CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Coins as the medium of exchange play vital role in the economic life of the people and thus focus on the prevailing conditions of the country. But this aspect of the coinage of the Sultans of Delhi has not yet been properly studied. Because, the proper information necessary for this study lack in the contemporary chronicles. No writer of that time discussed them with that importance as did Abul Fazl regarding the coinage of Akbar of the Mughal period. If they referred to them anywhere of their work it was casual. So it is such a vague that it does not convey any valuable information to fulfill our purpose. The ultimate result is that the perfect currency system of the Sultans of Delhi still remains unknown. Much speculations were made by scholars like Edward Thomas, H.R Nevill and H N. Wright in this regard but their discussions were limited only on a few aspects of this coinage and not on the whole currency system, and in this limited area too they differed on many vital points.

For example, regarding the silver and gold tankahs of the Sultans of Delhi, Thomas was of the opinion that they were struck to a standard weight of 100 ratis. So he converted the weight standard of these coins in grains troy at 175 grains taking 1.75 grains for a rati. H.N. Wright and H.R Nevill on the other hand fixed the weight standard at 96 ratis and converted it into 172.8 grains troy taking 1.8 grains for a rati. These scholars have only theorized and have not take any pains to consider the
actual weight of the coins. The known weight of the tankah/rupaya coins of the Khalji rulers does to go beygn 170.3 grains troy and their lower limit is 165 grains. Almost the same appears the weight of the tankahs of the Turkish Sultans who issued the coin of this denomination first.* As such it may well be said that the weight standard was confined in the proximity of 168-170 grains (10.90-1104 grammes).

Here it may be pointed out that we have now the treaties of Thakkur Pheru, the mint-master of the khalji rulers. He speaks that the gold and silver coins weighed 1 tola and he does not reckon it in terms of ratis. Instead he gives the weight system as follows:

1 tola 3 tankas
1 tanka 4 mashas
1 masha 16 javas
1 java 20 viswas

The conversion of these weights in terms of grains troy taking the maximum 170 grains / 1104 grammes for the tola which is the weight of a tankah or rupaya coin, we have the following results:

1 tola 11.04 gms / 170 gns
1 tankah 3.68 gms / 56.67 gns
1 masha 0.9167 gms / 14.16 gns
1 jaya 0.573 gms / 0.885 gns
1 viwa 0.0029 gms / 0.044425 gns.
As in the case of tankahs the above scholars measured the billon coins too in terms of rati, but Thakkur Pheru tells us that they weight one tanka (3.68 gms / 56.7 gns). When we practically look at these coins we find that they all weigh only in the proximity of 3.68 gms / 56.67 gns. It means that they are of the weight of on tankah and this confirms Thakkur Pheru. While dealing with these billon coins Pheru says that Iggani, Dugani, Chaugani, Chahagani and Athagani – all are uniformly of the weight of one tanka i.e., 3.68 gns / 56.67 gns and differ only in their silver content. These metrological weight as they appear are not the innovations of the Khalji rulers of their own, but they have been adopted by them in their coinage from the traditional metrology that were current from earlier times particularly from the time of Iltutmish.

Thakkur Pheru has clearly mentioned the mentionable values of all the billon of the Khaljis but he did not do it in case of the jitals of the Turki Sultans. Regarding the latter coins he simply mentioned their silver contents as well as their metal prices in terms of rupaya (or silver tankah). But now after the discovery of Dravya Pariksha it is easier for us to fix the denominational values of all these coins in the light of the Khalji coinage; and I have done this in those cases where the silver contents are available either from the statement of Thakkur Pheru or from their assay by Smith.

As such we may now say that Habibullah was not correct in his assumption that Iltutmish devalued his jitals in terms of earlier coins. It is only that he issued coins of a lower denomination than those were issued...
earlier. His billon coins are found to be of two different shades. On contained 2.8 grains (0.18 grammes) in a coin and the other just the double i.e., 5 grains (0.24 grammes). They may be identified as the Jital Iggani and Dugani respectively. The earlier coin of Muhammad bin Sam had three times of silver in relations to the lower denomination (i.e. jitals Iggani) of Iltutmish, so this may well be jital tigani coin. In this way the value of the coins of the successors of Iltutmish have been identified in most cases.

Another points is to be mentioned here that our scholars had not been clear about the terms jital and gani which were used occasionally in the contemporary chronicles. They were actually, synonymous. Jitals was an earlier term and gani was adopted later. Thomas believed that 64 jitals were equal to 1 tankah (i.e., silver coin) and H.N. Wright thought it to be 48. But in view of Thakkur Pheru's statement both the scholars were incorrect. A silver tankah was equal to 60 jitals or Igganis. And the divisions of the tankah were Iggani, Dugani, Tigani, chaugani, Chhagani, Athagani, Barahagani, Chabhisagani and Adatalisagani. This it is found that the submultiples of the tankah are divisible by three numerals viz., 1, 2 and 3. the Iggani, Dugani and Tigani are divisible only by that numeral. Chaugani and Athagani are divisible 2 only, while Chahagani, Barahagani, Chabhisgani and Adatalisagani by both 2 and 3.

Besides using the coins as medium of exchange in transactions, the medieval Muslim rulers utilized them also as means of political propagation. Through them the king used to express their vanity and
impress upon the people their greatness as kings. This is very much visible in the legends of the coins of the Sultans of Delhi that have been discussed in the earlier pages.

The most common title that express their status as king is “al-sultan al-muizzam” or “al-sultan al-a’azam” (i.e., the great or the greatest king). This title was common used by each and every Sultan of Delhi whether had this status recognized or not. For instance the pretender Shams uddin Mahmud (1318 A.D.) whose very identity is uncertain, issued some coins with vague name but adopted for himself the title of “Al-Sultan al-’azam” claiming that he was the great king. In fact, these titles were merely the grandiloquent style of expressing their sovereignty.

“Abul mulk” (i.e., the father of the kingdom) is an uncommon title and was used exclusively among the Sultans of Delhi by Mui’iz uddin Muhammad bin San. This title was earlier adopted on the Indian soil by the Gaznavid ruler Khusru Mal. By itself in this title there is nothing pretentious as the king was always considered by the people as their father. He is to take care of his subjects for all kinds of their well-being which is the function of a father.

Most of the rulers called themselves “abu-l muzaffar” and a fewe of them “abu’il fath”. Both these titles proclaimed for their adopters the clam of being victorious. These titles could well have been used by the kings as they were often on the quest of conquest and in many cases they were also victorious. So these titles may not be seriously taken as necessarily denoting anything spectacular.
Apart from these ceremonies titles there were a few boastful titles or epithets that were also adopted by a few Sultans. Among them one was 'Ala uddin Muhammad Khalji who had proclaimed himself “sikandar al-sani” or the second Alexander. Alexander was known for his conquest of vast territories and he marched with his army conquering countries one after the other. But ‘Ala uddin had adopted this title as soon as he occupied the throne of Delhi when he had not even one conquest to his credit. Similarly his son ‘Umar who was on the throne only for a few months, and whose position was tottering due to opposition of ‘Ala uddin, also adopted this title only to follow his father. Qutb uddin Mubarak, his another son, assumed as slightly different title. It is “Iskandar uzzaman” (i.e., Alexander of the time). It indicates that he was not so pretentious as his predecessor were. He just says that he was a great conqueror of his own time. Nevertheless this was also a boastful title or a tall claim at the time of his very accession to the throne while he achieved nothing of this kind.

Mention may also be made of a title “al-qutbi” (i.e., belonging to Qutb uddin) which was used on the Bengal and Kuraman coins of Iltutmish. It shows the relation of the king with Qutb uddin Aibak. This titles seems to have a historical background. After the death of Qutb uddin Aibak his son Aram Shah had ascended the throne. But due to his inefficiency the nobles of Delhi invited Iltutmish to occupy it and Iltutmish accepted the invitation gladly. But his claim to the throne was weak. So it was likely that to proclaim is right over the Delhi throne he might have
adopted this title (i.e., al-Qutbi) to who his close relationship with Qutbuddin Airbak as being his son-in-law, freed slave and member of the Qutbi faction of the amirs as against the Mu'izis.

Besides serving in economy and political needs, the coins also focus the religious beliefs of the king who issued from them and it is too an important information to us.

According to Islamic traditions also Muslim rulers outside Arabia had to acknowledge the allegations of the contemporary Khalifah of Islam ruling over Makka and Madina, and it was prohibited for them to adopt the titles of Khalifah for themselves. Man of the Muslim rulers followed this tradition in name only. They established kingdoms, ruled there independently and in order to legalize their rule in the eye of Islam they used to assume some religious titles expressing their allegiance to the Khalifah. In assuming these titles they did not feel it necessary to obtain prior approval from the Khalifah. Most of the Delhi Sultans had such titles. The practice was introduced first by Iltutmish among the Delhi Sultans and later it was followed by others.

Iltutmish's earlier titles of this kind was "burhanu amir al-mu'minin", by which he declared himself as "the testament of the "Commander of the faith" (i.e., 'the Khalifah')". Virtually it means that he was the viceroy ruling on behalf of the Khalifah. A little late he changed this title wish "nasir amir al-mu'minin" i.e., helper of the Khalifah". In this latter title he slightly improved his position. Now he was thinking himself not as subordinate but as his associate (helper). These titles he adopted in 614 and 616 A H.
much earlier than he received the investiture of the Khalifah in 626 A.H. It shows that from the very beginning he was keen to gain the protection from the letter (i.e., Khalifah).

This second title (i.e., nasir amir al-mu'minin) was also adopted by his successors Raziyah, Bahram was much later by the Khalji rulers 'Ala uddin Muhamamd and Mubarak Khalji. It adoption by Raziyah and Bahram was legitimate and justified as their predecessor Iltutmish and received the justification as their predecessor Iltutmish had received the investiture from the Khalifah. But he two Khalji rulers had no such claims. They had adopted it only as customary practice and only for a short period. 'Ala uddin Khalji had another title, it is “Yamin al-Khalifat” (i.e., the right hand of the Khalifat) by which he claimed the close association with the Khalifah as his “right hand” and the adhered to this title during the entire period of his reign. His son Mubarak also shared with this claim of his father in the very beginning of his reign in the early part of the year 617 A.H., but within a few a months he changed his mind and instead of becoming the viceroy (nasir) of the Khalifah he himself proclaimed to be the Khalifah and assumed the title of “amir al-mu'minin” also “al-imam al-'azam, Khalifatullah or Khalifatu rabbi ‘alamin” (i.e., the greater leader and the representative of God). He also called himself “al-wasiz billah” implying that he was “the confident in God” and thereby nearer to him.

Mubarak's successor Nasir uddin Khusru called himself “walliu amir 'al-mu'minin” i.e., the Deputy of the Khalifah. This epithet may be taken having duel meaning. It may be related to the original Khalifah of Islam as
well as the claimant Khaliah Mubarak. He also claimed himself “al-wasiq bi-nasir Rahman” following his predecessor but with slight modification that he was “the confident in the help of God.”

Besides serving as the medium of exchange and mean of political and religious propagation the coin also serve as a source of information for history. It is an additional benefit of which the issuing kings were not aware at all and for which the coins were not actually issued. This source of information is much more reliable than any other sources.

Its importance in case of ancient history of India is well recognized. But it has not been taken seriously for the history of Muslim rule in India as the written documents in the form of chronicles, farmans, ruq’at etc. of this period are found in abundance, yet there are many obscure corners of history where these documentary sources fail to shade any proper light. And it is here that the coins may usefully be utilized. In the period under review the coins throw some new lights to which no attention was paid so far.

➢ To begin with, it is the general impression that Muhammad bin Sam’s Laqab was “Shahib uddin”. It is hardly realized that he had also the laqab of “Mu’iz uddin”. The fact is that he was never known by the title of “Shahab uddin” in the context of Indian history. Much before his entry into India his brother bestowed upon his this later laqab (i.e., Mu’iz uddin) replacing the previous one (i.e., Shihab uddin). Since then this only laqab was associated with him till his death in 1206.
A.D. This fact has a great bearing on the history which is not realized so far.

Muhammad bin sam entered into India as the governor of Ghazani under his brother Ghiyas uddin and as such when he entered into Peshwar he was considering himself a the subordinate to his brother. This fact is borne out from a new coins issued from that place which bear the name Ghiyas uddin Muhammad bin Sam. To these coins no attention was paid earlier and no chronicle mentioned this fact in his work.

It is generally believed that the coins bearing the name “Muhammad bin Sam” were issued by Mu‘iz uddin in his own right. This may be true but as long as his brother Ghiyas uddin was alive he used the name Muhammad bin Sam on the coins without he *laqab* “Muiz uddin”. The name Muhammad bin Sam without he distinction of the *laqab* was applicable equally to Ghiyas uddin as well as Mu‘iz uddin, as the proper name of both the brothers was “Muhmmad bin Sam”. By using this camouflage name he tried to avoid any clash with his bother though virtually he was the master. This tactful device adopted by Mu‘iz uddin was not realized earlier by the historians. If al the Ghurid Indian coins minutely scrutinized it will be noticed that only after the death of Ghiyas uddin the *laqab* Mu‘iz uddin long with name Muhamamd bin Sam was used. Thus it is clear that so long
his brother was alive, Mu'iz uddin was subordinate to him and did not dare assert his independence.

The coins bearing the name of Muhammad bin Samon, one side and Sri Prithvirajadeva on the other, were a matter of controversy for quite some times and they were considered to be mules by some scholars. But as it has been discussed earlier these coins were undoubtedly joint-issues, struck by Prithviraja as his subordinate to Muhammad bin Sam. This makes it certain that Prithviraja was not killed at the battle of Tarain as most of the historians believes, and at the same time it corroborates the statement of Hasan Nizami and Prabandha Chintamani.

Conflicting opinions were being expressed about the date of Muhammad bin Bakhtiyar's conquest of Gauda (Bengal) A.D 1194, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1202, 1203 and 1204 were the dates suggested by different scholars for this event as discussed earlier elaborately. It is only the coins that have set at rest this long drawn controversy and produced a precise date (Ramzan 610 AH/May 1205 A.D.) for his conquest of Gauda (Bengal). While bringing these unknown facts to the notice of the scholars the discovery of the coins, commemorating the conquest of Bengal, corroborates the statement of Minhaj that Muhammad bin Bhakhtiyar Khalji had issued coins, but so far it was being disbelieved as coins.
were not available then. While in this case the coins confirms Minhaj at the same time the absence of the coins of Qutb uddin aibak falsify his statement that Qutb uddin had issued coins.

> It was believed so that 'Iwaz from the very beginning was an independent ruler of Bengal and was not a vassal of the Delhi Sultan Ilutmish. But the discovery of the coins of Muhammad bin Bakhityar Khalji commemorating the conquest of Bengal leads to the modification of this opinion. This coins has the same horseman motif which we see on certain gold and silver coins of Ilutmish but the mint name on them so far have been read variously. Now it is confirmed that the reading “bi-Guada” is the correct one and that these coins were issued from Bengal during 614 and 616 A.H. when 'Iwaz was governor there. These coins, therefore, prove that 'Iwaz had accepted the subordination of the Delhi Sultan Ilutmish in the early part of his reign.

> Coming the period of Raziyah we have evidenced that her coins were issued from Lakhnauti (Bengal) which had been stopped during her predecessor Rukh uddin Firuz. These Bengal coins of Raziyah, confirms Minhaj’s statement that she brought all the territories from Lakhnauti (Bengal) to Debal under her control.
Lastly we know only from the coins that an attempt was made by one Shams uddin Muhmud to assert himself as the Sultan of Delhi in 1318 A.D. when Mubarak Khalji was away to Deogir. No mention of this event is recorded by any chroniclers.

A rare coin issued by Bengal ruler Nasiruddin Ibrahim, which also bears the name of the ghiyasuddin Tughluq. The title used for Tughlaq ruler such as al sultan al-azam ghiyath al-duniya wal din abul muzaffar tughluq shah al sultan. In the light of above evidence we can safely reach to the conclusion that probably above mentioned Bengal ruler accepted the suzerainty of this first Tughlaq king. Unfortunately this had not been documented in any contemporary sources.

The use of legend, which is available to us o the token currency of Mohammad bin Tughluq gives us idea that he tried to, convinced the Muslim masses especially on religion ground. These coins bear the legend like muhr shud tanka raijdar ruzgar i-banda-i-midwar Muhammad Tughluq (mined tanka currency during the days of Muhammad bin Tughluq, who hops for devine favour and other side man ata al rahman faquad ata al rahman (he obeys the sultan obeys the God and obeys the prophet). It seems probably to exploit the religion sentiments to make people accepts these bronze coins on the value of silver coins.
Contemporary of Muhammad Bin Tughluq, Ziauddin Barani wrote in his Tarikh-i-Feruzshahi that above-mentioned rulers were the man behind the killing of Ghiyasuddin Tughluq. Probably this rumours or fact was in the air and through the coins Muhammad bin Tughluq cleared his position and used the legend shaheed (martyr) and anara allah buhanher (may Allah illumine his proof) for his father Ghiyasuddin Tughluq.

After AD 1389, Firuz Shah Zafar became sultan of Delhi after Tughluq shah for few months, but surprisingly enough his name is not included in the last Tughluq's Sultans in sources of period concerned like Tarikh-i-Mubarak shahi. But the coins issued by him, date and name appeared on it, we came to know about him.

Khizr khan who established the Saiyyad dynasty in AD 1414, never issued any coins in his name as it was done by most of the earlier rulers and unlike them not assumed even the royal title. This fact is only known to us through his coins. Even his son Mubarak shah became king in AH 824 too followed the policy of his father in his first eight years of reign till AH 837. This fact too is not borned out not by the literature but by the coins he issued.

The two copper coins having legend in devnagri issued by Kangra surler Prayaga Chandra and Ram Chandra issued with Ibrahim Shah Lodi titles and their names suggests that
they probably accepted the suzerainty of this Lodi sultan. Unfortunately, this fact is nowhere reported in any contemporary sources of the period concerned.

India, right from the beginning famous for the cultural and material importance. To know it clearly, government of India tried to build several museums in different corners of the country and sometimes charge some nominal free to visit inside the museums. Now a day as we know tourism is one of the major sources of income for the government particularly those who coming from different parts of the world. In my chapter VIII, I have try to know a new thing about which nothing has been written earlier, i.e., how coins attracts the foreign visitors to see the museum, especially coin section? I hope this dimension will certainly open a new debate among the researchers who are interested in numismatics and musicology.

These are a few information that the coins have added to the history of the Sultanate of Delhi.