

# THE EARLY TURKISH RULE IN NORTHERN INDIA: AN ASSESMENT OF THE BRITISH AND INDIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY DURING THE 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY

BIMAN KOLEY

PHD RESEARCH SCHOLAR, C.M.J. UNIVERSITY

## INTRODUCTION

Three literary works with direct bearing on the history, political institutions, religion and politics of the early Turkish rule in northern India appeared in the 20th century. Two of these works were the product of individual initiatives of A.B.M. Habibullah and K.A. Nizami. The third was produced by Muhammad Aziz Ahmad as his Ph.D. thesis (published, 1949) submitted to Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh. The three authors not only had different objectives in view but also adopted different modes of investigation. Their conclusions and themes, in some respects, were not identical, but there is considerable similarity in the questions they asked. An assessment of Habibullah's work brings certain points to notice. In the first place, the Slave kings from Aibak to Kayumur are designated by the author as *Mamluks*, a foreign denomination used for the studies in central Asia and not India. The early Sultans who ruled over northern India had been purchased and reared either by Muhammad Ghuri or Iltutmish and are recorded in history as *Ghulams or Bandagan-i-Turk* and not *Mamluks*. Secondly, the part of the 15th chapter entitled, "*Society and Culture*" devoted to the cultural development of the age has done scant justice to the literary progress of the time.<sup>4</sup> What is written by the author is too sketchy to fall in line with the standard of the monograph. The age in which scholars like *Hasan Nizami, Fakhr-i-Muddabir, Minhaj Siraj, Amir Khusraw, Muhammad Awif and Amir Hasan* flourished cannot be called barren. Besides, the author has not referred to the literary circle founded by Muhammad Khan Shaheed, the son of Balban at Samana. The prince was a scholar himself and spared no effort to diffuse knowledge and create literary interest in the Indian society. The circle had its own novelty. It functioned like a seminar in which various topics were discussed and verses exchanged. The circle was attended by *Amir Hasan* and *Amir Khusraw*, the luminaries of the age, and *Shaikh Sa'di*, the celebrated poet of Persia was invited there. Although the poet failed to respond to the invitation favourably, yet the fact that the invitation was extended to *Shaikh Sadi* indicates the wider range of Indian scholars and their knowledge of the outside world.

Nizami's picture of medieval Hinduism is a gloomy one, drawn mostly from *Alberuni* and quotations from the Laws of Manu. The latter can hardly be accepted as illustrating the

practical working of caste in Northwestern India in the 10th to 12th centuries. There is frequent mention of the —*urban revolution*” which followed the establishment of Muslim power, but the author did not tell what this consisted of except that the “*impure*” Hindu castes were not allowed to dwell within the city walls. A dispassionate examination of the social information expounded in the Sanskrit authors of the period immediately preceding Muslim conquests *Kalhana*, *Kshemendra*, *Somadeva* and so on - may yet improve the picture of Indian urban life. Carefully conducted excavations may in future reveal considerable differences between pre - and post – Muslim cities, but the evidence which would support or rebut these contentions is as yet lacking.

Three works about the individual Sultans, Qutbududin Aibek, Iltutmish and Razia who ruled in 13th century had also appeared. A.K. Srivastva’s *Life and Times of Kutb-ud-din Aibak* (Gorakapur, 1972); Rekha Joshi’s, *Sultan Iltutmish* (Varansi, 1979); and Rafiq Zakaria’s *Razia: Queen of India*, (Bombay, 1966) are three important monographs which shed light on reign of these Sultans of Delhi. But, the most important historiographical intervention in the study of this period, which is still extremely influential in the making of university syllabi and trends in research, was made by Mohammad Habib in a series of articles published intermittently through the 1920s and 1950s.

Contribution of another important British historian, Peter Jackson, who is well known as an authority in this field, to Islamic scholarship range from the banks of the Ganges and the Indus to Central Asia and Iran in the Mongol epoch as well as Middle Eastern crusader studies. Throughout his scholarly career, Peter Jackson has been preoccupied with the interplay between the 13<sup>th</sup> Century Mongol Empire of the Chinghizids and the history of the Delhi Sultanate. He contributed a monograph and a number of articles on the history of Delhi Sultanate. His work entitled, *The Delhi Sultanate: A Political and Military History* (Cambridge, 1999) is learned, full of erudition, and judicious, and it must be counted one of the most distinguished contributions to Indian history in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The 20th century histories written by the British and Indian historians on early Turkish rule help us to know about the state of affairs during the 13th century. They enrich our knowledge of the socio-political, economic and cultural milieu present at those times. The histories written by British and Indian historians had different set of objectives and different aims. But, constant improvements and new beginnings in the field of historiography helped its cause. However no work has been published till date on the 20th century historiography of Indian and British historians on the early Turkish Rule in northern India. The present investigation is a humble attempt in this direction. This work is divided into six chapters with an introduction at the beginning and conclusion at the end. It is an endeavour to trace the

characteristics and developments in the field of historiography during 20th century and makes an assessment of the historical writings on polity, society, economy, religion and institutions of early Turkish rule.

## ECONOMIC CONDITION OF SULTANATE PERIODS

Two western social thinkers – Karl Marx and Max Weber very much influenced the writings of early British economic historians of India. Karl Marx propounds his theory of the Asiatic system, a mode of production and social organization that inhibited all structural change. Max Weber seems to have agreed with Karl Marx though for different reasons. Weber urged that India had a stable unchanging society because of the caste system. Caste separated education from craft, segregated skills, and destroyed individual ambitions. These prevented economic mobility and created a firmly stable but stagnant economic structure. Weber's ideas have continued to dominate much of subsequent economic thought. The conditions in which modern historiography took shape in India helped to perpetuate these views. On the one hand, Indian historians' inherited a number of detailed dynastic histories, which laid out for medieval India at least, the bedrock for conventional history, in this economic aspects received notice if at all as merely incidental appendages. On the other hand, the scorn (spoken and unspoken) of imperialist historians for Indian contribution to civilization, led, by way of reaction, to the promotion of the cult of what may be called *benign antiquity*'.

One such insight related to the change that might occur owing to external invasions. As we have seen, Marx had thought that Indian history consisted merely of the regimes of "*successive intruders*", without their affecting any change in the basic social structure. But Kosambi saw that such intrusions could not be without some effect. He recognized in particular that "*the Islamic raiders ... Broke down hidebound customs in the adoption and transmission of new technique*". Kosambi felt nevertheless that the chance represented no more than the intensification of a process of feudalization that had already been set in motion in ancient India. In this, his position was different from that adopted by Mohammad Habib who argued (in 1952) that the chances resulting from the invasions were so sweeping as to constitute an "*urban revolution*" that was accompanied secondarily (in point of time) by a "*rural revolution*". Investigations in the economic past of the Indian subcontinent were initiated by the British historian in late 19th century. The forms of evidence used by historians have been the literary genre, epigraphic remains, and archaeological findings including numismatic material. Virtually none of these had had a quantitative dimension, either absolute or relative. As a result economic historians, especially of India's 13th century, have taken an anecdotal approach to their subject. Starting as they have with a black canvas, the energies of the economic historians concerned with

the medieval period have been absorbed in gathering together and categorizing a great mass of independent facts gleaned from the primary sources. For the longest time, W.H. Moreland remained the sole historian whose focus on the relationship between the state and the peasantry remained outside the fold of Sultanate historiography. Moreland argued that the revenue collection functions of the Muslim state in India were *the most potent factor in the distribution of the national income; while its action in regard to distribution inevitably reacted on production, so much so that we are justified in concluding that, next only to the weather, the administrator was the dominant fact in the economic life of the country.* Moreland's work was a mixture of extremely awkward anachronisms (note his discussion of *Hindu—Muslim* social and revenue systems and on the office of *wazir*), balanced by some much nuanced readings and translations of Persian texts and terminologies (see especially the discussion on his use of the term *Province* and *Governor*).

In the 20th century, economic historians remained concerned with society's material relationship. In their channel of inquiry, economic interaction show clear trends based on the aggregate of individual human activities. Hence investigators tend to focus on those phenomena which lend themselves to measurement or quantification. Current concerns require fairly sophisticated economic records. As these sources are unavailable for the medieval period, economic historians have been relatively slow to address substantive problems or formulate models of past economic activity. In spite of a clear lack of trustworthy statistical data or perhaps because of it, strongly articulated perceptions of the nature of India's medieval economy have become widely propagated. Certain of the putative elements, such as feudalization, decentralization, decline of trade and village self-sufficiency, have become virtual axioms of historic and economic texts. The wealth of information and analysis on Sultanate coinage is one of the glories of the world of knowledge, in the absence of other forms of evidence, which helped in reconstruction of 13th century economic history.

## RELIGIOUS PRACTICES OF SULTANATE

During the 20th century studies on religious practices and traditions of the early Turkish rule have made sufficient headway, in spite of the limited scope and availability of contemporary source materials. The study of medieval Islam as a religion with a total impact on Hindustan was not wholly neglected by 20th century historians even when, as during the first forty years of this century, narrative political history dominated modern historiography on medieval India. In the early 20th century, Thomas Arnold, Murray Titus, Mohammad Wahid Mirza and nearer independence and partition, Mohammad Habib, A.B.M. Habibullah and K. A. Nizami have directed their attention to the religious aspects of the Muslim '*presence*' in India.

But it would not be unfair to say that their contributions, however important individually, did not control the main thrust and the direction of historical works on medieval India before 1947. Their works did not have any appreciable effect upon the forms, technique and scope of such standard general histories as the *Oxford History of India* (London, 1919); *The Cambridge History of India*, Volume-III, (Cambridge, 1928) and Ishwari Prasad's *History of Medieval India* (1925).

James Mill division of Indian history on the basis of *religion* had a strong influence in the historical writings of early British and Indian historians. Contemporary understanding of Indo-Islamic history have been greatly influenced and sometimes distorted by contemporary agendas or conceptual categories which readily held the past hostage. Inferiority complex among the early Indian historians appears to be one important factor which hampered the cause of historical writings in pre-independence period. Some of these factors had lasting impact over understanding of Indo-Islamic religious practices and traditions. It may be helpful to assess the works of British and Indian historians on religious conditions prevailing in 13th Century.

R.C. Majumdar writing about Hindu-Muslim relations during the Sultanate of Delhi sees an uncompromising spirit of animosity between the two communities.<sup>408</sup> Living for generations as close neighbors, reciprocal relations were too superficial and touched merely the fringe of life. The ultra democratic social ideas of the Muslims, an object lesson of equality and fraternity, did not make any impact on Hindu social rigidity and attitude of inequality among men exemplified in the Caste system and Untouchables. Nor did the Muslims imbibe the Hindu spirit of tolerance and reverence for all religions. They did not moderate their zeal to destroy the Hindu temples and images of gods. The Hindu was Zimmi-a being protected by the Muslim state on condition of rendering certain service and suffering certain political and civil disabilities.

Writing on Hindu-Muslim Relations and Fusion of Hindu-, Muslim ideas and practices, A. Rashid in his book, *Society and Culture in Medieval India* (1206-1526 A.D.) believes that the medieval chroniclers are responsible for the attitude of some modern scholars towards the problem of Hindu-Muslim relations. He observes that the chroniclers would have us believe that the Muslim conquerors were good Muslims because their primary aim and motive in the wars and conquests were religious rather than political.

Sukhdev Singh's monograph on the history of Muslims of Indian origin, entitled, *Muslims of Indian Origin during the Delhi Sultanate: Emergence, Attitudes & Role (1192-1526 AD)*, (New Delhi 2005) is also an important contribution. It is originally a Ph.D thesis presented to Kurukshetra University (2000) for award of degree. The work is divided into six chapters. The

author illustrates the history of emergence of the Muslims of Indian origin as a social community and the role played by them in contemporary body politics and administration during the Delhi Sultanate. The author also discusses the various theories of conversion in India from the times of Arabs to the period of Delhi Sultanate.

## SOCIO-CULTURAL MILIEU OF TURKISH RULE

The works of early British historians had a strong influence to these compendia of history material, for example Stanley Lane Poole's (*Medieval India Under Mohammedan Rule*, London, 1903), Vincent Smith's (*The Oxford history of India*, London, 1919) and W. Haig (ed.) (*The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III- Turks and Afghans*, London, 1928). All these authors used the data provided by Elliot and Dowson and by the Bibliotheca Indica series almost to the exclusion of any other. It was a self-imposed limitation, writes Peter Hardy. Moreover, it was not true that the only literary evidence available to scholars was that provided by the works of medieval Muslim historians. *The India office Library, the British Museum* and the *library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, to mention only the most accessible, contained many works on Indo-Muslim religious observance, jurisprudence, mysticism and 'political thought' as well as collections of belles-lettres and poetry. Except, F.A. Steingass (*A Comprehensive Persian English Dictionary*, Delhi, 1973 reprint), no major contribution by any of the British historian was made in the modern studies of development of Persian culture, traditions and poetry in the 13th century.

The first book on social history which appeared in India during the 1930's, when political history dominated the scene of historiography on medieval India was K.M. Ashraf's, *Life and Conditions of the People of Hindustan* (Calcutta, 1935). His approach was non-communal and nationalistic and he attempts to study the life and conditions of the people of medieval India in economic terms and not on religious lines. The chapters in his book are divided under headings like '*The Sultan as a Private Person*', '*The Sultan as a public Person*', '*The Court*', '*Rural Life*', '*the Standards of life*', '*Domestic Life*' and so on, yet it is uncharitable on the part of Peter Hardy to say that his picture of society, "*is not dynamic but static; the work is an essay on dissection of a corpse not a description of a living, moving, changing organism.*" Ten years before K.M. Ashraf's monograph, in 1925, Yusuf Ali published his book, *Making of India* (London, 1925) and claimed that the Muslims 'brought a better organization and a manlier culture in India.'<sup>437</sup> His approach towards the writing of medieval social history is liberal and nationalistic.

Mohammad Habib observed two movements which helped in formation of early Delhi Sultanate. The first is the supremacy of the Turks as a military and governing class. Not less

important is the second movement, which E.G. Browne calls the '*Persian Renaissance*'. He further says the rise of minor dynasties in central Asia began to help in the revival of the Persian language, first poetry and then prose. The greatest patrons were of course, the Ghaznavids. The early Turkish rule in the northern India was built by both of these forces, the Turkish Mamluks and the Persian intelligentsia. The Turkish Mamluks were its founders and the Persian intelligentsia classes and their cultural traditions were its identity.

Indian historian U.N. Day's *The Government of the Sultanate*, discuss in its introduction, '*The Model of the Government*' which deals with the inheritance of the institutions of the early Turkish rulers. He traces the background of the institution inherited by the Delhi Sultans from the times of Muhammad the Prophet. He says, "*It was in Persia that the Muslims or the Saracens came in contact with culture far superior to their own... they could not resist copying the Persian system of government and Persian culture.*" He further adds that it was at Baghdad that the influence of the Arabs faded and the Persian influence began to dominate under the Abbasides. When the Abbasid Caliphate began to decline and distant provinces turned into independent Muslim kingdoms, this pattern was adopted by them with necessary modifications. The Turkish Sultans of Delhi also adopted many offices from this pattern and made additions and alterations in them as demanded by the various administrative problems that they were called upon to solve.

In the early 1950's, Muhammad Habib put forth a general hypothesis of '*Urban Revolution*' in northern India during the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries. Muhammad Habib, was the first historians who talked of social and professional mobility during the 13<sup>th</sup> century. He stressed on certain causes like the migration of Indian workers from outside to inside of the city walls with the coming of Turks; the shariat makes no discrimination whatsoever in the transactions of civil life and treats free contract regardless of the creed of the parties as the basis of the economic order and uplift in social status, equality in religion and freedom of profession etc. He argued these themes in light of classical Marxist position of Islam as an egalitarian social ideology cutting across caste boundaries and creating opportunities for social mobility. It is also evident, however, that K.M. Ashraf who wrote a book on social history 15 years before Muhammad Habib passed over the concept of mobility in social and professional areas.

An assessment of Indian and British historiography during the 20th century brings into prominence the branches, topics and areas in which sufficient research has been undertaken. It also highlights the gaps to be plugged, and areas in which further research can be pursued. One such area is the nature and function of the state or monarchy in the Mamluk period. The studies in this field are highly influenced by the contemporary political thoughts and agendas in

circulation during the 20th century. This perception of division of Indian history on the basis of religion was also fundamental. Distinction was made by James Mill when he divides Indian history into three periods and equated them with religions - ancient India with Hindu, medieval India with Muslim and modern India with British period. The colonial mentality and psyche of the rulers enforced a set of historical traditions which also relegated the colony to an inferior nation.

## REFERENCES

1. Irfan Habib, "*Social and Economic change in Northern India (1200-1500 A.D)*". P.I.H.C., 1981, Kurukshetra, pp. 2-3.
2. Max Weber's ideas are discussed in Morris D. Morris, "*Values as an obstacle to economic Growth in South Asia : An Historical Survey*", *Journal of Economic History*, Vol. XXVII, No. 4 Dec. 1967, pp. 588-607
3. Irfan Habib, —*Economic history of the Delhi Sultanate: An Essay in Interpretation*||, *I.H.R.*, IV (2), 1978, pp. 289-92.
4. *Agrarian System of Moslem India*, Delhi, 1990, reprint ; see especially, pp 216-28.
5. Rashid, "*Agricultural Tracts, Pastures and Woodlands in Medieval India*, " *J.O.B.R.S.*, Vol. LVII, Jan.-Dec. 1967, pp. 161-169.
6. Ryosuke Furui, "*The Rural World of an Agricultural Text: A Study on the Krisparāsara*, *Studies in History*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 2005, pp. 149-171.
7. Richard M. Eaton, *The Rise of Islam and the Bengal frontier, 1204-1760 A.D.*, New Delhi, 1997, pp. 113-134.
8. Peter Hardy, *Historians of Medieval India*, New Delhi, 1997, pp. 9-10.
9. Mohammad Habib, *Sultan Mahmud of Ghaznin*, 2nd Ed. Delhi, 1951, p. 1-11.
10. Irfan Habib, "*Technological Changes and Society, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*," Presidential Address, Section II, P.I.H.C., Varansi Session, 1969, pp. 1-10.
11. I.H. Siddiqui, *Medieval India Vol. I, op. cit.*, pp. 27-57.
12. I.H. Siddiqui, "*Social Mobility in the Delhi Sultanate*," in Irfan Habib, (Ed.), *Medieval India 1, op. cit.*, pp. 22-48.



13. Irfan Habib, "*Technological Changes and Society-13th and 14th Centuries,*" Presidential Address, Medieval India Section, 31st Session of the Indian History Congress, Varansi, Dec. 1969, pp. 1 to 26.

IJRSSH

The East India Company's rule of India continued until 1857, when the first Indian revolt led to the formal assumption of authority by the Crown. But the transition was not as big as people tend to think. The British rulers were very honest with each other about India behind closed doors. As late as 1928 the home secretary, Sir William Hicks, is quoted as saying, "There's all this nonsense about India being ruled for the benefit of Indians, this is utter cant and hypocrisy." 2017 was the 70th anniversary of the Partition of the Indian Raj which caused such an epidemic of bloodshed. Yasmin Khan, Associate Professor of History at Oxford University, and author of 'The Great Partition' draws on her research and family recollections to deliver the powerful story of partition. Watch Now. Most of the Indian subcontinent was conquered by the Maurya Empire during the 4th and 3rd centuries BCE. From the 3rd century BCE onwards Prakrit and Pali literature in the north and the Tamil Sangam literature in southern India started to flourish.[10][11] Wootz steel originated in south India in the 3rd century BCE and was exported to foreign countries.[12][13][14] During the Classical period, various parts of India were. Dissatisfaction with Company rule led to the Indian Rebellion of 1857, after which the British provinces of India were directly administered by the British Crown and witnessed a period of rapid development of infrastructure, economic decline and major famines.[26][27][28][29][30] During the first half of the 20th century, a nationwide. When Indians kicked out the British in 1947, they unwisely retained the school curriculum of the colonialists. Now the entire Aryan vs Dravidian idea revolves around skin colour. The people of northern India are light skinned and are in many instances white; they are supposedly the Aryans. On the other hand, the people of India below the Tropic of Cancer " or more specifically the south and east " have comparatively darker and sometimes black skin; they are presumably the Dravidians. Indeed, it is worth mentioning the during the early part of the 20th century Sikh immigrants to the US convinced the Immigration & Naturalization Service to grant them white status. Those days only white Europeans were allowed to enter the United States as immigrants.