APPENDIX A

Genealogical Table of Iltutmish:

On the basis of information provided by Minhaj’s *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri*, the following chart has been prepared:

```
Shamsuddin Iltutmish

Ruknuddin Firuz (r. 1236)   Ghiyasuddin Muhammad   Raziya (r. 1236-40)   Jalaluddin Mas’ud

Prince Nasiruddin Mahmud (d. 1230-31)   Qutubuddin   Mu’izzuddin Bahram Shah (r. 1240-42)   a daughter   Nasiruddin Mahmud Shah (r. 1246-1266)

Alauddin Mas’ud Shah (r. 1242-46)   Ruknuddin Firuz(?)   Mu’izzuddin Bahram(?)   a son

Tajuddin Ibrahim   Shihabuddin Muhammad
```
Information about nine children of Iltutmish is available in *Tabaqat-i Nasiri*. The eldest child was Prince Nasiruddin Mahmud who, we know, died before Iltutmish closed his eyes. After the death of Iltutmish, it was Ruknuddin Firuz who was placed to the throne in 1236 by the nobles. About Ruknuddin, Minhaj writes that people had their eyes upon him since the death of Prince Nasiruddin Mahmud.\(^1\) He ruled approximately for around seven months only.\(^2\) Ruknuddin’s mother was Khudawandah-i Jahan Shah Turkan who before her marriage with the Sultan was a maid in the harem. We are told by Minhaj that she was determined to eliminate the other children of Iltutmish in order to keep the throne safe for his son. Ultimately, this attitude became the cause of their undoing (mother and son). Ruknuddin’s son Alauddin Mas’ud Shah was later elevated to the throne by the Turkish nobility and ruled between 1242-46. During the reign of Ruknuddin, we find references of two rather lesser-known sons of the Iltutmish named Qutbuddin and Ghiyasuddin Muhammad. We do not have any information about the mother of either Qutbuddin or Ghiyasuddin Muhammad. Qutbuddin was said to be a youth of great worth and promise.\(^3\) But he was killed on the orders of Ruknuddin and his mother; Ghiyasuddin Muhammad is reported to be younger in years than Ruknuddin. He was last seen in Awadh where he revolted, like many other maliks, due to the tyranny of Ruknuddin and his mother. According to Minhaj, he broke into open rebellion in Awadh, captured the treasures that was going to the capital from Lakhnauti and plundered many towns of Hindustan.\(^4\) However, no other information regarding the fate of Ghiyasuddin is extant in medieval historical literature.

Raziya, apart from Prince Nasiruddin Mahmud, was the most capable among the children of Iltutmish who ruled after Ruknuddin for a period of roughly four years between 1236-40. She was also the daughter of Shah Turkan. Mu’izuddin Bahram Shah was another son of Iltutmish but no trace of Bahram’s mother has been found. A sister of his has albeit been mentioned by
contemporary historians. She was a divorcee who was later married to Ikhtiyaruddin Aetkin, the Naib (Deputy Sultan) of Mu’izuddin Bahram Shah, Mu’izuddin Bahram Shah was succeeded, as mentioned above, by Alauddin Mas’ud Shah, the son of Ruknuddin Firuz and grandson of Sultan Iltutmish.

In 1246, the throne of Delhi passed in to the hands of perhaps the youngest son of Iltutmish, Nasiruddin Mahmud. He was so named after the deceased Prince Nasiruddin Mahmud. Malikah- i Jahan was the mother of Sultan Nasiruddin Mahmud. This of course, was the title of the queen and her real name is not known. During the tenth year of Nasiruddin’s reign in 653 AH/ 1255 AD, she married to a prominent noble Qutlugh Khan. In the same vein, Sultan Nasiruddin Mahmud was married to the daughter of Ulugh Khan Balban on 20 Rabi ul Akhir, 647 AH/ 2nd August, 1249 AD. A son was born to them ten years later on 29th Ramadan, 657 AH/ 19th September, 1259 AD. We have no information about his name and subsequent life but names of four other sons of Nasiruddin Mahmud are found (see chart above). Ruknuddin Firuz was certainly not the one born to Balban’s daughter for there are references about him as early as 651 AH/ 1253 AD when Hansi along with post of Amir- i Hajib was assigned to Balban. It is therefore evident that apart from Balban’s daughter, Sultan Nasiruddin Mahmud had other wives or probably concubines who gave birth to his other sons. However, it is not apparent who among the other three, mentioned by Minhaj, was the grandson of Balban.

During the period of Nasiruddin Mahmud, we also came across the name of Jalaluddin Masud, his brother and another son of Iltutmish. He held the charge of Kannauj in 645 AH/ 1248 AD when he was entrusted Sambhal and Badaun. He later revolted against Nasiruddin. In short, we have information about nine children of Sultan Iltutmish; some of them wielded the royal power, others did not. But in the entire period of thirty years after Iltutmish’s demise, it
was only his progeny who were considered the rightful claimant to the throne. The same nobility who had openly accepted one of their comrades as their sovereign in place of Aram Shah in 1210 did not dare to elevate to the throne anyone else apart from the progeny of Iltutmish. We know that Balban Kishlu Khan, a prominent noble who commanded great respect among the amirs and maliks declared himself the sovereign after the assassination of Mu’izuddin Bahram Shah but the nobles rejected him and unanimously placed Alauddin Masu’d, the grandson of Iltutmish to the throne.\textsuperscript{12} Needless to say that Aibak had never been able to command so much respect and authority among the nobles and people at large as was attained by Iltutmish. This was probably one of the most significant achievements of the Sultan.

\begin{center}
\textbf{NOTES:}
\end{center}

1 See \textit{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri}, vol. I, p. 631
2 See \textit{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri}, vol. I, p. 636
3 See \textit{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri}, vol. I, p. 632
4 Ibid, p. 633
5 \textit{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri}, vol. I, p. 650
6 \textit{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri}, vol. I, p. 670
7 \textit{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri}, vol. I, p. 701
8 \textit{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri}, vol. I, p. 672
9 \textit{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri}, vol. I, p. 695
10 \textit{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri}, vol. I, pp. 683-84
11 Ibid, pp. 699-700
12 \textit{Tabaqat-i-Nasiri}, vol. I, p. 661
APPENDIX B

On the basis of the information provided by Minhaj-i-Siraj Juzjani,\(^1\) the following family-tree for Firuz Iltutmish, the Shamsi noble can be drawn:

From the chart, it is clear that Firuz Iltutmish and Tajuddin Binaltigin were cousins. It is also evident that the fathers of both Firuz and Binaltigin were paternal uncles of Il-Arsalan, the Khwarazm Shah. However, Minhaj at one place writes that Binaltigin was the son of one of the maternal uncles of Khwarazm Shah.\(^2\) However, Minhaj does not mention the name of the
concerned Khwarazm ruler. The confusion was solved by Nasawi. He writes that the sister of the father of Firuz (Salar) was married to Il-Arsalan.\(^3\) In this sense, Salar and the father of Binaltigin were obviously the maternal uncles of Khwarazm Shah (as mentioned by Minhaj) and that Khwarazm Shah was Takish. Therefore Malik Firuz was uncle as well as cousin of Takish Khwarazm Shah.

---

**NOTES:**

1 See *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri*, vol. I, pp. 233-45
2 See *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri*, vol. I, p. 199
3 See Nasawi as enumerated by Peter Jackson, *The Delhi Sultanate*, p. 42, fn. 09
On the basis of the information provided by Minhaj-i-Siraj Juzjani, the following tree about the origin of Nasiruddin (Abu Bikr) Madini, the Shamsi noble can be drawn:

Malik Nasiruddin Madini Shansabani as the name suggests belonged to the family of Shansab, the oldest ruling dynasty of Ghor. His grandfather Shihabuddin Muhammad was one of the seven sons of Izzuddin Husain, the ruler of Ghur and the mountainous tract of Jibal. He was in fact the brother of Alauddin Husain Jahansoz and Bahauddin Sam, father of Ghiasuddin and Mu’izuddin Muhammad Ghori. The father of Nasiruddin Madini, Saifuddin Suri was therefore, the first cousin of Mu’izuddin Muhammad Ghori. Nasiruddin Madini was therefore the nephew of Mu’izuddin Muhammad Ghori. The full name of Nasiruddin Madini was Nasiruddin Abu
Bikr. His grandfather Shihabuddin Muhammad had received the territory of Madin (situated in the suburb of Ghor) as his share from his father’s patrimony. After the death of Shihabuddin, his son Saifuddin Suri succeeded him at Madin. Saifuddin had two sons: Shihabuddin Ali and Nasiruddin Abu Bikr, and a daughter. The daughter was the eldest and was married to Mu’izuddin Muhammad Ghori. Mu’izuddin was thus the brother-in-law of Abu Bikr. Shihabuddin Ali of Madin, Abu Bikr’s brother, was martyred by the Turks of Khwarazm during the period of their domination. Abu Bikr probably had Kaziw (or Gaziw) and Timran as his appanage as Minhaj, waited upon him in this territory (618 AH/1221 AD) and was full of praise for Abu Bikr’s urbanity and generosity. The name of Nasiruddin Abu Bikr is also found among the maliks of Ghiyasuddin Muhammad of Ghor. During the calamities that befell on Ghur and Ghazni on account of Mongol onslaught, Abu Bikr moved to Delhi and presented himself at the Court of Sultan Shamsuddin Iltutmish and was received by him with honour and respect. He died in Delhi in 620 AH/1223 AD. From this account, it is evident that Nasiruddin Abu Bikr had an illustrious lineage and was the nephew of the Ghorid brothers (Ghiasuddin and Mu’izuddin) and also the brother-in-law (brother of the wife) of Mu’izuddin Muhammad Ghori.

NOTES:

1 See Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, vol. I, pp. 343-345
APPENDIX D

The Sufi -Ulama Interface: Nature of Conflict in the First Half of the Thirteenth Century

“The ulama are the partisans of reason, dervishes the partisans of love. The human intellect of the ulama dominates their sense of divine love, while attention to divine love among dervishes exceeds their use of the intellect” ¹

Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya (d.1325)

The entire medieval period of Indian history is surfeited with numerous evidences of ‘Sufi-Ulama’ altercations. There is a difference of opinion among historians regarding the nature of such relationship. The causes of these conflicts, their significance and their fall out has excited the curiosity of the readers and attracted the attention of the historians. This appendix concentrates on the Sufi-Ulama interface in the first half of the thirteenth century in the light of the political ambitions, ideological disparity and personal pursuits of the persons involved. It also tries to explore the over-all relationship between these two sections of medieval Indian society: Sufi, the follower of tariqat (the path) and Ulama, the upholder of the Shariah. The first half of the thirteenth century was the period of the commencement of the Muslim rule in India. It would be interesting to see if the rulers had any self-interest in promoting both these groups or was there any attempt on their part even to pit one against the other? I have tried to discuss the Sufi-Ulama interface with special reference to the Sufis of the Suhrawardi silsilah who were not only
present in India in large numbers but also commanded a large following during the early thirteenth century.

I

Etymologically, the term ‘Sufi’ is derived from the Arabic word Suf meaning ‘wool or wool-clad’. The first Caliph Abu Bakr (d. 634) is reported to have presented himself before Prophet Muhammad clad in a woolen blanket, after giving away all his riches in the way of God, indicating probably that it was a dress appropriate for the one who has renounced worldly wealth and pleasures. According to some Sufis, the term ‘Sufi’ is derived from ashab-i-suffah (people of the bench). It is notable that ashab-i-suffah were a group of people who were among the followers of the Prophet. They lived in his mosque at Madinah and led a life of voluntary poverty, devotion and self-mortification. These men served as the role models for the later Sufis who is said to have derived the terminology from these followers of the Prophet. The famous Suhrawardi saint, Shaikh Shihabuddin Suhrawardi (d. 1235) asserts that muqarrabun (those who are in close proximity with God) is the Quranic term for the Sufis. It is also believed that the fabric of the tariqat was woven round the khirqah received by the Prophet on the occasion of M‘iraj (ascent) and was handed over to Ali by him. While Shariah is supposed to govern the external life of the Muslims, tariqat took care of his needs in spiritual sphere. Other words from which the term Sufi is said to have been derived are safā (purity), and saff-i-awwal (first row). In short, Sufi signifies a man who had renounced worldly pleasures (tark-i-dunya) and dedicated himself to the attainment of the Supreme Reality (God).

The Ulama (sing. alim), in turn, constituted a very influential section of Muslim society in the middle ages. They were held in high esteem on account of their religious learning and in
many traditions of the Prophet they have been referred as his heirs. The Prophet has, for instance, once observed that “the ulama are much superior in dignity and status to others……After them, rank the kings”. Anybody who had acquired religious knowledge up to a prescribed standard could become an alim. The prestige and influence of an alim depended upon his devotion to learning as well as his piety. The Ulama were however classified primarily into two categories: the Ulama-i-akhrat and the Ulama-i-dunya. The Ulama-i-akhrat led a life of pious devotion and religious learning and generally kept themselves aloof from political affairs and materialistic pursuits. The Ulama-i-dunya, on the contrary, were to a large extent mundane in their outlook. They hankered for wealth and worldly prestige, mixed freely with the ruling elite and rendered moral support to all their activities, good or bad. It was this latter group who time and again brought forth an issue against the Sufis.

II

In order to understand the Sufi-Ulama relationship in the first half of the thirteenth century, it is imperative to have an idea of the Sufi sects that were predominant in India during this period, the ideology of the principal adherents of these sects and their attitude towards the state. The rise of the Turkish power in India coincided with the plantation of two Sufi orders (silsilahs) on the Indian soil: the Chishti and the Suhrawardi. Introduced in India by Khwajah Mo’inuddin Chishti (d. 1236) and Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya (d. 1262) respectively, these orders left an undeniable mark on the Indian society. Of them, the Chistis were destined to enjoy unparallel spiritual influence and popular acclaim. However, in the early thirteenth century, the situation does not seem to be so. The Chishti saints have yet to attain the status and
following that they came to enjoy subsequently. Even no contemporary record of Mo’inuddin’s life and activities is extant. The two major Chishti texts of the fourteenth century, *Fawa’idul Fu’ad* (compiled 1322) and *Khair-ul-Majalis* (compiled 1354) do not refer to the saint at all. The information provided by another fourteenth century Chishti text *Siyal-ul-Auliya* lacks detail. Therefore for the saint’s biographical details, we have to turn to *Siyar-ul-Arifin*, a Suhrawardi text compiled in India almost three hundred years after his death. No authentic account of Mo’inuddin’s life and activities in Ajmer is available. In fact, his reputation as a man of God grew gradually. But by the middle of the fourteenth century his grave at Ajmer had become a popular centre of pilgrimage. In 1332, Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq (r. 1325 – 1351) visited the shrine and gave lavish grants to its attendants. It assumed new height during the reign of Emperor Akbar. Therefore, it can be safely said that Shaikh Mo’inuddin Chishti as a saint had not assumed so much eminence as has been attained by his shrine later on. When the Chishtis rose to prominence in the fourteenth century and Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya (d. 1325) became a cult figure in Delhi, the genealogy and aura of the sect was perhaps traced back and awareness about Mo’inuddin Chishti, the founder of the sect in India and to which Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya belonged, was created. By the thirteenth century, it was commonly believed in the Muslim World that a great saint’s *baraka* (blessings) gets transferred after his death to his descendents as well as to the place of his burial.

Shaikh Qutubuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki (d. 1235) was, therefore, the first saint of the Chishti sect about whom sufficient information is available. A native of Aush he is said to have joined the circle of the disciples of Shaikh Mo’inuddin in Baghdad and subsequently became his chief khalifa. He arrived in India in the early thirteenth century and took up residence in Kilokheri, a
suburb of Delhi. In 1333, when Ibn-i-Battuta came to Delhi, he found the shrine of Shaikh Bakhtiyar Kaki as one of the three popular places of veneration in the city.\textsuperscript{12}

The third Chishti saint of the first half of the thirteenth century was Baba Farid (d. 1271), the spiritual successor of Shaikh Qutubuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki. He used to reside in Ajodhan, far from the seat of government and never meddled in politics or visited the royal court. He is said to have remarked once that if anyone desired elevation in his spiritual rank, he ought to keep away from hereditary princes.\textsuperscript{13} Interestingly enough, in spite of his predilection for \textit{sam'a}, a source of perpetual strife between the Sufi and the Ulama in the Middle Ages, no incidence of conflict of Baba Farid with the Ulama of his time have been reported.

The early mystics of the Chishti \textit{silsilah} preferred to cut themselves off completely from the kings, politics and government service. They believed that government service distracted a mystic from the single minded pursuit of his ideal which was ‘living for the lord alone’.\textsuperscript{14} By associating himself with the ruling elites, they believed, a Sufi isolated himself with the masses and ceased to be a man of commoners.

The other sect active in India along with the Chishtis was the Suhrawardi sect. The leading Suhrawardi saint of the period was undoubtedly Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya (1182-1262), a resident of Multan. However, Qazi Hamiduddin Nagori, Shaikh Jalaluddin Tabrezi (1244-45), Shaikh Nuruddin Mubarak Ghaznavi of the Suhrawardi fraternity were equally reputed. The Suhrawardi Sufis also stressed on the observance of the Shariah. Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya was very particular about the prescribed five times a day prayer. Once, some of the disciples of Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya, we are told, were performing ablutions. When they saw the Shaikh, all of them except one Sufi, hastened to pay their respect to him. He completed the
ablutions and then saluted the Shaikh. The Shaikh said that among all of you, he was the true dervish\textsuperscript{15} for he performed his ablutions first. He was very particular about the recitation of the Quran as well.\textsuperscript{16} It is said that even the slave girls of his khanqah would chant God’s name.\textsuperscript{17} Bahauddin Zakariya was also not in favour of overstressing the body in religious pursuits. He used to say that fast in the month of Ramzan was enough. He did not approve of the Chishti practice of bowing before a Shaikh. He emphasized on the observances of the external form of religion and never spared anybody found ignorant toward any form of religious devotion. The Suhrawardis rejected various ascetic exercises seeing in them the influence of the pagans.\textsuperscript{18} The Suhrawardis, with the exception of Qazi Hamiduddin Nagori, avoided sam’a though they did not disapprove it out rightly. It was approved but with stringent conditions by their spiritual master, Shaikh Shihabuddin Suhrawardi.\textsuperscript{19} Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya personally disliked it.

It is interesting to note that most of the Sufi-Ulama squabble of the early thirteenth century involved the Suhrawardi saints. In fact, instances of the conflict of Ulama in the first half of the thirteenth century with the Sufis of the Chishti sect are few and far between as compared to that of the Suhrawardis. It is almost paradoxical that the Ulama had conflict with any such group whose life-style and ideology was very much similar to that of their own. The Suhrawardi, in fact, adhered to the Shariah in the same manner as prescribed by the Ulama.

Now the question is why did the Ulama clash with the Suhrawardis? The answer perhaps lies in the approach of the Suhrawardi sect towards the state (which also distinguished them from the Chishtis). Their world view especially their attitude towards state patronage and government service was different from that of the Chishtis. The Suhrawardi saints consorted with kings, visited their court, accepted state grants and assistance and did not discourage government service. They believed that by establishing personal contact with the rulers, they could bring out
a change in their outlook. They did not justify exclusion of the rulers form their agenda of spiritual ascendancy for they believed that the life of people was inseparably connected with the ruler’s thought, behavior and convictions.\textsuperscript{20} By mixing with the ruler they could bring forth the misery of the subjects to the knowledge of the ruler. We are told that when Shaikh Ruknuddin (d. 1335), grandson of Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya and one of the greatest saint of the Suhrawardi fraternity, visited the Court, his palanquin would be flooded with the petitions from the people to be handed over to the Sultan.\textsuperscript{21} Shaikh Ruknuddin justified his intimate relations with the ruling elite on the plea that by doing so he can intercede with the Sultan on behalf of the people. They did not mind affluence and did not mind joining state service. However, in mingling with the rulers and participating in political affairs, the Suhrawardi saints followed the traditions set-up by their illustrious predecessors in Baghdad (refer to chapter seven). From the very beginning the Suhrawardis did not mind cultivating cordial relations with the political elites. Drawing inspiration from the Quranic verse: “Obey Allah, obey his Prophet and those in authority amongst you”, Shaikh Najibuddin Suhrawardi (d. 1168), the founder of the Suhrawardi fraternity, exhorted his disciples to pay full reverence to the rulers and abstain totally from finding faults with them.\textsuperscript{22} In this sense they were giving serious competition to the Ulama and hence revulsion of the Ulama towards them. Both were vying with one another for state patronage, governmental subvention and the attention of the monarch.

\section*{III}

This section is an elaboration of the last one. Here I have tried to explain the factors that motivated a monarch to rope in both these elements into their ambit. Given the political scenario
of the period, the ruler could not ignore either an eminent Sufi or an influential alim. A ruler’s contact with the people and the respect he commanded in the religious circles made his position unalterable.

The Ulama were one of the most dominant sections of the Muslim society and highly esteemed among the Muslims. Though it is true that religious leaders played second fiddle in administration yet during the period under study their support for the sovereign was indispensable for strengthening his position against his adversaries. They had fairly stable relationship with the local communities where they acted as a teacher, religious expert and adjudicator in the day to day life of the Muslims at large. The rulers therefore tried to cultivate friendship with the Ulama and seek their aid against their rivals. For instance, Sultan Iltutmish’s (r. 1210-1236) attempt to consolidate and expand the empire brought him into direct conflict with the Turkish slave-officers of Mu’izuddin Muhammad Ghori (d. 1206) who challenged his claim to kingship. They were not Indians but the Sultan’s fellow-brethrens and co-religionist who opposed him for their self-interest. In such a situation, it seems obvious that along with the nobility, the one who procured the support of the religious class would have an edge over the rest of the competitors. Needless to say, the influence of the Ulama presumably with the Muslim elite and soldiery and their support of Iltutmish helped consolidate his power in India. In the same vein, in order to expand his support base, Prince Nasiruddin Mahmud (d. 1231) gave grants to a host of Ulama, Sayyids, recluses and pious men of the capital Delhi and other cities and towns out of the booty which he had seized from the Lakhnauti campaign (1227). The goal of the Delhi sultan was to make Delhi a paramount power. For the Ulama, however, Delhi was the ultimate place of refuge for the uprooted Muslim community of Central and West Asia which could be developed into the chief metropolis of Islam. Sunil Kumar opines that in view of their
congruent aims, it is not surprising that the Ulama received warm welcome in Iltutmish’s newly conquered domains or they co-operated with the Delhi Sultanate. Most of the Ulama aspired for lucrative careers in state departments of justice, sadarat and ihtisab. In fact, the contribution of the Ulama of Delhi Sultanate to theological literature of their times was not very notable. The majority of Ulama, the guardians of sacred law, were utterly materialistic in outlook and opportunist in conduct. They entered into an unholy alliance with the secular authorities and by twisting the rules of the Shariah, found sanction for the Sultan’s un-Islamic practices. None of the Ulama, for instance, expressed their displeasure and disapproval when Iltutmish declared Raziya (d. 1240) as his successor though a Prophetic tradition does not endorse this conduct. When Sultan Nasiruddin Mahmud (d.1266) ascended the throne in 644/1245 A.D., the Sayyids and Ulama along with the maliks and amirs hastened to present themselves at the court and freely observed court etiquettes like kissing the hands of the Sultan and paying homage to him. The Ulama were also involved in trade and commerce. This may be in keeping with the Sunna of the Prophet who himself was a trader in his early life. Involvement with trade and commerce, however, necessitated proximity with the ruling elite. It helped augment their trade relations and multiplied their profit and provided greater stability to their business. As a corollary, it enhanced the popularity of the ruler amongst commercial group which facilitated the administration as well as expansion of his dominion. In addition, the association of scholars, artists, poets and Ulama (religious divines) with the royal court was a distinctive feature of the polity in Central Asia since the eleventh century. They were also indispensible to the functioning of the state because the Muslim legal and religious treatises were in Arabic language. Its interpretation demanded persons well-versed in Islamic learning who could interpret the laws keeping in mind the Indian conditions and deliver judgment which could suite the Indian social system.
During the period under review the Ulama emerged as a power to reckon with in politics. Their influence was however political in nature. They did not influence the course of political process as analyst of Muslim law but as politicians who sided with one or other pressure groups regardless of their dignity and prestige. During the reign of Aibek (d. 1210) the Ulama did not intervene significantly in the affairs of the ruling elite. However, gradually they became conscious of their position in the Sultanate. They became bold and began to assert themselves. When Iltutmish ascended the throne (1210), a deputation of Ulama headed by Qazi Wajihuddin Kashani, waited upon the Sultan and desired to see his letter of manumission. Only after being fully satisfied, they took the oath of allegiance to him. Learning from this bitter experience, Iltutmish tried to placate them in every possible way. Time and again, he bestowed the post of Shaikh-ul-Islam upon influential members of this group in order to win their goodwill. He also constructed many madrasahs and maktabs and appointed these men as teachers. The Sultan very tactfully handled the Ulama and created such conditions that instead of turning critics of his policies, they started supporting him unquestionably. Soon their spirit of independence was lost and they fell in line with the wishes of the Sultan. It goes to the credit of Sultan Iltutmish who used all his manipulative skills and piety and succeeded in keeping a check on this influential faction. In the struggle between the crown and nobility after the death of Iltutmish (1236), their clout over Muslims at large was exploited by both the parties. For instance, when Amir-i-Hajib Badruddin Sunqar Rumi conspired to remove Sultan Bahram Shah (d.1242) from the throne, he convened a meeting which was attended, along with other important personnel, by Qazi-i-Mumalik Jalaluddin Kashani, Qazi Kabiruddin and Shaikh Muhammad- i- Shami. ³¹ Again in 1257, during the reign of Sultan Nasiruddin Mahmud, the Shaikh-ul-Islam Sayyid Jamaluddin, Qutubuddin and Qazi Shamsuddin Bharaiji invited the rebels Izzuddin Balban Kashlu Khan and
Malik Qutlugh Khan to march on the capital and assured them that they would give up the gates (of the city) to them. Therefore, it can be said that many members of the clerical class were involved in politics and the sovereign was practically compelled to placate them in order to win their support.

In the same way, the Sultan could not afford to neglect the role a Sufi could play in the making of the Sultanate. The reason for such compulsion are not far to seek. During the period under review the Delhi Sultanate was in a state of infancy. The rulers especially Iltutmish were trying hard to give it a definite shape. Given the circumstances they could not afford to pick up quarrel with their non-Muslim subjects who were in majority in India. They knew very well that a pan – Indian resistance by the Hindu majority would prove fatal to the infant Sultanate. The situation demanded a healing touch to reassure the Hindu majority that the Sultanate was committed to their safety and security. The Sufis with their tolerant and broad minded outlook could very well provide this healing touch. These God – fearing men had the potential for bringing about unity among the heterogeneous elements that made up the Indian milieu. They were capable of toning down the animosity between the various communities present in India. As a result of Mongol invasion of Central and West Asia many saints, scholars, noblemen etc. had taken refuge in Delhi. They knew very well that the chances of their returning back to their homeland were dim and that Delhi was now the final resting-place for them. Their presence in large numbers was likely to arouse the suspicion and fear of the majority community. The Delhi Sultans could therefore hardly afford policies or actions that might reinforce opposition to their conquest. A liberal and tolerant attitude towards the indigenous people was thus required. The Sufis encouraged the ruling elite to be tolerant and benevolent towards the Hindus. These men of piety unleashed syncretic forces which facilitated the development of a common cultural
outlook. More importantly, there was a belief that an offence against a Sufi / Shaikh would lead to the downfall of the Sultan. It also led credence to the belief that such Sufi / Shaikh also had the power to bestow kingship on an individual.\textsuperscript{35} In the absence of a fixed law of succession such a belief was more likely to flourish.\textsuperscript{36} The chronicles of the Delhi Sultanate are replete with anecdotes of the bestowal of kingship by Sufis on persons of lesser renown and ordinary background. It shows the kind of reverence the hagiographers had for the Sufis and to what extent these men of piety influenced the mind of people at large. The Sufis seems to have a considerable hold on the men of letters as well and were respected by them. Whether it was Minhaj, Isami or Afif all have mentioned some incident or the other about the prophecy of a Sufi or a dervish gifting a crown to future Sultans. Moreover, for non-literates, non-Arabic speaking villagers or pastoralists, saints were not just the interpreters of Islam or mere representatives of religion. For them, Islam was what they preached and practiced.\textsuperscript{37} Along with the Ulama, they enjoyed massive popular appeal. We know that when Qutubuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki decided to leave Delhi and settle in Ajmer, the denizens of the city panicked. They followed him en-masse and requested him to stay behind. Therefore, these men could be utilized by the ruler as a ‘safety valve’ or counterpoise against the corrupt and greedy Ulama.

Moreover both the Sufi and the Ulama were capable of taking the role of a mediator at the time of foreign invasions and internal crisis. When Nizam ul Mulk (Muhazzabuddin) conspired against Bahram Shah (d. 1242) during the Mongol campaign and turned the nobles against the Sultan, the latter dispatched Sayyid Qutubuddin, the Shaikh ul Islam of Delhi for pacifying the rebel forces.\textsuperscript{38} In the same vein during the conflict with the Mongol commander Sali Nuyin in 1247, Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya interceded for the town and saved it from destruction. He negotiated successfully a peaceful settlement with the Mongol representative,
Malik Shamsuddin. Both these groups also extended moral support to the rulers if need arises. The sultan often asked their khatib (prayer leader) to deliver sermons before the rebels to pacify them. Minhaj, for instance, was directed to deliver discourses within the enclosure of the royal camp after victory in Uchch campaign in 1228 and the Gwalior expedition of 1232. Again, during the Mongol invasion in 1242, he was commanded by Sultan Bahram Shah to give lecture to the people of Delhi assembled in the Qasr- i- Safed (White Palace) who in turn pledged their loyalty to the Sultan. We also know that during the Mongol invasion of Multan, Qabacha asked for help from Shaikh Qutubuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki, who assisted him by extending moral support. Shaikh Bakhtiyar Kaki also provided his moral support to Sultan Iltutmish in the construction of Hauz- i- Shamsi.

Needless to say, both the groups were equally important for the existence of the Sultanate. The Early Turkish sultans of Delhi therefore looked for the support of these groups in order to consolidate their power and build an integrated and compact polity in India. This policy was initiated by Iltutmish who tried to enlist the support of as many men of religion as possible for the efficient running of his administration. Since the Chishtis were reluctant to take up government jobs (Shaikh Bakhtiyar Kaki had, for instance, turned down the offer of the post of Shaikh ul Islam) the Sultan invited the Suhrawardis to extend their support and the Suhrawardis obliged by acceding to his request and willingly accepted the post of Shaikh ul Islam and Sadr.

All the Suhrawardi Sufis were highly popular both in India and outside. We know that Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya (d. 1262), Shaikh Jalaluddin Tabrizi (d. 1241/1244), Qazi Hamiduddin Nagori (d. 1244), Sayyid Nuruddin Mubarak Ghaznavi (d. 1235) and Shaikh Majduddin Haji were present in India during the period of Iltutmish in the first half of the thirteenth century. It is clear that a number of khalifahs and disciples of Shihabuddin Abu Hafs
Suhrawardi had settled in the sub-continent in the first half of the thirteenth century and most of them enjoyed considerable popular esteem.

It can be safely assumed that in the first half of the thirteenth century, the Sultans of Delhi were far more closely allied to the saints of the Suhrawardi order in comparison to the Chishti saints. All the prominent khalifahs of Shaikh Shihabuddin Suhawardi in India were not only attached to the Court of Iltutmish but also enjoyed his patronage. The Suhrawardis were obviously more well-known in India during the reign of Iltutmish and his progeny. Even though they came to South Asia later than the Chishtis, they came in large numbers. As a group, they were thus numerically superior and more visible in the thirteenth century both in Delhi court and in the frontier province of Multan. They could thus serve the interest of the state much more than the Sufis of any other sect.

The only Chishti saint of the period who we can link with the Delhi Sultanate was Khwaja Qutbuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki. However, it was also very marginal. Though he extended moral support to Iltutmish and Qabacha, he was reluctant to take up any post offered to him by the Sultan or sought any favour from the State machinery. On the contrary, the Suhrawardi saints didn’t mind forging relations with the ruling elite. The large endowments (awqaf) given by the state to these Multani saints depicts the state’s predilection for a Sufi order located at the periphery of the empire. Needless to say that these Sufis were seen by the political elites as a potential ally in keeping the frontier provinces like Multan as it had been incessantly intruded by the foreign adversaries and surrounded by the warring local inhabitants both of which can be a disturbing factor for the politics of Delhi Sultanate.
In this background of Sufi – State rapprochement and alliance, the real cause of conflict between the Sufi and the Ulama in the early thirteenth century become amply clear. Both of them were eager for state patronage and it was quite natural that the Ulama looked upon the Sufis as competitors and rivals to their authority. They saw in them a potential source of danger to their position and prowess at any point of time. Moreover, like the Ulama, most of the early Sufis were also men of great learning and possessed thorough knowledge of Muslim law (shariah) and Islamic jurisprudence (fiqh). Many Sufis had in fact studied with the same teacher and attended the same institution as by an alim. Many Sufis had also started their career as an alim or had aspired for a government position. We know that even Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya desired to be a Qazi but was dissuaded by Shaikh Najibuddin Mutawakkil, younger brother of Baba Farid.\(^{45}\) Therefore the popularity and the pre-eminence of the Suhrawardi saints in Delhi and elsewhere was a thorn in the flesh of the Ulama and consequently they felt insecure in the presence of such alims who were also known for their spiritual prowess. They could pose a challenge to their authority as interpreter of the Shariah. The rulers also held them in high esteem. We know that when Shaikh Saifuddin Bakharzi, the disciple of Shaikh Najmuddin Kubra, was instructed by the latter to go to Bukhara and settle there, Shaikh Saifuddin protested by saying that there were many an Ulama in Bukhara and that they were both jealous of Sufis and angry with them.\(^{46}\)

There is also evidence that the hospices of the Sufis were frequented by influential people. The khanqah of Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya, for instance, is said to have been frequently visited by the nobles, merchants, traders, etc. This definitely added to the prestige of the Sufis in the eyes of the people at large which obviously would not have been relished by the Ulama. The presence of a group of Sufis who did not mind acquiring official appointments and state
sponsorship certainly hampered the political ambitions of the Ulama and was therefore detested by them.

IV

In this section, I propose to deal with few instances of Sufi- Ulama strife in the first half of the thirteenth century. It would also be my endeavour to explain appropriate reasons responsible for these altercations.

One of the well-known tussles of such kind in the early thirteenth century was between Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya and Qazi Qutubuddin Kashani. The Qazi was a distinguished alim of Multan. He was taken in high esteem by the then monarch of Multan, Nasiruddin Qabacha, who had even constructed a madrasah for him. The religious elites of Multan, particularly the Ulama, did not like the presence of Bahauddin Zakariya in their town because he belonged to the Sufi brotherhood which excelled both in legal and spiritual matters. Due to the difference of opinion over the method of the observance of namaz and other related issues, Kashani once forbade Shaikh Zakariya to pray at his madrasah and desired that he should pray at his own khanqah. After this incident Shaikh Zakariya never offered Morning Prayer in the madrasah of Qazi Qutubuddin. According to Qamar ul Huda, ”the heart of Suhrawardi- ulama religious differences lies in the ways Suhrawardi were able to balance their inner spiritual aspirations with the outer worldly demands of living according to the law.” However, the conflict seems to have been motivated by mundane considerations. Going by the doctrines of the Suhrawardis, there was not much difference between them and the Ulama. The altercation was purely personal owing to Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya’s political propensity and Qazi Qutubuddin Kashani must have taken it as potentially disadvantageous to his own position in Multan. On the other hand,
the Qazi’s influence at the Multan court was perhaps detrimental to the interest of the Shaikh who was himself not averse to remain in the good books of the ruling authority. It can therefore be assumed that the tussle between the Shaikh and the Qazi which was ostensibly an altercation based on the disparity between the doctrines of Sufism and Shariah, was obviously of mundane nature. Needless to say that this is one of the many instances of the tension between a person enjoying royal patronage and a Sufi longing to get the state patronage like his predecessors. The same Bahauddin Zakariya wrote letters to Iltutmish with the connivance of another Qazi of Multan whose name has been mentioned by Jamali Kanboh as Qazi Sharafuddin. Qazi Qutubuddin Kashani’s political proclivity is demonstrated by another incident. Once he visited Delhi at the invitation of Sultan Iltutmish. On reaching Delhi, he found that the Sultan was sitting in the quarter reserved for amusement. Shaikh Nooruddin Mubarak Ghaznavi was also present. The Qazi approached the Sultan, greeted him and expressed his desire to be seated next to him. The Sultan gladly granted his desire. The point to note is that both Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya and Qazi Kashani preferred proximity with the ruling elite and made sincere efforts to fulfill their desires.

Another infamous incident connected with the Sufi- Ulama interface that has been mentioned in Sufi tazkiras is the episode of Shaikh Jalaluddin Tabrizi. A Suhrawardi saint, he had been falsely accused of adultery by the Shaikh ul Islam of Delhi, Najmuddin Sughra. In Fawai’dul Fu’ad, it is mentioned that Najmuddin created such a furore that Shaikh Jalaluddin was compelled to leave Hindustan. Siyar ul Arifin furnishes the details of the incident. When Jalaluddin Tabrizi reached Delhi from Baghdad, Iltutmish came out of the city to greet the Shaikh. The reception accorded by the Sultan to Shaikh Tabrizi made the Shaikh ul Islam Najmuddin Sughra jealous. After his failure to poison the ears of the Sultan against Shaikh
Tabrizi, Najmuddin Sughra finally slapped the Saint with the charge of adultery.\textsuperscript{55} The author of *Akhbar ul Akhyar* also refers to Shaikh Jalaluddin Tabrizi being accused of something egregious by the Shaikh ul Islam.\textsuperscript{56} The ruling prince, Sultan Iltutmish is said to have convened a meeting (mahzar) to discuss the issue.\textsuperscript{57} Though the authenticity of the report regarding mahzar is highly doubtful, the incident surfaces the Sufi-Ulama tension to the core. It again seems to be a case of sheer jealousy on the part of an administrative officer against a man who could be a threat to his position in future. It undoubtedly suggests an undercurrent of personal rivalry. The frequent reference of this episode in medieval Sufi literature shows that there was a fierce competition between the Sufi and the Ulama to prove their respective superiority in the court and to undermine each other’s attempt to get closer to the Sultan.\textsuperscript{58}

Another Sufi-Ulama squabble which is mentioned in Sufi texts also involves Najmuddin Sughra. It is reported that Najmuddin did not pay proper respect to Khwaja Moinuddin Chishti when the saint visited the Sheikh ul Islam’s place. On being asked to explain his conduct, he complained that Shaikh Qutubuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki, the khalifah of Mo’inuddin was indifferent to his position as shaikh ul islam and considered it of no consequence.\textsuperscript{59} It was because of this remark that Mo’inuddin Chishti decided to take Bakhtiyar Kaki back to Ajmer. However, he refrained from doing so on account of the request of the people of Delhi as well as Sultan Iltutmish to let Shaikh Bakhtiyar Kaki stay in the city. It was a case of grudge of shaikh ul islam. Shaikh Bakhtiyar Kaki was a popular figure in Delhi. Najmuddin Sughra was perhaps apprehensive of losing his position to Shaikh Bakhtiyar Kaki as Sultan Iltutmish had offered the same post to the saint which he had refused.\textsuperscript{60}

Another instance of Sufi-Ulama acrimony is evident in the conversation of Shaikh Jalaluddin Tabrizi with the Governor of Badaun, Qazi Kamaluddin Jafri. One day Shaikh Tabrizi
went to meet the governor of Badaun. The Qazi was offering prayers. On hearing this, the Shaikh remarked, “Does a Qazi know how to offer prayer?” Next day the Qazi paid a visit to the Shaikh and asked the reason for such a remark. The Shaikh replied that the scholars (ulama) pray in the direction of Ka’ba but the beggars of God (fuqara) never offered prayers unless they see God. A similar episode of a Sufi’s attempt to establish his superiority over an alim is related about Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya. Once the Shaikh paid a visit to a devout man of Multan named Sulaiman. The Shaikh asked him to perform two genuflections of prayers in front of him. The man while praying did not put his feet in the prescribed manner. When again and again he failed to do so in the way Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya wanted him to do, the Shaikh ordered Sulaiman to settle in Uchch.

Isami has narrated one more episode of Sufi-Ulama discord during the reign of sultan Iltutmish. Two muftis (jurists), Qazi Sa’d and Qazi Imad who enjoyed the confidence of the king (Iltutmish) presented themselves before him and requested him to summon Qazi Hamiduddin Nagori, a Suhrawardi saint and chief exponent of Sam’a in Delhi. The Sultan convened a meeting to discuss the legality of Sam’a. Qazi Hamiduddin Nagori was also invited. When hard pressed on the issue of Sam’a, he replied, “Verily it is forbidden if the listener is an ordinary scholar (ahl- i- qal). It is permissible if the listener is a man of path (ahl- i- hal).” This is perhaps the first incident in the early thirteenth century where a discussion, about the alleged infringement of the Shariah by a Sufi, was conducted in the presence of a Sultan. Though nothing substantial came out from this discussion in terms of issuing a verdict against the legality or otherwise of Sam’a as demanded by a few Ulama, on closer look, this episode also suggests a faint undercurrent of rivalry between the two groups. Both the jurists enjoyed the favour of the ruler, while the Shaikh was also held in great esteem by the monarch who, on seeing him, would
stand up in respect. One more case involving Qazi Hamiduddin Nagori has come down to us. Once, many of his contemporaries wrote legal opinions against the practice of Sam’a. Everyone decreed that Sam’a was forbidden. Even a jurist friend of Qazi Hamiduddin Nagori wrote an adverse opinion, which was reported to the Qazi. When the friend came to see him, Nagori inquired about it and remarked, “All those other jurists who wrote rejoinder to my decree, in my opinion, are still fetuses in their mothers’ wombs, but as for you, you are a newborn infant. Such a child!”

It seems that the question of Sam’a had always been a bone of contention between the Sufis and the Ulama. It is also certain that most of the time the Ulama employed Sam’a as a tool to humiliate a popular Sufi saint. Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya has himself observed that there were quite a good number of Ulama who did not say anything about Sam’a while some without actual knowledge picked up a quarrel.

It can therefore be concluded that the Sufi- Ulama strife in the first half of the thirteenth century was motivated primarily by political rivalry, mutual jealousy and personal animosity between two groups. In this period the Suhrawardi dominated the spiritual space in Hindustan. Their popular appeal and connection with the ruling elites obliged the rulers to be in close proximity to them. The Ulama too were equally essential for the well-being of the Sultanate. At the time of the establishment of the Sultanate, the Ulama were bold and free from any outside influence. With the passage of time, they became engrossed in worldly pleasures, lost their independence of character and started associating themselves with the ruling house. They
became corrupt and came to be divided into two categories—Ulama-i-akhirat and Ulama-i-dunya. It was the Ulama-i-dunya who most of the time held grudge against the Sufis, especially the Suhrawardis. The reason perhaps lies in the attitude of the Suhrawardi saints towards the state. Many Suhrawardis, like the Ulama-i-dunya were interested in politics. They hankered for state patronage and government services. In this sense, they were becoming stiff competitors to the Ulama and thus the cause of their indignation between the two. Most of the cases of Sufi-Ulama discord that has been reported in the early thirteenth century involved a Suhrawardi Sufi on one hand and an alim on the other. There is a bleak possibility that in some cases the tussle were driven entirely by the laid-back attitude of some Sufis towards the Shariah and the vexation of the Ulama on account of that. The Suhrawardis were the follower of Shariah in very much the similar manner in which it has been preached by the Ulama. It is therefore unlikely that there arose a dispute between them on an issue the crux of which was disregard for the Shariah. In fact, the nature of Sufi-Ulama dispute was more mundane and less religious. Whether it was Qutubuddin Kashani’s squabble with Shaikh Bahauiddin Zakariya or Najmuddin Sughra’s allegation against Jalaluddin Tabrizi or his accusation about Shaikh Bakhtiyar Kaki, all imply an inkling of personal antagonism. It augmented manifold in the presence of a sultan (Iltutmish) who gave equal importance to the Sufis and the Ulama due to self-interest (see chapter seven). However, both these groups cannot be divided into two water-tight compartments. Generally, a Sufi was also an alim of high repute, well versed in all branches of Islamic laws and learning. Moreover, on certain doctrinal issues the Ulama and the Sufis also found common ground. We know for instance that along with Qazi Hamiduddin Nagori who gave Sam’ā a legal sanction in Delhi, it was Minhajuddin Juzjani, a member of the Ulama fraternity, who had lent his unconditional support the practice of Sam’ā in the capital city.⁶⁹
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