik Niẓām-u’d-dīn was apparently Dādbak but in reality Deputy of the State,⁶ which shows that Amir-i-dād and Dādbak meant the same office.
⁷ Ibid.
The Qāḍīs acted as Justices of the peace, and their primary duty was to settle disputes according to the rules of the shari'at. Appeals were allowed from the Court of the local Qāḍī to that of the Chief Judge, and from him to the Diwān-i-Risālat (Ministry of Appeals) and the Sulṭān. Appeals were, however, allowed in very special cases, which obviously involved a breach of law or miscarriage of justice. There were no advocates to plead cases in those days, and the Qāḍī after hearing the parties and their witnesses, declared his judgment there and then.

The Sulṭān was assisted in the discharge of his judicial duties by a board of divines ‘Ālims, Shaikhūs and Muftīs. The Qāḍīs tried to uphold their independence in the interpretation of the shari'at in the face of government and, consequently, contentions were bound to arise as regards the administration of law. Unlike modern states, Medieval governments were not law-making bodies, and Muslim law, too, was regarded as 'unchanging and unchangeable.' There was, in short, no such thing as case-law. The Qāḍīs were free to decide cases, which involved private rights only, but were subdued in cases, where they interfered with the administration of the country. Muslim law, like the Roman law, was undeveloped on the criminal side, and the deficiency was made up by promulgating such law as was provided by the state. The Sulṭān, in such cases, did override the decisions of the Qāḍīs. Criminal law was common to all the communities, but purely Hindu law was in all probability administered by the village Panchāyats, which still retained their judicial jurisdiction. An appeal from their decision lay to the provincial governors, and from there to the Emperor, the final court of appeal for all persons and all communities.

The government of the capital, Haḍrat-i-Delhi, was entrusted to the charge of the Kūtwāl-i-Mumālik¹ (Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police) and his staff. The Kūtwāl of Delhi was like the Ṣāhib-u’sh-Shurṭā of the

¹ Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 194.
'Abbasids. His rank was a little inferior to that of a minister, but he was regarded as one of the highest officials of the realm. He was entitled as Malik-u'l-Umarā or 'Alā-u'l-Mulk. When Bałban invaded the territory of Lakhnawtī, he appointed Malik-u'l-Umarā Fakhr-u'd-dīn Kūtwāl as his Regent in preference to the Vizier. The Kūtwāl was incharge of the Royal Harem, Treasury and the Capital city; and kept keys of the city gates, Royal Palaces and Treasury. When the Rāc of Nagarkut came to offer his homage to Sulṭān Fīrūz Šāh, the Sulṭān was accompanied by the Kūtwāl, who bore with him the keys of the fort. The duty of the Kūtwāl was to maintain peace and order in the city, and to apprehend thieves. The culprits were detained in the Kūtwālī (Police Station), and later on produced before the Qādi or the king, and in the absence of both before the Vizier. The task of parading the prisoner was also entrusted to the city-Kūtwāl.

The Barīd-i-Mumālik or the Commissioner of Intelligence and Posts and his deputy the Nā'īb-i-Barīd-i-Mumālik supplied the Sulṭān with all the necessary information regarding the current events of the realm. The capital was connected with the distant parts of the Empire with numerous chains of post offices, where carriers, both horsemen (Aulāq) and footmen (Piyādah), were stationed to carry on the messages and letters. To communicate the events that happened in distant provinces, post relays were established between the capital and the chief towns of the country. Horsemen or footmen were employed to carry post from place to place. There were three stations called Dāvah, each near a village, where footmen sat 'with their

---

2 Barānī, Tāriḵ-i-Fīrūz Šāhī, p. 269
3 Ibid., p. 85.
4 M.S.S. Seirat-i-Fīrūz Šāhī, p. 84.
5 'Affī, Tāriḵ-i-Fīrūz Šāhī, p. 494.
6 Mīfīrūz-u'l-Fīrūz. p. 45.
waists tied." The carrier had a long stick with ring-bells at the end. As soon as Dāk started from the city, the carrier, with the mail bag in one hand and the stick in the other, ran with all his might. The carrier stationed at the next post heard the sound of ring-bells, and hurriedly caught the bag and ran forcibly. Sometimes fruits for the Sulṭān were also conveyed in the like manner, and a high-placed offender was placed on a bed-steed and carried from place to place similarly.\(^1\) 

Barīds or official reporters (Akhbār Navis) and secret service officials were posted everywhere in markets and towns to inform the Sulṭān of the behaviour of state-servants, transactions in markets and all other events. When the Barīds of Badā'ūn failed to inform Balban\(^6\) of the murder of an attendant by the governor, they were hanged on the city gates by the royal orders. Sulṭān Muḥammad Tughlaq had innumerable intelligencers, who were divided into several classes.\(^3\)

Amīr-i-Akhūr or Aḥbūr Bāk\(^4\) was the lord of the Imperial Stable; the Shahkan-i-pil of the elephant Stable; and Shahkan-i-nafor of the camel stable. Amīr-i-Akhūr was one of the most important officers of the Empire. Quṭb-u'd-dīn, like many other contemporaries, first attained this position, and then he was appointed governor of Kūhrām and Sāmānah.\(^5\) The duty of the Amīr-i-Akhūr was to make excursions in quest of fodder and to manage the affairs of the stable. It was not necessary for him to remain at the capital\(^6\) and the work was carried on by his Nā'īb.

Sar-i-Jāndār (Chief of the Royal body-guards) was another important officer. Balban had several Sar-i-Jāndārs.\(^7\) It was not essential for the Sar-i-Jāndār to remain

---

\(^1\) Ibn-Battūṭah (Urdū translation by Muḥammad Ḥusain), pp. 2 & 3.
\(^2\) Ḍiyā Barānī, Tarīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 40.
\(^4\) Miṭṭah u'l-Futūḥ, p. 28.
\(^5\) Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 139.
\(^6\) Barānī, Tarīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 323.
\(^7\) Ibid., p. 24.
at the capital, for he was assisted in his work by his deputy, Nā‘īb-i-Sar-i-Jāndār, and Shaḥnāh-i-Zarrād Khānah (Superintendent of the armoury). He was often made commander of the right or left wing of the army. The Imperial throne was insecure, dangers beset it on every side and the Sultān had to ‘live in an atmosphere of perpetual suspicion and distrust.’ The disloyalty of his officers kept the king alarmed. The Central contingents of the royal body-guards, therefore, looked after the personal security of the sovereign. The Amir-i-Shīkār (Chief huntsman) organized the hunting campaigns. There was another officer known as Sar-i-Sīlāhdār (head of the Imperial armour-bearers), who secured the personal safety of the Sultān.

The religious dignitaries attached to the court were the Shaikh-u’l-Islām, (Chief ecclesiastic of the state), like the Shaikh-u’l-Shuyūkh of Egypt, Syed-i-Ajjal or Syed-i-Dargāh (head of the Syeds of the Empire) and the Khaṭīb, who preached the sermons and led the prayers. The office of Shaikh-u’l-Islām was conferred upon Jamāl-u’l-dīn Busṭāmī during the reign of Sultān Nāṣir-u’l-dīn. There was a government University at the Capital known as Nāṣiriyah College, where professors of eminence and renown delivered lectures to students. Diwān-i-Istihqāq (the Department of Pensions) granted allowances and pensions to ‘Alims and Hāfīzes. The head of the Department was probably subordinate to the Qāḍī-i-Mumālik (Chief Qāḍī of the state). The other department of charities or Diwān-i-Khairāt came in vogue only in the reign of Sultān Firūz Shāh.

1 The governorship of Sāmānah was transferred to Malik Sirāj, the Sar-i-Jāndār. Diyar Barānī, Tarīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 85.
2 Malik Saif-u’l-dīn Ibāk-i-Kishlū Khān was Nā‘īb-i-Sar-i-Jāndār in the reign of Sultān Nāṣir-u’l-dīn. Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 278, 279.
3 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, pp. 254, 255.
4 Miftāḥ-u’l-Futūh, p. 57.
5 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 169.
7 Barānī, Tarīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 247, and MSS. Seirat-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 34.
8 Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, p. 200.
9 ‘Alī, Tarīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, p. 351.
The *Mir-i-'Imāra*¹ (Controller of constructions), the head of the *'Imārat Khānah* (the Building Department) was assisted in his work by several *Shahnahs* or Superintendents of various departments under his charge.² The two smaller departments of Admiralty and Agriculture were placed under the charge of *Amīr-u'l-Behr* and *Amīr-i-kuh* respectively. The first officer was in charge of the numerous flotillas³ maintained on the Jumna, Ganges and other rivers for the use of travellers and armies. *Malik-u'l-Umarā Iftikhar-u'd-dīn*⁴ was *Amīr-i-kuh* of Sultan *Shams-u'd-dīn Ilutmish*. The other department looked after the improvement of agriculture, reclaimed waste lands and devised means for the welfare of cultivators. The *Amīr-i-kuh* supervised the construction of canals, the distribution of water and the clearing of jungles.

**THE END**

---

¹ *Afī, Tarikh-i-Firuz Shāhi*, p. 331.
² *Ibid*.
⁴ *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, p. 177.
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