Chapter - VI

Comparison with Indian Sources and Modern Works
COMPARISON WITH INDIAN SOURCES AND MODERN WORKS

(Under this head, the Arabic and Persian scholars and historian can be compared with the ancient and modern works as given by the Indian scholars)

The culture of India as described in original Indian sources and the sources which is available in the form of Arabic and Persian. Is there any correlation with the modern writers who have written the past and present history on the basis of found evidences and what they have seen in Indian society will be real and splendid work to the history. There are the various aspects which we have to discuss in the coming paragraph in the light of the Indian ancient sources and the modern works which are found in the form of various books and literatures.

There are the explanation that the Indian society are divided into four castes on the basis of birth as the Brahmans, Khatriyas, Sudras and Vaishyas. Some historian has given the two division Shweta (white) and Shyam (black).¹ Most of the scholars have accepted the four fold division of the Indian society (Rigned XIth Mandal of the hymns). The Brahamanas from the head and had performed religious duties and also hold over the education and learning. The next was Kshatriya who was born from arms symbolizes the character of Power and strength. His duty was to protect society and the country from the external as well as internal aggression. The third one was the Vaishyas who is originated from the thigh of the Purushukta and have performed the duty of trade and commerce. He is also involved in the agricultural activities. The last was the Sudra who originates from the feet of the Prushukta and considered the low in the position. His duty was to serve
of all the three who is also characterized as dvija born caste. This is the social
division of the society but during the Gupta period the fifth caste was also
included in the division was called Chandalas. He was considered the
outcaste and was mostly negated by the majority of the society. He was never
allowed to enter into the city before rising and after the sunset. He was never
allowed to mixed up with the other society. There are the division of the
Indian society as found in the Indian sources and also in the Alberuni and Ibn
Batutta works. But the Greek scholar Megesthene who came in India during
Mauryan Age has written the book Indica. Megesthene who came from
Greek and was very much influenced by the society of his own country. He
found that the society was divided into seven sects. This division was not on
the basis of birth but on the basis of profession. It means Megesthenese has
seen the Indian society in accordance with his own country and he has also
divided the Indian society into seven sects. So that there is no co-relation
between the two sources.

Likewise the marriage which is described in the ancient Indian sources
of Eight types. But the advent of Muslims in India had talked about only one
kind of marriage. This kind of marriage could not affected the Hindu laws of
the marriages.

When there is the discussion of Rajput clan who is the most affected
party of Muslims. The Rajput confrontation with Muslims starts when
Mahmood Gazni, Muhammad Ghori attacked India to established their rule
over India. Initially Ghori was defeated, but by great confidence Ghori has
attacked on the Rajput ruler Prithviraj Chauhan. In the second battle of Tarain
(1192), Prithviraj was defeated and by this defeat not only Ghori rule but the
tradition of Muslim rule established in India for a long period.³

By this way, Muhammad Ghori or the Turkish rule has established over India and what was the causes of success of Turkish. There are the many opinions given by the scholars by showing their evidences. The Muslim Scholars, the British and the Indian origin scholars are different in his opinion. The Muslim chroniclers Hasan Nizami, Minhajus Siraj and Fakhr-i-
Mudabbir. The first two say nothing about the cause of the Turkish success in India Almighty God gave the victory to Islam. This was the conventional statement which cannot be accepted. Fakhr-i-Mudabbir in his Adab-ul Harb has the detailed account of the horse as the chief instrument of war and condemnation of feudal levies the strength of the Turkish and the weakness of the Indian armies from a purely military point of view.

The British historian have attempted to explain the success of Muslim in the 13th century. Elphinstone wrote ‘As his Muizuddin’s army was drawn from all the war like Provinces between the Indus and the oxus. They were trained and had habit to gain success. Here Elphinstone ignores the fact that the Rajputs with whom the Turks had to contend were not, in the least, wanting in bravery, martial spirit and courage.⁴

Sir Jadunath Sarkar’s analysis of the causes of Muslim success in India as Islam gave to its followers three characteristics virtues which no other religion has inspired so successfully and which imparted to natural soldiers like the Arabs, Berbers, Pathans and Turks, a wonderful military efficiency. These were: First complete equality and social solidarity as regards legal
status and religious Privileges. Thus all destinations of caste and race were swept away and the sect was knit together like the members of one vast family of brothers. Secondly fatalism, spring from an absolute reliance on God and the belief that what Allah wills must triumph over every human effort. Thirdly freedom from drunkenness. Wine drinking is a since according to Quran and a crime punishable by the state in Muslim countries. On the other hand, wine drinking was the ruin of the Rajputs, Marathas and other Hindu soldiers and made them incapable of far-sighted military planning conducting surprises, and even guarding their own camps with proper precaution. Thus how the sources are different in their explanation and approaches.

The history of Rajasthan and its social system are mostly found in the writings of Chand Bardai (Prithviraj Raso), Col. Tod (Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan) G.S.H. Ojha (Rajputana Ka Itihas) and other important historians had made their explanation. The above explained historians and their works are discussed in this manner.

**Chand Bardai (Prithviraj Raso)**

Among the eminent historians of Rajasthan history, Chand Bardai is also an important historian. He is the contemporary of prithviraj Chauhan (also known as Prithviraj III). At the time of Muhammad Ghori invasion over India, Bardai was in the court of prithviraj. In the first conflict, Ghori was badly defeated by Prithviraj. Any how Ghori saved his life and again has started his preparation to take revenge as well as to rule over India attacked again in 1192 on Prithviraj and this battle is known as the battle of Tarain
(2nd). This was the planned war and Prithviraj was defeated and taken away from India to Ghazni where he died. Prithviraj Raso has mentioned this event which may be considered the one and important source of Rajput history.

Chand Bardai who came from Lahore in the court of Prithviraj Chauhan. He was appointed as the court poet and was posted on the various important post. He was also a Samanta of his Kingdom. It is stated in his writings that he had seen the battle and when Chauhan was taken away to Ghazni, he was along with them. The Book (Prithviraj Raso) was in the process of writing, but due to this event the work of writing was stopped and handed over to his son Jalhan to complete. It is said the book Prithviraj Raso was completed by Jalhan. Along with this description the social, political, economic and cultural explanation are also found. Here question arises that is all the description as given by Bardai are true or may any relation to the Persian sources that are found in the form of Alberuni’s India Tabquat-i-Nasiri, Chachnamah etc. Most of the scholar have not considered Chand Bardai work Prithviraj Raso as an authentic work and have any reality. Some believes that the descriptions are fictitious and traditional like story teller.

Col. Todd was very much impressed of this book and had translated mostly of the pages of the book in English. The ground of publication of this book was some how completed by Asiatic society of Bengal but at the same time in 1875 Dr. Wooler has found the book “Prithviraj vijay” by Jaynak in Kashmir. The book was looking more authentic to Prithviraj Raso and this has created doubt in the mind of wooler. The publication was adjourned and the work of verification was started. During the verification the book has
found no authenticity. Dr. Wooler was not alone, Col. Tod, G.S.H. Ojha, R.C. Shukla and Dr. R.K. Verma has also not found an authentic book or the source material to the Rajasthan. There are another group of historians who claims the authenticity of Prithviraj Raso written by Chand Bardai, Dashrath Sharma, Hazari Prasad Vishnulal Pandeya etc. They have accepted that Chand was the court poet of Prithviraj Chauhan and he had written the book named Prithviraj Raso. The war between Ghori and Chauhan, the lists of genealogy and great personality of Rajasthan, the story of Sanyogita etc. the all descriptions are not yet now wrong.⁷ By this way, Prithviraj Raso was the writing which has thrown light in the reconstruction of history of the times. Chand Bardai, the royal band of Prithviraj Chauhan of Delhi and Ajmer narrates the heroic exploits of his patron in his epic composition, entitled Prithviraj Raso. Inspite of its obvious drawbacks, its value as a piece of historical literature was duly recognized by James Tod, the celebrated author of the Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan.⁸ Prithviraja Raso gives not only a glimpses of life and death struggle between the Rajputs and Muhammad Ghori but also throws a flood of light on the political, military and socio, economic structure of the Rajput civilization immediately before the establishment of the Turkish rule in India.

**Gauri Shanker Ojha**

He was born in 1863 in Roheri (Sirohi) of Rajputana. He was not a genius from childhood. Somehow and someway he got his education. Dr. Bhagwan Lal Indra has attracted him to study manuscripts and coins. Ojha has accepted this challenge. The work of Col. Tod’s Annals and Antiquities
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Gauri Shanker Ojha

He was born in 1863 in Roheri (Sirohi) of Rajputana. He was not a genius from childhood. Somehow and someway he got his education. Dr. Bhagwan Lal Indra has attracted him to study manuscripts and coins. Ojha has accepted this challenge. The work of Col. Tod’s Annals and Antiquities
of Rajasthan and 'Rasmala' of Forbes has also impressed very much to develop his interest towards the history of Rajasthan. Firstly he was appointed as curator of Udaipur Victoria Hall Museum in 1890, then in 1908 he was given the charge of Rajputana Museum of Ajmer by lord Minto and he remain there till 1938. The day by day progress of his life have started and he has got many awards by the different educational institutions. In 1937, Banaras Hindu University awarded him the degree of D.Lit and Andhra University has given him the honour of great Archaeologist.9

G.S. Ojha has written the first book in Hindi language named ‘Prachin Lipimala’ in 1894 then afterwards this book was translated into English as Indian Palaeography and was included in the courses of the Indian Universities. He has gain the familiarity with the writing of the book ‘Rajputana Ka Itihas’ in various volumes. This book has included the complete history of Rajasthan. He has also slammed the many historians of early times who has written the history of Rajputana (Rajputs). Ojha has attacked over the writings of Chand Bardai 'Prithviraja Rao'. First he has doubt about the authenticity and he has never accepted Prithviraja Raso as the 12th century writing but may be the writing of modern times.

Likewise Prithviraja Raso G.S. Ojha has also ignore to accept the plea of James Tod about the origin of Rajputs. Tod's plea is that the Rajputs were from the stock of the scythian and Sakas. This is totally wrong, Ojha has considered him from the lineage of Aryans and they were Kshatriyas by caste. He has also vehemently emphasized that the Chauhan, Solanksis, Pratihara and Paramaras all were the Agnivanshi because this tradition was not found
earlier to the 16th century.\textsuperscript{10}

The different historians has their remarks over the personality and the writings of the G.S. Ojha. S.P. Sen (Historians and Historiography in Modern India) said that “by the Sheer weight and volume of what he wrote, Ojha out shines other Indian historians of his times. By his publications he succeeded firstly in removing a deep prejudice, universal among Indian historians at that time, against the value of local records as sources of information in reconstructing history”.\textsuperscript{11} He was the first to lay emphasis on the study of inscriptions as a source for the study of the history of Rajasthan. His work as historian was of a peculiar value to scholarship in the field of epigraphically research. This equipped with detailed information obtained direct from the sources he was able to throw light on many little known events of Rajasthan history and was able to quote documents and material which has remained hitherto untouched.\textsuperscript{12} There are some criticism over the writings of Ojha that Ojha work suffers from certain defects. First he did not give an integrated and comprehensive picture of the whole of Rajputana. Secondly he is so much swayed by an attitude of hero worship that at places he is unable to view things in their proper historical perspective. The fact is that in Ojha’s history there is a lack of penetrating analysis so essential to the proper assessment of historical forces.\textsuperscript{13}

K.A. Nizami and Muhammad Habib were the important historian for the Muslim rule in India. Both the historians has made their base of writing in Persian language. The Muslim invaders who came in India and stayed with the name of Sultanate rulers or the Mughal rulers has made the Persian
language as the medium of court languages. Nizami and Habib both has carefully studied the manuscript of the rulers and has written the absolute and objective history of India. Muhammad Habib has criticized the Rajasthani historians James Tod and G.S. Ojha. His opinion is that Tod was an Englishman, he did not know the single word of Persian. No doubt, Tod’s work on Rajasthan did something to give us a continuous view of the subject, but it was marred by many defects. Too much reliance was placed on bards and Story-tellers. Tod had no idea of the Persian histories available and sometimes made statements that insult one’s intelligence. The work done by the Gauri Shankar Ojha deserves great esteem, but he did not succeed in correlating Persian and Rajasthani records.

Inspite of that Muhammad Habib as a historian has great faith over the writings of Gopi Nath Sharma. G.N. Sharma, a Rajasthan Brahman wrote his first book in 1954 “Mewar and the Mughal Emperors”. It is one of the first work that have appeared in English on Rajasthan history based on the critical appraisal of all available authorities and with very detailed references. G.N. Sharma in his writing has made a correction in the inflated figures of the army used in Haldighati battles. He has co-related the figures with the Persian writers. Thus with reference to the battle of Haldighati, he notes, the official record, used by Abul Fazal and Nizamuddin gives 150 killed on the imperial side and 500 on the side of the Rana. Badauni who was present on the field gives the total number of causalities as 500 out of which 120 were Muslims. The Rajput sources give exaggerated numbers. G.N. Sharma has rightly remarks that the social structure of Rajasthan was not substantially different from the rest of India. Due to the absence of law of Primo geniture, the
position of noble Rajput families were worsened day by day. Sharma has again ignore the Tod’s proposition that Rajasthan was organized on a feudal basis like Medieval Europe. “A Rajput chief”, Dr. Sharma correctly points out,” rules over a state as a head of a clan which was divided into numerous sub-clans, at the head of which were petty chiefs, generally members of his own family, the relation between them was not so much of lord and vassal as of Kinsmen commonly termed Bhaiji. Kakaji or chut bhai These Kinsmen claimed social equality in all matters in domestic and political. This was not the cause in Medieval Europe where lord and vassal belonged to different strata of society.\(^4\)

By this way the historian of that time has not used the available sources that are found in the form of manuscripts, letters and inscribed on the buildings. They wrote plain history without knowing the languages of rulers. But the historians of modern times has rightly observed the paucity of the writings and are starting to correlate the contemporary sources with the latest and ancient findings. Now they are able to write the objective and impressive history. In the very modern times, the writing of history again perverted by the prejudices, social obligations and by the political interferences.

**Elliot and Dawson**

Henery Elliot and Henery Dowson both were the government officer during the British rule. They had served the post of Collector at many places. Both have the interest of the Indian manuscripts and had collected many of them during his service time. All these collected materials in different forms were minutely studied by Elliot and Dowson and had written in voluminous
book with the name of "The History of India as told by its own Historians" into eight parts. They had covered the whole Indian history form ancient times to the modern times. Most of the historians were highlighted and his works were very vividly described in his writings. The original documents were translated into English which are considered near to truth. Elliot and Dowson both have some drawbacks in his writings. They had prescribed the selected writings and the writers. Most of the historian were the courtiers during the Muslim rule. Notes and glossery were untouched. The translation was not in toto, it was based on the theory of somehow understanding.\textsuperscript{15} It is a great blame on them that they had written the book in keeping view the British rule in favour. The most of the translation are of the medieval times and of Arabic and Persian manuscripts as well as documents. Here again Elliot and Dowson had not given the fair writing of history. They had selected the writers, the manuscripts and the documents that were not harmful to the British rule were given place in his writings. But somehow the writings of Elliot and Dowson has co-relation with the original documents that are preserved in Arabic and Persian literature.

As this chapter may requires the explanation that the Indian sources that are in the forms of manuscripts, documents, letters, Palaeographic form and preserved in the various museums in the form of beads, terracotta, arms, dresses and in the form of statues. How much the modern scholars had utilized these sources in the writing of the Indian history in objective form. No doubt, the work which are available from the ancient time to modern time has some relations of fact and happening. It may not be ignore that the biasness, prejudices and the social pressure involves during the time of
history writings. As already mentioned earlier in the writing of Raja (king) than history. It is to discuss about R.C. Majumdar and S.C. Roychaudhry treatment of history. Both are the historian of modern times but had written mostly the ancient society and its culture. They also had mentioned the political affairs and how it effects the social traditions of Indian society.

R.C. Majumdar whose works are mostly known ‘Vedic Age’, ‘The Age of Imperial Kanna’, ‘The Struggle for Empire’ etc. He in the Vedic Age mention the complete social, religious and economic aspect of Vedic times as the historians admits the period between 1500-600 B.C. During these period the social customs, religious beliefs and economic conditions were dealt by the historians. He has used Veda, Ramayan, Mahabharat, Puranas as the main source for the writing of history. Each and every affairs of society as mentioned in the sacred book of Veda was carefully studied by them in the contemporary evidences. The next book “The struggle for Empire” was written by Majumdar and in this book he pointed out that there was the force who controlled over the society and that who controlled was named like ruler (King). There was the kingship tradition who always fought against each other to dominate over the society. Even in the modern times it is so happened. Therefore the basis of history writing in ancient or modern times were same, but the difference was that how the scholars have treated the sources at the time of writing history."16

Most of the example we find that single book was written by the two or more than historians. As “An Advanced History of India” written by Dutta, Majumdar and Roychaudhry. How these scholars have compromise the
thinking and observation that one have to co-relate to another. It means the sources has the universal Phenomena and was treated by any one can found the same explanation.

S.C. Roychaudhry opinion is that History is not merely a record of the various battles fought for the retention of the throne or the expansion of the empire. It is rather a record of the struggle waged by the human beings in the past to evolve the present institutions aiming at better living. For a long time the historians concentrated on the study of the Political history dealing with the political leaders and political institution. These historians considered these political leaders as the architects of the society and gave a priority treatment to their political activities. The historians confines themselves to the political history mainly because of the easy availability of the concerned material in the shape of court records are accounts left by the foreign travelers. In view of the limited material about the social, economic and cultural life of the common people which was quite difficult to access, they rather neglected these aspects.17

It was in the modern times or in the 20th century, the historians has realized the writings of social and cultural history that are difficult to other aspects of history. The sources that are found scattered and also in difficult languages of Sanskrit, Pali, Prakriti, Persian, Arabic etc. These languages are not for common people. The ancient sources are somewhere in the form of verses, idioms and phrases. It requires the hypothetical techniques. At this stage S.C.Roychaudhry has taken the challenge and written “Social cultural and Economic History of India” of Ancient, Medieval and Modern times. It
was realized that the social, economic and cultural history is of a greater significance than the political history, because even the political developments in a country are shaped and influenced by the social and economic conditions prevailing in the society. The western scholars did the splendid job in this direction. The Indians were not lag behind. K.P. Jyaswal in his writing ‘Hindu Polity’ advocates about the society and culture of India, K.M. Ashraf’s ‘Life and conditions of the people of Hindustan’, Moreland’s ‘Agrarian system of Muslim India’, Dr. Tarachand’s ‘Influence of Islam on Indian culture’ etc. They all have discussed the Indian society from every aspect.\textsuperscript{18} These works are indeed valuable studies but again do not cover the all aspects of the social, and cultural history of \textit{Medieval Age}. 
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