CHAPTER – IV

Relations with the Islamic World

Relations with Iran:

From the eighth century onwards wave after wave of immigrants from ‘Ajam (Persia and Central Asia) poured into India either as peaceful traders or proud conquerors. These immigrants slowly migrated to the Deccan parts of which later constituted the Bijapur Kingdom. Further, during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the political situation in Persia deteriorated due to the Mongol devastation. Consequently, thousands of peace-loving Persians fled to the west coast of India and settled there or migrated to other parts. Again emigration took place due to the transfer of the capital from Delhi to Daulatabad by Muhammad bin Tughluq bringing in the nobility and the gentry consisting of Persians and Central Asian nationals to the Deccan.¹

Thus by the time the ‘Adil Shahi dynasty was founded the demographic structure of the Bijapur consisted of “Iranian race”, which included not only Persians but also Afghans and others. The “Iranian Plateau” which extends over Persia, Baluchistan, Afghanistan and eastern portion of the Asia Minor etc., is the domain of the “Iranian race”. The ‘Adil Shahi nobility and the upper strata of the population, besides Turks, were Persians and Indo-Afghans, who were ethnologically Aryans, and constituted the bulk of the Bijapur army.² In 1529 Isma’il ‘Adil Shah formed an army of ten thousand cavalry consisting of

¹
²
Persians, Arabs, Turks, Uzbegs, Kurds etc. The Kurds and Armenians too belong to the Iranian race and by 1660. The Afghans formed more than one-half of the army of Bijapur.

Though the demographic structure of Bijapur consisted of various types of Iranian race, of one single ethnological family differing slightly in their cranial morphology\(^3\).

Further, the afaqi emigrants who had settled permanently in Bijapur, and Indians that is, Perso-Aryans and Indo-Aryans emerged from a common racial stock and migrated from a common homeland, sharing, common linguistic racial past and at one time they coexisted. Thus, the Iranians and Indians are like two brothers, who, according to a Persian legend, had got separated from each other, one going to the east and the other to the west. This racial affinity between the Persians and the people of Bijapur persisted even centuries after migration and which was strengthen, time and again, by the periodical influx of immigrants from Persia and Central Asia.

**Cultural Affinity**

Bijapur culture in particular and Indian culture in general was the result of a long fusion of ethnic unity. The idea of races in its formation has been varied, extensive and deep. Its innumerable incidents were drawn from different sources\(^4\).

Iran and India being adjacent countries, have both been from the remote past a common ground of cultural activities of different branches of the Aryans;
and they had maintained a fairly regular interchange of cultural values, which moulded their mutual lives in social, intellectual and religious spheres. Thus, close cultural relationship between Iran and Bijapur existed through the ties of common blood of afaqis, religious beliefs, ritual observances, customs and manners. And culture being complementary to trade, commercial relations between Bijapur and Iran provided opportunities for mutual understanding, appreciation, interested influence. The indigenous ideas and attitudes, mixed with Persian thought and traditions formed the composite culture of medieval India in general and Bijapur in particular⁵.

With the introduction of Shi’ah religion almost simultaneously in Iran and Bijapur the rulers of the latter looked to those of the former as a source of inspiration. The Shi’ah practices at Bijapur naturally made it a replica of Persian culture. Shi’ism gave a new set of ideas and social pattern. The Perso-Bijapur collaboration in political and religious affairs had its repercussions not only on cultural and intellectual activities of the ‘Adil Shahi Sultans, but its impact penetrated deep into various aspects of life and society at Bijapur.

Commercial Factors

Several factors contributed to the deep interest shown by the Bijapur traders in the Persian market. The easy accessibility of Persia by sea route from the Bijapur ports was one of the factors⁶.

Bijapur could get foreign horses only from Arabia, Iraq and Persia. Owing to irregular and uncertain supply from Arabia and Iraq, Bijapur had to depend on Persia for a regular supply of horses. It was an item of primary
military importance for an efficient cavalry, with our which Bijapur could not maintain its army. This necessity encouraged Bijapur rulers to sustain and maintain economic ties with Persia in a determined manner. And due to Perso-Mughal conflict over Qandhar, the “ruler of Persia was happy to allow the export of horses (to Bijapur) which could be used in war against his foe⁶.” The horse trade between Iran and Bijapur was carried on by the private Arab, Persian and Bijapur merchants. Moreover, in order to maintain their alien culture, the afaqi nobility, including the Persians required Persian articles of various descriptions for their daily life. This necessitated regular naval trade between the two States, more so because Persia too needed various Indian articles, which were exported from the Bijapur ports. The chief port of Bijapur, Dabul, was great commercial mart which had large trade with the countries of the Persian Gulf and the Red-sea.

**Political Relations:**

**The Safawis:**

At the time of the founding of the Bijapur Kingdom in 1489 and up to 1501 Persia presented a chequered political scene. It was parcelled out into numerous Persian States, ruled by different rulers. During this period (1489-1501) there seem to be neither any political nor diplomatic relations between Bijapur and the Persian States. However there existed cultural and commercial relations and there was a continuous flow of Persian migrants to Bijapur, who were patronized by Yusuf ‘Adil Shah⁷.
Political and diplomatic relations between Iran and Bijapur were established after the accession of Shah Isma’il Safawi to the throne of Adharbaijan in 1501. Then within a decade Shah Isma’il conquered and consolidated all the Persian States into one united State, ruled by a single Safawi monarch.

The Vital Link—Shi’ah Ideology:

Before coming to India, Yusuf ‘Adil Shah, during his wanderings in Persia, about 854/1450-1 was taken to Ardabil by Khwaja ‘imaduddin. At Ardabil Yusuf was enrolled as disciple of the venerable Shaikh Safiuddin, ancestor of Shah Isma’il of Iran and from whom the Safawi dynasty took its name. Thus, both Yusuf ‘Adil Shah and Shah Isma’il were disciples of the same house and had strong leanings towards Shi’ism, which became the basis for their political relations and formed the vital link between the two States.

Shah Isma’il, immediately after his accession to the throne of Adharbaijan, introduced Shi’ism in Iran and got the Khutbah read in the name of the Twelve Imams.

Yusuf ‘Adil Shah being unaware of the happenings in Iran, called an assembly of his nobles in 908/1502 and proposed his long cherished desire to promulgate the faith of Imamiyah and have the Khutbah read in the Shi’ah fashion. However due to the unwillingness of his powerful Sunni nobles he deferred the idea temporarily.
When the news arrived from Persia about the introduction of Shi’ism by Shah Isma’il, Yusuf became elated and wished to follow in the footsteps of the Safawi monarch. He took measures to accomplish his objective. In November 1502, Yusuf himself went to the mosque of the Ark-fort, along with several nobles, and got the text of the Adh’an modified with the addition of the words-“‘Ali Wali Allah”, and then caused the Khutbah to be read in the name of the Twelve Imams in exactly the same fashion Shah Isma’il did at Iran. The dissatisfaction of powerful Sunni nobles and diplomatic pressure of the neighbouring rulers, compelled Yusuf to discontinue the innovation and restore the Sunni practices. As soon as both the internal and external pressures faded out, he re-imposed Shi’ah doctrine. This time he gave liberty to the public to practice whichever faith they wish, without any compulsion.

During the infancy of Isma’il ‘Adil Shah, when Kamal Khan was regent, the latter belonging to the Sunni School gave an impetus to his own faith. In conformity with the old usage, he got in 1511, the Khutbah read in the name of the four Caliphs. Temporarily the vital link between Iran and Bijapur was broken.

Isma’il ‘Adil Shah soon after assuming the reins of the government re-imposed the Shi’ah practices in 1514 and showed greater zeal for this creed than his father. The background of Isma’il ‘Adil Shah’s leanings towards the Shi’ah ideology was the impact of his foster-aunt Dilshad Agha, a Persian lady of Shi’ah faith and who was instrumental in bringing Isma’il ‘Adil Shah to power.
In return for the small help which Isma’il ‘Adil Shah rendered in getting release of Persian ambassador from Bidar, the Shah of Iran paid him glowing tribute in a letter of 1519. The Shah very much appreciated the religious leadership of Isma’il ‘Adil Shah in sponsoring Shi’ism in Bijapur. Thus elated and encouraged Isma’il ‘Adil Shah ordered the holding of the prayers for the longevity of Shah Isma’il Safawi, every Friday and ‘Id days; and this practice was strictly followed during the entire reign of Isma’il ‘Adil Shah, upto 1534.

Isma’il ‘Adil Shah’s efforts to popularize and maintain Shi’ism were relegated by Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah on his accession in 1534. He suppressed the rituals of Imamiyah sect and deleted the names of the Imams from the Khutbah; he also restored officially the exercise of the Sunni practices.

The ideological bond was re-established by ‘Alil ‘Adi Shah I (1557-80). On the very day of his coronation, he reinstated the Shi’ism as the State-creed of Bijapur. He modified the Adh-‘an according to the Shi’ah fashion; and while removing the names of the Caliphs from the Khutbah, he introduced those of the Imams. ‘Ali did his best to propagate Shi’ism. He patronized at his Court master minds of Iran, Turan, Kirman and Khurasan. And about three hundred of these foreigners called Tabarraiya were appointed in the State services to abuse or vilify the Caliphs. The curses against the Caliphs were uttered in the Sultan’s presence in the mosques and at the public audiences. The Shi’ah doctors were paid by the State for their missionary activities.

‘Adil Shah I re-established Shi’ism firmly. “Iyyama-i-Ma’sumin”, which in the words of Shah ‘Abbas-I of Iran, was the vital link of Perso-
Bijapur relations. Shah Abbas-I says in a letter to ‘Adil Shah that the Safawi and ‘Adil Shahi dynasties were one family of “Tayyabin and Taherin”. The link was strengthened during the seventeenth century by Ali ‘Adil Shah II.

Theoretical Sovereignty of Safawids over Bijapur

Orthodox Sunni rulers generally regarded the ‘Abbasid Khalifah of Baghdad as the final authority and the legal sovereign of the entire Islamic world. As such, it was generally considered expedient to get legal sanctions of their rule from the Khalifah. They held the view that a king could hold the title of Sultan only with a covenant between him and the Khalifah. Likewise, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Shi’ah rulers of the Deccan looked to the Safawids of Persia for their link with Dar al-Islam. The Shi’ah rulers of Bijapur too sought recognition, patronage and guidance from the Safawids.  

Having established Shi’ism at Bijapur, Yusuf ‘Adil Shah in 1509, sent Syed Ahmad Harwi to Iran with presents and “declaration of attachment to Shah Isma’il Safawi.” But the recognition of Adil Shah’s sovereignty came about a decade later, in 1519, when Shah Isma’il in a letter sent through the Iranian ambassador Amir Ibrahim Beg, addressed Isma’il ‘Adil Shah with royal titles: “Glory of the Kingdom, State and Majesty etc.”, as an independent ruler. Isma’il Adil Shah highly gratified at the flattering acknowledgment of his sovereignty said that “now his dynasty got a royal status.”

Isma’il ‘Adil Shah ordered the recitation of prayers for the Safawid dynasty in the Khutbah on Friday, ‘Id day etc. It implies that Isma’il ‘Adil Shah has acknowledged the Safawid monarch as the final authority and sovereign of
Bijapur. He may be said to have established a covenant like that of Khalifah. Further, Isma’il ‘Adil Shah’s going down twelve miles to receive the Iranian ambassador clearly indicates the acceptance of subordination, like a vassal or protectorate, of the Shah of Iran. Therefore, it may be inferred that ‘Bijapur appeared as if it was an extension of the Persian Kingdom------.”

The existence of the theoretical and spiritual sovereignty of the Safawids over the Shi’ah rulers of Bijapur is further confirmed from a letter of Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II of 1612, addressed to Shah ‘Abbas-I. in the letter, preserved in Makatib-i Zamana-i Salatin-i Safawiyah, ‘Adil Shah writes that : it is “from the humblest slave Ibrahim to the exalted Emperor Shah ‘Abbas ---” and that “Deccan territories form as much as a part of Safawi Empire as the provinces of Iraq, Fars, Khurasan and Adharbaijan. Accordingly, the names of the Safawi monarchs have been recited in the (Friday) sermons and will continue to be recited in future. Our forefathers were appointed to rule over these territories and protect them by His Majesty’s ancestors. So our function is to rule the countries on His Majesty’s behalf and defend them against foreign aggression. And we would be as enthusiastic in performing our duties and rendering our service to His Majesty as other governors and officials.” However, these considerations of ‘Adil Shah were absolutely theoretical and nominal, consistent with the traditions of the medieval times15.

The case of Bijapur is analogues to that of Delhi Sultanate in the thirteenth century. Theoretically the Delhi Sultanate was a part of Abbasid Caliphate, and as such an Arab traveler observed that a traveler could “pass
from the confines of China to the Pillars of Hercules, from the banks of Indus to Cicilian Gates, from the Oxus to the shores of Atlantic, without stepping outside the boundaries of the territory ruled over by the caliph of Baghdad”.

And in the fourteenth century Bahman Shah, the founder of the Bahmani dynasty, acknowledged the theoretical supremacy of the Abbasid Caliphate and on the coins he styled himself as “right hand of Caliphate.”

Though the sovereignty of the Safawids was only theoretical and nominal, yet the ‘Adil Shahs in practice did seek from them help, guidance and advice. Once in 1612, Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II, while seeking the advice of Shah ‘Abbas-I on the Bijapur-Mughal relations, sought the latter’s permission in the following words “whether to send a Bijapur ambassador to the Mughal court or not-we would seek-clarification in this matter, from the court and may act as directed.” This practice is corroborated from a letter of Shah ‘Abbas-I to Sultan Muhammad Qutub Shah of Golconda (1611-26). In the letter, the Shah says that “Adil Shahi rulers al-ways reported and consulted in an affectionate way, in every matter, according to the royal courtesy.”

However, the Safawids never expressed themselves, the opinion, that they were the sovereign authority of Bijapur. On the contrary, the Safawids treated ‘Adil Shahs as independent rulers, right from the times of Isma’il ‘Adil Shah. In a letter of 1612, preserved in Jami’ul-Murasalat, Shah ‘Abbas-I prefixes honourific titles with the name of Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II, and he is addressed as an independent sovereign ruler. But still, in the letter there is a touch of his (Shah Abbas) superiority manifesting that he was the protector and
benefactor of ‘Adil Shah and Bijapur. This manifestation is corroborated by an independent authority Sir Thomas Roe, who wrote in 1616 that the “Persian King takes to heart the protection of the Kings of Deccan”.

A unique feature of the Safawid-Bijapur relationship was that Shah ‘Abbas-I, while holding the theoretical sovereignty of Bijapur, allowed the Mughal Emperor, Jahangir to exercise legal sovereignty there while advising Jahangir to make a peaceful settlement of Deccan affairs without conquering the Deccan kingdoms, Shah ‘Abbas-I, desired that Bijapur should be allowed to remain a tributary of the Mughals on payment of annual tribute. Thus, Bijapur formed a link between the Safawids and the Mughals, the two of the three great empires of Dar al-Islam of the seventeenth century. This contributed to the unity of the Dar al-Islam of the period in the midst of diversity.

**Diplomatic Relations:**

The initiative to establish diplomatic relations with Iran was taken by Bijapur. In 1509, Yusuf ‘Adil Shah for the first time sent his ambassador, Syed Ahmad Harawi with presents to the Court of Shah Isma’il-I. As a diplomatic sequel, in the following year the Shah sent an ambassador to ‘Adil Shah persuading him to join him in a general war against the Portuguese. The Persian ambassador, along with one from Ormuz (in Persian Gulf) on their arrival at Goa found that the place has been already conquered by the Portuguese. So they diplomatically pretended and adroitly changed the purpose
of their mission, and made overtures of friendship to Albuquerque. Later on, the Persian ambassador proceeded to Bijapur to meet ‘Adil Shah.

In the meanwhile, Harawi continued to reside, upto 1514 at the Court of Shah Isma’il. The Portuguese ambassador, Ferria, sent by Albuquerque from Goa, in 1514, found Harawi much offended at the better reception accorded to him. Thus, Harawi was a resident ambassador of Bijapur at Iran from 1509 to 1514 or even much later, because exact date of his return is unrecorded. But, it is quite certain that he returned to Bijapur by 1522, since in 1523 he was sent as an ambassador to Ahmednagar.¹⁸

The Persian ambassador who had proceeded from Bijapur to Bidar was detained by Amir Barid. In this dilemma the ambassador approached Isma’il ‘Adil Shah through a letter, and sought his assistance for his release. Isma’il promptly came to the rescue; and through his diplomatic manoeuvre, he obtained the requisite permission from the Bahmani Sultan for the release and safe return of the Persian ambassador. On his return journey the ambassador met Isma’il ‘Adil Shah at Allahpur, when the latter honoured the former with rich presents and provided suitable escort to accompany him to the port of Dabhol, from whence he embarked for Persia.

Shah Isma’il, in recognition of this meritorious service of ‘Adil Shah, sent a plenipotentiary in 1519, Ibrahim Beg to Bijapur, with a letter and valuable presents. On arrival at Bijapur, Ibrahim Beg was accorded a warm reception by ‘Adil Shah.¹⁹
With the adoption of Sunni doctrine at Bijapur by Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah I on his accession in 1534, there was seldom any diplomatic activity between Iran and Bijapur, upto the end Ibrahim I’s reign in 1557.

In spite of Sunni policies of Ibrahim I at Bijapur, Shah Tahmasp of Iran did not manifest any-Bijapur attitude. Thus in 1548, when Burhan Nizam Shah-I of Ahmednagar sought military help from Iran against Bijapur, Shah Tahmasp did not respond. This diplomacy of the Shah towards Bijapur, a Sunni State at that time, is significant, even though there existed community of faith between Iran and Ahmednagar. Probably for the good of the Shi’ah population in Bijapur the Shah of Iran did not like to take sides; moreover, practically it was not feasible to render any help.

With the accession of ‘Ali ‘Adil Shah I, in 1557 and reintroduction of Shi’ism at Bijapur diplomatic ties with Iran were resumed. It is not known when the first embassy from Bijapur was sent to Iran by ‘Ali I. But Iskandar Munshi’in ‘Alam Ara-I ‘Abbasi, records that the second embassy from ‘Ali I came to Shah Tahmasp in 984/1576. Thus the first embassy must have gone to Iran between 1557 and 1576; that is, after the accession of Ali I in 1557 and before the death of Shah Tahmasp in 1576.

Through his ambassador ‘Ali I communicated to the Shah that in his kingdom Khutbah of Twelve Imams is recited and that the name of Shah Tahmasp is also mentioned in the sermon.

Even though Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah-II, who ruled from 1580 to 1626, was a devout Sunni, yet he maintained cordial diplomatic relations with Iran. As a
tolerant ruler Ibrahim proved that Perso-Bijapur relations could be friendly on a more or less permanent basis, irrespective of the Shi’ah ideology. Mir Khalilu’l-lah, a stipendiary preceptor and guide of Shah ‘Abbas I, was a Persian immigrant at Bijapur, where he rose to eminence as calligraphist and became a close associate of Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II. Later on Shah ‘Abbas I sent for Khalilu’l-lah. Ibrahim readily sent off Khalil’l-lah as his plenipotentiary to the court of Shah ‘Abbas in 1613. Iskandar Munshi mentions this embassy in the following terms: “as the rulers of the Deccan had great sincerity and friendship with the Safawi monarchs from very old times, some time prior to this date ‘Adil Shah, the ruler of Bijapur sent Mir Khalilu’l-lah.” The purpose of this embassy is wrongly attributed as ‘Adil Shah being “alarmed at the growing friendship between the Shah, their natural ally, and Jahangir, their old enemy, and hearing of Khan ‘Alam’s reception in Persia and his influence over the Shah,” immediately sent his ambassador. According to Futuhat-i ‘Adil Shahi, it was when Shah ‘Abbas-I sent for Khalilu’l-lah that Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah-II took the opportunity to send him as his plenipotentiary and ‘Adil Shah did not send him at his own initiative.

The outcome of Khalilu’l-lah’s embassy was Shah ‘Abbas-I’s intercession in the Bijapur-Mughal affairs and ‘Adil Shah’s successful intrigue in the Perso-Mughal conflict over the Qandhar.
Role of Shah ‘Abbas-I in the Bijapur-Mughal Conflict:

But for the diplomatic and moral pressure exercised by the Safawids in favour of ‘Adil Shahs, the Bijapur kingdom would have been very likely wiped out much earlier then the time of Aurangzeb. Shah ‘Abbas-I was greatly interested in the preservation of the independence of Bijapur kingdom. And due to obvious reason he did not like the extinction of the Shi’ite Kingdoms of the Deccan.24

After Akbar’s death and on Jahangir’s accession the latter demanded ‘Adil Shah to sent an envoy to the Mughal Court offering condolences on the demise of Akbar and congratulations on his Coronation. ‘Adil Shah, instead of dealing with the matter himself wrote to the Shah of Iran for advice, as to whether a Bijapur envoy should be sent to the Mughal Court or the one from Persia was sufficient.

To Jabangir’s request, Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah gave an arrogant reply which enraged him and he decided to annex the Bijapur Kingdom. Consequently, he dispatched a large army to the Deccan. At this critical juncture, alarmed of the situation, ‘Adil Shah sought the assistance of Shah ‘Abbas-I in the following terms: “Although we on our part are fully determined to defend our countries and could not allow the Mughal ruler to occupy an inch of them, it is necessary that His Majesty (Shah ‘Abbas-I) should un-hesitantly come forward to help us in this vital matter.” Further, ‘Adil Shah pleaded help from the Shah on the ground that “the inhabitants of these regions had a peaceful life under the protection of His Majesty’s ancestors, our request is that His Majesty should
not leave as undefended.” There were two possible ways in which the Shah could render any help to Bijapur. One was obviously that ‘Adil Shah wanted the Shah to act as a arbitrator between him and the Mughal Emperor and exercise diplomatic and moral pressure in restraining military expedition on Bijapur. The other alternative was the creation of a diversion in favour of Bijapur, by way of an attack on Qandhar, a Mughal possession in the North West.

The Shah preferred the first course and recommended the case to Jahangir for a peaceful settlement, through the embassy of Muhammad Rida and by writing three letters to Jahangir. Regarding this embassy, Sir Thomas Roe cynically observes: “It is pretended that he comes only to treat a peace for the Deccanis whose protection (Shah) ‘Abbas taketh to heart, envying the increase of the empire.” There is no reference to such recommendation in the letters of the Shah preserved in Tuzuk-i Jahangiri. But three letters of the Shah and relevant to the affairs of Bijapur are preserved in the Munsha’ts of ‘Abdul Husain Tusi and in Majma‘ul-Insha of Qasim Aiwaugli Haidar.

In the first letter the Shah very politely pleaded for the “noble rulers of the Deccan high in rank and position,” who had the claims of being “neighbours” (Jawari) of Jahangir and requested him “to pardon the faith of the erring Deccanis and open the doors of mercy and favour to them for the sake of the writer in viem of the concord, amity and friendship existing for such a long time between their royal house.” As this letter failed to produce the desired effect, a second letter followed. In this, the Shah not only reiterated the
previous plea but also gave his own assurances for the good behavior of the
Deccan rulers in the following terms: “For the sake of the well wishing writer
the fault and short-comings of the Deccan rulers should be forgiven and over-
looked. In case anything happened from their side in future which went against
the wishes of the addressee of the family of Sahibqran, the work of
reprimanding them might be left to the writer so that people might talk about
the strong ties of alliance and friendship which made one king excuse big
offences and abandon big conquests only on the receipt of letters and messages
of another king.”

From the above two letters of Shah ‘Abbas it is quite evident that he
emerged as the champion for the cause of the preservation of the Bijapur. He
requested Jahangir to leave the affairs of the Bijapur at his discretion and not to
take any action against ‘Adil Shah. He even took the responsibility of
reprimanding ‘Adil Shah. The second letter had its desired effect and the
request of the Shah was “Virtually accepted” and royal favours” were shown
towards ‘Adil Shah. Sometime later when “the news of the renewal of
‘regardlessness’ (by Jahangir) to ‘Adil Shah came to the knowledge of the Shah
(of Iran), he again pleaded with Jahangir, this time on the ground that ‘Adil
Shahi Sultans were “bound by strong ties of loyalty and submission and did not
possess the might and power to display an attitude of opposition”

Again, on the decision of Jahangir to annex Bijapur Kingdom, Shah
‘Abbas advised the former that it would make little difference whether ‘Adil
Shah was allowed to remain “submissive and tribute paying vassal,” or other
were made to ask his place. He further suggested that if ‘Adil Shah was left in his possession, it would cause no harm to the Mughals. The letters of the Shah concludes with a very strange offer to Jahangir, that if he is bent upon conquering Bijapur for the sake of territorial gains, then in that case the Shah wrote “this well-wisher would be happy to give up an equivalent or even a larger territory from his dominions”

These correspondences clearly manifest the role of Shah ‘Abbas-I as the “preserver” of Bijapur Kingdom. He was even prepared, and in fact offered, to Sacrifice his own territory at North West frontier of Mughal Empire. But, he wanted Bijapur (and Golconda) to remain independent, acknowledge theoretical sovereignty of the Shah and legal sovereignty of the Mughal Emperor, like a Mughal vassal. As an arbitrator in the Bijapur-Mughal relations, he did succeed in evolving a solution to their conflict and effected temporary, if not permanent, peaceful settlement. And to a certain extent the diplomacy of Shah ‘Abbas I, shaped the Deccan policy of Jahangir in general, and Bijapur-Mughal relations in particular. The Shah interprets the peace treaty of 1617 between Deccan Kingdom and Mughals as a result of his recommendation and pressure on Jahangir.

Intrigue of Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II in Perso-Mughal Qandhar Affair

In the year 1022/1613, Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II in a personal letter, sent through Khalil-lah to Shah ‘Abbas-I, tried to enlighten the Shah about the recent political developments in India Though the letter is written in a humble tone it is highly diplomatic. The salient features of its contents are: to create
animosity in Perso-Mughal relations; inducement to the Shah to attack and conquer Qandhar; and the readiness on the part of Deccan Sultans to collaborate in this venture against the Mughals, by creating diversion in the Deccan in favour of Iran. It was a proposal for a Perso-Bijapur alliance against the Mughals. Obviously, this diplomatic maneuver of ‘Adil Shah was in order to counter balance the constant Mughal pressure over Bijapur.

It is quite evident from the letter that it was ‘Adil Shah who at his own initiative was intriguing in the Qandhar affair and not Shah ‘Abbas, with a covetous eyes on the Trans-Indus portion of the Mughal Empire. However, the Shah was tempted by the proposal of ‘Adil Shah and came to a secret understanding with Bijapur, through the embassy of Shah Quli Beg, who came to Bijapur in 1614-15, as an special envoy of Shah ‘Abbas. Shah Quli was accompanied with his counter-part, Khalilul-lah. The whole scheme seems to have been finalized during the second mission of Khalilullah to Iran in 1618 when he carried a personal letter from ‘Adil Shah to the Shah of Iran. And the intrigue materialized on Khalilul-lah’s return to Bijapur in 1621-22 along with his Persian counter-part, Talib Beg. Soon after their arrival at Bijapur31, hostilities commenced in the Deccan against the Mughals. Shortly after, an attack on Qandhar was launched by the Shah, obviously after the dispatch of the best Mughal generals to the Deccan. Thus the intrigue proved to be successful as, Jahangir was outwitted by the Shah of Iran who recovered Qandhar in 1622. And the Mughals were unable to cope up at two fronts.
After the death of Shah ‘Abbas-I and accession of Shah Safi in January 1629 there seems to be an interruption of a few years in the diplomatic exchanges between Iran and Bijapur. The initiative, to resume the ties, seems to have been taken by Shah Safi. Probably the Shah of Iran was guided by Shah Jahan’s imperialism. In late 1046/1637, Shah Safi appointed Ahmad Beg Qurchi to proceed on a mission to Muhammad ‘Adil Shah. Through Ahmad Beg the Shah sent a formal letter to the ‘Adil Shah. The letter began with the expression that it was a great pleasure to write a letter to ‘Adil Shah, with the usual words of compliments and reminding him the old friendship and attachment subsisting between the two dynasties, which he calls as a family of “Tayyabin” and “Taherin” and strengthened by religious tie of Iyma-i Masumin. Then he goes on to give details of the political developments in central and western Asia and concludes with a request to maintain regular diplomatic correspondence, with an offer to come forward unhesitantly for help he may require.

Muhammad ‘Adil Shah reciprocated this gesture by sending in the same year, his envoy Rahim Muhammad to the court of the Shah Safi gave an early conge in 1637 to Rahim Muhammad and entrusted him a letter. Muhammad ‘Adil Shah, like his predecessors, looked for help to Shah Safi. The latter was too weak to exert any pressure on Shah Jahan to check his imperialism in the Deccan.

The Mughals suspected that the diplomatic missions between Iran and the Deccan states were directed against them, and they strongly objected to
dispatch of any embassy from the Deccan to Iran. Muhammad ‘Adil Shah could not send the usual congratulatory embassy on Shah ‘Abbas-II’s accession, in 1642.

**Intrigues against the Mughals**

One of the causes, which prompted Shah ‘Abbas-II to take sides with Murad against Aurangzeb in the War of Succession, was to avoid the possibility of extinction of the Deccan Kingdoms, as a result of the success of Aurangzeb. The Shah was not slow to seize the opportunity, offered by the War of Succession to inflame Ali ‘Adil Shah II (and ‘Abdu’l-lah Qutb Shah) against the Mughals.

The Shah sent his envoy Mirza Muqim Kitabdar, with a letter to Muhammad ‘Adil Shah. In the letter the Shah, after reminding him of the old ties of friendship and religious affinity which bound the two houses, makes a gentle complaint against the temporary interruption in correspondence and lack of unity between the Deccan States, which encouraged the ‘evil-minded’ and ‘faithless’ enemies to gain upper hand. As there was still time to make amends, he urged ‘Adil Shah to sink his differences with Qutub Shah and emphasized their sectarian solidarity in order to take the utmost advantage from the confusion arising from the civil war among the Mughals. He further says that, Mirza Muqim would communicate what the writer (the Shah) had in his mind. Muqim was to communicate the secret coalition between the Shah and Murad on the one hand and the Shah and the rulers of Deccan on other hand.
In another letter, the Shah, while advising ‘Adil Shah (and Qutub Shah) to initiate hostilities against the Mughals, assured them that he too was preparing to move his own forces against the Mughal empire. The rapid victories of Aurangzeb over Dara Shikoh (April and May 1658) sufficed to keep the Deccan rulers from acting upon the Shah’s counsel. And the accession of Aurangzeb to the Mughal throne in 1658 altered the whole course of Perso-Bijapur diplomacy.

Soon after Aurangzeb’s accession, ‘Adil Shah-II and Abdu’l-lah Qutub Shah approached Shah ‘Abbas-II to save them from the threatened extinction. Shah ‘Abbas-II sent Budakh Beg in 1660 to congratulate Aurangzeb. The Shah not only verbally communicated his desire for the preservation of the Deccan states but sought the latter’s assurances. Aurangzeb resented this interference, and this was one of the main causes of the subsequent misunderstanding in Perso-Mughal relations. Following this, there seems to be a diplomatic lull between Iran and Bijapur. Probably, ‘Ali ‘Adil Shah-II realized the futility of pursuing Shah ‘Abbas-II to champion his cause. This lull continued after Shah Sulaiman’s accession to the Safawid throne in 1666, who was an utterly incompetent and weak ruler.36

**Persian Impact:**

Though Yusuf ‘Adil Shah was a Turk yet, before coming to India, he had been completely Persianised. He was educated in Persian and brought up at Sawa (in Persia) under the guidance of ‘Imadu-ddin Mahmud, a Persian
merchant. Further, his travel to famous places like Kashan, Isfahan and Shiraz, totally Persianised his thought and behaviour. The spirit of Persian renaissance, though a spent up force in the fifteenth century, had so much captivated his imagination that after he become ruler of Bijapur, he showed anxiousness to recreate and revive as much of Persian culture and traditions of Sassanids as possible. As such Yusuf ‘Adil Shah was “more Persian than Turk by training and culture.” His strong leanings towards Shi’ism, completed his Persianisation by its adoption at Bijapur as a State religion.

Yusuf had segregated his son Isma’il from the Indian environment and entrusted him to Persian and Turkish teachers, Muhammad–e-Kashi and others. Likewise, successive ‘Adil Shahi Sultans appointed Persian scholars as tutors to their children. For example, Ibrahim ‘adil Shah I in spite of his anti-afaqi policy, appointed firstly Khwaja ‘Inayatullah Shirazi and then later on, Mullah Fathullah Shirazi, as tutors to Prince ‘Ali. These Persian scholars completely Persianised ‘Ali in all spheres of life. He was not only given coaching in Persian language, but through the medium of Persian, into various branches of learning-syntex, logic, theology, philosophy etc. He became master of Persian calligraphy and penned in Naskh, Thulth and Riqa styles.

Though Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah-II received his early education through the indigenous languages, yet from his twenty-fourth year of life (1954) he was taught Persian literature by Shah Nawaz Khan, the Jumdatu’l-Mulk. Ibrahim-II attained very shortly the requisite command over Persian literature and was a great admirer of Makhzanu’l Asrar of Nizami and Rawzatu’s Safa of Mir
Khwand. Shah Nawaz Khan actively facilitated Ibrahim-II’s liking for Persian by arranging to place a number of standard Persian works of prose and poetry within the easy reach of the Sultan who was naturally tempted to read them in leisure hours. Shah Nawaz Khan’s plan worked admirably and within a short period Ibrahim II could speak fluently in Persian, and his study of literature and history considerably advanced.

**Persian Element in Administration:**

Several factors contributed to the making of ‘Adil Shahi administrative system. The heritage, race and creed of its rulers and the nobility had a profound bearing. ‘Adil Shahis were successors of the Bahmanis, and thus inherited all the Persian element and culture already existing in the Bahmani administration. The ‘Adil Shahi administrative system was “faithfully modeled on that of the Bahmani’s.” The ‘Adil Shahi administration took its colours from the race and creed of its rulers. Though they were of Turkish origin, but were Persianised. Then, the bulk of the afaqi nobility and ministerial staff, brought with them to their new home, as model, the type of administration which had long been prevalent in their native places. This was later modified in certain cases to suit the local environment and objectives. Thus, the ‘Adil Shahi administration presented a combination of Perso-Arabic and Turkish system in the Deccani setting. The Bijapur system of government became more or less replica of the Persian system, from the theory of kingship to the nomenclature of institutions and officers, court etiquette and army organization on mansabdari
system, every detail of ‘Adil Shahi organization breathed the Persian atmosphere. The Persian language was adopted as the official language for all administrative purposes. It became the language of the cultured elite.

Like the Sassanids, ‘Adil Shahi ruler was the supreme power in the State; he was the ruler, judge, administrator, military leader, sometimes even preacher and leader of public worship. The court ceremonies and social etiquette at Bijapur was mainly drawn from Sassanian traditions. Shi’ism was declared several times as the State religion of Bijapur. Moreover, on the model of the Persian national army of the Safawids, a uniform of the scarlet cap of twelve gores was introduced by Isma’il ‘Adil Shah in the Bijapur army and it was strictly enforced. This was in imitation of Qizilbash’s of Persia. The Shi’ah ideology penetrated in all walks of both official and private life and its influence was felt even during the period when the ‘Adil Shah was not a Shi’ah. The Shi’ah legends: “Ali Ibn-i Abi-Talib” (‘Ali son of Abu ‘Talib), “Ghulam ‘Ali” (Slave of ‘Ali), “Ghulam ‘Ali Murtaza” (Slave of Ali the chosen) were incorporated on the ‘Adi Shahi coins. Similar inscriptions are found on the mosques built during the reign of the Shi’ah rulers. Likewise the words-“Naib-i ‘Ali” (Viceroy of ‘Ali) adopted by the Shi’ah rulers is found on all the ‘Adil Shahi Farmans, of both the Shi’ah and Sunni periods, irrespective of the ruler being a Shi’ah or a Sunni.41

Persian coins called Lari, originally minted in the district of Lar at the head of the Persian Gulf was adopted by ‘Ali ‘Adil Shah II, who issued a silver Lari. Bijapur embraced a large portion of the Konkan littoral, where the traders
from Persia often landed and hence to meet the local demand for the Laris the ‘Adil Shah caused them to be struck in his name. It seems that the Laris were current only in the coastal areas of the kingdom. And it seems that the Persian coin “Abbasi” of Shah “Abbas II’s time was also a legal tender at the Bijapur ports.

Likewise, in all the departments of the ‘Adil Shahi organization, Persian impact was dominant. A comparative study reveals many features in common between the two states.

The Role of Persian Nobility in Deccan:

The Persian nobility played a major role in shaping the external and internal policies of Bijapur and in shaping the destiny of the kingdom itself. It was the image of the Persian system in the minds of the ‘Adil Shahi nobles that prevented the Bijapur Kingdom from ruins. The Persian nobles-Mustafa Khan Ardistani, Shah Adu Turab Shirazi, ‘Inayatullah Qazwini, Qasim Beg Tabrizi, Husain Inju and Shah Ja’far (a brother of Shah Tahir) had before them the ideal of a United Persian under Safawid (Persia which as a nation once again self-contained, centripetal, powerful and respected) made efforts to shun the personal rivalries among the Deccan Sultans and to form a political alliance amongst the rival kingdoms. This eventually brought about the overthrow of the mighty Vijayanagar kingdom.

Throughout the history of Bijapur, Persian nobles enjoyed ‘Adil Shahi patronage and exerted influence in the polities of Bijapur. The names of some
eminent Persian nobles may be mentioned here: Shah Tahir and Asad Khan Lari who brought about peaceful pact by their efforts between Bijapur and Ahmadnagar; Afzal Khan Shirazi, Wakil-us-Saltanat and Mir Jumla, was the savior of Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II (1580-1627) from the treachery of Kamal Khan and Kishwar Khan; Shah Fathu’l-lah Shirazi-renowned doctor of the learning and philosophy of ‘Ali ‘Adil Shah I’s reign was known as “Ten Intelligences” (Dih Aql), because of his versatile genius; Hakim Ahmad Gilani and ‘Ainu’l-Mulk Shirazi were two scholars who were accorded a grand reception on their arrival at Bijapur and were liberally rewarded; Mir Shamsu’-din Muhammad Isfahani was the Sadrul Jahan; Shah ‘Abdul Qasim Anju and Murtaza Khan Anju were the companions of the king; Rafi’ uddin Shirazi, the author of Tadhiratu’l Muluk, come to Bijapur in 1560, remained in royal service for several years; Mustafa Khan Ardistani and Shah Abu Turab Shirazi featured conspicuously in the political events of ‘Ali I’s reign. Abu Turab was instrumental to a temporary amelioration between Bijapur and Ahmadnagar; Sadruddin Muhammad Shirazi (later known as Shah Nawaz Khan) Prime Minister of Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II, and then Jumdatu’l-Mulk of Bijapur commanded reverence and devotion in every class, under the aegis of his enlightened administration, Bijapur revived the traditions of ‘Ali ‘Adil Shah-I’s period.43
Perso-Mughal-Bijapur relations:

Patronage of Persian Scholars and Literature:

With the Mongol cataclysm in ‘Ajam, the Persians and their culture suffered a severe blow. With the deterioration of the political situation in Persia during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries due to the intense military activity, thousands of peace loving Persian scholars fled to Delhi and the Deccan, where they found a welcome patronage. In some cases the ‘Adil Shahs sent for the poets and scholars from Persia and some were exchanged between the two States. Yusuf ‘Adil Shah was a liberal patron of learning and invited Scholars and poets from Persia to partake of his munificent patronage. Likewise, all the ‘Adil Shahs (except Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah I : 1541-57), patronized Persian scholars and they flourished at Bijapur.

Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah-II was a liberal patron of letters, and a brilliant galaxy of divines, poets minstrel, musicians, painters, illuminators, historians and traditionalists from Iran adorned his Court. Thus Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah-II’s reign “may be regarded as the golden age for Persian literature in Deccan” which in pageant of the prodigies of art and exudation surpassed the splendour of the court of Shah ‘Abbas-I of Iran. Under the ‘Adil Shahi rulers Persian literature flourished at Bijapur, and they established schools specifically for the teaching of Persian studies, where Persian was the medium of instruction. Pupils were provided with every comfort; they were supplied lodging, board and pocket money. Poems were compiled not only in Persian but in Dakhni-Urdu with the adaptation of Persian
metres and cannons of versification. The literature produced at Bijapur had far reaching cultural values. As the Shi’ah religion influenced Deccan poetry by turning the thoughts of the local poets in the channels of the lives of the Imams and the tragedy of Karbala, lament for the murdered Husain and his elegies (Marthiyah) become the universal poetical type. Under ‘Ali ‘Adil Shah II, one poet bore the title of Mirza ‘Marthiyah Khan’ or the chanter of elegies. Another poet Hashim ‘Ali compiled Marthiyahs under the title Diwan-i Husaini. Likewise, scores of literary works and histories were compiled both at the court under the patronage of ‘Adil Shahs and privately.

Persian Art and Architecture at Bijapur

The art of the Bijapur School owes much to Persian influence. The paintings of Bijapur can be traced from the third quarter of the sixteenth century onwards. This school was patronized by ‘Ali ‘Adil Shah-II who was a adept in the art of painting and varnishing. The Persian element entered largely in the paintings of the Bijapur school. The Nujumu’l-Ulum (“Star of Sciences”) painted in 1570, during the reign of ‘Ali ‘Adil Shah I is in part local adaptations of the early Safawid tradition and made of painting. Especially the 36th Chapter “On the subjugation of the fairies and super-natural things, according to Indian and Khurasani method” is illustrated with power and logic. Upto folio 240, the illuminations of the Nujumu’l ‘Ulum obviously endeavour to be Persian. But whatever reference they bear to Persian painting does relatively little to connect them with contemporary Safawid work. It contains the bundles of grass or plants of
different size, culled from Persian painting of Safawid traditions. The costumes are mixed Perso-Deccan. Their trim outlines hold clear and contrasting colour surfaces, more familiar with the Persian palette, then are the outlines with those of Persian figures. Their flux they convert into a staid solidity, ponderous in the horizontal. The downward gliding ease of the Persian line they transmute into amplitude to the right angle and changed with a movement as much banked as it is fierce. In these illuminations, the work of artisans, impoverished in their means and provincial form a Safawid point of view, a determined movement is unmistakable and this is a most vital feature of these painting. Further, the placing of coloured massives accurately outlined with a propelling power had a surface sprinkled with delicate Persian motives. The distinguishing feature in book illustrations of the Bijapur paintings was the Persian type of making the ground vibrant, around the determined movement of the leading figure.

The seventeenth century paintings of Bijapur display settings similar to the Safawid miniatures (established as a type of Sassanian Art). We find the figures of Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II and the attendants with a gold ground, pited level with the eye and a slanting ground. The incorporation of Safawid traditions in Bijapur paintings is attributed to Mulla Faruq Husain, a painter from Shiraz, who was attached to the court of Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II. In the “landscape” painting of Bijapur of the seventeenth century also, we find the Safawid trend of flowering trees with branches curved in three dimensions. And the scattering of the motives on the ground with foliage are after the Persian pattern46. These are some of the illustrations of the Bijapur paintings,
full of Persian motives, traditions and technique, besides having Mughal and local incorporations.

Persian calligraphy had also entered Bijapur through various ways in many forms. Masterpieces of Nasta’liq style, evolved by the Persians, was adopted in Bijapur for all purposes. All Persian manuscripts are in this style. Another style of writing Persian was Shakistah which is found mostly in official documents. Persian calligraphy is also preserved in the inscriptions of scores of ‘Adil Shahi monuments.

The ‘Adil Shahs were great builders and have left behind them more monument of note than all the rest of the Deccan Kingdoms put together. The architectural buildings of Bijapur comprise mosques tombs, and palaces. In Bijapur architecture, the Iranian element is so predominant that the whole architecture looks Iranian in style. The domes of all the ‘Adil Shahi monuments are of Persian origin. Likewise if we study in detail the plan and elevation of various monuments they reveal Persian origin. However, besides Persian the monuments in its design are mixture of Syrian, Byzantine and Egyptian styles. The cause was that the ‘Adil Shahs wanted to imitate the architecture of Turkey, Iran, Iraq etc., and as such the engineers employed were chiefly Turks and Iranians. Masons were Indians and even the calligraphist and artists were afaqis⁴⁷.
Turkey, Egypt and Arab States:

Relations with Turkey:

Deccan Sultanates diplomatic relations were mainly concentrated with Turkey and there seems to be hardly any diplomatic relations with other Islamic countries of Asia and Africa.

There were racial, cultural and commercial relations with the Ottoman Turkey. The continuous stream of Turkish immigrants to Bijapur formed an important percentage of the ‘Adil Shahi nobility. The afaqis dominated the Bijapur court. Their demography played a role in the external relations of Bijapur. As for example, the number of Turks, in the small Bijapur port of Dabhol, was about fifteen thousand. This was a strong inducement to the Ottoman Sultan I to join the alliance against the Portuguese in the Indian Ocean. The Turks of Dabhol were mostly merchants and had trade relations with their counterpart in Turkey.

While the Arab States of Asia and Africa, in a sense were intimate neighbours of Bijapur, only the ocean between them separated them as a broad highway. The intercourse between Arab States and South India dates back to pre-medieval times. Their relations during the medieval times were motivated by mutual commercial gains, reinforced by the common bond of Islam.

There was hardly any ground for Bijapur or Arab States to maintain diplomatic relations between them. Only on few occasions the Mamluk Sultan of Egypt and Arab States came in diplomatic contacts. But there were constant
commercial inter-course between them. Continuous groups of merchants, travelers and pilgrims of the Arab States visited Bijapur and vice-versa.

**Religio-Political Relations with the Ottomans**

Some of the ‘Adil Shahi Sultans were Sunni, followers of Abu Hanifa School. They owed their allegiance to the four Caliphs the success to Prophet Muhammad, a practice adopted by the Ottoman Sultan. The Sunni ‘Adil Shahi rulers got the Khutbah read in the name of the Caliphs. As the Sultan or a king in an independent Muslim State was regarded as the viceroy of the Caliph, so were the ‘Adil Shahi rulers.

The Ottoman Sultan Salim conquered Egypt in 1517. At this time, AlMutawakkil was the last of the Abbasid Caliphate in Egypt. About 1520, when Sulaiman was the Ottoman Sultan, Al-Mutawakkil resigned his rights of Caliphate and ceded his title to Osmanli or Ottoman Sultans of Turkey. By virtue of this, the Ottoman Sulans claimed not only “the sovereignty of the Muslim world” but the right to the Caliphate itself. That is, they claimed the spiritual, as well as political power held by the successors of the Prophet.

The ‘Adil Shahi Sultans, who professed Sunni faith and got the Khutbah read in Bijapur in the name of the Caliphs were virtually covered by the jurisdiction of Ottoman Khilafat. The rulers of Bijapur who professed the Sunni faith, during the times of Turkish Caliphate were: Isma’il ‘Adil Shah (only during the regency of Kamal Khan (1510-15), Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah I (1535-57), Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II (1580-1626) and Muhammad ‘Adil Shah (1626-56)49.
The founder, Yusuf ‘Adil Shah though got the Khutbah read alternately in Sunni and Shi’ah fashion; yet he was Shi’ah at heart and owed allegiance to the Safawid house. The last of the ‘Adil Shahi rulers, Sikandar got the Khutbah read in the Sunni fashion from 1680 onwards and in it included the name of Aurangzeb. Thus the nominal Caliphal allegiance was transferred from the Ottoman to the Mughals. Thus, during the Sunni period (up 1680) of ‘Adil Shahi Sultanate, the Sultans of Turkey may be said to have assumed the theoretical sovereignty-temporal as well as spiritual of the Bijapur Kingdom.

It seems that Bijapur and Ottoman Turkey probably never maintained any diplomatic relations. But, the Turkish national symbol—the Crescent was adopted by the ‘Adil Shahi rulers, as the royal emblem on all the public buildings in Bijapur. This symbol was not the religious symbol of the Muhammadans. Evidently, the ‘Adil Shahs tried to preserve their racial link with the Ottomans, in spite of their allegiance to the Safawids, due to political reasons.

**Relations with Egypt:**

Egypt’s contact with Bijapur was a reaction to the Portuguese challenge in the Indian ocean. It was a common menace to the commercial and navigational interest of the Mamluk Sultan of Egypt, ‘Adil Shah of Bijapur and other rulers of western India.50

Before the advent of the Portuguese, the Arabs, Persians, Turks and Indians exercised complete authority of India’s overseas trade. The Portuguese
supremacy at sea paralysed the seaborne trade of the Muslims in the Indian Ocean, the Red Sea, Persian Gulf etc. The Red Sea merchants lived in Jedda and had their factors at the important ports of western India. The rulers of Arab States and Egypt who controlled the important ports levied duties on Indian goods passing up the Red Sea, across the Egypt on their way to Alexandria. The advent of the Portuguese deprived these rulers of their income from the sea.

When the Portuguese captured the important port of the island of Socotra, which controlled the entrance to the Red Sea, it arose the jealousy of all the concerned States. Further, the news that the Portuguese had decided to appoint a resident viceroy and to keep a standing fleet in Indian waters, impelled Yusuf ‘Adil Shah and Mahmud Shah I of Gujarat to negotiate with the Sultan of Egypt for a joint action against the Portuguese. The Ottoman Sultan Salim I was also requested to join the league, but he did not take part. Ahmadnagar and the Zamorin of Calicut joined the league, at the request of ‘Adil Shah.

It was arranged that a fleet should be equipped at Suez and sent to India to cooperate with the light craft. Assistance and cooperation was to be given by Gujarat, Ahmadnagar and Bijapur; and information as to the movements of the Portuguese fleet was to be furnished by the Zamorin of Calicut in order to enable the Egyptian fleet to work out its strategy.52

The Egyptian fleet was placed under Amir Hunain, a naval Commander of the Mamluk Sultan, Qanswah-al-Ghuri. While the Gujarat fleet was
organized by Malik Ayaz, Governor of Diu, and Bijapur also sent a small fleet, at its disposal at Dabhol, to join the Egyptian fleet. The allies gave a crushing defeat, in 1507, in a naval battle to the Portuguese fleet, commanded by Lorenzo, off Chaul.

But with the capture of the Bijapur port of Goa by the Portuguese on 25\textsuperscript{th} November, 1510, the league of Bijapur, Egypt and others was broken. And with the conquest of Egypt by the Ottomans in 1517, the alliance become obsolete.

Religio-Political Relations with Egypt

After the sack of Baghdad in 1258 by the Mongol conqueror Hulagu and the death of the Abbasid Caliph al-Mustasim the centre of Caliphate shifted to Cairo. The succession of the Egyptian Caliphs was maintained unbroken in the same line till 1517. During this period of Egyptian Caliphate, ‘Adil Shahi rulers professing the Sunni faith were obviously under its nominal spiritual leadership and guidance.

In 1512-13, the Qadi of Cairo sent rich presents and his special blessings with encouragement to carry on the religious struggle against the Portuguese. The sending of special blessings was not without significance. It may be argued that the Qadi of Cairo had, to a certain, extent, spiritual leadership of the Muslim world\textsuperscript{53}.
Relations with Arab States:

Bijapur’s relations with Arab States of Asia and Africa was mostly commercial and cultural and there were hardly any diplomatic relations. Moreover there was no common ground to maintain any diplomatic relations. However, there was constant flow of scholars and other religious persons to Deccan⁵⁴.
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