

THE LIFE AND TIMES
OF
KUTB-UD-DIN AIBAK

●

Dr. Ashok K. Srivastava

M. A., Ph.D., D.Litt.

Department of History

UNIVERSITY OF GORAKHPUR

GORAKHPUR (INDIA)



Published by

PURVANCHAL PRAKASHAN

BUXIPUR

GORAKHPUR-273 001

INDIA

**Collection of Prof. Muhammad Iqbal Mujaddidi
Preserved in Punjab University Library.**

پروفیسر محمد اقبال مجددی کا مجموعہ
پنجاب یونیورسٹی لائبریری میں محفوظ شدہ

Published by :
PURVANCHAL PRAKASHAN
Buxipur
Gorakhpur-273 001 (India)

133274

Copyright
Ashok K. Srivastava

Price : Rs. 80.00

First Edition : November 1972

Second Edition : May 1982

Printed at
Shukla Printing Press
Nazirabad
Lucknow

DEDICATION

*In the sacred memory of my revered brother
late Shri Satish Chandra Srivastava
M. A., LL. M., Advocate who always
inspired me for such great under-
takings and without his ardent
labour, keen interest and
valuable assistance in
the preparation of
the manuscript,
the present book
could not
have been
completed*





Preface to the Second Edition

The first edition having exhausted this book was out of print for some time. During this time students and scholars of Medieval Indian History were put to great inconvenience, but I could not find time earlier to prepare the typescript for a second edition. I am happy that the book has been reprinted within a decade.

I am grateful to the Purvanchal Prakashan, Buxipur, Gorakhpur for undertaking its publication.

Gorakhpur :
March 14, 1982

Ashok K. Srivastava

P R E F A C E

The Turkish conquest of Northern India in the twelfth-thirteenth centuries is a great land-mark in the history of India. Like the Arabs, the Turks were also zealous Muslims noted for their martial temperament and iconoclastic character. The Arabs were undoubtedly, the first Muslims, who knocked at the gates of India and, ultimately, conquered Sindh and Multan (711-13 A. D.). They occupied and ruled over these regions for about three hundred years without any further gain. The Hindu states, quite adjacent to Sindh and Multan, were powerful enough to safeguard their freedom, culture and religion against the might of the Arabs, who had come to this country with the determined hope to annex the whole of India. But soon they were disillusioned when they repeatedly suffered crushing defeats in the open clashes against the Hindu Kings of India.

In the beginning of the eleventh century Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni of the Turkish stock, began his incursions into this country with fierce hostility. No fewer than seventeen times he laid his barbarous hands over the North-West and the Central regions ravaging them to their skeletons. He burnt city after city, razed to the ground thousands of sacred temples and broke images to pieces, killed in cold blood numerous Hindus including women, and innocent children and took away enormous wealth and serfs from this country. But his non-stop invasions and hostile acts against the Hindus failed to convert the whole of the population of the conquered regions to Islam. Similarly his ambition to extend the boundaries of his Empire towards the East could not materialise. Only a part of the Punjab passed away from its Hindu rulers into the hands of Mahmud. The Sultan, no doubt, founded a vast Ghazni Empire extending upto Punjab in the East, but his successors lacked his firmness and ardour, with the result that the Empire began to shrink. Taking advantage of the loopholes of the hostile enemy,

the rulers of the adjoining Hindu States invaded the Muslim posts and were successful in freeing most of their territories from the tyranny of the Muslims.

But with the coming of the Turks under the command of Shahab-ud-din Muhammad of Ghor in the last quarter of the twelfth century A.D., the whole situation took a different turn. Shahab-ud-din fully exploited the worse political condition then enfolding the whole of India and made many successful inroads into this country. But the record of his Indian conquests was not unblemished, for he was decisively defeated on more than one occasion by the powerful Rajput rulers like the Chaulukyas of Gujerat and the Chahamanas of Ajmer. But even these shocks and humiliating defeats did not deter Shahab-ud-din from his attempt towards his final goal. And he did succeed at last in overthrowing the powers of the Hindu States of Northern India. As a result of his renewed invasions and astounding victories his exploits reached as far as Banaras in the East and Kalinjar and Ajmer in the central and western regions of the country.

The man behind all these achievements was, undoubtedly Kutb-ud-din Aibak, the slave commander of the army of Shahab-ud-din. Kutb-ud-din's services to Shahab-ud-din were most distinguished and unparalleled. He accompanied him in his wars in Central Asia as well as in the Indian campaigns. During this period, Kutb-ud-din Aibak rose to great eminence and by dint of his laudable qualities he soon over-shadowed all his contemporaries and became the most favourite slave-commander of the Sultan.

The appointment of Kutb-ud-din Aibak as the Viceroy of the conquered Indian regions by Shahab-ud-din in 1192 A.D. is a clear proof of Kutb-ud-din's great services. But there is no clear record in the accounts of the contemporary chroniclers about the works and achievements of Kutb-ud-din Aibak in India before his appointment as viceroy. This may have been due to two reasons. Firstly, the highly imposing personality of the Sultan Shahab-ud-din might have eclipsed Aibak's personality itself and,

secondly, the attitude of the contemporary chroniclers themselves might have been such as not to praise a slave commander in the presence of the Sultan. None-the-less, his appointment to such a distinguished post must have been based on many considerations. It also affords evidence to the fact that during the time of the Indian campaigns with his master Shahab-ud-din, Kutb-ud-din Aibak should have become quite familiar with the Indian war tactics, atmosphere and topography. And because of these aforesaid reasons, he was rightly appointed to the vice-royalty of India. Kutb-ud-din proved worthy of this choice.

The time, when Shahab-ud-din departed from India, just after the appointment of Kutb-ud-din Aibak as the Viceroy, had been a most crucial one for both Kutb-ud-din Aibak and the Hindu rulers of Northern India. The position of the former was not sound enough and yet the situation demanded the stability of his government for the survival of the infant Turkish Empire in this country. The Hindus, who no doubt were defeated in their early encounters with the Turks, could not be crushed completely. They were still anxious to bring back their lost glory and to expel, thereby, the foreign element from their sacred land for ever.

These circumstances were, in fact, the real test of Kutb-ud-din's calibre and military genius. The intrepid slave general once more proved his mettle and emerged victorious in his endeavours. He, skillfully, saved the infant Turkish Empire from its complete annihilation at the hands of the hostile Hindu hosts. He was in fact the real architect of the Turkish Empire of the Northern India, also known to us as the "Sultanate of Delhi." But for this great figure of history, the establishment of the Turkish Empire in India so quickly, would never have been possible.

It is interesting to note that Kutb-ud-din could not remain satiated with his command confined to the territorial regions, initially conferred upon him, but also had the distinction to enlarge it by extending its boundaries towards west and east. In Gujerat he personally avenged the defeat of his master and made fresh conquests in the Rajputana and Doab regions, while

in the East beyond Banares he allowed Bakhtiyar, a Khalji commander, to launch fresh expeditions. This brought fruitful results. Bakhtiyar Khalji attacked and conquered both Behar and Bengal with a lightning speed. It was for the first time in the history of Islam that its flag reached the heart of Bengal in the East. The assassination of Shahab-ud-din in 1206 A.D. placed Kutb-ud-din Aibak and his Indian possessions in a more precarious situation. Yalduz and Qubacha, the two ambitious commanders of Shahab-ud-din were his greatest rivals for the claim to the throne of Delhi. But Kutb-ud-din very wisely cut off all his relations with Ghazni and mainly concentrated his energy and power on the stability of the infant Turkish Empire in India. He judiciously allowed Yalduz to occupy Ghazni and did not disturb him at all. Similarly, he established his matrimonial alliance with his second rival Qubacha and got married two of his daughters to him successively, one after another and allowed him to rule quietly in Sindh. If these steps had not been taken by Kutb-ud-din Aibak, the internal rivalries must have helped the Hindus to bring back their lost freedom. Thus Kutb-ud-din Aibak once again saved the Turkish Empire from falling into the dust. His authority was soon recognised by Ghiyas-ud-din Mahmud, the nephew and successor of Shahab-ud-din who sent to him the royal insignia and also conferred the title of Sultan upon him.

But, unfortunately, Kutb-ud-din Aibak could not survive for long to enjoy the fruits of his prudent work, and died in 1210 A.D. of the fall from horse in Lahore. After him, his weak son and successor Aram Shah succeeded him for few months though he was quite unfit to face the situation. Taking advantage of the weakness of the new Sultan, Iltutmish, another slave commander of Shahab-ud-din, with the support of the nobles of Delhi, occupied the throne of Delhi. In the fight, that ensued near the river Jamuna for the claim of the throne between Iltutmish and Aram Shah, the latter was soon defeated and put to death. Thus, with the fall of Aram Shah the family of the first ruling dynasty of the Delhi Sultanate came to an end. But the newly Turkish Empire founded and reared by the genius of Kutb-ud-din Aibak still

survived which paved the way for the later Sultans of Delhi to strengthen and consolidate it.

It is surprising enough to note that inspite of Kutb-ud-din's great services and his wonderful records in the domain of political achievements in the history of the Muslim world he failed to attract the attention of the scholars of the Medieval Indian History. Neither the European nor the non-European scholars have done justice to him. In fact, his achievements deserve to be dealt with separately.

Keeping these views in mind I took up this work some seven years back soon after the award of the Ph. D. Degree to me by the University of Gorakhpur. The notable feature of this work is that I have fully utilised the accounts of the contemporary as well as the later Muslim and the Hindu sources alike. It has been noticed that both the sets of the historians are emphatic and have gone from one extreme to the other in the praise or otherwise of this slave general and Sultan. In the present volume, therefore, an attempt has been made to maintain a balanced view which has so far been ignored. The information gathered from literary works both Persian and Sanskrit, have been corroborated by and supplemented with epigraphic records, wherever available. To make the narrative simple and plain the diacritical marks have been avoided. The author, therefore, craves the indulgence of the readers for the complete omission of these diacritical marks and certain misprints.

Undoubtedly, phrases or facts in their original forms have been borrowed and used occasionally, but this has been done only to support and strengthen the incorporated ideas.

It is to be pointed out here that I have only discussed Kutb-ud-din's career as a soldier, a Viceroy and the Sultan of Delhi. His career outside India has, therefore, been deliberately omitted.

The whole work has been divided into sixteen chapters in all. In the first chapter (Introduction) emphasis has been laid on the rise of the Turks and the Ghorian power. The second chapter deals with the early life and educational career of Kutb-ud-din Aibak. In the third chapter, a detailed account has been

given of Shahab-ud-din's invasions of India from 1175 to 1192 A. D. the year in which Kutb-ud-din Aibak was appointed as the Viceroy of India, presuming the fact that Kutb-ud-din must have accompanied the Sultan to India, as a soldier.

The real career of Kutb-ud-din Aibak in India begins properly after his nomination as the Viceroy of India. But he found himself in a difficult situation when the various Rajput states started their struggle against the Muslims to protect their religion, culture and freedom. The powerful Chahamanas rose in revolt with great vigour against the Muslims on many occasions. The Gahadavalas of Kanauj and Banares, the Chaulukyas of Gujerat and the Chandelas of Kalinjar continued fighting against the Turks (Muslims). Kutb-ud-din's relations with these states along with the stubborn resistance of the Hindus in general have been fully and separately narrated in Chapters iv, v, vi, vii, viii, ix and x respectively.

Although, the conquests of Behar and Bengal were not accomplished by Kutb-ud-din Aibak personally, he had an indirect hand in these conquests. It was on his direction that Bakhtiyar Khalji, the conqueror of Behar and Bengal, made surprise attacks on these states. Since Bakhtiyar was chiefly responsible for the eastern conquests, a short account of this general also finds a place in the present work. Besides, the controversy regarding the dates of the conquests of Behar and Bengal have been discussed fully in chapter xi.

Soon after the sudden assassination of Shahab-ud-din in 1206 A.D. Kutb-ud-din assumed his independent sovereignty and cut-off all his relations from Ghazni. But the time was still hard for him and he had to face numerous problems. But unfortunately, Kutb-ud-din could not survive for long and suddenly died of the fall from the horse in Lahore in 1210 A.D. All these have been narrated separately in the chapters xii and xiii.

Since many controversies have cropped up regarding Aram Shah, the son and successor of Kutub-ud-din Aibak, I have also discussed it separately in chapter xiv. Although, Kutb-ud-din Aibak was mostly engaged in the warfares against the Hindus

in India yet he showed his keenness in erecting various beautiful buildings which have been described at length in chapter xv. Lastly, a detailed and critical analysis of the character and achievements of Kutb-ud-din Aibak has been attempted in chapter xvi.

The author owes his deep sense of obligation and gratitude to his revered teachers Dr. H. L. Singh, formerly Professor and Head of Department of History, University of Gorakhpur and now Professor and Head of the Department of History, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, and Dr. G. D. Bhatnagar, formerly a Lecturer in the Department of History, University of Gorakhpur and now Reader in the Department of History, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, for their encouragement and valuable suggestions. I am equally indebted to Dr. U. N. Day Reader in the Department of History, University of Delhi, for most precious and matured suggestions. Lastly, I am indebted to all the authors of the period whose matured views and critical judgements have been my constant companions in the absence of their personal guidance in the preparation of the present work.

My thanks are also due to the Librarians and staff of the National Library, Calcutta, Khudabakhsh Library, Patna, Lucknow University Tagore Library, Amir-ud-daula Library Lucknow, the Gorakhpur University Library, and the various other libraries and collections of the country for affording me necessary facilities for the utilization of the most rare and useful materials and manuscripts. My thanks are also due to my friend Dr. H. C. Verma, Lecturer in the Department of History, University of Delhi and to all my other friends, colleagues and research students of the Department of History, University of Gorakhpur, for their valuable help and suggestions from time to time. I am especially thankful to my esteemed friend and colleague, Mr. K. G. Srivastava, Lecturer, Department of English, University of Gorakhpur, who took special interest in reading and correcting the Manuscript.

I take this opportunity to express my sense of gratefulness

to my friends Sri Yashbir Singh and Sri K. B. Singh for their ardent labour in typing out the manuscripts. I shall be, indeed, failing in my duty if I do not express my indebtedness to my revered elder brothers Sri R. N. Srivastava, Late Sri S. C. Srivastava, M. A., L L. M., Sri Girish Chandra Srivastava, M. A. (Hindi & English) and Dr. V. K. Srivastava, M. Sc. (Maths. & Chem.), Ph. D. (Gorakhpur), Ph. D. (Adelaide), and my brother in-law Sri R. P. Verma for the valuable assistance in reading and correcting the manuscript. I am further obliged to my loving nephews Ajai, Anoop, Anil, Mantoo, Babloo, Chikoo and Bobby and my nieces Renu, Ranjana, Baby, Veena and Rosy for their assistance in preparing the index and to all the members of my family for providing me necessary facilities for my study. However, I shall be failing in my duty if I do not express my deep sense of obligation and gratitude to my revered teacher Dr. R. B. Singh, Reader in the Department of Ancient History, Culture and Archaeology, University of Gorakhpur, for his masterly and valuable suggestions. I am extremely indebted to him for his kind assistance in the interpretation of some of the knottiest problems of this period. Lastly I am also thankful to the Gorakhpur University for the financial assistance.

October 22, 1972

ASHOK K. SRIVASTAVA

ABBREVIATIONS

A A	:	Ain-i-Akbari by Abu Fazal.
B F	:	Briggs Firishta
B M C	:	British Museum Catalogue of Coins.
C H I	:	Cambridge History of India, Vol. III.
D H N I	:	Dynastic History of Northern India by H. C. Ray, Vols. I & II.
E C D	:	Early Chauhan Dynasties by Dasharatha Sharma.
E I	:	Epigraphia Indica.
E R K	:	Early Rulers of Khajuraho by S. K. Mitra.
E T E D	:	Early Turkish Empire of Delhi by Muhammad Aziz Ahmad.
Firishta	:	Tarikh-i-Firishta, Text, Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow.
H M	:	Hammira Mahakavya of Nayachandra Suri.
H M I	:	History of Mediaeval India by Ishwari Prasad.
H O C	:	History of the Chahamanas by R. B. Singh.
H O K	:	History of Kannauj by R. S. Tripathi.
I A	:	Indian Antiquary.
I G	:	Imperial Gazetteer.
I H Q	:	Indian Historical Quarterly.
J A S B	:	Journal of The Asiatic Society of Bengal.
J I H	:	Journal of Indian History.
J R A S	:	Journal of The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain.

(XVI)

J R A S B L	:	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal Letters.
J B B R A S	:	Journal of the Bombay Branch of The Royal Asiatic Society.
or		
J B R A S		
K T	:	Kamil-ut-Tawarikh of Ibn Asir.
N P P	:	Nagari Pracharini Patrika.
N S P	:	Nirnaya Sagar Press.
P C	:	Prabandha Chintamani.
P O I H C	:	Proceedings of Indian History Congress
P K	:	Prabandha Kosa.
P V	:	Prithviraja Vijaya.
S J G M	:	Singhi Jain Grantha Mala.
T A	:	Tabakat-i-Akbari by Nizam-ud-din Ahmed.
Tabakat-i-Nasiri	:	Tabakat-i-Nasiri by Minhaj-us-Siraj Text.
T N	:	Tabakat-i-Nasiri English Translation by H. G. Raverty.
T M	:	Tajul Maasir.

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	... VII-XIV
List of abbreviations	... XV-XVI
Contents	... XVII-XX
CHAPTER I	
Introduction	... I—9
The Rise of The Ghorian Power	...
CHAPTER II	
BOYHOOD AND EDUCATION	... 10—19
His early name and descent	... 10
Kutb-ud-din In Ghazni	... 14
Kutb-ud-din's Campaign Against Sultan Shah	... 16
CHAPTER III	
SHAHAB-UD-DIN'S INDIAN CONQUESTS	... 20—50
The conquest of Sultan and Uchha	... 20
Shahab-ud-din's First defeat in India	... 22
The conquest of the Panjab and Sindh	... 27
The end of the Yamini rule in Lahore	... 28
Conflict with Prithviraja III	... 31
First Battle of Tarain	... 35
Second Battle of Tarain	... 40
The capture of Delhi	... 49
CHAPTER IV	
KUTB-UD-DIN AS VICEROY (I)	... 51—70
CLASH WITH THE CHAHAMANAS	... 51
The rebellion of Hansi	... 54
The Capture of Mirat	... 58
The Fall of Baran	... 59
The Second Capture of Delhi	... 60
Delhi Becomes The Capital of Kutb-ud-din	... 62
The Ajmer Rebellion	... 63
Delhi Rebels Again	... 65

(XVIII)

	Page
Kutb-ud-din in Ghazni	67
Kutb-ud-din Returns to Delhi	68
The Conquest of Kol	70
CHAPTER V	
KUTB-UD-DIN AS VICEROY (II)	71—94
CLASH WITH THE GAHADAVALAS	...
The Charge of a traitor	72
The Account of Jaichandra's Military Strength	75
Eerly Clashes with the Turks	79
The Battle of Chandawar	81
Capture of Asni	87
Annexation of Benaras	88
CHAPTER VI	
KUTB-UD-DIN AS VICEROY (III)	95-115
CLASH WITH THE CHAHAMANAS AGAIN	...
The Trouble at Kol	96
Kutb-ud-din Returns to Delhi	97
The Second Rebellion of Ajmer	97
Arrival of the Sultan and the Annexation of Bayana	106
The Fall of Gwalior	108
Chahamana's Last Resistance at Ajmer	111
CHAPTER VII	
KUTB-UD-DIN AS VICEROY (IV)	116-125
CLASH WITH THE CHAULUKYAS	126
CHAPTER VIII	
KUTB-UD-DIN AS VICEROY (V)	127-129
ACTIVITIES IN NORTHERN DOAB AND RAJPUTANA	127
CHAPTER IX	
KUTB-UD-DIN AS VICEROY (VI)	130-139
CLASH WITH THE CHANDELAS	130
CHAPTER X	
KUTB-UD-DIN AS VICEROY (VII)	140-141
THE FALL OF BADAUN	140

	Page
CHAPTER XI	
THE EASTERN CONQUESTS . . .	142-177
Bakhtiyar Khalji's Early Career . . .	143
His Early Incursions . . .	145
The Conquest of Behar . . .	147
The Date of the Conquest of Behar . . .	151
The Annexation of Bengal . . .	154
The Controversy of the Date . . .	155
A Story about Rai Lakshmansena by Minhaj . . .	159
The Expedition of Tibet and Turkistan . . .	169
Last days and Death of Bakhtiyar Khalji . . .	176
CHAPTER XII	
THE FALL OF THE GHORIAN POWER . . .	178-187
Political Disorder in the Ghorian Empire . . .	180
The Problem of his Indian Possessions . . .	180
The Problem of Multan . . .	180
The Rebellion of the Khokars . . .	181
The Murder of the Sultan Shahab-ud-din . . .	185
CHAPTER XIII	
KUTB-UD-DIN AS SOVEREIGN . . .	188-201
His Difficulties . . .	188
The Problem of Succession . . .	188
The Khwarazmian Menace . . .	189
Kutb-ud din's Accession . . .	190
Nasir-ud-din Qubacha . . .	191
Relation with Yalduz . . .	192
The Hindu Resistance . . .	194
The Khalji Rebellion in Bengal . . .	199
CHAPTER XIV	
END OF THE HOUSE . . .	202-211
His Last days and Death . . .	202
Aram Shah . . .	203
Fall of Aram Shah . . .	207

	Page
CHAPTER XV	
KUTB-UD-DIN AIBAK AS BUILDER . . .	212-221
Adinah Mosque or Juma Masjid . . .	214
Qutb Mosque . . .	214
The Qutb Minar . . .	217
Arhai Din Ka Jhopra . . .	218
Modification of the Rai Qila Pithora . . .	220
CHAPTER XVI	
ESTIMATE OF KUTB-UD-DIN AIBAK . . .	222-238
Kutb-ud-din Aibak as the First Sultan of Delhi . . .	234
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . .	239-249
INDEX . . .	250-263

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The rise of the Ghoriah power

The rise of Islam in the seventh century A. D. is one of the greatest events of history. It did not stamp its effect on its homeland Arabia only, but also deeply affected the neighbouring places in the peninsula and many other countries of the world as well. Inspired by the religious fervour, the newly converted Muslims overpowered the existing mighty states of the age and hoisted the Islamic flag right from the borders of China in the East to the heart of Spain in the West. It was, no doubt, a glorious achievement of the new religion which gave Arabia the honour of becoming the greatest power of the world within a hundred years of the birth of Islam. As a result, India could not escape from the greedy eyes of the Muslims who started pillaging western coasts as early as 636 A. D. But the coming seventy seven years marked the repeated failures of the Arabs who encountered many reverses. The Indians put up such a stubborn resistance that the Arabs, the conquerors of many powerful states, had to flee away suffering heavy losses. They, however, gained their maiden success in Sindh and Multan which were conquered in 711-13 A. D. by Muhammad bin Kasim, a youth of less than 20 years of age. But no further success could be achieved by the Arabs in India, although they ruled over the hitherto conquered territories directly or indirectly for about three hundred years.

But the sudden rise of the Turks¹, the newly converted

¹ The first irruption of the Turks was that of Qara' Khita from the land of Khita or Khitai, which consisted of vast tracts of territories in the north-west of China.

See ETED, p. 68 and footnote 2.

Muslims, brought about a rapid political change in the Muslim world. They challenged the feeble Arabian power which was by that time nearing its vanishing point and succeeded in throwing it to dust in central Asia almost without much effort.

The rise of the Turks had far-reaching effects on India. Ghazni, the renowned city of the Muslim world, became the seat of the ambitious Ghaznavide Turks. Sultan Mahmud, designated as Sultan for the first time in the history of the Muslim world,¹ was notorious (as known to the Indians) for his repeated ecclesiastical wars which he launched nearly every year in this country early in the 11th century. Sultan Mahmud's successive wars in India enabled him to annex the Punjab into the Ghazni empire but he does not seem to have desired to extend its frontiers beyond which was then ruled over by powerful Rajput rulers. Some of the energetic successors of Sultan Mahmud, who had lately shifted their capital from Ghazni to Lahore, also failed to extend their territory. Thus, Punjab, eventually became the third important Indian State which passed away from the Hindu rulers to the Muslim conquerors.

The gradual fall of the mighty Ghazni empire and, side by side, the weaknesses of the successors of the illustrious Sultan Mahmud, encouraged their rivals to raise their heads. Consequently, many great empires like those of the Seljuqs,² Qara-Khitai³ and the Ghors⁴ of the Turkish stock, appeared to put forth keen contest for political supremacy.

1 TN, Vol. I, pp. 75-76.

2 The Seljuqs were responsible for the overthrow of the Ghaznavide power from central Asia. In fact, the beginning of the Seljuqs empire may be dated from 1040 A.D., when they inflicted a crushing defeat on Masud I, ruler of the oxus region (Guzidah I, p. 435).

3 They were the Southern Turks whom the Muslim writers call as Qara-Khitai. They had established a strong empire on the eastern bank of the Jaxartes and were making powerful inroads into Transoxiana. Habibullah : The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, p. 22.

4 The principality of Ghor has been designated by Minhaj-us-Siraj as Shansabani, because of their descent from an ancestor named Shansab. Ibid., p. 25.

But, of all the Turkish dynasties, the chiefs of the principality of Ghor¹ had greatest dealings with India. Earlier the principality of Ghor had been reduced to the position of a dependency by Sultan Mahmud who had defeated its ruler Mahmud, son of Sur, the prince of Ghor.² Since the time of its defeat by Sultan Mahmud, it had been holding quite an insignificant position until it suddenly rose to prominence during the reign of Behram, the Ghaznavide ruler (C.1117-1152 A.D.).

Aziz-ud-din Husain, one of the rulers of the principality of Ghor, and a contemporary of Sultan Behram Shah of Ghazni, died leaving behind him seven sons known as "Seven Stars." The seven sons were Fakhr-ud-din Masud, (the eldest one), Kutb-ud-din Muhammad, Shaja-ud-din Ally, Nasir-ud-din, Saif-ud-din Suri, Baha-ud-din Sam and Ala-ud-din Husain better known as "Jahan Soz" or the world-burner.

During his life time, Aziz-ud-din Husain, the father of the seven sons, paid tribute to both the Seljuqs as well as to the Ghaznavides. But after his death, his sons were shelved into two divisions³: the one gave birth to the dynasty of kings at Bamyan,

1 The mountain fortress of Ghor was bounded in the north by the region as Gharjistan; in the west by the province of Herat by the Ghaznavide provinces of Garmsir (now the province of Fars) and Nirmuruz in the south, and by Kabul and Qandhar in the East. The dialect of the mountaineers which bore the name of Ghor differed materially from that of Khurasan: vide Barthold: *Turkistan Down to the Monghol Invasions*, p. 338.

2 ETED, p. 72.

3 Aziz Ahmad says that after Aziz-ud-din Husain's death his eldest son Malik Fakhr-ud-din Masud, whose mother was a Turkish lady, was not permitted to ascend the throne. He further writes that "This proves, among other reasons, that the Ghurian princes were not Turks." ETED, p. 72 and footnote 2. It is obvious from the statement of Aziz Ahmad that Malik Fakhr-ud-din was disallowed for the simple reason that his mother was of a Turkish stock. But our historian has failed to give the reasons for the negligence of the other elder brothers who were still alive. According to Aziz Ahmad, Saif-ud-din occupied the throne of his father and made Astiah his capital, but it is also clear from the statement of Firishta (BF, Vol. I, p. 166) that he was the fifth son of the late Aziz-ud-din Husain. The reasons for the negligence of Kutb-ud-din and Nasir-ud-din Mohammad, the second and the fourth sons respectively (Shaja-ud-din Ally the third died in infancy), have not been made clear by Aziz Ahmad. However, it appears that most probably

also called Tukharisatan and Mohatila, and the other to the Ghor dynasty at Ghazni.¹ Of the latter, Kutb-ud-din Muhammad, also called the king of the Mountains, had married the daughter of Sultan Behram Shah of Ghazni. Kutb-ud-din founded the city and the fortress of Firuz Kuh and made it his capital.²

At Firuz Kuh, Kutb-ud-din assumed all the dignities of a sovereign, but he could not enjoy the fruits of his newly established sovereignty at Firuz Kuh which fell prey to a contention between him and his brothers. This ultimately led Kutb-ud-din to retire towards Ghazni and take refuge in Behram's court. Sultan Baha-ud-din, in the meantime, had established himself at Firuz Kuh.

There too, Kutb-ud-din could not survive for long and was perfidiously murdered by the orders of Sultan Behram Shah of Ghazni.³ This is the origin of the feuds between the two houses, the Ghor and the Ghazni. When the sad news of the murder of Kutb-ud-din was brought to his brother Saif-ud-din Suri, the fifth son, he prepared his army to avenge the death of his brother. Consequently, he marched at the head of a strong army towards Ghazni, which soon fell upon it and Behram Shah fled towards India. Saif-ud-din himself occupied Ghazni and conferred the dominion of Ghor upon his brother Baha-ud-din Suri, the father of Ghiyas-ud-din and Shahab-ud-din⁴. But Behram Shah soon returned in the winter of 543 H. (1143 A.D.) when the troops of

the dominion of Aziz-ud-din Husain was divided among his sons after his death. Malik Fakhr-ud-din was given the territory of Kash (modern Kashan) Kutb-ud-din was given the territory of Warshad who founded the city of Firuz Kuh and made it his capital; the charge of Madin was given to Nasir-ud-din; Saif-ud-din occupied the throne of his father and made Astiah his capital; the district of Sankah was given to Baha-ud-din and Ala-ud-din was given the district and castle of Wajih.

Husain I B F, Vol. I, p. 161.

2 Ibid., p. 166.

3 It is said that Kutb-ud-din was accused of having cast his evil eyes upon the Sultan's haram and was, therefore, put to death by the orders of the Sultan of Ghazni (Behram Shah). ETED, p. 73.

4 Before his conquest in Khurasan he was called Shahab-ud-din but afterwards he was named Muiz-ud-din (Tabakat-i-Nasiri, Calcutta, 1864, p. 69). He is also known as Muhammad Ghorī or as Muhammad-bin-Sam.

Saif-ud-din were mostly gone to Firuz Kuh and Ghor from where they could not easily return on account of the roads being closed by heavy fall of snow. Taking advantage of the situation, Behram Shah prepared for a night attack. Saif-ud-din Suri was defeated and he consequently had to sustain along with his Wazir an ignominious death.¹

Smitten by this act of cruelty Baha-ud-din the sixth brother was morally compelled to invade Ghazni in order to avenge the death of his brothers. After collecting a huge army from Firuz Kuh and Ghor, Baha-ud-din advanced rapidly towards Ghazni. But as ill-luck would have it, he suddenly fell ill of small-pox and died soon at a place called Kidan.

After the sudden death of his brother, Ala-ud-din Husain the seventh and the last brother of the line ascended the throne of Ghor and Firuz Kuh. Now, Ala-ud-din firmly resolved upon attacking Ghazni² with the assistance of the combined forces of Ghor and Gharjistan.

When Behram Shah, heard about the intentions of Ala-ud-din, he made preparations and collected troops from Ghazni and his Indian provinces. But Behram Shah, the Ghaznavide Sultan of Ghazni was no match to the might of Ala-ud-din Husain who took ample vengeance and had thrice in succession inflicted crushing defeats upon Daulat Shah, the son of the Sultan of Ghazni, who was sent to oppose the enemy. Like storm the victors entered the city of Ghazni which was evacuated by its ruler Behram Shah, who in fear fled towards Lahore. This great city of Ghazni, noted mainly for its mammoth wealth, treasures, beautiful architectural buildings and for being consecrated as the centre of the Muslim education, was completely destroyed and

1 After the defeat of Saif-ud-din Suri he along with his treacherous Wazir, named Sayyad Majid-ud-din Masawi, were placed on two camels and paraded through the streets of Ghazni and were ultimately hung from the bridge. *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, Text, pp. 31,33.

2 Prof. Habib, while describing the main characteristics of the Ghorics, writes that "Alone among the ruling dynasties of the East, the royal line of Ghor is distinguished by the strength of its family affections and the absence of fratricidal conflicts." *Muslim University Journal*, 1930, p. 10.

put to fire for complete seven nights and days. Minhaj-us-Siraj, the contemporary writer, records that "during these seven days, the air, from the blackness of the smoke, continued as black as night; and those nights, from the flames raging in the burning city, were lighted up as light as day."¹ During the period of these seven days, free licences were issued to the soldiers of Ala-ud-din for plunder devastation, and slaughter. Every man, who was found, was slain and all the women and children were made prisoners. This action of Ala-ud-din earned for him the unenviable nickname of 'Jahan Soz' (the world-burner). By the orders of the victor, all the Mahmudi kings, with the exception of Mahmud, Masud and Ibrahim, were dragged from their graves and burnt. He defaced all the inscriptions, destroyed every public edifice of the Mahmudi kings which had no match in the world and demolished all the territory which had belonged to that dynasty. Nevertheless, in the midst of such a vast destruction of public buildings and tombs, the tombs of Sultan Saif-ud-din Suri and Kutb-ud-din were built.² Having thus exacted a terrible vengeance, he returned to Ghor and devoted himself to pleasure and wine and composed verses for minstrels to be sung in his praise.³

When Ala-ud-din 'Jahan Soz', ascended the throne of Firus Kuh, he imprisoned his two nephews, Ghiyas-ud-din Mohammad Sam and Shahab-ud-din Mohammad Sam, sons of Sultan Baha-ud-din, in the fort of Waziristan. The allowance for their maintenance was also settled.

In course of time, enthused by his unchallenged success in Ghazni, Ala-ud-din withdrew his allegiance and refused to pay tribute to Sultan Sanjar. This annoyed the Sultan Sanjar who attacked, defeated and made Ala-ud-din his captive. Ala-ud-din was popularly known for his wit and refined intelligence which soon impressed the Sultan Sanjar. One day a verse composed by Ala-ud-din made such an impression upon the Sultan that he was

1 TN, Vol. 1, p. 353.

2 Ibid., p. 354; BF, Vol. 1, p. 169

3 TN, Vol. 1, p. 356. Similarly when Ala-ud-din was at Ghazni he composed many verses in his own praise. See Ibid., p. 356.

ultimately induced to release him from the imprisonment. Later he established his power at Ghor and got himself married with the daughter of Sher Shah, one of the Maliks of Kharjistan. Taking advantage of the situation, Ala-ud-din conquered Bamyan, Tukharistan, the districts of Jarun and Bust, and succeeded in pushing Gharjistan in the valley of the Murghab river and its fortresses into the fold of his possessions. He even ventured to make an inroad into Khurasan and captured Tulak near Herat.

Ala-ud-din however, died his natural death in the year 551 A.H. (1156 A.D.), and was succeeded by his son, Sultan Saif-ud-din.¹ The new Sultan released the two princes Ghiyas-ud-din and Shahab-ud-din (his cousins) from the fort of Waziristan in which they were confined by Ala-ud-din Husain. Prince Ghiyas-ud-din remained at the court of Firuz Kuh in the service of Sultan Saif-ud-din, but Shahab-ud-din went to Bamyan and entered the service of his uncle, Fakhr-ud-din Masud. Ghiyas-ud-din remained in the service until the tragic death of the Sultan. In a little more than a year Saif-ud-din commenced a war with the Ghuzz and on the day of battle he was killed by one of his own soldiers. The Ghuzz completely defeated the Ghorian forces and compelled them to flee towards Gharjistan. When the Ghorian army was already in the way, the Amirs and Maliks gave their allegiance to Ghiyas-ud-din in Marwar-rud and installed him on the vacated throne of Firuz Kuh.²

When the intelligence of the accession of Ghiyas-ud-din reached the ears of Shahab-ud-din he turned towards his uncle Fakhr-ud-din; bowed his head respectfully and with his (uncle's) permission he left the court and came to Firuz Kuh. When he reached there, he waited upon his brother and paid his respects and was appointed Sar-i-Jandar [or chief armour-bearer] by his brother Ghiyas-ud-din.³ He was also entrusted with the charge of the territories of

1 Habibullah: *The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India*, p. 26, wrongly mentions Sultan Saif-ud-din as the brother of Ala-ud-din. Both Minhaj-us-Siraj and Firishta, clearly write that Saif-ud-din who succeeded Ala-ud-din after his death was his son. TN, Vol. I, p. 365 and BF, Vol. I, p. 168.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 370.

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 370; Ibid., p. 447.

Astiah¹ and Kajuran. Both the brothers lived together for one year. But soon after there cropped up a thorn on the plane of their smooth relationship with the result that Shahab-ud-din went to Sijistan and stayed there for one winter. But his brother Ghiyas-ud-din called him back and again assigned to him the territories of Astiah and Kajuran.² The two brothers were also successful in killing Abdul Abbas, the killer of their cousin Sultan Saif-ud-din and thus they succeeded in taking revenge against him.

But Ghiyas-ud-din and Shahab-ud-din had to face a serious menace from the side of their uncle, Malik Fakhr-ud-din Masud, the ruler of Bamyan, who was the eldest and the only surviving member of the famous "seven stars", now aspiring for the throne of Firuz Kuh. With the coalition of Malik Ala-ud-din Qimaj, a Sanjari Amir and the ruler of Balkh, and Malik Taj-ud-din Yalduz of Herat, he marched towards Firuz Kuh. The illustrious Ghoride princes, Ghiyas-ud-din and Shahab-ud-din, proceeded to Ragh-i-Raz to stem the advancement of the enemy. At first, they successfully defeated Yalduz and the army of Herat was put to its heels. They next turned towards Ala-ud-din Qimaj, who was also killed on the following day. The shocking news of the defeat and disaster of his two powerful allies, perplexed Malik Fakhr-ud-din, who now decided to retire. But the two brothers did not allow him to retire without a meeting. They approached him and when he apologised most humbly, he was allowed to go back to Bamyan.³

Shahab-ud-din, the illustrious general of Ghiyas-ud-din, made successful wars in the name of his ruling brother. As a result, Girmsir, Zamin-i-Dawar and Heart were liberated. Many important places like Farar, Fiwar, Baghshur, Taliqan, Juzerwan and the territories of Qaliyun and Gharjistan were also annexed to the growing Ghorian power. And soon after Shahab-ud-din was appointed as the governor of Taginabad.⁴

1 It is also written as Istiya. It is the name of a small district and range of hills between Ghazni and Herat. T N, Vol. I, P. 370 footnote 2.

2 Ibid., p. 447

3 T N, Vol. I, p. 374.

4 Ibid., pp. 376, 448.

When Shahab-ud-din became the master of Taginabad, the Ghuzz had wrested the territories of Kabul, Zabul and Ghazni from the hands of Khusru Shah where they remained for twelve years.¹ Khushru Malik, the successor of Khusru Shah, had to content himself with the kingdom of Lahore.

From his new seat of Taginabad Shahab-ud-din continuously made incursions into Ghazni and harassed the territories of Ghuzz. At length, Sultan Ghiyas-ud-din led an army in person and conquered Ghazni² in the year 569 H. (1173 A.D.), and returned to Firoz Kuh after placing his brother Shahab-ud-din at the throne of Ghazni.³

Shahab-ud-din, from his new seat at Ghazni, added fresh laurels to the Ghorian kingdom and brought the whole territory of Ghazni under his sway and soon conquered Gardaz also.

As Shahab-ud-din, the Ghorian prince, was an ambitious man he began to frame his elaborate schemes for the conquest of India and to extend the Ghorian power far in the East which soon got the sanction of his brother Ghiyas-ud-din, the king of Ghor and Firuz Kuh. Ghazni once more became the centre of the Muslim power to annihilate the Hindu states of India.

1 Ibid., pp. 448-449.

2 The glory of the Ghorian princes added lustre to the throne of Ghazni and elevated the kingdoms of Hind and Khurasan. Saif-ud-din was the first individual who designated himself as the Sultan of the line and was eventually the first to conquer Ghazni. Ala-ud-din Husain repeated it and took Ghazni but did not rule there. The throne was next taken by Ghiyas-ud-din who conferred the government of Ghazni to his brother Shahab-ud-din in 1173 A. D. When Shahab-ud-din was killed in 1206 A. D. the crown was confided to his slave Sultan Taj-ud-din Yalduz and so the line ended.

3 T N, Vol. I, p. 377 ; Nisbat Namah of Fkhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, p. 19. Here Firishta is wrong in giving the date of the conquest of Ghazni in 567 H. (1171 A. D.), BF, Vol. I, p. 169.

CHAPTER II

BOYHOOD AND EDUCATION

Kutb-ud-din Aibak was one of the three slave generals of Sultan Shahab-ud-din Ghori, who gradually rose to high command. The remaining two were Taj-ud-din Yalduz and Nasir-ud-din Kubacha. The rise of these slave generals to such a high position is no surprise, for they were men of genius, trustworthy, faithful, and possessed all the qualities of a great general. They were ever prepared to give a test of their mettle even at the face of the worst or most perilous circumstances. By the time of the death of Shahab-ud-din Ghori (1206 A.D.) Yalduz was holding charge in Ghazni, Nasir-ud-din Kubacha in Sindh and Kutb-ud-din Aibak in Hindustan. But amongst all, mentioned above, Kutb-ud-din Aibak's foothold at the nearby places of Delhi marks the most significant event in the Indian history, as he directed all his energies and made whole-hearted efforts for achieving the unaccomplished task of the Arabs in order to bring the whole of India under the banner of Islam. Although, not fully crowned with success in his endeavour, it may safely be said that at least he partially succeeded in rendering his valuable services to the cause of Islam by establishing the Muslim rule in Northern India which lasted for many centuries that followed.

His Early Name and Descent

Kutb-ud-din Aibak's name has aroused a great controversy among the scholars of history, partly due to the omission of some relative facts by some of the contemporary writers and partly because of the incorrect translations of their accounts. We, however, have no authentic information regarding the early name of Kutb-ud-din. Briggs, in his translation of 'Tarikh-i-Firishta' writes that after having avenged his defeat against the Hindus in 588 A.H. (1192 A.D.), Shahab-ud-din made Aibak incharge of the Indian territory and dignified him with the title of "Kootb-ood-

deen",¹ which means the "Pole-Star of Religion".² This view has further been strengthened by Mr. Dow who extends to us almost an identical opinion.³ It is curious to note, at this point, that neither this statement does find any place in the original text of Firishta nor any reference has been made by any other writer, known to us, to the effect that this dignified title was conferred upon him in the year 588 A.H. (1192 A.D.). On this occasion, he was simply appointed Commander of the Indian territory. It is very likely that he would have been so named long before this event.⁴ Although, no date as to the conferment of this title is available, but, nevertheless, the above statement makes at least one thing very clear that 'Kootb-ood-deen' was not his real name and that it was conferred upon him by Shahab-ud-din on some graceful occasion.

In this way, Aibak⁵ seems to be the earliest name known to us from the sources of our study. According to Minhaj-us-Siraj Kutb-ud-din's little finger (of one hand) had a fracture, and on that account he used to be styled "I-bak-i-Shil,"⁶ (The powerless

1 BF, Vol. I, p. 191.

2 Dow as quoted by Roverty in TN, Vol. I, p. 571 note 7; but Briggs in his translation of Tarikh-i-Firishta incorrectly translates it as the "Pole Star of the faithful," BF, Vol. I, p. 191 and note.

3 As quoted by Raverty in TN, Vol. I, p. 575 and note 7.

4 See also TN, Vol. I, p. 515, footenote 7.

5 According to Brigg's Firishta it is 'Eibak.' Major Raverty repeatedly mentions 'Ibak.' But it is 'Aibak' and neither 'Aibak' nor 'Ibak' as mentioned by Briggs and Raverty respectively. Hibak is a Turkish word in which "Ai" means 'Moon' and "Bak" means 'Lord.' Therefore, Aibak means 'Moon Lord.' Read also List of Mohammadan and Hindu Monuments, Vol, III p. 9. According to Sir, W. Aaig "Aibak" means 'moon Lord' and may indicate that he was born during an eclipse, or 'Moon-face,' an epithet which in the east suggest beauty 'though we learn that he was far from comely. CHI, Vol, III, p. 41.

6 Some also mention it as 'Shal' but there is no material difference in the meaning of the two. The Arabic 'Shal' means having the hand (or part) withered whereas the Persian 'Shi' signifies 'soft,' limp, weak, powerless, impotent, paralysed. Thus here 'Shil' as mentioned by Minhaj-us-Siraj seems to be more correct in place of 'Shal' of other writers. Some state that it was the Sultan Shahab-ud-din who gave Kutb-ud-din the name of 'Aibak-i-Shil.' Firishta incorrectly states that the Sultan Shahab-ud-din purchased him and called him by the familiar name of Aibak and later on dignified him with the title of Kutb-ud-din. BF, Vol. I, pp 190-91.

figured).¹ Later historians like Yahya-bin Sirhindi², Firishta,³ Nizam-ud-din Ahmad,⁴ Sujjan Rai⁵ and many of the modern historians⁶ have simply copied the views of Minhaj-us-Siraj. But, on the other hand, we know that Kutb-ud-din was a very active and energetic man, and not at all paralysed in his limbs.⁷ It is, therefore, very difficult to accept the views of Minhaj-us-Siraj and others as narrated earlier. It may also be noted that the name 'Aibak' itself frequently occurs in the Tabakat-i-Nasiri⁸ and therefore, it must be the name of a tribe not a nick-name as mentioned by Minhaj-us-Siraj and others.⁹

Similarly, it is most unfortunate that no historian, either contemporary or later, has written anything about the year in which this great conqueror of the age and the creator of a Turkish Empire in India, was born. Due to the absence of this important fact of history, we have been unable either to fix the date of Aibak's birth or trace out his parentage. His place of birth is also not known to us. Although, some of the early writers have mentioned about Kutb-ud-din in detail but, nevertheless, they remained silent on this all important issue and, therefore, have left out this issue quite lively and unsettled. Minhaj, who is our most authentic source of information for the early Muslim history, in the beginning, writes without disclosing the parentage of Kutb-ud-din in this way: "The beneficent Sultan Kutb-ud-Din Aibak, the Second Hatim, was a high-spirited and open-handed monarch. The Almighty God had endowed him with intrepidity and beneficence, the like of which, in his day, no

1 TN, Vol. 1, p. 513.

2 Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, English Translation by K. K. Basu, p. 14.

3 Tarikh-i-Firishta, English translation by Briggs, Vol. 1. p. 190.

4 Tabakat-i-Akbari Text (Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow), p. 41.

5 Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh (Edited by K. B. Jafar Hasan, Delhi), 1918, p. 188,

6 Sir, W. Haig, CHI, Vol. III, p. 41; Mohammad Aziz Ahmad, ETED, P. 123.

7 Major Raverty in TN, Vol. 1, p. 513 footnote 1.

8 Hodivala, S. H. Studies in Indo-Muslim History, p. 204.

9 It is also interesting to note that there is a town, also, of the same name (Aibak), on the high road from Bulkha to Ghor, equi-distant from these two places. BF, Vol, p. 190 footnote.

sovereign of the world, either in the east or west, possessed."¹ Testifying this lucid and exaggerated account, Firishta, a later historian, tells us some what in the same strain: "Kutb-ood-Din was of a brave and virtuous disposition; open, and liberal to his friends, courteous and affable to strangers. In the art of war and good government he was inferior to none, nor was he a mean proficient in literature."²

Thus, it is quite evident from the writings of the Muslim historians, that they have completely ignored to mention the year of Kutb-ud-din's birth. They do not give even a round about idea of it. All the same, with almost an unanimous report of these historians, we are told that Kutb-ud-din was a Turk by descent who seems to have been sold early in his childhood to a merchant who brought him from Turkistan to Neshapur, where he was purchased by the Chief Kazi, Fakhr-ud-din 'Abdul-Aziz of Kufa, who according to Minhaj was one of the descendants of the great Imam Abu Hanifa of Kufa, and the governor of the province of Nishapur and its dependencies.³

This new master of Kutb-ud-din, Kazi Abdul Aziz, who was a man of great ability and foresight "finding that heaven had endowed him genius, sent him to school, where he made considerable progress in the Persain and Arabic languages as well as in science."⁴ In this way, by the virtue of the best education imparted to him Kutb-ud-din grew in the service and society of his master's sons and with them he learned to read the Kuran, and also acquired the arts of riding and archery.⁵ Thus, providence had placed Kutb-ud-din under the service of such a man where he quickly learnt the royal discipline and received higher education to such an extent that whenever an opportunity arrived

1 TN, Vol. 1, p. 512.

2 BF, Vol. 1, pp. 189-90.

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 513 and see also the same, p. 384 notes. But Lubb-ut-Tawarikh, p. 7, wrongly mentions that the new master was the governor of Peshawar (by Rae Bind Rae MS-Abd-us-Salam Collection). The Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah (Nishbat-Namah), edited by Sir E. Denison Ross, London, 1927, p. 2.

4 B F, Vol. I, p. 190.

5 TN, Vol. I, p. 515; ED, Vol. II, 299.

he displayed these very qualities which invariably increased his power and prestige day by day. In a short time he became remarkable for his manly qualities,¹ and was "adorned with all the accomplishments of the age."²

For these obvious reasons, Kutb-ud-din, within a very short time, became a remarkable figure and his name was soon spread far and wide for his skill and manly bearings. When he reached the age of adolescence, merchants from distant parts flocked to purchase him on a very high price. But Kutb-ud-din does not seem to have been sold to any of the merchants till the death of his master Kazi.³ After his master's death Kutb-ud-din was sold as a part of Kazi's estate by his executors and was bought by a rich merchant on a considerable sum.

Kutb-ud-din in Ghazni

The new merchant, after having purchased him on a very high rate in Nishapur, brought him in the famous city of Ghazni, where he heard of Shahab-ud-din's predilection for the purchase of slaves. According to Minhaj-us-Siraj, he sold Kutb-ud-din to him⁴ on a very high price.⁵ In this way, Kutb-ud-din's fate ultimately fell into the superb hands of Shahab-ud-din under whose able patronage, this young and worthy slave began to show signs of promise.

Although Kutb-ud-din was ugly in his outwardly appearance, but, nevertheless, he was endowed with "laudable qualities and

1 Ibid.

2 Firishta (Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow, 1875-76), p. 60.

3 BF, Vol. I, p. 190.

4 FN, Vol. I, p. 513; ED, Vol. II, p. 299.

5 BF, Vol. I, p. 190 : According to some authorities, Kutb-ud-din was presented to Shahab-ud-din as an offering, but received a large sum of money in return. See TN, Vol. I, p. 513 footnote 8. The author of the Lubb-ut-Tawarikh (p. 8) supported by the Raudat-us-Safa (of Muhammad Ibn-i-Khund Shah, Bombay 1271, Vol. IV, p. 888), mentions that Kutb-ud-din was purchased by a merchant from the Kazi's sons. Later, the Tabakat-i-Akbari (p. 41) and BF, Vol. I, (p. 190) both assert that afterwards he was offered to Sultan Shahab-ud-din, who purchased him for a high price.

admirable impressions",¹ which soon made him popular in Ghazni. He reconciled these heavenly qualities so well with his obedience to the new master, that very soon he attracted his master's special notice towards him and started gaining his confidence and favour gradually. Our historians also tell us of an incident of the court of Shahab-ud-din, which further consolidated his position and won for him certain dignified titles and posts. Describing that event, Minhaj-us-Siraj informs us that Sultan Shahab-ud-din occasionally plunged himself into music and convivial activities, and in the course of such entertainments, he used to bestow gifts and honours upon his slaves. One night, as usual, the Sultan, during the course of an entertainment, commanded for the gift to be bestowed upon each of the slaves present there in form of gold and silver, both wrought and unwrought. When Kutb-ud-din received the gift as his share, he conducted a similar assembly and bestowed the whole of it upon other slaves and kept nothing, either small or great for himself.²

This news soon spread like wild fire among the people at Ghazni and was a great proof of his benevolence, generosity, liberality of attitude, and liberty of mind. And when it was brought to the notice of the Sultan next morning, he was deeply moved and his heart burst out in endless praise for Kutb-ud-din. It was not all and the only pervasive effect of his aforesaid benevolent act. For when the Sultan asked for the cause he, fair-spoken as he was, kissing the ground, replied very meekly that, "all his wants were so amply supplied by his Majesty's bounty, that he had no desire of burdening himself with superfluities, provided he retained his sovereign's favour."³ This answer made the Sultan puffed up with pleasure. To testify this boundless pleasure of Sultan it must be recalled that shortly afterwards the Sultan had shown him a great favour and intimacy before the throne and the royal audience-hall and distinguished him by assigning to him an honourable post from among his important

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 513.

2 Ibid., p. 514 ; ED, Vol. II, p. 299.

3 BF, Vol. I, p. 190.

officers. Thus, Kutb-ud-din became a favourite of his master and his rank grew higher and higher till he was made Amir-i-Akhur (Lord of the Imperial Stable).¹ In this way, Kutb-ud-din became the leader of a body of men and a great official.

Kutb-ud-din's Campaign against Sultan Shah²

This event as described by Minhaj and later by Firishta was certainly the beginning of the rise of Kutb-ud-din's great military career. While Kutb-ud-din was still holding the office of the Amir-i-Akhur, the Sultan of Ghor, Ghazni and Bamiyan, went towards Khurasan to check the advancing forces of Sultan Shah. At this stage, Kutb-ud-din showed great courage and gave proof of his skill and calculated actions in repelling the onslaughts of Sultan Shah. He held the command of the forage. Thus, one day, while plunged in quest of forage,³ he was caught unawares by a portion of the cavalry of the enemy.⁴ Though small in number, Kutb-ud-din and his followers displayed bravery of a very high order, but, nevertheless, their unequalled heroism even at the cost of many lives could not give them any success in face of the overwhelming number of the enemy. Lastly, they were taken as prisoners and were carried to Sultan Shah,⁵ who ordered Kutb-ud-din to be put in irons.⁶ But a few days after, the table was turned. Sultan Shah was decisively defeated by the Ghorian armies. The victors thus, released, Kutb-ud-din and brought him on camel's back to his master Sultan Shahab-ud-din.⁷ There Kutb-ud-din was treated with great honour and much favour, and gifts were conferred upon him.⁸

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 514.

2 Dr. Ishwari Prasad wrongly mentions him as the Shah of Khwarizm. HMI (1952), p. 151. In fact, he was his brother, Sultan Shah. See also ETED, p. 126 footnote 4.

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 514.

4 TN, Vol. I, p. 515; ED; Vol. II, p. 300; Tabakai-i-Akbari, p. 41 and Firishta (BF, Vol. I, p. 191), both almost agree in their statements and write that Kutb-ud-din faced the enemy face to face near the banks of Murghab, towards Meru, where he was ultimately taken to prisoner.

5 TN, Vol. I, p. 515 ED; Vol. II, p. 300; B F., Vol. I, p. 191.

6 BF, Vol. I, p. 191.

7 TN, Vol. I, p. 515; B. F., Vol. I. p. 191.

8 TN, Vol. I, p. 515; footnote 5.

Here Minhaj-us-Siraj, the author of the *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, informs us that immediately after this event, when Sultan Shahab-ud-din reached his capital, the fief of Kuhram was assigned to Kutb-ud-din's charge.¹ And from this place he is said to have advanced towards Mirat (Meerut) which he took in Hijri 587² (C. 1191 A.D.). But Minhaj's this statement does not seem to be correct. It is contradicted by his own account. Major Raverty, however, argues that "this," even "could not have been immediately on returning from the campaign, for as yet the battle of Tarain was not gained".³ The year 587 H., as given by Minhaj is somewhat confusing. In fact, it was the year in which Kutb-ud-din Aibak, as 'Lord of the Stables,' was taken prisoner in Khurasan, and, therefore, it is impossible to fix the same date of the aforesaid event. Our historian, thus, contradicts as to his own dates.⁴ Hasan Nizami, another contemporary historian also gives the impression that having conquered Ajmer and Delhi, Sultan Shahab-ud-din made Kutb-ud-din, the Governor of Kuhram and Samana, and returned back to Ghazni.⁵ Firishta, who is a much more later historian, states that in the year 588 H. (C. 1192 A.D.) Sultan Shahab-ud-din, after having avenged his defeat appointed his trusted general as the chief command of the Indian possession⁶ and that Kutb-ud-din designed his various conquests in India from that place.⁷

It is, however, evident from the available sources that Shahab-ud-din's victory over Prithviraj III broke the backbone of the Chahamanas power and, ultimately, laid the whole of the latter's dominion at his feet. His successive victories over Delhi and its nearby places further consolidated his position in India. Hansi, Kuhram, Sarsuti and Sirhind which were all strategic places,

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 515

2 Ibid., p. 515.

3 Ibid., p. 515 and footnote 7.

4 See TN, Vol. I, p. 379 and p. 569.

5 ED, Vol. II. p. 218.

6 BF, Vol. I, pp. 178, 191; But here Firishta erroneously states that on this occasion Aibak was dignified with the title of "Kootb-ood-Deen."

7 BF, Vol. I, p. 191.

were soon annexed, and garrisoned.¹ Although, Ajmer was reduced to the state of dependency, nevertheless, for the sake of convenient administration, the family of the illustrious Prithviraja III was allowed to rule over it. Consequently, Prince Govindaraja,² the son of Prithviraja III³ who is stated to be a minor at that time,⁴ was appointed as a puppet and tributary ruler of Ajmer. So was the case with Delhi which was, too, put under the charge of Kanhadeva's unnamed son.⁵ To strengthen his position, Shahab-ud-din had left behind him an army which "remained encamped within the boundary of Delhi at the Mauza of Indarpat (Indraprashta)."⁶ In the end Shahab-ud-din entrusted his favourite general "Kutb-ud-din, on whose fortunate forehead the light of world-conquest shone conspicuous," with government of the fort of Kuhram⁷ and Samana⁸ and himself went back to

1 Ibn-Batutah, who visited India in the 14th century A.D., mentions, Saraswati (Sarsuti), besides being the name of a river, was also a great city, and during Akbar's reign it was one of the Muhallas of Sarkar Sambhal. See Major Raverty in TN, Vol. I, p. 468 and footnote.

2 Tabakat-i-Nasiri, p. 120; Tarikh-i-Fakhruddin Mubarak Shah of Fakhruddin Mubarak Shah known as Fakhre Mudabbir, ed. E.D., Ross, London, 127, p. 22.

3 Dr. R.B. Singh: The History of the Chahamanas, p. 210; EC, pp. 110, 101. Hasan Nizami does not give the name and simply writes that the son of Prithviraja was made the tributary ruler of Ajmer. ED, Vol. II, p. 216. Firishta, on the other hand, gives his name as 'Gola' or natural son of Prithviraja, BF, Vol. I, p. 178. C. V. Vaidya in his Downfall of Hindu India, Vol. III, p. 339 calls the same prince as Nainsi, while Ojha in Rajputana, Vol. I, p. 170, mentions Govendarai. Govindaraja, however, has been interpreted on the authority of Hammiramahakavya, as the grandson of Prithviraja III. I.A., 1879, p. 55. See also DHNI, Vol. II, p. 1093 note. But Dr. Sharma on the same authority of Hammiramahakavya, asserts that his natural name was Govind, "it is perhaps better to regard Gola (of Firishta) as a mistranscription for 'Guva a well known' construction of the word Govinda, and not to interpret it as "a natural son." ECD, p. 102 and note 1.

4 Dr. R. B. Singh : The History of the Chahamanas, p. 210.

5 Ibid., p. 211.

6 ED, Vol. II, p. 216.

7 This Kuhram has been wrongly mentioned in CHI, Vol. III, p. 41, as Guhram.

8 This is in the Patiala State.

Ghazni with success.¹ Kutb-ud-din, who according to Hasan Nizami, "...by his lofty courage and pure faith without doubt was worthy of the kingdom and suitable for the throne of sovereignty; and by the aid of his sword of Yemen and dagger of India became established in independent power over the countries of Hind and Sind."² Giving a most lucid expression our historian further writes that "He purged by his sword the land of Hind from the filth of infidelity and vice, and freed the whole of that country from the thorn of God plurality, and the impurity of idol-worship, and by his royal vigour and interpidity, left not one temple standing. He extinguished the flame of discord by the splendour of the light of justice, and the smoke of the darkness of oppression vanished from the face of the earth."³

1 ED, Vol. II, p. 217.

2 Ibid.

3 ED, Vol. II, p. 217 .

CHAPTER III

SHAHAB-UD-DIN'S INDIAN CONQUESTS

The conquest of Northern India by the Turks really commenced during the time of Shahab-ud-din. The contemporary writer, Minhaj-us-Siraj records that Shahab-ud-din used to advance every year from Ghazni to bring the portions of Hind and Sindh under his sway.¹ Consequently, after his appointment to the throne of Ghazni in 1173 A. D. as governor by his elder brother Ghiyas-ud-din Muhammad, Shahab-ud-din began to plan for the conquest of India.

The Conquest of Multan and Uchha

Shahab-ud-din first invaded India in 571 A. H. (1175 A. D.)² through the Gomal pass³ for the conquests of Multan and Uchha. Shahab-ud-din first attacked Multan and defeated the Karmathian heretics. Having subdued Multan, he marched towards Uchha in the same year and laid siege around the fortress. The Bhatti⁴

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 115.

2 Ibid, Vol. I, p. 449 BMC, Sultans of Delhi, Int; XI. The Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 12. But Firishta wrongly describes the fall of Multan in 572 A. H. (1176 A. D.), BF, Vol. I, p. 169.

3 It is remarkable to note that Shahab-ud-din in his early invasions of India passed through Gomal Pass and the passes like Khyber, Bolan, Kurram and Tochi were not utilized. It was, however, the Gomal pass which, definitely, was the safest and the shortest of all the other routes. Habibullah: The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, pp. 55-56 and note I; The Struggle For Empire, p. 117.

4 Asir, XI, p. 77; Yahya Sirhindi: Tarikhi-Mubarak Shahi, p. 6; Firishta: Tarikh-i-Firishta, Lucknow, 1867, p. 56; Nizammuddin Ahmad: Tabakat-i-Akbari, p. 37. Most of the modern writers accept that Uchha was then occupied by the Bhatti Rajputs. R.B. Singh: The History of the Chahamanas, p. 183; Dasharatha Sharma: Early Chauhan Dynasties, p. 80; CHI, Vol. III, p. 38; A. K. Srivastava: A study of the Muslim Account of India upto 12th Century A. D., p. 375 (A Ph. D. Thesis of Gorakhpur University not yet published). But Habibullah does not agree to it. He says that the later

Rajputs, who at that time held the fortress, gallantly defended it and foiled Shahab-ud-din's every effort to scale its walls. Having thus failed in his attempts, Shahab-ud-din tried to capture it by treachery. As Firishta, informs us, Shahab-ud-din having failed to capture the fort by force, had recourse to treachery. He sent a confidential message to the Bhatti queen with a promise to marry her if she would deliver her husband. "The base woman returned for answer that she was rather too old herself to think of matrimony; but that she had a beautiful and young daughter, whom if he would promise to espouse, and leave her in free possession of her wealth, she would in a few days remove the Raja." Shahab-ud-din accepted the proposal, and the Rajput queen, in a few days found means to assassinate her husband, and opened the gates for the enemy to capture the fort.¹

Shahab-ud-din, after reducing the fort, married the Rani's daughter after getting her converted into the Islamic faith, but he did not fulfil the other part of his promise. And, instead of entrusting the Rani with the government of the country, he sent her to Chazni where she died afterwards engrossed in deep sorrow and utter disappointment. The daughter of the Rajput queen, too, did not survive for long and died within two years of this event.²

The above story of Shahab-ud-din's conquest of Uchha as related by Firishta, a much more later historian, does not find full support from the early writers. Ibn-Asir, almost a contemporary writer, is the only chronicler who has recorded this event in his book *Kamilu't Tawarikh* (or *Tarikh-i-Kamil* of the Persian

historians like Yahya Sirhindi, Firishta and others have probably on the authority of Ibn Asir state that it was held by the Bhatti Rajputs. He further argues that the annals of the Bhattis, however, do not make the slightest reference to their ever having held Uchha. He, therefore, suggests that it is likely that it was held by the Karmathian heretics. *The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India*, p. 36 and note 66 and 67. Similarly Dr. A. L. Srivastava also supports Habibullah's statements and says that Uchha was held by the Karmathians. *The Sultanate of Delhi*, p. 94.

¹ BF, Vol. I, p. 169.

² *Ibid*,

writers). He mentions therein that the queen of the Bhatti Raja of Uchha, in the hope to marry her daughter to the Ghoride prince, managed to poison her husband to death and allowed the invaders to occupy the fort.¹ But immediately after two pages of this narration in his account, the chronicler gently admits that his description regarding India is based on hearsay knowledge and, therefore, it should not be taken as confirmed.² His statement led many of the modern scholars to think that the event described by Firishta and other later historians are not correct.³ The story of the intrigue between the Bhatti queen and Shahab-ud-din as related earlier might have taken a coloured shape when Ibn-Asir heard it from some one afterwards. But all the same it looks certain that Shahab-ud-din reduced the fort of Uchha by some foul play, treachery or strategem.⁴

However, after the conquest of Multan and Uchha, Shahab-ud-din returned back to Ghazni, giving the charge of the newly conquered regions of India to Ali Kirmani, one of his dependable officer.⁵

Shahab-ud-din's First Defeat in India

Having thus been inspired by his early success in India, Shahab-ud-din tried to emulate the examples of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni and decided all at once to penetrate deep into the

1 Asir, XI, p. 77.

2 Ibid., p. 79.

3 Habibullah : Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, p. 36. and note 66; For the early Muslim occupation of Uchha, see IG, IXXIV, p. 82.

4 S. M. Haq in his book, A Short History of the Delhi Sultanate, p. 55 and note, disagrees to it and says that neither any treachery is mentioned in the earlier and authentic works nor is it in conformity with the character and temperament of Sultan. But Mr. Haq seems to be a bit partial and forgets that Shahab-ud-din won many battles in India by way of treachery. His conquest of Lahore in 1186 A.D. and subsequently the victory in the second battle of Tarain in 1192 A.D. are some of the burning examples of Shahab-ud-din's foul play and teachery.

5 BF, Vol. I, p. 70.

133274

Chaulukya State of Gujerat in the year 574 H. (1178 A.D.).¹ The province was rich in resources and were regarded as "the Key to the Indian hinterland." The Western Rajput States, which bowed their head to the Chaulukyas of Gujerat were their main source for strength. Naturally, it was an obstacle before Shahab-ud-din's schemes for the Indian conquests. Thus, elevated by his initial conquests, and brushing aside the difficulties and the bitter experiences that he might have to face, and forgetting the mishaps encountered by Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni, Shahab-ud-din acted quite contrary to the dictates of geography and finally resolved to measure swords against the Chaulukya king of Gujerat.

Crossing through Multan and Uchha and having refreshed his troops Shahab-ud-din struck across the Rajputana through the sandy desert towards Nehrwala,² whose king, although young and inexperienced in warfare, was comparatively strong in his forces.³ The Turkish army also seems to have proceeded through Kiradu, where Turushkas are known to have broken the image of Somesvara the presiding deities of the town before Kartika, V. 1235 (1178 A.D.)⁴. Therefore, the Turkish army reached Nadol which does not seem to have offered much resistance.⁵ The place which was then held by one of the cousins of the illustrious Chahamana ruler Prithviraja III of Ajmer,⁶ fell somewhat in an easy way. Crowned with these successes, the armies of Islam proceeded to Gujerat in order to give final blow to the Chaulukya power. But contrary to their expectations, they were vehemently opposed by

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 452; BF, Vol. I, p. 170; C.M. Datt: *The Chronology of India*, p. 162.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 451. Here the later writers like Badauni, Nizam-ud-din and Firishta who were almost contemporary to each other appear to have utilized the same sources available to them.

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 452; Firishta does not mention this event in detail.

4 *Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Western Circle, 1906-7*, p. 42.

5 PV, Ojha, and Guleri edition, X, p. 50. Muslim historians do not mention this event clearly.

6 HOC, p. 185.

the young Chaulukya king Mularaja II whose army inflicted a crushing defeat on the Muslim army.¹

This defeat on the Muslim army was so severe in character that Shahab-ud-din could himself hardly save his life.² The Dabhoi inscription seems to support this view, that the progress of Shahab-ud-din was further retarded by the valiant ruler of Gujerat who defeated and repulsed his army completely.³ Referring to this very event, the Sundha-hill inscription of the Nadol Chahamanas distinctly speaks of Kilhana, a member of the family, as having defeated Turushkas and erected a golden gateway there.⁴ Since the known dates of Kilhana hang from 1164 to 1194 A.D. and as he was an ally of the Chaulukya king, it can be safely assumed that he might have fought for his overlord in 1178 A.D. against this common enemy.⁵ Similarly, a fragmentary

1 The Struggle For Empire, p. 78. Here Dr. D. Sharma charges Prithviraja III the Chahamanas king of Ajmer for not rendering his help to the Chaulukya king for this common cause. He, on the authority of the Prithvirajavijaya (XI, 2-4), asserts that Kadambavasa, the Chief Minister of Prithviraja III did not advise his master to do so. ECD, p. 80. But the subsequent events show that Prithviraja III on this occasion was a minor and had not attained the age of maturity. For this reason Somesvara the late Chahamanas king had appointed queen Karpuradevi, as regent. The regent queen, therefore, looked after the administration of the kingdom with the help of her trusted Minister Kadambavasa. See HOC, p. 160; PV, IX, 12, and PV, IX, 36-44. Dr. R. B. Singh, on the same authority (PV, XI, 13-23) argues in these words :

“Prithviraja III appears to have offered no material assistance either to the forces of Gujerat or to his own cousins of Naddula to drive away the invader. The Prithvirajavijaya, however, seems to suggest that Prithviraja III was keen to do so and although no material help was sought from him, his wise Minister Kadambavasa had some diplomatic hand in the defeat of the Sultan.” HOC, p. 185. Similarly, Dr. Ganguli says that “When the news of the fall of Nadol reached Ajmer, Prithviraja resolved to crush the invaders, but refrained from taking any hasty action on the advice of his Minister Kadambavasa, who deemed it wise to allow the enemy to exhaust himself by fighting with the Gurjaras.” The struggle For Empire, p. 106.

2 TN, Vol. I, pp. 45-52; TA, p. 36; and Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh, Tr., ED, Vol. I, p. 66.

3 EI, 1.26, JIH, Vol. XV, August, 1936, p. 173.

4 EI, 9, p. 69.

5 JIH, Vol. XV, August, 1936, p. 174.

inscription at Kiradu near Mount Abu, dated V. S. 1235 (1178 A.D.) records the repair of a temple broken by a Turushka army. It probably refers to the invasion of Shahab-ud-din.¹

But, there has arisen a controversy with regard to the name of the Chaulukya sovereign. The Muslim writers are unanimous in identifying this king with Bhim Deo, or Bhima II, the brother and successor of Mularaja II, and this view has been accepted by some of the modern scholars.² Thus, the author of the *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, informs us that in the year 574 A. H. (1178 A. D.), "Sultan Mu'izz-ud-din marched an army towards Nahrwalah by way of Uchchah and Multan. The Rae of Nahrwalah, Bhim Diw, was young in years, but he had numerous forces and many elephants; and, when a battle took place, the army of Islam was defeated and put to the rout, and the Sultan-i-Ghazi returned again without having accomplished his designs."³ Similarly, *Firishta*, while describing the same event states, that in the year 574 A. H. (1178 A.D.), Shahab-ud-din "again marched to Oocha and Moulton, and from thence continued his route through the sandy desert to Gujerat. The Prince Bhim-dew (a lineal decendant from Brahma Dew of Guzerat, who opposed Mahmood Ghiznevy), advanced with an army to resist the Mahomedans, and defeated them with great slaughter. They suffered many hardships in their retreat, before they reached Ghizny."⁴

But just contrary to that has been said by the Muslim writers, Hindu sources agree that Mularaja II, (C. V. S. 1232-1235) defeated the Muslim army while still an infant.⁵ On this dreadful

1 EI, 11, p. 72. This inscription seems to be in the way to support the fact that when the Muslims reached Nadol on their way to Gujerat, they broke the temple referred to. But after the final defeat of the Muslims, the Hindus were able to rebuild it.

2 ETED, p. 76.

3 TN, Vol. I, pp. 451-52.

4 BF, Vol. I, p. 170.

5 After the death of Ajayapala, his young son Mularaja II, succeeded him in 1175 A. D. (V. 1232). The earliest known inscription of his brother and successor Bhim II is dated as V. S. 1235. Hence Mularaja's reign lasted for not more than three years. A. K. Majumdar : *Chaulukyas of Gujerat*, pp. 131-33.

occasion the mother queen Naiki Devi,¹ acted as a regent and with her son in lap she led the Chaulukya army to a glorious victory against the Muslims at Gadarghatta² near the fort of Mount Abu. This defeat of the Muslim army is the only event which find special mention during the short but shining reign of Mularaja II. For instance, Somesvara informs us that Mularaja defeated the lord of the Turushkas and vanquished the Mlechcha army.³ Arisimha also testifies to this triumph of Mularaja II over the Muslims.⁴ Probably, referring to this very event, an inscription of Bhim's reign states that during the reign of Mularaja even a woman could defeat the Hammira.⁵

Evidently, therefore, the hero of this victory was not Bhim Deva II, as mentioned by the Muslim writers but his elder brother, Mularaja II.⁶ It is, however, a pity that none of the earlier Indian sources speak of the invader's name.⁷ But some of the modern

1 Some scholars identify Naiki Devi as the daughter of Kadamba Paramadin, king of Goa. *The Struggle For Empire*, p. 78, *Bombay Gazetteer*, I, p. 195, *Ibid.*, II, p. 548, 565, and 567. But A. K. Majumdar, on the strength of a Chandel inscription holds that Naiki Devi was, most probably the daughter of the Chandel Paramandi (C. 1223-1253 V. S.) whose father was known to have died while fighting against the Turushkas. *Chaulukyas of Gujarat*, p. 131.

2 *Prabandhachintamani of Merutunga*, Tr. Tawney, p. 154.

3 As quoted by Dr. A. K. Majumdar in *Chaulukyas of Gujarat*, p. 131.

4 *Sukritasankirtana of Arisimha*, II, V. 46.

5 *A Collection of Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions published by Bhavanagar Archaeological Department*, p. 210, Verse 29.

6 *IA*, 1877, pp. 186; Forbes: *Rasmala* (ed. Ralinson), Vol. I, p. 199; *Ojha: Rajputana I*, p. 220; H. C. Ray: *DHNI*, Vol. II, pp. 1004-5; *Chaulukyas of Gujarat*, pp. 131-35. So the overwhelming internal evidences leave no room for doubt that the battle was fought during the reign of Mularaja II. About this time the Paramara Vindhya-varman wrested Malva from this Chaulukyas. Mularaja II died in the early part of A. D. 1178 and was henceforth succeeded by his own younger brother Bhim II, who was obviously a minor then. *The Struggle For Empire*, p. 78.

7 The Ahada Copper plate of Bhim Dev refers to Mularaja, the Chaulukya king of Gujarat, as one who defeated in war the invincible lord of Garjana (Ghazna), *Proceedings of the Seventh Oriental Conference Baroda*, 643). The mention of Garjana or Ghazna, evidently signifies to an invasion from Ghaznavide of Lahore which does not seem to be correct. As Dr. H. C. Ray

scholars are of the opinion that the commander of the defeated Muslim army was none else but Shahab-ud-din himself.¹ The contemporary Muslim historians also confirm it. Dr. A. K. Majumdar puts it as : "The victory over Muizzud-Din was one of the most brilliant victories of the age, and it would indeed be surprising had the victor not received any encomium from his contemporary poets and scribes."² As regards the name of Bhim II in place of Mularaja II as the victor against the Sultan, it appears that the death of Mularaja II, immediately after this event while still an infant, and a long reign of his brother Bhim II who, later on, came into clash with the Turks, are, perhaps, responsible for this mistake on the part of the Muslim writers.

The Conquest of the Punjab And Sindh

Shahab-ud-din's severe defeat at the hands of the Gujeratis was not only humiliating to him but also frustrated the whole scheme of his Indian conquests. But he still considered the conquest of India his life-long mission, and did not leave this idea even for a moment. Therefore, he again mobilised his army and determined to conquer India with a fresh zeal and well-designed plan. But for a successful military operation into the heart of India, a strategic military post was essential for him. His earlier crushing defeat of Anhilwara, perhaps made him wiser, for after that, instead of proceeding deep into the interior of India, he concentrated his energy on capturing and liquidating the remnant of the Yamini kingdom of Lahore. He rightly thought that with

suggests that it is highly improbable that the mild and voluptuous Khusru Malik Taj-ud-Daulah, (C. 1168-86 A. D. the ruler of the line would have dared so distant an expedition. D H N I, Vol. II, pp. 1004-5. Similarly, the early Muslim writers like Minhaj also tells us about Khusru Malik that 'he abandoned himself wholly to pleasure while the servants of the state and governors of the country exercised independent power.' T N, Vol. I, p. 114. And obviously, such a king cannot be supposed, in absence of positive evidence to have led a distant expedition.

1 Frobes : Rasmala, I, 199; Buhler : I A, VI, 137; Jackson: Bombay Gazetteer, I, i, fn 4; Haddivala: Studies in Indo-Muslim History p. 202. Habibullah : Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, p. 53; ETED, p. 76.

2 Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p. 133.

Lahore as the base of operation the work of conquest in India may become easier.

The End Of The Yamini Rule In Lahore

Of the once very extensive empire founded by the genius of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni in the first quarter of the 11th century A.D., only the Punjab could remain in their possession. They had already lost their pomp and power- prestige and possessions. In fact, just when the Yamini empire was coming towards its fag-end, it received the final blow from the repeated invasions of Shahab-ud-din, during the reign of Khusru Malik, the last of the Ghaznavide rulers of the Indian provinces. Shahab-ud-din, therefore, with his new scheme of the Indian conquest, recruited his army again, and marched towards India in the year 575 A.H. (1179 A.D.),¹ and invaded Peshawar (Farshawar) which he, ultimately, conquered and annexed to the kingdom of Ghor.²

Thus, Lahore alone remained in the hands of Khusru Malik. But he was not destined to keep it for long in his possession. At length, Shahab-ud-din turned his attention towards Lahore in the year 577 A.H. (1181 A.D.),³ and invested Khusru Malik in his capital. It is said that this time Chakradev, the ruler of Jammu had invited Shahab-ud-din and promised him to accord all possible help in his war against Khusru Malik, the Ghaznavide ruler.⁴ But, being unable to take Lahore by force, Shahab-ud-din was reconciled with a treaty.⁵ Khusru Malik, who was now drawing to his close without any glory to his name gladly availed himself of

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 552; BF, Vol. I, p. 170.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 452; BF, Vol. I, p. 170.

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 115; but Firishta places this event in 576 A. H. (1180 A.D.); BF, Vol. I, pp. 157-170.

4 CHI, Vol. III, p. 39. The reason for this conflict between Chakradev and the Ghaznavide ruler is said to have been latter's support to the tribesmen known as Khokars who had rebelled against the authority of the Jammu-Chief. According to Firishta, the Sultan Khusru Malik being reduced at that time, by wars both with the Indian princes and the Afghans, was unable to Shahab-ud-din in the open field. BF, Vol. I, p. 170. Also Read: Bakhshish oppose Singh Nijjar. Punjab under the Sultans, pp. 26-25.

5 BF, Vol. I, p. 157.

the circumstance, and immediately, surrendered an elephant and his four years old son Malik Shah¹ as a hostage for the performance of the treaty.²

In 1182 A.D., Shahab-ud-din led an army towards Dewal in the province of Sindh and overran the whole country as far as the sea coast, and returned with great spoil.³

But Khusru Malik, who had earlier submitted to Shahab-ud-din, did not, fulfil the agreement and, Shahab-ud-din again invaded Lahore in 581 A.H. (1184 A.D.), but again he failed to get any success.⁴ Subsequently, he retired towards the fort of Sialkot, repaired it, and left a strong garrison under Husain, son of Khar-mil, and then returned to Ghazni.⁵ Minhaj-us-Siraj states that after the return of Shahab-ud-din Ghor, Khusru Malik, again besieged the fort of Sialkot with the help of Khokhars but failed to get it back and returned to Lahore.⁶

Having failed twice, Shahab-ud-din collected again a huge army, and made the final attempt to reduce the city of Lahore. Minhaj, Yahya bin Sirhindi and Firishta write, that in the year 582 A.H. (1186 A.D.),⁷ Sultan Shahab-ud-din obtained a victory and siezed Khusru Malik.⁸ According to Minhaj-us-Siraj and

1 Ibid., pp. 157-158, 170-71.

2 TN, Vol. 1, p. 115; BF, Vol. I, pp. 157-58, 170-71.

3 TN, Vol., 1, pp. 552-53; BF, Vol, I, p. 171: Tarikh-i-Mubrak Shahi: English translation by K. K. Basu, p. 6: The Struggle For Empire, p. 117.

4 TN, Vol. 1, p. 453; BF, Vol. 1, p. 157.

5 TN, Vol. pp. 453-54; Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, English Translation by K. K. Basu, p. 7; BF, Vol. 1, pp. 158, 171.

6 TN, Vol. 1, 455; Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, Loc, Cit, p. 7.

7 Ibid. p. 455; p. 7; BF, Vol. 1, pp. 159, 171; Lahore Its History, p. 12.

But Minhaj-us-Siraj contradicts his own statement when at one place (TN, Vol. 1, p. 115) he places the same event in the year 583 A. H. On the other hand, the author of the Habibus Siyar places the event in the year 583 A. H. (1187-88 A. D.), when having siezed Khusru Malik, Shahab-ud-din imprisoned him and sent to Ghazni,⁹ and was soon put to death. ED, Vol. IV, pp. 211-12.

But the date given by Minhaj-us-Siraj in which the fort of Lahore was reduced, is generally accepted as already mentioned above (582 A.H.).

8 He was put to death sometime in 598 A.H. (TN, Vol. 1, p. 115). Sir W. Haig places the death of Khusru Malik in the year 1192 A. D. CHI, Vol. III p. 37.

Firishta, however, Lahore was taken possession of by strategems and false promises made by Shaha-bud-din Ghori to Khusru Malik.¹ The foul play began, after Shahab-ud-din's failure in his attempt to subjugate Lahore. Thus, we may conclude the last phase of the struggle in the words of Firishta that while he (Shahab-ud-din) "was preparing for this expedition, he gave out, that it was intended against the Suljooks, writing at the same time to Khoosrow Mullik, that he was desirous of accommodating their differences by a treaty of peace. To convince him of the sincerity of his intention, he released his son Mullik Shah, and sent him back to Lahore with a splendid retinue. The escort had orders to make short marches, while his father Khoosrow Mullik, impatient to see him, advanced a part of the way to meet him. In the meantime Mahomed Ghory, with 20,000 doaspa cavalry, marching with incredible expedition, by a circuitous route, turned the mountains, and cutting off Khoosrow Mullik from Lahore, surrounded his small camp in the night. The Emperor awoke in the morning as if from a dream, and seeing no means of escape, threw himself on the mercy of his enemy."² Shahab-ud-din then sent Khusru Malik and his family as prisoners to his brother Sultan Ghiyas-us-din Muhammad, Samat Firuz-Koh, who confined them in a fort of Balarwan, in Gharjistan, where they were sometime after put to death, during the subsequent war with Khwarazm Shah, and the dynasty of Ghazni then became wholly

1 TN, Vol, p. 115; BF, Vol. I, pp. 158-59.

2 BF, Vol. I, pp. 158-59. Some of the modern scholars do not agree on Firishta's above account. They put in their argument that no such treachery has been mentioned in the Persian Text of Firishta (Bombay edition, p. 99. Vol. I, S. M. Haq : A Short History of the Delhi Sultanate, p. 56).

But the treachery of the Sultan is also indicated by Minhaj-us-Siraj. He thus, writes that the Sultan Khusru Malik "was induced, under the faith of a treaty, to come out, upon which he was taken and sent off to Ghazni" TN, Vol. I, p.115. For Sultan's strategems, see Lahore Its History, p. 12 and ETD, p. 77 and A. K. Srivastava: A Study of Muslim Account Of India, Upto 12th Century A.D. (A Ph.D. Thesis Of The Gorakhpur University not yet published), pp. 371-73. Read also Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, English Translation by Basu, p. 7 for the views given there.

extinct.¹ Thus, the great Yamini dynasty, which lasted from 962 to 1186 A.D., or for 224 years, ceased to exist, and the empire passed from the house of Ghazni to that of Ghor.²

Conflict With Prithviraja III

The annexation of the Punjab and Sindh, brought the frontiers of the newly established Ghorian kingdom very close to the Rajput States of Northern India and these resulted a great conflict soon between him and the Rajput rulers. Now, the boundary of the kingdom of both Shahab-ud-din and Prithviraja III stood face to face with a long common boundary of their empires, and, unless the latter was defeated his dreams to subjugate India could not be fulfilled. It was for this task that for the next six years the Muslim conqueror set his mind at and directed all his energies to the annihilation of the Chahamanas power. In spite of the annexations of Multan, Uchha, Sindh and the Punjab, Shahab-ud-din was far from being the master of Hindustan. He knew it well that the Chahamanas of Ajmer and Delhi were the greatest obstacles in the way of his success in India. Neither the immense wealth of the fertile regions could be obtained nor the banner of Islam could be pushed forward unless the mighty Chahamanas were defeated. The holding of the keys of the gates of Delhi and Ajmer, therefore, became his first concern to achieve this end.

The Prithvirajavijaya, according to Dr. H. C. Ray throws light on the vain attempts of Shahab-ud-din to have coaxed Prithviraja III, to become his ally.³ It is surprising enough that Muslim writers have not touched even a fringe of the fact. Though the details of his representation made by Shahab-ud-din on his way to Gujerat in 1178 A. D.⁴ cannot be known owing to the missing of the relevant pages of Prithvirajavijaya, but subsequent incidents show clearly that his effort to establish an alliance with

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 115; BF, Vol. I, p. 171

2 See also History of the Punjab, (1964) p. 93.

3 DHNI, Vol. II, p. 1036.

4 The Struggle For Empire, p. 106.

this powerful prince failed miserably.¹ Hammiramahakavya, tells us that when the kings of the west, had suffered severely at the hands of Shahab-ud-din, they chose Sri Chandraraja, the son of Govindraja, as their spokesman who in a body came to Prithviraja. The Chahamana sovereign was informed that Shahab-ud-din had pillaged and burnt most of their cities, defied their women, and reduced them altogether to a miserable plight. The noblest of the Rajput families had disappeared before him, and he had established his capital at Multan. Prithviraja III was, therefore, filled with indignation and declared to the assembled princes that he would force the Sultan to beg their pardon on his knees with his hands and feet heavily manacled and fettered, or else would be no true Chohan (Chahamana).² We also learn from the Prithvirajavijaya that on hearing of the hostile activities of Shahab-ud-din, Prithviraja III decided to exterminate the Mlechhas. The Prithvirajavijaya says that when the 'beaf-eating Mlechachha', named Ghori, heard³ of the bow of his Chahamana rival, he tried to negotiate peace with him.³ Consequently, an ambassador was sent to Prithviraja III at Ajmer. Simultaneously, the Sultan attacked Nadol, perhaps on his way to Gujerat. This made the Chahamana king furious, who with the resolve to lay the Ghori's glory to dust ordered the mobilisation of his forces.⁴ But Kadambavasa, the trusted and the wise minister of Prithviraja III refrained him from taking any hasty decision, who deemed it wise to allow the enemy to exhaust himself by fighting with the Gurjaras.⁵ Perhaps, at the same time the news was conveyed to him that the king of Gujerat has utterly destroyed the Ghori's forces. Thus, although the Chahamanas did not have any direct hand in the defeat of the Sultan, the Prithvirajavijaya does suggest that Prithviraja's Chief Minister Kadambavasa had a diplomatic hand in it.⁶

1 Ibid., p. 106.

2 HM, III, 1-15; I. A., Vol. VIII, p. 60.

3 DHNI, Vol. II, p. 1036.

4 PV, X, 39-51; Sharda : Speeches And Writings, p. 211.

5 The Struggle For Empire, p. 106.

6 PV, XI, 13-23.

Nevertheless, none of the available sources, neither the Muslim nor the Hindu, has given a true account of Prithviraja's encounters with the Muslims. The struggle, which lasted for about a decade in which Prithviraja, fought gallantly to protect the country from falling into the hands of the Muslims, has been differently painted by the two sets of historians. Muslim writers have attempted plainly to conceal the fact, for they mention only two such open fights between the two.¹ According to them, in the first encounter, the Muslims suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of the Chahamanas. But this defeat was fully avenged by them in the second clash wherein Prithviraja was ultimately captured and killed. But Hasan Nizami and Muhammad Ufi, the Muslim writers of the 13th century, erroneously describe only one battle in which according to them the armies of Islam were victorious after a grim fight.² They, however, made no allusion of the first one.

This ignorance of the Muslim writers, was simply due to their deep-rooted hatred for the Hindus for whom they always used aspersive languages and considered them as the enemy of God. It is highly likely that, fanatics as they were, the Muslim writers have vigorously tried to shield the defeat and dishonour of the army of Islam, particularly of Shahab-ud-din, the champion of Islam, who having defeated the mighty Hindu monarch, succeeded in founding mightily the Islamic Empire. Unfortunately, the later historians who completed their works many centuries afterwards, depended mostly on the accounts of their co-religionists alone and did not turn the pages of other records as recorded by the Hindus. Therefore, without due elucidation of this fact in their writings it seems all the more impossible for them to give a true account of the war as between Prithviraja III and Shahab-ud-din.

On the other hand, the Hindu records refer at least seven clashes in which Prithviraja III was victorious all the time before he was finally defeated, captured and, ultimately, put to death

1 Minhaj, Firishta and Nizamuddin etc.

2 Taju-l Ma-asir, ED, Vol. II, p. 212; Jami u-l Hikayat, ED, Vol. II, p. 200.

after the fateful battle of Tarain in 1192 A. D. Like the Muslim writers, the Hindus also hold very divergent views with regard to the number of engagements between the two rivals. Prabandha-Chintamani excels in numbers and even goes to the length of describing not less than twenty-three fights between the two monarchs.¹ Prithviraja Raso, the other Hindu record, counts as many as twenty fights between the two.² Similarly, Prabandha Kosa also tells us that Prithviraja took Shahab-ud-din as prisoner twenty times in succession but he was himself taken prisoner by the latter in his next attempt.³ While referring to the number of battles, Surjana Charita also supports the traditional number of twenty-one engagements.⁴

Hammira-Mahakavya narrates in somewhat a different manner. According to this source Prithviraja marched ahead towards Multan to punish his adversary and "in the battle that ensued, Prithviraja took Shahab-ud-din captive and was, thus, enabled to fulfil his vow, for he obliged the haughty Muhammad Ghori on his knees to ask forgiveness of the princes when he had despoiled. He allowed Shahab-ud-din to go to Multan. Seven times after this did he advance Prithviraja to avenge his defeat, each time with greater preparation than before, but each time he was signally defeated by the Hindu monarch."⁵ Thus, it is evident from this account that Shahab-ud-din succeeded in destroying his formidable foe in his ninth attempt. The Prithviraja Prabandha, however, is the only Hindu source which narrates the minimum number of clashes as eight only between the Chahamanas under Prithviraja III and the Turks under Sultan Shahab-ud-din.⁶ The 'Viruddha-Vidhi-Vidhvansa' of Lakshmidhara, though does not give the actual number of clashes, yet it clearly writes that Skanda, the Senadhipati of the Chahamanas forces killed the Turushkas

1 Tawny : PC, pp. 189-91.

2 Prithviraja Raso (N.P. ed.).

3 SJGM, Vol. VI, p. 117, Vastupala Prabandha.

4 Tawny : PC, pp. 189-91.

5 HM, III, 1-49; IA, Vol. VIII, p. 60.

6 SJGM, Vol. II, p. 87.

(Muslims) continually.¹ It is quite evident from this record that Viruddha-Vidhi Vidhvansa is only there to corroborate it.

Like the Muslim accounts, these Hindu records are also full of exaggerated statements which are not very useful material for the purpose of a sober history.

It is, indeed, difficult to account this wide divergence in between the opinion of the Muslim and Hindu writers. It appears, however, that both the Muslim as well as the Hindu sources are incorrect in their respective approach for if the Muslim writers try to suppress facts in order to avoid any mention of the defeat or discomfiture of the army of Islam, the Hindu writers similarly exaggerate them. But, although the Hindu sources do not agree to the number of clashes, they are unanimous on the point that there were several engagements between the two forces, of which the unanimous number appears to be seven. In fact, after the conquest of Lahore in 1186-87 A. D. by Shahab-ud-din he could not be thought of as remaining idle and actionless and doing nothing for nearly two years upto 1191 A. D., the date of the first battle of Tarain. As the two kingdoms had a widely stretched common border of several hundred miles, it is quite likely that aggressive as the Muslims were, there might have been a number of border clashes between the two armies, minor or major, in which the intruders might have been beaten back with severe losses. The Hindu writers appear to have noted these encounters prominently on one side and the Muslim writers have completely ignored these counter-parts on the other.²

First Battle of Tarain

Shahab-ud-din apparently could not prolong any more in spite of the final appeal to arms against his Chahamana rival, and thus marched towards Hind in 587 A.H. (1191 A.D.)³ with a huge army and occupied the fortress of Tabarhindah.¹ He then put

1 Verse II; IHQ, September, 1940, Vol. XVI, No. 3, p. 570.

2 Read also A. K. Srivastava : A study Of the Muslim Account Of India. Upto The 12th Century A.D. (A Ph.D. Thesis of the Gorakhpur University, not yet published), p. 387.

3 TN; Vol. I, p. 457; BF, Vol. I, p. 171.

the fortress under the immediate command of Malik Ziya-ud-din, the Kazi Muhammad-i-Abd-us-Salam, Nisawi, Tulaki,² and left behind 1200 selected horses and some foot-soldiers to garrison it, till he returned from Ghazni after a period of eight months.³

- 1 Major Raverty tells us that although the printed text has Sirhind, all the other copies of the text and many others have the name of the place as Tabarhindah (or Tabarhindh). He further informs us that many authors of comparatively modern date including the *Tabakat-i-Akbari*, *Mirat-i-Jahan Nama*, and *Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh*, also have Sirhind. He then quotes the *Tarikh-i-Alfi*, *Zubdat-ut-Tawarikh-i-Hind* which call the place Tarhindah. He again refers to Badauni who has the same in one copy and Tarhindah in another and in a different place he says that it was Jaipal's capital. The *Lubb-ut-Tawarikh-i-Hind* calls it Tabarhindah now known by the name of Bhatindah. In Briggs' translation of *Firishta*, the place is called Pathindah or Bithunda while Major Raverty himself tries to read the place in another copy of the MS as Bathindah which Dow calls "the capital of Taberhind." Raverty thus concludes that it was the fortress of Batindah which Briggs probably meant, some 100 miles west of Thanesar. Raverty. TN, Vol. I, pp. 457-58, foot-note 3.

Sir W. Haig (*CHI*, Vol. III, p. 40); H. C. Ray (*DHNI*, Vol. II, p. 1087, foote-note 2) and some others have tried to identify it with Bhatinda in the Patiala State. Dr. Dasharatha Sharma, on the other hand, tries to identify it with Sirhind, a place now situated in the Patiala State (*Indian Culture*, 1944, 75 : *Early Chauhan Dynasties*, p. 82, foot-note 51). But, according to the Thornton's *Gazetteer of India*, London, 1886 (p. 872), Sirhind is the name of the tract "consisting of the NE portion of the plain which intervenes between the Jumna and the Sutlej rivers. It includes the British districts of Ambala, Ludhiana, and Ferozpur, together with the native states of Patiala, Zind and Nabha; in the Historical sense, it embraces the level plain between the Himalayas and the desert of Bikanaer, the Sultej and the Jumna." *DNHI*, Vol. II p. 1087, foot-note 2.

- 2 TN, Vol. I, pp. 457-58. This Kazi Zia-ud-Din, was the son of the uncle of the maternal grand-father of the writer of this history (namely, Kazi Majd-ud-Din. Tulaki). Compare also *ED*, Vol. II. p. 295.

The Muslim historians are almost unanimous in describing that Prithviraja marched ahead with a vast army to meet Shahab-ud-din in the field of battle. But if we analyse the circumstances in which Prithviraja III was fighting against the Turks in 1191 and 1192 A.D. the account of the Muslim historians appear to be clearly exaggerated. Muslim historians who were the followers of Islam always tried to glorify the achievements of Islam against the Hindus. Perhaps, due to their this fanaticism they have mentioned the vast and powerful army of Prithviraja III just to glorify and praise the victory of Islam against the mighty Hindu king. For the detailed account of the strength of Prithviraja III, see also *HOC*, p. 199 and footnote 51.

- 3 TN, Vol. I, p. 458; Brigg's *Firishta* simply mentions that more than one thousand horsemen were left in the fort by Shahab-ud-din. *BF*, Vol. I p. 172.

But when Shahab-ud-din's army was marching towards Ghazni, news came to him that Prithviraja, the ruler of Ajmer, was marching towards Tabarhindah accompanied by other rajas of Hind,¹ and Govindaraja,² his feudatory ruler of Delhi. According to Firishta, the Hindu army was swelled in number to, "two hundred thousand horses, and three thousand elephants",³ on receipt of this information, Shahab-ud-din marched back to meet

1 TN, Vol. I, pp. 458, 459; BF, Vol. I, p. 172. Minhaj writes the word Ranas, but in some copies of the same author have Rais, while others have a number of Rajput princes who accompanied Prithviraja in this war. TN, Vol. I p. 459, foote-note 8. Firishta, however, states that the Raja of Ajmer in alliance with other Indian princes marched with 200,000 horses and 3,000 elephants. BF Vol. I, pp. 171-72. But it is more likely that Prithviraja's army consisted of his own forces together with those of the Vassal chief and neighbouring princes.

2 Major Raverty informs us that the oldest copies of the Tabakat-i-Nasiri has the name Govind and Govindah while others have Gaband and Goyend. He further tells us that some more modern copies of the text have Kand and Khand and Khandi. TN, Vol. I, pp. 459-60, foot-note 9. Firishta calls him Chawund Rai (BF, Vol. I, pp. 171-73), which name is also acceptable to Col. Tod (AAR, Vol. I, p. 119). Raverty, however, quotes a Hindu source, according to which it was Kidi Rae (TN, Vol. I, p. 461, foot-note), while the history of Jamun, as quoted by him, calls him Khandi Rae (Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 466-67 foot-note 1).

Dr. R. B. Singh (History of the Chahamanas, p. 193, foote-note 28) suggests that the names of all the three persons Naranaha Kanha, Rai Govinda and Chamunda. It appears quite likely that Narnaha Kanha, (deva), who is said to be the uncle of Prithviraja (Raso Sara, p. 253), (according to the Lubb-ut-Tawarikh-i-Hind Khandi Rae was a blood relation of Prithviraja. TN, Vol. I p. 469, foot-note 9), was the third and unnamed son of the Marwar princes Sudhava, the chief queen of Arnoraja (PV, VI, 31), and, due to his personal valour as well as close blood relation, he might have been appointed as the viceroy of Delhi. If our suggestion be correct, he (Kanhadeva) may be identified with the Rae of Delhi, who is variously called by Muslim historians as Govind, Gaband, Goyend Kand, Khand, Khandi or Chawund Rai, and by Hindu authors as Kidi Rae, Khandi Rae or Naranaha Kanha. Major Raverty, on the basis of Muslim historians and three Hindu chroniclers, calls him the brother of Rae Pithora (TN, Vol. I, p. 460, foot-note 9), but this relationship is clearly untenable, for Prithviraja had only one brother (PV, VIII, 46-52) named Hariraja who survived the emperor (Elliot : Vol. II, pp. 218-19) and ultimately put an end to his life in fire, (HM, III, 74)

3 BF, Vol. I, p. 172.

the Hindu force and encountered it at Tarain,¹ a village in Karnal District.²

The Chahamanas made a ferocious attack on the Muslims. Describing this event Firishta writes that at the outset the right and the left wings of the Muslim army were completely cut down which ultimately fell back and formed a circle. Shahab-ud-din, who was himself fighting in the centre of his army was advised to provide for his own safety.³ The Muslim vanguards comprised of the Khalj Amirs also followed a similar course. But despite this adverse situation the Sultan did not loose heart at all and relying exclusively on his limited followers, he rushed into the Hindu army slaughtering mercilessly those who came within the reach of his blood-thirsty sword. Piercing, thus, through the Hindu army his searching eyes fell on Govindaraja, the raja of Delhi, mounting on his elephant and commanding his army. Without losing any time the Sultan hurled a javelin with full might right in front of

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 459. The place where both the armies met has been differently identified by the Muslim writers. Firishta and Badauni identified it with Taraori which must be one by this name in Karnal District. Here Firishta's translation (B. F., Vol. I, p. 172) gives its name either as Narain or as Tiro-wry which is wrong. Lane-Poole probably relying on Brigg's Firishta also mention woronly as Narain which has been followed by many other modern historians (Mediaveal India, p. 51). Dow has, "Sirauri upon the banks of the Sirusty." Elphinstone, followink Brigg's calls it, "Tirowry, between Taneser and Carnal," and E.D., Vol. II, p. 295 in the translation of the passage of this text, evidently trusting upon Brigg's translation rather than on the original text, is led to disbelieve our author wrong; but acknowledges, at the same time, in a foot-note that "the text (our authors') has Tarain," and adds "but Firishta gives the name as Narain, and says it was afterwards called Tirauri. He places it on the banks of the Sarusuti fourteen miles from Johansar and eighty miles from Delhi." Now all these are incorrect so far as Firishta is concerned, even the lithographed text of Brigg's own revision, for the former has Tarain like other authors and not Narain.

According to Prithviraja Raso the opposing armies met each other at Panipat. (Raso Sara, p. 407). But this error is most probably due to the fact that the whole of the area is commonly known as Panipat. For the identification of Tarain read also Mushtaq Ahmad Cheema's article entitled. 'The Site of the Battle Of Tarain, POIHC, Lahore 1940, pp. 227-29.

2 ECD, p. 459.

3 BF, Vol. I, p. 172.

Govindaraja's mouth which knocked down two of his teeth.¹ The Hindu raja, who was in no way inferior to the Sultan either in valour or in generalship, paid him back in his own coins by severely wounding him on the upper part of his arm with his javelin.² The Sultan's injury was so serious, writes Minhaj, that "The Sultan turned his Charger's head round and receded, and from the agony of the wound he was unable to continue on horse back any longer. Defeat befell the army of Islam so that it was irretrievably routed, and the Sultan was very nearly falling from his horse seeing which, a lion (hearted) warrior, a Khalj stripling recognised the Sultan and sprang up behind him and supporting him in arms, urged the horse with his voice, and brought him out of the field of battle."³ Thus, completely routed, the Muslim army took to its heels. The Hindu soldiers gave a hot chase as far as 40 miles. The Muslim army, however, escaped and took refuge in the fort of Lahore.⁴ The armies of Islam had never tasted such a humiliating and crushing defeat by the Hindus in India.

It was, indeed, a serious blunder that the Hindus did not take full advantage of the plight of the Muslim army, and instead foolishly allowed their scattered army to re-assemble at some distance from the field and to retire safely afterwards. It was a golden opportunity for the Chahamanas sovereign Prithviraja III to have crushed completely the fleeing Muslim army whose leader was already seriously wounded. For this great mistake, which ultimately hurt the independence of the Hindus, Prithviraja can never be excused.

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 460. But Brigg's *Firishta* writes that many teeth were knocked down. BF, Vol. I, p. 172.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 460. According to *Firishta*, it was an arrow which pierced Sultan's right arm. BF, Vol. I, p. 172 (Brigg's Translation of the relevant passage is very faulty).

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 460.

4 BF, Vol. I, p. 173. The author of the *Habib-us-Siyar* relates contrary to all other authorities that when Shahab-ud-din was wounded, he fell from the horse, and lay in the field among the slain till night, and that in the cover of darkness, a party of his own body-guard returned to search for his body and carried him to his camp. As quoted in BF, Vol. I, p. 173.

After inflicting this crushing defeat on Shahab-ud-din, the Hindu army reached Tabarhindah, and besieged it. The seige continued for about thirteen months,¹ whereupon the defence led by Kazi Tulak, broke down and the Kazi had to yield to the Hindu army.²

Second Battle Of Tarain

Shahab-ud-din, who had sustained severe defeat and an unforgettable injury returned to Ghor, after a little recovery.³ On reaching Ghor, Shahab-ud-din publicly disgraced those officers who had slipped away from the field of battle⁴ but he could not forget the shame and humiliation which he had suffered at the hands of the Hindus in India. According to the Muslim historians, he could only spare a month with his brother at Firoz Kuh and returned to Ghazni. "Having made sleep and rest unlawful to himself", he devoted himself entirely to the task of revenging his reverse.⁵ Firishta tells us that at length having recruited 1,20,000 of chosen and picked Turks of Tajak and Afgan horsemen", many of whom had their helmets ornamented with jewels, and their armours inlaid with silver and gold", he marched from Ghazni towards India, without disclosing his intentions.⁶

The Prithviraja Raso, on the other hand, records the Ghorian forces as including one lakh of horses, nine lakhs of footmen and ten thousands of elephants.⁷ This number is much more than that already given by the Muslim historians. Both of the sets of the historians seem to have exaggerated in their account in order to prove the chivalry and generalship of their respective heroes. However, placing himself at the helm of such a huge and well-equipped army Shahab-ud-din, in the following year marching

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 464; BF, Vol. I, p. 173.

2 BF, Vol. I, p. 173.

3 Ibid, p. 173.

4 Dow : History of Hindustan, Vol. I, pp. 130-31.

5 Here the translation of Firishta by Brigg's is faulty. We, therefore, have followed the translation of Raverty in his English translation of the Tabakat-i-Nasiri, Vol. I, p. 464, and note 7.

6 BF, Vol. I, pp. 173-74.

7 Raso Sara, p. 415.

his way off Peshwar and Multan, reached Lahore. According to Firishta when Shahab-ud-din had advanced as far as Peshawar an old sage of Ghor came forth and asked about the intentions of the Sultan. Shahab-ud-din immediately replied, "Know, old man, that since the time of my defeat in Hindoostan, notwithstanding external appearances, I have never slumbered in ease, or waked, but in sorrow and anxiety. I have, therefore, determined with this army, to recover my lost honour from those idolators, or die in the attempt."¹ It is further related that the old sage also prophesied for Shahab-ud-din's victory which invariably encouraged him and his army. Shahab-ud-din afterwards received valuable support from the adversaries of Prithviraja.² Having thus consolidated his position, Shahab-ud-din sent Kiwam-ul-Mulk Ruh-ud-din Hamza, one of his principal chief, from Lahore to Prithviraja as ambassador with the message to embrace Islam which was haughtily answered and thrown-off by the dauntless Prithviraja.³ This despicable and impious attitude on the part of Shahab-ud-din made Prithviraja restless, who with a resolve to meet the situation, exhorted the neighbouring princes and feudatory rajahs to melt under his banner in order to repulse their foe from the country. This national call was soon responded by other Hindu rajahs of the North,⁴ and according to Firishta, the Hindu army swelled in number to 30,000 horses, besides above 3,000 elephants, and a body of infantry, which waited the Muslim on the former field of battle.⁵ According to some authorities,

1 BF, Vol. I, p. 174. But Firishta's text (Newul Kishore, Lucknow, p. 57) gives the same story in some different way and writes that "since my defeat in Hindustan, I have not been in my life nor have I changed my cloths, 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."

2 In the History of Jammu of which summary would be found in Raverty's translation of the Tabakat-i-Nasiri, it is to be found that Vijayaraja of Jammu is said to have helped Shahab-ud-din against the Chahamanas. See also HOC, p. 199 and foot-note 43.

3 Taj-ul-Ma-asir, ED, Vol. II, pp. 212-13; BF, Vol. II, pp. 174-75.

4 In this alleged war Jaichand, the ruler of the Kanauj and Banaras was the only other strong ruler of the North who did not join the Hindu army.

5 BF, Vol. I, p. 175.

Prithviraja, elevated with his former victories over the enemy, collected only a small force that was about him and with this handful of men he advanced to meet the invader.¹ Shahab-ud-din having scented the intention of Prithviraja marched ahead and once more reached the plains of Tarain. Both the armies encamped face to face with the river Sarsuti flowing in between them.² Prithviraja, who had been joined by one hundred and fifty of brave Rajput princes, and their legitimate forces having sworn by the water of the Ganges either to dispel the dark clouds of the common danger once for all or die as martyrs in the upkeep of their priceless faith, wrote to Sultan to return back safely. They even threatened the Sultan of the prospect of complete destruction if he failed to do so. Shahab-ud-din, who was fully aware of the bravery of the Rajputs, believing that discretion was the better part of valour, replied to him, "I have marched into India at the command of my brother, whose general only I am. Both honour and duty bind to exert myself to the utmost in his service; I cannot retreat, therefore, without orders; but I shall be glad to obtain a truce till he is informed of the situation of affairs and till I have received his answer."³ The Hindus, who were over-confident of their might and valour, failed to understand the real motive of the Sultan, who had obtained victory in India several times by means of treachery. The Hindus relied upon what Shahab-ud-din had said and passed that day and night in holiday mood. The next morning they had to pay for their untimely relaxation when Shahab-ud-din's army launched an attack upon them before the visibility of the first rays of the sun.

According to Muhammed Ufi, the author of the *Jami-ul-Hikayat*, who composed his work a little after this event, writes, that "When the opposing forces approached each other and the camp fires were visible on either side, the Sultan gave directions that every man should collect plenty of wood before his tent. At night he directed a party of soldiers to remain in the camp, and

1 HOC, p. 199 and note 51.

2 BF, Vol. I, p. 175.

3 BF, Vol. I, p. 176.

to keep fires burning all the night, so that the enemy might suppose it to be their camping ground." The Sultan then marched off to another direction with the main body of his army. The infidel saw the fires and felt assured of their adversaries being there encamped.¹ Then leaving the centre of his army with luggage and elephants several miles away, the Sultan divided the rest of his army into four divisions, each consisting of 10,000 archers in number, and bade them to attack the Hindus from right and left; from front and rear and retire pretending flight,² without giving them a chance to fight successfully.

It was hardly day-light when the Muslim troops reached the Hindu camps un-noticed and launched their first attack upon them. Minhaj informs us that at the time of this attack the Hindu leader Prithviraja was asleep³ and his soldiers were just moving out for their oblations and other morning duties.⁴ The Hindus, who were not prepared for this sudden attack, were taken aback. A state of utter confusion overtook the Hindu army. But they soon settled down and came out with a fighting tempo. Seeing this, Shahab-ud-din halted his troops which were divided into four divisions and ordered them, "to charge in succession on the centre, and renew the attack by turns, wheeling to the rear after they had discharged their arrows."⁵ In this way, Shahab-ud-din's army fought well till about three o'clock in the afternoon⁶ and taking it as the most opportune time to force a decision in his favour, he led his final charge with "12,000 of his best horses, whose riders were covered with steel armour, and making one desperate charge, carried death and destruction throughout the

1 ED, Vol. II, p. 200.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 468.

3 Prabandha Chintamani writes that Prithviraja was asleep at that moment after breaking his ekadas fast. Firishta also supplements it when he writes that Hindus spent the night in riot and revelry. Thus Prithviraja was asleep at the time of the attack.

4 TN, Vol. I, p. 468 and note; ED, Vol. II, p. 200; BF, Vol. I, p. 176; Ham-miramahakavya, 111, 58.

5 BF, Vol. I, p. 176.

6 Brigg's Firishta writes till sun-set, Vol. I, p. 177.

Hindu ranks."¹ The Hindus were beaten hollow and, according to Hasan Nizami, "an hundred thousand grovelling Hindus swiftly departed to the fire of hell."² Govindraja, the raja of Delhi was also killed in the battlefield.³ Prithviraja, the Chahamana ruler of Ajmer and the leader of the Hindu army, finding the situation beyond control, tried to escape on a horse but was soon recognised and taken prisoner in the neighbourhood of the Sarsuti.⁴

It is evident from the subsequent events that Prithviraja survived for sometime after his defeat.⁵ Shahab-ud-din's army seized immense booty and camp-equipage. The forts of Sarasvati, Samana, Kuhram; Hansi—all went into the hands of the Muslim invaders in succession.⁶

Shahab-ud-din then proceeded in person to the fort of Ajmer and captured it after slaying many thousands of its brave defenders and kept others into slavery.⁷ Having taken immense wealth from the fort which was said to have been accumulated from the days of its prosperity,⁸ Shahab-ud-din, in the words of Nizami, "... destroyed the pillars and foundations of the idol temples, and built in their stead mosques and collegees, and the precepts of Islam; and the customs of the law were divulged and established."⁹

Our historians are unanimous in describing the result of the second battle of Tarain in which the Hindus were decisively

1 Ibid.

2 Taj-ul-Ma-asir, ED, Vol. II, p. 215.

3 The Sultan is said to have recognised him by the absence of the broken teeth that he had himself knocked out. TN, Vol. I, p. 469.

4 This Sarsuti is in the neighbourhood of Saraswati river as suggested by Raverty. But just after a couple of lines Minhaj speaks Sarasvati as a fort which was surrendered to the Muslims. So is the case with Firishta (Vol. I, p. 177). Ibn-Batuta puts it down as a place on the route from Abhojar to Delhi. Dr. D. Sharma, therefore, thinks correctly that this place is most probably Sirsa of the Hissar District, Punjab, ECD, p. 86 and note 72.

5 ECD, p. 86; HOC, p. 209.

6 TN, Vol. I, p. 468; BF, Vol. I, p. 177.

7 BF, Vol. I, p. 177; TA, Vol. I, p. 39.

8 Taj-ul-Ma-asir, ED, Vol. II, p. 215.

9 Ibid.

defeated. But our historians do not agree at least on one issue and that is as to what happened to Chahamana sovereign Prithviraja III after his defeat in this battle. Among the Muslim historians, Muhammed Ufi and Hasan Nizami, who were almost contemporary to each other, mention clearly that Prithviraja was taken prisoner.¹ Hasan Nizami, the author of the *Taju-l Ma-asir*, however, gives us some detailed information and writes that "The Rai of Ajmer, who had managed to obtain his release, or at least, immunity from punishment, and whose ancient hatred against the Musalmans, was deeply rooted and concealed in some intrigue, which is only very obscurely indicated, so that orders were issued for his death, and diamond-like sword severed the head of that abandoned wretch from his body."² Minhaj-us-Siraj, who came to India from Ghor in 624 A.H., (1227 A.D.) and completed his celebrated book *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, writes differently, narrating that Prithviraja alighted from his elephaant, mounted a horse, and took to flight from the field, but he was captured near Sarsvati, and was put to death.³ Testifying to the same opinion, Firishta, a much later historian, also holds that the "King of Ajmer, being taken in the neighbourhood of the Soorsutty, was afterwards put to death."⁴ But it is very surprising to note that Abul Fazal, who was a contempary of Firishta, gives another account. According to him the Sultan took Prithviraja to Ghazni where he met his death.⁵

Similarly, divergent opinions are also not far to seek in the Hindu sources. Chanda gives an amazing story that after his defeat, Prithviraja was taken to Ghazni by the Sultan, where he was rendered blind but managed to shoot the Sultan to death with the help of the poet who had also reached there.⁶ According

1 *Jami-ul-Hikayat*, ED, Vol. II, p. 200; *Taj-ul-Ma-asir*, ED, Vol. II, p. 215.

2 ED, Vol. II, p. 215.

3 TN, Vol. I, pp. 465-69.

4 BF, Vol. I, p. 177.

5 Francis Gladwin, AA, Vol. II, pp. 106 and 103.

6 *Prithviraja Raso*, *Bana-Bedha Prastava*, p. 2387-2468; *Raso Sara*, pp. 435-48. The story thus goes on that Prithviraja was taken to Ghazni to the Sultan as prisoner. The poet Ch and Bardai reached him in the disguise

to Major Raverty, the same story is recorded in the history of Jamun as well.¹ The Prabandha Chintamani, which was written in 1304 A.D., informs us that Shahab-ud-din took Prithviraja to Ajmer as prisoner and had some intention of reinstating him on the throne of Ajmer as his feudatory. But when he saw the picture gallery of Prithviraja containing painting which represented the beef-eating Mlechhas-being killed by pigs, he got him killed.² The Prithviraja Prabandha' a book that was written in the first quarter of the 14th century A.D., narrates that Prithviraja was captured in the battle-field and was kept prisoner in a house at Ajmer. One day Pratapasimha, the traitor minister of Prithviraja communicated to the Sultan his intention to kill him. Upon this caution Sultan got him thrown into a pit where the royal prisoner was stoned to death.³

The Hammira Mahakavya, a later work, which was completed in the first quarter of the 15th century A.D.,⁴ narrates that a Muhammedan took the Chahamanas king unawares from behind, threw him round his neck and drew him prostrate on the ground while other Muhammedans bound him captive. From this time the king refused all food and rest. In spite of the noble overtures made by his Amirs to release the royal prince

of a mendicant and through his help Prithviraja, who was made blind, shot the Sultan dead with his arrow and then both of them put an end to their lives.

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 486 and foot-note 3.

2 Tawany, PC, p. 191.

3 SJGM, Vol. II, p. 87. The detailed story thus runs in this way: "The Sultan sat in the court in front of the place where they had housed Prithviraja (after his capture). This distressed him (the Raja). The Raja's Prime Minister, who was a traitor but unknown as such to him, approached him and said, "My lord, what can be done? It was so destined. "The Raja replied "If thou givest me my bow and arrow, I shall kill the Sultan. "He assented and going to the Sultan asked him not to sit at his usual place. The Sultan had a metal statue of himself put there. Then going to the Raja, the Minister provided him with a bow. The Raja shot the arrow and the statue fell divided into two pieces. The Raja threw off the bow, saying 'My task has not been accomplished; somebody else has been killed.' Then the Sultan had the Raja thrown into a pit and pelted with stones." Quoted from EGD, p. 87, foot-note 81.

4 NPP, New Ed., Vol. XII, Part III, pp. 264-65.

who, out of sheer magnanimity, had set the Sultan free so many times from his prison, the Sultan got him killed in the end.¹ The Virudha-Vidhi-Vidhvansa is the only Hindu record which seems to suggest that the Chahamana king was killed in the engagement.²

These are some of the views of the two sets of historians, the Muslims and the Hindus, who have differently narrated the whole incident and in their own fashion. But a scrutiny of their statements will help us to arrive at a fairly satisfactory conclusion. Among the Muslim writers, Muhammed Ufi and Hasan Nizami are unanimous on the point that Prithviraja III was taken to Ajmer as a prisoner. And since they were contemporary writers there is no reason to discard them altogether. Though Minhaj-us-Siraj, writes that Prithviraja was taken prisoner in the neighbourhood of Sarasvari and was sent hell, yet he does not write clearly whether the Chahamana sovereign was put to death immediately after his capture or his life was spared for sometime. The statement of Firishta, on the other hand, seems to suggest that Prithviraja was alive for sometime after his capture at Sarasvati.³

The Hindu sources, like Prabanda Chintamani and Prithviraja Prabandha, agree on the issue that Prithviraja was brought to Ajmer as captive by Shahab-ud-din where the Chahamana king was killed after sometime. The Hammira Mahakavya records that Prithviraja was made captive, but it erroneously transfers the whole scene to Delhi. This mistake of his is due to the fact that 'Hammira Mahakavya' was written a little more than two centuries after this event and, therefore, many fictitious stories, which were already in vogue, might have been mingled in it. The 'Prithviraja Raso,' which contains much later additions and interpolations, is rather full of exaggerated account and fictitious

1 Verse 23, IHQ, September, 1940, Vol. XVI, No. 3, p. 571.

2 Verse 23, IHQ, September, 1940, Vol. XVI, No. 3, p. 571.

3 Firishta simply writes : "king of Ajmer, being taken in the neighbourhood of the Soorsutty, was afterwards put to death." BF, Vol. I, p. 177.

stories than of historical.¹ The statements recorded in *Ain-i-Akbari* and *Virudha-Vidhi-Vidhvansa* are absurd and do not find any support clearly from the earlier writers.

Among the contemporary writers, Hasan Nizami, gives us a detailed account and writes clearly that the life of the Chahamanas king was spared. But Prithviraja was noted for his "ancient hatred against the Musalmans which was deeply rooted and concealed in the bottom of his heart." He was in some intrigue and "the diamond-like sword severed the head of the abandoned wretch from his body." Such was the statement of Hasan Nizami which also finds support at least from two Hindu sources, the *Prabandha Chintamani* and the *Prithviraja Prabandha* which were written after a little more than a century. The former tells us of Prithviraja's general hatred against the Muslims while the latter speaks of a particular intrigue with the Sultan.

The *Prabandha Chintamani* also mentions that Shahab-ud-din had some intention of reinstating Prithviraja to the throne of Ajmer as his tributary chief in India. Probably, for this reason Shahab-ud-din took the Chahamanas king at Ajmer with him. This finds confirmation from a coin which was issued from the Delhi mint bearing the names of both Prithviraja and Muhammed-bin-Sam.² The subsequent events also show that Shahab-ud-din was not anxious to take over the administration of Ajmer under his direct control. Consequently, after the death of Prithviraja, he did not annex its whole region and instead appointed his son to the government of Ajmer.³ This all could be possible only after the defeat and the acceptance of Prithviraja to rule as their tributary chief. But Prithviraja, who was still alive to the situation and was anxious to expel the Muslims from the country, preferred death to slavery. It is highly likely that Prithviraja might have endeavoured for the freedom of the country from Turkish Serfdom. Such intentions of Prithviraja created a great obstacle in

1 Its author, Chand, in order to have assign a glorious end of his hero seems to have depicted a fictitious story.

2 Thomas: *Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi*, pp. 17-18.

3 ED., Vol. II, p. 216

the way of Shahab-ud-din, who later ended the chapter by putting Prithviraja's life to an end.¹

Thus, came to an end the life and career of the great Medieval Indian hero, who stood like a rock in the way of Turks in this country. His departure from the scene was a signal for the downfall of the Hindu kingdoms and had made the task easier for the Turks. It was, indeed, a great national loss and owing to the absence of this true leader the whole of the Northern India fell flat before the rising Turkish power within a few years after this event.

After the death of the illustrious Chahamana king, Prithviraja III, Shahab-ud-din appointed his son Govindraja as the governor of Ajmer, on the payment of a large and regular tribute.²

The Capture of Delhi :

After settling the affairs at Ajmer, Shahab-ud-din marched towards Delhi which was "among the chief (mother) cities of Hind³." It appears that after the death of the Viceroy of Delhi in the second battle of Tarain, his principality was taken away by his unnamed son,⁴ who gallantly defended it against the onslaughts of Islam. When Shahab-ud-din reached there he saw "a fortress which in height and strength had not its equal nor second throughout the length and breadth of the seven climes⁵." The Muslim army laid siege around it. "A torrent of blood flowed on the field of battle." We are further told by Hasan Nizami that when "the Rai and Mukaddams of that country" were convinced of their ultimate fate "placed their heads upon the line of slavery, and their feet within the circle of obedience, and made firm the conditions of tribute (malguzari) and the usages of service."⁶ A similar view is also held by Lubb-ut Tawarikh-i-Hind¹ and Tarikh-i-Firishta.²

1 ED, Vol. II, p. 215.

2 BF, Vol. I, pp. 177-78. But Firishta gives the name of the son of Prithviraja as Gola, or natural son of 'Pithow Ray', BF, Vol. I, p. 179.

3 ED, Vol. II, p. 216.

4 HOC, p. 211.

5 ED, Vol. II, p. 216.

6 Ibid., p. 216.

It is quite clear from the above statements that the chief of Delhi also submitted to the Sultan probably on the same conditions as were offered to the son of Prithviraja III at Ajmer.³ Thus, Delhi, one of the most important of all the Indian cities fell ultimately in the hands of Shahab-ud-din. The Sultan then in order to make his position more secure in that region, left an army which "encamped within the boundary of Delhi, at the mauza of Indarpat (Indraprashta)", and himself went back to Ghazni with triumph and victory.⁴ Kutb-ud-din Aibak, one of his trusted generals, was made the governor of the entire conquered regions of India.

The appointment of Kutb-ud-din Aibak as Shahab-ud-din's Viceroy in India was not a sudden choice. And although, no historian, either Hindu or Muslim has written anything as to the part played by this unique personality in the annals of history in the conquest of his master, yet it appears that his services must have been great. Kutb-ud-din's appointment as a Viceroy in India marks an almost ubiquitous fact that this slave-commander had a vast experience of India without which his appointment as the Viceroy of India was not possible. And true to the expectations of his master, this trusted commander proved worthy of his choice and succeeded in achieving the goal of his master as has been shown in the preceding chapters.

1 As quoted by Raverty in TN, Vol. I, p. 469, footnote 9.

2 BF, Vol. I, p. 178.

3 HOC, p. 211.

4 ED, Vol. II, p. 216

CHAPTER IV

KUTB-UD-DIN AS VICEROY (I)

Clash with the Chahamanas

The fateful event of 1192 A. D. in which Shahab-ud-din gained his final victory over the illustrious Chahamana prince Prithviraja III, almost decided the fate of this ancient country. The defeat of this mighty prince, did not merely lead to the loss of a dynasty or to the crushing of a clan but fostered a great political disturbance and introduced throughout the country an element of fear and doubt as well in the peaceful enjoyment of life and religion. In fact, after the decisive second battle of Tarain, there seemed to be no serious hurdle in the way of the materialisation of the aggressive designs of the Sultan in Northern India. Naturally, the fall of Delhi gave him the key to the gates of India and thus his monumental victory over Prithviraja III made easy his task of stamping his influence on Northern India. His successive victories in A. H. 588 (1192 A. D.)¹ over the forts of Ajmer, Sarsuti, Samana, Kuhram, Hansi and Delhi further consolidated his position and, undoubtedly, made Shahab-ud-din, the master of a great portion of Northern India.

In the course of discharging his new assignment as Shahab-ud-din's Deputy in India, Kutb-ud-din "purged by the sword the land of Hindus from the filth of infidelity and vice and freed the whole of that country from the thorn of God-plurality, and the impurity of idol-worship." Many forts and districts were brought under the sway of his ever crumbling feet. So Kutb-ud-din, "by his royal vigour and intrepidity, left not one temple

¹ TN, Vol. I, pp. 469, 515. This data has generally been accepted by the scholars. But we have been apprised of just another place in TN, Vol. I, p. 456 note to which elucidates that in the same year a campaign against Sultan Shah was launched (Not Khwarazm Shah but his brother).

standing."¹ Hasan Nizami, the author of the *Tajul-I Ma-asir*, in a very exaggerating manner writes that "he extinguished the flame of discord by the splendour of the light of justice, and the smoke of the darkness of oppression vanished from the face of the earth."² The same author also gives the impression that from the fear of the undoubted might of Islam, many Hindu chiefs around Kuhram, surrendered themselves unconditionally, and paid their humble respect to him.³

On this gracious occasion, a grand feast was held to ceremonise the promotion of Kutb-ud-din who "was so just and generous that the name of Naushirvan and the tale of Hatim Tai were in course of oblivion."⁴

Thus in consolidating his position Kutb-ud-din had the full use of his tenacity and courage to deal with the Indian chiefs and to launch further expeditions. The subsequent events happened with such a lightning speed that a state of utter chaos and confusion prevailed throughout the Chahamanas kingdom. The transfer of political power from the Chahamanas to the Turks was sudden, and surprising. This change in the political condition was, perhaps, due to the fact that the Chahamanas had been never ready to meet the new situation with equanimity, strength and cooperation. They were so proud of their power and strength that they could have never expected such disastrous defeat; a whole-sale extinction of their faith, religion, culture and the demolition of their homeland. Every where a terrible drama of blood-shed ensued. The Hindus, who refused to embrace Islam, were in large numbers brutally put to death. The sacred temples were raised to the ground and images were broken to pieces.

1 TN, ED, Vol. II, p. 217.

2 Ibid., p. 217. Apart from giving the citation as TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 217, it must be shown that this statement bounds in exaggeration and it reflects a characteristic which no human valour could have attained nor can achieve at any future date, howsoever, sharp, blood-thirsty or heavenly sword ones' might be. Even the incarnated people, history shows, could not efface all and sundry the dint of evil from the face of the earth.

3 ED, p. 217. But it is historically incorrect and the Rajputs, though beaten had still some fight left in them.

4 ED, p. 217.

Not only this but even mosques were erected in place of these demolished temples to preach and propogate Islam in this country. The noble sentiments of the Hindus which were already broken to pieces by the Arabs and the Ghaznavides respectively, had received yet another blow at the hands of the Ghorides. The mighty Chahamanas, who were the only hope of this country and who alone could have launched a crusade against the inroads of Islam in the country, were at that grievous moment helplessly witnessing, like a lion in chains, the brutal destruction of this holy land. The mighty Chahamanas, through mutual discord and lack of foresightedness, were, ultimately, forced to lay prostrate at the altar of fate.

However, the Chahamanas were merely defeated and not completely uprooted, for they still remained the greatest foe to the Turks and to their designs for any permanent settlement in India. It was, obvious, therefore, that without their complete suppression the scheme of India's conquest could never be possible. Although beaten and crest-fallen the Chahamanas had still in them certain amount of residuary fighting spirit and were anxious to expel once for all the Muslim invaders from their sacred homeland. Thus, having recovered from the deadly shock sustained in the earlier encounter, the Chahamanas began to make brisk preparations and plans for the emancipation of their country from thralldom. With this sole object in view, they carried on a series of revolts here and there against the invaders. But one obvious difficulty with the Chahamanas which greatly hampered the carrying out successfully of their scheme was that, unfortunately, they had no able leader or king to organise their scattered power to meet the common enemy. Their dauntless hero Prithviraja III had already died, who, by employing diplomacy and war tactics, could have alone led them to victory and restored their last glory. Naturally, therefore, the task was heavy and onerous. On the other hand, their adversary had further strengthened his position by virtue of fresh conquests and had thus acquired more perfection in the technique and the strategy of launching successful invasions. Besides, he had increased considerably the numerical

strength of his army. But even then the superior position of the enemy failed to create any impression upon the Chahamanas. The Chahamanas, who 'having sworn by the water of the Ganges', "had determined that either they would conquer their enemies, or die-martyrs to their faith." Consequently, Ajmer, Hansi, and Delhi simultaneously rose in rebellion against the Turks.

The Rebellion of Hansi :

With courage and determination, the Chahamanas rose in revolt, for the first time, under the leadership of Jatwan¹ at Hansi. The rebellious Jatwan, appears to have been a feudatory chief and a commander of an army of the late Prithviraja III.² The news of this sudden revolt was brought to the notice of Kutb-ud-din Aibak when he was rejoicing and making merriment because of being appointed as Viceroy of India.

We learn from Hasan Nizami³ that a huge army under the

1 According to Elliot he was probably a mere leader of the Jat tribe, which still maintains its position in the nearby of this scene of action ; ED, Vol. II, p 217 and footnote 1; Dr. Qanungo wrongly mentions him as the Jat of Hariana; History of the Jats, p. 32; Firishta tells us that he was a commander of Bhimdeva II's forces, and was killed in 591 H. while trying to checkmate Kutb-ud-din's advancement towards Anhilwada: CHI, Vol. III, p. 41. He also asserts that Jatwan owed allegiance to Raja Bhim of Anhilwada. See also Muhammed Aziz Ahmad; ETED., pp. 127-23 and footnote 1. Professor Habibullah also asserts that he was some chief of the Jat tribe, who possessed the area; The Foundation of the Muslim Rule in India, p. 62; Dr. Ganguli does not give his name and writes simply a Hindu chief; The Struggle For Empire, p. 118. It shows complete ignorance of the actual fact, as we learn from Hasan Nizami that he was defeated and killed on the border of Bagar in 538 H. The word Jatwan is, however, a mistranscription of the word Chauhan, Professor S. Hodivala: Studies in Indo-Muslim History, p. 179 ; Bagar, where this Chauhan commander was slain was in the region of south, and south-west of Fatiabad, Sirsa, Hissar and Bhiwani; IG, Vol. XII, p. 149. There is another Bagar in south which includes Banswara and Dungarpur states respectively. This similarity of name, perhaps had led our historian Firishta to suppose that Jatwan was a relative of Bhimdeva II whose kingdom included these parts; ECD, p. 100 and footnote 3.

1 HOC, p. 213 and foot-note 84.

2 ED, p. 217.

command of Jatwan, "animated by one spirit"¹ gathered round the Muslim army at Hansi². Consequently, in September 1192 A.D. "the honoured month of Ramzan", the Chahamanas commander, raised his hand in the fight against Nusrat-ud-din, the commander of the fort of Hansi, and compelled him to take refuge in the fortress. When this news was communicated to Kutb-ud-din, who was at Kuhram near Delhi, as Shahab-ud-din's Viceroy in India, he was awfully disturbed. He mounted his horse and marched in person hurriedly, and covered during one night twelve "parasangs", to face the situation quickly. When Jatwan, the leader of Hindu army got a scent of Kutb-ud-din's rapid march with a massive army to meet the challenge, he decided strategically not to give battle in the open field. He, therefore, for want of better and favourable conditions to fight against the Turks, consequently decided to retire towards the neighbouring hills. Jatwan decamped with his army towards the borders of Bagar.³ But Kutb-ud-din was not to lose this opportunity which could easily earn for him an immediate victory. He therefore, hotly pursued the Hindu chief and did not allow him to secure a defence or refuge.

Here we find contradictory statement in Hasan Nizami's *Taju-l-Ma-asir*, who is a contemporary source of information. According to him "The accursed Jatwan, when he heard the news of the arrival of the serious armies, felt himself compelled to depart from under the fort and fled." He further pens down. "The soldiers of Islam came upto the army of Hind on the borders of Bagar; and although Jatwan saw there was no chance of successful opposition in battle, yet as he saw destruction impending on him from the throat of the dragon, and the road for flight was blocked up and the standards of State and royal

1 Ibid., p. 217. Hasan Nizami seems to have recognised the rising of the nationalistic spirit among the Chahamanas which animated them to force Kutb-ud-din and his army back to their homestead.

2 The place has been identified as the Guhilah principality of Asika or Hansi, established by the Chahamanas of sakanbhari; DHNI, Vol. II, p. 1203.

3 This place is to be identified with the region stretching from the South and South-West of Fatiabad, Sirsa, Hisar and Bhiwani; IG, XII, p. 149.

Victory were unfurled, yielding to the necessity of the case, and not at his own option, he prepared for the fight.”¹ This contradictory statement of Hasan Nizami which is suggestive of two opinions, undoubtedly amounts to the suppression of the truth and the supporting of the falsehood. Fired with the ambition of always adding a new feather to the cap of Islamic glory the Muslim chroniclers frequently put forth such uncredencial statements as would disparage and nullify the Hindu deeds and correspondingly highten the Muslim glory in their stead. Such a prejudicial work cannot be relied upon as an authentic source of information. And, therefore, we should be very cautious in utilising and working upon the materials furnished by such Muslim chroniclers. In fact, Jatwan, ambitious and impatient as he was to bring back the lost glory of the Chahamanas, had unfortunately, no sufficient army at his disposal to oppose the huge armies approaching from two side, one under the command of Kutb-ud-din himself and another under the charge of Malik Nasrat-ud-din. Jatwan, therefore, was quite justified in giving up the idea of an immediate fight and instead to switch on to a casual retirement in the hope of a better opportunity in order to measure the strength of his opponents which could bring for him victory in its wake. This bold decision, which culminated in a flight, or perhaps retreat, has wrongly been interpreted by the Muslim historians as the result of fight. Further, Hasan Nizami’s statement, that at Bagar “not at his own option he prepared for the fight”, does not give a correct estimate of the event. Although, there is no authentic record to gauge this estimate of Hasan Nizami, but it appears that Jatwan, finding Kutb-ud-din and his army away from the Muslim posts, tested his luck by giving a measured though open fight to the Turks in Bagar. This timely decision taken by the Chahamanas was not the last alternative left to them as indicated by the Muslim historian. They could have, otherwise, saved their lives, if at all they wanted to do so. But instead, they boldly decided to engage the Turks in battle and so they turned back steeped in great hostility. Hasan

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 217-18.

Nizami further writes that with this decision of the Hindus "the noise of the hautbois and shells confounded the world, the thunder of the drums ascended to heaven, and the blast of the brazen clarions resembled the sounding trump (of resurrection)."¹

A severe battle ensued in which the hostile armies attacked each other "like two hills of steel, and the field of battle became tulip-dyed with the blood of the warriors." But fortune had always played an important role in the defeat of the Hindus, who were again beaten after a grim fight. Jatwan, himself fighting with great courage succumbed to his alleged decision "and the dust of the field of battle was commingled with the blood of that God—abandoned wretch, and the whole country was washed from the fifth of his idolatory."²

After this victory Kutb-ud-din went to Hansi, and, according to Hasan Nizami, he stayed there for few months in order to repair the feet.³ But even this statement of Hasan Nizami appears to be concocted and does not bear even a fraction of truth. The stay of Kutb-ud-din at Hansi does not appear to be for reasons of repairs. But it is very likely that since Hansi had become the centre of the revolutionists under the Chahamana leaders in the upper part of Western India, Kutb-ud-din was under a bounden responsibility to stay over there for few days to maintain peace and order which was quite essential for him for the purpose of consolidating his stronghold in that region.

However, after having accomplished his design Kutb-ud-din retired towards Kuhram, the nuclear of his Government "which", in the words of Hasan Nizami, "acquired fresh beauty from his blessed foot."⁴

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 218.

2 Ibid., p. 218, Brigg's Firishta, while taking the same event surprisingly writes that "In the year 589, Jeewun Ray, a general of the Raja of Nehrwalla, in Gujerat, advanced with an army to besiege Hansy. Kootb-ood-Din, marched with his forces to relieve, compelled him to raise the seige, and pursued the Guzeraties to their own frontier." BF, Vol. I, pp. 191-92.

3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 218.

4 Ibid., p. 218.

In a nutshell Kutb-ud-din's victory further strengthened his position in India and the news of this splendid achievement was soon despatched to his reverend master at Ghazni with a note "that the foundation of all this success was the lofty courage and pure faith of his Majesty."¹

The Capture of Mirat :²

Inspired by the victory against Jatwan, Kutb-ud-din planned to add fresh laurels to his cap by annexing the neighbourhood of Delhi. Such a design, on the part of this Muslim commander, is clearly in support of the contention that he had determined to expand the Muslim empire upto the heart of India. Naturally, therefore, Mirat which seems to have been ruled by some feudatory chief of Prithviraja III was bound to become the next target of Kutb-ud-din's fresh designs because of its political importance during those days. Therefore, in 588 H. (1192 A.D.)³. Kutb-ud-din set out from Kuhram towards Mirat which was "one of the celebrated forts of the country of Hindu for the strength of its foundations and superstructure." In the way, we are informed by Hasan Nizami, of some of his dependable chiefs of the country who joined him to render him assistance.⁴ Kutb-ud-din seems to have succeeded in capturing this fort without the least difficulty and converted all the idol-temples into mosques. For fear of death many people embraced Islam.⁵ Kutb-ud-din, then appointed a Kotwal and left him in the fort of Mirat with a commendable army at his disposal to look after the affairs of that place.⁶ Thus,

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 219.

2 The place is to be identified with the modern city of Meerut.

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 469. Brigg's *Firishta* also supports it (BF. Vol. I, p. 191). *Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shah*, p. 41, has given the year 1193 A. D. which is obviously a mistake. C. V. Vaidya also takes this event in 1193 A.D. Vaidya's this statement is based on the authority of *Tabakat-i-Nasiri* who often mentions the capture of Mirat in 537 AH, (TN, Vol. I, p. 515) but this is the year in which Kutb-ud-din as Lord of the stables only was taken prisoner in Khurasan and, therefore, it is impossible. Our author constantly contradicts his own dates. See TN, Vol. I, pp. 379, 469 and 515.

4 TN, ED, Vol. II, p. 219.

5 *Early Turkish Empire of Delhi*, p. 128.

6 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 219.

the Muslims established to the east of the Jammuna, a Muslim out-post.

The Fall of Baran¹ :

Having suppressed the rebellion of Jatwan and after the fortification of the forts of Hansi and Mirat, Kutb-ud-din devoted himself to further conquests. Consequently, the same year Kutb-ud-din managed to cross the Jammuna to establish a military post in the Upper Doab to fulfil his ambitions. The major portion of the region was under the occupation of the Gahadvalas, who ruled over it through the Dor Rajputs as their feudatory chiefs with Baran as their stronghold. Still they were not ready to surrender anything of their own to the Muslim power, which had already extended just across the river. The Dor Rajputs did not occupy Baran alone but they also held considerable portions in Meerut, Aligarh, Bulandshar, Mathura, Etah and, to some extent, across the Ganges in Moradabad.²

Their traditional accounts clearly speak that Chandrasena, the local leader gave a stubborn fight to stem the rise of the Turkish power.³ We also find a partial confirmation by a document available to us that at least treachery decided the issue.⁴ Ajaipal a relation of Chandrasena⁵ who acted as a traitor, helped the Turkish forces to victory and in return he was granted by Shahab-ud-din a land in reward for his services to the Turkish forces. Ajaipal is also said to have embraced Islam along with his many trustworthy followers and was named Malik Muhammad Qad Daraz after his conversion.⁶ The letter grant of Shahab-ud-din also refers to the appointment of Qazi Nuruddin

1 Modern Bulandshar.

2 For its detailed account see JASBB, 1879, p. 273.

3 Habibullah Op. Cit, p. 62. The Dor traditions speak that Chandrasena lost his life in defending Baran against the Turks in 1194 A.D. But the Muslim historians give the weight of this event as 1192 A.D., which appears to be correct against A.D. 1194.

4 Habibullah, Op. Cit, p. 62 and Appendix 'A'.

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid., Appendix 'A'.

thereafter.¹ Later on, Kutb-ud-din fortified the place and made it a base to operate successfully the Gahadvala dominion from the North.

The Second Capture of Delhi :

By the time the Chahamanas were planning to make their final bid to recover their lost glory Delhi, which had been previously conquered by Shahab-ud-din, immediately after the fall of Ajmer in 1192 A.D. once again raised its head in insurrection. The unnamed Chahamanana prince who was installed by the Shahab-ud-din as a vassal and tributary ruler of Delhi, was convincingly suspected of having designed some serious and damaging scheme for the overthrow of the Muslim yoke.²

Before we set out to deal with the consequential happening that followed the existing state of affairs it is all the more important to point out the political significance which Delhi had acquired at that uneffaceable moment. Indeed, since our glorious ancient days Delhi has been enjoying an air of undisputed political importance in the political history of India. Also at that time an importance of a similar character was studded on the crown of Delhi. This city, then acquired the most strategic position as well as it served as the key to the hinterland, and was designated as the only place from where the scheme of the expansion of the Muslim empire could be successfully carried out. Ajmer played the second fiddle in the comity of politically important places of the country. Before its annexation to the Muslim empire, Ajmer had been the capital town of the mighty Chahamanas. But, nevertheless, because of its being situated well inside Rajputana, surrounded on all sides by valiant Rajput States, it seemed quite insecure and unformidable as a seat of Muslim power in India. Kuhram (also known as Inderpat) which was, no doubt, the seat of Kutb-ud-din's government in 1192 A.D. could hardly satisfy Kutb-ud-din's ambitions design to establish a powerful Muslim empire in the North-East. Obviously, therefore, it wore a provisional character for the seat of Kutb-ud-din's government

1 Ibid., Appendix 'A'.

2 The Struggle for Empire, p. 119.

and remained merely as a temporary camp. Naturally, therefore, Delhi was a better choice and played a first fiddle in the political structure of the country and in matter of political expediency and convenience as well. As the situation demanded, Delhi, could not be left into the hostile hands of the brave Chahamanas, for it, "was a nucleus of aggressive national and religious sentiment and formidable obstacle to the progress of the Muslim arms."¹ Therefore, Kutb-ud-din manoeuvred to bring Delhi into his immediate control, and soon with the Chahamanas insurrection, Kutb-ud-din got the fair opportunity of invading Delhi.

Thus, Kutb-ud-din who had determined to raise and establish Islamic faith in this country could not tolerate when he heard of the hostile designs of the Chahamanas of Delhi and marched, immediately after the conquest of Mirat, to settle the affairs there. He made no delay and by virtue of his huge army at his command he seiged Delhi in 588² (1192 and 1193 A. D.).

1 CHI, Vol. III, p. 41.

2 Hasan Nizami, a contemporary historian does not give any date in this connection; TN, Vol. I, p. 469 says 587 H. (1191 A. D.). But TN, Vol. I, p. 514 gives the date for the same event at the end of 538 H. (1192 A. D.) thus Minhaj contradicts his own statement. Tarikh-i-Mubarakshahi, p. 11; and TA, Vol. I, p. 38-39; and Firishta, Vol. I, p. 53 also gives the same date. The year 1191 A. D. could never be possible because it was the year of the first battle of Tarain, and Kutb-ud-din must have conquered Mirat and Delhi after 1192 A. D. the second battle of Tarain. CHI, Vol. III, pp. 41-42 gives the same date either December, 1192 A. D. or January 1192 A. D. But Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, p. 22 another contemporary and reliable source clearly states that Kutb-ud-din conquered and reliable source clearly states that Kutb-ud-din conquered Delhi in 538 H. (1192, A. D.). In one of the arch which is to be found in the eastern entrance 'Qutb Mosque' and inscription which gives the idea that Kutb-ud-din having conquered the fort built this mosque in the year 587 H. or 539 H. (1191 or 1193 A. D.). Ibn Batuta misreading it wrongly gives 534 H. (1188 A. D.) as the year of the conquest of Delhi (Ibn Batuta, Paris. ed., Vol. II, p. 116). Thomas Edward: Chronicle of Pathan Kings of Delhi, London, 1871, p. 22 reads the same inscription as 537 A. H. On the other hand, General Cunningham in Archaeological Report, p. 23 records the same inscription as 539 A. H. Prof. Habibullah supports Cunningham's statement on the argument that the inscription on the Kutb-Minar can also be read as 589 H. (1193 A. D.) Foundation of the Muslim Rule in India, p. 63 and footnote 40). Muhammad Aziz on the other side seems to have supported 537 H. as the year of the conquest of Delhi; Early Turkish.

The city of Delhi "which is the source of wealth and the foundation of blessedness" seems to have fallen without any stiff resistance. The ruling Chahamana family was forced to surrender and Kutb-ud-din entered the city in great triumph and dethroned its ruler previously installed by his master Shahab-ud-din as the tributary ruler. "The city and its vicinity was freed from idol-worship and in the sanctuaries of the images of the Gods, mosques were raised by the worshippers of one God."¹

Delhi Becomes The Capital of Kutb-ud-din :

The ambitious designs of Kutb-ud-din Aibak to bring Delhi under his suzerainty was now accomplished. The annexation of Delhi and the interwoven motive for the extension of the Muslim empire right upto the heart of Hindustan led him, as of necessity, to shift his capital from Kuhram to Delhi.² Firishta informs us that consequent to this political event in the year 589 H. (1193 A. D.), Kutb-ud-din, "making Delhi the seat of his government, established himself there and compelled all the districts around to acknowledge the faith of Islam."³ This change of the seat of government from Kuhram to Delhi proved a boon to this conqueror in that advantageous position of Delhi was bitterly exploited and was ultimately worked upon as a key to the Indian conquest. It was for the first time in the history of the Muslims that Delhi, which had been the ancient capital of Hindustan, was, incidentally and for strong political reasons, made by Kutb-ud-din as the capital of the Muslim empire. The Arabs and the Chaznavides (Turks), who conquered Sind and Punjab earlier, had decidedly failed to make any impression on or cause terror to the interior states of Hindustan. This is why that in spite of their long rule over these provinces their empire could not be extended beyond the territory of Sind and Punjab. The reason is not far to seek. The central places of Sind and Lahore lay far from the political expediency and could not, therefore, afford to them any opportunity to extend the Muslim empire to the East. The

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 219.

2 The place was of a political importance.

3 BF, Vol. I, p. 178.

reason for this utter failure of both of the Arabs and the Ghaznavides to extend their empire beyond Sindh and Punjab was well in sight of Kutb-ud-din who rightly threw his capricious eyes on Delhi and ultimately made it in the year 1193 A. D. as the capital town of the Muslim empire in the East. This was, naturally, a wise step which afforded Kutb-ud-din and successors wide scope for territorial acquisition and expansion, without which the Muslim empire, like the Arabs and the Ghaznavides, would have fallen into oblivion. But as against the untowered fate of the Arabs and the Ghaznavides, this political change in the character of the governance, brought in its wake immediate fruitful result to Kutb-ud-din. Within a short span of a decade the whole of Northern India from Delhi to Gujerat on the one side and from Delhi to Bengal, on the other, were successfully invaded and conquered and, therefore, keeping in view this historic event, the credit for the extension and the establishment of the Muslim empire in Hindustan must go to Kutb-ud-din's earlier occupation of Delhi. Had Kutb-ud-din made mistakes like that of his predecessors in not making Delhi as his capital town, the judgment of history, the political structure and the social preoccupations of the country would have been of different character altogether.

The Ajmer Rebellion :

Notwithstanding, these vital occurrences in favour of Kutb-ud-din which could have stonified his position, no doubt, the brave Chahamanas still remained the greatest obstacle in translating the scheme of Kutb-ud-din's dream into real conquest. And, therefore, the Chahamanas who always lay in wait for an opportunity, finding the Muslim governor busy in the affairs of Delhi, collected themselves under the leadership of Hariraja,¹ the younger brother of the late Prithviraja who, in turn, mobilised the forces

1 Hasan Nizami calls him Hiraj and Elliot wrongly interprets it to be an abbreviation of the Sanskrit word "Dhiraj", a potentate, which is still used on the seals of the Hindu Rajas. Firishta, on the other hand, calls him Hemraja; ED, Vol. II, p. 219 and footnote 1. Some historians also call him Hamir; Raverty : TN, Vol. II, p. 57. But they are all incorrect, because according to Hammira Mahakavya (of Nayachandra, IV, 2) clearly gives his correct name as Hariraja. See also Ray : DHNI, Vol. II, p. 1093.

of the Chahamanas and declared war against Kutb-ud-din. The cowardly, unpatriotic and disgraceful attitude of Govindraja, culminating in his acceptance of the post of a tributary ruler of Ajmer, was not at all tolerated by the members of the family, who by the impact of their conventional traditions preferred death to slavery. Accordingly, we learn from Hammir Mahakavya that prince Govindraja was banished from the kingdom of his father by his uncle Hariraja¹, who took refuge in the fort of Ranthambore² which was lately annexed by Kutb-ud-din.³ Having, thus, recovered Ajmer Hariraja advanced towards Ranthambore⁴ and laid siege around it. At this stage the Chahamanas seem to have committed a blunder. And, instead of mobilising themselves towards Ajmer and to Ranthambore respectively, they ought to have attacked Delhi straightway, where Kutb-ud-din was busy in suppressing local revolts. But, unfortunately, they centralised their attention on Ajmer and Ranthambore and thus wasted most of their valuable time in the siege of Ranthambore and missed, therefore, the golden opportunity to recover Delhi.

However, then Kutb-ud-din settled the affairs at Delhi, he received intelligence from Kiwan-ul-mulk Ruhu-d-din Hamza, under whom Kutb-ud-din had garisioned the fort of Ranthambore⁵ after its conquest, that Hiraj (Hariraja), the brother of the Rai of Ajmer, had gone into rebellion, and "had turned his face towards the siege of the fort of Ranthambore" and that the son of Pithaura who had advanced under the protection of the sublime court, "was in the state of extreme danger." Having realised the

1 HM, IV, 24 and 29 ; NPP, Vol. III, part III (new ed.), p. 275.

2 ECD, p. 100.

3 Fakhre Mudabbir, p. 22.

4 Prof. Habibullah wrongly mentions the siege of Ranthambore prior to the recovery of Ajmer by Hariraja; *The Foundation of the Muslim Rule in India*, p. 63. Muhammad Aziz, however, altogether omits the conquest of Ajmer by Hariraja; *Early Turkish Empire of Delhi*, pp. 129-30.

5 Fakhre Mudabbir, p. 22. For a great dated in 1194, of a village near Ajmer, by Hariraja's wife, Pratapadevi, read *Annual Report of the Rajputana Museum*, 1911-12.

gravity of the situation and finding the kite of imminent danger hovering over his head, Kutb-ud-din immediately placed Sabik-l-mulk Nasru-din, at the helm of affairs at Delhi in his absence, and himself proceeded to Ranthambore, "passing over hills and desert like a wild ass or an antelope."²

We are further told by the Muslim chroniclers that Hariraja, knowing the limitations of his resources, and that "he could not content with the army of Islam", gave up the idea of any more fight and retired with his army towards the hills on the arrival of the Turk Commander. Apparently, Kutb-ud-din had an easy pull and got control over the situation.¹ "At this time", writes Hasan Nizami, "the son of Rai Pithaura, was favoured with the robe of honour and other kindness, and in return for this friendship, he sent abundant treasure for the service of the state, together with three golden melons, which with extreme ingenuity had been cast in moulds like the full moon."²

Delhi Rebels Again :

Having thus recovered both Ajmer and Ranthambore from Hariraja, Kutb-ud-din reinstalled Govindraja as the tributary ruler of the former. But the powers of Hariraja who had retired towards the hills with his army unannihilated was yet to be shattered. In the meantime, Kutb-ud-din engaged himself rapaciously in the subjugation of the country and in the suppression of the uprising of the country where confusion and unrest prevailed on account of the political upheavals. Such a contemptuous and abhorrent treatment meted out by Kutb-ud-din to the Hindu masses, roused aggressive resentment in them, who had already nursed feelings of hatred and contempt against the Muslims for their anti-Hindu and inhuman attitude and for their utter disregard for their gods and goddesses as well. And, therefore, they resolved to repulse the Muslims under the Chahamana leaders from the country.

The absence of the Turk Commander from Delhi, also pro-

¹ TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 220.

² Ibid., p. 220.

vided a fair opportunity to the Chahamanas to raise their heads in succession against Sabiku-l-mulk Nasru-din, who had been appointed by Kutb-ud-din to look after the proper governance of Delhi in his absence. Consequently, the former prince of Delhi who had been ousted by Kutb-ud-din, immediately responded to the call of the nation groaning heavily under the revages of the Muslim empire, and took full advantage of Kutb-ud-din's absence from his headquarter. He, therefore, in order to formulate his scheme into reality, seems to have invited the neighbouring people to flock under his banner to annihilate once for all the destroyer of their ancient culture and religion. The pulse of the nation was in their favour at that moment and, therefore, their invitation was soon solicited by a large number of the neighbouring Hindus. This instantaneously resulted into the building up of a large army of "idolatrous, turbulent and rebellious tribes" which assembled under one banner and for one common cause.

Kutb-ud-din, who was engaged in bringing peace and order back to Ajmer, was elicited with the heart-rendering news of the uprising of the Chahamanas under the command of the dispossessed prince of Delhi, who had raised his head with "the vapour of pride and conquest."¹ On hearing of it he immediately rushed towards Delhi, leaving Hariraja undefeated and safe behind the hills. In the encounter that followed, the Chahamanas prince was taken prisoner. And by the orders of the Turk Commanders, "his head was severed from his body and sent to Delhi which had been his residence and capital."² The victorious army, thereafter, entered the city and the people of Delhi were once again forced to witness the sanguine drama of bloodshed and disaster.

Later Kub-ud-din, at his this splended achievement sent "written accounts of his captures of forts and strongholds and his victorious and holy wars" to Ghazni, the seat of his master's place. When the news of his exploits reached Shahab-ud-din, he became mad in happiness and invited his commander to Ghazni to receive thanks and gifts in person.³

1 TM, ED, Vol. I, p. 220.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

Kutb-ud-din in Ghazni :

Kutb-ud-din received the invitation of his master in the same year, "when the heat was so great as to prevent travelling, but he set out on his journey at the commencement of the rainy season,"¹ and reached Ghazni safely where he stayed for some time.² The Muslim chroniclers have penned down no other reason of Kutb-ud-din's galloping to Ghazni than the invitation of the Sultan, who greeted him in person with honour and gifts. It is very surprising that Kutb-ud-din could have preferred gracing the invitation of his master to his leaving the country in disruption and in the teeth of adverse circumstances and when there was every possibility for the natives of the country to succeed in creating holes into the Turkish empire. Therefore, it is highly probable that Kutb-ud-din might have been called back to Ghazni by his master to assist him against the Khwasazmian menace,³ for his own capital town of Ghazni was itself in imminent danger.

However, casting aside this creditable fact, Hasan Nizami informs us that when Kutb-ud-din reached Ghazni "he enjoyed the happiness of kissing hands, and received other marks of special favour before the great throne, and the degree of his rank was raised above all the other chiefs of the world." He further mentions that a festival was ceremonised at his arrival "and splended jewels and valuable clothes and costly arms, and slaves of great price" were presented "to the king."⁴

1 Ibid., p. 221.

2 Minhaj describes this journey in the reign of Iltutmish, when having conquered Naharwala and Gujerat went to Ghazni accompanied by Malik Nasir-ud-din Husain; T. N., p. 168. This view is further supported by Futuh-us-Salatin, p. 84. Another some places the same event in 601 H. (1204 A.D. Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din *Mubarak Shah. p. 25). But this supposition is impossible, as Hasan Nizami clearly speaks that Kutb-ud-din and Iltutmish both invaded Kalinjer in 1202 A.D. Kutb-ud-din bought Iltutmish after his visit to Ghazni and if the event took place in 1204 A.D., Iltutmish could never be present there. The probable date of Kutb-ud-din's this journey to Ghazni is 1193 A.D. Muhammad Aziz Ahmad: Early Turkish Empire of Delhi, p. 130, foot-note 6.

3 The Struggle For Empire, p. 119.

4 TM, ED, Vo. II, p. 221.

We find a poetic description of the place where Kutb-ud-din was luxuriously accommodated and which was situated in the garden of the minister Zia-ul-Mulk. But at the fall of the rainy season, he fell ill and was "removed from the residence of the minister to the place of the sovereign, which is the seat of prosperity,"¹ But Kutb-ud-din could not recover fully, and on account of his bad health, "he could not rejoin in his heart with the festivities."² After having recovered from his long illness, Kutb-ud-din took leave from the Sultan and received "a patent conferring" of the government of Hindustan upon him "and everyone of the principal officers of his army was rejoined exceedingly, at-receiving from his Majesty suitable presents and promotion of rank"³ when Kutb-ud-din arrived at Kirman,⁴ on his way back to Delhi, he was welcomed and received with great honour by Taj-ud-din Yalduz.⁵ Kutb-ud-din was later favoured by Taj-ud-din Yalduz, who gave his daughter in marriage to him, and a great feast was held on this gracious occasion.⁶

Kutb-ud-din Returns to Delhi:

Thus, Kutb-ud-din who had by then become the 'defacto' as well as the 'dejure' ruler of India under the occupation of the Turks, returned Delhi, his capital city, and heard no news of any further uprising of the valiant Chahamanas.

It is, indeed, most surprising that this long absence of Kutb-ud-din from the country could not infuse into the Hindu Rajas fresh blood of regaining the lost glory of the nation by driving away the Turks from their homeland. Had the Indian princes collected under one banner shedding away all their mutual differences and determined to repulse from this sacred country during the intervening period the future onslaughts of the Muslims, the

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 221.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

4 Elliot places Kirman in the Bangash country between Kabul and Banu; ED, Vol. II (Aligarh Ed.), p. 219, foot-note.

5 He was also a slave of Shahab-ud-din.

6 TM, Vol. II, p. 221.

history of India would have been widely different. But it seems that these Hindu Rajas did not at all avail themselves of this golden opportunity. They rather preferred to live in retirement and relaxations. This and similar other deep rooted and inherent weaknesses of the Hindu Rajas had been in vogue since long and this paid them back in their own coins in the end and India was, ultimately, won over by the alien rulers.

There seem to have taken place some astray risings and revolts which were easily brought under control.¹ In the meantime, Kutb-ud-din came back from Ghazni in the year 1193 A.D. and "the crown and throne of sovereignty received honour and adornment in his kingly person."² On this gracious occasion the city and its vicinity rejoiced and were magnificently "decorated like the garden of Iran, and the gates and wells were adorned with the gold tissues of chin and bracades of Rum."³

Hasan Nizami, further, mentions that the triumphal arches were raised, which were exceedingly beautiful, on the top of which even a strong wringed bird could not surmount, "and the glittering of the lighting of the swords and the splendour of the arms, which were suspended on all sides of them, inspired terror in the spirit of the beholder."⁴ Kutb-ud-din on his return from Ghazni also built the Jama-Masjid at Delhi in 1193 A. D.⁵ "and adorned it with the stones and gold obtained from the temples which were demolished by elephants."⁶ Thus, the materials obtained from the destruction of the Hindu temples were freely used in the construction of Jama Masjid which was covered with "inscriptions in Toghra, containing the divine Commands."⁷

1 The Struggle For Empire, p. 119.

2 TM, Tr., ED, Vol. II, p. 221.

3 Ibid., pp. 221-22.

4 TN, ED, Vol. II, p. 222.

5 According to the inscription on its entrance gate it was stated just after the annexation of Delhi in 1192 A. D. It was, however, completed in 1196 A. D. and enlarged during the reign of Iltumish; Futuh-us-Salatin, p. 110.

6 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 222.

7 Ibid., p. 222.

The Conquest of Kol¹ :

Kutb-ud-din's next target was the annexation of Kol which was "one of the most celebrated fortresses of Hind."² Its occupants were most probably the Dev Rajputs under the Gahadwala with Baran as its headquarters.³ Possibly this Kol became a more severe menace which demanded an immediate action.⁴ Therefore, Kutb-ud-din after passing sometime in Delhi, marched towards Kol crossing Jun (Jummuna) in the year 590 H. (1194 A. D.)⁵ "which from its exceeding purity, resembled a mirror"⁶ and took the fort after an obstinate resistance on the part of Rajputs. All the Hindus garrisoned in the fort were forced to choose either Islam or death. And according to Hasan Nizami those "who were wise and acute were converted to Islam", "but those who stood by their ancient faith were slain with the sword."⁷ By thus launching a massive massacre of Hindus, the Muslim nobles and chieftains entered the fort, and obtained "much treasures and countless plunder, including one thousand horses."⁸

1 This is to be identified with modern Aligarh. According to some popular legend Kol owes its origin to one Kosharab, a Kshattra of the lunar race, who called the city after his own name. Its present designation was named by Balarama, who annexed and conquered the neighbouring regions of the Doab and slew the great demon Kol. Another tradition says that the district was occupied by the Dor Rajputs before the first Muslim invasion, and continued its occupation by the raja of Baran till the close of the 12th century. See Muhammad Aziz : The Early Turkish Empire of Delhi, p. 133 footnote 4.

2 This is according to Hasan Nizami, ED, Vol. II, p. 222. But Minhaj gives the year of this event as 589 H., p. 120.

3 Habibullah : Foundation of The Muslim Empire in India, pp. 62-63.

4 Ibid., p. 63.

5 TN, ED, Vol. II, p. 222.

6 Ibid., p. 222. Habibullah places this event immediately after Kutb-ud-din's return in 1194 A. D. which is not correct. It is clear from the statement of Hasan Nizami that Kutb-ud-din having returned from Ghazni built a Jami Masjid in 1193 A. D., and it was after staying for sometime that he marched towards Kol.

7 TM, Vol. II, p. 222.

8 Ibid., p. 222. Muhammed Aziz wrongly mentions that it was after the conquest of Kol that Delhi was made the seat of the Government; Early Turkish Empire of Delhi, p. 133, but we have seen earlier that after the occupation of Delhi in 1193 A. D., Kutb-ud-din transferred his Government from Kuhram to Delhi.

CHAPTER V

KUTB-UD-DIN AS VICEROY (II)

Clash with the Gahadavalas

Like Chahamanas of Ajmer and Delhi the Gahadavalas¹ of Kanauj and Banaras were yet another powerful Rajput kingdom in Northern India which gradually assumed greater momentum and more menacing proportions against the Turk invasions the dark clouds of which were looming large in the North-Western horizon of this country. By this time the powers of the Chahamanas were almost broken. Ajmer and Delhi were snatched away from them. Kutb-ud-din's subsequent victories over the forts of Hansi, Sarsuti, Mirat (Meerut) and Baran had further consolidated the strength and the growing power of the Turks in the country. The annexation of Kol (Aligarh) in 1193 A.D. opened the road to India beyond Yamuna, and the Turks had started thinking of carrying successful onslaughts into the deep regions of India. For the successful operation of this Scheme, Dr. Habibullah points out, Kutb-ud-din had probably visited Ghazni in person for the formulation of the plans in concert with his master, Shahab-ud-din, who it is further said, came himself with a large army to execute the plans.² The formulation of these fresh plans was necessary because at that time Gahadavalas were anticipated as the greatest obstacle in the way of successful inroads of the Turks in the East. As such the realisation of the dream of founding a Muslim Empire in the heart of India was felt to be an uphill task unless the powers of these Gahadavalas who had held

1 Lanepoole and Dr. Ishwari Prasad erroneously call them the Rathors. *Mediaeval Ind.*, p. 53 and *History Of Mediaeval India*, p. 140. For the identification and origin of the Gahadvala dynasty, see the *History Of The Gahadvala Dynasty* by Rama Niyogi, pp. 28-42; and *History of Kanauj* by Dr. R. S. Tripathi, pp. 296-300.

2 Habibullah : *The Foundation Of The Muslim Rule In India*, p. 64.

the key to the rich and fertile plains of India were finally annihilated. Also it was not an easy task for Kutb-ud-din either to bring Jaychanda (C. 1178 A.D.—1194 A.D.) to terms or to defeat him, who was the ruler of the Gahadavala dynasty at that time and who, according to both the Muslim as well as Hindu accounts, was one of the greatest kings of India and the contemporary of Prithviraja III (C. 1178 A.D.—1192 A.D.).

The charge of a traitor :

Some scholars hold that Jayachandra had some secret communication with Shahab-ud-din to ensure the humiliation of Prithviraja III, who was not only his contemporary, but also a rival for the establishment of supremacy in Northern India. On the authority of Chand Bardai, Major Raverty asserts the probability of this event².

It is fact that though there is no direct evidence so far available to prove that Jayachandra either assisted the Sultan or was in league with him in the defeat of the Chahamana sovereign in the fateful battle of Tarain, there are several factors leading to indirect evidence which cannot be altogether brushed aside in this connection. The living tradition that Jayachandra played the traitor by the country when its fate was being decided in the Turk-Chahamana conflict has been coming down for the last eight centuries and as such it cannot be altogether ignored. The fact that the name Jayachandra has become synonymous with the word traitor in the annals of the country, is itself a matter of great consequence. Further, we learn from the Vidhi-Vidhvanasa, more or less a contemporary work that when Prithviraja marched to oppose the army of Islam in the second battle of Tarain in 1192 A.D., the Commander-in-Chief of his forces (Senadhipati) Skanda had gone with his army to some other front³. This front could not be against Chandelas whose power and prestige had already sunk too low to think of any armed confrontation with

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 466, foot-note 1, and p. 467. See also Tod : Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan (Crooke Ed., Vol. I, p. 300).

2 Op. cit, p. foote-note 1, p. 467, 300.

3 IHQ, September, 1940, p. 571.

the Chahamanas in the last decade of the 12th century A.D.¹ Similar was the case with the Chaulukya ruler Bhima II, who, on account of internal chaos and confusion in his own kingdom which had even led to his own deposition from the throne for a few years², could not be in a position to threaten the Chahamana frontier during this period. In fact, his Prime Minister had already indicated his intentions a few years earlier not to court hostility with the Chahamana king³. As regards the Paramaras of Malwa, they had already been reduced to a negligible position during this period⁴, and, secondly they seem to have made an alliance with the Chahamanas⁵. Naturally, there could be no question of any border clash or hostility between the Paramaras and the Chahamanas.

The powerful State in Northern India which could be hostile to the Chahamanas was the Gahadavala kingdom of Kanauj. The Chahamanas had conquered the Delhi region in the time of Vighnaraja IV⁶, and as this region was then under the protection of the Gahadavalas⁷, they could not be reconciled with this loss of territory. This hostility had recently been renewed between Prithviraja III and Jayachandra on account of the abduction of the latter's not unwilling daughter Samyogita from her marriage Pandal by the young and chivalrous Chahamana sovereign Prithviraja III⁸. This must have apparently infuriated king Jayachandra to such an extent that he might have determined to annihilate the Chahamana power by any means whatsoever. It is not unlikely, therefore, that, there might have been some border skirmishes between the two states just at a time when the Sultan of Ghor was making repeated invasions of the Chahamana territory for the expansion of the kingdom of Islam in India. It may or may not

1 Singh, R. B. : The History of the Chahamanas, pp. 167-69.

2 Majumdar, A. K. : Chaulukyas of Gujarat, pp. 160-61.

3 Sharma, D. : Early Chauhan Dynasties, p. 77.

4 Ganguly, D. C. : History of Paramara Dynasty, p.

5 Singh, R. B. : The History of the Chahamanas, p. 199, foot-note 51.

6 Ibid., pp. 145-47.

7 Tripathi, R. S. : History of Kanauj, pp. 319-20.

8 Singh, R. B. : The History of the Chahamanas, pp. 174-79.

be a fact that Jayachandra sent an invitation to Shahab-ud-din to invade the Chahamana kingdom, but his policy of armed hostility with Prithviraja III while he was engaged in a life and death struggle with the Sultan, did help the latter in the realisation of his cherished desire to conquer Hindustan and to this extent Jayachandra cannot be absolved of his responsibility of playing a treacherous role by the country as a whole. His observance of festivity at Kanauj at the sudden end of the Chahamana king¹ at the hands of the Sultan only confirms our suspicion that at a time when the fate of the country was being decided for centuries, the Gahadalvala sovereign adopted a dubious role by his mother-land and finally let her down and its posterity has nicknamed him as Jayachandra the traitor, it was at his own doing for which nobody is to blame except the ruler of Kanauj who failed his country at a critical hour in its history.

Thus, the feelings of hatred and hostility reared by Jayachandra against Prithviraja III ultimately brought about the defeat of the latter, but it had nothing better in store for him either. Once the gates of the country were thrown open by the most treacherous enemy of Hinduism, Jayachandra and others had to be swept away by this Islamic flood of unbounded ferocity.

The view that "the invasion of this country was an almost inevitable corollary to Muhammad's complete victory over the Gaznavide in the Punjab"² may be partially true, for invasion does not mean annihilation. If the Sultan could be decisively beaten in the first battle of Tarain, it could have been repeated in the second battle too. But this could have been possible only when Prithviraja had been allowed to concentrate his energy entirely towards meeting this aggression. But this could not be, end, as ill-luck would have it, he had to face the enemy both at home as well as from outside all at once which ultimately proved not only his own ruin but also of the whole country³.

1 1 SJM, Vol. II, p. 89.

2 An advanced History of India, p. 278.

3 For the other view read Dr. Roma Niyogi (Miss) : History of the Gahadvala Dynasty, p. 112.

The account of Jai Chandra's Military Strength :

Before we enter into discussion as regards the conflict between Sultan Shahab-ud-din and Jai Chandra, it is more necessary to deal with the military power and strength of the latter. As a matter of fact, the army of Jai Chandra seems to have impressed both the Hindu as well as Muslim chroniclers. The bardic Hindu works like *Prithviraja Raso*¹ are full of exaggerations and anachronisms which have fully weakened the force and authenticity of these works. They inform us that Jai Chandra bore the epithet of "Pangu" or "Dal Pangula" for he maintained a stupendous force.² This, ultimately, led Chand Bardai to say that in the march "the van had reached their ground, and the rear had moved off."³ According to the testimony of Suraj-Prakash Jai Chandra's armed forces consisted of 80,000 men in armour, 30,000 horses covered with Pokhar in quilted mail; 300,000 Paiks or infantry; 200,000 bowmen and battle axes; alongwith a host of elephants bearing warriors.⁴ We are further told that with the help of this huge and stupendous army, Jai Chandra embarked upon a career of conquest and annexed the earth as far as 700 Yojanas.⁵ Besides, he is acknowledged to have defeated even the king of Ghor before his final engagement with him.⁶ According to the 'Purusapariksa' of Vidyapati, which supports this view, "Yavanesvara Sahavadin" (Sihabuddin) fled several times after sustaining defeat.⁷ The next important Hindu source for our study is 'Rambhajanari' which names Jai Chandra as the "Nikhila-Yavana-Ksaya Kanch,"—"the destroyer of all the Yava-

1 Buhler while commenting on the *Raso* writes that it "had better be left unprinted;" *Proceedings Of The Asiatic Society Of Bengal*, 1893, p. 95. See also *JBBRAS*, May, 1928, pp. 203-11.

2 Cf "Sainyatisayat Pangubirud daharakah," Introduction to the *Rambhajanari*, p. 4; Act. I, p. 6; *Prabandh Chintamani*, V, 210 (ed. Jinavijaya Muni, p. 113).

3 Tod; *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* (Crooke), Vol. II, p. 936.

4 Tod: *Loc. Cit.*, p. 936.

5 *HOK*, p. 322. One Yojana being roughly equal to eight English miles, *Ibid.*, p. 322.

6 *Raso Sara*, pp. 95-98.

7 Vidyapati's *Purusapariksa*, Eng. Tr., Nerukar's ed. (Bombay, 1914), Ch. IV, 11th tale (*Ghasmara Katha*), pp. 146-47.

nas."¹ Some Chahamana chronicles also affirm and testify some of the great conquests of Jai Chandra. He is also said to have twice defeated Sidharaga, king of Anhilwara (Gujerat).²

Similarly, the military power and the extensive jurisdiction of Jai Chandra, struck even the Muslim historians.³ According to Hasan Nizami, a contemporary historian, 'Jai Chandra, "had an army, countless as the particles of sand" and "prided himself on the number of his forces and war elephants."⁴ Ibn Asir, the author of the 'Kamilu-Tawarikh', another contemporary historian records that Jai Chandra had 700 (seven hundred) elephants "and his men were said to amount to a million" which also included many nobles of his army.⁵ Firishta, who is a later historian, also bears testimony to the same account. According to him, Jai Chandra had a numerous arrays of horses "besides upward of 300 elephants", which he led to oppose the advancing army of Islam.⁶

It is, thus, quite clear from these two sources—Hindus as well as the Muslims—that they have manifestly exaggerated in giving vent to their accounts. The reason of such exaggerations seems to stand on different footings. While describing the exploits and strength of Jai Chandra, the Hindu writers, who were definitely not fond of meddling into writing history, have unmindfully exaggerated their accounts. But, on the other hand, the Muslims were great and fervent history writers and, therefore, they cannot be excused of exaggerating their accounts to such an extent. It is very likely that to add great laurels to the achievements and exploits of the armies of Islam, they quite mindfully, have given the impression of fairly a large number of the army of Jai Chandra so that great and rare credit should travel to the side of Islamic army which, though small in number comparatively, inflicted a crushing defeat upon "the army of the enemies of religion." This attitude of an unhistoric character is further revealed from the

1 Rambhamanjari, Act. I, p. 5.

2 Tod : Op. Cit., p. 936.

3 ED, Vol. II, pp. 223 ff and p. 251; BF, Vol. I, p. 178 ff.

4 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 23.

5 ED, Vol. II, p. 251.

6 BF, Vol. I, p. 178.

statement of Ibn Asir, who showing his complete ignorance of the fact, erroneously writes that "The king of Benaras was the greatest king in India, and possessed the largest territory, extending length-wise from the borders of China to the province of Malawa (Malwa), and in breadth from the sea to within ten day's journey of Lahore."¹

Unfortunately, we have no means to fix exactly the boundary line of Jai Chandra's kingdom. But it must have been limited on account of the emergence of several strong principalities in the country at that time. The Imperial Chahamanas who had annexed Ajmer, Delhi and their nearby places, reached the height of their glory during the reign of Vighraja Iṽ (C. 1150-64 A. D.)², and were already bidding for supremacy in the North under the vigorous rule of the illustrious Prithviraja III. In the South, the Chandellas had assumed greatest power and glory during the reign of Madanvarman (C. 1125 A. D.-1165 A. D.), who, according to the Mau inscription, destroyed "the army of Kasi."³ From the Madanpur inscription, it is also certain that during the reign of Madanvarma's successor Parmardi or Parmal (1165 A.D.-1203 A. D.), it was Prithviraja, and not Jai Chandra, who occupied Mahoba and other fortresses in Bundel Khand.⁴ The phrase, "borders of China", according to Dr. R. S. Tripathi, may be presumed to denote that the kingdom was extended upto the foot of the Himalayas⁵. According to an inscription, Jai Chandra's kingdom appears to have extended upto Gaya in the East.⁶ It is also certain at the same time that the regions of Allahabad, Benaras and the surrounding tracts must have been under his suzerainty. Gahadavala's relation with Benaras was

1 KT, ED, Vol. II, p. 251.

2 See for the exploits of Vighraharaja IV, Dr. R. B. Singh's *The History of The Chahamanas*, pp. 142-153.

3 The King of Kasi has been identified with Vijai Chandra (C. 1155 A. D. —1169 A. D.), who, on this occasion, was forced to pass his time "in friendly behaviour." E. I., Vol. I, pp. 198, 204, Verse 15.

4 Progress Report of The Archaeological Survey of India, 1903-04, p. 55.

5 HOK, p. 324.

6 Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1880, pp. 76-80; I.H.Q., V, 1929, pp. 30.

more intimate and because of it being the habitual residence of the kings or owing to its religious character and advantageous position, and being situated "in the centre of the country of Hind,"¹ it became a sort of second capital almost from the beginning of their rule. For this reason, it appears that the Muslim historians call Jai Chandra as the "Rai of Banaras"², and so also do the other several other Hindu authorities.³ Similarly, there was the Sena Dynasty in the East. And Laksmansasena, who has been identified with the Rai Lakhmananiya of the Muslim writers, was thus a Sena king, contemporary of Jai Chandra. According to the Bakarganj inscription of Kesavasena⁴ and the Madhianagar grant,⁵ this Sena King, had erected, "many pillars of victories," in Benaras and Allahabad. But it is impossible to believe that Laksmansena, who himself fled without offering any resistance to the small army led by Bakhtiyar Khilji, could have even extended his conquest upto Benaras and Allahabad which were under the possession of the strong Gahadavalas. Nevertheless, the fact revealed by the above cited authorities do suggest one thing that contemporary to the Gahadavalas, in the far east there was a Sena Dynasty which was also powerful and strong.

In view of these facts, it is quite impossible to place reliance on the account of Ibn Asir, stated earlier. Whatever the position of the Gahadavala Dynasty might have been at the time, they met the Turk invaders, nevertheless, there is, at last, one thing quite evident from both these, Hindu and Muslim authorities to the effect that Jai Chandra was the last great monarch of Kanauj, whose power and the size of his empire had even struck the Muslim historians.

1 ED, Vol. II, 223.

2 Ibid., pp. 222, 223, 300 etc. Firishta calls him as the Prince of Kanauj and Banares; B. F., Vol. I, p. 178.

3 Prabandha Chintamani, V, 210 (ed. Jinavijaya Muni, p. 113), also see III, 121, p. 474.

4 JASB, VII, Pt. I (1839), pp. 42, 43. Re-edited by R. D. Banerji, Ibid., NS, X, (1909), pp. 97-104.

5 Ibid., NS, V (1909), pp. 473, 476, Verse II.

Early clashes with the Turks :

Before the Turks and the Gahadvalas had finally met at Chandawar in 1193 A. D., the Muslim historians only speak of a minor engagement between them in which the Turks are said to have successfully carried the day and took away with them much plunder and booty.

We are informed by the Muslim historians that immediately after the fall of Kol, Kutb-ud-din received the news of his master, Sultan Shahab-ud-din's march from Ghazni in order to execute fresh plans for the conquest of India.¹ On the receipt of this information, Kutb-ud-din marched ahead upto Peshawar to meet and greet the Sultan,² and presented to him an elephant "laden with white silver and red gold,"³ besides one hundred five horses & many other valuable presents.⁴ It was most probably Peshawar⁵ where Kutb-ud-din mustered a strong fifty thousand mounted soldiers before the Sultan,⁶ "and being honoured with a dress, was preferred to the Command of the the advance of the royal army."⁷ Consequently, by the orders of the Sultan, Kutb-ud-din proceeded with the vanguard consisting of one thousand cavalry and defeated, "the army of the enemies of Religion."⁸ Testifying to the same statement, another contemporary Muslim historian Ibn Asir also writes that the king of Ghazni (Sultan Muizzudin), sent his general Kutb-ud-din, to wage war in the provinces of Hind. The Muslim general, however, was victorious and returned with prisoners and booty.⁹ On his return Kutb-ud-din and his officers were presented with robes of honour.¹⁰ This incursion of the Turks under the vanguard of Kutb-ud-din, naturally, refers

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 222.

2 BF, Vol. I, p. 192.

3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 222. But Brigg's *Firishta* mentions two elephants, the one loaded with gold, and the other with silver; Vol. I, p. 192.

4 BF, Vol. I, p. 192.

5 Ibid, p. 190.

6 Ibid, p. 192; TM, E.D, Vol. II, p. 222.

7 BF, Vol. I, p. 192.

8 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 222.

9 Ibid., pp. 250-51.

10 Ibid., p. 223.

to some other engagement that took place between the Turks and the Gahadavalas before the decisive battle of Chandawar. Again, the statement of this Muslim writer, that after the fall of Kol and after making Delhi the seat of his Government, Kutb-ud-din compelled all the districts around to accept the faith of Islam,¹ obviously makes some indirect references to a few clashes that took between the Turks and the Gahadvalas during the reign of Jai Chandra.

But some of the Hindu sources record various engagements between the two rival enemies in which Jai Chandra was victorious every time. The literary works like Raso, Purusapariksa and the Rambhamanjarinataka also support and endorse this fact.²

It is, however, evident that the fall of Mirat and Kol brought about the expansion of the Turkish possessions very close to the frontiers of the Gahadvalas whose empire extended as far as Baran (modern Bulandshar) in the West. It is highly probable that the aggressive forces of the Turks might have raided the territory of the Gahadavalas for more than once and in turn would have kissed the gallows of defeat in every such encounter against the territorial army of Jai Chandra. It is very likely, that the Muslim historians, in pride of their own religion and to shield the armies of Islam from the ignominy reaped as a result of their crushing defeats aforesaid, make no reference to these intervening encounters. Therefore, it is highly likely that there might have taken place some territorial fights in which the Hindus emerged victorious every time. It is also possible that the Hindu writers might have related these territorial victories to the credit of Jai Chandra and thus praised him as having more than once successfully fought against the Muslims. But this army which seems to have inflicted defeats in torrents upon the Muslim armies appears to have been a body of Gahadavalas frontier guards and not the main army under Jai Chandra. For we know that Jai Chandra himself took the field only in Chandawar in C. 1194 A. D. where he met his defeat and death.

1 BF, Vol. I, p. 178.

2 Roma Niyogi : The History of the Gahadavala Dynasty, p. 110.

The Battle of Chandawar¹ :

When Jai Chandra, "the chief of idolatory and predition," at the moment, was informed of the aggressive designs of the Turks towards him, he was alarmed and was thrown in a state of utter turmoil and disappointment. His hopes were blighted and his calculations, that after the defeat of Prithviaaja III, he would be the only ruler left to assume and wield supreme power in the North, broke to pieces. He soon realised that his turn had now come. Unfortunately, no confederacy seems to have been convened to stem the advancing tide of the Muslim forces in the East. Perhaps the defeat of the illustrious Prithviraja III had poured cold water on the enthusiasm and the nationalistic spirit of the Hindus they are proud of since times immemorial. To adumbrate this idea, Dr. Ishwari Prasad writes that the Rajputs "might have otherwise rallied round his banner."² But Dr. Ishwari Prasad's supposition is a feeble one and does not arrest any support from the political history of the time. For, we know that there had already been sown the seed of serious hostility between the Chahamanas and the Gahadavalas regarding the assumption of political supremacy in the North which lasted for more than thirty years. The 'Prithviraja and Sanyogita' episode³ had further worsened their relations. And obviously throughout the reign of Jai Chandra there does not seem to have been advanced any negotiation for a compromise from either side. Jai Chandra was himself guilty of not supporting and fighting for his neighbours, the Chahamanas, in their 'life and death' struggle against the Muslims. Here Jai Chandra may fairly be called no less than

1 Chandawar or Chandanawal is a place on the Jumuna river, near Firozabad, now in the Etawah District. But CHI, Vol. III, p. 43 wrongly states that Chandawar is modern Firozabad.

2 HMI, p. 140.

3 The immediate cause for the conflict between the Chahmanas and the Gahadavalas was the elopement of the Princess Sanyogita, the daughter of the King Jai Chandra with the king of Ajmer. Later, Prithviraja and his chiefs succeeded in carrying off the Gahadavala princess by force from Kanauj amidst the assemblage of a large number of princes and kings of the country. This event which took place in about 1191 A.D. led further hostility between them. For detailed see Dr. R. B. Singh: *The History Of The Chahamanas*, pp. 174-79.

a traitor for, as has already been pointed out in the previous pages, it was definitely a fight for the liberation of the country from the greedy clutches of the alien Muslims and, therefore, Jai Chandra committed a blunder in refusing to give even a fringe of assistance to the Chahamanas at that crucial moment. This fatal mistake of his, finally led the country to embrace serfdom which continued under different systems of Government, till 15th August, 1947.¹

Now, assuming that the defeat of Prithviraja had poured cold water on the courage of the Hindus, it was but natural for one to conclude that the Chahamanas must have given up all hopes to defend their country. Nevertheless this defeat cannot go to the extent of showing that it had ended once for all the war of the Chahamanas for liberation. For, although defeated, the Chahamanas could not be beaten hollow and the preceding pages clearly bear testimony as to how enthusiastically and with what high spirits they continued to fight against the Muslims in order to repulse them from their sacred home.

Under the existing circumstances, therefore, it was not this defeat and the lack of enthusiasm which evidently deprived the Rajputs of coming under the banner of Jai Chandra, as indicated by Dr. Ishwari Prasad, but rather it was the territorial war and the political tension which tentatively prevented them from being united into one solid and formidable force. The better policy would have been for Jai Chandra to call for a confederacy and ask his neighbouring Hindu Rajas to come to his help to meet the alleged strong adversary who was the common danger to all of them. In fact Jai Chandra, who was well aware of the truce and treachery of the Turks did not make any serious and contemplated attempt in this direction.

However, at this critical hour, Jai Chandra, brimming up with the traditional spirit of the Rajputs, proved equal to the occasion and gave a taste of the inherited Rajput's chivalry and intrepidity. The moment the cat rang the bell, he ordered

¹ Not only this but even after the independence of the country the united India was divided into two parts known as India and Pakistan.

133274

for the mobilisation of his army, and according to the exaggerating account of Hasan Nizami, he advanced to oppose the Turks "with an army, countless as the particles of sand," "and," whereby, "the noise of the war drum proclaimed to the ears of the worshippers of one God."¹ A similar view is also held by Ibn Asir who includes seven hundred elephants² and his men, according to our chronicler, were said to amount to a million along with many distinguished nobles.³

Firishta, who is a later historian, also gives the impression of a huge army of Jai Chandra.⁴ All this lend support to the conviction that Jai Chandra marched ahead to punish and repulse the Muslim army with a vast army. Of what form and character and to which extent the exaggeration might have been poured into the statement of the Muslim writers, one cannot evaluate but at least it affords one impression that Jai Chandra marched with his full strength at his command and entered the territorial occupation of the Muslims⁵ to avenge the loss and infamy sustained in the previous engagements. Sultan Shahab-ud-din, who had come personally with a large army to execute his further operations beyond Delhi in the heart of Doab regions,⁶ marched with his full might in 590 H. (C 1193 A.D.).⁷ At this stage (we have seen earlier), the Sultan was honourably received by his General, Kutb-ud-din, who met and joined his master's army with all his soldiers and valuable presents at his command. And very soon, "fifty thousand mounted men clad in armour and courts of mail,"

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 233.

2 Firishta gives the number of elephants only three hundred; BF, Vol. I, p. 178.

3 KT, ED, Vol. II, p. 251.

4 BF, Vol. I, p. 178.

5 Roma Niyogi : The History Of The Gahadavala Dynasty, p. 111.

6 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 207 wrongly writes that Sultan Muizzud-din marched by way of Benares and Kanauj. The author's topographical knowledge is certainly faulty, for we know it definitely that the battle was fought at Chandawar which is in the Etawa District.

7 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 222; Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, p. 23; TN, p. 140. But BF, Vol. I, p. 178 gives the year 589 H., (1193 A.D.).

were mustered up by Kutb-ud-din himself and then the Sultan marched with this combined strength, for the prosecution of his long cherished ambition.

The opposing armies met each other at Chandawar for a final blow. Ibn-Asir, who seems to be partial with the numerical strength of the army of Islam, writes that "when the two armies met, there was great carnage; the infidels were sustained by their numbers; the Musalmans by their courage, but in the end the infidels fled, and the faithful were victorious."¹ This statement of Ibn Asir can hardly be believed in the light of the military strength of both of the two contending armies which we have already discussed. However, it is certain that the Hindus never fled from the field of battle as recorded by this chronicler because we know it for certain that Raja Jai Chandra, along with his numerous followers, was finally killed in this pitched encounter. It is very likely that the death of Jai Chandra might have disheartened the rest of the Hindu soldiers who, finding defeat inevitable, might have left the battle-field. Therefore, a panic, of which the Muslim historians have given impression, must have been created in the Hindu army after Jai Chandra's death and not before-hand. Notwithstanding this event, a dreadful battle is recorded to have ensued in which Kutb-ud-din played a pivotal role. During the course of the battle, Kutb-ud-din along with the Sultan and the Sipahsalar (Commander of Troops), Iszzaud-din Husan, son of Kharmail, another prominent leader of the van, attacked the enemy vehemently. The Hindus struggled hard to rout the advance guards of the enemy but they were ultimately defeated and subdued by Kutb-ud-din's this advance guards.²

At last, Jai Chandra, "the Rai of Benares, who prided himself on the number of his forces and war elephants," rushed to the scene of battle.³ He, fought very gallantly in this battle of life

1 ED, Vol II, p. 231.

2 TM, (MSS), p. 290; BF, Vol. I, p. 58. According to Prof. Habibullah (p. 82, foot-note 40), this preliminary engagement has been described only in Firishta's account, Vol. I, p, 53; but the copy of the MSS of TM by Hasan Nizami also mentions this preliminary engagement as indicated above.

3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 223.

and death. The result was that a well contested and sanguine battle ensued between these two rival forces. The valiant Hindu army led by Jai Chandra gave a balanced fight and just when the Hindus were on the verge of carrying away the day, unfortunately, in the thickness of fight, writes Hasan Nizami, Jai Chandra "seated on a lofty howdah," received a deadly wound from an arrow, and fell from his exalted seat to the earth."¹ As regards the arrow which took away the life of Jai Chandra, Firishta writes that Kutb-ud-din, "who excelled in archery," with his own hand shot the arrow, which, "piercing his eye, cost the Raja his life."² The unfortunate occurrence, ultimately caused in the Hindu army, turmoil, confusion and panic. The Sultan was fully alive how to take advantage of the utter confusion that prevailed among the Hindu fighting soldiers and therefore, very subtly he turned it into their complete rout.³

Relating to the same pitched battle between the armies of Islam and the Gahadavalas, some of the Hindu records state that the alleged fight continued for at least seven days. And it was after a successful fight for a week, according to the Raso, that Jai Chandra 'fell fighting in the battle-field.'⁴ Similarly, Vidyapati's Purusapariksa, another Hindu source, suggests that Jai Chandra was killed by the trick of some treachery in which his own queen Subhadevi was a party.⁵ But these Hindu records like the Muslim chroniclers, are exaggerated ones and hence they cannot be relied upon to their entirety. No Muslim writer whether contemporary or later, gives even a faint idea of such happenings. Although it would be worthwhile and justifiable not to pin any reliance on such narratives, but at least, it leaves to us one impression to the effect that the battle, in question, might have continued for more than a day which the Muslim historians have manifestly concealed in order to show that the

1 Ibid, p. 223.

2 BF, Vol. I, p. 192.

3 Fakhre Mudabbir, p. 23; TM, f. 112, 117-3. Ibn-ul-Asir, XII, p. 49.

4 Raso Sara, p. 455.

5 See Nerukar's English translation, Bombay, 1914, Ch. IV, 11th tale (Ghasma-rakatha), pp. 146-153; Darbhanga ed. 41st tale, pp. 225-233.

might of the Islam was of such an invincible character that it even defeated a vast Hindu army in no time. On the other hand, it is also highly probable, that finding himself unable to bring Jai Chandra to his knees, the Sultan might have resorted to some strategy he was renowned for to overpower his mighty opponent. But at the same time it is extremely doubtful whether queen Subhadevi herself had played an unpatriotic role by partaking into this strategy.

However, after the signal defeat of Jai Chandra, free licence was issued to the Muslims to cut and kill the Hindus. "Slaughter of the Hindus was numerous", writes Abn Asir, and "none were spared except women and children, and the carnage of the men went on until the earth was weary."¹ According to Hasan Nizami, the head of Jai Chandra was carried to the commander on the point of spear and "his body was thrown to the dust of contempt."² We are further informed by Ibn Asir, the author of the *Kamil-ut-Tawarikh* that no one would have recognised Jai Chandra's dead body, "but for the fact of his teeth, which were weak at their roots being fastened in with golden wire."³

Here again, the Hindu authorities differ from that of the Muslim ones, and say that Jai Chandra was not killed in the battle-field. In order to put off the robes of disgrace and infamy, he met a "death congenial to the Hindus by drowning himself in the sacred Ganges."⁴ This view has further been fervently supported by Prof. C. V. Vaidya, who holds that Jai Chandra drowned himself into the river.⁵ But this view of the Hindu sources does not find any support from any of the existing authorities. On the other hand, the Muslim historians are almost unanimous in their contention that Jai Chandra was killed in that pitched battle. But the statement of Ibn Asir that no one would have recognised the Jai Chandra's dead body, "but for

1 KT, ED, Vol. II, p. 251.

2 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 223.

3 KT, ED, Vol. II, p. 251.

4 Forbes : *Rasmala*, I, p. 223.

5 HM I, Vol. III, p. 343.

the fact of his teeth, which were weak at their roots being fastened in with golden wire," does create some doubt. Ibn Asir, was a contemporary historian. The way in which he has given vent to this account, naturally portends some doubt as to whether Jai Chandra was really killed in the battle. But the vagueness in his statement has left the fact undisclosed. At the same time it is no denying the fact that the accounts of the other contemporary historian, Hasan Nizami, and a later historian Firishta, respectively, cannot be distrusted or ignored without a solid reasoning. These two writers are also unanimous to hold that Jai Chandra was killed in the engagement aforesaid.

The Muslim historians put forth that by virtue of this victory, "the impurities of idolatory were purged by the water of the sword from that land and the country was freed from vice and superstition."¹ Furthermore, immense booty was obtained, "such as the eye of the beholder could be weary to look at." According to Hasan Nizami this booty included one hundred elephants,² where as Firishta gives the number of the captured elephants as three hundred.³

Capture of Asni⁴

After the defeat of the Hindu army at Chandawar, Sultan Shahab-ud-din marched with his army towards Asni "where treasure of the Rai", was said to have been "deposited"⁶ The place of Asni appears to have been an important stronghold of

1 TM, ED., Vol. II, p. 223.

2 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 223. But Elliot says that according to some copies the number of elephants is given as 300; Ibid., p. 223.

3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 297; BF, Vol. I, p. 193. But Ibn Asir gives its number to only 90 and of the rest were killed to escaped. He further tells us that among all the captured elephants there was a white elephant who alone did not salute the Sultan like other elephants who were ordered to salute the Sultan Muizuddin; ED, Vol. II, p. 251.

4 Asni has been identified by Muhammad Aziz Ahmad as the ruined fort near Jaunpur; Early Turkish Empire Of Delhi, p. 134 and foot-note 5, CHI, Vol. III, p. 43 erroneously calls it Asi which is not correct. In fact, Asni is now in Fatehpur District. See, The Struggle For Empire, p. 54.

5 Both Hasan Nizami and Firishta dispose to the march of Asni; TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 223; BF, Vol. I, pp. 178-79.

6 ED, Vol. I, p. 223.

the kingdom of Kanauj from the time of the Pratiharas. Its significance is further enhanced by the discovery of an inscription of Mahipala.¹ So, only within a few days from the victory of Muslim army at Chandawar,² Sultan Shahab-ud-din beseiged this important fort and captured it. The victors found there gold, silver and precious stones in large³ numbers including one hundred elephants.⁴

Annexation of Benares

But the victory of the Turks at Chandawar would not have added much to the glory of Muslim empire in the Northern India if the city of Benares, which was the second capital of the Gahadavalas and "the centre of the country of Hind," were not annexed. It is very likely that the Sultan was perfectly aware of this fact. This is why that after the capture of Asni, he quickly marched with a huge army towards Benares. Here we are told that the invaders found little difficulty in plundering it.⁵ There was no resistance, whatsoever. This capture of Benares witnessed the destruction of one thousand holy temples which once had adorned the city of Benares and the raising of mosques on their foundations.⁶ "The knowledge of the law became promulgated and the foundations of religion were established."⁷ According to Hasan Nizami many Rais and chiefs of Hind came forward to offer their allegiance.⁸ This statement, no doubt, uncovers the fact that after the fall of Benares, some of the feudatory dynasties of the Gahadvala had perished at the hands of the Muslims and their States disappeared. But, nevertheless, the numbers of such feudatories have been few. Rather, the majority of them took advantage of this situation and declared themselves independent.

1 Dr. R. S. Tripathi : History of Kanauj, p. 330 foot-note 3.

2 BF, Vol. I, pp. 178-79.

3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 223; BF, Vol. I, p. 179.

4 Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, p. 23.

5 Ghulam Husain Salim : Riyazu-s-Salatin (A History Of Bengal). Translated into English from the original Persian with notes by Maulvi Abdus Salam, M.A., Calcutta, 1904, p. 59.

6 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 223; BF, Vol. I, p. 171.

7 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 223.

8 Ibid., p. 223.

The Sultan then bestowed the Government of the conquered territories on "one of the most celebrated and exalted servants of the State", in order that "he might distribute justice and repress idolatory."¹ The Sultan after having thus garrisoned both Asni and Benares returned to the fort of Kol, where he confirmed Kutb-ud-din Aibak in the vice-regency of India.² He then after settling down these affairs marched back to Ghazni laden with treasure, gold, silver and precious stones which were loaded on fourteen hundred camels. The captured elephants were also carried away along with them.³ As regards the conquest of the Sultan, we are informed that "the record of his celebrated holy wars had been written in histories circulated throughout the breadth of the fourth inhabited quarter of the world."⁴

After the exit of his master from this country, Kutb-ud-din brooded over very calmly how to secure the full allegiance of the nobles and the chiefs of the Kanauj kingdom. With a view to achieve it, he girded his flag on the fort of Asni, and delayed his stay there for few days more in order to see the consequence of that plantation. Fortunately, his foresightedness immediately bore fruitful results "and the chiefs and elders all around hastened to his services with various kinds of rarities and presents; and his noble court became the scene where the princes and generals of the world came to bow their heads in reverence."⁵

Thus, this defeat of the Gahadavalas had cast into oblivion the last resort of the Northern Indians to free themselves from the Turkish onslaught. Now there seems to have been no immediate trained army at the disposal of the Hindu fighters for freedom to stem the growing power of the Muslims in India. It is highly probable that this shortcoming might have silenced the Hindus till any military force on a demanded standard could

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 224.

2 BF, Vol. I, p. 179.

3 KT, ED, Vol. II, p. 251. Here Firishta exaggerates the account and writes that the spoils were taken on 4,000 camels; BF, Vol. I, p. 193.

4 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 224.

5 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 224.

be organised while in the meantime the Muslims spread their sway upto the border of Bengal in the East. The fate of the Northern India was already sealed in 1192 A. D. when Prithviraja III the mighty Chahamanas prince fell fighting against the Muslims. But this conquest of the Turks culminating into the occupation of most of the important, fertile and strategic regions of the East, extending as far as Benares and Chandravati in the East, almost touching the borders of the Bengal kingdom, further consolidated their foothold and afforded them, therefore, fresh vigour and curiosity to embark on new conquests.

At the same time a careful survey of the Muslim accounts reveal that Kanyakubja was not conquered by the Muslims in C. 1193 A. D. And, therefore, like the Chahamanas of Ajmer and Delhi, the Gahadavalas of Kanauj and Benares were not fully crushed down. They still survived in the country.

Firishta is the only Muslim historian who, however, included Kanauj in the list of the cities visited and conquered by the Muslims that year. He states that the Sultan "took possession of the country as far as the boundaries of Bengal."⁵ But Firishta is a much later historian and hence his statement requires to be examined further in the light of some contemporary records. The contemporary Muslim historians, like Hasan Nizami and Ibn Asir, who give a detailed account of the event do not, however, include the city of Kanauj in the list of the cities and places visited and sacked by the Muslims in 1193-4 A.D.⁶ According to Minhaj-us-Siraj, another contemporary historian, who is a most reliable source of information to us, writes that the Muslim army advanced towards Kanauj, but he does not mention therein whether the alleged army reached the targetted city. The same authority gives an impression that Kanyakubja was conquered

1 BF, Vol. I, pp. 192-93 and see also Ibid., p. 178.

2 ED, Vol. II, pp. 222 ff. and 250 ff.

3 TN, Vol. I, pp. 470, 608, 627.

4 Ibid, p. 627.

5 The History of the Gahadavala Dynasty, p. 115.

6 TN, p. 627.

by Iltutmish who subsequently issued new coins to commemorate the occasion.¹ Not only Kanauj but also Badaun and Ayodhya are mentioned by Minhaj² to have been conquered by Iltutmish. On the other hand Dr. (Miss) R. Niyogi opines that though the Muslim invasion proved disastrous to the ruling Gahadavala king who was ultimately killed and his empire collapsed, "but the authority of the erstwhile empire of Kanyakubja was not fully destroyed in the Antervedi and the Gahadavala Dynasty continued in the person of the boy-king Hariscandra."³ She, on the authority of the Macchlishahr-grant and the Belkhara inscription, suggests, that Harischandra's authority was respected at least from Jaunpur to Mirzapur. She emphasises that Tabakat-i-Nasiri's inclusion of Benaras among the early conquests of Iltutmish,⁴ emphatically indicates that the earlier invasion of the city may not have resulted in its immediate annexation⁵ to the Muslim empire. This strongly suggests, in the opinion of Dr. (Miss) Niyogi that the Gahadavalas still continued to rule over a small portion of their territory, as an independent kingdom. The argument put forth by her gets support from the charter found at Macchlishahr in the Jaunpur District records to the effect that Harischandra in the month of Pausa in the Vikram Samvat 1253 (Sunday, the 6th January 1197 A. D.) was conferred full sovereign title. On this joyous occasion,⁶ he was granted the suzerainty of the village of Pamahi and, of its outlying hamlets comprising of one Rahini Yaka. The discovery of the two other copper plates also confirm the name of Harischandra as the son of Jai Chandra. The Kamauli Copper plate further records that Harischandra was born on the 8th tithi 1232 (Sunday the 10th August, 1175 A. D.). The alleged copper plate also reveals that his father gave the village of Vadesara Kangalipallala to the Purohita Prahara-jasman in honour of his "Jata Karma" ceremony.⁷ Another copper plate which is now preserved in the Benaras "Sanskrit Vishwavidyalaya Library indicates that on 13th tithi of the same month and year (31st August, 1175 A. D.), Harischandra's

1 TN. Vol. I pp. 470, 608, 627.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 627.

3 The History of the Gahadavala Dynasty, p. 115.

4 TN. Vol. I, p. 627.

5 The History of The Gahadavala Dynasty, pp. 115-16.

6 EI, X, pp. 94, 98-99.

7 EI, X, pp. 126-127.

“Namkarana” ceremony was performed and two villages were granted to the Mahapandita Harisikesa-Sarman on this occasion.¹

Thus, we gather from these evidences that Harischandra was only nineteen years old when his father, Jai Chandra, was killed in his engagement against the Muslims; and that he ruled at least for three years from that sensational event. But at the same time we utterly fail to locate the nature of his rule. Here Dr. (Miss) Niyogi points out that Harischandra was Gahadavala ruler whose “authority was respected at least from Jaunpur to Mirzapur, probably on both sides of the Ganga.”² It does suggest that Harischandra continued to be an independent sovereign even after the historic fall of his father Jai Chandra. But “it is unthinkable”, writes R. S. Tripathi, “that this boy-king could have maintained his independence even in a circumscribed era, when many a war-worn veteran had fallen, and the Moslem army had reduced the kingdom as far east as Benaras.”³ Therefore, it would be highly reasonable to hold that, as in the case of Ajmer, Prithviraja’s son was allowed to rule over it on the annual payment of a large tribute. So, suggests Dr. R. S. Tripathi, also that Harischandra “was allowed to reign in a portion of his ancestral dominion after he had acknowledged himself a tributary of the newly established Moslem power at Delhi.”⁴ Dr. Tripathi’s this hypothesis most probably finds support from an inscription of 1253 V. (1197 A. D.), discovered a few miles to the South-East of Chunar⁵ in the Mirzapur District, which records the erection of a pillar when Ranaka Vijaya Karna was the ruler of that region. The most striking point of this inscription is that it does not give the name of the king of Kanauj, but simply uses the phrase, “Srimat Kanya-

1 IA, XVIII, pp. 129-34.

2 The History of The Gahadavala Dynasty, p. 116.

3 HOK, p. 334.

4 HOK, p. 334. “It has been stated that Zaffarabad, four miles to the South-East of Jaunpur, was the sight of a palace of the later rulers of Kanauj.” C. Cunningham : Archaeological Survey of India Report, XI, p. 104; Smith : JRAS; 1908, p. 792; Fuhrer: Sharqi Architecture of Jaunpur, p. 64.

5 At Belkhara (Ancient Velasara).

Kubja-Vijayarajye.”¹ This indicates that although Vijaya Karna had not made himself independent of Kanauj, the Moslem supremacy over the kingdom was perplexing or abhorrent to him, and so he discreetly omitted any specific reference to Harishchandra or his Muslim overlord.² For the demand of the political expediency, Sultan Shahab-ud-din, probably spared the life of the royal family from complete extermination. He “must have thought that concentration of all power in the hands of his viceroy at Delhi might tempt the latter to hatch the egg of independence; and moreover, loyalty of these distant conquests would best remain assured under such feudatories as owed their position the Sultan’s protection and generosity”³

But the sudden death of the Sultan in 1206 A.D. provided an opportunity to Kutb-ud-din of becoming the king of the Muslim India.

Consequently, Kutb-ud-din with the help of his another able lieutenant, Iltutmish, freely reduced the whole administration of the Northern India to one of a permanent character which was founded on the adorned doctrines of Islam or was congenial to the spirit of Muslim rule in India. We are not certain when the authority eclipsed from Kanauj, but from a coin it is certain that during the reign of Iltutmish land revenue of Kanauj went to the Imperial coffers at Delhi.⁴ Besides, Minhaj-us-Siraj, the author of the *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, assures that in 623 H. (1226 A.D.), the territory of Oudh was placed under the charge of Malik Nasir-ud-din Mahmud, who over-came the “refractory infidels”, and brought a “considerable number under obedience.”⁵ It clearly shows that by this time, Muslims had become absolute masters of the Ganges-Jamuna Doab whose governors were ruling over the different provinces of the kingdom.

1 Archaeological Survey of India Report, XI, pp. 128-30. See also JASB, 1911, NS, pp. 757-70.

2 HOK, p. 335.

3 Ibid., p. 335.

4 JASB, 1881, Pt. I, p. 66.

5 TN, Vol, I, pp. 628-29.

In the light of the above we may conveniently conclude that the defeat and the death of Jai Chandra in 1193 A.D. let loose the dogs of the enemies of Islam to bring Kanauj to their feet. But the Muslims do not appear to have hurried the annexation of Kanauj or the destruction of the royal family as indicated earlier. The royal family of the Gahadavala Dynasty seems to have been ruling over it as a vassal and tributary ruler of Delhi until its final subjugation in 595 H. (1198-9 A.D.).¹

1 This date is according to Habibullah, *Op. Cit.*, p. 64.

CHAPTER VI .

KUTB-UD-DIN AS VICEROY—(III)

Clash with the Chahamanas again

We have seen in the preceding chapter how had Sultan Shahab-ud-din and his slave general Kutb-ud-din succeeded in capturing the kingdom of the Gahadavalas in the East in 1193 A.D. Eventually, the battle of the Chandawar decided the fate of the Hindus in the East; and the falling of Asni and Benares to the swords of the Turkish conquerors in India the same year in succession had quickened the loss of their courage in restoring the lost glory of the country. In the blaze of these conquests of the Muslims, there looked every possibility of their annihilation in the immediate future. But, nevertheless, the Chahamanas, who were already defeated had still in them certain amount of resistance; and though, their powers had greatly shattered in the prementioned encounters, they could not bid good-bye to the anxiety of expelling the Muslims from the unsophisticated soil of this country. Fortunately, when the Muslims were busy heart and soul in the conquest of the East, these Chahamanas got a golden opportunity to try their luck once more. But they did not make the needed use of this opportunity. They ought to have revolted against the Muslims the moment the Muslim army was engaged in the battle of the Chandawar, but, instead, they preferred to wait till Sultan's return to Ghazni. This is why that after Sultan's return to Ghazni we find the Chahamanas fighting in Ajmer against the Muslims under the leadership of Hariraja, the brother of the late Prithviraja, for the liberation of his country. However, such uprisings can be designated as merely interludes in the face of the vast drama of unimpeded conquests carried on by the Muslim intruders.

The Trouble At Kol

The Sultan had, before the initiation of trouble at Kol, returned Ghazni laden with enormous wealth and elephants after gaining triumphant victory over the Gahadavalas. Kutb-ud-din, whose authority to deal freely with Indian affairs was confirmed by that time, had to stay on for sometime in the fort of Asni in order to maintain peace and order. But, since the Hindu's resistance had never ended as has been impressed upon in previous pages, the Chahamanas again hastened the reorganisation of an army under the banner of Hariraja to restore their down-trodden glory. But the sheets of fog cannot be dispelled by a fan. And, therefore, the feudatories of the Chahamanas, which had once formed the great Chahamanas empire, also seem to have been reduced into a confederacy on this vital occasion placing Hariraja at the helm of affairs.

The first of the series of this new insurrection took place at Kol, which had lately been captured by Kutb-ud-din in 1193 A.D. Consequently, the Dor Rajputs¹ who once ruled there as the vassal of the Chahamanas, raised arms against the Muslims. Here we are informed by Hasan Nizami, that Kutb-ud-din on receiving this news hastened to suppress the rebellions who "after the manner of fox-playing with lions", had troubled the Muslims much by their deceits and stratagams.² Fortunately, Kutb-ud-din reached there in time for the relief of the garrison at Kol and, as expected, he immediately got control over the situation. The resistance of the Hindus was broken and the rebellions, "by the edge of the sword," "were despatched to the fire of hell,"³ resulting in the raising of three bastions, as high as heaven with their heads, "and their carcasses became the food of beasts of prey."⁴ The entire city was freed from idols and idolworship whose foundations were rooted out and precepts of Islam established⁵ in

1 Habibullah : Op. Cit., p. 65. According to Hasan Nizami, it was a certain tribe of the neighbourhood of Kol, ED, Vol. II, p. 224.

2 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 224.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.

their stead. After, thus, controlling the situation at Kol, Kutb-ud-din appointed Malik-ul-umara Hisam-ud-din 'Ulbak', who was "one of the chief pillars of the State," as the incharge of the place.¹

Kutb-ud-din returns to Delhi

After quietening the insurrection and settling the affairs down at Kol and its neighbouring places, Kutb-ud-din returned to his capital town Delhi, and turned his head towards the abodes of the city, "the alter of the prosperity of the world."² Hasan Nizami, who, no doubt, exaggerates his account, writes that Kutb-ud-din, on his arrival at Delhi this time, administered law and justice with so much impartiality that among other results, "the wolf and sheep drank water out of the same pond." Baffling problems relating to thieves and thefts, which had before been on everyone's tongue, also fell to the dust.³

The second rebellion of Ajmer

Kutb-ud-din had hardly settled the problems of Kol and managed the administrative affairs of Delhi and rested only for a while, when the news that the Chahamanas had raised their heads at Ajmer in 1194 A. D.,⁴ once again put him to troubles. Although effectively bridled and subdued, the Chahamanas under the impulse of restoring their massive losses both moral and material, once again gathered with one mission beneath the stalwart leadership of Hariraja, who was ever keen and desirous to bring back his ancestral fame and to push the Muslim glory

1 Ibid.

2 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 224.

3 Ibid., p. 225.

4 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 225 has 589 H. (1193 A. D.). Dr. R. B. Singh has also supported the same date as given by Nizami : *The History of The Chahamanas*, p. 217. Habibullah, on the other hand, places the same event in 591 H. (1195 A. D.), p. 65. All these dates are impossible, and from the events that took place earlier and afterwards the date suggested by them appear to be incorrect. *Tarikhr-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah* clearly gives the year of this event as 591 H. (1194 A. D.). This date has also been supported by *Firishta* : BF, Vol. I, p. 179.

into dust once for all. Having thus resolved, Hariraja emerged once again from the hills of Alwar¹ with his surviving followers, and raised the standard of the revolt against the Turks. He, immediately attacked Ajmer, defeated and expelled his nephew Govindaraja once again from the capital. The unfortunate and terror-stricken prince, who was merely a show-boy and a puppet in the hands of the Muslim conqueror, was forced to take refuge in the fort of Ranthambhor, again, for the safety of his life.²

Hariraja, thus, recovered Ajmer from the hands of the Muslims without much bloodshed and difficulty. But the fact that he ruled at Ajmer as an independent ruler even for a fraction of time, does not find support from any of the contemporary Muslim historians, whereas, on the other hand, we gather from some of the indigenous literary sources that Hariraja, after this fateful event, had ruled there independently for sometime. While testifying this fact, the 'Virudha-Vidhi Vidhvansa', of Lakshmidhara, tells us that Hariraja ascended the throne of Sakambhari with the assistance of Skanda, one of the great generals of Prithviraja III.³ This view is further supported by the Hammira Mahakavya of Naya Chandra Suri⁴ which is also confirmed by an epigraphic evidence.⁵ The Tantoti image inscription clearly shows that his queen Pratapadevi held the village of Tantoti in the district of Ajmer in her fief in 1194 A. D.⁶ Thus, all these evidences prove, beyond any shadow of doubt, that Hariraja after dethroning his nephew Govindaraja, occupied the country around Ajmer and ruled there at least for sometime. But as the gravity of the situation had demanded, Hariraja did not prove worthy to the occasion. It is grossly unfortunate for the Chahamanas that Hariraja, who was the only hope left for carry-

1 BF, Vol. I, p. 193. This Alwar is a State in Rajputana.

2 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 219; TN, Vol. I, pp. 516-18, footnote 2.

3 IHQ, September, 1940, p. 571, Verse 24.

4 HM, 3, 73-82 and 4, 1-19.

5 Dr. R. B. Singh : Op. Cit., p. 218.

6 It has been noticed by Dr. G. H. Ojha in Rajputana Museum Report, 1911-12, pp. 2 and 5, which has now been preserved in the Rajputana Museum, Ajmer.

ing out successfully the struggle for freedom and who, like a great hero and a defender of the faith and culture of the country, had already given a testimony of his valour and a proof of his being rightfully chosen for the common cause by snatching away Ajmer from the hands of the Muslims without much difficulty, appears to have fallen into the pleasures of life,¹ just when situations had started moving into Hindus favour.

His luxuriant life, ultimately proved fatal. He never realised the alarming character of the situation he was placed in and the imminent danger he was surrounded by. On the other hand, the enemies of the country were not far away, and Ajmer in order to be repossessed could, therefore, be attacked at any moment by the Muslim forces. Therefore, in face of such delicate situation, the adoption by the Hindu of the policy of self-defence and reinforcement of the army could have been much better and effective. Moreover, it was a high time for Hariraja to have formed a confederacy with the other powerful states of the country like the Chaulukyas of Gujerat and the Chandelas of Kalinjar. But this poor and ill-fated Chahamana prince miserably failed, and due to this folly he could not enjoy for long the fruits of his initial success. Of course, it was another serious mistake committed by him. Instead of strengthening his force and maturing his stronghold over the newly annexed Ajmer, he preferred as early as in 1194 A. D. to launch an invasion on Delhi through his ablest commander Jihtar (Jaitra Rai)² sometime after

1 HM, IV, 2-3.

2 The name is written "Jibtar" in one MSS of the Taju-l-Ma-Asir and "Jhitar" in another : ED, Vol. II, p. 225, footnote 1. However, Taju-l-Ma-Asir's translation in ED, Vol. II, p. 225 mentions him as "Jihbar." Firishta calls him as "Chutr Ray", and according to Dr. H. C. Ray he was one of the heroes of Prithviraja III : DHNI, Vol. II, p. 1012, footnote 2. Major Raverty on the other hand, gives his name as "Jhat Rae"; T.N., Vol. I, pp. 516-18, footnote 2. Prof. Habibullah writes him as Jhatrari, op. cit., p. 65; while Dr. Aziz Ahmad says that he was Jhet Rae, op. cit., p. 135. Jhet Rae is not Hariraja as Vaidya thinks, op. cit., p. 341; but his lieutenant. Dr. D. Sharma thinks that the actual name appeared to be Jaitra or Jaitraraja : ECD p. 101, footnote 9. But we learn from the Prithviraja Raso that the son of Govindaraja was called Samantasimha : Raso Sara, p. 239; while this general appears to be identical with the Abu Paramara Jaitra Rai of the Raso, who was one of the heroes of Prithviraja III : HOC, p. 219 and footnote 103.

the occupation of Ajmer. Not only this, but he never remained watchful or vigilant as respects the way to which the wind would blow, which should have been a proper act on the part of such an important figure who represented the will of the nation at that crucial moment. Instead, after issuing the commandment aforesaid to Jihtar, and, thus throwing the whole of his followers into the jaws of a grim struggle, he let himself swayed by bewitching currents of luxuriant life. However, leaving aside this earthly weakness of Hariraja, it is arguable whether his decision of attacking Delhi at such an immature stage was justified. The answer would probably be in negative. Hariraja should not have embraced this course of action until a planned preparation was in sight or the capture of Ajmer was made permanent. Rather, his hasty and incongruous step brutally weakened his position and power.

As to the aftermath of his untimely yet fatal orders, we learn from Hasan Nizami, that having received orders from his newly crowned Chahamanas king of Ajmer, Jaitra Rai supported by an army hastened to the borders of Delhi, "and the people were suddenly caught in the darkness of his oppression and turbulence, and the blood and property of the Musalamans fell into danger and destruction." Jaitra Rai, in pride of his initial successes lost the balance of his head and hastened to invest Delhi in order to lose whatever he had achieved till before. Kutb-ud-din, realised the gravity of this new menace not before long and prepared himself in no time to repulse this imminent danger. At this stage Hasan Nizami informs us that, "When the mention of these circumstances was made to the blessed ear of the Khusru, in a moment of courage and royal determination, he employed himself in the punishment and extinction of the rebel."¹ Moreover, the death and defeat of the Gahadavala king Jai Chandra, and the subsequent suppression of the Hindu resistance at Kol, had virtually enabled the Muslims to call in action their full force against the Chahamanas. And like a wise and seasoned general Kutb-ud-din, "ordered that a portion of his victorious army

¹ TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 225.

should be set apart and equipped for his personal service, and that the rest of his army should be detached to the frontiers for the subjection of the accursed, and the destruction of the enemies of the state and religion."¹ With these preparations Kutb-ud-din marched towards Ajmer with a large army² even at the middle of the scorching hot season, "when the armour on the bodies of the valiant was inflamed by the heat of the sun, and the sword in the scabbard melted like wax." Under the circumstances, Kutb-ud-din and his army found it difficult to march in the light of the sun, and the Muslim army was, therefore, compelled to make only night marches.³

When Jaitra Rai was informed of Kutb-ud-din's unexpected approach with a huge army, he was led to believe that he himself did not possess as much army as was sufficient to give blow for blow in an open and pitched battle against the formidable force of the adversary and, therefore, he very wisely decided to give up the idea of any direct clash as there was a great risk in an open engagement and in conformity to this decision, the Chahamana Commander hurriedly retired towards Ajmer to join his master Hariraja.⁴ But this act of the retiring of the Chahamana Commander towards Ajmer, did not stop Kutb-ud-din in the way and he went straight-way to Ajmer.

On the other hand, Prince Hariraja, being joined by his trusted general gained confidence and came out to vouchsafe the honour and prestige of his country and, ultimately, met the Muslim host in an open encounter with heart overflowing with

1 Ibid., p. 225.

2 According to Hasan Nizami, Kutb-ud-din selected a force of 2,000 horses to encounter the Chahamana Commander (MSS, Op. 342).

3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 225.

4 According to Firishta, BF, Vol. I, p. 194, there was a clash between the Chahamana General Jaitra Rai and Kutb-ud-din's army, in which the latter separating twenty thousand horses from the rest of the Chahamana army engaged enemy, and put them to flight. However, after some days, they collected their scattered troops and retreated in good order towards Ajmer. But Firishta, is a later historian, and no contemporary historian either Hasan Nizami or Minhaj-us-Siraj, give any impression of this engagement. It is, therefore, impossible to believe the statement of Firishta.

passion and blaze of nationalism and unimaginable amount of intrepidity. Thereafter, a keenly contested battle ensued, but, nevertheless, the Muslim soldiers once again proved their superiority and gained upper hand by virtue of their numerical strength. This made Hariraja realise that there was no chance of his victory and, therefore, if he insisted on continuing the battle any more, his timidity would heavily tell upon the last hope of the country and a sure defeat must invariably travel to his lot. Therefore, there was no other way than to forsake the idea of the engagement and in consonance to this decision Hariraja was obliged to retire within the walls of the fortress of Ajmer.

But this was too late. This act of Hariraja of taking refuge in the fortress of Ajmer could not save Chahamanas from falling into the rapacious hands of the Muslims. There was no way-out to escape this deadlock, and therefore, finding further resistance impossible, Hariraja was smitten by the love of the native traditions and resolved to prefer death to defeat. Accordingly, Hariraja, with the ladies of the Harem ascended the funeral pyre in despair and in this way he threw himself and his family into the flames of death.¹

But we are informed of a different version by Firishta who gives a contrary statement that Hariraja and his general Jaitra Rai came out from the fort to give battle to the Muslim army that ensued wherein Hariraja was slain and his army was put to rout.² As to the fecundity of this statement of Firishta, it can be said that it finds little or no support either from the contemporary Muslim or Hindu versions. The Hammira Mahakavya, elucidates that Hariraja on being convinced that he could no longer put forth effective resistance vis-a-vis the Muslim onslaught, he readily allowed himself to be consumed by the flames and, thereafter, the alleged fort swept into the hands of the Muslim invaders.³ This Hindu version irrevocably finds support from a contemporary Muslim writer, Hasan Nizami, the author of the Taju-l-Ma-Asir,

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, pp. 225-26; TN, Vol. I, pp. 516-18 foot note 2; HM, IV, 16-19.

2 BF, Vol. I, pp. 179, 194.

3 HM, IV, 16-19.

who states that Jaitra Rai, "sacrificed himself in the flames of a pyre, and immediately after the fort fell."¹ This statement of Hasan Nizami gives two informations: the first one is that there must not have been an open fight between the Muslims and the Chahamanas because the expression Jaitra Rai "sacrificed himself in the flames of a pyre" clearly suggests the inability of the Chahamanas forces, shattered in the Ajmer fort, to put forth any resistance against the Muslim intruders and, therefore, they including Jaitra Rai prepared a burning pyre and threw themselves into the lap of its flames; and the second one is that the falling of the fort of Ajmer into the hands of the Muslims (as per version of Hasan Nizami) must have been possible after the death of Hariraja for no such thing may be believed to have taken place before the death of the ruling king it matters little that the commander of the army (like Jaitra Rai in this case) had been succumbed to the flames. Further, if there was no open fight between these two adversaries (the contrary of which Firishta suggests) it is certain (as has been impressed upon by the *Mammira Mahakavya*) that Hariraja in utter despair, had also consigned himself to the flames along with his brethren and family. The non-mentioning of his name by Hasan Nizami in his account as respects his being swallowed up by the flames does not give place to any doubt whatever. As Hasan Nizami was not a historian in the true sense of the term, it is very likely that he must not have anticipated the controversies that may arise in this respect while writing out this account. But, nevertheless, a critical examination of his statement, aforesaid, undoubtedly reveals that no open battle had taken place between the two armies and that Hariraja and Jaitra Rai in the fort of Ajmer were consumed by the tyrant flames on their own accord.

Thus, a correct version of it may be found in both the records, *Hammira Mahakavya* and the *Taju-l-Ma-Asir*, and, therefore, Firishta's account, a much later work, seems to have been based upon some fictitious tale, which lacks historical value.

¹ TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 226.

However, immediately, after this event, the court of Ajmer, "which was one of the most celebrated in Hind", was taken over by Kutb-ud-din. The helpless Hindus of the city were once more obliged to witness with open eyes the terrible scene of massive massacre followed by the conversion of their holy temples into mosques. Hasan Nizami, the reputed contemporary historian himself writes that Ajmer which restored its honour from times immemorial and had occupied a most celebrated place in Hind was now reverted ; the Islamic religion was reestablished and "the road of the rebellion was closed." Our historian further records that "infidelity was cut off, and the foundations of idol-worship were utterly destroyed." And by his new arrangement "the roads were freed from the fear and danger of robbers, and the oppressed subjects were delivered from their distresses."¹

To afford convenience and effective administration Kutb-ud-din now resolved on the direct annexation of Ajmer, and, therefore, he installed there, for the time being, a Muslim Governor incharge of affairs at Ajmer and himself returned to Delhi.²

Prince Govindaraja, the son of Prithviraja, who was installed as a puppet ruler of Ajmer by Kutb-ud-din proved a liability as vassal. But after the annexation of Ajmer, under the direct rule of the Muslims, Govindaraja was most probably conferred the fief of Ranthambhor, by his overlord. This supposition gets more support from Hammira Mahakavya which testifies that after his externment from Ajmer by his uncle Hariraja, prince of Govindaraja had established himself as a ruler at Ranthambhor.³ Indeed, this was possible under the hegemony of the Muslims alone.

Thus, with the fall of Hariraja, who occupied the throne of Ajmer at least upto the 8th of the dark of Vaisakha, V. 1251, ended the kingdom of Sapadalaksa which lasted nearly for five centuries⁴ in one stretch. The repeated rebellions, perpetrated

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 26.

2 Ibid., p. 226.

3 HM, 4, 20-31.

4 ECD., p. 101.

by the Prince Hariraja and the Rai of Delhi, who belonged to the royal-blood, unmistakably exhibit the ceaseless efforts of the Chahamanas directed to restore the fallen glory of their beloved and ancient home. They were so much swayed by their patriotism that the yoke of bondage did not fit in well with their pride and traditions.¹ The struggle which was thrown in between the Chahamanas and the Truks had lasted for long. The elongation of this struggle was due to the fact that both the contenders were anxious to establish their supremacy, although on different and heterogeneous ground. For, while the Chahamanas had concentrated on defending their country from the serfdom and on repulsing the Muslim intruders, the Muslim army was definitely on its way to subjugate the Chahamanas and to plant, thereafter, the standard of its religion on the unsophisticated soil of the Hind. But the ultimate result was not of a happy character. The citadel of the Chahamana resistance, was, in the end, aggressively pulled down and smashed and thus the gallant Chahamanas, although offered full-blooded resistance till their last breath, were finally routed. But, nevertheless, they did not spare even a fraction of their energy or a drop of their blood in attempting to save their country from falling into the hands of anti-religionists or in preventing their culture and civilization from being disparaged or ravaged.

On the whole, however, this event had procreated a glorious history whereby the Indian bard still gets eloquent and rhapsodical as he settles to sing of the brave deeds of the mighty Bisala and the gallant Prithviraja III, the last of the Hindu emperors of Delhi.

About the same time, Firishta gives the account of the statement that in the year 591 H. (1194 A.D.) "Kootb-ood-deen marched towards Nehrwala, the capital of Gujerat, Jeewun Ray,² the general of Bheem Dew, who was encamped under the walls, fled at his approach, but on being closely pursued, he drew up his army, and fought till he lost his life, when his army resumed

1 DHNI, Vol. II, p. 1092.

2. He is also called Jatwan or Jitwan.

its flight. Bheem Dew, hearing of this defeat, fled from his dominion; and Kootb-ood-Deen having ravaged the country at leisure obtained much booty. He marched from thence to the fort of Hansy, which he repaired, and having visited Kohram returned to Dehly."¹ It is remarkable that this statement of Firishta has not been supported either by Minhaj or by Hasan Nizami the contemporary historians. Further, this statement shows his ignorance of the actual fact inasmuch as it is known to us from the accounts of Hasan Nizami, a contemporary source that 'Jeewan Ray' or Jatwan, was defeated and finally slain on the border of Bagar in 588 H. According to Prof. Hodivala this Jatwan is a mistranscription of the word Chahamana.² The Bagar tract, where this Chahamana chief was slain, is situated in the region from the South and the Southwest of Fatihabad, Sirsa, Hissar and Bhiwani³. Dr. Sharma, however, mentions that there is another Bagar in the South including the Banswara and Dungarpur States. Most probably the knowledge of this fact and the mention of Bagar as the tract where 'Jatwan' or "Jeewan Ray" was slain led Firishta to calculate that he was a relative of Bhimadeva II whose kingdom included this tract.⁴ More or less, Firishta's this account has not been supported by any other source of our information and hence this event looks impossible.

Arrival of the Sultan and the annexation of Bayana

The very next year the news that the Sultan had marched towards Hindustan from Ghazni put Kutb-ud-din in extreme ecstasy and hilarious rejoicings. He advanced himself as far as Hansi to greet the Sultan and "had the honour of kissing hands and being distinguished above all the princes of the earth by the endless favours which were lavished on him."⁵ The Sultan and

1 BF, Vol. I. p. 194. The same event with the same facts have been given in detail at a very early stage by Hasan Nizami, See TM, ED Vol. II, pp. 217-18.

2 Studies In Indo-Muslim History, p. 179.

3 IG, XII, p. 149.

4 ECD, p 100, footnote 3.

5 TM; ED, Vol. II, p. 226. According to Firishta, Kutb-ud-din was also presented with an Arab horse and a robe of honour; Firishta, Text, p. 62.

Kutb-ud-din had some initial discussions in respect of the formulation of fresh plans for the annexation of other parts of the Northern India. Major portion of the Chahamanas Empire was already captured by the Sultan with the assistance of his able general Kutb-ud-din. But some of the outlying provinces which had probably broken away from Ajmer after the decisive battle of Tarain in 1192 A.D. still needed annexation because they refused to form part of the Muslim empire. It is transpired that these provinces took full advantage of the uneven condition prevailing in the country and perhaps declared their independence in their respective spheres.¹ The task of the new rulers was, therefore, to bring them back to their original status and with this aim in view, suggests Dr. R. B. Singh,² an expedition was despatched towards Thangar (Banyana),³ in the year 592 H. (1195-96),⁴ which was the capital of the Jadon Bhatti Rajputs. The chief of the fort, Kunwar Pal who was either a governor or a feudatory ruler during the reign of Prithviraja III⁵ and "who prided himself on the number of his army and the strength of his castle,"⁷

1 Dr. R. B. Singh : Op. Cit., p. 221.

2 Ibid., p. 221.

3 According to Firishta's text this "Thanger" is now called Biana : ED, Vol. II, p. 226, footnote 1. Minhaj, however, called it "Thankar" : ED, Vol. II, p. 300. This Bayana has been identified with an ancient town in Bharatpur State : ETED, p. 137. According to Ain-i-Akbari, this Bayana was the capital of a province and possessed the large fort which contained many "buildings and Subterranean, caverns and a very high tower."

4 Muhammad Aziz Ahmad places this event in 1195 A. D., p. 137 and footnote 2, probably on the authority of Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, p. 23. Tabakat-i-Nasiri wrongly gives the year of this event as 591 (1195 A. D.) : E D, Vol. II, p. 300. Alfi is far from the fact when he places this event in 1194 A. D. Hasan Nizami, E.D. Vol. II, p. 226, has been supported by Prof. Habibullah, who thinks that the conquest of Bayana was completed in 592 H. (1195-6 A. D.), p. 65. Hasan Nizami's date is further confirmed by Fakhre Mudabbir, p. 23. A locally current couplet in Hindi has preserved the date and name of the Muslim Commander : Cunningham Reports, VI, p. 55.

5 Habibullah : The Foundation Of Muslim Rule In India, p. 65.

6 History Of The Chahamanas, p. 221, footnote, 110; C H I, Vol. III, p. 43, wrongly mentions that he was "the Commander of Bhim's army." According to Muhammad Aziz Ahmad, op. cit., p. 137, footnote 6, he was the Raja of Thankir : C. V. Vaidya, Vol. III, p. 299. Hasan Nizami gives the name of the chief of Bayana as "Kunwar Pal", but its MSS has only "Ku Pal", : ED Vol. II p, 227 footnote 1. But, he is also mentioned as Kumar Pala in the annals of the ancestors of the Jadon Bhatti Dynasty of Kerauli : Cunningham : Reports, XII, pp. 6, 7-8.

7 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 226.

evacuated the capital without any resistance. He himself retired towards the neighbourhood of the fort of Tangarh (Tahangarh), for the safety of his life.¹ But an effective siege soon compelled him to evacuate the fort and sue for peace. The Sultan though spared his life, took possession of his kingdom. Thereafter, several strongholds and the strategic outposts of the nearby were annexed and garrisoned; and "the country was purified from the defilement of infidelity, and no opportunity remained for opposition and rebellion."² The entire portion of the newly conquered Bayana kingdom was entrusted to the charge of Sultan's another trusted Turkish slave, Baha-ud-din Tughril,³ "who was acquainted with matters of administration, and the customs of setting soldiers in array."⁴ The latter founded another military station at Sultan-Kot as a mean to operate successfully in the fertile plains of the country both in the East and West.

The fall of Gwalior

Sultan's next target was the annexation of the strong fort of Gwalior which has been described by Hasan Nizami as "the pearl of the necklace of the castles of Hind."⁵ By this time the fort was held by a prince of the Parihar Dynasty⁶ named as Rai Solankh Pal by our historian⁷ Hasan Nizami, "who had raised the

1 Minhaj, p. 60.

2 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 227.

3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 227. The name of the Muslim Commander and the year of its conquest can be found in one of the couplet in Hindi as noticed by Cunningham : Reports, VI, p. 55.

4 T M, E D, Vol. II, p. 227.

5 T M, E D, Vol. II, p. 227.

6 Habibullah : The Foundation Of Muslim Rule In India, p. 66; The Struggle For Empire, p. 120.

7 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 228. Firishta, p. 62, calls him Rae 'Silkman' and not the Rae Solankh Pal, see Vaidya, Vol. III, p. 305. A fragmentary inscription discovered in Jhansi, mentions the prince Sallakshanasinha, being engaged in fighting the Javanas (Yavanas). But unfortunately, the inscription bears no date : E I, Vol. I, p. 214-15. According to Cunningham the name of the prince can be identified with the Parihara Lohangdeo. Archaeological Survey Report, Vol. II, pp. 378-79. Dr. R. B. Singh thinks that although, the identity of this prince is almost obscure, he appears to have been one of the feudatory chiefs who adorned the court of Prithviraja III. And as the Kachchhapaghatas inhabited the region during this period, Solankh Pal might be taken to be a scion of this clan. In all likelihood he established himself as an independent ruler after the fall of Prithviraja III : Op. cit., p. 222 and footnote 112.

standard of infidelity and predition, and prided himself on his countless army and elephants." This prince appeared to have resolved to give a tough fight to the Muslims in their scheme of conquest.

So immediately after settling the affairs at Bayana, the Sultan accompanied by his royal army, including his general Kutb-ud-din and other noted officers, marched in the year 592 H. (1196 A.D.)¹ towards 'Galewar' (Gwalior) to invest that fort.² Subsequent to this march of the Sultan, we are told that when Solankh Pal, the Rai of the fort "saw the power and majesty of the army of Islam," he became alarmed and dispirited. He decided to evacuate the fort but "wherever he looked he saw the road of flight blocked up." Therefore, in order to save the country from utter destruction, he, ultimately, "sued for pardon, and placed the ring of servitude in his ear." As also he agreed to pay tribute and sent ten elephants as peace-offering. The Sultan seized this opportunity and raised the strength of the siege. And in consequence to the Rai's acceptance of Sultan's suzerainty, the latter offered the royal protection and allowed the former to retain the fort.³ It is, indeed, surprising to note that in spite of regular resistance by the Hindus at various conquered regions, this Hindu chief was admitted to rule over Gwalior after its reduction. According to Prof. Habibullah, to allow half-subdued enemy to continue in occupation of a strong fort was, however, strategically inadvisable. And it was for this reason that a complete reduction of the fort at a suitable time in future, was accordingly decided upon.⁴

At this stage it is evident from the writings of Firishta that some affairs by then at Ghazni had demanded Sultan's immediate presence over there.⁵ And in the fitness of things, it was not at all possible for him, or more so desirable, to instal another trouble at Gwalior. He, therefore, gladly accepted the offer made

1 This date is according to Hasan Nizami : TM., ED, Vol. II, p. 227.

2 TM, E D, Vol. II, p. 227.

3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 228.

4 The Foundation Of Muslim Rule In India, p. 66.

5 BF, Vol. I, p. 180.

by the Hindu chief and left him unmolested in order to bring immediate peace. On the other hand, if the Sultan had launched on the complete annexation of this strong fort, a terrific political agitation would have gripped the whole of Gwalior and the doors of fresh resistance by the Hindus were let open which could have seemingly delayed the Sultan's arrival at Ghazni in time. In view of this delicate situation, the best policy which the Sultan embraced, was to leave Gwalior half subdued and to annex it at some opportune time in the near future. Under the circumstances, therefore, the charges framed by Habibullah against the Sultan, appears to be unhomely, untenable and without any justification.

Later, just in conformity to the pre-determined policy of the Sultan, Baha-ud-din Tughril who was incharge of the fort of Bayana, was chosen for the task of reducing the said fort completely. He made Sultan Kot as the base and cut off Gwalior's communications with the plains. This ruthless act of Tughri caused, among the Rajputs of the fort of Gwalior, great hue and cry, and their condition became more pitiable. The continuous shortage of grains and the dismal means of communication soon made their condition more worse. Their this condition, tantamount to famine-stricken one, did not permit them to hold the fort intact. There were no weapon in their hands to hew this block. Therefore, they were compelled to surrender the fortress in utter helplessness and deep agony in the end. Kutb-ud-din, thereafter, easily occupied the fort in the name of the Sultan and annexed it to the Delhi Sultanate.¹

After this event, however, "when the neighbouring country was freed from the enemies of religion, and the Rai of Hind became enrolled amongst the number of servants and friends" the Sultan prepared himself to return to Ghazni. Kutb-ud-din, after the departure of his master, came back to Delhi where festivities were celebrated on his arrival.² And probably on this gracious occa-

1 None of the two sources, the Taju-L-Ma asir, or the Gwalior Namah, record its final occupation. But Fakhre Mudabbir places the event in 597 H. (1200-1 A. D.).

2 TM ED. Vol. II, p. 228.

sion the Juma Masjid of Delhi, the foundation of which was already laid by Kutb-ud-din in the year 1193 A.D., was completed.¹

Chahamanas Last Resistance At Ajmer

Although, Ajmer, the seat of the mighty Chahamanana power, was lately annexed to the direct rule of the Muslims, yet this colossal political event could do little to crush or pull off the noble sentiments enshrined in the hearts of the Hindus as respects their candid ambition to achieve independence. Born and bred in free and unsubdued atmosphere the people of Ajmer could not feasibly adjust themselves to the prevailing conditions of slavery they were thrown in by the supreme power of the Turks. Notwithstanding, the manifold political and economic difficulties that menaced them aggressively in the realisation of their goals and irrespective of the martyrdom of many of the bravest Chahamanana kings at the alter of freedom, the Chahamanas struggled hard for many years together to liberate their country, but alas ! fortune never smiled on them as if it was writ large in their lot. Their last resistance under the able leadership of the Prince Hariraja, was also put to naught. Although, this young prince had gained some initial success, which did cast on them some rays of hope but the irony of fate intervened again and he was ultimately beaten hollow by the Muslim intruders.

This unwanted death and defeat of Hariraja virtually orphanaged the country in matters of leadership. There was practically no one left to lead the people to victory or to imbue in them any such hope. It was the saddest experience of the time. The Chahamanas who once filled the galaxy of great and farsighted leaders excelling both in the art of war and the show of bravery as respects their other countrymen, became leaderless at the crucial time when they most needed one of such men. Helplessly, therefore, they were switched on to bear this brunt by themselves. Burdened with this onerous task of gaining freedom without an able general and, moreover, having reaped a bitter and sad experience of the new regime, they once again tried to steer through these unfavourable circumstances and took initiative to flout the demons of their religion and to restore freedom thereby.

¹ Firishta, text. p. 62

As a result of this steadfastness of the Chahamanas to the sole ambition of gaining freedom, Kutb-ud-din, towards the end of the year 1196 A. D. (592 H.),¹ was obliged to face yet another sanguine threat from them. In the meantime, the Mher tribe,² which spread over in the neighbourhood of Ajmer, after having formed an alliance with the dispossessed and broken Chahamanas, called for an armed assistance from the Chaulukyas, another mighty rulers of Gujerat, to drive the Muslims far away from Rajputana.

In this connection, we learn from Hasan Nizami that when an intelligence was brought to Kutb-ud-din, stationing that time at Ajmer, that a party of seditious Mhers, "who were always shooting the arrow of deceit from the bow of refractoriness", and, "has sent spies and messengers towards Nahrwala, representing that a detachment of the army of the Turks had arrived at Ajmer, of no great strength and numbers, and that if from that quarter a force could be immediately sent to join them, before the enemy could find the opportunity of putting themselves in a state of preparation, they could make a sudden night attack upon them, and might rid the country of them, and if anyone of the Turkish army were to escape from the talons of the eagle of death, he

1 TN, (Text) p. 140; TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 228 gives the years 591 H. (1195 A.D.), which is not correct. Similarly Firishta also gives a wrong date i.e. 1195 A. D. (592 H.): B. F., Vol. I, pp. 179-80. On account of this confusing statement some of the modern writers also place the event in 1195 A.D., See Dr. R. B. Singh: *The History of The Chahamanas*, p. 223; *The Struggle For Empire*, p. 120. The CHI, Vol. III, p. 44, is far from the fact when it places the event in the year 1197 A. D. But the correct date has been given in many other contemporary works like the *Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah*, p. 23, which clearly places the even in 1196 A.D. See also Habibuillah, op, cit., p. 66 and ETED p. 139, footnote. 5.

2 In all the MSS of *Taju-l Ma-Asir*, the tribe's name is given as Tuni or Nartir. Firishta, p. 60, also supports it. But the English translation of both the works by Elliot and Briggs have Mhers or Mercs: ED, Vol. II, p. 228 and BF, Vol. I, p. 196. Major Raverty : TN, Vol. I, p. 550 and CHI, Vol. III, p. 44, call them as Mers or Mairs. Dr. Muhammad Aziz Ahmad thinks that they were Bhattis, originally Bhatti Rajputs who held the fort of Bhatner, which was captured by Mahmud of Ghazni in about 1004 A. D. : *Early Turkish Empire of Delhi*, p. 13 footnote 6. However, in any case, the name of the tribe shows it clearly that they originally inhabited in Ajmer.

must necessarily take the road of flight, and with his two horses would make three stages into one, until he reached Delhi in a state of destruction,"¹ he let himself plunged in deep calculations and natural anticipations, befitting a great general like him, as to how this uprising could successfully be suppressed. He was also alive to the gravity of the situation and the decided intention of the Hindus. He found the garrison of Ajmer quite insufficient to checkmate the flow of this roaring tide and, therefore, he immediately, called for reinforcements from Delhi. Indeed, it adds to the great courage and correct calculations of Kutb-ud-din, that he set out on the early morning which spell the most hottest day of the season and surprisingly attacked the advance guard of the Mher forces assembled in front of the city without any idea of clash with the Muslims till the arrival of the army of the Chaulukyas which had not yet arrived. In fact, Kutb-ud-din wanted to meet the Mhers and the Chaulukyas separately and presumably with this aim Kutb-ud-din, even, without a sufficient garrison and without waiting for the receipt of assistance from Delhi, made an assault on the Rajputs in order to inflict a crushing defeat on them before any help could come to them from the Chaulukyas and then to meet the latter single handed. But he was beaten back in his own coin, and received a deadly blow at the hands of the Rajputs. A fierce battle ensued which let the result hung in balance throughout the day and night. But the table was turned next morning, when the army of the Rajputs was strengthened by the coming of the Nahrwala army for their assistance. In the tough fight that took place, thereafter, many Musalmans and some valiant generals of Kutb-ud-din were killed. Instantly, the Muslim Commander himself fell down from his wounded horse which was severely injured. This sudden reverse, largely dispirited the Muslim army which was forced to retreat from the battle-field. The wounded Muslim general Kutb-ud-din,

¹ TM, ED, Vol. II, pp. 228-29. Firishta also supports it with the slight variation. According to him Kutb-ud-din received this news at Delhi, when his army being dispersed over his provinces, he was forced to march in person against these confederates with the few troops present in Delhi : BF, Vol. I, p. 196.

who according to Firishta had received six wounds,¹ was carried away with great difficulty by his soldiers to Ajmer on the back of another horse. The combined Hindu army gave a hot pursuit to Kutb-ud-din, and his army retiring towards Ajmer, who took shelter within the four walls of the fort. The Rajputs took up their positions and laid a close siege "within one parasang of that place."² The siege continued for several months during which period Kutb-ud-din kept himself shut vigilantly within the walls of the fort. This state of affairs led the continuation of the hostilities.³

But Kutb-ud-din's condition became critical and, therefore, somehow or the other he managed to send a confidential news to his master at Ghazni to render him an immediate military aid. When this intelligence reached the ears of the Sultan Shahab-ud-din, he at once dispatched a very large army under the command of several Amirs; Jahan Pahalewan, Asad-ud-din Arsalan Kaliji (most probably a Khalji)⁴, Nasir-ud-din Husain, Izz-ud-din son of Muwaiyid-din Balkh, and Sharf-ud-din Muhammad Jarrah,⁵ to reinforce his general in Hind.

Before the arrival of this despatch, Kutb-ud-din was placed on the sharp edge of an immensely critical situation and he knew it well that any further delay in cutting off this uprising would lead to the annihilation of the Muslim army and the overthrow of the Muslim rule in the country of Hind. On the other hand, the Rajputs, plunged in deep rejoicings at the procurement of victory, bravely continued to siege with a determination to destroy the Muslim army root and branch. Thus, surrounded by the hostile Rajputs it had become all the more impossible for Kutb-ud-din to continue resistance any more. But fortune smiled on him once again and the reinforcement sent by the Sultan for his relief, reached him in the beginning of the winter. This

1 BF, Vol. I, p. 196.

2 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 229.

3 Firishta, Text, p. 62.

4 Ibid.

5 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 229. Firishta includes the name of Islam Khan in the list given above. Firishta, Text, p. 62.

timely arrival of the contingent, however, saved the situation from becoming more worsened. The result was that the Rajputs had to lift the siege on the arrival of this fresh and huge army from Ghazni.¹

Indeed, this was the last of the several attempts made by the princes and the people of Ajmer to expel the Turks therefrom and, although this time, they were tangibly supported by the brave Chaulukyas and had also registered in their favour some initial success, but they utterly failed to carry it to the stage of implementing the bosomed mission for they did not fair well in the final encounter. This tactical blunder in their strategy sealed their fate for ever and they could not raise their heads again against the Turks who had become supreme in the country.

¹ TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 229.

CHAPTER VII

KUTB-UD-DIN AS VICEROY—(IV)

Clash with the Chaulukyas

The Chaulukyas of Anahillapataka or Anhilwara (in Gujerat) was another mighty Rajput kingdom of India which came into clash with the armies of Islam under Kutb-ud-din Aibak. At this time the reigning prince of this kingdom was the powerful Bhima II who ascended the throne in the early year of 1178 A.D., after the immature death of his elder brother Mularaja II.¹ This young prince, although a minor at the time of his accession,² proved quite worthy of the difficult situation he was placed in.³ This was, indeed, the most trying situation for him wherein he was perhaps to play the last card. Rather he was in predicament. For the Chahamanas, under Prithviraja III and his brother Hariraja respectively, and then the neighbouring tribal peoples who had launched a long drawn struggle against the Muslim onslaught for the restoring of the status quo were all defeated which enhanced the Muslim power doubtlessly. And therefore, Bhima II, who was young in age, found himself confronted by this uprising tide of the Muslim invasion under Kutb-ud-din. We have seen in the preceding pages how Bhima II had successfully helped the Mhers of Ajmer in the struggle for independence and played as trumpcard in inflicting a crushing defeat on the Muslims at Ajmer in 1196 A.D., wherein the Muslim general, Kutb-ud-din, was himself seriously wounded and had to shut himself within the fort of Ajmer for several months to save his life and to resist the complete rout of the Muslim power in India till the arrival

1 AK, Majumdar : Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p. 138; the Struggle for Empire, p. 78.

2 The Struggle For Empire, p. 78.

3 For his early problems and difficulties, see A. K. Majumdar's Chaulukyas of Gujarat, pp. 138-39.

of the fresh armies from Ghazni which reached there timely and, thereby, saved the Muslims from utter destruction. By this time, that is before the arrival of the fresh reinforcement, it appears that the Hindu army had retired and took up its position at the fort of Mt. Abu exactly, at the same place where Sultan Shahab-ud-din had been decisively defeated and wounded severely, some eighteen years back.

Kutb-ud-din, could not efface from his mind the humiliating defeat in the previous engagement¹ and the green wounds received therein always reminded him of that unhappy event. This made him more revengeful and, therefore, he resolved to measure his vengeance on the king of Gujerat for his rendering help to the rebellions of Ajmer. He, further, gained confidence by the arrival of the fresh and strong troops from Ghazni. But at the same time Kutb-ud-din was so much overpowered by the pain of the alleged severe injuries that he could not immediately march towards Gujerat to punish this Rajput king as resolved. It was only after the healing, up of his wounds, as Firishta informs us, that he could lead the expedition in that direction.² Consequently, Kutb-ud-din marched in the middle of Safar, 593 H. (January, 1197 A. D.)³ from Ajmer with a huge and powerful army to destroy the Rai of Nehrwala. Here, as to the route followed by Kutb-ud-din in this march,³ Hasan Nizami and Firishta, who are the only source of information for us, differ from each other. Most probably, he passed through the lofty forts of Pali and Nadol,⁴ the occupant of which the Hindu chief

1 BF, Vol. I, p. 196.

2 TM, ED; Vol. II, p. 229. But Muhammad Aziz on the authority quoted therein places the same event in the beginning of Jaunary, 1196 A.D. which is not correct : Early Turkish Empire of Delhi, p. 139 and footnote 7.

3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 229; BF, Vol. I, p. 196.

4 Hasan Nizami has Pali and Nadol: ED, Vol. II, p. 229, and Firishta reads it Baly and Nadole : BF, Vol. I, p. 196. But according to Raverty it is Pali and Nadol : TN, Vol. I, p. 520. C. V. Vaidya and Ray suggest that Nadol was the former capital of the Chahamana Rajputs, now in a village in Desuri District of Jodhpur State. Pali fort is situated about 6 miles West of Satara Town, Bombay and was built by one of the kings of Delhi in the 13th century. However, there is an old Patti fort situated in the Kasur Tahsil of Lahore

had vacated before his arrival. The Chaulukya feudatory Jayatsimha, who was the incharge of the forts of Pali and Nadol,¹ joining hands with Dharavarsa² Paramara, the chief of Abu, and his equally renowned brother, Palhana or Prahladana,³ "drew up at the foot of Mount Abu,⁴ and at the mouth of a pass stood ready for fight and slaughter."⁵ This was the very place where Sultan Shahab-ud-din had tasted his first severe defeat in India.

Placed within the fold of such predicament, the Muslims did not dare to attack the Rajputs who were then in a strong position, "especially", writes Hasan Nizami, "as in that very place Sultan Muhammad Sam Ghori had been wounded, and it was considered of bad omen to bring on another action there, lest a similar

District now in Pakistan. Pali is an old fort in the District of Jodhpur : C. V. Vaidya, Vol. III, p. 301 and Ray, Vol. II, p. 1121. Dr. Ojha on the other hand thinks that the conflict at Nadol was not with Turuskes, but was the Javalipura Chauhan Udayasimha. History of Rajputana, Vol. II, pp. 461-62.

- 1 Karan of Hasan Nizami : TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 230, who was the leader of the Hindu army at the fort of Mount Abu has been identified by Vaidya and Dr. Bhandarkar with Kelhana: Vaidya, Vol. III, p. 301; EI, Vol. XI, p. 73, which is not correct. In fact Kelhana had died earlier either in before V. 1251 (1194-95 A. D.), about two years before this battle. Kelhana was succeeded by his son and successor Jayatsimha which is confirmed by Sadadi inscription of V. 1251 (1194-95) in which he is mentioned as Maharajadhiraja Jayatasimha, son of Kelhana (as noticed by D. R. Bhandarkar, EI, Vol. XI, p. 73). This evidence makes it clear that the leader of the Hindu army to hold the forts of Pali and Nadol was Jayatsimha and not Karan or Kelhana of the various authorities.
- 2 Hasan Nizami calls him 'Darabars' whereas Firishta reads it "Darabarz" : TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 229 and BF, Vol. I, p. 196. This identification of the Hindu Commander is quite obvious and 'Darabars' or 'Darabarz' of the Muslim historians is evidently a corruption for the name of the Paramara chief Dharavarsa of Abu: ECD, p. 140 and footnote 23; A. K. Majumder: Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p. 144.
- 3 "Wallin or Wallan Warisi" of Firishta : BF, Vol. I, p. 196, and Text p. 62, is probably a mistranscription of Pahlana which in turn is a corrupt form of Palhana or Prahladana, the heir apparent and younger brother of Dharavarsa: ECD, p. 140 and footnote 23.
- 4 Firishta correctly says that fort of Abugarh in the territory of Sirohi, Rajputana where the Rajputs had collected their army to defend the passage into Gujarat : BF, Vol. I, p. 196.
- 5 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 230.

accident might occur to the commander.”¹ Therefore, partly realising the strategic position held fast by the Hindus and partly being swayed by the superstitious beliefs Kutb-ud-din showed complete hesitation to attack. The contending armies remained there for many days. But unfortunately, the Hindus misconstrued this hesitation of Kutb-ud-din and carried it as far to identify it with the cowardice of the Muslim army and foolishly left this most strategic position with a view to giving the invaders an open fight. Indeed, it was a wrong move by the Hindus. Had they remained there, the Muslims’ hope to strike an avengeful blow might have been blighted. But they lost their patience. Jayat-simha and his friends, ultimately, took the lead and abandoned their advantageous positions and moved on to the plains where the Turkish horses could prove a boon. According to Hasan Nizami, the Hindus abandoning the pass, advanced to encounter the Muslim army and “turned their faces towards the field of battle and the plain of honour and renown.”² But Firishta gives a different account of this event. He states that it was Kutb-ud-din, who took the initiative and, “notwithstanding the difficulties of the road and the disadvantages of ground, attacked and defeated the Hindu army.”³ But, Firishta’s account must be studied with great caution and surveillance, as he wrote his history many centuries after the event had actually occurred; whereas Hasan Nizami is a contemporary historian whose account ought to be more reliable than that of Firishta. According to Hasan Nizami, the two armies stood face to face for sometime and were engaged in making preparations for fight. Having been informed of the fact that the Hindus had left their previous positions and had come to fight in the plains, Kutb-ud-din did not want to miss the golden opportunity of forcing a decisive battle.

Kutb-ud-din, therefore, ordered his army to advance in the night of the coming Sunday, the 13th of Rabi-ul-awal 593 A.H.

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 230.

2 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 230.

3 BF, Vol. I, pp. 196-97.

(3rd February, 1197 A.D.),¹ for the enforcement of a decision. The next morning, Kutb-ud-din contacted the main army of Bhima which was under the command of the powerful and vallant Rajput generals. The hostile armies met each other early the same morning and a terrific action ensued thereafter which continued till mid-day. Although, the Hindus put up a stubborn fight, the superior mobility and shock-tactics of the Muslims combined with the favourable circumstances decided the issue once more in their favour.² Firishta tells us that in this battle more than 50,000 Hindus lost their lives; 20,000 of them were taken as prisoners and a vast spoil also fell into the hands of the visitors.³ A similar account is also found in the work of the comtemporary historian, Hasan Nizami, who includes twenty elephants; and cattle; and arms beyond all calculation in the seize of the spoils which fell into the hands of the Muslims. As to the general massacre of the Hindu army, our historian writes that "most of their leaders were taken prisoners, and nearly fifty thousand Hindus were killed and from the heaps of the slain the hills and the plain became of one level."⁴ In the ensuing fight, many Hindu leaders also lost their lives and Jayatasimha, the chief of the Hindu army, might have been one of the them.⁵ But according to Hasan Nizami, Karan Simha (identified with Jayatasimha) escaped death and retired towards the hills, of Rajputana.⁶ But as we hear nothing of him after this event, it is very likely that this Hindu Commander had met his death in this engagement.

Kutb-ud-din and his army did not stay there any longer and marched towards Gujerat and ravaged it without being offered

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, pp. 229-30. "The battle in said to have taken place on Sunday, the 13th of Rabi-ul-awal, 593 A.H. The Julient equivalent of 13th Rabi I. Hisabi, 3rd February, 1197, was a Monday. The date given may have been the 18th according to the Hilali the 'Ruyyat' or orthodox system, as it was a Sunday." S. H. Hodivala: *Studies in Indo-Muslim History* (Bombay, 1939), p. 183.

2 Minhaj, p. 140; T.M., ED, Vol. II, p. 230.

3 BF, Vol. I, p. 197.

4 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 230.

5 ECD, p. 140, footnote 26.

6 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 230.

any further resistance.¹ Bhima II, the Chaulukya king, had already left the capital with his trusted persons and treasures and had gone to some distant fortress within his dominion.² The city of Nahrwala "which is the most celebrated in that country" and the kingdom of Gujerat, "which is a separate region of the world," were annexed by the Muslims.³ The capital town of Anahilla-pataka (Anhilwara) was pillaged and devastated mercilessly by the Muslims who also pulled down the temples and sacked its palaces. According to Firishta, Kutb-ud-din left a governor in Gujerat with a strong garrison after creating a shocking devastation and returned to Delhi via Ajmer.⁴ But one contemporary historian, Hasan Nizami, states that after this victory Kutb-ud-din returned to Ajmer and thence he finally moved towards Delhi and arrived there on a very auspicious day. But he makes no mention of any governor, left behind by Kutb-ud-din.⁵ The Muslim historians, however, records that after returning to Delhi, Kutb-ud-din sent a large quantity of jewels and gold and also many captive slaves (both male and female) including thirty two elephants as tribute to his master at Ghazni. His tribute was received by his majesty with suitable acknowledgement of the value and splendour of his general's service.⁶ And on this brilliant scene, Kutb-ud-din was overjoyed and showed many favours upon his officers and increased their ranks.⁷ According to Firishta, he also divided the remainder of the spoils among his fellow soldiers.⁸

Thus Muslims under the command of Kutb-ud-din, registered a great victory over the mighty Chaulukyas who had beaten the Turks twice and thus avenged their alleged defeats. Firishta, a

1 BF, Vol. I, p. 197.

2 Ojha appears to have confused in the sequence of events. See Rajputana, Vol. I, p. 271.

3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 230.

4 BF, Vol. I, p. 197.

5 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 230.

6 Ibid., p. 231; Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, p. 23; BF, Vol. I, p. 197.

7 TM, MSS, p. 429.

8 BF, Vol. I, p. 197.

later historian asserts that after this event Kutb-ud-din left a governor at Gujerat and then returned to Delhi by way of Ajmer. But Hasan Nizami, the contemporary historian, does not tell anything about the appointment of the governor by Kutb-ud-din for the surveillance of the newly conquered regions. No doubt Hasan Nizami is silent about the mention of any governor on which Firishta lays emphasis, nevertheless, he tells us that "the kingdom of Gujerat, "which is a separate region of the world, came under the dominion of the Musulmans."¹ This statement made by this historian atleast makes it certain that the kingdom of the Chaulukyas of Gujerat had, doubtless, been taken away by the Muslims. Dr. Muhammad Aziz Ahmad gives the impression that Nahrwala (Gujerat) was surely shaken but was not subjugated till a century later.² In support of his contention he states that both Khursru and Ziya Barni, in connection with the conquests of Alauddin Khalji, describe Gujerat as "an unravished bride, which no Muslim hand had touched."³ "Ram Chandra (1271-1309) was the last of the independent Hindu sovereigns of the Dekkan. The Musulmans had been firmly established at Delhi for about a century, and though they had not yet turned their attention to the Dekkan, it was not possible that they should refrain from doing so for a long time."⁴ He further argues that the country was not subjugated till 1294 A. D. the date of the conquest of Devagiri by Alauddin.⁵ Dr. A. B. M. Habibullah, on the other hand, asserts the occupation of Gujerat and thus says that "the expedition was intended to be a purely punitive measure but easy success probably tempted the victor to turn it into an occupation." He further thinks, that "its hazardous distance from Delhi however, was bound to make it a liability, the imperfect hold on Rajputana became a serious obstacle. The conquest in any case, was soon nullified."⁶ It is, therefore, quite evident

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 230.

2 Early Turkish Empire Of Delhi, p. 140.

3 Ibid., p. 140, and footnote 3.

4 R. G. Bhandarkar : Early Histry Of The Dekkan, p. 250.

5 ETED, pp. 140-41 footnote.

6 The Foundation Of Muslim Rule In India, p. 67.

from Dr. Habibulla's statement that Gujerat was at last temporarily annexed to the Turkish Empire, which is also articulated from the accounts of both Hasan Nizami and Firishta.

But it is surprising enough to note that none of the available Muslim sources informs us as to when and why the Muslims evacuated Gujerat. Perhaps this very omission by the Muslim historians, which is of a very important character, has led Dr. Muhammad Aziz Ahmad to suppose that Gujerat was not subjugated till a century later. It was after its subjugation by Alaud-din that we hear very often of Gujerat in the Muslim accounts. In fact, but for a few sporadic raids, Gujerat remained unmolested by the Muslims for a little more than a century. Dr. A. K. Majumdar seems to have rightly estimated the stubborn resistance offered by the Chaulukyas of Gujerat against the Muslims when he says that probably the Muslims "remembered for a long time the defeat of Muizz-ud-din the first defeat of Qutbud-Din, and then his hard won victory only to be followed by his ultimate expulsion from Gujerat. The memory of these incidents were probably sufficient to keep them at bay for such a long period. No other north Indian dynasty put up a more sustained or successful resistance against the Muslims for a longer period."¹

Thus the Muslim historians are silent to limelight this account but, some of the local authorities such as the contemporary Chaulukya inscriptions boastfully record the expulsion of the Turks.² Ibn Asir's information also speaks of the eventual restoring of the country by Aibak himself to its Hindu rulers.³ The Chaulukya king Bhima II is epigraphically proved to have snatched his country from the Muslims and assumed the sovereignty of the country for a fairly long time. This sovereignty of the country continued till 1240 A. D. during which period his occupation on Abu had always remained unimpaired.⁴

Probably Bhima II had come out of his hiding place, after

1 Chaulukyas of Gujerat, p. 145.

2 EI, p. 22, 338-9; 11, p. 439.

3 Asir, XII, p. 79.

4 Asiatic Researches, p. 269; 1A, 1877, p. 187.

the departure of Kutb-ud-din, and gradually drove out the Muslims from Gujerat. The Ahada grant of the Bhima further proves that he held Mewad in 1207 A. D. As well the Abu Stone inscription (No. 1) of V. S. 1265 evidently shows that the mountain passes of Abu again fell under his suzerainty by the year, 1209 A. D. It is also very likely that by this time, Bhima II was in reoccupation of the Bali district of Godwad in South-eastern Jodhpur.¹ But, unfortunately, like the Muslim sources, these records also failed to mention the year when the Muslim occupants were driven out of Gujerat. But, nevertheless, it is certain that the strong Muslim garrison left behind by Kutb-ud-din utterly failed to control the uprisings of the Hindus as a result of which the custodians of the garrison were ultimately forced to retreat and to throw all the territorial gains entirely into the hands of its Hindu rulers. The mention, as to the gallant fight and the display of this heroic struggle of the Hindus launched to bring back the lost glory of their sovereign, is to be found in the Dabhoi prasasti composed by Somesvara, the contemporary poet,² and in the Devapattana prasasti of Sridhara as well.³ These sources also indicate that the Muslim army, after the departure of Kutb-ud-din, in devastating attempts to increase the boundary of their occupation, made fresh annexations of the forts of Cambay and the sacred city of Somnath. Surrounded by the Muslim garrison and the like, the capital of the Chaulukyas apparently lost its strategic significance. It was thought of as deplorably unguarded in the exigencies of the prevailing circumstances and, therefore, it was the crying need of the hour to effect an immediate change into it for the purpose of a proper defence. In compliance to this decision, according to Dr. A. K. Majumdar, the remaining generals probably shifted towards the sea with the remnants of the army.⁴ The Muslims in-charge of the garrison of Gujerat, being intoxicated by their earlier victory, attacked these fortified places but they were beaten back to their original

1 As noticed by Dr. A. K. Majumdar : Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p. 145.

2 Dabhoi Prasasti, VV. 15-17 : EI, 1, 22.

3 As noticed by Dr. A. K. Majumdar : Chaulukyas Of Gujarat, p. 146.

4 Chaulukyas Of Gujarat, p. 146.

status with great slaughter. Dr. A. K. Majumdar, at this stage, opines that "probably the Hindus regained confidence after these victories, and followed them with renewed vigour, without stopping till the Muslims were driven out of Gujarat. Bhima was again in Anhilapataka in V. S. 1258 (C. 1201 A. D.) as we learn from the Colophon of a manuscript."¹

Whatever may be the force and authenticity of these available sources, but it is not possible for us to believe that the Muslims had voluntarily evacuated Gujerat after its conquest in 1197 A.D. As it is clear from the above, the Muslims were ever eager to thrust their Islamic sword deep into the heart of India, how it could have been possible for them to evacuate it voluntarily. As well the policy of annexing the Hindu States by the Muslims never leaves any doubt that the Muslims were repulsed from Gujerat by force and were not made to evacuate the place on their own accord. It is not, however, correct to believe, as Dr. A. B. M. Habibullah impresses upon that "Its hazardous distance from Delhi, however, was bound to make it a liability; the imperfect hold on Rajputana became a serious obstacle."² Upholding almost the same view, Dr. Parmatma Saran states that "some scholars oppose that it was due to the valour shown by Bhima II that the Turks did not venture to attack Gujarat for one full century. But the immunity of Gujarat from Turkish invasion was probably due mainly to its being situated at a long distance from the capital with the important territory of Rajputana intervening between the two. These obstacles were not easy to overcome for a general who was kept preoccupied with insurgence and revolt rampant in the country around the capital."³ Dr. Muhammad Aziz Ahmad is certainly far from catching this fact when he writes that "Nahrwalah (Gujarat) was surely shaken but was not subjugated till a century later."⁴ But, nevertheless, the available Hindu sources have clearly shown that the Muslims having occupied Gujerat, for some time, were engaged

1 Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p. 146.

2 The foundation of the Muslim Rule in India, p. 67.

3 The Struggle for Empire, p. 121.

4 Early Turkish Empire of Delhi, p. 140.

with the Hindus in a fierce fight wherein the latter fought very gallantly and once more inflicted a crushing defeat upon the former and ultimately compelled them to withdraw from their sacred land. The Muslim historians also lay support to the fact that Gujerat was annexed but they utterly failed to record the evacuation of the Muslims from that place. It is, however, very surprising to note that after the terrific expulsion of the Muslims from these areas, Kutb-ud-din made no effort, light or heavy, to bring it back under his control as he did in the case of Ajmer and other places. Instead, he sat silent leaving his dream to extend his territory upto the heart of Gujerat unaccomplished. It is very likely, that the valiant warlike tribes of Rajputana, its hazardous distance from Delhi, and lastly, Kutb-ud-din's preoccupation in suppressing the revolts around the capital city must have served as conspicuous reasons for him not to take any action against the Hindus during those crucial movements. But at the same time the glorious resistance offered by the Hindus, and their stubborn fight for independence which actually terrorised Kutb-ud-din and his army, cannot be side-tracked. Probably, this was a convincing reason for Kutb-ud-din in not having taken any further step against such a hostile people of the country and was consequently led to satisfy himself with his previous holdings. The Muslim historians actually failed to record this engagement because it might have told of a brilliant achievement of the Hindus and of their successful resistance for freedom against such a strong adversary, who was the conqueror of many land and country. If the historians aforesaid had narrated this incident, definitely then Kutb-ud-din would have been derogated from the high post which he holds in the eyes of his admirers. This shows the gross partiality of the Muslim historians in recording only the achievements and glories of Islam and in excluding to mention any thing which might prove as an insult to Islam.

CHAPTER VIII

KUTB-UD-DIN AS VICEROY (V)

Activities in Northern Doab and Rajputana

It is misfortune that Kutb-ud-din's military activities, in India after his Gujerat expedition in 1197 A. D., and till 1202 A. D., are not well known to us. The trend of his political career in India, for nearly 5 years, has, indeed, been surprising. The contemporary Muslim historians, like Hasan Nizami and Minhaj-us-Siraj, do not ostensibly record any of his military operations or his fresh conquests in between the gap period mentioned above. It is, however, more surprising, on the part of the former not to have mentioned his political account irrespective of the fact that he has given a fairly more detailed account of Kutb-ud-din and his conquests in India than the latter. Similarly, a later historian, who, although gives a quite comprehensive and authentic account of Kutb-ud-din, but has not anywhere mentioned any event after 1197 A. D. and before 1202 A. D. But, nevertheless, we have, fortunately, been furnished with another account, accorded by Fakhre Mudabbir, another contemporary writer, which invites us for the study of Kutb-ud-din's political career during the period of these five years.

From Fakhre Mudabbir, we learn that after the return of Kutb-ud-din from Gujerat, he carried his arms towards the Hindu territories which were still unsubdued. The mighty Gahadavala's, who were decisively defeated in the battle of Chandawar in 1193 A. D., ultimately, fell to pieces. Some of the feudatory dynasties must have also perished by the sword of the Muslims. Even then there seems to have remained few others who still recognised the suzerainty of the tottering Gahadavala Dynasty.¹ But the majority of them probably availed the existing situation and declared

¹ The History of the Gahadavala Dynasty, p. 117.

themselves independent.¹ The Rashtrakuta Dynasty of Vodamayuta seems to be one of them.²

It may, thus, be fairly concluded that the limitations of the victory of the Turks were not caused only by the existence of the line of Jai Chandra and his feudatories but by the erstwhile feudatories even after the battle of Chandawar. It necessitated, therefore, a complete overthrow of the Muslims, who supplanted them of their kingdoms and kings by the first half of the 13th century. The country lying across the upper Ganges, which was still unaffected by the Muslim arms, attracted a large number of Gahadavala emigrants from the South; Badaun presumably still retaining its Rashtrakuta Dynasty.³ It was quite natural for the aggressive policy of Kutb-ud-din to have launched an expedition in that direction. Probably, for this reason, as our historian Fakhre Mudabbir writes, Kutb-ud-din in 594 H. (1197-8 A. D.) captured Badaun from its Rashtrakuta ruler Lakshmanapala.⁴ The conquest of Badaun was soon followed by a second occupation of Banaras where Kutb-ud-din and his army is said to have destroyed many idol-temples.⁵ According to Fakhre Mudabbir, Kutb-ud-din, afterwards, turned his eyes towards "Chantwarwal" (Chandawar) and Kanauj, which were subsequently conquered in the year 595 H. (1198-9 A. D.). His next target was Rajputana, where some expeditions are reported to have been targeted. Subsequently, Kutb-ud-din annexed Sirohi, and forced the Chahamanas of Nadol to migrate to safer places. Since these Chahamanas had founded the houses of Kotah, Bundi and Sirohi, they could not allow Aibak to establish a firm and lasting foothold on the soil of Rajputana.⁶ The next important event as given by Fakhre Mudabbir is that of the conquest of Malwa and its neighbouring territories in the year 596 H. (1199-1200

1 Ibid., pp. 117-18.

2 Ibid., p. 118.

3 The Foundation of the Muslim Rule in India, p. 63.

4 EI, Vol. I, p. 64. See also C. V. Vaidya : Op. Cit., Vol. III, p. 300.

5 Fakhre Mudabbir, p. 24.

6 The Struggle For Empire, p. 121.

A.D.).¹ This fact, however, needs confirmation. It is not probable that the hold on Rajputana was sought to be extended, and the process caused a Chahamana migration from Nadol to southwards. The establishment of the Chahamana ruling families of Bundi, Kotah and Sirohi are, at any rate, ascribed to this period of the Muslim penetration.² Aibak's hold on Rajputana, however, was, in no way, destined to be a permanent one, as is quite obvious from the subsequent events. In the year 597 H. (1200-1201 A. D.), Gwalior was also finally annexed by him, and in the next year Kutb-ud-din, himself, is said to have proceeded towards Ghazni to pay his humble homage to his master,³ but he was advised to return back.

1 Fakhre Mudabbir, p. 24; Minhaj makes an obscure reference of this event when he writes Kutb-ud-din conquered the territories as far as Ujjain, p. 140.

2 Erskine: Rajputana Gazetteer, p. 237. See also for a Rajput reference of Kutb-ud-din's invasion of Nadol in 1197 A. D. : History and Culture of the Indian People, V, no. 87.

3 Fakhre Mudabbir, p. 23.

CHAPTER IX

KUTB-UD-DIN AS VICEROY (VI)

Clash With The Chandelas

Kutb-ud-din's scheme for the conquest of the Northern India was almost complete by the end of the 12th century A. D. Notwithstanding, there still remained in the Central region of the country, a powerful Rajput kingdom yet to be subdued, under the rule of the brave Chandelas of Jejakabhukti (modern Bundelkhand). The kingdom of this surviving Hindu State was extended as far as Kalpi and Asni in the North and beyond the line of the Yamuna in the East¹ "This country was rugged, full of ravines, and waterless, and they possessed a number of mighty forts perched on the summits of hills, the mightiest of these being Kalanjara² (Kalinjar) and Mahoba."³ The mighty fort of the Kalanjar under its illustrious Chandela ruler Vidyadhara twice foiled Sultan Mahmud's efforts to reduce it, when the Muslim conqueror with numerous records of victory was forced to reconcile with a treaty in which mutual gifts were presented from either sides.⁴ They still boastfully remembered such a glorious achievement against the Islamic sword, and it was not possible

1 The Struggle For Empire, p. 122.

2 It is a hill-fort in the Girwan Tahsil of Banda District, 35 miles South of Banda Town in U. P. The fort occupies a hill, which rises abruptly and is separated from the land by a deep valley extending about 7 miles across. It is 1203 feet above the sea level and the 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 Siwa under the title of Kalanjar or 'He who causes time to grow old.' According to the local authority, it was strongly fortified by Chandra Bhim or Varmma, the legendary founder of the Chandela Dynasty. IG, Vol. XIV, p. 311. As quoted by Muhammad Aziz Ahmad : Op. Cit., p. 141, footnote 5.

3 The Struggle For Empire, p. 122.

4 The first engagement between Vidyadhara and the Sultan Mahmud took place in the year 1019 A. D. and the second fight in 1022 A. D. For its detailed account see N. S. Bose : The History Of The Chandellas, p. 164; and ERK, pp. 74-83; A. K. Srivastava, Op. Cit., pp. 280 ff.

for Kutb-ud-din to occupy even an inch of their land without a dreadful consequence. In fact, their Northern borders for a long distance touched the South-Eastern borders of the newly established Turkish kingdom. The establishment of such a Turkish kingdom adjacent to the kingdom of the Chandelas was quite intolerable to the latter. And, on the other hand, since the Muslims were quite aggressive in their character, hostility was bound to rest in between them. The annexation of Baneres and Asni was a new threat to the security and the independence of the Chandela kingdom. The annexation of the States aforesaid, must, therefore, have dragged the Chandelas and the Muslims into many a minor territorial wars.

Of course, the existence of such a hostile and the powerful State so near to the Islamic kingdom, was not tolerable to Kutb-ud-din. Hence, its annexation became, more or less, essential for the security of his newly conquered regions. First a complete overthrow of the Hindu States in the North was the demand of the situation for the accomplishment of which a Muslim governor offered his services voluntarily. Ultimately, the border raids and territorial hostilities turned into a major clash and Paramardi,¹ the unfortunate Chandela king (C. 1165 A. D. 1202 A. D.) who had hardly recovered from the shattering blows of the Chahamanas, came into clash with a more formidable foe, the Turks.

To meet this last surviving and mighty Rajput kingdom of the North, Kutb-ud-din took elaborate precaution and mustered up a huge and powerful army in order to cast a final blow upon it. And we are informed by Hasan Nizami that Kutb-ud-din accompanied by the 'Sahib-Karan'; 'Shams-ud-din-Altmarsh', another noted slave Commander, and "having girded up their lions" proceeded

¹ This name is given according to Dr. S. K. Mitra : ERK., p. 126. See also History Of The Candellas; pp. 93-99. Hasan Nizami calls him as "Parmar", the Rai of Kalanjar (E D, Vol, II. p. 231). C H I, Vol, III, p. 47 has Parmal, the Chandel raja of Kalanjar. Prof. Habibullah and Dr. Aziz Ahmad both mention him as Parmardideva, Op. Cit., p. 69 and p. 142. According to the Stone incscription at Kalanjar, it is Paramandi, See D H N I, Vol. II, pp. 718. 719.

at the head of the huge army in the year 599 H. (1202 A. D)¹, to invest Kalanjar, an ancient fort of Bundelkhand. But Paramardi, the Chandela ruler, put up a stiff resistance and collecting his available forces he marched ahead to meet the invading army in the battle-field. In this grim battle, the Hindus, no doubt, fought gallantly for the defence of their freedom, but being overpowered in forces, the Hindus found themselves unable to resist for a longer time. Therefore, Paramardi drew up his army in the fort, closed its doors and continued his resistance.² But Kutb-ud-din laid around it complete siege and cut-off all the contact of the fort from the outside world and deprived it of the necessary supplies as well. Soon the condition of the fort became worse and the people started starving. In such a precarious condition, the fort could not be defended for long. And we gather from Hasan Nizami that being convinced of this fact and finding himself unable to resist against the onslaught of the Muslims, Paramardi began to negotiate for peace and expressed his willingness to surrender and to pay a heavy tribute and elephants. For his promise of allegiance, writes Hasan Nizami, he was admitted to the same favours as his ancestor had wrested from Mahmud Subuktigin.³ But while the Chandela king was engaged in the preparation of the payment of tribute and elephants, he died of a natural death. Thus, he could not execute any of his promises. Whereupon, his minister (Diwan or Mahlia) Aj Deo (Ajayadeva)⁴, relying on a newly discovered supply of water, repudiated the treaty and reorganised the forces, continued the hostility and gave much trouble to the Muslims.⁵ But Firishta, who gives the same version as given by Hasan Nizami, differs at least on one issue. According

1 TM, ED, Vol II, p. 231. Also see BF, Vol. I, p. 197.

2 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 231 and p. 197.

3 Ibid., p. 231.

4 Firishta, p. 62 has "Jadh Deo." According to Raverty and CH I. it is Ajah Deo, T N, Vol. I, p. 532, and Vol. III, p. 47. Elliot's translation of Taju-l Ma'arir gives 'Aj Deo', Vol. II, p. 231, but its manuscript MSS has 'Waj Deo', p. 452 as pointed out by Dr. Aziz, Muhammad Aziz Ahmad p. 142 footnote 5. But in fact, it is either Ajaya Pal or Ajaya Deo. See Vaidya, Vol. III, p. 351; The Struggle For Empire, Habibullah, p. 69.

5 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 231.

to him, the Hindu Raja, seeing himself hard-pressed, offered Kutb-ud-din Aibak the same tribute and presents which his ancestors had formerly paid to Sultan Mahmud. The proposal was accepted, but Raja's Minister, who resolved to hold out without coming to terms caused his master to be assassinated, while the presents were preparing.¹ But this statement of Firishta of the violent death of Paramardi, is a later one, and lacks support from the contemporary historians, and therefore, it is not accepted by all. But it is clear from both, Hasan Nizami and Firishta, that Paramardi's offer for the alleged submission was not at all liked by his Minister Ajayadeva, who continued fighting with the Muslims after the death of the king.

However, relying on the supply of water from a hillside-spring, Ajaya Deva again hoisted the Hindu flag over the fort and commenced fighting. But in spite of the gallant resistance, the fort could not be defended. Kutb-ud-din ordered his men to discover the source of the Hindu strength. His men soon found the means which supplied water to the fort. The water-course was diverted and thus the Hindus were compelled once again to sue for peace.² But Hasan Nizami records that Ajaya Deva continued his resistance until he was compelled to surrender in consequence of severe drought which eventually dried up all the reservoirs of water in the fort.³ Therefore, on 24th March, 1203 A. D.⁴ the Hindu garrison in an extreme state of weakness and dissatisfaction came out of the fort and decided to evacuate the place and retired towards the neighbouring stronghold of Ajaigarh.⁵ And the fort of Kalanjar "which was celebrated

1 BF, Vol. I, p. 197.

2 The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, p. 69.

3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 231.

4 Dr. Aziz Ahmad gives the date of the conquest of Kalanjar as April 4, 1203 A. D. (ETED, p. 142) which is not correct. Dr. Shadani reads the date of Kutb-ud-din's conquest of Kalanjar as roz-i-doshanbab basbtan-i-mab-i-rajab in the year 599 H. (quoted from IHQ, Vol. XXX, p. 145). Thus, the date 20th rajab as read by Elliot (ED, Vol. II, p. 231), no longer stands, as has already been pointed out by Hodivala (Studies in Indo-Muslim History, p. 163).

5 The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, p. 69; The Struggle For Empire. p. 122.

throughout the world for being as strong as the wall of Alexander" was annexed. As a result of this victory, the Muslims repeated their history again and demolished many holy temples of the Hindus and converted them finally into mosques. The standard of Islam was raised everywhere, and in the words of Hasan Nizami, "the very name of idolatry was annihilated." Hindus, who denounced Islam, were either put to sword or taken as prisoners whose status were, ultimately, converted into that of slavery. Our historian records that "Fifty thousand men came under the collar of slavery, and the plaine became black as pitch with Hindus." A large number of elephants, cattles and countless arms,¹ including gold and jewels,² also became the spoils of the victors. Kutb-ud-din garrisoned the fort and proceeded on to subjugate the other forts of the Chandelas.

In the first instance, the victors turned their eyes towards the most important fort of the Chandelas named Mahoba,³ which, according to Firishta, was the capital of the principality of Kalpi, and was subdued without much difficulty.⁴ Firishta's this reference to Mahoba, as the capital of the principality of Kalpi, led Dr. Ray to suggest that Mahoba and its surrounding regions were no longer under the occupation of the Chandelas, whose dominion never extended as far as that region.⁵ But Dr. Ray's supposition is, however, not correct.⁶ After the annexation of Mahoba, Kutb-ud-din settled the affairs and appointed one Hazab-baru-d

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 231.

2 BF, Vol. I, p. 197.

3 Its name has been derived from a great sacrifice (or Mahorsava), as performed by the Chandra Varmma who is said to have been the traditional founder of the Chandela Dynasty. Mahoba, the famous city of the Chandela kingdom stands on the high banks of the Madansagar lake built by its ruler Madan Varmma, the fifteenth king of the line. The fort is now under the complete ruins. See ETED, p. 142 and footnote 8.

4 BF, Vol. I, p. 197. This Kalpi is now in Hammirpur District. According to Dr. Aziz Ahmad, Kalpi is still a Tahsil of the Jalaun District, U. P., ETED, p. 143, footnote 1.

5 DHNI, Vol. II, p. 722; N. S. Bose : History of the Candellas, p. 99 also supports Dr. Ray.

6 ERK, p. 127.

din Hasan Arnal as the Commander of the fort of Kalanjar¹ of Mahoba and of its surroundings² and himself went ahead for further conquests towards Badaun.

With the conquest of Kalanjar and Mahoba, the whole kingdom of the Chandelas, the last great surviving Hindu State of the North, fell flat before the Muslim onslaughts. And there seemed no other powerful Hindu State to check the growing strength of the Turkish empire in the Northern region of the country. All the Rajput States, which though fought gallantly ultimately fell one by one. The main reason for the defeat of these powerful States in the North was the lack of united action which was never dependent upon either for collective security or for collective self-dependence. And each one of them fought in vain to repulse the Muslims whose strength had undoubtedly increased by that time. By the close of the 12th century A.D., the Muslims, under the superb generalship of Kutb-ud-din Aibak, had already triumphed over almost all the Rajput States of Northern India, but the beginning of the thirteenth century brought forth fresh laurels to this Muslim conqueror, who hoisted the Islamic flag right upto the heart of the Chandela kingdom. "Thus", writes Dr. S. K. Mitra, "ended the long reign of Paramardi, the last great ruler of the Candela dynasty, who had a chequered career. It was during his reign that the Candella power rose to its height. His reign was also marked by serious reverses which crippled the Candella power almost irreparably."³

Thus, the Chandela kingdom was annexed by Kutb-ud-din,

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 232.

2 Eliot's translation of Taju-l Ma asir shows that Hazab-baru-d din Hasan Arnal was appointed as the incharge of Kalanjar after his conquest in 1203 A.D. (ED, Vol. II, p. 232). Relying on the MSS copy of the same work (MSS, p. 460). Dr. Aziz Ahmad gives the name of the same Commander as the incharge of Mahoba, the capital of the territory of Kalpi, (ETED, p. 143). Therefore, it is not clear whether the Muslim Commander was appointed as the incharge of Kalanjar alone or of all the places of the neighbourhood of it. But, in the absence of any other name given by our chroniclers, it is highly likely that Hazab-baru-d din Hasan Arnal might have been appointed as the incharge of Kalanjar and its neighbouring conquered forts and cities.

3 ERK, p. 127.

who, entrusting the government to one of his trusted Commander, proceeded further towards Mahoba and finally to Badaun. But, soon after this event, the Chandelas seem to have recovered their kingdom from the Muslims and reoccupied it. The Muslim historians do not mention as to when and how the Chandelas regained their ancestral kingdom by driving out the Muslims of their homeland. But some of the Hindu sources lay support to the fact that soon the Muslims were repulsed from Kalanjar, and the kingdom of the Chandelas once again became independent. The Prithviraja Raso refers to one Samarjit as the son of the deceased Parmal (Paramardi), who recovered Mahoba from Pajjun Rai, one of the officers of the illustrious Prithviraja III, and occupied it till he was defeated and killed by Binaeuddin, a Muslim. According to some scholars this Binaeuddin is a misreading for Bahauddin Tughril, who was appointed as the governor of Bayana after its conquest in 1196 A.D.¹ This governor afterwards became the master of the whole of the central India after the death of Kutb-ud-din. But, this statement of Raso does not find support from any epigraphic evidence. But, on the other hand, according to the Chandela inscription, Trailokyavarman became the immediate successor of Paramardi,² who, as per Rewa Copper Plates of 1240-41, is understood to have ruled for about 36 years.³ Thus, the Chandela inscription, aforesaid, makes it quite clear that in spite of the severe attacks of the Muslims during the reign of Paramardi, the Chandelas power could not be completely extinguished. It appears that after the fall of Kalanjar in 1202 A.D., the Chandelas retired towards Ajaygarh fort and making this place as their base under the leadership of Trailokyavarman, the son and the successor of Paramardi, soon managed to expel the Muslims and recovered their kingdom. The successor of Paramardi soon justified the prowess of the great Chandelas by

1 BF, Vol. I, p. 195 ; IA, XXXVII, p. 145, footnote 50.

2 Trailokyavarman's earliest record is dated in V. S. 1261, i. e. 1205 A. D. (The Garra Plates, EI, XVI, p. 272-77), with in a period of three years from the date of the last record of Paramardeva (Kalanjar Inscription of 1201 A. D.), JASB., XVII, Part I (1843), p. 313-17.

3 I A, XVII, p. 224-36.

using the traditional title of the family 'Kalanjaradhipati.' This glorious success of Trailokyavarman against the Muslims is also evidenced by the Garra Plates of Trailokyavarman¹ and by the Ajaygarh inscription of Viravarman.² The Ajaygarh Rock inscription of Viravarman (1260 A.D.) states "Then (i.e. after Paramardi) the prince Trailokyavarman ruled the kingdom, a very creator in providing strong places. He was like Vishnu in lifting the earth, emerged in the ocean formed by the streams of Turushkas."³ It has been suggested that "the war referred to was in some way or other connected with Kutbuddin's investment of Kalanjar in 1202 A.D., and the fall of Mahoba in 1203 A.D."⁴ But this has been pointed out by Dr. Ray and Dr. N. S. Bose who think that it was most probably Trailokyavarman's war with the Muslims, in which he won back Kalanjar.⁵ The Muslim historians are almost silent on this issue, but all the same they give some astray references in support of the above fact. Minhaj-us-Siraj, the contemporary historian states that in the year 631 H.(1233 A.D.), Malik Nusrat-ud-din Taishi led an expedition from Gwalior towards Kalanjar causing discomfiture to the Raa of Kalanjar,⁶ who had no courage to oppose the enemy. Finding no resistance there, the Muslim Commander freely looted the city, demolished its temples and lofty buildings and also captured a fabulous booty. Then, this is a clear proof that the Muslims after the occupation of Kalanjar in 1202 A.D. could not hold it for a long time and the fort soon passed away from their hands. And by the year 1233 A.D. the fort was certainly under the possession of the Chandelas as shown by Minhaj-us-Siraj himself. The Ajaygarh Rock inscription not only praises Trailokyavarman's recovery of the Chandelas dominion but also credits him with an erection and the remodeling of the fortifications of the Kalanjar fort.⁷ The Muslim histo-

1 EI, XVI, pp. 272—77.

2 Ibid, I, pp. 327, 329, V. 7.

3 Ibid, p. 327.

4 Journal of Indian History. Vol. XV, 1936, p. 175; N.S. Bose: op. cit., p. 101.

5 D H N I, Vol. I, pp. 732—33; N.S. Bose: op. cit., p. 101.

6 TN, Vol. II, pp. 732-33.

7 EI, Vol. I, p. 329, V.9.

rian says that Trailokyavarman fled away at the approach of the Muslim army without giving any fight to them in 1233 A.D. But on this point one cannot, however, vouch for the strictest accuracy of the Muslim writer.¹

Thus, from the available sources we have gathered that though the Muslims gained their victory against the Chandelas and captured their kingdom early within the few years of the dawn of the new century, but the Chandelas, prided of having twice foiled the attacks of the Sultan Mahmud to annihilate them, retired towards the fort of Ajaygarh leaving their capital city Kalanjar entirely on the disposal of the Muslim conqueror. But the Chandela Rajputs whose powers were, no doubt, shattered, still had some courage in them. The deep love for independence and for the protection of their holy temples, and the problem of the safety of their glorious culture and religion always kept their courage alive. Fortunately, the Hindus soon found Trailokyavarman, the son of the last Chandela ruler who actually saved the country from falling into pieces. Under the able and superb rule of this man the Chandelas recovered soon their strength and power in the fort of Ajaygarh and became as mighty as ever. And, consequently, making Ajaygarh as the base of operation, Trailokyavarman exhibited such a glorious chivalry that the Muslims suffered everywhere crushing defeats and were, ultimately, compelled to evacuate the place. In order to save their lives and property the Muslims retired from Kalanjar to the Muslim bases. The fort of Kalanjar, ultimately, passed again into the hands of its Chandela ruler who held it for a considerable long time. But the hard won victories of the Hindus must have caused some of the valuable lives and severe losses as indicated in some of the discovered Plates and the Grants made for the maintenance of the family of the deceased warriors who had contributed to the grand victories of the Chandelas.² The

1 ERK, p. 130.

2 The Garra Plates tell us that in the battle of Kakadadaha Rauta Pape laid down his life. Similarly, a Grant of 'Martyukavrtti' was also made for the maintenance of the deceased warrior who was killed in the engagement with the Muslims. EI, Vol. XVI, p. 275—76.

Muslim historians who are noted for their partial accounts in favour of the achievements of Islam again failed to do justice with another glorious resistance of the Hindus. The bold decision of the Hindus in the midst of allround danger of the Muslims who had become supreme power in the North by conquering a large portion of the various Hindu kingdoms is a praiseworthy effort to bring back their last independence. However, due to the ignorance of the Muslim writers of this important event and also in the absence of the proper Hindu records, it is impossible to fix the exact date of the recapture of Kalanjar by the Chandelas. Dr. N. S. Bose, however, thinks that "From Trailokyavarman's assumption of the title Kalanjaradhipati, in the Garra inscription, it can be assumed that he succeeded in recovering Kalanjara from the Moslems before A. D. 1205."¹

¹ History Of The Candellas, p. 100.

CHAPTER X

KUTB-DU-DIN AS VICEROY (VII)

The Fall of Badaun

After Kutb-ud-din had accomplished his victory at Kalanjar and Mahoba, he turned his attention towards Badaun¹, "which", in the words of Hasan Nizami, "is one of the mothers of cities, and one of the chiefest of the country of Hind."² According to the local traditions, the city of Badaun was founded in the tenth century by an "Ahar" prince "Buddh."³ But when the Muslims invaded it, it was under the occupation of the Rathor Lakhana-pala, the eleventh successor of Chandra, who was the founder of the dynasty.⁴ The city fell an easy prey to serfdom as Kutb-ud-din annexed the city in the year 1203 A.D., without any stiff resistance.

Shortly after this event, while Kutb-ud-din was yet at Badaun Iktiyaruddin Muhammad Bakhtiyar Khalji, who, according to Hasan Nizami, was "one of the chief supporters of the State, the splendour of Islam, and celebrated throughout Hind for his religious war", came to pay his respects to him from the direction of Oudh and Behar.⁵ According to Firishta, he was "appointed as the governor of Behar by the king, but had for sometime back paid little attention to the royal commands, came at this time to pay a visit to Kootb-ood-Deen, conciliating him with rich presents."⁶ But our contemporary writer Hasan Nizami gives a

1 Brigg's (BF, Vol. I, p. 193) places Badaun between the rivers of Jumna and Ganges. Hammer (Genald, IV, 185), has most probably followed Briggs. But there is no authority in the original for this statement. Elliot, however, places, it in Rohilkhand, to the East of the Ganges, ED, Vol. II, p. 232, footnote 1.

2 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 232.

3 Early Turkish Empire Of Delhi, p. 143, footnote 3.

4 EI, Vol. I, p. 63.

5 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 232.

6 BF, Vol. I, p. 198.

more clear statement and says that at this time Bakhtiyar presented twenty elephants and various kinds of jewels and money to Kutb-ud-din, who in return received him with kindness and beneficence, and conferred many titles and robe of honour on him and "exalted", him "above the leaders of the time." He was also entrusted with the charge of the extension of the Muslim kingdom with the further conquest in the East towards Lakhnauti and Bengal. And when the Khalji Commander took leave, he was again honoured with many offerings such as a tent, a naubat, a drum, a standard, and magnificent robe of honour, a horse and trappings, a waistband, sword, and a vest from the private wardrobe.¹ Kutb-ud-din, then himself returned to Delhi, the capital city of the Muslim kingdom.²

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 232.

2. Ibid, p. 232.

CHAPTER XI

THE EASTERN CONQUESTS

As regards the policy enshrined in the original scheme for the conquest of Northern India, it may safely be said that Sultan Shahab-ud-din and his Indian governor Kutb-ud-din Aibak had probably never thought of any military adventure beyond the Gahadavala dominion in the East. Kutb-ud-din, who was made the governor of the Muslim dominion of India, was preoccupied with his own problems. The continued struggle of the Hindus for independence, and their determination to expel the Muslims from their sacred country, made Aibak quite watchful in his North-Western problems. Under the exigency of such insurrectional disturbances to think of annexing even a portion of the territory beyond the Gahadavala dominion was a sheer dream for the Muslims. It was rather a high time for the consolidation of their kingdom than to put it into claws of fresh danger. Therefore, neither Sultan Shahab-ud-din nor his Indian viceroy Aibak, did employ his energy in that direction. But to the good luck of the Muslims, they soon found a reckless soldier named Muhammad Bakhtiyar Khalji,¹ who because of his undaunted courage and dare-devil adventure, surprisingly annexed the eastern lands to the dominion of the Turks. Thus, he astoundingly afforded the materialisation of that dream which had never been

1 He is also called by Minhaj as Malik-ul-Ghazi, Ikhtiyar-ud-din, Muhammad son of Bakht-yar Khalji, TN, Vol. I p. 543. His full name is Ikhtiyar-ud-din Muhammad Bakhtiyar Khalji, but Muhammad Bakhtiyar or Bakhtiyar Khalji has been followed here throughout the work. Badauni, the author of the Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh, p. 57. calls him Muhammad Bakhtiyar Ghuri. It is wrong to suppose that this Khalji soldier was a slave of the Sultan Shahab-ud-din. But it will be wrong to suppose that he was also independent to the authority of Kutb-ud-din as we clearly learn from both Hasan Nizami and Minhaj-us-Siraj that after the conquest of Behar Bakhtiyar came to pay his homage to Kutb-ud-din Aibak at Badaun. This could not have been possible without the assumption of any authority. He is also called as Aghibek which in Turkish language means, 'Lord of the fold.'

dreamt of in the beginning and which eventually provided fresh blood to the already growing Turkish power in India. But before we discuss in detail about the eastern conquests of this impetuous and courageous soldier it will not be out of place to deal briefly with his early career whose services to Islam in India, early in the first decade of the 13th century, was only second to Kutb-ud-din Aibak.

Bakhtiyar Khalji's early career

The first Muslim conqueror of the Eastern India was Muhammad Bakhtiyar Khalji, a descendant of the Khalji tribe of Ghor of the province of Garmsir,¹ who was endowed with many laudable qualities. In the words of Minhaj "he was a man impetuous, enterprising, intrepid, bold, sagacious, and expert."² when he left his home land and came to the court of sultan Shahab - ud - din at Ghazni, he was placed before the Minister of the Diwan - i - Arz (Military Department). But, the Minister was not satisfied with him and rejected him for his ugly appearance. Dissatisfied with this adventure, Bakhtiyar, then left Ghazni and proceeded towards Hindustan seeking good employment there.

Here, we find different version about Bakhtiyar's first employment in India. Badauni, the author of the Muntakhab-ut Tawarikh states that "his company did not please Sultan Qutb-u'd din at Lahore"³ which, according to Dr. Aziz Ahmad, is quite possi-

1 T N, Vol I, p. 548. The Khaljis belonged to the Turkish race who had earlier settled in the Garmsir between Sistan and Ghazni. Mistaking it, the European scholars identify them with the Afghan tribe of Ghanzi. But, in fact, they belonged to a Turkish tribe, who probably migrated from Turkistan and settled in western Afghanistan. Unfortunately, the period of their migration from Turkishtan to western Afghanistan cannot be fixed. But their being a Turkish tribe is further proved by the Jami-ut Tawarikh, Introduction to the Zafar Namah and Tabakat-i-Nasiri. Minhaj-us-Siraj, TN, Vol. I, p. p. 518 and note 3; E D, Vol, p, II, 308, clearly mentions Bakhtiyar as Turk, and further Fakhr-u'd-din Mubarak Shah in his Tawarikh, p. 37 mention Khalji as one of the clans of the Turk. These evidences leave no doubt that Bakhtiyar Khalji belonged to the Turkish race.

2 T N, vol. I, p, 548,

3 Muntakhab-u't Tawarikh, o. 57.

ble.¹ A different version is given in the footnote of Minhaj's *Ta-bakat-i-Nasiri* to the effect that on being dejected from Ghazni, Bakhtiyar came into the service of the Muqti of Kanauj.² But, according to Isami Bakhtiyar got his first employment in Hind-ustan under "Jaiasingha of Jitur"³ or Jaitrasinha of the Guhelot clan then ruling at Nagda, about 70 miles West of Chitor.⁴ The statement of the various authors, as depicted above, cannot be ascertained as it is nowhere found in the main account of the contemporary historian like Minhaj-us-Siraj himself, who is alone accredited for furnishing a detailed account of Bakhtiyar Khalji.

However, the same historian tells us clearly, that from Ghazni, Bakhtiyar proceeded towards Delhi, and presented himself in 589 H. (1193 A. D.) before the court of the Diwan-i-Arz, but, unfortunately in spite of his many laudable qualities, he was again rejected on the same ground. Disheartened by these failures, Bakhtiyar went towards Badaun, and entered the services of Hizbaru-ddin Hasan, Commander-in-Chief,⁵ who received him with kindness and gave him some suitable position for his maintenance.⁶

But, the decisive battle of Tarain in 1192 A.D., not only changed the whole complexion of Sultan Shahab-ud-din's fate, but that of Bakhtiyar Khalji also. And after the victory was achieved, Ali Nagauri, a military officer of the Sultan, who was feudatory of Nagaur⁷ employed in his services Muhammad Mahmud, the paternal uncle of Bakhtiyar. When the former was made the feudatory of Kanauj, he assigned to the latter the fief of Kashmandi.⁸ Incidentally, after the death of his maternal uncle, Bakhtiyar became the feudatory of Kanauj.

1 E T E D, p. 107, footnote 2.

2 Minhaj, pp. 146-7 Quoted by Habibullah, op. cit., p. 83 foot note 71.

3 Futuhus-Salatin, ed, A.M. Husain, Agra, 1938 p. 95.

4 Habibulla Op. Cit., p. 83, footnote 71.

5 He was a feudatory Sipah-Salar. But he was quite independent of Kutb-ud-din's authority.

6 TN, Vol. pp. 548-49.

7 TN, Vol. I, p. 549 It is a historic city in Jodhpur State. This officer of Shahab-ud-din was also independent to Kutb-ud-din's power.

8 TN, Vol. I, p. 549 The place Kashmandi was then situated within the territory of Kanauj.

After this new assignment, Bakhtiyar soon proved his worth and showed all signs of promise. As also, he quickly proved himself as possessed of a great daring heart and resourcefulness.

But this gifted soldier, having served in the fief of Kashmandi¹ (or Kashtmandi), went to Oudh and petitioned its ruler, Malik Hisamu d' din Aghul-Bak² for his betterment. The gallant deeds and wonderful activities of the remarkable soldier, had already reached the ears of the ruler of Oudh, who acknowledging his abilities, conferred upon him two fiefs that lay between the Ganges and the Sone.³

His Early Incursions

Bakhtiyar soon adjusted himself to the new situation he was placed in. Just after so adjusting himself, he began to show his zealous capacity and valour by making frequent raids in the neighbourhood surrounding his fiefs. The territories of Behar and Munir had been the regular target of his punitive raids. He had trained horse and sufficient arms which used to facilitate him in making his raids successful. He was always vigilant to strengthen these equipments, which work he carried on ceaselessly by bringing much plunder until at least he could gather plenty of

1 It was situated, then, in the territory of Kanauj.

2 TN, Vol. 1, p. 549; According to Aziz Ahmad, he was another independent Commander under the authority of Kutb-ud-din. Op. Cit., p. 107. footnote 3.

3 The names of the fiefs have been given in the printed text of Tabakat-i-Nasiri, as "Sihlat and Sihti", which are unfortunately not traceable, TN., Text, p. 147. According to some it is "Kampilah and Patiali near Badaun", Hodivala : Studies in Indo-Muslim History, 1939, p. 206. Supporting the same view Badauni also gives its names as 'Kanpala and Patiali, M T, p. 57. Major Raverty suggests it with Bhugwat and Bhiwali which has been generally accepted by the scholars. Habibullah, op. Cit., p. 69. And according to the same authority the mistake is due to the phonetic resemblance with 'Patihah and Kuntilah', which like Bhugwat (Bhagwat) and Bhiwali (Bhiuli,) are situated close to each other in the neighbourhood of Chunar, Ibid., p. 83, footnote 72. See also Cunningham Reports; XI, p. 128. But Raverty's supposition that the fiefs of Bhugwat and Bhiwali were situated between the Ganges and the Karmahnasah to the eastward of Chuwargarh does not seem to be correct, as these were not included in the province of Oudh. Therefore Dr. Aziz Ahmad's placement between the Ganges and the Sone seem to be quite probable, op. cit., p. 108, footnote 1.

horses, arms and men in that way. Out of these raids, Bakhtiyar proved himself a matchless adversary to the one made in the direction of the Magadha region lying East of the Karamanasa river.¹ It seems that there was no organised opposition at that moment after the fall of the Gahadavala Dynasty. These successful inroads, brought fresh laurels to him, and in the words of Minhaj-us-Siraj "the fame of his alertness and bravery, and the booty (he had acquired), became noised abroad. Bodies of Akhlaj,² from different parts of Hindustan, turned their faces towards him."³ As the result of this, Bakhtiyar soon established his position very strongly. Thereafter, he organised a powerful and large army of brave Khalji warriors, who mostly belonged to the eastern borders of Afghanistan and had by then scattered in the various parts of the country. They had flocked to him in bands to render their military services to him. To test the valour of his newly formed army, he launched a military operation as far as Odantapura (in Behar), the renowned city famous for its monastic University which gave its name to the country around. It is very doubtful whether the invasion was a successful adventure or not. The Rohtasgarh (Shahabad) inscription dated 1223, speaks of an illustrious chieftain named Pratapa who had illuminated the earth with his glories and more so enhanced by his feats in crushing the Yavanas.⁴ This most probably refers to some incident in the course of the invasion of Behar led by Bakhtiyar Khalji⁵ in (C. 1200 A. D.). Dr. P. Saran and Dr. Ganguli hold that in his military adventures at about the year 1200 A. D. in the territory of Behar Bakhtiyar met with no opposition. But

1 The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, p. 69.

2 The printed text has 'Ikhraj' which is the plural of "Khalji."

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 551.

4 EI, IV, p. 312.

5 JIH, Vol. XV, 1936, p. 178. For Uddandapandesa, see Cunningham: Reports, III, p. 118; VIII, p. 75; XI, p. 185. Most probably referring to this very invasion of Uddantapur, Taranath says that a Turushka force comprised of 500 bold warriors were defeated. Samaddar, J.N.: Glories of Magadha, Patna, pp. 132-32. Also see S. C. Sarkar Some Tibetan References to Muslim Advance in Behar and Bengal in Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission, 1942.

the statement emanating from the inscription cannot be ignored.¹ However, his numerous exploits and the undaunted courage soon caught the sight of the Muslim Commanders of the world. His fame, ultimately, reached the ears of Kutb-ud-din who sent him a robe of honour and in recognition of his merit showed great favour and conferred upon him many titles.²

The Conquest Of Behar

Being thus encouraged by the honour bestowed upon him, Bakhtiyar continued his raids towards Behar in order to give it a final blow. In this way he passed away his one year or two (1201-1202 A. D.) in plundering the neighbouring places and at last emboldened by these successes he obtained Aibak's permission to launch a massive attack on Behar.³ Behar which gloriously defended the land and checked the eastward expansion of the Muslims through the North-Bihar, in the twelfth century, under the powerful Hindu kingdom of Mithila,⁴ during the Karnata dynasty,⁵ could not withstand the onslaughts of Bakhtiyar. Narasimhadeva, the Karnata king of Tirhut, paid tribute to Bakhtiyar simply to protect his kingdom against further onslaught and consequently ultimate ruin.⁶ However, there is no exact proof to show that Bakhtiyar took complete possession of Mithila,⁷ and

1 The Struggle for Empire, pp. 122-23.

2 ED, Vol. II, p. 306; TN, Vol. I, p. 551.

3 The sacred land of Behar is well known from the very ancient times. The ancient kingdom of Magadha had its capital at Rajgir. The place is well known throughout the world for its great associations both from Lord Buddha and Mahavira, founders of new religions, Buddhism and Jainism respectively. The grand Gupta Dynasty was flourished in this very region early in the fourth century A.D. The ninth century saw the Buddhist Dynasty being founded by Gopal held its sway over Behar.

4 Mithila lay between the Kosi and the Gandak.

5 History of Behar, Prof. Radhakrishna Chaudhury, 1958, p. 163. The third ruler of the Karnata dynasty, Narasimhadeva (1188-1227 A.D.) was under Lakshmanasena of Bengal and was forced to be a tributary of Muhammad Bakhtiyar. Radha Krishna Chaudhury, History of Muslim Rule in Tirhut p. 30 and the authorities quoted there.

6 Radha Krishna Chaudhry : History of Muslim Rule in Tirhut, p. 31.

7 Ibid. Read also Ibid pp. 30-33.

whatever reference we have about a tributary to Bakhtiyar, is based on the solitary evidence of Mulla Taqia. Bakhtiyar's unsuccessful invasion of Behar in C. 1200 A. D., has been noticed above. Taking into consideration all aspects, the power of the Hindus, he suddenly appeared before the fortified city of Behar, only with two hundred horsemen,¹ according to Minhaj, and began the war by taking the enemy unawares. The last of the line of Buddhist Dynasty, with its Odantapuri as its capital,² had to face the tide of the Muslim invasion from the West.³ Bakhtiyar in his campaign was accompanied by his two accomplished brothers of great allegiance, who served as lieutenants in Bakhtiyar's army. One of them was Nizam-ud-din by name and the other was Shams-ud-din.⁴ Having heard of the account from Shams-ud-din at Lakhnauti in the year 642 H. (1243 A. D.), Minhaj tells us that when Bakhtiyar reached the gate of the fort (Hisar and Galah), fighting began vehemently. The two wise brothers displayed great heroism and were quite active throughout the engagement. It is, however, difficult to believe that the fort possessed a sufficient military force to put up a strong resistance. Rather the fort was feebly defended by some of the Hindu soldiers, for the majority of the people in the fort were Sramanas (Buddhist monks), with shaven-heads⁵ who can not be expected to be seasoned warriors.

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 522. But since Bakhtiyar had already tested a serious reverse in his early expedition as noticed earlier, the number of his forces given by Minhaj appears to be quite less.

2 IG, Vol. III, p. 208-209.

3 R. D. Benerji (Banglar Itihasa, Vol. I, pp. 252-53, 1915) thinks that it was most probably Govindapala who was ruling in the District round Odantapuri, Nalanda and Vikramsila, and was killed on this occasion in the engagement against Bakhtiyar. Cf. JASB, 1921, p. 14, and Vol. XVII, 1951, No. 1, p. 29. Also see IHQ., Vol. XXX, 1954, p. 141, DHNI, Vol. I, p. 369. But according to the inscriptions Mahendrapala has been mentioned as the last king, who is identified with Indradyumna of local tradition, and is said to have been defeated by Bakhtiyar Khalji, see Vaidya, MHI, Vol. III, p. 229.

4 TN, Vol. I, p. 552, has Shamsam-ud-din which according to Aziz Ahmad is rather improbable. Early Turkish Empire of Delhi, p. 109 footnote 1.

5 These Sramanas (Buddhists) have been wrongly taken by the Muslim historians as Brahmans which has been accepted by many of the modern scholars, TN, Vol. I, p. 552; Early Turkish Empire of Delhi, p. 10, The Struggle for Empire, p. 123. For the Sramanas offering resistance, see Taranath, quoted in Samaddar, Op. Cit., p. 26 and 148.

Since there was no stubborn resistance, due to the lack of military force, Bakhtiyar with great vigour and audacity rushed towards the gate of the fort and with the help of the noted two brothers gained possession of the fort and obtained much booty. All the inhabitants, who were most probably the Budhists with shaven-heads, were killed.¹ In the terrible drama of bloodshed, Bakhtiyar not only massacred the Hindus but also destroyed their holy places and temples. Behar, which was the centre of Budhist learning and which was teeming with Budhist students and monks, was ruthlessly destroyed. Later, Muhammad Bakhtiyar found a big library with millions of books of different languages of the world. He called some persons to explain their contents, but all of them were killed when the objective was achieved and obviously there was no Hindu left alive to read those out. He also found that the whole fort and the city own places of study. But he seems to have destroyed the whole library and its books,² because it did not contain Islamic literatures.³ Behar, which in Hindi language, means a college,⁴ and was the centre of the Budhist learning and was thus ultimately stripped off its glorious significance.

1 According to Minhaj they were the Brahmans, TN, Vol. I, p. 552.

2 Minhaj does not mention clearly about the complete destruction of the books, see TN, Vol. I, p. 552. For this reason Dr. Habibullah, Op. cit., p. 84, footnote 76, contradicts the statement of R. D. Banerji (Bangalar Itihasa, I, p. 322; N.N. Law : The Promotion of Learning In Medival India, p. 1-20), on the ground that there is no authority for this statement. But we know it clearly that wherever the Muslim's went, their conquest soon followed the wholesale destruction of the place. And Bakhtiyar, who was noted for his cruelty and stone heartedness, in the wake of destruction, might have destroyed the Hindu and Budhists books. It was inherited in the character of the fanatic Muslims who paid no respect to culture and religion of the other people who have no allegiance in Islam.

3 "It is said that in Behar there was a Hindu Library which fell into hands of Muhammad Bakhtiyar. The latter enquired from the Brahmans as to the reason for the collection of the books. The Brahmans replied that the whole town formed a college, and that in the Hindi Language a college was called Behar, and that hence that town was so called." Ghulam Husain Salim: Riyazu-s-Salatin, English Translation, p. 61.

4 TN, Vol. I, p. 552, footnote 3; Riyazu-s-Salatin: A History of Bengal by Ghulam Husain Salim, translated into English from the original Persian with notes by Maulvi Abdus Salam, M. A., Calcutta, 1904, p. 161.

Although, the fulfilment of Bakhtiyar's mission of destroying Behar gave a death blow to Buddhism, yet the Muslims utterly failed to achieve their longings to uproot Buddhism completely from there. Instead, the Budhists retired towards the distant parts and started observing their religion. It also appears from an inscription of Vidyadhara of Samvat 1276 (1219 A. D.) that Buddhism did not wholly disappear from Northern India.¹

Most probably, on this occasion, as we learn from the Tibetan chronicler Taranath of the 15th century, Bakhtiyar had also captured the monastic city of Vikramsila and Nalanda and had also built a fortress on the site of Udantapuri.²

With the fresh conquest of this another Hindu kingdom in the East, a large portion of the present Behar province was brought within the sway of the Muslim dominion. A major portion of Purnea, fell into the possession of Bakhtiyar, who seems to have wrested away this Eastern part of Mithila from Lakhanavati.³ Bakhtiyar firmly held these regions along with the ravine tracts on the Northern bank of the Ganges stretching from the mouth of Gandak to that of the Kosi. Thus, the important ravine tract of Bhagalpur and Monghyr, lying North of the Ganges and forming the highway of communication between Bengal and Oudh down to the middle of the 14th century⁴, passed into the hands of the invaders.⁵

¹ Furhru: The Sharqi Architecture of Junpur, pp. 72-73.

² IA, Vol. IV, pp. 366-7.

³ At that time, Lakhanavati was bounded by a North-easterly straight line from the modern town of Purnea to Rangpur, on the East by the Tista, on the South by the Ganges and on the West by the lower course of Kosi and from its mouth across the Ganges to the Rajmahal hills, History of Behar, p. 163.

⁴ History of Behar, p. 164.

⁵ After the exploits of Behar, Bakhtiyar's rank was advanced so much "that the juice of envy set flowing amongst Sultan Kutb-ud-din's other officers, who burned in the fire of envy and shame, and combined to expel and destroy him, so much so, that one day in the presence of the Sultan, in regard to his strength and prowess, they said unanimously that Muhammad Bakhtiyar, owing to exuberance of strength, wanted to fight with an elephant. The Sultan wondering questioned him. Muhammad Bakhtiyar did not disavow this false boastfulness, though he knew that the object of the associates of the king was to destroy him. In short, one day when all the people, the elite as well as the general public, assembled in Darbar, a white rogue elephant was brought to the White Castle (Qasr-i-Sufed). Muhammad Bakhtiyar tying up the lom of his garment on the waist, came out to the field, struck the elephant's trunk with a mace, when the elephant ran away roaring. All the spectators, including those assembled, and the envious, raising shouts of applause to the sky, were confounded." And the Sultan bestowed upon him a special Khilat and many presents and prizes, Riyazu-s-Salatin, Op. Cit., pp. 61-62; TN, Vol. I, p. 554.

The date of the Conquest of Behar

There is a great deal of controversy over the year in which Behar was, for the first time, conquered by Bakhtiyar. This divergence of opinion has probably arisen due to the omission of this date by our historian, Minhaj-us-Siraj, who alone furnishes us with the detailed account of the event. But for the chronology of the subsequent conquests it is, very important to fix the date of this significant event. Among the modern scholars, Sir W. Haig, in the Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, clearly indicates that the conquest of Behar was achieved sometime in the year 1193 A. D., and after this successful inroad, Bakhtiyar went to Kutb-ud-din in the summer of the same year to pay his obedience at Delhi.¹ But this does not seem to be correct. Perhaps Sir W. Haig has misunderstood the event completely as will be seen below. Maulavi Abdus Salam also places the same event in 592 A. H. or 1196 A. D.² Similarly, most of the scholars, including Dr. Ishwari Prasad, agrees that the conquest of Behar was completed in the year 1197 A. D.³ But these dates are too early to be placed with this event. Unfortunately, Minhaj-us-Siraj is silent on this issue. However, Fakhruddin-Mubarak Shah, who is also known as Fakhre Mudabbir, states that the conquest of Bidur (Bihar) took place in the year 600 H. (1203-4 A. D.).⁴ Fakhre Mudabbir's statement finds support from another contemporary historian, Hasan Nizami, who distinctly mentions that after Kutb-ud-din's conquest of Kalanjar, while the former was yet at Badaun, Bakhtiyar went to pay his respects to him from the direction of Oudh and Behar.⁵ Obviously, we learn from the same authority that the conquest of Kalinjar took place in the year 599 H. (1202 A. D.)⁶. And it was only after his Behar triumph that Bakhtiyar met Kutb-ud-din at Badaun. The local authorities, however, do not refer to any successful inroad of the Muslims in Behar in

1 CHI, Vol. III, p. 42.

2 Riyazu-s-Salatin, Op. Cit., p. 62, footnote 1.

3 History of Mediaeval India, 1952, p. 143.

4 Tarikh-i-Fakhruddin Mubarak Shah, p. 25.

5 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 232.

6 Ibid., p. 231.

the 12th century A. D. For the Rohtasgarh (Shahabad) inscription dated 1223 A. D.,¹ boastfully records that the illustrious lord Pratapa enhanced his glories by crushing the Yavanas. This may possibly refer to some incident respecting the invasion of Behar which might have been made by Bakhtiyar Khalji in C. 1200 A.D.² This evidence clearly shows that by the end of the 12th century A. D., Behar was not conquered by the Muslims as supposed by many of our scholars. But, from the subsequent events, and also from the writings of Hasan Nizami and of Fakhre Mudabbir, we may safely place the year somewhere near 1202 A. D. which is the record-year for the first Muslim conquest of Behar by Bakhtiyar Khalji.

After this victory, Bakhtiyar returned laden with plunder and booty, and the fame of his alertness, bravery and the spoils spread far and wide. He, thereafter, started for Delhi in the year 1202 A. D., with valuable presents to be paid as a token of respect to Kutb-ud-din.³ But Hasan Nizami, who is more detailed here, states that after the conquest of Kalanjar in 1202 A. D., when Kutb-ud-din was yet at Badaun,⁴ "Ikhtiyar-ud-din Muhammad Bakhtiyar, one of the chief supporters of the states, the splendour of Islam, and celebrated throughout Hind for his religious wars", came to pay his respects from the direction of Oudh and Behar. He also presented twenty elephants and various kinds of jewels and money to him.⁵ Kutb-ud-din received him with royal kindness and beneficence, and thus he "was exalted above the leaders of the time."⁶ He further honoured him with many magnificent robes and titles, and gave him permission for further incursions, but on condition of relying on his own resources without expecting any help from him.

1 EI, IV, p. 312.

2 Journal of Indian History, Vol. XV, p. 178.

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 552.

4 Bakhtiyar met Kutb-ud-din at Badaun and not at Delhi as supposed by Major Raverty, TN, Vol. I, p. 552.

5 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 232.

6 Ibid., p. 232.

These great favours bestowed by Kutb-ud-din upon this Khalji soldier, who was a free man and most probably uneducated, were never tolerable to his rivals. It ultimately, aroused such a degree of jealousy and sense of enmity in them that in their convivial parties they used to sneer at him and cast on him jibes and ironical remarks. The rival party began to plot to kill Bakhtiyar out of the animosity which had reached its climax by that time. Ultimately, they gained the upper hand in the intrigue and represented to Kutb-ud-din¹ that Bakhtiyar should fight a mad elephant in the white palace. Kutb-ud-din, at the outset, hesitated as he did not want to put the valuable life of the undaunted Bakhtiyar into danger. But the pressure of some of his high officials, could not be neglected and ultimately he was induced to order Bakhtiyar to combat with an elephant. Accordingly, one day a public assembly was held for this very purpose in the white palace where a huge gathering had assembled to witness this unusual fight of a man with an elephant.² Consequently, Bakhtiyar's enemies brought before him in the arena "an elephant, strong enough to stand the onslaught of this brute", who they said "is not to be found in Hindustan." Bakhtiyar was then asked by Kutb-ud-din whether he wished to fight the elephant. But Bakhtiyar, who was exceedingly modest, proved equal to the occasion, and at once fearlessly jumped into the arena outswelling with great courage. He struck his mace³ with such a blow on the elephant's forehead that it fled away frightened and Bakhtiyar pursued it. The whole audience was surprised enough to see the extra-ordinary feat and chivalry of Bakhtiyar. Even his enemies, who were caught in their own trap, were pulled into his favour and admired his praiseworthy achievement.⁴ Thus

1 TN, Vol. I, pp. 552, 554, call Kutb-ud-din as Sultan. See Aziz Ahmad Op. Cit., p. 109, but this is not correct, because Sultan Shahab-ud-din was still alive and Kutb-ud-din was simply his viceroy in India.

2 TA, p. 47, gives different picture and mentions that Kutb-ud-din had a white elephant with whom Bakhtiyar was ordered to combat. Some say that Bakhtiyar was compelled to fight with a lion. See Aziz Ahmed, Op. Cit., p. 109, footnote 4.

3 It is not a battle-axe as mentioned in ED, Vol. II, p. 306.

4 TN, Vol. I, p. 554; Riyazu-s-salatin, Op. Cit., pp. 61-62.

the table was turned. The rivals became his admirers and the conspiracy against him besides falling to the ground enhanced his prestige and honour. Kutb-ud-din, on this triumphant achievement, bestowed upon him fresh gifts out of his own royal treasure, and robes of honour. He also ordered his nobles to present valuable offerings to Bakhtiyar in recognition of his great feat. But Bakhtiyar distributed the whole of his gifts among the servants of the court and himself proceeded towards Behar wearing his robe of honour.¹ Bakhtiyar's fame spread throughout the country like a wild fire and the Hindus of the territories of Behar, Eengal and of Kamrup became much frightened.

The Annexation of Bengal

The occupation of Behar by Bakhtiyar brought the Muslim dominion very close to the frontiers of Bengal. The ruling dynasty of Bengal at this time was the powerful Sena Dynasty under the reign of Lakshmanasena,² but it had begun to shrink, during the closing years of the 12th century, A.D. Its power soon shattered and many of its states set-up themselves as independent kingdoms in this region.³ Weakened by such disruption within its own region, the Sena kingdom, whose past glory had already fallen to dust, had to face yet another blow from the side of the Muslims, who had become supreme in the North. At the time the armies of Bakhtiyar were ravaging the territory of Behar, Lakshmanasena,

1 It is stated in the *Tarikh-i-Firishta* and the *Tabakat-i-Akbari*, p. 47 that the next after Bakhtiyar's return received a firman assigning him Behar and Lakhnauti and along with it a red pavillion, a banner and a drum. But Minhaj who is a contemporary historian does not mention this fact and, therefore, the statement given by the latter historians like *Firishta* and *Nizamuddin Ahmad* is difficult to accept. More or less, such an honour, in those days meant all the insignia of royalty and Kutb-ud-din could not bestow these in Sultan Muizzuddin's life time. See also *ETED.*, p. 110 and footnote 3.

2 He is also called by the Muslim historians as Rai Lakhmaniya, *TN*, Vol. I, p. 557; *Futuh-us-Salatin*, p. 96. According to Dr. Banerji an "era was founded to commemorate the beginning of the reign of Lakshmana Sena," *EI*, Vol. XIV, p. 159.

3 For example one Dommanapala set up an independent kingdom in the region before, event in or before 1196 A. D. See also *The Struggle for Empire*, p. 39.

who had become quite old, was sitting idle in his capital town thinking vistfully that the Muslims after their conquest of Behar would retire without intruding his territory. And, therefore, he foolishly neither made any effort to drive the invaders away from Behar nor took any action in strengthening the defence of his own territories. No able ruler would have ever failed to realise the gravity of the situation, and do the needful for the safeguard of the country, specially against the invaders, who were quite known, throughout the country, for their strategem and notorious onslaughts. But, Lakshmanasena, proved quite unequal to the call of time and acted rather lethargically. On the other hand, the easy victory of Behar which diffused the name and fame of Bakhtiyar far and near encouraged him for his further incursions. His Behar conquest served as the prelude to his subsequent invasions of Bengal and further encouraged by the innocent behaviour of the king Lakshmanasena he finally determined, after his Behar conquest, to carry the Islamic flag deep into the heart of Bengal.

Hence, immediately after the conquest of Behar, Bakhtiyar went to Kutb-ud-din to pay him respects and in return obtained the permission for his further conquests in the East. Kutb-ud-din allowed him on the condition that he will have to rely on his own resources, and that no help would be rendered by him. Bakhtiyar agreed to the proposal and began to mobilise his forces to penetrate into the last great surviving Hindu State of the North.

The Controversy As To The Date

Yet another controversial event within the fold of the period under review has been as to the date of Bakhtiyar's invasion of Bengal which has divergently divided our scholars into opposing groups. Charles Stewart, in his History of Bengal which he wrote in 1813 A. D., fixes the date of this event in 1203-4 A. D.¹ However, a little less than half a century afterwards (i.e. 1871 A. D.), Edward Thomas, probably, agreeing with Stewart, gives

¹ Stewart : History of Bengal, 2nd ed., 1910, p. 61.

the same date as 599 H. (1202-3 A. D.)¹. But after a couple of years, Major Raverty has surprisingly pushed back the event to as early as in 1193 A. D., thus, cutting off about 10 years² from the date originally suggested by Charles Stewart and Edward Thomas respectively.³ Major Raverty asserts that Bakhtiyar ruled in Bengal for about 12 years, and was assassinated then about the middle of 602 H.⁴ (1205-6 A. D.). Major Raverty's supposition of Bakhtiyar's 12 years rule in Bengal appears doubtful from his own account as he does not give the source of his information. "Major Raverty", as pointed out by Blochmann, "is mistaken, however, on his own authorities, when he asserts that the conquest of Bengal took place in 590 H. or A. D. 1194."⁵

Blochmann⁶ himself fixes this date in 594 or 595 H. (1198 or 1199 A. D.). But Blochmann, who, probably fixed the dates entirely on the basis of *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, cites eight important events of the life of Bakhtiyar Khalji in between the two clear dates. The first of them being 589 H. (1193 A. D.), when Bakhtiyar reached Delhi but was rejected for the reasons discussed earlier; while the other, 602 H. (1205-6 A. D.), when the Muslim conqueror of the East was assassinated.⁷ But Blochmann's suggestion as to the date is merely conjectural and can be easily tossed downward or upward by a margin of one or two years.⁸ The vital defect in this conjecture, as pointed out by Ahmad Husain Dani, was that "Blochmann has not taken into account the infor-

1 *The Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi*, p. 110.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 558, footnote 7.

3 *Ibid.*

4 *Ibid.*

5 JASB, 1875, p. 276.

6 See also IHQ, Vol. XXX, 1954, p. 133.

7 Therefore, in between 1193 to 1205-6 A.D., Blochmann arranges the events in the following ways (i) appearance in Delhi in 589 H.; (ii) acceptance of service in Badaun; (iii) going to Oudh, receiving fiefs of Bhagavat and Bhuli, and plundering expeditions for the year or two; (iv) conquest of Behar and journey to Kutb-ud-din; (v) "second year after his conquest of Behar, he sets out for Bengal and takes Nadiya"; (vi) fixing of the capital at Lakhnauti and making administrative arrangements; (vii) after some years, invasion of Tibet; (viii) return and death in 602 H., See IHQ, Vol. XXX, 1954, p. 132.

8 K. Bhattasali : IA, Vol. III., 1923, p. 320.

mation supplied by other Muslim historians, like Hasan Nizam, Nizamud-din Bakhshi, Farishtah and 'Abdul-Qadar Badayuni.'¹

Among the writers of the 20th century, Manmohan Chakravarti² was the first to have suggested the fixing of the date of Bakhtiyar's invasion to Bengal on the basis of the Hindu sources. He throws considerable light on the dates proposed by Blochmann (1199 A.D.) and Edward Thomas (1202-3 A.D.) and opines that the events as given in the career of Muhammad-i-Bakhtiyar are more in harmony with the earlier dates than with the later ones.³ But the arguments put forth by our scholar are not absolutely correct as has been shown by both N. K. Bhattasali⁴ and Ahmad Dani.⁵

The next historian, who has discussed the problem at length, is R.D. Banerji, who also seems to have followed completely the arguments advanced by Manmohan Chakravarti.⁶ R.D. Banerji clearly contradicts the date given by Major Raverty but asserts the validity of the Chakravarti's points. He strongly holds that the sack of Behar took place in the year 1199 A.D. and that the very next year (i. e. 1200 A.D.) the destruction of Nadiya was completed. This fact, according to him, is also evidenced by the Panclaka manuscript, preserved in the Cambridge University, London. This view is further supported and strengthened by Dr. K. R. Qanungo, and others.⁷ Dr. Ishwari Prasad's statement is faulty as he places the conquest of Behar in 1197 A. D.,⁸ which was subsequently followed by the fall of Bengal about two years later (i. e. 1199 A. D.)⁹. On the other hand, Dr. N. K. Bhattasali, on the basis of Parganati Era,¹⁰ has tried to fix the date

1 IHQ., Vol. XXX, No. 2, 1954, p. 134.

2 JASB., 1908, pp. 151-53. For his detailed arguments and criticism see IHQ., Vol. XXX, 1954, pp. 134-139.

3 IHQ., Vol. XXX, March, 1954, No. I. p. 134.

4 IA, Vol. III, 1923, p. 320.

5 IHQ., Vol. XXX, 1954, p. 134 ff.

6 Bangalar Itihasa, Vol. II, pp. 15-17.

7 History of Bengal, Vol. II, ed. by J. N. Sarkar, pp. 32-33.

8 History of Medieval India, p. 143.

9 Ibid., p. 144.

10 IA, 1923, pp. 314-20.

of this disputed event of the period under review as 1202 A. D.¹ A similar view is also held by Sir W. Haig, who thinks that "in 1202 Ikhtiyar-ud-din left Behar with a large body of horse, and marched so rapidly on Nadiya that he arrived at the city with no more than eighteen companions."² But he does not seem to be sure about the date himself when he writes in the footnote of the same page that "this date is not quite certain. Some authors place the expedition a year later, and one some years earlier."³ This makes it certain that our historian is himself confused and is not clear about the date of the event. But the year of 1202 A. D. has also been supported by some of the scholars on the basis of the Tibetan chronicle. Also the Saka-Subhodaya, a later compilation, dates the sack of Nadiya in S. 1124 (1202 A. D.)⁴. On the basis of a verse in the Saka-Subhodaya and the testimony of a late Tibetan chronicle Pag Sam Jon Zong of Sumpa M Khan-Po Dr. R.C. Majumdar provisionally accepts 1202 A.D. as the year of Bakhtiyar's expedition to Bengal and his conquest of Nadiya.⁵ Mr. Ahmad Hasan Dani in his article "Date of Bakhtiyar's raid on Nadiya", places the event in 1204 A. D.⁶

But these conflicting views, regarding this date, can be corrected in view of the statements corroborated by the Muslim historians, both contemporary and later. Among the contemporary writers, Hasan Nizami, tells us that after the conquest of Kalanjar, when Kutb-ud-din had encamped in Badaun, Bakhtiyar came from the direction of Oudh and Behar with valuable presents to pay homage to him. The conquest of Kalinjar, according to him, took place in 1203 A. D.⁷ The Tarikh-i-Fakhruddin Mubarak Shah (Nisbat Namah) which was composed in 1206

1 For the full discussion of the arguments given by N. K. Bhattasali, see IH Q., Vol. XXX, 1954, pp. 141-143.

2 CHI, Vol. III, p. 46.

3 CHI, Vol. III, p. 46, footnote 1.

4 R.C. Majumdar : History of Bengal, Vol. I, p. 380, footnote 1 and also p. 180, footnote 6.

5 R.C. Majumdar. History of Bangal, Vol. I, p. 247.

6 IHQ, Vol. XXX, 1954, p. 145.

7 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 232.

A.D., also asserts that in 599 H. (1202-3) Kutb-ud-din, undertook an expedition against Kalanjar.¹ And according to the same authority, it appears that Behar was captured in 600 H. (1203 A. D.), which he assigns to the capture of Bidur² (Behar). The date of the conquest of Kalanjar, as given by Hasan Nizami, has already been corrected by Dr. Shadani who reads it as March 24, 1203 A. D, instead of April 4, 1203 A.D. Therefore, the meeting of Kutb-ud-din with Bakhtiyar at Badaun must have taken place sometime in April 4, 1203 A.D. By that time Behar was already conquered and this has already been discussed earlier. Some later historians also support the view already enumerated. According to Badauni, the author of the Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh, Bakhtiyar returned to pay his visit to Kutb-ud-din after the conquest of Behar and the next year the Khalji Commander brought an army from Behar towards Lakhnauti and arrived at the town of Nadiya.³ All these authorities agree that Bakhtiyar met Kutb-ud-din only once and that too after his Behar conquest which was accomplished in the year 1203 A.D., followed by the annexation of Bengal which, according to Minhaj, took place next year. If we agree to the statement of Minhaj-us-Siraj, a contemporary historian, who takes the conquest of Bengal as one year after the capture of Behar it seems to have occurred sometime in the year 1204 A.D. Thus, it may be quite reasonable to hold that this event took place either late in the year 1203 A. D. or early in 1204 A.D.

A story about Rai Lakshmansena⁴ by Minhaj

Here we find a very interesting story given by Minhaj-us-Siraj, regarding the ruler by Bengal, Rai Lakshmansena, at the time Bakhtiyar Khalji invaded this distant part. Although of little historical value because our historian himself admits that the story given by him is based on some credible authorities, it is,

1 Text edited by Sir E. Denison Ross, London, 1827, p. 24.

2 Ibid, p. 25.

3 MT, Eng. Tr. by Ranking, Vol. I, pp. 81-82. The author of the Tazkirat-ul-Muluk also writes that Bakhtiyar met Kutb-ud-din after his conquest of Behar. As quoted by Raverty, Op. Cit., Appendix D, XXVI.

4 Minhaj-us-Siraj calls him Rai Lakhmaniah.

nonetheless, important in that it will help us in enumerating Bakhtiyar's easy success in Bengal. According to him the great Rai ascended the throne of which Nadiya was capital and ruled over there for not less than eighty years. He was a posthumous child and was in his mother's womb at the time of his father's death. Consequently, the crown was placed upon the belly of the widow-queen of the late Rai and all the Rais and nobles expressed their deep sense of gratitude, loyalty and respect to her. The whole royal family attained a great respect throughout Hindustan and was considered to have held the rank of Khalif or Sovereign.¹

When the time of the birth of Lakshmansena approached nearer and symptoms of delivery appeared his reigning mother assembled the astrologers and wise men in order that they might predict whether the time was auspicious. They all unanimously said that "if the child should be born at this hour, it will be unfortunate exceedingly, and will never attain unto sovereignty, but, if it should be born two hours subsequent to this time, it will reign for eighty years." When his mother heard this opinion of the astrologers, she ordered her legs to be tied together, and caused herself to be hung with her head downwards. She also directed the astrologers to watch for the auspicious time. When they all agreed that the time for delivery had come, she ordered herself to be taken down, and Lakshmansena was born directly, but he had no sooner come into the world than his mother died of the pangs and anguish she had endured. Lakshmansena was placed up on the throne and he ruled for eighty years. The author of the *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, on the authority of some trustworthy persons, further, states that no one, great or small, ever suffered injustice at his hands. He used to give a lac to every such person as asked him for charity. A similar custom was being practised by the generous Sultan, the Hatim of the time, Kutb-uddin. In that country the current money is Kandas (Kauris) and not Jital and the smallest present that he made was a lac of Kandas.²

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 555.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 55.

We further gather from some authority that when Bakhtiyar annexed Behar in 1203 A. D. and caused the Muslim territory to expand right upto the borders of the Sena Dynasty, the fame of the Muslim conqueror had reached the ears of the Rai Lakshmansena and spread throughout his entire dominion. As a result of this triumph of Bakhtiyar, a number of astrologers, wisemen, and counsellors of his kingdom presented themselves before the Rai Lakshmansena and said "In our books of the ancient Brahmans they have foretold that this country will fall into the hands of the Turks, and the time of its fulfilment has drawn near. The Turks have subjugated Behar, and next year they will surely come into this country. It is expedient for us that the Rai should consent¹ so that he, along with the whole people, should be removed from the country in order that he may be safe from the molestation of the Turks."²

The Rai Lakshmansena immediately asked "Is there any token given in your books with respect to this man who is to subdue our country?" They replied in the affirmative and said that "the indication of him is this that when he stands upright on his two feet, and lets down his two hands, his hands will reach beyond the point of his knees in such a way that the fingers will touch the calves of his legs."³ Lakshmansena observed that it was best for him to send trustworthy and confidential persons to make an enquiry about those peculiar characteristics. Accordingly, confidential agents were despatched to investigate the matter. An examination was made and the peculiarity was found identical in the person of Muhammad Bakhtiyar Khalji. On the confirmation of this news, most of the chiefs and trusty persons were so terrified that they decided to leave their homeland and went towards the country of Sankrat⁴ and to the cities of Bang and

1 Elliot erroneously translates that "Rai should make peace with them" (Turks). See ED, Vol. II, p. 308.

2 TN, Vol I, p. 556.

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 557. In the true sense legs caused the portion below the knees. This is an old Hindu idea of the figure of a hero, whose both hands standing upright hangs down below the knees.

4 The place, according to Elliot, refers to 'Jaggannath' (ED, Vol. II, p. 308, and footnote 20). Stewart in his History of Bengal also supports the same view.

Kamrup. But Lakshmansena, in spite of the hard pressures by his nobles, did not agree to their proposals to leave his capital and remained there with his remaining followers. With the flight of the citizens and many wealthier inhabitants of the city, Nadiya became almost a deserted place.

Taking advantage of the terror-stricken people of Nadiya, Bakhtiyar decided to make a sudden attack on the capital of Lakshmansena. He, therefore, in about 1204 A.D., prepared a large army, and left Behar and marched swiftly towards that direction. We are told by Minhaj-us-Siraj that while passing through the difficult Jharkhand regions of South Behar, Bakhtiyar marched so quickly that his main army was left behind and only eighteen of his best soldiers could keep pace with him.¹ With his main army being left far behind, Bakhtiyar tactfully handled the situation. He knew that any impression of an attack will cause the annihilation of his small army and, therefore, he entered the territory of Lakshmansena peacefully and without showing any sign of waging war. He did not molest any man and went ahead rapidly without ostentation so that no one could suspect who he was. Consequently, Bakhtiyar and his followers did not receive any opposition as the inhabitants and the guards were under the impression that they were the horse-dealers from the North. In this way Bakhtiyar completely deceived the Hindus and dashed towards the fort of Rai Lakshmansena. Before he reached the gates of the fort his main army had also entered the city² and Bakhtiyar taking the guards and the inhabitants unaware, suddenly attacked them with naked swords. The surprise attack of the Muslims caused a great confusion among the Hindus who were not ready to meet the danger and began to raise hue and cry in such a way that it ultimately reached the ears of Rai Lakshmansena who was taking his mid-day meal as usual.³ But before any measure could be taken, the invaders cut-down the guards at the gates and burst into the royal palace and commenced the

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 557.

2 Nadiya. But according to Minhaj it is "Nodia."

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 557.

onslaughts. Many unwarranted Hindus were atonce put to the sword. Lakshmansena, being incapable to withstand the Bakhtiyar's onslaughts, decided to evacuate the palace without any further resistance. He left the unfinished meal and fled away through the back door almost half-naked and bare-footed,¹ towards Vanga² in East Bengal.³ Therefore, the flight of the king decided the issue and after the arrival of his full army, the whole treasures, along with the wives of the king, maiden servants, attendants, women and numerous elephants, fell into the hands of the Muslims. The subjugation of the country continued until the whole territory was brought under the Muslim's sway and the entire resistance against this huge invading army was rendered useless.

The whole story of Bakhtiyar's conquest of Nadiya is given by Minhaj-us-Siraj alone, but our author does not say anything regarding the source of his information. It appears that Minhaj-us-Siraj most probably heard of this narrative in 641 H. (1243 A.D.), when he himself met Shams-ud-din one of Bakhtiyar's commanders at Lakhnauti. But it is evident that he had no reliable source for such an information. The whole story looks like a romantic tale which is difficult to be accepted. Such an easy victory of Bakhtiyar and Rai Lakshmansena's flight without offering any resistance must have surprised even the conquerors. The story of the eighteen horsemen⁴ who defeated the powerful Sena king of Bengal has evoked further comments from a number

1 Minhaj simply writes bare-footed, TN, Vol. I, p. 558. But Hindu custom shows that the Hindu of high caste used to eat in almost half-naked state, it also appears here that the Rai Lakshmansena fled from the place in that very fashion.

2 The Struggle For Empire, p. 39. But Dr. Ishwari Prasad identifies the place with Dacca. According to him the Raja fled towards Vikrampur near Sonargaon which was a place of refuge for all those who were discontented at Gaur, HMI, p. 144 and footnote 22.

3 See for further study about the place where Rai Lakshmansena had retired from Nadia, IHQ, Vol. XXX.

4 Riyazu-s-Salatin also mentions that Bakhtiyar conquered Bengal with only eighteen horsemen, Op. Cit., p. 63.

of Indian scholars like C.V. Vaidya,¹ R.D. Banerji² and others.³ It will be quite unjust to levy the charge on Rai Lakshmansena that he did not come to the rescue of his kingdom, and like a coward ruler he fled away from the back door without giving any fight to the Muslim invaders. It will be another mistake to suppose that a powerful king, like Rai Lakshmansena of Bengal, who knew the advancement of the Muslims against him, could have failed to make any proper arrangement for the safety of his kingdom and even allowed the invaders to enter the royal palace without any opposition and that his foolish act, ultimately, caused the destruction of the empire.

Although, it is true that Rai Lakshmansena by then had become quite an old man and his empire had already begun to shatter into pieces⁴ and many states had emerged out of the Sena kingdom, yet the Sena empire was powerful enough, at least to put up a stubborn resistance, but unluckily, they were misled by the tactic adopted by Bakhtiyar who begun fighting before the royal palace only with eighteen of his horsemen. But, they were able to hold their own until the main army had arrived and with the assistance of this huge army Bakhtiyar could easily overpower and plunder the place. The story of the eighteen horsemen, as given by Minhaj-us-Siraj, is, therefore, an exaggerated account. The superstitious prophesy of the astrologers that the country should fall before the long armed Turk which, according to Minhaj, created such a panic into the minds of the people of Nadiya that most of them took to flight, is obviously an overstatement. According to an epigraph, Lakshmansena evidently had performed on 27th of Sravana in 1203 A.D., the 25th regnal year, the propitiatory rites to seek help from any impending calamity.⁵ It means that the king Lakshmansena was quite aware of

1 Op. Cit., pp. 126-29.

2 Op. Cit., Vol. I. pp. 324-25.

3 Indian Culture, 1935, pp. 133-36.

4 See IHO, X, p. 321. The grant found in the Sunderbans area in Saka 1118/1196 A.D. signifies to an independent ruler. Also see N.R. Ray : Bangalar Itihasa, pp. 516-29.

5 JRASB, 1942, Vol. VIII, No. 1, pp. 17-21.

the impending catastrophe and to think, therefore, that he sat idle at the royal palace without adopting any measure to oppose the menacing Muslim forces is wrong. The whole account of Minhaj in this regard is based on secondary sources and cannot be accepted as denoting the whole truth. No doubt, the "boldly led surprise attacks", says Habibullah, "can paralyse even more courageous and well prepared forces,"¹ but even it cannot justify the statement of Minhaj who asserts that the Rai fled away through the back-door without any fight. Even if we accept the story narrated by Minhaj, we will have to accept by his own account that Lakshmansena showed great courage and confidence by not accepting the proposal to leave the capital in the company of the other panic-stricken citizens long before the actual attack by the Muslim army had taken place; and considering the circumstances which forced him to leave the city, we can hardly blame him or regard it as an act of cowardice. It is also interesting to note that Nadiya was only occupied after the arrival of the chief army. Therefore, Minhaj's statement for Bakhtiyar's conquest of Nadiya could be read with great care and caution.

However, the simultaneous capture of Nadiya and the flight of king Lakshmansena never amounted to the total annihilation of this great empire in the East. Like the Rajputs of the West, the Senas also shifted their capital from Nadiya to Dharyyagrama on the Lakshya (East Bengal) on the way² to further retirement to Kamarupa, if necessary. There, Lakshmansena continued ruling over the petty Sena State which included East Bengal and South Bengal³ for a considerable period of three generations at least

1 Op. Cit., p. 73.

2 IHQ, Vol. XXX, 1954, p. 142. According to Minhaj, Lakshmansena retired towards "Sankaut and the towns of Bang and Kamrup", where he soon met his death. Prof. Habibullah thinks that Sankuat is perhaps a mispronunciation for Sankat or Sankakot, a stronghold of the baniks (merchants) in the twelfth century, Op. Cit., p. 74. However, Firishta, Vol. I, p. 232, interprets it with Jagannath in Orissa. But Jagannath as a place of religious importance came into prominence only in the 13th century A.D. See also for Sankat of Dutta's article in IHQ. 1940, pp. 705-6.

3 The Struggle For Empire, p. 40.

upto 1242 A.D.¹ This new seat of the government of the Senas has clearly been identified with Vikrampur near Sonargaon about eight miles South-East of Dacca, which had been the favourite place of residence of Lakshmansena's great grand-father, Balasena.²

Thus, it is crystal-clear that only a small portion of North-West Bengal fell into the hands of Bakhtiyar and that his successors had to carry on constant war and a campaign of ceaseless efforts for centuries together to wrest the remaining portions of Bengal from the hold of the Hindus.

It was probably from the new capital that Lakshmansena in the 27th year of his reign i. e. 1205 A.D., 'granted land' in the Bhawal Pargana of the Dacca District.³ This further proves the independence of Lakshmansena and shortly after this event Lakshmansena seems to have died and was succeeded by his sons.⁴

Bakhtiyar, on the other hand, sacked the city of Nadiya and destroyed its fortifications. But the occupation of Nadiya was only short-lived for it did not possess a strategic importance. The powerful Sena army was not fully crushed down and they still held their position in the East and the South of Bengal. The love for freedom and National prestige aroused sense of liberation in the Sena army which was not expected to retire from the new place without meeting dreadful consequence. The Gang kingdom of Orissa was another great power which threatened Bakhtiyar. Therefore, his permanent stay at such an unstrategic place in the lower Bengal would have certainly strained Bakhtiyar's communications and resources. For the security and the free military operations to effect further expansion, Bakhtiyar wanted to establish his headquarters at some safer place. He, therefore,

1 IHQ, Vol. XXX, 1954, p. 137.

2 CHI, Vol III, pp. 46-47.

3 JRASBL, 1942, p. 71.72.

4 TN, Vol. I, p. 558.

having sacked Nadiya, retreated towards Lakhnauti¹ (Lakshmanavati),² the Northern Western capital of the Senas on the Ganga, near the present site of Gaur in the Malda District,³ and made it his seat of government.⁴ He brought the different parts of that

1 Dr. N. K. Bhattasali conclusively identifies it with Nagar in Bihun District. According to him Nagar was the old capital and the chief town of Birbhum which is still an important place. The name of the place was spelt in some copies of *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, as Nagar and confused in others as Lakhor and probably in analogy with Lacknauti or Lakhnor, *JRAS*, 1935, pp. 101-102. Stewart in his *History of Bengal*, p. 62 identified it with Nagor in Birbhum about 85 miles South-West of Lakhnauti. This view is further supported by Banerji, *History of Orissa*, Vol. I, p. 248. Mr. Chakravarti has placed it somewhere in modern Murshidabad District, *JASB*, (N.S.), Vol. V, p. 214-15, Lakhnor is doubtless situated in the South-West on the Orissa frontier and it lay on the route which connects Behar with Orissa, Habibullah; *Op. Cit.*, p. 74. This Lakhnauti appears to have been the old name of Gaur, which had been the capital of the Pala Dynasty in the 9th and 10th centuries of the Senas in the 12th century, *ETED*, p. 110.

2 This city was founded by or renamed by Lakshmansena, Habibullah : *Op. Cit.*, p. 73.

3 *IGI*, XII, p. 18; *JASB*, (N. S.), II, p. 282.

4 *TN*, Vol. I, p. 559. According to Ahmad Hasan Dani, Lakhnor was not conquered immediately after the conquest of Nadia, *IHQ*, Vol. XXX, Part I, p. 12. But Minhaj asserts that he stayed for some years at Lakhnauti, probably to arrange for the administration of the country and to conquer the nearby places, (*TN*, Vol. I, p. 559). But according to Ahmad Hasan Dani, *Loc. Cit.*, p. 13, he most probably stayed there to arrange for the administration. It was perhaps the same time that Husamuddin Iwaz was given the fief of Gangori, 'Ali Mardan that of Barsul, and Muhammad Sheran those of Santosh and Moseda, *History of Bengal*, Vol. II, ed. by J.N. Sarkar, p. 13, footnote 1. Thereafter Bakhtiyar's ambition to conquer Turkistan and Tibet began to torment his mind, *TN*, Vol. I, p. 560. He sent Muhammad Sheran and his brother with a portion of his forces towards Lakhnor and Jainagar. Then this Ahmad Sheran is the only passage, according to Ahmad Hasan Dani, where we are told that an expedition was sent to Lakhnor and Jainagar, and the time is not just after the conquest of Nadiya, but it was before the departure of Bakhtiyar for Tibet. But according to him Lakhnor was for the first time conquered and annexed by the Muslims either in the time of Husamuddin Iwaz, or Ali Mardan, the successors of Sheran of Devkot. The time of this conquest came only when Husamuddin Iwaz united the Khaljis and crowned himself as an independent ruler under the new name of Ghiyathuddin Iwaz Khalji, *IHQ*, Vol. XXX, Part I, pp. 13-14. For its detailed account Ahmad Hasan Dani's, article, *First Muslim Conquest of Lakhnor*, *IHQ*, XXX, Part I, 1954, pp. 11-18. But Minhaj himself contradicts his statement, who mentions the capture of Lakhnor immediately after the fall of Nadia, *TN*, Vol. I, p. 559. Therefore, Dani's supposition is a doubtful statement.

territory under his sway and introduced therein, in every part, facilities for the reading of the Khutbah, and the coining of money.¹ A number of mosques colleges, and monasteries were raised by him and his officers and he sent a major portion of the spoils to the Malik Kutb-ud-din Aibak.²

Bakhtiyar's establishment at Lakhnor or Lakhnauti soon brought a fruitful result. Since the place was situated on the road which connected the route from Behar to Orissa,³ it served as the military outpost to guard the South-Western frontier towards Orissa and also to look after the affairs of Behar directly from that place. Similarly, Bakhtiyar established another military station at Deokot (Devikot) which has been identified with the ancient town locally known as Bangarh, few miles South-West of Dinajpur town.⁴ Thus, the area belonging to these outposts included the parts of Maldah, Dinajpur, Murshidabad and Birbhum Districts on the two sides of the Ganges.⁵ The Western borders, however, ran across the Tista-Karatoya basin.⁶

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 559; ED, Vol. II, p. 309 translates the same passage of Tabakat-i-Nasiri in this way that Bakhtiyar "caused his name to be read in Khutba and struck on the Coins." But this translation is not correct, as there is not a word in the text about causing "his name to be read in the Khutbah and struck on the Coins." According to the Zubdat-ut-Tawarikh he established "the Khutbah and money of Islam." Quoted by Raverty, TN, Vol. I, 559 footnote 3. Badauni, on the other hand asserts that Bakhtiyar caused his own name to be read in the Khulbat and to be inscribed on the coin [Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh, text, p. 58]. But all these seem to be quite impossible as Minhaj-us-Siraj one contemporary chronicler does not mention a word about it in his Tabakat-i-Nasiri. Bakhtiyar Khalji most probably issued coin in the name of the Sultan, Shahab-ud-din, to whom he appears to have been most loyal. He had no occasion whatever to issue money in the name of Kutb-ud-din Aibak, who was still a slave; and Muhammad Bakhtiyar only died in the same year in which Sultan Shahab-ud-din was himself assassinated. Raverty, TN, Vol. I, p. 559 footnote 3 and Ibid p. 572 footnote 9 See Thomas : The chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, P. 110 and note 1.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 559. Here Elliot again erroneously writes 'Sultan Kutb-ud-din' instead of Malik Kutb-ud-din.

3 Habibullah; Op. Cit., p. 74.

4 Ibid, p. 74.

5 It has been noticed by Minhaj as Rash and Varendri (Ral and Barind), Laghu Bharata, a Hindu account mentions Bakhtiyar's plunder of the merchants of Jogibhaban, near Bogra, captured the wealth of the Senas, who ruled on the banks of the Karakotya, Dacca University, History of Bengal, II, pp. 5-6.

6 The former then flowing in a more westerly channel than at present. See for the changes of its course, Dacca University History of Bengal, Vol. II, pp. 5-6.

The Expedition Of Tibet And Turkistan

Bakhtiyar's easy success in Bengal fired him with the ambition of conquering even Tibet and Turkistan.¹ And, therefore, after being equipped both with power and grandeur, Bakhtiyar turned his mind to acquire the remaining eastward of Lakhnauti,² Tibet and Turkistan without properly being aware of the distance to be traversed and the difficulties to be surmounted. On the face of many unsizable difficulties, according to A.B.M. Habibullah, it was a mad project³ indeed. But he further amends his opinion by writing that the founder of the Muslim rule in Bengal should be credited with possessing some calculating sense.⁴ He further says that "Minhaj possibly hints at the real purpose of the expedition when he speaks of the trading routes, numbering about 35, that carried a brisk traffic in Tangan horses from "Karambattan" (possibly Kumrikotah in Bhutan) and "Tibet" to Kamrup and thence to the districts of North Bengal. Bengal being particularly deficient in horses, Bakhtiyar may, reasonably have desired to obtain a monopoly of this imported breed. In undertaking it, however, he overstepped his limits."⁵ But horses alone could not have been the main reason for this tedious expedition. In fact, Bakhtiyar, intoxicated by his unopposed triumph over Rai Lakshmansena, had begun to indulge in dreams to carry on the Islamic banner beyond the foothold of Himalayas, overlapping the geographical barriers. He, most probably, thought that his simple adventure to these remote places would terrorise the minds of the inhabitants and the glories of Islam will be raised by establishing a Muslim rule there. Moreover, he underestimated the Hindu powers, who were

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 560. Futuh-us-Salatin, p. 96. According to Muhammad Aziz Ahmad, Bakhtiyar most probably invaded Northern Bengal or Assam, but he actually imagined he was invading Turkistan, Op. Cit., p. 112, footnote 6.

2 Minhaj's East of Lakhnauti, TN, Vol. I, p. 560, should be taken as the North-East of that place.

3 A. B. M., Habibullah Op. Cit., p. 75.

4 Ibid., p. 75.

5 Ibid., p. 75.

simply beaten and could not be enabled to surrender their freedom for which folly Bakhtiyar had to repent soon.

For this purpose, Bakhtiyar appointed his lieutenants Muhammad Sheran and Ahmad Sheran to guard the frontiers at Lakhnauti and Jainagar in his absence and himself collected a huge army of about 10,000 horses¹ and numerous foot soldiers² for this adventure. But the lack of topographical knowledge induced Bakhtiyar to employ a certain Kuch³ who had been converted into Islam by Bakhtiyar to conduct him into the hills. This time Bakhtiyar also seems to have entered into some treaty with the king of Kamrup (Assam) who agreed to refrain from molesting him and to assist him rather, at least by advice.⁴ Thus, after having made all the provisions, Bakhtiyar set out in about the middle of 1205 A.D.⁵ in that direction with a huge force to raise the standard of Islam. But unfortunately, we have no authentic evidence to determine the route followed by Bakhtiyar and his army. The Muslim historians who are the authorities to have furnished us with a detailed account of Bakhtiyar's this perilous adventure even do not give us a correct picture. Perhaps, their vague accounts and ignorance of geography preserved in the corrupted text afford us no means of determining his route.

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 560; Raverty says that according to generality of accounts Bakhtiyar set out with a force of about 12,000 horse, TN, Vol. I, p. 560, footnote 4.

2 Rauzatu-s Safa gives the number of foot soldiers as 30,000 along with the 10,000 horse. The number given here seems to be some exaggerated statement. See also TN, Vol. I, p. 560, footnote 4.

3 According to Minhaj, among the hills which lie between Tibet and Lakhnauti, there are three races of people, i.e., Kuch (Kuch Behar), Mich or Mej and Tihar (Kachai), all have Turki features and speak different languages, something between the language of Hind and Tibet. TN, Vol. I, p. 560. Stewards gives these names as Koonch, Mikeh (or Mielch) and Neharu, History of Bengal, p. 46.

4 CHI, Vol. III, p. 49.

5 Minhaj places this event some years after the conquest, Nadiya and Lakhnauti, which is obviously a mistake because we definitely know from the same authority that Bakhtiyar died immediately after his return from this expedition in about 602 H. (1205) A.D.). Major Raverty, however, places it in 601 H. which is also not correct, TN, Vol. I, p. 560, footnote 4.

The Kuch-guide first led Bakhtiyar and his army towards a city called Bardhan Kot¹ which according to the Muslim historians was founded by the Persian Shah Gushtasib.² Facing the town there runs a stream (called Begmati river) which is exceedingly large and which appears to have formed the boundary between his territory and the king of Assam.³ When the river enters the frontiers of Hindustan it is called in Hindi language as 'Samundar.' According to Minhaj, it is in height, breadth, and depth, three times greater than the Ganges.⁴ Bakhtiyar and his army found it difficult to cross it and it took ten days complete to cross the river. Ultimately, the Muslim army, which presumably crossed the river Brahmaputra, marched towards the north through the upper course of the river into the hills and reached a spot where there was a stone-bridge across the river which was supported by twenty stone arches. It was here that the Koch-guide took leave of him, but at the nick of the time when the Khalji warrior was about to cross it he received message from the king of Kamrup (Assam). The Rai of Kamrup (Assam), who was lately informed of the passage of the Muhammadans, sent some confidential officials to warn Bakhtiyar against invading the Tibet. He also advised him to return back and make more suitable arrangements for this expedition. He also seems to have assured that the next year he would also muster up his forces and herald the Muhammedan army to secure the country." But Muhammad Bakhtiyar

1 The place still bears the name which is 20 miles from Bogra, on the Karatoya river, Habibullah; Op. Cit., p. 76, footnote 93.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 561. The printed text of Tabakat-i-Nasiri has Garsashib Shah, whereas Badauni calls him "Garshasb."

3 CHI, Vol. III, p. 49.

4 The river Bagmati has been identified by many with "Karatoya", The Struggle For Empire, p. 43. But the printed copy of the Tabakat-i-Nasiri, has Brahmaputra or Brajmadi, p. 152. The Bagmati is a river which rises in Nepal but falls into the Gandak river, but it does not seem to be as vast as has been described by Minhaj. However, the description of three times greater than the Ganges is an exaggerated account, See TN, Vol. I, p. 561 and footnote 1. But in all probability the river appears to have been no other than the Brahmaputra river.

5 TN, Vol. I, p. 565. Also see Bhandarkar: Early History of the Dekkan, p. 215.

paid no heed to these suggestions and crossed the bridge and marched ahead towards the hills of Tibet leaving his two officers, one Turk and the other Khalji, with a large force to protect the bridge till he returns. To which direction Bakhtiyar marched thereafter or what part of Tibet he would have actually meant to conquer when he marched on is difficult to be struck at in absence of relevant sources. But we learn from Minhaj, who gathered his account in 641 H. (1243 A. D.) from the version of Muatamad-ud-daula, who had served under Bakhtiyar at Lakhnauti, that the Muslim army threading through dense jungles, defiles and passes of the mountains, could reach the plain on the 16th day of their most tedious journey. The place where they reached has a strong fort with a populated land and flourishing villages.¹

The inhabitants were alarmed of the arrival of the Muslim army and, when the Muslims led an attack upon the fort, the garrison of the fort and the surrounding places came to oppose them and a keenly contested battle ensued, thereafter. The deadly fight continued from morning till sun-set in which the Muslim army suffered a great loss and most of them were slain and wounded. The only weapons of the defending army had been "bamboo spears; and their armour shields and hamlets, consisted only of raw silk strongly fastened and sewed together." They all carried long bows and arrows. When night came, the prisoners captured during the day-fight were brought before Bakhtiyar, who on enquiry ascertained that at the distance of about fifteen miles (five parssangs) from that place there situated a fortified city of a great size called Karam Batan. The walls of the city were of hewn-stones, and its inhabitants were Brahmans and Nunis or idol-worshippers.² They also told the Muslim commander that the city was very strong and was protected by 50,000 valiant Turk soliders well armed with bows and spear.³

1 TN, Vol., I, p. 565.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 567 and footnote 3. Minhaj further informs us that it was under the possession of the Chief of these people. They professed Budhist religion. About 15,000 horses are sold in every morning in the market of that city. Stewarts: History of Bengal p. 66, says that the prince was a Christian which is not correct.

3 ED, Vol. II, p. 311, emtnions three hundred and fifty thousand.

And as soon as the Muslim invaders had arrived messengers went to report their approach who along with the Turk soldiers reached the next morning. The news terrorised the Muslims and damped their spirit and at last they decided to fall back without forcing for a decision.

Muhammad Bakhtiyar soon became aware of the nature of the country and saw his men tired and exhausted by the fatigue of the long and strenuous journey. The first encounter proved fatal to them and that many of them were either killed or wounded and the honour of the day's fight went to the soldiers of the Karam Bahan. The news of the further arrival of the fresh army from the nearest garrison next morning further disheartened him greatly. Under such a difficult situation Bakhtiyar found himself quite unable to withstand the onslaughts of the local army. Bakhtiyar studied the psychology of his fearful army very carefully and consulted his nobles on such a delicate problem, who all unanimously consented to retreat. The Muslim army, therefore, finally decided to withdraw in shame and dishonour with the determination to invade it again with much more greater preparation in order to avenge their defeat. The retreat of the Muslim army was marked by a terrible hardship and they had to pay the penalty for their overestimation and rashness in advancing so far in the distant and unknown country without securing their communication and provisions. The hill-people of the neighbourhood destroyed and obstructed the roads and burnt all the food and forage and the inhabitants of the valleys and passes all removed themselves far away from the road so that "not a blade of grass nor a stick of firewood" could be found. The provisions carried by them were ended and the supply was no more. Neither the fodder nor fuel was procurable throughout the fifteen days of the return journey and the Muslim soldiers were reduced to kill and eat their own horses. A large number of them died of this hardship. After suffering severely from the shameful adventure, they reached the country of Kamrup¹ (Assam).

Unfortunately, the two officers, who had been deputed to

¹ TN, Vol. I, pp. 468-69,

guard the bridge aided by a considerable detachment had quarrelled themselves and in their animosity with each other they neglected their duties to take care of the bridge and the road.¹ Their enmity had reached to such an extent that Badauni writes that they first fought themselves and afterwards abandoned the bridge.² Taking advantage of this spite and mutual jealousy, the Hindus of Kamrup destroyed the bridge. When Bakhtiyar after a great hardship could manage to reach the bridge, the only way to enter his territory, he found the arches demolished. The Muslim army was greatly troubled and perplexed as there was no other way to cross the river, and not a single boat was procurable. Due to the scarcity of vegetation and food and the fatigue of the hard journey and further delay would mean the complete annihilation of the army. Stung by such horrible situations, Bakhtiyar became confounded and utterly non-plussed and was ultimately obliged to halt at some place and to prepare rafts and boats to cross the river.

The Muslim soliders went for the search of a suitable place for the shelter and found in the vicinity of that place very lofty and strong temple of beautiful structure. The temple was rich and large and is said to have contained numerous idols of gold silver, and one very large golden idol which exceeded two or three thousand miskalas (or mans) in weight.³ Realising the gravity of the situation, Bakhtiyar was induced to take refuge in the temple and started making arrangements to procure woods and ropes for the construction of the rafts to cross the stream.

The Rai of Kamrup was soon informed of the distress and weakness of the Muslim army. He, thereafter, decided to avenge the losses of the Hindus who had heavily suffered at the hands of Bakhtiyar and his army at various places. Bakhtiyar, who once took every advantage of the helplessness of the Hindus by taking them unaware, now himself fell in a similar trap. He knew no

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 569. According to the *Zubdat-ut-Twarikh* the two Amirs, on account of spite and mutual jealousy, abandoned guarding the bridge, and each went his own way.

2 MT, p. 59.

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 569 and footnote 7.

mercy and killed the Hindus vehemently, but now the table was turned and he himself was at the mercy of the Hindus. Consequently, the Rai of Kamrup, who was eagerly waiting to strike against the Muslim army, issued orders to his soldiers of the territory to gather around the temple who at once came to prosecute it. As directed by the Rai the Hindus then started levying after levying all around the temple and planted bamboo spears and plaited them together in the ground in such a way that they looked like a wall in combination. To entrap the Muslim army, the bamboo-wall was led to rise quickly. The Muslim army when learnt of it were terrified by the action of the Hindus and went to their master and told him frankly that if they remained passive they would all be taken in the trap laid by the Hindus and thus they could all be made prisoners; and suggested to find out some means to escape. The armies of Islam, threatened by the imminent danger and finding no other way to escape, finally decided to rush forth jointly at one particular spot and in doing so they succeeded in reaching an open ground after countenancing bitter obstacles. But the Hindus did not leave them unmolested. They pursued them up to the banks of the river and halted there. The river was deep with strong currents and was difficult to be crossed over by the Muslim army. Every one who tried his best to find out the means to cross the river miserably failed. Suddenly one of the soldiers urged his horse into the water and it was found fordable to the distance of a bow-shot.¹ Soon a general cry of the army echoed the surrounding to the effect that a formidable passage was found out and the terror-stricken Muslim army out of fear and due to the agony suffered in the onslaughts of the Hindus, jumped into the river. But when they reached the middle of the stream, they found the water very deep and full of strong currents. They could not resist the forceful current of the deep river and almost all of them perished with the exception of Muhammad Bakhtiyar and about a hundred more soldiers, who managed to escape with a great difficulty.² The

1 ETED, p. 116 and footnote 1.

2 Badauni : Op. Cit., p. 59, that about 300 or 400 Muslim soldiers reached Devkot,

remaining army which did not jump into the river were all killed by the Hindus on the very bank of the river.¹ The Hindus, thus, took possession of the bank and of its nearby places as well, which were previously conquered by the Muslims. This crushing defeat of the Muslims and the valiant fight of the Hindus is confirmed by an inscription found at Kanaiharsi (Gauhati, Assam). The inscription clearly says that the Turks, during the course of their fight, fought against the Assamese in the thirteenth day of Chaitra of Saka year 1127 and met with complete destruction.² This almost certainly refers to Bakhtiyar's invasion of Tibet via Assam,³ when during his return journey the armies of Islam had met with severe reverses and it was after tremendous sufferings that he could trace out his way back.⁴

However, the date which the inscription bears is somewhat confusing, and the March 1206 A. D. as taken by the various scholars to be the date of occurrence of this event, is not correct. For, we definitely know that Bakhtiyar, soon after this event, was assassinated in the year 602 H. (1206 A. D.).⁵ It is, therefore, only from the side of the Muslim historian that the date of this invasion could be conjectured.

Last days and death of Bakhtiyar Khalji

Muhammad Bakhtiyar escaped, any how, from this watery grave, and this informytion soon reached the people of 'Kunch' and 'Mej'. The converted 'Kunch' people, who had previously acted as the guide of Bakhtiyar's army, came forth with their relatives, met him in the way and received him with great kindness and hospitality. Bakhtiyar with the assistance of this guide, ultimately, reached Devkot. It was, perhaps, greatest disaster

1 Ibid., p. 59.

2 IHQ, 3, p. 843. According to Padmanath Bhattacharya, the date corresponds to 27th March 1206, Kamarupasanavati, p. 44. But N. K. Bhattasali reads it 7th March, 1206, IHQ, Vol. IX, pp. 48-63.

3 NK Bhattasali says that this invasion was in fact, directed against Assam and not Tibet, IHQ, Vol. I, pp. 48-63.

4 JIH, Vol. XV, Part 2, August 1936, pp. 175-176,

5 TN, Vol. 1, p. 573.

which had befallen the armies of Islam in Hindustan. But Bakhtiyar could not recover from severe fatigue and the disaster of this shameful adventure and fell ill by the excess of grief and sorrow.¹ The author of the *Rauzat-us-safa* goes a step ahead when he writes that Bakhtiyar's "mind gave way under his misfortunes; and the sense of the disaster, he had suffered, resulted in hopeless melancholy."² Bakhtiyar was so shameful of his failure as noted by Minhaj, that he would never go out, because he felt ashamed to look on the wives and children of those who had perished. If even he did ride out, all people, women and children, from their house-tops and the streets cried out cursing and abusing him.³ In this position the remark often fell from his tongue, "has any misfortune befallen Sultan Ghazni Muizzuddin Muhammad Sam." He used to say that "my fortune has turned so bad." It was so that Sultan Muizzuddin was killed about that time. Muhammad Bakhtiyar's trouble grew worse and he died ultimately in 602 H. (August 1205 A. D.).³

According to some writers there was a man of the same tribe named Ali Mardan Khalji who was very bold, dauntless and ambitious and was the feudatory of Narankui.⁴ Taking the advantage of the illness, he came to Devkot⁵ when Bakhtiyar had been lying ill. Although no one had seen Bakhtiyar for the last three days, but Ali Mardan secretly or by some means got into him, drew aside the sheet with which he was covered, and killed him with a dagger.⁶ Thus came to an abrupt end the life of that great soldier whose services to Islam as the landmaster has been considerable and without him the conquests in the far Eastern regions of Behar and Bengal would never have been possible with such a lightning speed.

1 Ibid., p. 572.

2 *Rauzat-us-Safa*, Vol. IV, p. 889.

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 573.

4 Muhammad Aziz Ahmad: *Op. Cit.*, p. 116. But Minhaj simply mentions Koni; *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, p. 156; Badauni: *Op. Cit.*, p. 59, wrongly gives its name as "Narnol, which is located in Patiala State. However, the place is uncertain and cannot be identified correctly.

5 The place has been identified by Muhammad Aziz Ahmad with the modern district of Dinajpur, *Op. Cit.*, p. 117.

6 TN, Vol. I, p. 573.

CHAPTER XII

THE FALL OF THE GHORIAN POWER

Kutb-ud-din, who had returned back to Delhi after his conquests of Kalanjar, Mahoba and Badaun, decided to go to Ghazni to pay homage and tribute personally to his master Sultan Shahab-ud-din. Consequently, at the time Bakhtiyar Khalji was engaged in his Eastern campaigns, he proceeded towards Ghazni in 1204 A.D. to meet his master at Barshur where he was received by his master with great honour and respect. But, Kutb-ud-din soon returned to Delhi after his meeting with the Sultan.¹

The year 1204 A. D. is the landmark in the history of the Ghorian Empire. It was the year when Behar and Bengal were conquered and annexed to the Ghorian power for the first time in the history of Islam. But the same year which saw the zenith of the Ghorian power began to show its doom. Sultan Shahab-ud-din, who felt no difficulty in succeeding his elder brother Ghiyas-ud-din, who had long lost all power in the empire preserving only the name of the king before his death,² began to loose battles in the war against the infidels. Sultan Shahab-ud-din's adventures had, undoubtedly, been successful in India, but his repeated inroads of Khurasan resulted in utter failure and no territorial gain could be achieved there.

Again in 1204 A. D. Sultan Shahab-ud-din launched an expedition into the Khwarazmian territory, defeated its Sultan Muhammad in the battle, but failed to capture the city of Kwarazm.³ The Sultan Muhammad, finding himself in the fort appealed to his overlord, the Ghur Khan, and to the Sultan us-Salatin of Samar Kandi for assistance. In his efforts to capture the city, Shahab-ud-din's army had encamped and lost many

1 TM, p 467, wrongly places the event in 600 H. (1203 A. D.)

2 BF, Vol. 1, p. 180 ; Ghiyas-ud-din, the elder brother of Shahab-ud-din died in the year 1202 A. D.

3 Tabakat-i-Nasiri, pp. 121-122.

of their brave officers and men in an attempt to escalate it.¹ In the meantime, Sultan Shahab-ud-din heard that the forces of Qara Khitais under the command of Tayanku Taraz and of Sultan-us-Salatin of Samarkand were advancing with their armies for the relief of Khwarazm. On receiving the intelligence, Sultan Shahab-ud-din lost all hopes of taking the city and realising the gravity of the situation he decided to retire in order to avoid meeting any reverse.² But the Sultan delayed in his retreat till the allied forces reached so near that he was compelled to burn his baggage and to retire with the utmost precipitation towards Khurasan.³ But Khwarazm Shah pursued Sultan Shahab-ud-din and compelled him at Hazar Asp to give battle where the latter was completely defeated.⁴ Khwarazm Shah obtained a great booty including many elephants and a vast treasure.⁵ With all this he returned back to Khwarazm.

But Qara Khitais and his army had taken a circuit to cut off his retreat towards Balk and Ghazni and intercepted him. Thus, surrounded by hostile enemies, Sultan Shahab-ud-din and his army was compelled to give battle. Fortunately, Hasan Kharmil, one of the commanders of Shahab-ud-din, who led the advance guard of the Ghorian army, succeeded in driving off the enemy. He, further, requested the Sultan to make an assault upon the fleeing army, but the Sultan hesitated and did not give consent. The conflict between the Sultan and Hasan Kharmil rose to such an extent that the latter ultimately withdrew himself from the Sultan's services and retired.⁶ The remaining hundered horsemen fought, as usual, desperately. Though overpowered by numbers, they defended and saved the life of the Sultan. In spite of the small band, the Ghorian army cut his way through the enemies and at length succeeded in reaching a place of safety in the fort of Andkhud,⁷ situated at a stone's throw from the field of battle.

1 BF., Vol. I, p. 181.

2 Tarikh-i-Jahan Kusha, Vol. II, p. 56.

3 BF, Vol I, p. 181.

4 Tarikh-i-Jahan Kusha, Vol. II, p. 56.

5 Ibid., p. 56; BF, Vol. I, p. 181.

6 TN, Vol. I, pp. 474-75.

7 TN, Vol. I, pp. 477-78; BF, Vol. I, p. 181.

Thereafter, the Qara Khitai Turks besieged the fort and began to mine the walls. But seeing the defeat and death impending upon him, Sultan Shahab-ud-din purchased his life on the payment of a large ransom.¹

Political disorder in the Ghorian Empire

Shahab-ud-din's crushing defeat at the hands of the Qara Khitai Turks at Andkhud made him unpopular and his reputation as a military general diminished considerably. His military reputation and prestige in India suffered a fatal blow. His defeat was responsible for a general revolt, confusion and disorder throughout his empire. Taking the advantage of the situation and of the rumour of the death of the Sultan Shahab-ud-din, one of his most trusted slave general Yalduz,² the governor of Ghazni, declared his independence. Many of the other trusted commanders also raised their heads and desired to adopt an independent attitude. But Kutb-ud-din, whose position was more sound than any of the slave commanders of the Sultan, was still loyal and helped greatly in suppressing the general uprising in Hindustan.

The problem of his Indian Possessions

The rumour of Sultan's death not only made Ghazni the centre of the revolt and desruption in the Ghorian Empire but it also marked the signal for a general rising among the turbulent tribes inhabiting the Western provinces of Shahab-ud-din's Indian Empire.

The problem of Multan

At the time the Sultan Shahab-ud-din and his small band were besieged in the fort of Andkhud by a huge army of the enemies, Aibak Bak,³ "one of the most confidential servants of the State" and "an officer of high rank in the army," fled from the field of battle under the impression that the Sultan had been

1 BF, Vol. I, p. 182.

2 For the detailed account of Yalduz (or Taj-ud-din Yalduz), see Aziz Ahmad: *Op. Cit.*, pp. 97-100.

3 This name is given according to Hasan Nizami, which is generally accepted, *TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 233.* But Briggs' *Firishta* wrongly calls him as 'Zeeruk', *BF, Vol. I, p. 182.*

killed. He hurriedly fled "with the speed of the wind" towards Hindustan, and reached Multan.¹ Immediately after his arrival at this place, he met Amir Dad Hasan, the governor of Multan, and deceitfully persuaded him to believe that he had come for the purpose of imparting to him a royal command, which could only be communicated to him in private and should not be publicly divulged.² Amir Dad Hasan was accordingly convinced and when a private meeting was arranged Aibak Bak took the opportunity of the helplessness of the governor, assassinated him and got the possession over the fort of Multan.³ For a long time, the people could not know the reasons for this sudden political change. As a matter of fact, Aibak Bak, spread the news that Amir Dad Hasan, the governor of the place, had been imprisoned by the royal commands. But the false news could not remain undisclosed for a long time and, ultimately, the fact was revealed before the officers, inhabitants, and throughout the country about the display of this disloyalty.⁴ Shahab-ud-din, after having purchased his life at Andkhud, retired towards Ghazni unmolested but there he was resisted by his slave Yalduz who opposed his entrance. This opposition obliged the king to continue his route to Multan. Here Aibak Bak, who had rebelled against the Sultan also resisted him, but Sultan Shahb-ud-din with the assistance of his many friends gave battle and obtained a complete victory and the traitor was taken to prisoner. But being surrounded by the hostile Hindus on the borders of India, did not take any action against them and returned back to Ghazni and occupied that place.⁵

The Rebellion of the Khokars⁶

The various uprisings in the different parts of Shahab-ud-din's empire had convinced the chief of the tribe of mountaineers

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 233.

2 TM, ED, Vol. II p. 233.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

5 BF, Vol. I, pp. 182-183.

6 Muslim historians also call them the Gakkhars. This tribe still lives in the East of the District. The race was quite a dominant one at the time of the

called Khokars and the tribes of the hills of Lahore and Jud hills that the Sultan was slain. According to them, such transactions could never have been made by Aibak Bak in the life time of the Sultan Shahab-ud-din. In consequence to these impressions, and by combining themselves, as well, the Hindus once again aspired for independence under the leadership of Khokar chiefs Bakan and Sarki, "who thrust their heads out of the collar of obedience", and emerged out as fighters for freedom. The cherished ambitions of the Hindus for their independence and dominion affected the heads of their leaders, who having collected a huge army, opened the plunder of cattle, and kindled the flames of turbulence between the rivers of Chinab and Jhelum.¹ When their ravages had exceeded all bounds, Bahau-d-din Muhammad, the governor of Sangwan,² on the borders of Multan, with his brother and many other chiefs set out to oppose them with the determination to repress the Hindu resistance. But the armies of Islam could not stand before the onslaughts of the Hindus who were anxious to regain their independence, and who captured many of the Muslims and killed them vehemently.³ The power and strength of the Hindus increased day by day and provided a fresh threatening to the Muslim dominion in India. Khokars who having defeated the Muslim army even overran Punjab and captured Lahore⁴ in 1203 A. D.⁵, and cut off the roads through which the

Muslim conquest, and had long succeeded in retaining their independence both in the Jhelum and in the neighbouring district of Rawalpindi, IG, Vol. XIV, p. 152.

- 1 TM, ED, Vol. I, p. 234. But, the same authority wrongly mentions the Waters of Sodra and "Jhelum". Infact, there is no such stream in the name of Sodra. The Sodra is the Chinab itself, so called from the old town of that name on its eastern bank. See ED, Vol. II, p. 234, footnote 1.
- 2 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 234. But it is most probably Sahwan situated on the river Indus near Manchhar Lake. See Muhammed Aziz Ahmed : Op. Cit., p. 144, footnote 4.
- 3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 234. Muhammed Aziz Ahmed gives the impression that many of the Hindus were captured and put to death, which is not correct. See, Op. Cit., p. 144.
- 4 BF, Vol. I, p. 183.
- 5 Sayed Muhammed Latif : Lahore : Its History, Architectural Remains and Antiquities, 1956-57, p. 13.

revenue could be sent to Ghazni.¹ But Sulaiman, another Muslim commander from the fury of the onslaughts of the Hindus, had already fled towards Ghazni to tell the tale of this Hindu resistance.

When these circumstances were reported to the Sultan Shahab-ud-din he determined to crush down this Hindu uprising. He himself prepared to proceed to the scene of action and sent in an advance one of his confidential servants Amir Hajib Siraj-ud-din Abu Bakr to inform Kutb-ud-din of his intentions against the Khokars.² Consequently, Sultan Shahab-ud-din marched from Ghazni in person on October 20, 1205 A. D.,³ at the head of the large army to annihilate the Khokars. Consequently, Kutb-ud-din, in the cold season of the same year⁴ marched from Delhi to assist his master in order to attack the Khokars from both the sides-East and West (Kutb-ud-din from the East and Sultan Shahab-ud-din from the West).

At every stage, Kutb-ud-din received the intelligence from the Sultan's camp to proceed and to halt but not to take any measures against the Khokars until he had passed the river Chinab which intervened between his and the royal camp. At this place Kutb-ud-din is said to have killed four fierce tigers and one day after crossing that river, he, ultimately, joined the Sultan's camp at the banks of Jhelum, where he was received with royal kindness.⁵ According to both Minhaj and Hasan Nizami, the royal camp was, further, strengthened by the joining of Shahab-ud-din. Iltutmish also came from Badaun with his troops to accompany the Sultan.⁶ At last writes Hasan Nizami "they mounted their horses and swam them like fish across the Jhelum, and on the bank of the river entered on their plans for the approaching action, and arranged all the preparations for

1 This event according to Syed Muhammed Latif took place in 1203 AD.

2 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 234.

3 Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, p. 27; Fhtuh-us-Salatin, p. 97.

4 Tabakat-i-Nasiri, p. 140.

5 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 234.

6 Tabakat-i-Nasiri, p. 169; and TM. (MSS), p. 493.

fight, after joining together in consultation."¹ Kutb-ud-din suggested on this occasion that the Sultan himself should not expose his person against such a hostile enemy and that the command of the Muslim army should be entrusted to him alone. But his suggestion seems to have had no effect upon the resolution of the Sultan. Soon a fierce battle ensued between the Khokars and the Muslims near the ford of the Jhelum, "the waves of which were filled with blood." The opposing armies "commingled together like waves of the sea, and contended with each other like night and day, or light and darkness."² The keenly contested battle, ultimately, decided the fate of the Khokars who were at last defeated and dispersed and the victorious army "made their blood to flow in streams."³ As a result of the war, the Khokars, who were keenly devoted to their freedom and religion, were completely routed and more than 200,000 Hindus were put to death.⁴ The Hindus whose lives were spared were induced to embrace Islam.⁵ The general massacre of the Hindus was so severe that Hasan Nizami writes that "in that country there remained not an inhabitant to light a fire."⁶ "Much spoils in slaves and weapons, beyond all enumeration, fell into the possession of the victors."⁷

The war of the Jhelum almost decided the issue, but during the course of war, one of the sons of the Khokar Rai, the chief instigator of these hostilities, rushed into river with "a detachment of his Satanical followers, and fled with one horse from the field of battle to a fort on the hill of Jud, and having escaped the sword, threw into it the last breathings of a dying man."⁸ The Sultan Shahab-ud-din did not want to leave a single revolutionary

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 234.

2 Ibid., p. 235.

3 TN, ED, Vol. II, p. 298.

4 Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, p. 28.

5 Sayed Muhammad Latif: Lahore, Op. Cit., p. 13.

6 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 235.

7 Ibid., p. 235.

8 TM, ED, Vol. II p. 235.

alive, and, therefore, he proceeded ahead towards the hill of Jud,¹ the very next day, after the initial success at Jhelum. The action was soon renewed which resulted into the capture of the fortress "and the Hindus like a torrent descended from the top of the hill to the bottom."² The Rai of the hill of Jud was captured but his life was spared. Here also an immense booty fell into the hands of the Sultan.³ The Sultan then, accompanied by Kutb-ud-din and the chief officers of the State proceeded towards Lahore and recovered it from the hands of the Hindus.⁴ After having recovered Lahore, Kutb-ud-din took permission from the Sultan to return to Delhi. And before Kutb-ud-din was allowed to return, the Sultan conferred upon him the title of Malik and made him heir-apparent of Hindustan,⁵ and then took an affectionate farewell.⁶

The Murder of the Sultan Shahab-ud-din

The Sultan had, no doubt, succeeded in suppressing various uprisings in India, but his last adventure to India proved quite costly in which he had to pay his own life. However, his arrangement in India failed to bring any permanent result. The revolutionaries were, undoubtedly, defeated in the open fight where they could not stand before the numerical strength of the Muslim army. But subsequently they began to plot by some indirect means to avenge the hostile attitude of the Sultan. And when the Sultan was returning from Lahore to Ghazni, he fixed his camp on 25th February 1206 A. D. "within the borders of Dhamek,⁷ and his tent was pitched on the bank of a pure stream

1 The neighbouring districts of Rawalpindi and the Jhelum were the homeland of the Khokars. The hill and fortress of Jud lay somewhere near Rawalpindi, which is enclosed by a long range of hills from all sides. But the exact location of the hill and the fortress are not traceable. See also Muhammad Aziz Ahmed, *Op. Cit.*, p. 145, footnote 4.

2 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 235.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 235.

4 BF, Vol. I, p. 183.

5 *Tarikh Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah*, p. 28.

6 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 235.

7 The place is differently called by our historians. The above name is according to Hasan Nizami, *ED*, Vol. II, p. 235; *The Futuh-us-Salatin*, p. 97, gives the name of the same place as Damyak. *Firishta*, however, gives the name of the village as Rohtuk, on the banks of the Indus, where the Sultan met his death, *BF*, Vol. I, p. 185.

in a garden filled with lilies, jasmins and other flowers",¹ a little West of the river Jhelum on the Indus.² Here, according to Hasan Nizami, when the Sultan was engaged in the evening prayer some infidels came running like wind towards him and killed three armed attendants and two chamber-sweepers on the spot. They then surrounded the Sultan's own tent and one or two men out of three or four revolutionaries, ran up towards the Sultan, and inflicted five or six desperate wounds upon him.³ The Sultan instantly died on the 3rd Shaban, 602 H., or March 15th 1206 A. D.⁴ But our authorities differ in describing the murder of the Sultan. According to Isami some fanatical Shiah of the heretical Ismail sect" attacked the Sultan, while he was engaged in the evening prayer and killed him.⁵ But, others distinctly write that they were the Khokars who murdered the Sultan.⁶ The *Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah*, another contemporary, work, however, does not give any account as to how the Sultan was murdered. *Firishta*, though a later account asserts on the point that 20 'Gukkurs' (Khokars), who had lost some of their relations in the later wars, entered into conspiracy against the king's life and sought an opportunity to carry their horrid purpose into effect. He further writes that "the weather being sultry, Mahomed had ordered the screens, which surrounded the royal tents in the form of a large square, to be struck, in order to give free admission to the air. This afforded the assassins an opportunity of seeing into the sleeping apartments. They found their way upto the tents in the night, and hide themselves, while one of them advanced to the tent-door, but being stopped by a sentry who was about to seize him, he plunged his dagger into his breast. The cries of the dying man aroused the guard, who running out to see what was

1 TM, ED, Vol. II, pp. 235-236.

2 The place where the Sultan was assassinated was according to Sayad Muhammad Latif, was situated on the banks of the Nilab, Lahore, Op. Cit., p. 13.

3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 236.

4 *Taju-l Maasir*, pp. 513. 516 and 520; *Minhaj*, p. 124.

5 *Futuh-us-Salatin*, p. 97.

6 *Guzida*, I, p. 412 *Juwaini*; I, p. 59; *Mirat-i-Jahan Nama*, 50 a; *TA*, Vol. I, p. 40 Latif calls him Ghakkars, perhaps a misreading for Khokars. *Lahore: Its History and Antiquities* p. 13; and, *History of the Punjab* (1964), p. 94.

the matter, the other assassins took that opportunity of cutting their way into the king's tent." The Sultan was at asleep, with two slaves fanning him. When the Sultan and his slaves saw the Khokars entering inside, they were petrified with terror. The Khokars, without any hesitation sheathed their daggers in the Sultan's body, "which was afterwards found to have been pierced by no fewer than 22 wounds."¹ Thus, the variation in the opinion put us in a great difficulty as to who murdered the Sultan. But both the sets of the historians have sufficient ground to ascribe the murder of the Sultan to the Ismaili heretic or the Khokars who were equally hostile to the Sultan.² According to Habibullah who on the evidence of Ibnul Asir suggests that probably, both of them participated in the crime.³ But the Khokars, a warlike tribe, who had heavily suffered at the hands of the Sultan in the previous war might have formed a conspiracy to take the life of the Sultan, and avenged their defeat thereof by killing him in cold blood.

Thus, ended the life of the great Sultan, who by that time had already ruled for 32 years⁴ since the commencement of his government over Ghazni, and then since his accession to the throne.⁵ His dead body was carried to Ghazni,⁶ where he was buried in the new vault which had been built for his daughter on 22 Shaban, 602 H (April 3, 1206 A. D.).⁷

1 BF, Vol. I, pp. 185-186. See also Ibid, p. 193.

2 Ibnul Asir, XII, p. 99, says that when the assassins were secured two among them were found to be Muslims (circumcised); and this could simply suggest that among them were others, who were not Muslims.

3 Habibullah: Op. Cit., p. 78.

4 BF, Vol. I, p. 186.

5 BF, Vol. I, p. 186.

6 Ibid, p. 187.

7 TM (MSS); pp. 536 and 520; BF, Vol. I, p. 186.

CHAPTER XIII

KUTB-UD-DIN AIBAK AS SOVEREIGN

His Difficulties

The sudden assassination of Sultan Sahab-ud-din at the bank of the Sindh in 1206 A. D., placed Kutb-ud-din and his officers in India in a difficult situation. The death of his master, no doubt, provided an opportunity for Kutub-ud-din to assume an independent sovereignty in India, but the time was hard and tough for him. The early conquests of the Sultan and his lieutenant Kutb-ud-din in India, as described in the previous chapters, had only initiated a process whose completion still required sustained military action which seemed foredoomed by the implication of this sudden death. Kutb-ud-din, who was himself still a slave and merely Sultan's representative in Delhi, found himself in quite a vague and confused situation, surrounded by the Hindu revolutionaries all along the Turkish kingdom. The condition of the Ghorian empire in the Central Asia was even more worse. The problem of succession and the regular threatening menace of the Khwarazm Shah added fresh problems to Kutb-ud-din's difficulties.¹

The Problem of Succession

First of all the sudden death of Sultan Shahab-ud-din brought the whole of the Ghorian empire into a state of disorder and soon a contest arose among the contestants for the throne. The Sultan had no son to succeed him after his death and this gave the rival parties full opportunity for hatching a conspiracy and intrigue for the acquisition of the throne. Consequently, in the absence of the legal heir-apparent of the deceased Sultan, the courtiers openly divided themselves into two rival groups. Ghiyas-ud-din Mahmud, the son of the late king Ghiyas-ud-din Mohammad,

¹ For Kutb-ud-din's difficulties see also K. A. Nizami's *A Comprehensive History of India*, Vol. Five. The Delhi Sultanate, pp. 201. ff

the elder brother of Shahab-ud-din, became the hot favourite of the vazir and the officers of the Turki mercenaries for the succession of the throne of Ghor, after the death of his uncle.¹ But this claim was challenged by Baha-ud-din, a cousin of the late Sultan and the governor of Bamyan, who was strongly supported by the chiefs of Ghor.² This rivalry for the claim of the throne was sure to give rise to a serious conflict. The future of Kutb-ud-din was, more or less, dependent upon the fate of the Ghorian empire. But fortunately for Kutb-ud-din, the supporters of Ghiyas-ud-din Mahmud succeeded in placing him at the throne as the successor of the Sultan Shahab-ud-din, who, like his uncle, gave many favours to Kutb-ud-din Aibak.³

The Khwarazmian Menace

The Khwarazmian house served as the greatest danger to the rise and the expansion of the Ghorian empire. The Ghorian prince, taking the advantage of the civil war,⁴ annexed Khurasan and captured its important places like Nishapur, Tus, and Meru between 1200 A. D. to 1201 A. D. But this success of the Ghorians proved short-lived and they were soon paid back in their own coin. The new Khwarazmian ruler Ala-ud-din, who succeeded Takash, was an ambitious and energetic king and proved himself matchless for the Ghorian power. He even aspired to bring back his lost territories and recovered Nishapur and other places from the hands of the Ghorian princes. His exploits even reached the heart of Herat which was also captured and occupied by him in the year 1201 A. D. This hostility between the two sovereigns continued even after the death of Ghiyas-ud-din Mohammad who was succeeded to the throne of Ghor by his younger brother Shahab-ud-din in the year 1202 A. D. But Shahab-ud-din's crushing defeat at their hands in 1205 A. D. at Andkhud, placed them in on the upper hand and the military reputation of Sultan Shahab-ud-din and the Ghorian power received a fatal blow.

1 BF, Vol. 1, p. 186.

2 Ibid. p. 186.

3 Ibid, p. 198.

4 After the death of Khwarazmian Takash in 1200 A. D., there ensued a civil war.

The Sultan was himself forced to purchase his life after the payment of heavy ransom and then returned towards his own kingdom with shame and defeat.

Kutb-ud-din's accession

And soon after his accession Ghiyasuddin Mahuud sent all the insignia of royalty—a throne, a canopy, standards, and the title of Sultan to Kutb-ud-din Aibak¹ in 602 H (1206-5 A. D.). Kutb-ud-din Aibak in order to receive these marks marched in Hijri 602 (1206 A. D.) from Delhi to Lahore². The army of Islam suffered heavy loss in the way on account of excessive heat, but they ultimately reached Lahore on Tuesday, Zikat 11, 602 Hijri (June 19, 1206 A. D.)³. Kutb-ud-din Aibak and his army was warmly received there by all the nobles, officers, learned and pious men, scholars, saints, sufis, Imams, Sayyads and all the notable persons of Lahore⁴. After a few days, Kutb-ud-din Aibak ascended the throne at Lahore on Tuesday, 17th of the month of Zikat 602 Hijri (Tuesday, June 26, 1206 A. D.)⁵. After great rejoicing, he returned therefrom in a few days to Delhi⁶.

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 525. Rizvi: *Adi Turk Kalin Bharat* p. 8; BF, Vol. I, p. 198: Dr. Nigam is incorrect when he on the authority of *Minhaj-us-Siraj* writes that on this occasion Sultan Ghiyasuddin Mahmud granted to Kutb-ud-din Aibak a chatra and raised him to the rank of Malik and conferred upon him the territories of India. Nobility under the Sultans of Delhi, p. 22.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 525: *Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah*, Rizvi: *Adi Turk Kalin Bharat*, p. 250. But according to Major Raverty on this occasion Kutb-ud-din Aibak did not determine to go to Lahore, because Lahore was not the capital. He thinks that the correct reading refers not to his going to the city of Lahore, but into the territory of Lahore to join his master the Sultan against the Khokhars. After there, overthrew, the Sultan came to Lahore, accompanied by Kutb-ud-din Aibak; and subsequently, after Sultan's assassination, the latter assumed sovereignty there. TN, Vol. I, footnote 7 on p. 525. But this supposition does not seem to be correct as *Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah* who was the contemporary and intimately known to Kutb-ud-din Aibak clearly states that when the news of the assassination of Sultan Shahab-ud-din reached Delhi Kutb-ud-din Aibak was not there and had gone to some other direction. Rizvi: *Adi Turk Kalin Bharat*, p. 250.

3 *Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah* Rizvi: *Adi Turk Kalin Bharat*, p. 250: According to Yahya Sirhindi Kutb-ud-din set out from Delhi, and came to the auspicious city, of Lahore. On Tuesday, the 18th Zikat (June 26, 1206 A. D.) of the same year, he took his seat on the throne at Lahore, and conferred valuable gifts, largesses, and robes of honour upon his amirs and the maliks. To such an extent did he extend his hand of liberality that people called him Sultan Kutb-ud-din Lakh-bakhs. *Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shah*, KK, Basu, p. 15.

4 *Ibid.*

5 TN, Vol. I, p. 525-6: Rizvi: *Adi Turk Kalin Bharat*, p. 8; TM, FD, Vol. II, p. 236.

6 BF, Vol. I, p. 198.

Sultan Shahab-ud-din's murder in 1206 A. D., however, gave a fresh vigour and energy to Khwarazm Shah who now designed to extend his territory beyond the Hindu-Kush regions. The annexation of the Ghorik-kingdom was, however, a ripe opportunity to the aggressive policy of Khwarazm Shah. The feeble and weak successor Ghiyas-ud-din Mahmud was incapable of properly holding the situation under control. His disposition to conviviality, pleasure and jollity was pre-eminent. The new Sultan had no ambition and was satisfied with his ancestor's principality and took no interest in meeting the imminent danger. The increasing power of Khwarazm Shah and his new schemes of conquests were the source of a menacing danger not only to the Ghorian empire in the Central Asia, but also to its Indian possessions. Kutb-ud-din Aibak, whose power in India was not yet firmly established, had to face the precarious and difficult situation of the annihilation of the Ghorian powers from the Central Asia almost single-handed.

Thus, Khwarazm Shah having swallowed up the whole of Iran and Central Asia, now cast his greedy eyes upon Ghazni. To make the matter worse, as respects Kutb-ud-din's infant Turkish empire of India, Yalduz not only possessed the capital of Shahab-ud-din's vast empire but also claimed the whole of his master's dominion including Delhi. It was, certainly, a hard time for Kutb-ud-din and unless resisted successfully, this claim would mean not only a loss of Delhi's sovereignty but also an extension of Khwarazm Shah's ambitious designs in India. At such a critical time Aibak very wisely continued his residence at Lahore in order to keep himself ready to meet any military threat from without.

Nasir-ud-din Qubacha

Nasir-ud-din Qubacha, who held, the Indus and its nearby places, was an ambitious man but no immediate challenge was expected from his side for the supremacy of power in India. In fact, there had always continued a good relation between Kutb-ud-din Aibak and Nasir-ud-din Qubacha¹. To maintain his position in India

¹ Kubacha was Kutb-ud-din's son-in-law.

and to keep his empire in tact, he ably established matrimonial relation with Qubacha. And as Minhaj-us-Siraj writes Kutb-ud-din Aibak gave his two daughters one after the other in marriage to Qubacha,² and as a mark of good relations Qubacha, on several occasions' visited Delhi to pay his' homage to Kutb-ud-din Aibak.³

Relation with Yalduz

Besides various problems, Kutb-ud-din had also to face some enternal ones that were created by other slave commanders of the late Sultan Shahab-ud-din. There were at least four such slave commanders, who rose to high command, including Kutb-ud-din Aibak himself. Besides Kutb-ud-din, they were Malik Baha-ud-din Tughril³ (1195-1200 A.D.) Nasir-ud-din Qubacha⁴ (1206-1228 A. D.), and Taj-ud-din Yalduz⁵ (1207-1216 A. D.), But fortunately, Malik Baha-ud-din Tughril suddenly died in 1200 A. D. after measuring a brief hostility against Kutb-ud-din Aibak.⁶ Nasir-ud-din Qubacha, who had married the two elder daughters of Kutb-ud-din,⁷ however, always remained on good terms with him. But there appeared a more terrific threat from the side of Yalduz with whom Kutb-ud-din Aibak had to deal with directly.

The assassination of Shab-ud-din made no change in Kutb-ud-din's position in India. He received more favours from the new Sultan, Ghiyas-ud-din Mahmud. And a little after three months from the time of Shahab-ud-din's death Kutb-ud-din

1 TN, Vol. I, pp. 529-30, 532

2 ETED, p. 101

3 For the detailed account see TN, Vol. I, pp. 544-547; BF, Vol. I, p. 202; and ETED, pp. 103-106.

4 For the detailed account see TN, Vol. I, pp. 531-544; ETED, pp. 100-103.

5 For the detailed account see TN, Vol. I, pp. 493-506; BF, Vol. I, pp. 199-201; and ETED, pp. 97-100.

6 For the conflict between Kutb-ud-din Aibak and Malik Baha-ud-din Tughril see ETED, pp. 105-106.

7 TN, Vol. I, pp. 529-530, 532. But Firishta slightly differs from Minhaj-us-Siraj and writes that Kutb-ud-din Aibak had three daughters, the eldest of whom was married to Nasir-ud-din Qubacha, the second to Shams-ud-din Iltutmish, and upon the death of the eldest, Qubacha was allowed to marry her sister, the youngest daughter, BF, Voi. I, p. 206.

Aibak assumed the sovereign status. The duration of three months time appears to have been occupied by manoeuvrings to build up a strong party of supporters.¹

But Yalduz, the governor of Ghazni² who had previously given his daughter in marriage to Kutb-ud-din, could not tolerate the royal favours bestowed upon his son-in-law and was, therefore, the first among the slave commanders of Shahab-ud-din to have raised his head against him. Not being satisfied with this petty principality of Ghazni, Yalduz aspired to wrest away Lahore and the Panjab from the hands of Kutb-ud-din. With this intention Taj-ud-din Yalduz collected a huge army and marched from Ghazni to capture Lahore. He, however, effected the place by the treachery of the governor, whom he afterwards expelled³ and occupied Lahore and the Panjab. It was sure to create hostility between him and the Sultan Kutb-ud-din. And when the Sultan heard of this event he disputed his right and proceeded towards Lahore from Delhi to punish his father-in-law. The decisive battle took place in the year 1206 A. D.⁴ in which Yalduz was finally defeated and he fled from the field of battle towards Kirman and Shivuran.⁵ Kutb-ud-din did not want to leave Yalduz⁶ uncrushed and pursued him as far as Ghazni which he occupied and ascended to the throne there and, thus, took that kingdom also into his own hands⁷. But Kutb-ud-din soon became unpopular in Ghazni owing to

1 Habibullah : Op. Cit., pp. 88-89; Dr. A. L. Srivastava: The Sultan ate of Delhi, p. 121.

2 Tabakat-i-Nasiri, p. 133. Yalduz twice occupied Ghazni before he was dethroned by Kutb-ud-din in the year 1206 A. D. But he regained it for the third time after the gap of forty days and held it till the year 1215 A. D., when his power was finally supplanted by the Khwarazm Shah. See for its detailed account, Muhammad Aziz Ahmad: Op. Cit., pp. 97-100.

3 BF, Vol. I, p. 198.

4 Futuh-us-Salatin, p. 100.

5 BF, Vol. I, p. 198.

6 Dr. Nigam wrongly thinks that the conflict between Kutb-ud-din Aibak and Yalduz was not on account of the sovereignty of Hindustan but it was only a boundary dispute.

S. B. P. Nigam : Nobility under the Sultan of Delhi, p. 22.

7 BF, Vol. I, p. 193.

his wedding himself to wine and other pleasures of life.¹ the affairs of the government fell into disorder. Consequently, the citizens of Ghazni and the Turkish Amirs, who were greatly disgusted with this conduct, secretly informed Yalduz of the Sultan's negligence, and invited him to avail himself of the opportunity. Yalduz, who was already waiting for an opportunity, secretly raised his troops and advanced towards Ghazni. When he appeared in the neighbourhood of Ghazni, Sultan Kutb-ud-din was surprised at this action because he had no intelligence of Yalduz's hostile designs. Now, it was too late to take any action for defence. So Sultan Kutb-ud-din was terrified at the approach of Yalduz and he fled from Ghazni towards Lahore by way of Sang-i-Surkh² only after a short rule of 40 days there.³

Kutb-ud-din's failure as an administrator at Ghazni served as a great lesson to him and he "now became sensible of his folly, and repented." Coming back to Lahore, Kutb-ud-din finally decided to settle himself at Lahore, and made it the second capital of the Muslim India.⁴ "After which", writes Firishta, "he continued to exercise justice, temperance, and morality; and his kingdom was governed by the best laws till his death."⁵

The entire country of Hindustan right from Peshawar to the shores of the ocean and in other direction from Swistan to the borders of the hills of Tibet, came under the supreme domination of Kutb-ud-din.⁶

The Hindu resistance

Kutb-ud-din, who had to face many difficult problems after

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 503; BF, Vol. I, p. 199.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 503; BF, Vol. I, p. 199.

3 TN, Vol. I, pp. 503, 527. According to *Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi* Kutb-ud-din ruled at Ghazni for only four days. English Translation by K. K. Basu, p. 15. Read also K. A. Nizami: *A Comprehensive History of India*, Vol. V, 'The Delhi Sultanate, p. 202; Dr. A. L. Srivastava: *The Sultanate of Delhi*, p. 123.

4 TM, (MSS), p. 532.

5 It is wrong to assume that Kutb-ud-din made Lahore his capital as indicated by Firishta. BF, Vol. I, p. 199.

6 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 236.

the sudden death of his master Shahab-ud-din, found himself exclusively preoccupied in dealing with them. Among the many of the so-called menacing problems before Kutb-ud-din, there was a most serious and threatening one which came from the side of the Hindus in Hindustan who, finding the Ghorian empire in complete disruption, had again aspired to win freedom. The military power of the Hindus, which was not annihilated but merely scotched and stunned by the rapidity of the Muslim conquest, now showed every sign of recovery and even of offensive action. The Hindus, who were keenly devoted to the safety of their culture, religion and freedom, resolved again to expel the Muslims from the country. The Hindu's resistance and their all out struggle against the world's greatest power at the time occupied an unique place in the pages of history.

Parmardi, the powerful Chandela ruler of Kalinjar had been defeated by Kutb-ud-din and his kingdom was annexed to the Muslim empire in 1202 A. D. But the Chandela power was not entirely extinguished and its new ruler Trailokyavarman, who shifted his capital from Kalinjar to Ajayagadh, infused a fresh lease of life into the dying moment. And by the year 1206 A. D., he quickly recovered Kalinjar from the hands of the Muslims and found himself justified to use the family's favourite title 'Kalanjaradhipati.' This achievement of the Chandela ruler and his recapture of the fortress from the hands of the Muslims has been clearly shown by the Garra Plates of Trailokyavarman¹ and by the Ajayagadh Inscription of Viravarman² as well.

In expelling the Muslims from Kalinjar, many of the officers of Trailokayavarman seem to have been killed on this occasion whose families were granted land for their livelihood.³ After this momentous victory, Trailokyavarman proceeded along the south-eastern side to the North Baghelkhand and extended his power upto the coast of the Kalachuris.⁴ It is, therefore, clear that

1 EI, XVI, p. 272-77.

2 Ibid, Vol. 1, p. 327-329, V. 7.

3 EI, XVI, p. 275-276.

4 ERK, p. 130.

Trailokyavarman, who came to the throne at a very critical moment when the fortune of the State had trickled fast into darkness, not only managed to recapture the fortress of Kalinjar from the Muslims, but even attempted effectively to stem their further expansion in the South.

In addition to the Chandelas, many other Hindu chiefs who occupied the portions in the Gangetic plain still held them out. An inscription of date V. S. 1279 (1223 A. D.) discovered in Mirzapur refers to the destruction of the "Javanas"¹ at the hands of one of such chiefs Maharataka Pratapadhavala of Japila. This probably refers to the Hindu uprising in that region which also endangered the Muslim kingdom under Kutb-ud-din in India.

The Gahadavala's power was already shattered in the fight with the Muslims in 1193 A. D., near Chandawar and the defeat and the death of their leader Jayachandra in the same year had laid prostrate the Gahadavala kingdom at the feet of the Muslims. But the Gahadavala power does not seem to have been completely destroyed by the Muslims. For, we correctly know that Harishchandra, the son and successor of the deceased Jayachandra, assumed full sovereign titles on V. S. 1253, or Sunday, the 6th January, 1197 A.D. at the age of only 19 years.² According to Dr. Tripathi, it is unthinkable that this boy-king could have maintained his independence even with a circumscribed area, when many a war-worn veteran had fallen and the Muslim army had reduced the kingdom as far as Benares.³ Upholding the same opinion Miss Niyogi writes that it is difficult to imagine how this boy-king sustained his position in the face of Muslim aggrandisement.⁴ It has been, therefore, suggested that Harishchandra was allowed by Sultan Muizzuddin to remain as a feudatory ruler.⁵ Thus, having suffered disastrous defeat at the hands of the Muslims in 1193 A. D., the Gahadavala did not possess the power

1 EI, Vol. IV, pp. 310-312.

2 HOK, pp. 333-334; The History of the Gahadavala Dynasty, p. 113.

3 HOK, p. 334.

4 The History of the Gahadavala Dynasty, p. 113.

5 Ibid, pp. 113-114; HOK, pp. 334-335.

which they once enjoyed. But their ambition to bring back the lost glory of the house was never uprooted from their hearts. Harischandra the boy-king of the Gahadavala Dynasty, however, found means to establish himself in the districts of Farrukhabad and Badaun.¹ The Macchlishahr grant and the Belkhara inscription show that Harischandra's authority was respected at least from Jaunpur to Mirzapur, probably on both the sides of the Ganga. Varanasi also may have been included in his dominion.² Probably Harishchandra, taking the advantage of the various troubles in the Ghori empire, managed to establish his power in the East as an independent ruler and resolved to expel the Muslims from his dominion. That Benares remained in the hands of the Hindus is confirmed by the statement of Minhaj-us-Siraj, the author of the *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, who included Benares among the early conquests of Iltutmish.³ It shows that either the Muslims had failed to occupy Benares completely in their earlier campaigns or they were soon repulsed by the Hindus from there. And probably it was to avenge the defeat of the Muslims sustained earlier that Iltutmish had to launch another successful invasion on Benares sometime after Kutb-ud-din's death.

Similarly, the Pariharas also seemed to have regained their initiative and recaptured Gwalior from the hands of the Muslims. The local authorities at least give detailed account about the continuous Pariharas rule up to 1231 A. D.⁴ Unfortunately, we do not find any coin or inscription in support of the early rule of the Pariharas over Gwalior after the overthrow of the Muslim's rule from there. But at least we find some later coins and inscriptions of a prince named Malayavarmadeva, who belonged to the same family in Narwar, Gwalior and Jhansi, which evidently proved an independent authority of the Parihara Prince over Gwalior from 1220 A.D. to 1233 A. D.⁵ It is, however, more

1 Rev.: History of the Rathors (Silver Jubilee Volume III).

2 The History of the Gahadavala Dynasty, p. 116.

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 627.

4 Gwalior Namah, footnote 10; Cunningham Reports, II, pp. 378-381.

5 Cunningham Reports, II, p. 315, 378-381; Coins of Medieval India, pp. 80-90; Ojha: Rajputana, I, p. 166; I. A., 1918, p. 241.

probable that sometime after the death of Sultan Shahab-ud-din, when Kutb-ud-din was busy in dealing with the problems of the west, the Pariharas of Gwalior could have found means to regain their independence. It was due to it being occupied by Hindus Iltutmish had to conquer Gwalior several years after when he besieged and ultimately captured it in 629 H. (C. 1231-2 A. D.) from the hands of the Parihara ruler, Malayavarmadeva¹ and appointed lieutenant named Rashid-ud-din there.² The Hindu feudatory of Ranthambhor, originally placed under the suzerainty of late Prithviraja's son, ceased to own vassalage. The recovery of Ranthambhor's independence under Govindraja³ is to be found in the fragmentary Rajput ballad, Hammiramahakavya.⁴

The Khalji Rebellion In Bengal

In the far East, Bakhtiyar Khalji, the conqueror of Bengal received the terrible disaster at the hands of the Hindus and within a couple of years of its conquests he received such a deadly blow that he could not recover from the shocks and fell ill. Malik Alauddin Ali Murdan Khalji⁵ an ambitious Khalji commander and the feudatory of Narankui, managed to assassinate Bakhtiyar about the same time when Sultan Shahab-ud-din was

1 Minhaj calls him Mangal Deo. TN, Vol. I, p. 619.

2 Cf. Gwalior Namah, f. 11.

3 The Hammiramahakavya describes him (Govindaraja) as Prithviraja's grand son (IV 28-31). But it has been suggested that "if Prithviraja III was born in V. 1223 or so and died in V. 1248, it would be difficult to think of a son capable enough to carry on the work of government in V. 1251. By then he could at the most have been 10 to 11 years old." Rajasthan Through the Ages, P. 615 footnote 1.

4 IA, 1879, p. 69. See also for a reference to Ranthambhor's suzerainty over Jaitra Singh of Manglana in IA, VI, p. 86. But on the evidence of Manglana Stone Inscription Dr. Dashratha Sharma asserts that Valhana who succeeded his father Govindaraja at Ranthambhor, continued to recognise the supremacy of the Delhi Sultanate like his father, Op. Cit., p. 102; Rajasthan Through the Ages, p. 615. We are further told that Iltutmish had to launch an expedition in getting back Ranthambhore during the reign of its ruler Viranarayana. And having failed to capture the fort of Ranthambhor by force, Iltutmish next tried diplomacy, Hammira mahakavya, IV, 41-75. And according to Minhaj Ranthambhor was captured in 623 H. (1226 A.D.) by Iltutmish TN, Vol. I, pp. 610-11. It makes clear that Ranthambhore had earlier slipped away from the hands of the Muslims either during the reign of Kutb-ud-din or immediately after his death during short and feeble rule of his son Aram Shah.

5 For his detailed account see TN, Vol. I, pp. 576-80; ETED, pp. 117-120.

himself murdered. The position of the newly conquered region became even worse due to the murder of the Khalji general.

It is related that there were two brothers: Muhammad Shiran¹, and Ahmad-i-Shiran in the service of Bakhtiyar Khalji. When Bakhtiyar started for his campaign in Kamrup and Tibet, he sent Muhammad Siran and his brother Ahmad with a small detachment of his troops to Lakhnauti and Jajnagar in the year 1205 A.D. When the news of the defeat and death of Bakhtiyar reached them, they hurriedly returned from their stations and came dutifully to Devkot and performed the mourning ceremonies. Thereafter, Muhammad Shiran proceeded towards Narankui, the fief of Ali Mardan, and siezed him in punishment of the crime he had committed and put him in prison under the charge of the Kotwal of the place named Baba Kotwal Isfahani. He then returned to Devkot, collected all the nobles and held an assembly. All the nobles paid their allegiance to him as the head of Khalji Amirs, but each one of them continued to rule over the districts in their possession respectively, Muhammad Shiran was very active, energetic, and was a man of exemplary conduct and qualities.²

Ali Mardan, who was very resolute, bold and fearless, contrived to ingratiate himself with the Kotwal, and escaping from prison, he went to the court of Delhi. Since Sultan Shahab-ud-din had died, Khaljis no longer remained his slaves or heirs to his empire. More or less, his successor Sultan Kutb-ud-din in Hindustan was not entitled to Behar. However, Ali Mardan persuaded Aibak to intervene in the Lakhnauti affairs. Upon his representations, Sultan Kutb-ud-din sent Qaimaz Rumi, the governor of Oudh, towards the territory of Lakhnauti with the royal com-

1 For his detailed account see TN, Vol. I, pp. 573-76 ; ETED, pp. 117-120.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 574. It is related that when Bakhtiyar sacked the city of Nadiya and defeated the Rai Lakshmansena, the soldiers, followers and elephants of the Rai were dispersed, and the Muhammedans pursued and plundered them. Muhammad Shiran was three days absent from the camp, on this pursuit so that all the officers began to be apprehensive about him. After the third day news was brought that Muhammad Shiran had captured eighteen or more elephants in a certain jungle, with their drivers, and alone by himself he was keeping them there. Horsemen were sent out to his assistance and all the elephants were brought in. TN, Vol. I, p. 574; TA, p. 51.

mands to locate Khalji chief at some suitable fiefs. In execution of the royal orders when Qaimaz Rumi was marching ahead, Hisamu-d-din Auz Khalji, who had been the feudatory of Kankuri¹ during the time of Bakhtiyar Khalji, received him with great honour and then both of them went to Devkot. There Qaimaz Rumi transferred the fief of Devkot to him (Hisamu-d din Iwaz Khalji) and then returned. but this transfer of the fief was not acceptable to Muhammad Shiran and other Khalji chiefs, who having assembled together determined to attack Devkot. Consequently Qaimaz Rumi who was on his way to Oudh, returned from the middle of the journey and broke into pieces the confederacy of the Khalji Amirs by inflicting a crushing defeat upon them. Subsequently, quarrels broke out between the Khalji Amirs themselves and in the fight that ensued Muhammad Shiran was slain² in the vicinity of Maksidah and Santus.³ But Ali Mardan who was at this time at Lahore, eventually persuaded Aibak to appoint him as the governor of Lukhnauti. Ali Mardan, who was the favourite of Kutb-ud-din, was immediately made the governor of Lakhnauti. When he crossed the Kosi river in order to assume his new office, he was received by Hisamu-d-din Iwaj who had come from Devkot. When Ali Mardan entered Devkot, he assumed the reins of the government and brought all the territories under his rule. But soon he commenced a reign of terror and when Sultan Kutb-ud-din died, he assumed royal state, and ordered his name to be read in the Khutba under the title of Sultan Alauddin.⁴

Such was the state of affairs at the time when Sultan Shahab-ud-din had died, whereupon Kutb-ud-din found himself surrounded by the hostile enemies which demanded a quick and unified action for the emergence of the newly established Turkish kingdom in Hindustan. Indeed, it is misfortune for the Hindus who did not seriously avail the golden opportunity, which the time

1 Muhammad Aziz Ahmad : Op. Cit., p. 118 and footnote 3.

2 According to the Raudat-us Safa, Vol. IV, p. 889, Muhammad Shiran was killed in the engagement against Hindu ruler, which is not correct.

3 Muhammad Aziz Ahmad: Op. Cit., p. 119, and footnote 1.

4 TN, Vol. I, p. 578.

had afforded them. Their long cherishing ambition to regain their freedom and to expel the Muslim intruders from the country would have been fulfilled had they fought jointly on this occasion. Kutb-ud-din was certainly not in a position to deal with them alone without any assistance from Ghazni. Sultan Mahmud, the nephew and successor of the late Shahab-ud-din was himself a weak and unambitious ruler of Ghor and many of his feudatories slipped out of his hands. But the pleasure-loving Sultan had little to do with them. Under the circumstances, he was never expected to give any military aid to Kutb-ud-din at the time of crisis. Ghazni too from where Shahab-ud-din used to support Kutb-ud-din had now passed into the hands of Yalduz. And as we know, the hostility between him and Kutb-ud-din increased day by day and there was not the least probability for Kutb-ud-din to get any help from that direction. The opportunity, therefore, for the Hindus was well in time and if they had jointly fought, Kutb-ud-din could have never got success in suppressing them. But probably, not because of want of any chivalry on the part of the Hindus but because of the non-availability of a good leader, the Hindus miserably failed to avail this golden opportunity.

CHAPTER XIV

END OF THE HOUSE

His last days and death

The assassination and death of Sultan Shahab-ud-din had already placed his newly established Indian kingdom into a difficult situation which his slave commander Kutb-ud-din had to deal with all alone. His Indian kingdom was soon surrounded by black clouds of misfortune, the details of which have already been narrated in the preceding chapter. Since the situation in the North-West had been rapidly changing, Kutb-ud-din, who soon realised the gravity of the situation, mostly lived at Lahore in order to keep himself ready to face the situation. He, for the time being, left the idea of extending his authority over the outlying areas which could receive only his passing attention. Kutb-ud-din, preoccupied in his foreign and external affairs realised soon to preserve Delhi's separate entity and of establishing a strong political frontier. He, therefore, took up this task and began to work according to his schemes in order to save his Indian kingdom from any foreign molestation. But unfortunately, the task was still unaccomplished when he suddenly fell from his horse at Lahore while playing the game of Chaghan (A game like modern Polo) in such a way that the pommel of the saddle entered his chest and Sultan died at the spot in the year 607 H. (1210 A. D.)¹ Sultan Kutb-ud-din's period of government, from the first conquest of Delhi upto this time, was twenty years, and the time of his reign, during which he wore the crown and had the Khutba read and coin struck in his name was little more than four years.² He was finally buried at Lahore³ on

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 528; TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 237; BF, Vol. I, p. 119. *Mirāt-i-Jahan Nama*, footnote 53, places death of Kutb-ud-din 609 H. (1212 A.D.). But this is not correct as the latest available inscription of Kutb-ud-din is also dated Ramzan, 607 H. (1210 A. D.), which lay support to the fact that he died in 1210 A. D.

2 TN Vol. I, p. 528, BF, Vol. I, p. 200, *Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi English Translation* by K. K. Basu, p. 16.

3 TM, ED, Vol. II, p. 237.

November 4, 1210 A. D.¹ And sometime afterwards Sultan Iltutmish constructed a mausoleum for him.²

Aram Shah

The sudden death of Kutb-ud-din Aibak at Lahore in the midst of the threatening dangers from all sides, placed the infant Turkish kingdom in India in even worse condition. The difficult task which the late Sultan had taken up was still unaccomplished when he met his doom early in the year 1210 A. D., leaving his Indian kingdom in a confused order. Consequently, as the Muslim kingdom of India could not remain without a chief, the officers of Lahore raised Aram Shah to the throne of Delhi and treated him as the successor of the late Sultan Kutb-ud-din Aibak in India.

With the accession of Aram Shah to the throne the first question arises as to who he was? This question requires a special treatment more so because our historians are diagonally opposed in identifying Aram Shah's descent. To start with, we find four clear-cut versions about his indentification. The first set of historians say that Aram Shah was the son and successor of Kutb-ud-din Aibak. The second group mentions that he was the brother of Kutb-ud-din Aibak. According to the third version he was none but an adopted son of the late Sultan. And lastly, some scholars assert that Aram Shah was not even a relative of Kutb-ud-din Aibak, but was elevated to the throne at Lahore and was presented as a son to be an heir to rule as a puppet in the hands of some ambitious nobles.

Now let us examine the above versions one by one separately. In the chapter on Aram Shah in *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, Minhaj-us Siraj mentions Sultan Aram Shah as "son of Sultan Kutb-ud-din Aibak."³ But further, just after a few lines, he himself writes that Kutb-ud-din had three daughters of whom two, one after the death of the other, were wedded to Malik Nasir-ud-din Qubacha,

1 This date is according to Muhammad Aziz Ahmad : Op. Cit., p. 147.

2 *Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi*, English Translation by K. K. Basu, p. 16.

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 528.

and the third was married to Iltutmish.¹ This, therefore, makes no reference to Aram Shah. It appears that though Minhaj, who was a contemporary historian, was himself not very much certain about the identity of Aram Shah. But the view that Aram was the son of Kutb-ud-din has been further supported by many other works like *Lubb-ut Tawarikh*,² *Tabakat-i-Akbari*,³ and *Tarikh-i-Firishta*⁴ respectively. The *Intikhab-ul-Muntakhab* written by Abd-ul-Shakur shows that Aram Shah, after his father's death ascended the throne.⁵ The author of the *Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi* also writes of him as the son of Kutb-ud-din Aibak.⁶ Similarly, according to *Tarikh-i-Ghuri*, Aram Shah was the eldest son of Kutb-ud-din Aibak.⁷ However, *Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh* and *Chahar Gulshan* both assert that he was the so-called son of Kutb-ud-din Aibak.⁸ Some of the modern scholars like Dr. A.B.M. Habibullah,⁹ Dr. A. L. Srivastava¹⁰ and others also accept Aram Shah to be the son of the late Sultan Kutb-ud-din Aibak.¹¹

The second view is held by Abul Fazl who very surprisingly mentions Aram Shah as the brother of Kub-tud-din Aibak.¹² Abul

- 1 Ibid., pp. 529-530.
- 2 *Lubb-ut-Tawarikh* by Rae Bind Rae MS-Abd-us-Salam Collection 316, 86, p. 9.
- 3 *Tabakat-i-Akbari* of Nizam-ud-din Ahmad (Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow) p. 55. According to the same authority "he had no other son", English translation by B. De, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1927, p. 60.
- 4 Briggs *Firishta*, Vol. I, p. 203.
- 5 *Intikhab-ul-Muntakhab* of Abd-ul-Shakur MS-Abd-us-Salam Collection 87/317, p. 170.
- 6 *Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi* of Yahya bin Abd-ullah Sirhindi. English Translation by K. K. Basu, p. 16.
- 7 *Tarikh-i-Ghuri*; Abd-us-Salam Collection, Aligarh 11/145, p. 13.
- 8 *Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh* of Sujian Rai (or Sujan Singh), edited by K. B. Zafar Hasan, Delhi, 1918, p. 18 and *Chahar Gulshan* by Chander Bhan, MS-Abd-us-Salam Collection, 62/292.
- 9 A. B. M. Habibullah : *The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India*, 1961, pp. 91-92.
- 10 Dr. A. L. Srivastava : *The Sultanate of Delhi*, p. 125.
- 11 Lane Poole : *Mediaeval India*, p. 70; and also *the Struggle for Empire*, p. 131; see also *the History of Hindustan*, translated from the Persian by Alexander Dow, Vol. I, 1812, p. 155; Dr. Ishwari Prasad: *History of Mediaeval India*, p. 154.
- 12 Raverty : *Op. Cit.*, p. 529, also refer footnote 4; *The Chronology of India*, *Op. Cit.*, p. 176.

Fazl, who was a later historian, gives no authoritative argument. His source of information is found to be weak on corroboration. This is why the other historians take no account of the version made by him.

However, the third version is headed by Raverty who suggests that Aram Shah was an adopted son of Kutb-ud-din Aibak and hailed him with the title of Sultan Aram Shah.¹

The author of *Tarikh-i-Jahan Kusha* goes a step further when he writes that Kutb-ud-din had no son, but a slave known as Iltutmish who became heir-apparent to the throne.² This view, according to Muhammad Aziz Ahmad, gives the most appropriate expression that Kutb-ud-din Aibak had no son, but a slave known as 'Iltutmish' who became heir-apparent to the throne.³ He further writes that Aram Shah, in fact, was not a relative of Kutb-ud-din Aibak.⁴ Sir W. Haig seems to be confused on this point and is not clear whether Aram Shah was the natural or the adopted son (of Kutb-ud-din Aibak. This heir-apparent was sometimes described" by him incorrectly "as Aibak's adopted son) but usually believed to have been a son of his body." Similarly, Henry George Keene also seems to be confused in establishing the relationship of Aibak with that of Aram Shah because at one place he mentions the latter as the son of Kutb-ud-din Aibak⁶ while at the other he controverts his own statement and describes him as only an adopted son.⁷

Lastly, the fourth group of the scholars assert that Aram Shah was not a son of Kutb-ud-din Aibak, and in order to avoid

1 Ibid., p. 529 and note 4. See also Haji Dastgir Zafarale-Walihi, edited under the title of "An Arabic History of Gujrat", E. D. Ross, London, 1921, Vol. II, p. 686.

2 Ala-ud-din Ata Malik Juvaini: *Tarikh-i-Jahan Kusha*, Gibb Memorial Series 1912, Vol. II, p. 611.

3 Muhammad Aziz Ahmad : *Early Turkish Empire of India*, 1949, 152, footnote 1.

4 Ibid, p. 152, footnote 1.

5 *The Cambridge History of India*, Vol. III, p. 51.

6 Henry George Keene : *Bibliographical Dictionary*, London, 1894, pp. 7320.

7 Ibid, p. 320.

confusion and strife inseparable from a delayed or disputed successor, the nobles of Lahore, hurriedly proclaimed him as son. Muhammad Aziz Ahmad belonging to the last group, argues that the new Sultan (Aram Shah) was neither the son nor the brother of Kutb-ud-din Aibak. "Sultan Aram Shah", according to him, "therefore, might have been a Turkish Malik whom his colleagues and friends raised to the throne with a view to retain peace, tranquility, order and government, as also the probable heir Shams-ud-din Iltutmish was not available on the spot and the throne could not remain vacant so long as he took to return to Delhi."¹ He further writes that "Kutb-ud-din had no son to succeed. However, a son was presented to be an heir but the final choice lay with the Maliks and Amirs. They could choose from among the relations of the ex-king or select a new man altogether. Aram Shah was selected for his weakness to play the part of a mere puppet. Selection by the officers meant that they exacted favours as pre-condition to their support."²

In the face of these varied statements, unfortunately, Hasan Nizami, a contemporary historian who furnishes us with a detailed account of Kutb-ud-din Aibak's life and career, does not give any information about Aram Shah. Oversighting the short reign of Aram Shah, he simply passes on to the accession of Iltutmish after the death of Kutb-ud-din,³ which, according to him, took place in the year 607 H. (1210 A. D.)⁴

Under the circumstances aforesaid, it is almost difficult to arrive at a fair conclusion. All the historians, contemporary, later or modern, have gone too far from the fact and have simply led their faculty to travel in vain from one extreme to another in order to locate the fact. With the silence of a reliable and contemporary work like *Taaj-ul-Maasir* of Hasan Nizami on the issue there has been left the only other reliable work, *Tabakat-i-Nasiri* of Minhaj-us-Siraj, which is certainly the only and the most authen-

1 Muhammad Aziz Ahmad: Op. Cit., p. 152; K. A. Nizami Op. Cit., pp. 206-7

2 Ibid, p. 153.

3 ED, Vol. II, p. 337.

4 Ibid, p. 237.

tic source for study. Probably, relying on the second version¹ of this great historian, Muhammad Aziz Ahmad asserts that Kutb-ud-din left no son to succeed him, and therefore, Aram Shah was neither his son nor brother but was merely a Turkish Malik, who was installed at the throne.² But Minhaj is a frank historian and he has clearly mentioned in the case of Shahab-ud-din that he had no male heir³ to succeed him and therefore his vast empire was succeeded by his feeble nephew Mahmud.⁴ Similarly, had it been the case also with his another favourite Sultan Kutb-ud-din Aibak, he would never have failed to record it. But here in this case Minhaj has not frankly admitted that Aram Shah was not the son of Kutb-ud-din. His mere mentioning of the name of Aram Shah as the son and successor of Kutb-ud-din altogether rejects the theory of Muhammad Aziz Ahmad whose statement is purely based on the second version of our this historian. It is more likely that Aram Shah, who was weak and feeble son of Kutb-ud-din, pleasure loving unlike his father, and incapable to hold the reins of government, would have failed to attract most of our historians as also Minhaj-us-Siraj, who was a strong admirer of Kutb-ud-din. That is way perhaps, he makes only a passing reference as to the identity of Aram Shah who was the real son and successor of Kutb-ud-din Aibak.⁵

Fall of Aram Shah

It is quite clear from the above that due to the call of the urgency, the chiefs and nobles of Lahore installed Aram Shah, the son of Kutb-ud-din, as the heir and successor of the late Sultan. Though ill-adopted, he was destined to govern such a vast empire. Nasir-ud-din Qubacha, one of the slave commanders of Shahab-ud-din, who was then the governor of Sindh, taking advantage of the weakness of the new Sultan, marched towards

1 In his second version Minhaj-us-Siraj mentions only three daughters of Kutb-ud-din and makes no reference of Aram Shah. Raverty: Op. Cit., pp. 529-530.

2 Muhammad Aziz Ahmad; Op., Cit. pp. 152-153.

3 Raverty: Op. Cit., p. 496.

4 Ibid., p. 518.

5 Read also my article life and career of Aram Shah, published in the Research Bulletin of the Department of History, University of Gorakhpur, January, 1967.

Uch¹, and Multan,² in order to extend his dominion. He consequently captured these ones along with Sherwan, Dewal and other places.³ His authority, according to Minhaj-us-Siraj, reached as far as the sea shore and many forts, cities and towns of the territory of Sindh, including Tabarhinda, Kuhram and Sarsuti, which also in quick succession fell into the province of his power.⁴ He is also said to have occupied Lahore several times.⁵ At the same time the Khalji rulers of Bengal also revolted and grimly asserted their independence; similarly, other dependent chiefs also threw off their allegiance in many parts of the empire.⁶

The nomination of Aram Shah as the successor of Kutb-ud-din was not supported by other nobles, particularly, the nobles of Delhi. Consequently, the nobles, amirs and the chiefs were divided into two open groups; the chiefs of Lahore who supported the nomination of Aram Shah as the Sultan of Delhi, and the chiefs of Delhi, who challenged this nomination. The time was hard and tough which demanded a strong and powerful man, but Aram Shah was on the contrary,⁷ not endowed with the requisite qualities and was completely unfit to deal with the problems. Therefore, the Amirs of Delhi rejected this appointment. In the meantime, Iltutmish, the slave and son-in-law of Kutb-ud-din, had already earned his name and fame during the governorship of Badaun.⁷ In fact Sultan Kutb-ud-din had regarded him as his son⁸ and had given him the governorship of Badaun.⁹ Ulti-

1 It became the chief city of upper Sindh under Qubacha.

2 Raverty: Op. Cit., pp. 530-532.

3 Ibid., pp. 530-532-534.

4 Ibid, p. 532.

5 Ibid, p. 532.

6 Briggs Firishta, Vol. I, p. 203.

7 At this time, and for sometime after, the fief of the territory of Badaun was the greatest in the Delhi kingdom.

8 Raverty: Op. Cit., pp. 530, 603, Iltutmish was also a favourite of Shahab-ud-din Ghorî who once instructed Kutb-ud-din Aibak says: "Treat I-Yal-timish well for he will distinguish himself." Ibid, p. 605.

9 Raverty: Op. Cit., pp. 530-604; Briggs Firishta: Op. Cit., p. 203. Muhammad Aziz Ahmad says that Iltutmish was given the fief of Badaun which signifies his wish to make his heir apparent, Op. Cit., p. 153. But if we agree that Aram Shah was the son of Kutb-ud-din, it is hardly to be believed that in the presence of his own son Kutb-ud-din ever showed his wish to be succeeded by his slave governor in the place of his own son. Keene, however, asserts that Iltutmish was an adopted son of Kutb-ud-din Aibak, Op. Cit., p. 330.

mately, the nobles of Delhi in consultation with the other discontented nobles and headed by the Sipah-Salar or the commander of troops Ali-i-Ismail who was the Amir-Dad (Lord Justice) of the capital city,¹ despatched an invitation to Iltutmish, at Badaun² to hasten to Delhi and assume the throne.³ Iltutmish, at once accepted the offer and marched hurriedly without hesitation at the head of his army and by the assistance of his party he met with a cordial reception. He captured the fort and the city of Delhi in 607 H.⁴ or 1211 A. D., and the whole territory around the capital city was subsequently brought under his sway.⁵

On the other hand, in order to dethrone Iltutmish from Delhi Aram Shah collected, for his assistance, a large army, comprising mainly of Qutbi Amirs and Maliks. As also he managed to raise a powerful army from Amroha and other parts of the dominion. Thus, Aram Shah having recruited a strong force advanced towards Delhi to punish Iltutmish. The challenge thrown by Aram Shah was promptly responded to by Iltutmish, who had already possessed the capital. He rushed towards the bank of Jamuna to thwart Aram Shah from entering into the capital city. The contending armies met each other in the plain facing the city and after a feeble resistance put forth by Aram Shah and

1 Here we find some difference in the writings of Muhammad Aziz Ahmad and Minhaj-us-Siraj. The former mentions Amir Ali-i-Ismail the Sipah Salar (Commander of Forces) and Amir-i-Dad (Chief Judge) as the leaders of the nobles of Delhi who invited Iltutmish to ascend the throne of Delhi, Op. Cit., p. 153. But the latter clearly gives only one name that Ali-i-Ismail who was also the Amir-i-Dad (Lord Justice) of the capital of Delhi who with the consultation of the other nobles had invited Iltutmish to come to Delhi. Raverty: Op. Cit., 605.

2 According to Badauni, Iltutmish came from Hardwar and Badaun to Delhi. Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh, Calcutta, 1893, p. 61. But considering the geographical locations of these places the statements of Badauni seems to be incorrect.

3 Raverty: Op. Cit., pp. 605-606; Briggs Firishta: Op. Cit., p. 233.

4 Raverty: Op. Cit., pp. 606. Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh, p. 190 has the year 1211 A. D. Similarly, The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 51, places the accession of Iltutmish on the throne of Delhi in later half of the year 1211 A. D.

5 Raverty: Op. Cit., p. 606.

his army the former was ultimately defeated and put to rout. Most of the followers of Aram Shah, including both Aqsanqar and Farruk Shah, were slain.¹ Aram Shah himself in all probability was martyred by his adversary.² The reign of Aram Shah, which was terminated within a space of one year,³ proved short-lived. During this short reign, the newly founded Turkish Empire in India broke into pieces and was majorly subdivided into four portions. The territory of Sindh was under the possession of Nasir-ud-din Qubacha; the dominion of Delhi was dominated by Iltutmish; the territory of Lakhnauti was occupied by the Khalji Maliks and Sultans; and the state of Lahore, which according to the flux of circumstances, was occupied sometimes by Qubacha and sometimes by Iltutmish until the former was finally defeated at the hands of the latter in the year 1227 A. D.⁴

Thus, it is quite clear from the above description that Aram Shah's short reign was one of a total failure. Had he survived a little more as a Sultan of Delhi, the Muslim kingdom of India

1 *Tarikh-i-Firishta*, Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow, p. 65.

2 Raverty: *Op. Cit.*, p. 530 According to some "the decree of destiny reached Aram Shah." Sir W. Haig writes that Aram Shah was defeated and captured by Iltutmish. But all these are not correct. We, in fact, find no trace of Aram Shah afterwards. Therefore, it is highly likely that Aram Shah must have been put to death either in the engagement or sometime later by the orders of Iltutmish.

3 *Lubb-ut-Tawarikh*, p. 10; Briggs *Firishta: Op. Cit.*, p. 204; *Tabakat-i-Akbari*, p. 55. According to Habibullah, Aram Shah ruled for not more than eight months (*Op. Cit.*, p. 92), and Muhammad Aziz Ahmad thinks that Aram Shah's rule was terminated within the space of one year (*Op. Cit.* p. 154). Keene fixes the period of his reign for one year (*Op. Cit.*, p. 77). According to one source Aram Shah ruled up to 1215 A. D. See Habibullah: *Op. Cit.*, pp. 106-107, footnote 20. But this is in no way correct statement, as we find Iltutmish's earliest coin which was issued as early as in 603 H. or 1211 A. D. His earliest available inscription is also dated back Jamidi; 603 H. or 1211 A. D. See *Catalogue of coins in Indian Museum*, 11, Int., p. 6; *Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica*, 1911-12, p. 3. But Habibullah in his book *Op. Cit.*, pp. 106-107, footnote 20, incorrectly quotes Raverty's *Minhaj-us-Siraj's* p. 539 footnote 4, which is not available. I have thoroughly read Raverty's book but I failed to trace the evidence shown by Habibullah.

4 Raverty. *Op. Cit.*, pp. 530-531,

was sure to have been dismantled. But thanks to the timely emergence of Iltutmish into a powerful and capable person as regards the governance of the empire that the Muslim Kingdom was saved from falling to the dust. The doom of Aram Shah was inevitable before such a worthy man like Iltutmish. And with the defeat and overthrow of Aram Shah from the Delhi Sultanate, sometime in the end of 1211 A. D., came the end of the line of the first ruling family over the newly founded Turkish Kingdom in Northern India. The family of Iltutmish immediately, thereafter, succeeded his master Kutb-ud-din's family which, however, lasted for about half a century.¹

¹ Read also author's article 'life and career of Aram Shah' published in the Research Bulletin of the Department of History, University of Gorakhpur, January 1967.

CHAPTER XV

KUTB-UD-DIN AIBAK AS BUILDER

Kutb-ud-din Aibak is popularly known to us as a great soldier and the founder of the Delhi Sultanate. However, it does not suggest that he was not known at all as regards the construction of the architectural buildings and the exhibition of his keen devotion towards it. It is true that in India he had to pass most of his time in the battle-fields which provided him little opportunity to show his genius in other fields. Of equal reality is the fact that his destructions were much more larger than his constructions, but it does not mean that he was without any taste for the construction of the buildings. Even his preoccupations in the political affairs and his involvement in many other internal and external difficulties did not diminish the zeal of this Muslim conqueror with the result that whenever he did find time and opportunity he prudently devoted himself in erecting various important buildings. Like his invaluable services to the growing power of the Turkish Empire in India, he proved himself to be the pioneer of introducing and erecting the first great building on the Muslim style in India. The technique and the art employed by him in his so-called constructions was of course much influenced by the Hindu art. As also the materials which he utilized in those constructions were largely of the Hindu origin. In India, the political career of Kutb-ud-din was short, but, nevertheless, his achievements were certainly great. Some of his historical and monumental buildings not only added another feather to his cap but they also indicate themselves as objects of greater attraction to the tourists in Delhi.

Unfortunately, Kutb-ud-din, in his military campaigns in India, followed the footsteps of his co-religionists of bloodshed, destructions and devastation, which ultimately caused the ruinous effects to the Hindu buildings and temples. He not only performed the role of a great destroyer, but he also utilized the stones and materials of those dismantled Hindu buildings and constructed

mosques and other Muslim buildings on their foundations. In the absence of clear contemporary evidences, it is very difficult to assess the number of the buildings constructed by Kutb-ud-din Aibak. Hasan Nizami is the only contemporary writer who furnished us with some references, for instance, in the wake of his conquests Kutb-ud-din raised thousands of Hindu temples to the ground at Delhi, Ajmer, Meerut, Banares and Kalanjar and constructed mosques in their places.¹

These evidences, though not very explicit, but all the same, they throw light on the fact that Kutb-ud-din must have built many buildings out of which only few could be known to us to day. His magnificent buildings do not only show the keenness and genius of Kutb-ud-din but also tell us of his highly advanced knowledge of engineering and scientific methods of the constructions.

In the following pages we will discuss some of the most important buildings of Kutb-ud-din Aibak which were either started by him and finished by the later Sultans or completed and built by himself alone. In fact, during the vigorous rule of the founder of the slave dynasty Kutb-ud-din Aibak, the schemes of many important buildings were initiated. And the beginning of the Islamic architecture in India must be dated in the real sense to the establishment of Sultanate of Delhi by him. His three buildings, i. e., Qutb-Mosque (1195 A. D.), Qutb Minar (C. 1199 A. D.), and a mosque at Ajmer known as the "Arhai din ka Jhopra" (C. 1205 A. D.), were executed approximately between

¹ According to Hasan Nizami, Kutb-ud-din built the Jama Masjid at Delhi and adorned it with the stones and gold obtained from the temples which had been demolished by elephants. Similarly, Meerut (Mirat), Ajmer and Kalanjar also witnessed the same fate and its temples were converted into mosques, T M, E D, Vol. II. p. 222. Similarly, Meerut (Mirat) also witnessed the same fate. Our historian further states that at Benaras after having defeated Raja Jaichand, Kutb-ud-din destroyed nearly one thousand temples and raised mosques on their foundations.

The same historian also includes in the list Ajmer and Kalanjar where the Hindu temples and buildings were destroyed and mosques were constructed in their place; T M, E D, Vol. II pp. 219, 223, 226 and 231.

the years from 1195 to 1205. This represents a decade of architectural efforts of marked portent, during which period were laid the foundations of Islamic building and art in India.¹

Adinah Mosque or Juma Masjid

Among the buildings which Kutb-ud-din had built the first one was that of his Adinah Mosque or Juma Masjid the foundation of which was laid in Delhi in the year 1193 A. D. which is derivable from the inscription to be found on its entrance gate. Kutb-ud-din commenced this mosque immediately after his capture of Delhi in 1192 A.D. But it was completed in 1196 A.D., and was further enlarged during the period of Iltutmish.² Hasan Nizami, the contemporary writer, tells us that Kutb-ud-din "adorned it with the stones and gold obtained from the temples which had been demolished by elephants, and covered it with inscriptions in Toghra, containing the divine commands." The Mosque originally consisted of two courtyards, one inner and one outer, with eleven beautiful arches. "Originally a thick coat of plaster concealed the profuse idolatrous ornamentations"⁴, which unfortunately has fallen away and there is no clear trace of it. But it appears, that the entire structure was re-arranged and on its very foundations was erected⁵ some great building.

Qutb Mosque

One of the most important buildings of Kutb-ud-din Aibak was the Kutb-Mosque, also known as Quwwat-ul Islam (Might of Islam), which was built by him in Delhi. The construction of Quwwat-ul Islam, which was the symbol of the might of the new force, was commenced in 1195 A.D. within two years of the

1 Indian Architecture (The Islamic Period), P. 6.

2 ETED, p. 131 and footnote 3.

3 ED, Vol. II, p 222.

4 E T E D, p. 131.

5 Fergusson writes : "The probability seems to be that the entire structure was rearranged in the form we now see it by the Muhammadans." History of Indian And Eastern Architecture, Vol. II, (London, 1899), p.502.

conquest of Delhi.¹ Although, the mosque was built by Kutb-ud-din but further extensions were, nevertheless, made in the time of Iltutmish in about 1230 A. D.²

To destroy idolatry and to build mosques on its foundation was the old tradition of the Muslims. Kutb-ud-din also maintained it. Our chroniclers write that when he captured Delhi "the city and its vicinity was freed from idol worship, and in the Sanctuaries of the Gods, mosques were raised by the worshippers of one God,"³ Kutb-ud-din also found in the centre of the Hindu citadal a large temple which was immediately ordered to be razed to the ground. The Muslim commander selected this site for the construction of a mosque which was just situated to the North-East of the Qutb-Minar. Originally, the plan of the mosque seems to have been plain and simple but Kutb-ud-din built it quite hurriedly. Our chronicler tells us that 27 Hindu and Jain temples of the neighbouring places were pulled down to furnish the material for the mosque. Due to the free utilisation of the materials of the Hindu buildings the Hindu style dominates throughout the Islamic art. The pillars still bear all the traces of their origin and some of the sculptured figures of men and animals, forbidden by the Quran are clearly noticed there. The figures of some of the Hindu gods are also retained there³ which tell their own story. To shadow the excessive Hindu influence on the technique of the buildings constructed by him Kutb-ud-din modified it two years after its completion through a screen in front of the western cloister, "a characteristic element of the mosque design" which was inherited by the Turks.⁵ The bold and graceful letters of Quranic verses were inscribed on it but the skilled hands of the

1 On the basis of an Inscription found on inner lintal of the eastern gate-way indicates that this Jama Masjid was built by Kutb-ud-din in the year 587 (1191 A. D.), E T E D, p. 131. But this date, i. e., 1191 A. D., cannot be possible because the decisive battle of Tarain was yet to be fought. And before that fateful event of 1192 A. D., no Muslim Mosque was ever possible to be built in Delhi which was then under the mighty Chahamanas possessions.

2 Monuments of Delhi, Vol, III, p. 10.

3 ED., Vol. II, p. 219.

4 Surendra Nath Sen : Delhi And Its Monuments, pp. 5-6.

5 Habibullah : Foundation Of Muslim Rule In India. p. 357.

Hindu craftsmen with its traditional design is apparent in the pattern of the decoration bordering the Arabic lettering.¹

That the mosque was built by Kutb-ud-din Aibak has been clearly mentioned on the main entrance domed gate in the East.² The northern and southern walls are also pierced with two gates facing each other. According to the other inscription to be found on the arch of the North-gate, "the building was commenced by the high command of Muhammad bin Sam, ally of the Amir-ul-Mumenin", in 592 H.

It is quite evident from the reading of this inscription that both Kutb-ud-din as well as his master had shared their hands in it. Another date 594 H. is mentioned on the south pier of the central arch of the great screen.³

Briefly, the mosque was raised on the plinth (for Chabbutra) of a temple and consisted of a large courtyard some 141 feet by 105 feet, open to the sky and surrounded by gray stone pillars. Inside the court stands the famous iron pillar of King Chandra. "It was doubtless treated as an ornamental piece, for no one at that date know what message it bore."⁴ The proper prayer-hall of the mosque was built facing the west on the side of Mecca. Kutb-ud-din, however, modified and enlarged it about two years later after he had returned from Ghazni⁵ towards the closing year of the 12th century (1199 A. D.).⁶ Consequently, the prayer-hall was screened off by a wall 8 feet thick with series of magnificent and lofty arches. Further additions were made in it during the time of Iltutmish (1230 A. D.) and Alauddin Khalji (1296-1316 A. D.) respectively.

Kutb-Mosque (Quwwat-ul-Islam Might of Islam) is now in

1 Ibid.; p. 353.

2 Monuments of Delhi, Vol. III, p. 9, For the reading of this inscription see Thomas Edward : Chronicle Of The Pathan Kings Of Delhi (London, 1871), pp. 22-23.

3 As noticed in ETE D, p. 132

4 Surendra Nath Sen : Delhi And Its Monuments, p. 6.

5 Ibid, p. 7.

6 Percy Brown : Indian Architecture (Islamic Period) p. 10.

complete ruins yet its remains tell the glory of its past which was once "a living symbol of the might of the new force, which impelled the Turks and the Afghans to carry its banner further East and South."¹

The Qutb Minar

The most celebrated building for which Kutb-ud-din Aibak is much famous is his monumental 'Qutb-Minar' also called by many as 'Leaning Tower of India.'² Kutb-ud-din planned and commenced it in about 1199 A.D. and was ultimately completed by Iltutmish.³ This magnificently immense and lofty tower,⁴ is originally some 238 feet in height⁵ and is consisted of five

1 Surendra Nath Sen: Delhi and its Monuments, p. 5.

2 See Dr. D. S. Trivedi's article the 'Leaning Tower of India,' published in the daily Northern India Patrika, Allahabad, April 4, 1965 (Sunday Magazine). Dr. Trivedi in the same article ascribes it to Samudra Gupta who built it as a observatory tower to study the Nakshatras. But this does not seem to be correct as Samudra Gupta started his reign in a small principality with Pataliputra (Patna) as his capital. Later on, he extended his territory by his fresh conquests beyond Jamuna in the West. It appears that modern Delhi and its near by places also fell in his possessions. It is to be noted down that Delhi at that time did not occupy any importance. More or less, the place was far away from the capital city of Pataliputra which was at the same time surrounded by the hostile enemies. Under the circumstances it looks impossible for Samundra Gupta to have built such an observatory tower far beyond his capital city. If Samundra Gupta at all wished for any such building he should have built it in his own capital city for his expediency and better supervisions. Similarly, many fabricated stories are attached with the Qutb Minar as to who built it? Some say that it was built by the illustrious Prithviraja III, the Chahamana king of Ajmer, so that he might see the holy Jamuna every morning. Some even go further back to say that it was built by Vignaraja IV, another powerful Chahamana ruler of the 12th century A. D. to commemorate his victory of Delhi. But all these are not correct because the minar was obviously built on the Islamic pattern and the Muslim character is obviously traceable in it. Qutb Minar which was first built by Kutb-ud-din Aibak was named after the famous saint Qutb-ud-din of Ush near Baghdad who is popularly known as Qutb-Shah.

3 There are on the Minar inscriptions of both Kutb-ud-din and Iltutmish. But the Minar was struck by lightning during the time of Firuz Tughluq's reign. Consequently, the fourth storey was replaced by two smaller ones. The fifth storey has an inscription of Firoz which makes mention of its repairs. Again in 1503 Sikandar Lodi restored the Minar and repaired its upper storey. The building was further affected by an earthquake of 1803 A. D.

4 The free standing of tower and pillar was not unknown in India, but Cressel thinks that the ancestry of the Qutb-Minar must be connected with the mosque towers derived ultimately from the Church towers of Christian Syria, Cresswell, K. A. G.: A Short Account of Early Muslim Architecture, Penuin Books, London, 1958, p. 111.

5 Dr. Ishwari Prasad wrongly mentions its height as 242 feet, HMI, p. 552.

storeys. But there are reasons to believe that two top-most storeys were entirely rebuilt by the Tughluq rulers as they differ in style as well as material from the rest of the tower.¹ The whole building was again built by the complete materials available from the destructions of the Hindu temples and images which are clearly visible even to this time.

With the base of 46 feet in diameter and tapers to a width of 10 feet at the summit, the tall tower stood proclaiming to the whole world the prestige and might of Islam, which seems to have been its primary object.² "Such a building was made possible by the inspired vision of Kutb-ud-din Aibak, and realized through the creative genius of the Indian workmen."³ When the building was completed it became one of the finest architectural monuments ever produced.⁴

With all probability, the tower originally consisted of only four storeys. The first three storeys remained untouched and the fourth and fifth were repaired and added by the later Sultans of Delhi. Each of the four storeys differ from each other in the style as well as in design. The first is wedge-shaped flanges altering with rounded flutes; the second has circular projections; the third is star-shaped; while the fourth is simply round.⁵ From the artistic point of view, the most elegant features of the building are the balconies and the method design of their support. The Qutb Minar is compared with Ghori minaret of Jam, the modern site of Firuz Kuh and if the Jam minaret differs from the Qutb Mosque, it is only in the material and in exterior decoration. The Delhi Minar also carries out some idea in red sandstone.⁶

Arhai Din Ka Jhopra

Another important structure that has been assigned to the

1 Surendra Nath Sen : *Dhli And Its Moments*, pp. 8-9.

2 Percy Brown : *Indian Architecture (Islamic period)*, p. 11.

3 Percy Brown : *Indian Architecture (Islamic Period)*, p. 12.

4 *Ibid*, p. 11.

5 *Ibid*, p. 11.

6 Habibullah: *Foundation of Muslim Rule in India*, pp. 359-360.

7 *Ibid*, p. 360.

name of Kutb-ud-din Aibak is the mosque of Ajmer better known to us as the 'Arhai din ka Jhopra' (just of two and half days). We gather from our chronicler that Kutb-ud-din conquered Ajmer where "religion was established, and infidelity was cut off, and the foundations of idol-worship were utterly destroyed."² Immediately after its capture, Kutb-ud-din seems to have commenced its construction in the year 1200 A. D. which was duly completed during the reign of Iltutmish. Traditionally the mosque was completed within two and a half days and, therefore, it is called 'Arhai din ka Jhopra. But most probably it came to be called by this name due to an old established mela or fair-ground which was held there every year lasting for two and a half days.

Like the mosque of Delhi, the Arhai din ka Jhopra was also built with the materials obtained from large number of the dismantled Hindu temples. Due to this reason, the Hindu features and art are equally noticeable in the mosque.

Although, planned and prepared in the same manner as that of Delhi, yet the mosque of Ajmer was certainly an improvement upon the mosque of Delhi. Moreover, the mosque of Ajmer covers just double the space occupied by the Delhi mosque and thus it was on much larger scale and, therefore, it allowed to its designers an additional scope to construct it in a better way. "The result is gracefulness in its slender pillars, finer proportions in its columned aisles, and a more finished adjustment of its roofing."² The pillars have certainly been re-erected exactly as they were originally designed to stand.³ Most of the portions of the mosque is now in ruins. But the West side with its nine-domes still stands and the remaining cloisters of the other three sides have been destroyed. "What remaining", however remarks Fergusson, "is sufficient to show that it must originally have been a singularly elegant specimen of its class."⁴

Iltutmish further added glory to this mosque with the screen

1 ED, Vol. II, pp. 226.

2 Percy Brown : Indian Architecture (Islamic Period,), p. 13.

3 Cunningham : Archaeological Report, Vol. II, p. 261.

4 Fergusson : A History of Indian And Eastern Architecture p. 513.

of seven arches by which he adorned the courtyard. Fergusson seems to have been much impressed by the elegance and magnificence of the central screen of the mosque which rises to a height of 56 feet. According to him "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." He further writes that "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."²

Modification of the Rai Qila Pithora

Qila Rai Pithora (or Pithaura) was the famous Hindu stronghold of Delhi which was recorded by Hasan Nizami as "a fortress which in height and strength had not its equal nor second throughout the length and breadth of the seven climes."³ And when Kutb-ud-din was appointed as the viceroy of India at Kuhram, he lost no time, after consolidating his position, in erecting this monumental building of stones on the site of this Hindu stronghold and made it the Moslim capital of Delhi. We gather from Hasan Nizami that the conqueror entered the city of Delhi, and "its vicinity was freed from idols and idol-worship, and in the sanctuaries of the images of the mosques were raised by the worshippers of one God."⁴ The erection of mosque and the Qutb Minar has already been discussed. The fortress of Qila Rai Pithora has been recorded as the first of the seven historical cities of Delhi when it was captured and occupied by Kutb-ud-din Aibak.⁵ Hasan Nizami, a contemporary writer, also declares it as unequal and none to second in its height and strength. But all these seem to be historically incorrect and by the time Kutb-ud-din finally conquered it, it neither occupied strategic position nor any political importance. But Kutb-ud-din was the first Muslim conqueror who soon realised that "he who holds Delhi holds India" and began to elevate it into the key position of the country. For this

1 Fergusson: A History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, p. 513.

2 Ibid., p. 513.

3 ED, Vol. II, p. 216.

4 ED, Vol. II, p. 219.

5 Percy Brown: Indian Architecture (Islamic Period) p. 11.

reason, Kutb-ud-din must be credited because he was the first to realize that for the strong footing of the Muslims in India, the transfer of Muslim capital to Delhi is quite essential. Accordingly, Kutb-ud-din chose this place for the Muslim capital in India from where ruled the first nine Muslim sovereigns of Delhi, Kutb-ud-din, Aram, Iltutmish, Rukhuddin, Raziya, Muizzuddin, Bahram, Alauddin Masud, Nasiruddin Mahmud and Ghiyasuddin Balban.¹ The Qila Rai was further strengthened and modified by its new masters and within circuit was built the famous white palace of Kutb-ud-din Aibak.²

1 Surendra Nath Sen: Delhi and its Monuments, p. 5.

2 Ibid, p. 5.

CHAPTER XVI

ESTIMATE OF KUTB-UD-DIN AIBAK

Kutb-ud-din Aibak's rapid rise from the lowest status of a slave to that of an independent sovereign itself speaks of the distinguishing qualities and profound abilities that he was endowed with. It is a fact that all men and women irrespective of the equipments and capacities which they have from their births, are undisputedly the product of their surrounding environment in which they cradle their career. Therefore, for the purpose of the assessment of the character and the achievements of this great figure which are the landmarks in the annals of history, it becomes all the more necessary to invoke the aforesaid admitted rule beginning with the close examination of the spirit and trend of his age. Before undertaking this difficult task, it would be proper to describe in a nut-shell that the contemporary writers have already bestowed on him lavish praise and they regard him as one of the greatest Muslim sovereign of the age.

To begin with it is admittedly an established fact that he already distinguished himself as a man when he had first started building his career. His laudable qualities and admirable way of handling a situation soon enabled him to excel his contemporaries. He began to show signs of a bright future when he was brought from Turkistan to Nishapur as a slave and sold to one Qazi Fakhr-ud-din. His new patron and master "finding that heaven had bestowed him with great genius sent him to school where he made considerable progress in the Persian and Arabic languages, as well as in science."¹ Kutb-ud-din quickly learnt to read Quran and acquired the art of horse-riding, archery and other manly qualities to such an extent that in a very short span of time he became well known for such manly qualities² and, "he

1 BF, Vol, I, p. 190.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 513.

became adorned with all the accomplishments of the age."¹ His warlike prowess, and bountiful generosity influenced his friends and enemies alike.²

On account of his great qualities, merchants flocked from distant parts to purchase Kutb-ud-din Aibak on a considerable sum. And, consequently, fortune smiled on him when he was, ultimately, purchased by Shahab-ud-din on a very high price. This Sultan had a boundless craze for purchasing a large number of Turkish slaves whom he very affectionately maintained and cared. This habit might have developed in him because of the fact that he had no male heir upon whom to bestow the benedictions of his paternal love. But this habit of his was vehemently criticised by many of his well-wishers who predicted that it might bring in its wake bad days to the Sultan in immediate future. On one occasion one of his courtiers gathered so much courage as to limelight this heightening fault of the Sultan. To this the Sultan with absolute indifference replied, "other monarchs may have one son, or two sons : I have so many thousand sons, namely, my Turk slaves, who will be the heirs of my dominions, and who after me, will take care to preserve my name in the Khutbah throughout those territories."³ True to the expectations of his beloved master Sultan Shahab-ud-din, Kutb-ud-din fervently seized every opportunity to give to the unaccomplished dreams of his late master a real shape. And it was due to his sincere devotion and unflinching efforts that at length he was crowned with success in triumphantly fulfilling his master's cherished goals.

Obviously, if Kutb-ud-din Aibak, with such striking amount of steadfastness to the cause of loyalty and several other heavenly possessions, is labelled as having occupied the foremost place among all the other slaves of Shahab-ud-din it is no exaggeration nor will it be an amazing fact. This reward is nothing in comparison to the vastness of his character and the richness of his

1 TM, ED, Vol, II. pp. 298-299.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 512.

3 TN, Vol. I, P. 497.

qualities. And though incongruous in appearance¹ as per information elicited by Minhaj, yet his virtues, valour, bravery, enterprise together with his other qualities were so overwhelming and bountiful that our chroniclers were stimulated from within to elevate him still higher. Minhaj-us-Siraj who completed his book *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, a little after the first half of the thirteenth century A. D., also pays him a lofty tribute and writes that "The beneficent Sultan Kutb-ud-din, the second Hatim, was a high-spirited and open-handed monarch. The Almighty God had endowed him with intrepidity and beneficence, the like of which, in this day, no sovereign of the world, either in the East or West, possessed."² Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, who is popularly known to us as Fakhre Mudabbir, places Kutb-ud-din in valour even higher than Rustam. According to him, "his valour, bravery and enterprises are such that if Rustam were alive, he would have taken pride in having been his Hajib (Chamberlain).³ His exploits were so great and his beneficence and generosity so widely known that not only his bitterest hostiles were reduced to submission⁴ but hundreds of thousands⁵ of freemen were converted into slaves.⁵ Besides, Kutb-ud-din was endowed with amazingly fine personal behaviour and unequalled sense of justice which combined together made lasting impressions upon his supporters who started flocking around him in large numbers. The intensity and prowess of this effect was so forceful and pungent that shortly afterwards, Kutb-ud-din was completely taken aback when he found under his banner as among his supporters men of various castes and creeds, including Turks, Ghorides, Khaljis and Hindustanis. But irrespective of this vast congregation of people of multi-caste and multi-race within the rank and file of his supporters, there seems to be no instance when anyone of them could have ever dared to violate Sultan's any rule. The tenets of the administration of justice and equity were strictly founded by

1 ED, Vol. II, p. 299.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 512.

3 *Tarikh-i-Fakhar-ud-din Mubarak Shah*, p. 49.

4 *Taj-ul-Maāsir* (MSS), p. 113; *Tabakat-i-Nasiri* (Calcutta, 1864). p. 130

5 *Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah*, p. 21.

him.¹ Hasan Nizami a contemporary writer, while acknowledging this quality of Kutb-ud-din writes that when he turned his face towards Delhi "he administered justice" with so much impartiality that among other results the wolf and sheep drank water out of the same pond, and the very mention of the thieves and theft which had before been current on the tongues of everyone, fell to the dust."²

But despite possessing all these qualities, Kutb-ud-din was not bereft of the suicidal weakness of his predecessors which shook the very foundations of their ambition to establish imperial Muslim power in India. Like them, Kutb-ud-din was also a zealous Musalman who, unfortunately, travelled on the same beaten track of the early Muslim invaders. He hated the idols and idolatry, razed down the temples and broke the images of the Hindus to pieces and in their stead and on their foundations erected mosques with the materials of the dismantled Hindu buildings.³ Hasan Nizami depicts a vivid picture as respects Kutb-ud-din's anti-Hindu religion activities in Hindustan. The sacred temples of Delhi, Ajmer, Kol (Aligarh) Mirut (Meerut), Hansi, Benaras, Kalinjar and many other places, fell prey in succession to the fury and anti-Hindu attitude of Kutb-ud-din and were ultimately put to flames and replaced by mosques.⁴ This was not all. The Hindu worshippers were brutally treated and a large number of them sacrificed their lives in defending the sanctity of their gods and goddesses. It is gathered from the chroniclers themselves that in order to aloft the standard of Islam and to add more glories to it, Kutb-ud-din, particularly, took boundless

1 Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah writes that "He established justice and equity with such strict foundations that in spite of the large number of troops gathered round his banner—consisting of Turks, Ghuris, Khurasanians, Khaljis 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." Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, p. 33.

2 ED, Vol. II, pp. 224-225. The statement is no doubt an exaggerated one.

3 Tajul-l-Maasir, ED, Vol. II, pp. 216, 219, 222, 223, 225, 226, 231 etc.

4 Ibid, pp. 216, 219, 222, 223, 225, 226, 231 etc. For the religious policy of Kutb-ud-din, read my article 'Kutb-ud-din Aibak ki Dharmik Niti, published in the Shodha Patrika, Gorakhpur University 1969-70 pp. 18-25.

delight in carrying out all these activities in India¹ so that he might be perpetually remembered and adorned as one among the staunch supporters and propagators of Islamic faith. Kutb-ud-din extended valuable services to the Islamic faith by establishing several schools and colleges in Hindustan for its wide circulation. Kutb-ud-din, who was the most favourite of all the slaves of Shahab-ud-din, was also a liberal and modest man of a very high order. On one occasion during the course of an entertainment launched one night by his master, he gave a honey like taste of his abounding modesty and liberal attitude when he distributed among his companions all his presents consisting both of gold and silver and kept nothing, either great or small for himself.² The greatness of his generosity has repeatedly been lime-lighted by Minhaj-us Siraj who mentions that it was the score of his liberalism that the entire regions of Hindustan were filled with his friends.³ Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, another chronicler, also holds the same view and writes that Kutb-ud-din was precisely the greatest slave ever seen earlier.⁴ Though his rivals envied his position, yet his rise could never be hampered and the serenity of his liberalism won for him the most coveted name of Lakhbakhsha⁵ or the giver of Lakhs. While describing the generosity of Kutb-ud-din Aibak, Firishta, though a later historian, writes that when a man is praised for his generosity in India, it is said even to this day that "He is as liberal as Kootb-ood-din Eibak."⁶ Kutb-ud-din Aibak took keen interest in personally distributing the money in both cash and kind to the poor and needy.⁷ He also established a special fund to help saints, widows and the orphans of the state.⁸

As we have seen earlier, Kutb-ud-din was not bereft of the taste of architectural buildings. He built some remarkable mosques and other edifices at Delhi, Ajmer and other places. The tall and tidy 'Qutb Minar which beggars description in beauty and

1 Tajul-l-Mausir, Tr. E. D., Vol. II. Similarly, Bakhtiyar Khalji also destroyed the Hindu places of Worship in his campaigns of Behar and Bengal and founded mosques on their foundations.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 514; BF, Vol. I, p. 190.

3 TN, Vol. I, p. 512.

4 Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, p. 21.

5 Ibid, p. 51; TN, Vol. I, p. 512; BF, Vol. I, p. 200

6 BF, Vol. I, p. 200; Firishta wrote his book towards the end of Akbar's reign.

7 Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, Rizvi in Hindi, p. 351.

8 Ibid.

grandeur is a living monument of Kutb-ud-din's genius and sublime taste for splendid and architectural buildings. For all this it is assumed that had Kutb-ud-din not devoted himself to or concentrated on political engagement in India much more magnificent buildings of high architectural order would have been constructed.

He was in no less degree imbued with a literary taste and love for education. Under the able patronage of his previous master, Kazi Fakhr-ud-din, the governor of the province of Nishapur, he received his early education. He soon became efficient in Arabic and Persian languages and acquired the knowledge of the Quran and by the time he came to power in India, he was already known for his literary taste and scholarship.¹ It was because of this thirst for learning that despite being one of the great conquerors and generals, love of letters could not take flight from him even when he assumed the highest office. Rather, in order to crown the merit of education and learning which made him successful in life he opened many schools and colleges to impart education on Islamic pattern. Therefore, the Muhammedan learning was promoted by the establishment of hundreds of mosques which like the Churches of Medieval Europe were centres of both religion and learning.² On his own part he took keen interest and utmost delight in allowing himself to be in the midst of a society of educated and cultured members. On this analogy he helped his court become a centre of learned men.

During the vigorous rule of the Sultan Mahmud, Ghazni had become the centre of Muslim learning and education. But his feeble successors soon shifted the capital from Ghazni to Lahore sometime in the middle of the 12th century A. D. Due to this change of capital, the Muslim learning and education was extended upto Lahore in the East. But Kutb-ud-din, after his appointment as Viceroy of India at Kuhram in 1192 A. D., chose Delhi as his central place for his further military operation in India,

1 NN Law : Promotion of learning in India (1916), p. 19,

2 NN, Law : Op. Cit., p. 19

and finally made it the capital of the newly founded Turkish kingdom of India. Kutb-ud-din also kept up the cultural tradition of his master and was a great patron of Persian letters.¹ For his liberal patronage of Persian letters, which was manifest from the huge gifts of money to his poets, sometimes a lac (of rupees) for a single ode, he was called bestower of lac.²

In order to encourage the men of letters, Kutb-ud-din also appointed pious and learned men of high ranks,³ and some of the great scholars of the time also adorned his court by their presence.⁴ And by the orders of Kutb-ud-din Aibak special arrangements were made to help the men of the letters, pious and the readers of Quran.⁵ Due to Kutb-ud-din's this encouraging attitude, men of letters, specially Persian poets and scholars began to flock in large numbers to Delhi from Tus, Nishapur, Ghor and Ghazni. This process assuredly kept up the same standard of Persian speech and poetic taste among the peoples of India as was obtained during the time of Sultan Mahmud.⁶ Thus, in this way Delhi, in a short time, became the greatest rival of Ghazni, which in due course of time became the greatest centre of the Muslim culture and civilization in the East. Kutb-ud-din, therefore, must be credited for all these achievements.

On the basis of the above, it can fairly be concluded that Kutb-ud-din was one of those great conquerors who possessed a rare combination of generalship and love of learning.

1 Muhammad Abdul Ghani : *The Pre-Mughal Persian in Hindustan* (The Allahabad Law Journal Press, Allahabad, 1941), p. 332.

2 See, *Ibid*, p. 332.

3 Kutb-ud-din nominated a pious and learned Sufi, Sayyid Hasan Amin (agent of Ajmer. *Ibid*, p. 228. Similarly amongst the scholars who basked in the sunshine of his royal favours, the names of Qazi Hamid-ud-din Istikhar Ali b. Umarul-Mahmudi, Sadr-ud-din Hasan Nizami and Maulana Baha-ud-din Ushni may be particularly mentioned. *Some Aspects of Religion and Politics in India During the Thirteenth Century*, p. 113.

4 Scholars like Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah and Hisam-ud-din Ahmad-Ali-Shah became his courtier.

5 *Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah*, Rizvi in Hindi, p. 251; *Some Aspects of Religion and Politics in India During the Thirteenth Century*, p. 113.

6 Muhammad Abdul Ghani, *Loc. Cit*, p. 331.

One may view this opinion by pointing out that by the time Kutb-ud-din was busy in extending Muslim education in North-western regions of India, there was yet another Muslim Commander named Bakhtiyar Khalji who was putting in similar efforts in the far eastern regions but that on the direction of the Sultan-himself.

As well Kutb-ud-din Aibak was a faithful and a loyal servant of his master,¹ Shahab-ud-din. Even during the time of revolt and confusion he did never forsake his loyalty to his master and behaved and acted like a true servant throughout. He also very faithfully and with zealous efforts carried out the unfinished work of his master and pushed the Islamic banner far deep into the rigid and the cohesive culture of Hindustan with amazing success. In no way it would be less than an unquittious fact to hold that but for his sole efforts the dream of his late master could never have been realised. Furthermore, he exhibited his deep sense of loyalty in never brooding over securing independence from his master even after the death of Shahab-ud-din in 1206 A. D. did but he even after the death of Shahab-ud-din in 1206 A.D. did not strive to mint coins in his independent name as did his master. For he still considered himself to be the slave of the late Sultan.

Later, he cut off very wisely all the relations from Ghazni² in order to protect and preserve the conquered regions of Hindustan from the foreign foe and founded, thereof, an independent Turkish Empire in the Northern India. This was, however, the unaccomplished dreams of his master which witnessed its realization after the dreamer's own death. Such was a great sense of loyalty in

1 When Shahab-ud-din was defeated at Andkud, it caused a general anarchy in the state. Everywhere the tribes and governors openly revolted against him but Kutb-ud-din Aibak remained loyal to him.

2 According to Dr. R. P. Tripathi Kutb-ud-din's "greatest service was to cut India off from the supremacy of Ghazni which had existed for about two centuries. By doing so he paved the way for an independent Sultanate in India free from any outside interference. Some Aspects of Muslim Administration (1936), p. 24 Read also Dr. A. L. Srivastva : The Sultanate of Delhi, p. 125.

Kutb-ud-din that even after his master's demise, he did not shirk from directing every atom of his effort in order to give his master's ambition a real shape.

Despite all these rich possessions this typical plant of the time also distinguished himself as a great commander and as a successful conqueror. Ever since his joining the services of Shahab-ud-din, he began to prove his mettle by virtue of his valour, intrepidity, courage and successful wars. This pleased the Sultan too much and in recognition of the merit of this able Turki slave, he went on bestowing upon the latter one honour after the other, until he was finally elevated to the post of Amir-i-Akhur (Lord of the Imperial Stables). From this post again he displayed perfect heroism and shared a vital role in the war which ensued between Shahab-ud-din and the Sultan Shah of Khurasan. This made him harvest further popularity. Shahab-ud-din very rightly, therefore, exploited the ingenuity of this slave commander in his planning of the schemes of Indian conquest.

His master classed him as a commander of the first rate and appointed this trusted commander as a Viceroy of India, just after he gained his final victory in the second battle of Tarain, and himself retired in triumph and success. Even having been appointed to the post aforesaid, Kutb-ud-din could not sit idle and went on successfully executing the orders of his master. Immediately afterwards, a belief as to the real conquest and of the stability of the Turkish Empire in India began to gain ascendancy in his 'Self' very quickly. During the roughly estimated period of about two decades, Kutb-ud-din, by dint of his successful wars, expanded his territory far beyond Delhi. His career as a conqueror in India was of unbroken triumphs. He himself conquered practically the whole of Northern India and allowed another commander Bakhtiyar Khalji to bring under his sway the far eastern regions. Even the powerful Rajput kingdoms like Chahamanas, Gahadavalas, Chaulukyas, Senas and Chandelas though offered bold resistance, could not withstand the might of the onslaughts of Kutb-ud-din and had to surrender larger portions of their kingdom to him in the end.

Kutb-ud-din equally avenged the humiliating defeat of his master against the Chaulukyas of Gujerat. It is worthwhile to recall here that his master, Shahab-ud-din had previously been defeated by the very Chaulukyas of Gujerat against whom his slave commander Kutb-ud-din later took revenge. In that encounter Shahab-ud-din had to flee away from the battle-field on account of his being wounded severely. This defeat, Shahab-ud-din could never forget. Nor could he ever gather courage throughout his life-time to go again in person to Gujerat to avenge his first set-back in India. Fortunately, his able slave-commander rose to the occasion for the cause of his master and soon after his appointment as the Viceroy of India, he marched in person and, as mentioned above, defeated the armies of the Chaulukyas in 1197 A. D.

Some levy charge against Kutb-ud-din that he "was not a constructive or far-sighted statesman¹." But this charge has no force. For the time was full of chaos and political disturbance. His infant empire in India had to face number of the internal and external problems which consumed much of his time and energy. Judging from this viewpoint we must cast all marks of credit in Kutb-ud-din's favour because it was only by the genius of his diplomacy and statesmanship that he was able to save his empire from being extinguished.

Further, to secure the support of his friends and colleagues he always encouraged and bestowed upon them intermittently, fresh honours. So, after the conquest of Behar and Bengal by Bakhtiyar Khalji, Kutb-ud-din recognised his merit by the grant of a robe of honour and canopy of state. To maintain his position in India and to keep his empire intact, he ably established matrimonial relations with some of his strongest rivals. To meet this end, he himself married with the daughter of Yalduz,² the Sultan of Ghazni and gave his two daughters one after the other in marriage to Sultan Nasir-ud-din Qubacha³ and a third one to

1 ETED, p. 149; Dr. A. L. Srivastava, *The Sultanate of Delhi*, pp. 122, 125.

2 TN, Vol. I, p. 500.

3 Ibid, p. 530.

Iltutmish¹, another promising Turki slave. This further consolidated his position and made him the unrivalled master of the Turkish empire in India. His far-sightedness also did not allow him to tolerate or to submit to the growing powers of his rivals. For this reason only he did not surrender the fort of Gwalior to Baha-ud-din Tughril, although the fort was promised to the latter by his late master.

Kutb-ud-din Aibak was a powerful and capable ruler and showed signs of his tremendous administrative ability also. He was a high-spirited and open handed monarch² who always maintained a high character.³ Unfortunately, fortune did not provide him enough opportunity to prove this ingenuity, although he was capable of doing so. During the short yet bright career of his reign which lasted only for about four years after the assumption of his independence, Kutb-ud-din displayed enormously remarkable administrative capabilities. The chroniclers with identical voice express their gratitude and lavish praise on him. According to Hasan Nizami peace and justice had reached to such an extent that "the wolf and sheep drank water out of the same pond and the very mention of thieves and theft, which had before been eminent on the tongues of everyone, fell to dust."⁴ He further writes in his praise that "the roads were freed from the fear and danger of robbers and the oppressed subjects were delivered from their distresses."⁵ A similar impression has also been given by Minhaj-us-Siraj⁶ and other chroniclers as well.⁷ Even Abul Fazl the court historian of Akbar the Great praises Kutb-ud-din Aibak and remarks that "he achieved things, good and great."⁸ Although the statements of these chroniclers are lengthy and contaminated by exaggeration, yet at least they do

1 Ibid,

2 HMI, pp, 152-53.

3 Ibid., p. 153.

4 ED, II, p. 225.

5 Ibid, p. 226.

6 TN, Vol. I, 512.

7 Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, Rizivi in Hindi. p. 250.

8 Ain-Akbari (Sir Syed edition), Vol. II, p. 198.

suggest that Kutb-ud-din had possessed administrative abilities also. But unfortunately his sudden death did not allow him to distinguish himself much in this field.

Kutb-ud-din Aibak helped considerably in the expansion of Islamic power in India. In fact, no Muslim conqueror had, beforehand, ever dreamt of settling down permanently in this country. Although the Muslims had won many fateful battles, but, nevertheless, their victories could never decide the fate of this country. Their efforts were far away from subjugating the whole of India.

The first Muslim conqueror was, doubtless, Kutb-ud-din Aibak who aimed at the permanent settlement in India. And, therefore, credit must be showered on him in profusion for such an undertaking, the doing of which must have inevitably been thought of as a herculian task by other Muslim conquerors. Practically, he overran the whole of the Northern India from Indus to the Ganges and from the Himalyas down to the Vindhya range.¹ His Indian conquests were much wider and more stable than that of any of the early Muslim invaders. And it was he who actually laid the foundation of the Muslim administrative system in India.² His reign also marks the introduction of Islamic law and judicial machinery in India.³ And he has been rightly described by Haig as the "real founder of Muslim dominion in India."⁴

Kutb-ud-din is crowned as the first Muslim Sovereign who ascended the throne of Delhi,⁵ and laid the foundation of a powerful Muslim rule in India which remained intact and lasted for about six hundred and fifty years. His own kingdom, which

1 ETED, p. 150.

2 Muhammad Basbeer Ahmad : The Administration of Justice in Medieval India, 1941, p. 25

3 Ibid, p. 25. Compare Sir Denison Ross : Islam, p. 60,

4 CHI, Vol. III, p. 41; HM1, p. 150.

5 According to Dr. R. P. Tripathi, Kutb-ud-din was not the sovereign ruler of Muslim India. He mentions Iltutmish as the first sovereign of Muslim India. Some Aspects of Muslim Administration (1936), pp. 23, 24 and 27 is not correct.

was established by his personal genius with Delhi as its capital, is better known as the Sultanate of Delhi. Dr. Ishwari Prasad correctly remarks that he ranks among the great pioneers of Muslim conquest in India.¹

Of all the most remarkable thing to be noted is that Kutb-ud-din Aibak was the first among the Muslims to have realised the alround practical importance of Delhi as the key-post of India. To him the fact that "he who holds Delhi holds India" was fully known. Accordingly, he modified the city and transformed it into the capital of his kingdom in India. Due to this transfer of the seat of the Muslim power to Delhi, the latter soon became as one of the greatest centres of the Muslim culture and religion. Never before-hand was Delhi the capital of India, nor was it ever regarded as significantly important city in all its manifestations. However, it is difficult to trace the early history of Delhi, but one thing seems to be certain that it did not count much during the old reigns.² But Kutb-ud-din bagged away every amount of credit as respects the diffusion of the significant character and the political importance of the city of Delhi. And it is no surprise, therefore, if Delhi because of its key-position in the country as acknowledged first by Kutb-ud-din, has been chosen as the capital of this free independent India.

Kutb-ud-din Aibak as the first Sultan of Delhi

The question, whether Kutb-ud-din was the first sovereign of Muslim India or was simply a slave, occupying merely the office of a Sipahsalar³ at the time of his death, is still wedded to controversy. While describing the status of Kutb-ud-din Aibak, our chronicler, Minhaj-us-Siraj says "This section on Shansabanis and their slaves, is concluded; and, after this, I come to the section on

1 HMI, p. 153

2 Prof. Habib : Introduction to the Revised edition of Elliot and Dowson's History of India, Vol. II, p. 62. But according to Prof. Habib, the glory of founding it (Delhi) belongs to Sultan Shams-ud-din Iltutmish (1211-1236) (Ibid., p. 62), which does not appear to be a correct supposition. In fact, the first credit must go to Kutb-ud-din Aibak and then to Iltutmish who, no doubt, glorified Delhi after his firm footing in India.

3 Epigraphia Indo-Moselmica, 1911-12, p. 2.

the Sultans of Hindustan, the first of whom to be mentioned is Sultan Kutb-ud-din, Aibak and his illustrious action,"¹ He further writes clearly that after the death of Shahab-ud-din, his successor and nephew Ghyas-ud-din Mahmud gave Kutb-ud-din, the royal canopy and conferred upon him the title of Sultan.² The same chronicler also records that Kutb-ud-din wore the crown and had the Kutba read and coin struck in his name.³

A similar view is also expressed by another contemporary chronicler, Hasan Nizami.⁴ Later writer like Firishta seems to have supplemented it.⁵

On the other hand, the school of opposing opinion does not adorn Kutb-ud-din as the Muslim sovereign of India. Ibn Batuta who came to India in the fourteenth century A. D., does not mention Kutb-ud-din as the first independent sovereign of the Muslim India and, excludes as well, his name from the list of the Sultans of Delhi submitted by him to Firoz Tughlaq.⁶

Edward Thomas also strongly doubts if Kutb-ud-din had ever struck his name on the coins as described by some of the contemporary chroniclers. According to him, the assertions of the contemporary chroniclers, seem to have a conventional phrase of the right to coin.⁷

Most probably, pinning reliance on these sources, particularly that of Ibn Batuta, Dr. R. P. Tripathi states positively that "although the historians say that Kutb-ud-din struck coins in his name, no specimen of them has so far been discovered. Nor do we know anything about the Khutba."⁸ Dr. Habibulla.

1 TN, Vol, I, pp. 506-507.

2 TN, p. 525.

3 Ibid., p. 523. Futuh-us-Salatin also testifies that Khutba was read in the name of Kutb-ud-din Aibak, p. 101.

4 TM, ED, Vol. II, pp. 236-237.

5 BF, Vol. I, p. 200; Also Alexander Dow: The History of Hindostan, Vol. I, p. 149.

6. Batuta, III, p. 164. (Translated in French by C. Defremery and B. F. Sanganarette).

7 Thomas : The Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, pp. 37-39.

8 Some Aspects of Muslim Administration, p. 23.

also supports Dr. R. P. Tripathi and says that technically Kutb-ud-din was still a slave till he obtained his formal manumission in 605 H. (1208 A. D.). He further writes that in inscriptions he always used his titles as Sipahsalar. On the basis of this and similar other ones, he finally concludes that "coins were struck and the Khutbah read in his name throughout Hindustans," "must be taken as a conventional phrase emphasising his sovereign power, for no silver or billion coin of his has yet been discovered."¹ According to him, "Aibak's assumption of supreme power in Lahore in June 1206, therefore, meant no formal change in the government, for he adopted no sovereign titles and issued no coin of his own."²

According to Dr. R. P. Tripathi, the history of Muslim sovereignty in India properly begins from the reign of Iltutmish³ who was the first sovereign ruler of Muslim India.⁴ This view is further supported by Prof. Habibullah, who though admits that Kutb-ud-din Aibak outlined the Delhi Sultanate and its sovereign status yet he finally concludes that Iltutmish was unquestionably its first king.⁵

From the above, it appears that the non-inclusion of the name of Kutb-ud-din by Ibn Batuta, in the list of the Sultans of Delhi, has been the main source of information to these scholars. In fact, our this traveller in his list only included the names of the Sultans of Delhi and not that of Lahore. It is very likely that since Kutb-ud-din ascended the throne at Lahore his name could not be included in the list of those submitted by Ibn Batuta, who only mentions the names of those Sultans only who ascended the throne of Delhi.

Similarly, the non-availability of coins⁶ bearing the name of

1 The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, p. 89.

2 The Struggle for Empire, p. 130; For similar views Read also Dr. A. L. Srivastava : The Sultanate of Delhi, p. 121.

3 Some Aspects of Muslim Administration, p. 24.

4 Ibid., p. 27.

5 Habibullah : The Foundation of The Muslim Rule in India, p. 105.

6 We have no independent coin of Kutb-ud-din Aibak, but there have come to light four copper pieces of rayed circle which contain the appellation 'Qutbi' in fact must have been taken into consideration. These coins were most probably issued from Kuraman. Nelson Wright : The Coinage And Metrology of the Sultans of Delhi, p. 69. and also pp. 14-15.

Kutb-ud-din Aibak had precisely led many of our scholars to suppose that Kutb-ud-din Aibak was not an independent sovereign. Apparently, there seems to be no doubt in this statement. But all the same it should not be made the sole basis of decision because if Kutb-ud-din Aibak was not an independent sovereign of Muslim India then what he was? In fact Kutb-ud-din Aibak was made free after the death of his illustrious master Shahab-ud-din in 1206 A. D. and was no more a slave. After that consequently, Kutb-ud-din himself found as the master of the infant Turkish Empire of Delhi and assumed the supreme authority after 1206 A. D. His recognition as Sultan with all the royal insignia by Ghiyas-ud-din Mahmud¹, the nephew and successor of Shahab-ud-din, further consolidated his position. Taking advantage of the situation Kutb-ud-din Aibak rightly cut India off from the domination of Ghazni and laid the foundation of an independent Turkish Empire in India. Dr. R. P. Tripathi himself admits that "his greatest service was to cut India off from the supremacy of Ghazna which had existed for about two centuries. By doing so he paved the way for an independent Turkish Sultanate in India² free from any outside interference."³ Thus Dr. R. P. Tripathi seems to have acknowledged Kutb-ud-din's independent status in India. Writing about the political status of Kutb-ud-din Aibak in India Dr. Muhammad Aziz Ahmad clearly states that the "first Muslim sovereign, who ascended the throne of Delhi and laid the foundation of Muslim rule in India, was Sultan Kutb-ud-din Aibak, a slave of Sultan Shahab-ud-din of Ghur"⁴

The reign of Kutb-ud-din portended a high time for the consolidation of the infant Turkish Empire of India. In the midst of numerous menacing or threatening dangers Kutb-ud-din very rightly concentrated his energy and power for the establishment of the empire and rather took no interest in minting coins in his

1 TN, Vol. I, p. 525.

2 K.A, Nizami : Op. Cit., p. 205; HMI, p. 153.

3 Some Aspects of Muslim Administration, p. 24 : In this way Dr. R. P. Tripathi contradicts his own statement as narrated earlier, See Ibid, p. 27.

4 Early Turkish Empire of Delhi, p. 193 : Also see the same p. 147.

own name. But, unfortunately, before he could struck out his own coins he died suddenly from the fall of his horse at Lahore. As also, it should be recalled that since Shahab-ud-din the beloved master of Kutb-ud-din, had no son to succeed him, he executed all his paternal love to his numberless Turki slaves. And since Kutb-ud-din had occupied amongst all, the first place, it was the will of the Sultan that he should be succeeded to by this slave after his death. He kept this idea lively throughout his life-time. The same conclusion will almost be reached if we brood over a little as to why Shahab-ud-din had always encouraged Kutb-ud-din and ultimately made him his heir apparent if he had no will to let him succeed after his death.

Thus, from the discussions placed immediately above, it is crystal clear, that Kutb-ud-din was unquestionably the first Sultan in the history of the Delhi Sultanate. This finding arrived at, after penetrating through the available materials, should be deemed to have set at rest that perplexing controversy which has so far enormously vexed the scholars of the two schools mentioned aforesaid.

In the end, it should also be mentioned that although Kutb-ud-din had himself founded the Muslim Empire in Northern India, he could not survive for long to enjoy the fruits of his hard work. Unfortunately, this real architect of the Delhi Sultanate died soon after his fall from the horse at Lahore. But nevertheless, his innumerable services to the cause of Islam and its followers both in India and in Pakistan will always be esteemed high and will be immortalised in the annals of history. Thus Kutb-ud-din Aibak writes Firishta "was certainly a great captain, and might be classed among the greatest men in history, had not his licentious conduct at Ghizny, Tarnished the glory of his life."¹

1 Read also Dr. Khaliq Ahmad Nizami : A Comprehensive History of India Vol. Five, the Delhi Sultanate, p. 200.

2 BF, Vol. I, p. 200.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ORIGINAL SOURCES

(A) Persian Texts and Translations

- Ain-i-Akbari** : Abul Fazl, translation by Francis Gladwin.
- Chahar Gulshan** : Chandra Bhan, M. S. S. Abdus Salam Collection.
- Futuh-us-Salatin** : Isami, edited by A. M. Husain, Agra, 1933.
- Gwalior Namah** : Hiranman Munshi, British Museum.
- Habib-us-Siyar** : Khondamir, Extracts translated in Elliot and Dowson's History of India, Vol. IV.
- Ibn Batutah** : Kitabar Rahlah, also called Tuhfatun Nuzzarfi Gharaib-il-amsar; edited (a) Cairo, 1870-71, (b) with a French translation. Defremery and Sanguinatti, Paris, 4 Vols., 1853-59, (c) Abridged English translation H. A. R. Gibb; London, 1929, (d) English translation (of the Travels in India Maldiva and Ceylon) by Mahdi Husain, Baroda, 1953.
- Jami-ul-Hikayat** : Mohammad Ufi, Extract translated in Elliot and Dowson's History of India, Vol. II.
- Jami-ut-Tawarikh** : Rashid-ud-din Fadlullah, edited by E. Blochet, London, 1911.
- Kamil-ut-Tawarikh** : Ibn Asir, translated by Bulak, 1874 and Extracts translated by Elliot and Dowson's History of India, Vol. II.
- Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh** : Sujjan Rae, edited by K. B. Zafar Hasan, Delhi, 1918.
- Mirat-i-Jahan Numa**: Anonymous, Oriental Manuscripts in the British Museum.

- Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh : Al Badauni, Calcutta, 1868, English translation by Ranking Lowe and Haig, 3 Vols., Calcutta, 1884-1925.
- Raudatut-Safa : Muhammad Ibn-i-Khund Shah, Bombay, 1271, Vol. IV.
- Riyaz-us-Salatin : Ghulam Husain Salim, translated into English from the original Persian, with notes, by Maulavi Abdus Salam, M. A., Calcutta, 1904.
(A History of Bengal)
- Tabakat-i-Nasiri : (a) Minhaj-us-Shiraj, Calcutta, 1864. English translation by Major H. C. Raverty, Vol. I & II Calcutta, 1897.
(b) Extracts translated in Elliot and Dowson's History of India as told by its own Historians, Vol. II.
- Tabakat-i-Akbari : Nizam-ud-din Ahmad, Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow, English translation by B. De, 3 Vols., Calcutta, 1913-1940.
- Tarikh-i-Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah (Nishbat Namah) : Fakhr-ud-din Mubarak Shah, known as Fakhre Mudabbir, edited by Sir E. Denison Ross, London 1927.
- Tarikh-i-Firishta : Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow, English translation by John Briggs under the title of History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India, Vol. I, 1908.
- Tarikh-i-Ghuri : Vol. I, Abdus Salam Collection, Aligarh.
- Tarikh-i-Guzidah : (a) Hamid-ullah Mustaufi, edited by E.G. Browne, London, 1910.
(b) Facsimile, edition, Gibb Memorial Series, London 1913.
- Tarikh-i-Jahan Kusha : Vol. II Ala-ud-din Ala Malik Juvaini, Gibb Memorial Series, 1912.
- Taj-ul-Maasir : Hasan Nizami (Hyderabad Manuscript), Extracts translated in Elliot and Dowson's the History of India as told by its own Historians, Vol. II.

- Tarik-i-Mubarak Shahi** : Yahya Bin Abdullah Sirhindi, edited by Dr. Hydayat Husain, Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta, 1931, English translation by K. K. Basu, Baroda, 1932.
- Zafarle-Warlihi** : Haji Dabir, edited under the title of "An Arabic History of Gujrat" by E.D. Ross, London, 1921.
- Zubdat-ut-Tawarikh**: Calcutta 1827.

or

Mulhid-ut-Tawarikh**(B) Sanskrit and Hindi Texts and Translations**

- Dvyasraya Mahakavya** : Hem Chandra Suri, edited by A. V. Kathvate, Bombay Sanskrit Series No. LXIX; also Extracts translated in I. A., Vol. IV.
- Hammira-Madamardana** : Jayasimha, Gaeyekwad Oriental Series, 1920, No. X.
- Hammira Mahakavya** : Naya Chandra Suri edited by M.J. Kirtane, Bombay, 1879.
- Hammira Raso** : Jodharaja, edited by S.S. Das, published by Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Benaras 1929 and 2nd edition, 1939 (Hindi).
- Harsha-Charita** : Bana, edited by J. Vidya Sagara, Calcutta, 1892, translated by Cowell and Thomas, London, 1897.
- Kavya-Mimansa** : Rajasekhara, edited by C. D. Dalal and R. A. K. Shastri, Gaeyekwad Oriental Series, No. 1, 1916.
- Lalita Vighraharaja-Nataka**: Somadeva, Gottinger Festschrift, 1901, pp. 1-15; also I.A., VI, XX, pp. 201-212.
- Prabandha Chintamani** : Merutunga, Singhi Jain Granthamala, 1939, Vol. I, translated by C. H. Tawney, Calcutta, 1899, and also its Hindi translation by Dvivedi, Sindhi Jain Series, Santiniketan, 1933.

- Puratana Prabandha: Singhi Jain Granthamala, 1936, Vol. II.
Sangraha
- Prithviraja-Vijaya : Jayanaka, edited by G.H. Ojha and C. Guleri, Ajmer, 1941.
- Prithviraja-Raso (Hindi) Chand Bardai, edited by S. S. Das, Nagari Pracharni Sabha, Benaras, 1904.
- Purusa-Pariksa : Vidyapati,
(a) Darbhanga, Series, 1810.
(b) English translation by Nerukar, Bombay, 1914.
- Rasmala : G. K. Forbes, edited by Rawlinson, Vol I, Oxford, 1924.
- Raso-Sara : Edited by S.S. Das, Nagari Pracharini Sabha Benaras.
- Rambha Manjari : Nayachandra, edited by Ram Chandra Nataka Sashtri, Bombay, 1899.
- Speeches & Writings H. B. Sharda, Ajmer, 1935.
- Surjana-Charita : Rajasekhara, Unpublished Government Manuscript No. 1135, preserved in the Asiatic Society of Bengal ; also Extracts noticed in Nagari Pracharini Sabha Patrika, Banaras, 1941, pp. 205-22
- Sukritasankirtana : Arisimha,
(a) Edited by G. Buhler.
(b) Edited by Chaturvijai Muni, Bhavanagar, Sri Jaina Atmanandasabha, Bhavanagar, 1917.
- Virudha-Vidhi- : Lakshmidhara, Extracts noticed in Indian
Vidhvanasa Historical Quarterly, XVI, pp. 567.
- (C) Modern Works**
- A Comprehensive : Edited by Muhammad Habib Khaliq Ahmad
History of India Nizami published under the auspices of
Vol. V. the Indian History Congress, 1970.
The Delhi Sultanate
A. D. 1206-1526.

- Adi Turk Kalin : S. A. Abbas Rizvi, Aligarh 1956.
Bharat
- An Advanced His- : Majundar, Dutta, Roy Chowdhury, Mac-
tory of India millan, 1948.
- A Collection of Pra- : Published by Bhavangar
krit and Sanskrit Archaeological Department.
Inscriptions.
- Annals and Anti- : Crooke, edition, Oxford, 1920.
quities of Rajasthan
Vol. I and II.
- A Short Account : K.A.C. Cresswell, London, 1953.
of Early Muslim
Architecture
- A Short history : S. M. Haq, Model Press, Delhi.
of the Delhi
Sultanate
- A Study of : A. K. Srivastava, Ph.D. Thesis of the
Muslim Account Gorakhpnr University, 1963. Not yet
of India upto 12th published.
century A. D.
- Archaeology and : Carr Stephen, Delhi, 1876.
Monumental
Remains of Delhi.
- Bangalis Ithasa : N. R. Ray,
Banglar Itihasa : R. D. Banerji, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1915.
Chaulukyas of : A. K. Majumdar, 1956.
Gujerat
- Delhi and its : Surend Nath Sen 1948.
Monuments
- Dynastic History : H. C. Ray, The University Press, Calcutta,
of Northern 1936.
India Vol. I&II.
- Early Chauhan : D. Sharma, 1959.
Dynasties

- Early History of Kamrup : K. L. Barua, Shillong, 1933.
- Early History of the Dekkan : R. G. Bhandarkar, Bombay Government Central Press, 1895.
- Early Turkish Empire of Delhi : Muhammad Aziz Ahmad, 1949.
- Gloreis of Magadha : Samaddar J. N. (Patna).
- History and Culture of the Indian People, 6 Vols. : Majumdar & Pusalkar (ed.), published Bombay, Vol. V.
- History of Behar : R. K. Chaudhary, 1958.
- History of Bengal : Stewart, Charles, London, 1913.
- History of Bengal, Vol. I. : R.C. Majumdar (ed.) Dacca University. 1943
- History of Medieval Hindu India, Vol. III, entitled "Downfall of Hindu India" : C. V. Vaidya, Poona, 1926.
- History of Bengal : J. N. Sarkar (ed.)
- History of India : Elphinstone, Hon. M., edited by E.B. Cowell, London, 1905.
- History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, 2 Vols. : James Fergusson J. Burgess, London 1910.
- History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, Vol. III : James Fergusson, London, 1899.

- History of India : Elliot and Dowson,
as told by its
own historians,
Vol. II & IV
- History of India
as told by its
own Historians,
Vol. II.
Reprinted with
Introduction by
Professor
Mohammad-
Habib and
supplement by
Khaliq Ahmad- : Elliot and Dowson, (Aligarh edition), 1952.
Nizami.
- History of : Ishwary Prasad 1952.
Mediaeval India
- History of : Prof. Radhakrishna Chaudhary, 1970
Muslim in Rule
in Tirhut
- History of the : Mohammad Latif, 1964.
Punjab
- History of the : K. R. Qamungo, 1925.
Jats
- History of Kanauj : R. S. Tripathi, 1959.
- History of Rajpu- : Dr. G. H. Ojha, Ajmer, 1933.
tana, Vol. I.
- History of Rajpu- Dr. G. H. Ojba, Ajmer, 1937.
tana (Hindi) Vol. I
and II.
- History of the : Ramkarana.
Rathors (Sir A. M. Silver Jubilee), Vol. III, Part 2.

History and Culture
of the Indian Peo-
ple, Vol. V

Islam : Ross, Sir Denison.

(a) Indian Architec-: P. Brown.
ture (Islamic Period)

Lahore : Its History: Muhammad Latif, 1966—7
and Antiquities.

Literary History of Brown, E.G., Vols. IV, London, 1902-1924.
Persia

Medieaval India : Stanley Lanepoole, London, 1903.
Under Muhammadan
Rule.

Nobility under the : S. B. P. Nigam (1968).
Sultans of Delhi
A. D. 1506-1398.

The Pre-Mughal : Muhammad Abdul Ghani, 1941.
Persian in Hindustan

Promotion of N. N. Law, 1916.

Learning in India.

Raso-Sara — Edited by S.S. Das, Nagari Pracharini Sabha,
Benaras.

Rasmala — G. K. Forbes, edited by Rawlinson, Vol. I,
Oxford, 1924.

Rajasthan Through : General Editor.
the Ages, Vol. I Dr. Dasharatha Sharma published by
(from the Earliest Rajasthan State Archives Bikaner, 1966.
Times to 1316
A. D.

Speeches and Writ- : H. B. Sharda, Ajmer, 1935.
ings.

Some Aspects of
Religion and Poli-
tics in India dur-
ing the Thirteenth

- Century. : Khaliq Ahmad Nizami 1961.
- Some aspects of : R. P. Tripathi
Muslim Adminis-
tration in India.
- Studies in Indo- : Hodivala, S. H., Bombay, 1939.
Muslim History.
- The Administra- : Muhammad Basheer Ahmad, 1941.
tion of Justice in
Medieval India.
- The Administra- : Qureshi, I. H. Lahore, 1958.
tion of the Sulta-
nate of Delhi.
- The Cambridge, : Edited by Sir W. Haig, 1953.
History of India,
Vol. III.
- The chronicles of : Edward, Thomas, London, Turnor & Co
the Pathan Kings 1871.
of Delhi.
- The Chronology : C. Mabel Daff, 1899.
of India.
- The Early Rulers : S. K. Mitra, 1958.
of Khajuraho.
- The Foundation : A. B. M. Habibullah, 1961.
of Muslim Rule
in India.
- The History of the : Dr. B. B. Singh, 1964.
Chahananas.
- The History of : (Miss) R. Niyogi, 1959.
the Gahadavala
Dynasty
- The History of : Alexander Dow, 1812
Hindustan, trans-
lation from the
Persian, Vol. I.

The Sultans of Delhi-Their coinage and Metrology : H. N. Wright, printed for the Government of India, Oxford University Press, 1936.

The Pre-Mughal Persian in Hindustan : Muhammad Abdul Ghani, 1941.

The Struggle for Empire : B. C. Majumdar (Editor), Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1959.

The Sultanat of Delhi : A. L. Srivastava, 1950.

Turkistan Down to the Mongol Invasion : Barthold, English translation by H. A. B. Gibb, London, 1928 2nd edition, 1958.

JOURNALS, PERIODICALS, GAZETTEERS AND MAGAZINES, ETC.

Annual Report of The Archaeological Survey of India.

Annual Report of The Rajputana Museum.

Archaeological Survey Reports (Cunningham).

Asiatic Researches.

Bombay Gazetteer.

Epigraphia Indica.

Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica.

Indian Antiquary.

Indian Culture.

Indian Historical Quarterly.

Imperial Gazetteer.

Islamic Culture.

Journal of Indian History.

Journal of The Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Journal of The Bombay Branch of The Royal Asiatic Society.

Journal of The Royal Asiatic Society, London.

Muslim University Journal, Aligarh.

Nagari Pracharini Patrika.

Northern India Patrika (News Paper).

Proceedings of the Seventh Oriental Conference, Baroda.

Proceeding of the Indian History Congress.

Proceeding of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Rajputana Gazetteer.

Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission.

Research Bulletin of the Department of History, University of Gorakhpur.

Shodha Patrika, Gorakhpur University.

Index ¹

A

- Abdul Abbas 8
Abdul Aziz 13
Abu, 118, 123, 124,
Abdul Fazl 45, 46, 204, 232
Abdul-Qadar Badayuni 157
A.B.M. Habibullah, 204,
Adinah Mosque or Juma-
Masjid 214
Afghanistan 146
Afgan 40
Aghul-Bak 145
Ahar 140
Ahmad Husain Dani 156, 157
Ahmad Sheran, 70, 199,
Ai bak, 12, 147, 191, 193, 199,
200, 205,
Ain-i-Akabari, 48.
Aibak. Bak. 180, 81.
Ajmer, 17, 18, 23, 31, 32, 37,
44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51,
52, 60, 64, 65, 66, 71, 80, 92,
95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 2, 3,
4, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16,
17, 22, 26, 213, 219, 225.
Aj-Deo (Ajayadeva), 132, 133.
Ajaipal 59.
Ajaigarh Rock, 136, 137.
A. K. Majumdar (Dr) 27.
Akbar 232,
Akhraj, 146.
Alauddin Husain, 3, 5,
Alaudin Masud, 221.
Ala-dd-din, 6, 7, 205.
Ala-ud-din Khalji, 216.
Ali kirmami, 22.
Aligarh, 225.
Allahabad, 77, 78.
Alwar, 98.
Ala-ud-din Khilji
Alexander, 134.
Ali-i-Ismail, 209.
Ali Kirmani, 22.
Ali-Nagauri, 144.
Ali Mardan, 167, 177, 199, 200.
Amir Dad Hasan, 181.
Amir Hajib Siraj-ud-din Abu-
Bakr, 183.
Amir-ul-Mumenin, 216.
Anhilwara, 27, 76.
Anahillapataka or Anhilwara,
116, 21
Andkhud, 179, 189.
Arab, 1, 10, 17.
Arabia, 1.
Arabs, 53, 62, 63.
Arabic, 205.
Aram, 221.
Aram Shah, 203, 204, 205, 206
207, 208, 209, 210, 211,
Asni, 87, 89, 95, 96.
Aqsandar, 210.

1. The list does not include the footnotes.

Arhai din ka Jhopra, 213, 218,
219.

Asia, 2.

Atiah 8.

Ayodhya, 91,

Aziz-ud-din Husain, 3,

B

Baba Kotwal Isfahani, 199.

Badaun, 91, 125, 135, 136,
140, 144, 151, 152, 156, 153,
159, 174, 208. 128, 135, 136,
140, 144, 197, 208, 209,

Bagar, 106.

Baha-ud-din Sami, 3, 4, 5.

Baha-ud-din, 6, 108, 110.

Baha-ud-din Tughril, 136, 232,

Baha-ud-din Muhammad, 182.

Bakan, 182.

Bakhtiyar Khilji 78, 148, 152,
157, 159, 176.

Bakhtiyar, 141, 143, 144, 145,
146, 147, 148, 149. 150, 151,
152, 153, 154, 156, 157; 153,
159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164,
166, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172,
198, 199, 200, 229, 230, 231.

Balasena, 166.

Bali, 124.

Balk, 179,

Balkh, 8.

Banaras, 71, 71, 78, 84, 88, 90,
91, 92, 95, 128, 131, 196,
197, 213, 225.

Bamyan, 3, 7, 8, 16, 145.

Banaras Sanskrit-Vishvidyalyah
91.

Bangalar Itiasa, 157, 164.

Banglar Itihasa, 148.

Banswara, 106.

Banyana, 107.

Baghshur, 8.

Baran, 59, 80.

Bardhan kot, 171.

Barsure 178

Barthold

Bayana 106, 108, 109, 110, 136.

Behram, 221

Beharam Shah, 3, 4, 5

Behar, 140, 195, 146, 147, 148,
149, 150, 151, 152, 154, 155,
157, 158, 159, 161, 162, 168

Benerji, 154, 107

Bengal, 141, 146, 149, 155, 157,
160, 161, 163, 165, 166, 167,
169, 198, 208

Begmati, 171

Bhagalpur, 150

Bhagarat, 156

Bhatti, 20, 21, 22

Bhima, 25, 26, 120, 124, 125

Bhima II, 116, 121, 123, 124,
125

Bhimdeo, 25, 105, 106

Bhiuti, 145

Bhiwati, 145

Bhiwa, 106

Bundi, 128, 129

Bundelkhand, 132

Briggs, 10, 204

'C'

Calcutta, 4, 149, 204

Cambay, 124

- Cambridge History of India, 151, 204
 Cambridge University, 157
 Cairo, 220
 Chaitra, 176
 Chakravarti, 157
 Charles Stewart, 155, 156
 Chand Bardai, 72, 75
 Chandawar, 79, 80, 84, 87, 96, 127, 128, 196, 127, 128
 Chandravati, 90, 167
 Chandra, 190
 Chandra Sena, 59
 Chandra Raja (Shri), 32
 China, 1, 22
 Chinab, 183
 Chitor, 144
 Chahar Gulshan, 204
 Chokradir, 28
 Chohan, 32
 Chunar, 92
 Chunargarh, 145
 Cunningham 202
- 'D'**
- Dabhoi, 124
 Dacca, 163, 166
 Dal Pangula, 75
 Dekkan, 122
 Delhi, 10, 17, 18, 24, 31, 37, 38, 44, 47, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 70, 71, 73, 80, 83, 90, 92, 93, 94, 97, 99, 101, 104, 105, 110, 111, 113, 121, 122, 125, 126, 141, 144, 151, 152, 156, 177, 183, 188, 190, 191, 193, 199, 208, 209, 210, 213, 214, 215, 218, 219, 220, 221, 225, 226, 226, 227, 228, 230, 233, 236, 237, 238
 Delhi Sultanate, 124, 112
 Deokot, 168, 176, 199, 200
- Devagiri, 122
 Devikot, 168, 199, 200
 Denapur, 168
 Dhamek, 135
 Dharyyagrama, 165
 Dommanakata, 154
 Dr. A.B.M. Habibuillah, 122, 123, 125
 Dr. A.K. Majumdar, 123, 124; 125
 Dr. Aziz Ahmad, 143
 Dr. Dasharatha Sharma, 198,
 Dr. Mohammad Aziz Ahmad, 122, 123, 125
 Dr. N.S. Bose, 137, 139
 Dr. Parmatma Saran, 125
 Dr. R.B. Singh, 108
 Dr. Roy, 134, 137
 Dr. S.K. Mishra, 135
 Dungarpur, 106
- 'E'**
- Early Turkish Empire of Delhi, 148
 Eastern India, 143
 E. Denison Ross London, 159, 205
 Edward Thomas, 155, 156, 157, 235
 Elliot, 161
 Europe, 227

F

Fais, 34
 Fakhr-ud-din Masud, 3, 71, 8, 13.
 Fakhr-ud-din, 13.
 Fakhr Mudabbir, 127, 123, 151, 152, 224.
 Fakhruddin Mubarak Shah, 151, 224, 226.
 Farar, 8
 Farishtah, 157,
 Fatihabad, 106.
 Farukhabad, 197.
 Farukh shah, 210.
 Firishta, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21, 22, 29, 30, 37, 38, 40, 41, 45, 46, 62, 76, 83, 85, 87, 90, 102, 103, 105, 106, 109, 114, 113, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 132, 133, 136, 140; 154, 165, 186, 226, 235, 235, 237.
 Firuz kuh, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 30, 40.
 Firoz Tughluq, 235.
 Fiwar, 8-
 Futuh-us-Salatin, 154.
 Furgusson, 220.

G

Gadarghata, 26
 Gahadavala, 73, 77, 78, 79, 91, 92, 94, 100, 127, 128, 142, 146.
 Gahadavalas, 59, 71, 72, 73, 74, 85, 89, 90, 95, 96, 196.
 Galah, 148.
 Gandak, 147, 150.

Gangori, 167.
 Gganl, 66.
 Ganguli (Dr.) 146,
 Ganges, 42, 54, 86 93, 125, 45, 150, 168, 171, 223.
 Ganga, 92, 167.
 Gardai, 9
 Garmsir, 143.
 Gaur, 167.
 Gharijistan, 5, 7, 8, 30.
 Ghar, 3, 4, 5, 9, 14, 15, 16, 18, 29, 30, 40, 41, 45, 73, 75, 201.
 Ghass, 2
 Ghaznavide, 2, 5, 3, 63, 74.
 Ghazni, 2, 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 28, 29, 30, 36, 40, 45, 50, 66, 67, 68, 71, 79, 88, 89, 95, 96, 106, 109, 110, 114, 115, 117, 121, 129, 144, 181, 183, 181, 191, 193, 201, 227, 228, 229, 237, 238.
 Ghazz. 7, 9.
 Ghyas-ud-din Muhammad Sami, 6, 9, 20, 189, 190, 235, 237.
 Ghiyas-ud-din, 4, 7, 8, 9, 191.
 Ghiyasuddin Balban, 221, 234.
 Ghor, 228.
 Ghor, 32, 189, 97.
 Ghoride, 32, 53.
 Ghorian, 7, 9, 16, 13, 40, 19, 112, 191
 Ghulnm Hussain Salim, 149.
 Gopal, 147.

- Godwad, 124.
 Gorakhpur, 207.
 Govind Raja, 18, 32, 37, 38, 39, 44, 49, 66, 65, 98, 104.
 Govindpelo, 148.
 Guholat, 144
 Gujrat, 23, 24, 25, 31, 32, 32, 99, 105, 112, 116, 117, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 223.
 Gukhure, 196.
 Ghor, 32, 189, 197.
 Ghoride, 32, 53.
 Ghorian, 77, 9, 1613, 40, 19.
 Ghulam Hussain Salim, 142.
 Gopal, 147.
 Godwad, 124.
 Govind Raja, 18, 32, 37, 39, 39, 44, 49, 64, 65, 98, 104.
 Govindpala, 148,
 Guhelot, 144,
 Gujrat, 23, 24, 25, 31, 32, 99, 105, 112, 126, 117, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127.
 Gukhurs, 186.
 Gupta Dynasty, 186.
 Gwalior, 108, 109, 110, 127, 137, 197, 232.
 Haig, 233,
- 'H'**
- Habibullah, 71, 149, 165, 169, 187, 235, 236
 Hasan Nizami, 17, 19, 23, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 65, 67, 68, 70, 76, 83, 85, 86, 87, 90, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 111, 116, 131, 132, 132, 134, 140, 206, 213, 214, 228, 225, 232, 233, 235
 Hansi, 17, 44, 51, 54, 55, 57, 59, 71, 225
 Hariraja, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 111, 116.
 Harishchandra, 91, 92, 93, 196, 197
 Hammira Mahakavya, 32, 34, 46, 47, 98, 102, 103, 104, 198
 Hammira, 26
 Hatim, 12
 Haig, 233
 Henry George Keene, 205
 Hindustan, 10, 31, 62, 63, 68, 74, 194, 195, 199, 200, 225, 226, 229, 235, 236
 Hisamuddin, 97
 Himalayas, 77
 Hisamuddin Auz Khilji, 200
 Hissar, 106
 Hodivala, 106
- 'I'**
- Ibn Asir, 123, 187
 Ibn Batuta, 234, 235, 236
 Ibak-i-Shil, 11
 Ibn-Asir, 21, 22, 77, 79, 83, 84, 86, 87, 90
 Ikhraj, 146
 Iktiyaruddin Muhammad Bakhtiyar Khaliji, 140, 152

- Ikhtiyar-ud-din, 158
 Iltutmish, 91, 93, 97, 98, 183,
 197, 203, 204, 205, 206, 208,
 209, 210, 211, 214, 215, 216,
 219, 231, 236
 Indarpur, 18
 India, 2, 3, 12, 17, 20, 22, 23,
 28, 31, 40, 42, 45, 46, 48, 49,
 50, 51, 53, 54, 60, 63, 68, 71,
 72, 73, 79, 89, 92, 96, 116,
 127, 153, 185, 189, 191, 211,
 212
 Indian, 8, 123, 43, 142, 209,
 221, 225, 226, 226, 228, 229,
 232, 232, 233, 235, 236, 237
 Indians, 2, 10, 17, 28, 49, 50,
 52, 62, 64, 191
 Indian Culture, 164
 Indus, 186, 191
 Inam Abu Hanifa of Kufa, 13
 Indraprashta, 18, 50
 Indarpat, 50
 Indradyumna, 148

 Iran, 191
 Isami, 144
 Ishwari Prasad (Dr), 81, 82,
 83, 151, 157, 163, 234
 Islam, 33, 39, 41, 44, 49, 51, 52,
 53, 59, 62, 65, 70, 72, 73, 76,
 80, 84, 85, 86, 93, 94, 96,
 106, 116, 126, 134, 139, 140,
 143, 152, 160, 170, 177, 184
 Islamic, 21, 74, 76, 104, 125,
 130, 131, 149
 smail, 186
 Iszzaud-ud-din Husan, 84
 Izzud-din, 114
 'J'
 Jadon Bhatti, 107

 Jagganath, 161, 165,
 Jaichandra, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80,
 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 91,
 92, 94, 100, 128
 Jai Singha, 144
 Jainism, 147
 Jahen Pahalewan, 114
 Jajnagar, 170
 Jami-ul-Hikayat, 42
 Jama-Masjid, 69
 Jammu, 28
 Jamun, 46
 Jamuna, 59, 70, 93, 209
 Jaunpur, 91, 92, 150.
 Jamun, 7
 Jata Karma, 91
 Jatwan, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 106
 Jayatsimha, 117, 119
 Jaya Chandra, 72, 73, 74
 Jeewan Ray, 105, 106
 Jayakabhukti, 130
 Jhansi, 197
 Jharkhand, 162
 Jhelum, 182, 183, 184, 185,
 186
 Jihtar (Jaitra Rai), 99, 100,
 101, 102, 103
 Jita, 160
 Jitur, 144
 Jud, 182, 184
 Juma Masjid, 111

'K'

- Kabul, 9
 K. Bhattasali, 156
 Kadonbarasa, 32
 Kalinjer, 99, 130, 132, 133,
 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139,
 151, 152, 158, 159, 195, 196,
 213, 225
 Kalanjar Fort, 137
 Kalanjaradhipati, 137, 139,
 195
 Kalachuris, 195
 Kalpi, 130, 134
 Kamauli, 91
 Kamil-tu-tawarikh, 21, 76, 86
 Kamrup, 154
 Kampilah, 145
 Kamauli, 91
 Kamdeo, 160
 Kanauj, 71, 73, 74, 78, 88, 89,
 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 128, 144,
 145
 Kanhadeva, 18
 Kankuri, 200
 Kanyakubja, 90, 91
 Karan Singh, 120
 Karamansa, 146
 Karambattan, 168, 72
 Karmahnasah, 145
 Karmathian, 20
 Karam Bahan, 172
 Karnata, 147
 Karnal, 38
 Kartika; 23
 Kansis, 160
 Kashmami, 144, 145
 Kazi Abdul Aziz, 13, 14
 Kazis, 190
 Keravasens, 78
 'K'
 Kidam, 5
 Kilhana, 24
 Kiradu, 23, 25
 Kirman, 68, 193
 Kinch, 176
 Kiwan-ul-Mulk, 41, 64
 Kol, 225
 Khalji Amirs, 39
 Kazi Fakhr-ud-din, 222
 Khalji, 49, 160
 Khalji, 141, 143, 146, 157, 159,
 172, 199, 200
 Kharmil, 29
 Khurasan, 230
 Kharjistan, 7
 Kutb Mosque, 216, 217
 Kuhram, 17, 18, 47, 51, 52, 57,
 60, 62, 106, 220, 227
 Kutb-ud-din, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14,
 17, 50, 51
 [Kutb-ud-din Aibak], 52—80,
 83—85, 89, 93, 95—143, 145,
 190—193—238
 'L'
 Lanepoole, 204
 Lahore, 2, 5, 9, 27, 28, 29, 30,
 35, 39, 41, 62, 143, 182, 185,
 191, 198, 200, 206, 208, 210,
 238
 Lakhmaniya, 78, 147, 154
 Lakhnauti, 14, 148, 130, 154,

- 156, 159, 163, 67, 68, 69, 70,
193, 194, 199, 200, 203, 206,
207, 208, 210
- Lakhnor, 167, 169
- Lakshmidhara, 34, 98
- Laksmannawa, 78
- Lakshamanapala, 128
- Lakshamansena, 154, 155, 160,
161, 162, 163, 64, 65, 66
- Lakshya, 165
- Landon, 157
- Lord Budha, 147
- Lubb-ut-Tawarikh-i-Hind, 49
- ‘M’
- Macchlishahr grant, 91
- Madanpur, 29, 30
- Madan Varman, 77
- Madhinagar, 78
- Magadha, 146
- Mahoba, 130, 134, 106, 137,
140, 178
- Mahavira, 147
- Mahendrapala, 148
- Maher, 112, 111, 116
- Mahmud Subuktigin, 132
- Mahmud, 61
- Major, 17
- Major Raverty, 72, 145, 152,
156, 157
- Malaya varma-deva, 196
- Malda District, 167
- Maldah, 168
- Malik Alaud-din-Ali Murdan
Khalji, 188
- Malik Baha-ud-din-Tughril, 192
- Malik Fakhr-ud-din, 8
- Malik Hisamud-din A-ghul
Bak, 145
- Malik Kutb-ud-din Aibak, 168
- Malik Muhammad Qala Darar,
59
- Malik Nasir-u-din-Mahmud, 93
- Malik Nasrat-ud-din, 56
- Malik Nusrat-u-din-Taishi, 137
- Malik Shah, 29, 30
- Malik Taj-ud-din Yalduz, 8
- Malik ul-umra, 97
- Malik Ziya-ud-din, 35
- Malwa, 77, 77, 128
- Mangol, 3
- Manmohan Chakravarti, 157
- Manzor, 18
- Masud, 6
- Mathura, 59
- Maulvi Abdus Salam, 149,
151
- Mawaigid-din-Balkh, 114
- Medieval India, 149, 151
- Meru, 189
- Merrut, 59, 213, 228
- Mewad, 124
- Minhaj, 224
- Minhaj-us-Siraj, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12,
13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 20, 45, 46,
47, 51, 159, 162, 163, 164,
192, 203, 206, 209, 226, 232,
234
- Mirat, 17, 59, 61, 71, 80, 225
- Mirzapur, 92
- Mithila, 147, 150
- Mlechacha, 32
- Modern Bundelkhand, 130

- Monghyr, 150
 Mohafila, 41
 Mohanpandita Harisikeasa-Sharma. 92
 Mohmud Ghizney, 25
 Mohomed Ghooory, 30
 Monghyr, 150
 Moradabad, 59
 Mount Abu, 25, 26, 27
 Mr. Dow, 10
 Mount Abu, 117
 Muatwad-ud-duala, 172
 Muhammad Aziz Ahmed, 205, 206, 207, 237
 Muhammad Bakhtiyar Khilji, 161
 Muhammad Bakhtiyar, 147, 150, 157, 171, 172
 Muhammad Bin Kasim, 1
 Muhammad-bin-sam, 4, 48, 216
 Muhammad Ghorī, 4, 34
 Muhammad-i-Abdus-salam, 36
 Muhammad Sheran, 170, 199
 Muhammad Sam Ghorī, 118
 Muhammadji, 33, 42, 45, 46, 41
 Muhammedans, 46, 48, 171
 Muizzud-din, 4, 25
 Mularaja II, 116
 Mulla Tagi, 197
 Multan, 1, 20, 22, 23, 25, 31, 32, 34, 41, 208
 Munir, 145
 Muizzd-din, 25, 221
 Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh, 143, 159
 Mugti, 144
 Murghab, 7
 Murshidabad, 167, 168
 Musrat-ud-din, 55
 'N'
 Nadiya, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167
 Nadol, 24
 Nadol, 117, 118, 128, 199
 Nagaur, 144
 Nagar, 167
 Nagla, 144
 Nalauda, 148, 180
 Naushiroan, 52
 Narasimhadwa, 147
 Naraukni, 171, 198, 199
 Narwar, 197
 Nasir-ud-din, 3, 44
 Nasir-ud-din Qubacha, 210, 231
 Nasir-ud-din Husain, 114
 Nasir-ud-din Mahmud, 221
 Nasiue-din, 65, 66
 Naya Chandra Suri, 98
 Nehrudala, 23, 25
 Nehrwalla, 105, 112, 113, 117, 121, 125
 Nirmuruz, 3
 Nlrawi, 36
 Nikhila-Yawana Ksaya Kaudi, 75
 Nisawi, 36
 Nisbat Nama, 158

Nishapur, 14, 13, 189, 222,
227, 228
Niyogi, 92
Nizami, 44
Nizam-ud-din, 148
Nizam-ud-din Ahmad, 12, 154
Nizam-ud-din Bakushi, 157
N.K. Bhattasati, 157, 158, 67
Nodia, 162
Northern Doab, 127
Northern India, 107, 130, 135,
142
Nunis, 176

‘O’

Odantapura, 146, 148
Orissa, 165, 166, 167, 168
Oudh, 93, 140, 145, 150, 151,
152, 156, 158

‘P’

Pag Sam Jon Zong, 158
Pajjan Rai, 136
Pali, 117, 118
Palihah, 145
Pathana, 118
Panchaka, 157
Paramara, 118
Paramardi, 131, 132, 133, 135,
136
Parihara, 197
Parihar Dynasty, 108
Parmars, 73
Patiali, 145
Patnan Kings, 156
Patna, 146
Peshwar, 41, 79, 196
Persia, 227

Persian, 21, 149
Persian Shah Qushlasib, 171
Pithaura, 84
Pole, star of Religion, 11
Prabandha Chintamani, 24,
45, 47, 48
Praharaja Prabandha, 46, 47,
48
Poratapa, 946, 152
Pratapdevi, 98
Pratinaros, 88
Prithviraj, 104
Prithviraj III, 17, 18, 23, 31,
32, 33, 37, 39, 41, 42, 43,
44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 56, 53,
54, 63, 72, 73, 74, 77, 81, 89,
92, 95, 98, 105, 107, 116,
136
Prithviraja-vijaya, 32, 34
Prithviraja Raso, 34, 40, 47,
75, 136
Probandha Kasa, 34
Prof. Habibullah, 109, 110
P. Saran (Dr.), 146
Pungu, 75
Punish, 34
Punjab, 2, 23, 31, 62, 63, 74,
182, 193
Purnea, 150
Puronita, 91

‘Q’

Qaimaz Rani, 196, 200
Qaliyeem,
Qaudhar, 3
Qara Khita. 1, no
Qara Khitai, 2

- Qara Khitais, 179, 180
 Qita Rai, 221
 Qila Rai Pithora, 220
 Qubacha, 192
 Queen Naiki Devi, 26
 Qutb-ud-din, 123
 Qutb Mosque, 213, 214, 218
 Qutb Minar, 213, 215, 217,
 218, 220, 226
 Quwwat-ul-Islam, 214, 216
- 'R'**
- Rabi-ul-awal, 119.
 Raudhakrishna Chaudhary,
 (Prof) 147.
 Ragh-i-Raz, 8
 Rai, 109, 110, 117, 160, 161,
 174.
-
- Rai Pithaura, 54, 65.
 Rai Laxman Sena 154, 161,
 167, 163, 184, 69.
 Rais, 154,
 Raja, 163.
 Rajgir, 147.
 Rajmahal, 150.
 Rajput, 107, 110, 113, 114, 115,
 116, 117, 118, 120, 130, 131,
 135, 138, 165, 198,
 Rajputana, 25, 112, 129, 122,
 125, 128, 129.
 Ramabhamanjari, 75.
- Ram Chandra. 122,
 Ranake Vijaya Karna, 92.
 Rangan, 55.
 Rangpur, 150.
- Ranking, 159.
 Ranthambore, 64, 65, 98, 104.
 Rauzat-us-safa, 177.
 Rasintha Kutra, 128.
 Raso, 85.
 Rathor Lakhanpala, 140..
 Raverty, 159, 205.
 Raziya, 221.
 R. C. Majumdar (Dr) 158.
 R. D. Banerji, 149, 157, 164.
 Rewa, 136.
 Riyaz-us-saatin, 149, 150, 151,
 153, 163.
 Rohimyoke, 91.
 Rohtasgarh, 152, 146.
 R. P. Tripathi, 235, 236, 237,
 R. S. Tripathi (Dr.) 77, 92.
 Ruknuddin 221,
- 'S'**
- Sabik-i-Mulk, 63, 66.
 Sahib-Karam, 131.
 Saif-ud-din, 7, 8.
 Saif-ud-din Shri, 7, 4, 5, 6.
 Sakambhari, 98.
 Saka Subhadaya, 158.
 Saka, 164.
 Solankh pal 139.
 Samana, 44, 54.
 Samar Kand, 180.
 Samaddar, 148.
 Sams-ud-din, 148.
 Savat, 149.
 Samar Kandi, 178.
 Sangwan, 182.
 Sanat, 165.
 Sankot, 165.

- Sankrat, 161.
 Sanknat, 165.
 Sankrat, 161.

 Sanyogita, 81.
 Sapadalaksa, 14.
 Saraf-ud-din Muhammad-
 Jarrah, 174.

 Sarsvati, 45, 46, 47.
 Sarsuti, 42, 44, 51, 71, 268.
 Sayyad-Majid-ud-din Masaur, 5.
 Sayyeds, 190.
 Sena, 164.
 Sena king, 163.
 Sena Kingdom, 164.
 Setyugs,
 Sena-dhipati, 34.
 Sahab-ud-din Mohammad-
 Gaur, 6.

 Shahab-ud-din, 8, 9, 19, 14, 15,
 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25,
 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35,
 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47,
 48, 49, 50, 51, 55, 59, 60, 62,
 66, 71, 72, 74, 75, 79, 83, 87,
 93, 95, 114, 117, 118, 142,
 193, 144, 192, 201, 223, 229,
 230, 231, 237, 238.
 Shadani, 159.
 Shahakad, 146, 152.
 Shahsab, 24.

 Shaja-ud-din Alhya, 3.
 Shams-ud-din, 163.
 Shams-ud-din Altamash, 137.
 Sharji, 156.
 Sharma, 106.
 Sher Shah, 7.
 Sherwan, 208.
 Sialkot, 29.

 Sind, 19, 29, 62,
 Sindh, 10, 20, 31, 207.
 Sindhraju, 76.
 Sirhind.
 Sirohi.
 Sirsa, 106.
 Sultan Mahmud, 228.
 Sultan Shah, 230.
 Syria, 220.
 Spain 1, 220.

 Skanda, 34, 72, 98
 Somesvara, 124
 Somnath, 124
 Sona, 145
 Sonargaon, 163, 166
 Samanas, 148
 Shavana, 164
 Sridhara, 124
 Srimatkanya Kubja Vijaya-
 rajya, 93
 Stewart, 161, 167
 Subhadur, 86
 Sujjan Rai, 12
 Sulaiman, 183
 Suljooks, 30
 Sultan, 150, 160, 187
 Sultan Aram Shah,
 Sultan Alauddin, 203

- Sultan Ghiyas-ud-din Muhammad, 30, 182
 Sultan-i-Ghazi, 25
 Sultan Kutb-ud-din, 150, 193
 Sultan Muizzuddin, 154, 177, 196
 Sultan Mahmud, 23, 23, 28, 130, 132, 138, 201
 Sultan Shahab-ud-din, 11, 79, 153, 178, 184, 198, 202
 Sultan Shah, 16
 Sumps-M-Khan, 158
 Sunderbans, 164
 Sundha zill, 24
 Suraj Prakash, 25
 Surana charita, 34
 Swistan, 194
- 'T'**
- Tabakat-i-Nasiri, 224
 Takahat-i-Nazimi, 4, 17, 25, 45, 46, 93, 144, 145, 156, 206, 12, 91, 160, 67, 203
 Tahakat-i-Akhari, 154
 Takarhindah, 37, 39, 208
 Taginabad, 8, 9
 Tajak
 Tajud-din Yalduz, 68, 192, 193
 Taj-i-Ma-asia, 45, 46, 52, 206
 Tajul Masia, 102, 103
 Taligan, 8, 9
 Tangar (Tahangarh), 143
 Tangan, 169
 Tantoli, 93
 Tarain, 17, 34, 35, 38, 42, 44, 45, 48, 51, 72, 74, 107, 144
 Taranath: 146, 148, 150
 Tarikh-i-Firishta, 28, 49, 54, 200
 Tarikh-i-Fakhrudin Mbarak Shah, 151, 158, 186
 Tayanku Taraz, 179
 The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, 146
 Tibet, 156, 169, 172, 194
 Tibetan, 146, 150, 158
 Tirhut, 197
 Tista, 150
 Tista Korato a basim, 168
 Trailokyavarman, 136, 137, 138, 139, 195, 196
 Tripathi (Dr), 196
 Tughril, 168, 110
 Tukharistan, 4, 169, 222
 Tulak, 7
 Tulaki, 36
 Turk, 65, 66, 71, 72, 144, 172, 180
 Turks, 1, 2, 40, 19, 27, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 68, 71, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 90, 98, 105, 111, 112, 115, 123, 128, 130, 142, 161
 Turkish, 2, 3, 23, 24, 48, 49, 59, 67, 80, 89, 95, 194, 203
 Turushkas, 137, 146
 Tus, 189

'V'

Vadesara, 91
 Vaisakha, 104
 Vaidya, 148
 Vanga, 163
 Varanas, 152
 Yavanas, 146
 Vidyadhara, 130, 150
 Vidya Pati, 75, 85
 Vighra Rayal, 75, 77
 Vijaya Karan, 93
 Vikrampur, 152
 Vikramsila, 145, 150
 Vikram Samvat, 91
 Vodamayata, 128
 Viravarman, 137, 195
 Viruddna-vidhi-vidhvansa,
 32, 35, 47, 48, 72, 98
 Vishnu, 137

'W'

Wasih, 4n
 Waziristan, 6, 7
 West, 148
 W. Haig (Sir), 151, 156

'Y'

Yahya-bin Sirhindi, 12, 29
 Yalduz, 180, 181, 192, 194,
 201, 231
 Yamini, 27, 28, 30
 Yanma, 71, 130
 Yavanesvara Sahavadew, 75

'Z'

Zabul, 9
 Zamin-i-Daur, 8
 Zia-Barni, 122
 Zia-ul-mulk, 68
 Zikad, 190

END

