

15

THE REGIONS OF SIND, BALUCHISTAN,  
MULTAN AND KASHMIR:  
THE HISTORICAL, SOCIAL AND  
ECONOMIC SETTING\*

*N. A. Baloch and A. Q. Rafiqi*

**Contents**

THE RULERS OF SIND, BALUCHISTAN AND MULTAN (750–1500) . . . . .	298
The °Abbasid period and the Fatimid interlude (mid-eighth to the end of the tenth century) . . . . .	298
The Period of the Ghaznavid and Ghurid Sultanates (eleventh and twelfth centuries) .	301
The era of the local independent states . . . . .	304
KASHMIR UNDER THE SULTANS OF THE SHĀH MĪR DYNASTY . . . . .	310

\* See Map 4, 5 and 7, pp. 430–1, 432–3, 437.

## Part One

# THE RULERS OF SIND, BALUCHISTAN AND MULTAN (750–1500)

(*N. A. Baloch*)

From 750 to 1500, three phases are discernible in the political history of these regions. During the first phase, from the mid-eighth until the end of the tenth century, Sind, Baluchistan and Multan – with the exception of the interlude of pro-Fatimid ascendancy in Multan during the last quarter of the tenth century – all remained politically linked with the ʿAbbasid caliphate of Baghdad. (Kashmir was ruled, from the eighth century onwards, by the local, independent, originally non-Muslim dynasties, which had increasing political contacts with the Muslim rulers of Sind and Khurasan.) During the second phase – the eleventh and twelfth centuries – all these regions came within the sphere of influence of the powers based in Ghazna and Ghur. During the third phase – from the thirteenth to the early sixteenth century – they partly became dominions of the Sultanate of Delhi, which was in itself an extension into the subcontinent of the Central Asian power base. Simultaneously, local sultanates independent of Delhi also emerged. Besides, the explosion of Mongol power in Inner Asia had repercussions in these regions.

## The ʿAbbasid period and the Fatimid interlude (mid-eighth to the end of the tenth century)

When the ʿAbbasids supplanted the Umayyads in 750, Sind, the easternmost province of the caliphate, included Makran and Turan and Qusdar (western and central Baluchistan), Sind proper (including Kachh) and Multan (southwestern Panjab). Further expansion and consolidation followed, beginning with the conquests of the caliph al-Mansūr's (754–75) energetic governor, Hishām b. ʿAmr al-Taghlibī. During his six-year tenure of power (768–74), Hishām achieved several victories. Throughout the early ʿAbbasid period, Sind continued to receive regular governors and the province enjoyed internal peace. Later,

the authority of the caliphate grew weaker, leading to the establishment of some five independent Arab principalities in Mansura, Multan, Turan and Qusdar, Makran and Mashkey.

### THE HABBĀRĪ AMIRATE OF MANSURA

In the strife that erupted in Sind in 841–2, the local chief ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Habbārī emerged victorious. In 854 al-Mutawakkil appointed him as governor and he held this position during the caliph’s reign, but in the wake of the disorder following the death of al-Mutawakkil in 861, ʿUmar, though continuing to read the *khutba* (Friday worship oration) in the name of the ʿAbbasid caliph, established himself as an independent ruler in Mansura. Thus ʿUmar became the founder of the Habbārī dynasty. He, his son ʿAbd Allāh (who was ruling in 883) and his grandson ʿUmar (who was in power at the time that al-Masʿūdī visited Sind in 914–15) were effective rulers. Caravan routes from eastern Persia led to Mansura and further on into the subcontinent. During the tenth century, the capital of the Habbārīs continued to flourish, as confirmed by the reports of al-Istakhri, Ibn Hawqal and al-Maqdisī, who all visited it. In Mansura, the Habbārī dynasty lasted until 1025, when Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazna overthrew their last ruler, Khafīf.

### THE BANŪ MUNABBĪH AMIRATE OF MULTAN

The Banū Munabbih, who claimed to be of Qurayshite stock, had established themselves in Multan at about the same time that the Habbārīs had done in Mansura. At the opening of the tenth century, Ibn Rusta was the first to report on the well-established rule of the Banū Munabbih in Multan. According to a report recorded by al-Bīrūnī, one Muhammad b. al-Qāsim b. Munabbih established himself in Multan after his victory there. He probably belonged to the house of Jahm b. Sāma al-Shāmī, who had allegedly settled in ‘Kashmir’ (sic) as far back as 712–14 and whose descendants had reportedly continued to flourish there. Muhammad b. al-Qāsim attained prominence in the later ninth century and wrested power, probably from a rebel deputy of the ʿAbbasids, around 861–4. He and his successors gave allegiance to the ʿAbbasids and recited the *khutba* in the caliph’s name. During their long dynastic rule, which remained unchallenged for over a century, the Banū Munabbih brought power, prestige and prosperity to Multan, as confirmed by the geographers who visited it. After the middle of the tenth century, the power of the dynasty began to be eroded due to ‘Carmathian’ (i.e. pro-Fatimid) propaganda, which was gaining momentum. Thus it seems that the rule of the Banū Munabbih came to an end during the years 982–5.

In Turan–Qusdar and Makran, the two westernmost divisions of Sind, central ʿAbbasid authority broke down earlier than in Mansura and Multan. ʿImrān al-Barmakī was the last ʿAbbasid governor who, under the caliph al-Muʿtasim (833–42), had led his forces from

Mansura to Qusdar and asserted his authority in that turbulent region. But ʿImrān was killed in Mansura in 842; the provincial administration collapsed and the two amirates, Qusdar and Makran, and the third smaller one of Mashkey (see below), emerged as independent entities.

### THE RULERS OF TURAN

Turan (central Baluchistan), with its capital at Qusdar (Khuzdar), was governed by the Habbārīs of Mansura until the end of the ninth century. Then, early in the tenth century, the chief Mughīra b. Ahmad established himself independently in Turan, changing its capital from Qusdar to Kijkanan (Kalat), a fertile district producing grapes, pomegranates and other winter fruit, but no dates. Mughīra did not recognize the supremacy of the Habbārīs since he read the *khutba* ‘only in the caliph’s name’. Mughīra was succeeded by his brother Muʿīn b. Ahmad, who ruled during the time in which Ibn Hawqal wrote (mid-tenth century). During his reign, the administration was far from satisfactory; his deputy, Abu ʿl-Qāsim al-Basrī, had appropriated all powers – administrative, judicial and military – and under these circumstances the radical, egalitarian sect of the Kharijites occupied the region soon afterwards. These hard-pressed sectarians had sought refuge in the far-away fringes of the caliphate ever since al-Muhallab b. Abī Sufra had expelled them from Iraq and southern Iran. From the ninth century onwards, they succeeded in establishing themselves in the regions between south-eastern Iran and Sind.

The Kharijites occupied Qusdar in about 971, set up their own principality and ruled independently, without recognizing the ʿAbbasid caliph. Writing in 982, the anonymous author of the *Hudūd al-ʿālam* [The Limits of the World] observed that the residence of the ‘king of Turan’ was in Kijkanan (Kalat). The fact that soon afterwards, these ‘kings’ changed their capital from Kalat to Qusdar is confirmed by al-Maqqdisī. That these just sovereigns were Kharijites who were then being called ‘caliphs’ is borne out by a contemporary report recorded by the *qādī* Abū ʿAlī al-Tanūkhī (d. 994), according to which a Kharijite ‘caliph’ was ruling the country from Qusdar, which was at that time (before 994) a stronghold of the Kharijites.

### THE BANŪ MAʿDĀN DYNASTY OF MAKRAN

The Kharijites apparently became significant in Makran towards the end of the ninth century so that al-Masʿūdī observed, ‘Makran is the land of the lawless Kharijites.’ Soon afterwards, in about 951, Makran fell into their hands and the ruler ʿĪsā b. Maʿdān was called by the Indian title Mahārāj by the people. Coastal Makran had trade links with the

Indian towns of the littoral and the fact that Mahārāj meant ‘Supreme Sovereign’ led the Kharijite ruler to assert his independence by taking this exalted Indian title. Obviously, his being recognized as ‘Great King’ contravened the °Abbasid caliph’s position as sovereign. °Īsā thus became a notable member of the independent Banū Ma°dān dynasty that ruled Makran from Kiz/Kej (Kech) for at least a century and a half, from Saffarid to Ghaznavid times.

### MASHKEY

Situated between Kirman and Makran, the petty principality of Mashkey existed in the middle of the tenth century. Its independent ruler, Mudar b. Rajā’, read the *khutba* only in the name of the °Abbasid caliph. Later, by about 985–6, when al-Maqdisi was writing, the principality seems to have been annexed by the ruler of Makran and to have become a part of the administrative district of Panjgur.

## The Period of the Ghaznavid and Ghurid Sultanates (eleventh and twelfth centuries)

Under pressure from the strongly orthodox Sunni new powers of the Ghaznavids and then the Ghurids in what is now Afghanistan (see above, Chapters 5 and 8), neither the Kharijite rulers of Makran and Qusdar (who recognized no sovereign but God) nor the Multan rulers (who came to recognize the Fatimids of Egypt) were able to continue their sectarian independence much longer; they compromised by submitting when vanquished, but then reasserted their independence when left to themselves. In 971, when the Buyid °Adud al-Dawla’s military power prevailed in Tiz and Makran, the Ma°dānid ruler accepted Buyid suzerainty. After 977–8, however, with the decline in power of the Buyid dynasty and when Sebüktegin had attacked and annexed Qusdar, Ma°dān transferred his allegiance to the Ghaznavids, first to Sebüktegin and then to Sultan Mahmūd. However, Ma°dān soon involved himself in the politics of Central Asia. The Karakhanid conqueror of Bukhara, the Ilig Nasr, entered into a secret pact with the ruler of Qusdar, stipulating that Ma°dān would rise in rebellion against Ghazna when the Karakhanid invaded Khurasan. This accordingly happened in 1011, but Sultan Mahmūd marched against him, laid siege to the town of Qusdar and seized the ruler, who now paid tribute and delivered fifteen elephants and a substantial indemnity in cash. In return, the sultan allowed him to retain his principality as a vassal of Ghazna.

On Ma°dūn’s death in 1025, his younger son °Īsā usurped power, forcing the elder son Abu ’l-°Askar Husayn to flee to Sistan. In 1031 Sultan Mas°ūd sent a powerful army

against ʿĪsā, who was killed. Abu ʿl-ʿAskar Husayn, who now succeeded him, eschewed Kharijism, extended his power and read the *khutba* in Masʿūd’s name. This prince was a man of learning, well-versed in medicine, and wrote a treatise on left-side hemiplegia (i.e. paralysis). He ruled Makran successfully and for a long time, until a date beyond 1058(?). After his death, one might assume that the Kharijite faction would have reasserted its power, but subsequently the Ghurid sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muhammad (1173–1203) attacked and annexed Makran, putting an end to the local dynasty.

### MULTAN: THE FATIMID INTERLUDE

Ismaʿili propaganda was introduced into Sind and Hind from Yemen in 883. In Sind it did not become effective while the Habbārīs were ruling there. In Multan, the Fatimid *dāʿīs* (propagandists) sent by al-Muʿizz (952–75) succeeded by the middle of the tenth century. In 965 al-Muʿizz wrote an encouraging letter and sent seven mission flags to the *dāʿī* Jalam, who subsequently gradually subverted the power of the Banū Munabbih. At the time when Ibn Hawqal was writing, power was still in the hands of the ‘Qurayshite ruler of the Banū Sāma’ (i.e. the Banū Munabbih). According to the report in the *Hudūd al-ʿālam*, by about 982 the Qurayshite ruler of the Banū Sāma dynasty was still ruling in Multan, but was reciting the *khutba* in the name of the Fatimid caliph. By then the pro-Fatimid forces under Jalam had presumably come to dominate, compelling the ruler to change allegiance from the ʿAbbasids to the Fatimids. Subsequently, during 982–5, Jalam attacked, defeated and killed the Banū Sāma ruler. This is to be inferred from the following statement of al-Maḳḍisī: ‘They read the *khutba* in the name of the Fatimid and do not do anything except by his order.’ He makes no mention of the Qurayshite/Banū Sāma/Banū Munabbih ruler in Multan, and also confirms that the famous Multan idol in the temple of the sun god was still there.

Jalam’s next target was this temple of Aditya. In order to gain sufficient power to fight back in case the destruction of the idol brought avenging forces from Kanawj and other Hindu states against him, he seems to have proceeded slowly. It was some time after 985 that Jalam destroyed the idol. According to the report preserved by al-Bīrūnī:

Jalam broke the idol into pieces, killed its priests, converted the temple mansion, which stood on an elevated platform, into a new Jāmiʿ Mosque, and ordered the old Jāmiʿ Mosque to be shut down, from hatred against anything that had been built under the Umayyads.<sup>1</sup>

It is not known how long Jalam governed Multan, but there being no further mention of him in any record, one can assume that he soon died or was eliminated by rival *dāʿīs*. Shaykh

<sup>1</sup> Al-Bīrūnī, 1910, Vol. 1, p. 116.

Hamīd, who was possibly heading a less intransigent faction, rose to power and won the confidence of Sebüktegin, who left him to rule Multan. But his grandson(?) Dāwūd b. Nasr b. Hamīd later aligned himself with Anandpāl, the Hindūshāhī ruler of Wayhind, against Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazna, who then stormed Multan in 1006. Dāwūd escaped, with his treasure, to an island in the Indus. The city elders in Multan sued for peace on payment of the tribute, which was granted. However, the Carmathians (pro-Fatimid elements) were not spared and their mosque was razed to the ground. The sultan appointed Sukhpāl, ‘the nephew of the Shah’ (of Kabul), as his governor and he himself hurried back to Khurasan to repel the Ilig Khan’s invasion. Thereupon, Dāwūd returned to Multan and wrested the fort from Sukhpāl. Early in 1011–12, as disturbances flared up again, Sultan Mahmūd attacked Multan, captured Dāwūd, imprisoned him and annexed Multan to the Ghaznavid sultanate.

Sultan Mahmūd’s two expeditions had broken the power of the pro-Fatimid elements in Multan, though some remained underground and continued to foment the occasional rebellion. Back in Egypt, with the disappearance of al-Hākīm in 1017, the power of the Fatimids was shaken and consequently the strength of their agents in distant Multan also declined. Al-Hākīm’s partisans of the Druze faction, founded by Hamza b. ʿAlī in 1017, made some attempts to reinvigorate pro-Fatimid elements in Multan through Bahā’ al-Dīn al-Muqtanā. On Sultan Mahmūd’s death in 1030, al-Muqtanā found it opportune to revive contacts, and in 1034, addressed a letter to the influential local chief Ibn Sumar (i.e. ‘Rājipāl son of Sumar’, of the house of Abu ’l-Futūh or Abu ’l-Fat’h Dāwūd (see above, Chapter 5). But Ibn Sumar’s faction had already dissociated itself from pro-Fatimid elements and had gained the confidence of the new Ghaznavid sultan, Masʿūd, so that the Younger Dāwūd (al-Asghar) was granted a pardon and freed from prison on Ibn Sumar’s recommendation. In his letter, al-Muqtana praised Ibn Sumar and reminded him of the fidelity of his elders, Dāwūd al-Akbar and others, and, warning him not to be misled, urged him to rise and play an active role. Ibn Sumar’s response is not recorded, but the elements led by Dāwūd the Younger remained active underground and rose in open rebellion when they found the local administration weak. Thus on the death of Sultan Masʿūd in 1041, they succeeded for a while in capturing the fort of Multan, but fled before the forces dispatched by the new Sultan Mawdūd. The people of Multan surrendered the fort and agreed to perform the *khutba* in the names of the ʿAbbasid al-Qādir and of the Ghaznavid Mawdūd.

Subsequently, during the period of the Ghurid sultanate, Multan remained peaceful except for one rebellion attributed to the Carmathians, against whom Sultan Muʿizz al-Dīn Muhammad took action in 1175 and delivered Multan from their hands.

## The era of the local independent states (thirteenth to early sixteenth century)

### THE SULTANATE OF MAKRAN

The sultanate of Makran, with Kej as its capital, emerged out of the Ghaznavid/Ghurid dependencies of Makran and Qusdar by the turn of the twelfth century and included both the former amirates. In Jūzjānī's *Tabaqāt-i Nāsiri*, Tāj al-Dīn Abū Makārim of Makran is referred to as a Malik of the two Ghurid sultans Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Mu<sup>c</sup>izz al-Dīn. The foundation for the emergence of the Makran sultanate was laid in the twelfth century by Malik Hasan, who was succeeded by his son Abu 'l-Makārim Khusraw Shah. The latter's own two sons Tāj al-Dīn and Nusrat al-Dīn, after the death of Mu<sup>c</sup>izz al-Dīn in 1206 assumed the title of sultan and ruled jointly for a long period. With the integration of Makran and Qusdar, a strong power emerged with maritime and commercial trade links and the pastoral resources from the vast hinterland. The religious base of the society was apparently now orthodox Sunni. No one drank wine, but both the <sup>c</sup>Īds and the Nawrūz festivals were celebrated with enthusiasm. Both the Persian and the 'Makrani' (?Baluchi) languages were used. With the Baluch as the backbone of their military power, the sultans of Makran were able to inflict a crushing defeat on the invading Oghuz. This victory added to the power and prestige of the Makran rulers, and Makran was soon compared to Khurasan. The rulers actively promoted maritime commerce, and merchants and mariners from Makran reached the east Asian shores. According to one tradition, the main port became popularly known as 'Jawadar' (Gwadar), i.e. gateway to Java. Among others, the learned Abū Is'hāq of Makran settled at Pasai in Sumatra, where he became known as Abū Is'hāq al-Makrānī al-Fāsī (i.e. of Makran and then of Pasai). Thus Makran, like Sind, contributed to the early commercial and cultural contacts between the region and South-East Asia.

The references in the court poet Sirājī's panegyrics to the four sons of Sultan Tāj al-Dīn and the two sons of Sultan Nusrat al-Dīn indicate that the line of successors probably continued; there is nothing to show that Makran was under any other rulers up to the fourteenth century.

### MULTAN UNDER NĀSIR AL-DĪN QABĀCHA (1206–28)

After its annexation to the Ghurid sultanate, Multan became an administrative province of the succeeding Sultanate of Delhi. On Sultan Qutb al-Dīn's death in 1210, Nāsir al-Dīn Qabācha, the governor of Multan, became independent. He ruled successfully, extended his power and consolidated the kingdom; and he succeeded in blocking the Mongol inroads

into Multan which commenced with their pursuit of Sultan Jalāl al-Dīn Khwarazm Shāh in 1222. The Khwarazm Shah wanted a foothold in Multan, but Qabācha stood firm until the sultan left for Sind on his way to Iraq. In 1222 Qabācha faced the Mongols, who besieged the Multan citadel for forty days but failed to occupy it, and then withdrew. During Qabācha's reign (1206–28), education developed and colleges were founded; his court became a rendezvous for the learned, and some of the earliest Persian works in the subcontinent, such as °Awfī's literary anthology *Lubāb al-albāb* and °Alī Kūfī's *Fat'h-nāma* on Sind history (translated from Arabic) were produced. In 1228 Sultan Iltutmish of Delhi attacked Qabācha, and on the latter's death in that same year, Multan was once again annexed to Delhi.

### THE LĀNGĀH SULTANATE OF MULTAN (1437–1525)

With Iltutmish's victory, Multan became a province of the Delhi Sultanate and remained so for the next two centuries. Timur's sack of Delhi in 1398 shook the sultanate and led to the collapse of the central administration and the province of Multan passed into the hands of the Lāngāhs and the whole of Sind was possessed by the sultans of Sind.

There is much confusion in the sources about the identity of the Lāngāhs and the beginning of their rule in Multan. According to the historian °Abd al-Haqq, the author of the *Tārīkh-i Haqqī* (written in 1592–3), with the decline of the power of the sultans of Delhi, Budhan Khan of Sind, the chief of the Baluch tribe of the Lāngāh, assembled his force at Uchh and invaded Multan. He expelled the *khān-i khānān*, occupied the fort, took the title of Mahmūd Shāh in 1437 and became the first ruler of the independent state of Multan. He ruled for sixteen years and laid the foundations of the Lāngāh sultanate. His son Sultan Qutb al-Dīn succeeded him and further consolidated its power. On his death in 1469, his son Shāh Husayn ascended the throne and became the most illustrious ruler of the line, bringing peace and prosperity to the country during the thirty years of his reign (1469–98). Shāh Husayn increased his military power by inviting and settling in his territory a considerable body of Baluch. He wrested the principality of Shorkot from Ghāzī Khan and extended his control up into Chiniot. His prestige rose when he repelled the invasion of Multan by the Delhi forces under Bārbak Shāh and Tātār Khan. However, his grandson Mahmūd was killed when the ruler of Sind, Shāh Hasan Arghūn, invaded Multan in 1525: having lasted for almost ninety years, the rule of the Lāngāhs came to an end.

### SŪMARĀ RULE IN SIND (c. 1050–1360)

The Sūmarās, who had long been settled in south-western Sind had, through their fraternization and alliance with the Banū Tamīm Arabs in Sind, gained political influence under

the Habbārī rulers of Mansura. With the fall of the last Habbārī ruler Khaffī in 1025, Sind came under Ghaznavid rule, though effective authority was not maintained. During the reign of Sultan °Abd al-Rashīd (1049–52), the Sūmarās met together in their stronghold of Thari (in the present Badin district) and declared their independence. They chose a leader called Sūmarā as their first ruler.

The exact chronology of the Sūmarā rulers is obscure. According to later histories and traditions, there were between nine and twenty-one rulers, but no unanimity exists concerning their regnal periods. As verified by external sources, the earliest Sūmarā ruler whose name figures in history was Sinān al-Dīn Chanesar, who was ruling Daybul (in southern Sind) in 1224 when Jalāl al-Dīn Khwarazm Shah passed through Sind. The last Sūmarā ruler, Hamīr, son of Doda, was killed by the Sammās some time before 1365 (see below).

The Sūmarā amirate of Sind lasted for more than three centuries (*c.* 1050–1360). For most of this period the Sūmarās held southern Sind and the territories east of the Indus, which extended northwards and halfway to Multan, and included the western part of Bikaner and Cutch in the south. At the peak of their power, during the reign of Hamīr I, their rule is said to have extended up to Marwar in the south-east and to the boundaries of Gujarat in the south. The later Sūmarā rulers remained under constant pressure from the sultans of Delhi, who controlled Sind's northern provinces of Bakhar and Siwistan and, on occasion, intervened in the Sūmarās' internecine disputes. In general, Sind under the Sūmarās remained independent and the people united in resisting outside interference even when their rulers were at odds with each other. This is confirmed by the tradition which is epitomized in the epic of *Dodo Chanesar*. Composed in different versions and narrated by professional minstrels over the centuries, it may be counted among the world's most famous epics. The Sūmarā period was one to which Sind tradition traces the origin of some of the great romances and stories, which became the pillars on which the edifice of classical Sindhi poetry and literature rests.

The fall of the Sūmarās was mainly due to their dwindling economic base. Their prosperity had depended on the waters of the Puran channel, which was then the main course of the Indus. As the Indus began to flow along a more westerly course, the volume of water in the Puran diminished, adversely affecting the agricultural prosperity of the Sūmarā lands. On the other hand, the changed course brought prosperity and power to the Sammās who supplanted them.

#### THE SAMMĀ SULTANATE OF SIND (1350–1520)

The sultanate was founded by the Sammā chief Unnar, an erstwhile functionary of the Delhi Sultanate. He first rose in revolt in Shewan in 1333–4, a few days before Ibn Battūta's

arrival. Later, he assumed the title of Sultan Firūz al-Dīn and became the undisputed ruler of Thatta after Sultan Muhammad b. Tughluq of Delhi died while attacking Thatta in 1351, so that the imperial army returned to Delhi. To preserve their independence, the Sammā rulers now had to contend with pressure from both Delhi and Central Asia.

Unnar was jointly succeeded by his son Sadr al-Dīn Shāh Bānbhnia and his brother<sup>c</sup> Alā ' al-Dīn Shāh Jūna. In order to weaken the authority of Delhi, which was exercised through the governor in Multan, Bānbhnia aligned himself with the Mongols who were attacking Multan from the north. He also remained on the offensive internally against the Sūmarās who ruled eastern Sind (i.e. the territory to the east of the Indus). He finally attacked and killed Hamīr, son of Doda and last Sūmarā ruler, who was supported by the governor of Multan on orders from Delhi. In 1365 Sultan Firūz Shāh of Delhi marched against Thatta, but a political settlement was reached when Bānbhnia surrendered in 1366. The sultan agreed that the Sammās could rule Sind as his vassals, but he held Bānbhnia and later his son Tamāchi as hostages in Delhi. On Firūz Shāh's death in 1388, however, Delhi lost control over the Sind province and an independent sultanate of Sind became a reality.

Beginning with Unnar, fifteen Sammā 'community chiefs' (*jāms*) ruled as sultans of Sind from Thatta.<sup>2</sup> Tamāchī, who returned from Delhi in 1388 (Bānbhnia having died on the way), ruled with the title of Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Shāh. The next illustrious ruler was Jām Tughluq Jūnā (1428–53), who, in order to counterbalance Delhi, entered into matrimonial relations with the neighbouring sultans of Gujarat. The alliance between the two littoral sultanates gave an impetus to maritime trade. Numerous allusions in the classical Sindhi poetry of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries show that Sindhi merchants and mariners frequented Java and penetrated beyond Perlak, the capital of the Samundara state in eastern Sumatra. The last illustrious ruler of the line was Sultan Jām Nizām al-Dīn Shāh. During his long reign (1462–1508), education spread and commerce and agriculture progressed; and under the commander-in-chief Daryā Khan, a scion of the Lāshārī (Baluch) community, who enabled the bulk of the Baluch soldiery to become the backbone of the army, the sultanate became militarily strong.

The political events in Central Asia during the latter half of Sultan Jām Nizām al-Dīn's reign had an impact on the affairs of Sind. In the wake of the Thirty Years' Rind- Lāshārī War, the Sind army had occupied Sibi while the Arghūns from Kandahar had reached Shal (Quetta) and had made incursions through the Bolan pass. The battle of Jālūgīr (in the Bolan pass), during which Muhammad Beg, brother of Shāh Beg Arghūn, was killed, proved decisive and the Arghūns never again attacked Sind during the lifetime of Sultan Jām Nizām al-Dīn. After his death in 1508, however, the situation changed. Hard-pressed

<sup>2</sup> See Baloch, 1954.

by Bābur in Kandahar, Shāh Beg Arghūn decided to attack Sind. After successful initial raids and the occupation of Sibi, Bakhar and Sehwan, he conquered Thatta in 1521. With Arghūn's victory, the sovereignty of the Sammās in Sind comes to an end. The ruler Jām Fīrūz surrendered, but Arghūn allowed him to rule southern Sind from Thatta. In 1528, however, Jām Fīrūz fled to Gujarat and sought refuge with Sultan Bahādur Shāh.

### THE BALUCH PEOPLE, THEIR MIGRATIONS AND THEIR PRINCIPALITIES (750–1500)

There are no written records concerning the origin of the Baluch people or the chronology of their migrations. Indirect evidence comes partly from the later histories but mainly from Baluch ethnography and their oral tradition, particularly as embodied in their classical poetry, although this imaginative material must obviously be used with caution.

The Baluch are not mentioned in Islamic geographic and historical sources until the tenth century, and then shortly afterwards, in Firdawsī's *Shāh-nāma*; they are usually linked with the Kūfichīs or Qufs as predatory peoples, apparently still pagan, living in the mountains of south-eastern Persia, from which they preyed on Muslim caravans. The Buyid and Ilyasid rulers of Fars and Kirman led punitive expeditions against them, and from then onwards they probably gradually became Islamized. In the eleventh century, they must have moved eastwards into what is now Baluchistan, doubtless after the stronger power of the Seljuqs took over Kirman and reduced the opportunities for raiding and banditry, i.e. after 1040. Since the central highlands of Baluchistan were by the eleventh century occupied by the non-Indo-Aryan, Dravidian Brahuīs, the Baluch tended to bypass this region and make for the Indus valley, towards Sind, Multan and Panjab. Linguistic evidence shows that Baluch was originally a northern dialect of Iranian, placing the homeland of the Baluch people somewhere south of the Caspian Sea; their migrations into south-eastern Persia may have been due to pressure from the warfare of the later Sasanians with the Hephthalites which racked eastern Persia, although this is wholly undocumented.

The last phase of substantial Baluch migrations took place at the turn of the twelfth century and continued into the wake of the upheavals caused by the Turkish–Mongol invasions from Central Asia. According to one tradition, forty-four *būlāks* (clans) moved. In effect, this was a mass exodus, from Sistan and Kirman to their main concentration in Makran. On the one hand, the Baluch strength there became the backbone of the sultanate of Makran, and on the other, the increase of the Baluch population in Makran led to an extensive migration south-eastwards. According to tradition, five main sub-stocks from the progeny of Jalāl Khan, namely Rind, Lāshārī, Kora'ī, Hoat and Jatōi, became identifiable at

this stage, and from their power base of the sultanate of Makran they sought new pastures and new horizons.

### THE PRINCIPALITY OF KALMAT

The Hoat, who were the first to leave, followed a twofold movement; those who went southwards, along the coastal belt, established their principality in the central littoral region, with Kalmat as their capital. They actively participated in sea trade, and Kalmat became a prosperous state and served as a supporting base for the onward advance of the later Kalmati group into the Habb and Indus valleys.

### PRINCIPALITIES OF THE DERAJAT

The other Hoat sub-stocks of the Dodā'īs and the Chandiās, as also the Korā'īs and the Jatois, migrated north-eastwards. Avoiding the colder highlands of Kalat, they descended from the Mullah pass into the plains of Kachchi-Gandava and from Harbab and other passes into the Indus valley. The Dodā'īs, migrating further north, eventually reached and occupied the eastern slopes of the Sulayman mountains. By the end of the fifteenth century, under their chief Suhrāb Khan Dodā'i, they were powerful enough to form the core of the military power of the Lāngāh sultanate of Multan (see above). They also vigorously developed the settled areas and founded the flourishing market towns of Dera Ghazi Khan (1494) and Dera Isma'īl Khan, the capitals of their two principalities, which the Hoat-Dodā'i clan ruled for some two centuries.

### THE PRINCIPALITY OF KALAT

Leaving Makran a century after the Hoat, the clans of the Rind-Lāsharī confederacy reached central Baluchistan by the middle of the fifteenth century. Kalat was already a Baluch principality, having been conquered by the early migrating Baluch tribes. It was then ruled by Mīr °Umar, son of Miro of the Mirwarri dynasty of the Brahuis. When Mīr °Umar blocked the Rind-Lāshari advance, he was killed in the ensuing battle and Kalat was thus occupied and ruled by the Rind-Lāsharī confederacy. Because of its cold climate and meagre resources, inadequate to sustain the bulk of its people, the confederacy does not seem to have stayed in Kalat for long. The Rind and allied clans descended into the plains of Sibi through the Bolan pass, while the Lāsharīs and their allied clans, passing through the Mullah pass, spread into the plains of the Kachhi-Gandava country. There the Rinds, led by Mīr Chākar, and the Lāsharīs, led by Mīr Gwāhrām, quarrelled in a dispute concerning horse racing. This resulted in the long-drawn-out battles of the Thirty Years' War, which became

the main theme of classical Baluch poetry. The Rinds sought help from the Timurids of Herat, and Mīr Chākar or his emissary is said to have visited the court of Sultan Husayn Bayqara (1469–1506). The Lāsharīs received support from the Sammā ruler of Sind, Jām Nīzām al-Dīn (1462–1508), whose commander-in-chief Daryā Khan, alias Mubārak Khan, was a scion of the Lāsharī family. The Thirty Years' War sapped the energies of the once powerful Rind-Lāsharī confederacy. The Arghūns, who ruled Kandahar on behalf of Herat and were supporting the Rinds, found it opportune to extend their power into the plains of Sibi and eventually into Sind. Under pressure, the Rinds and the Lāsharīs disengaged, the Lāsharīs going to Thatta and thence to Gujarat and Mīr Chākar leading his people to the Multan region.

## Part Two

# KASHMIR UNDER THE SULTANS OF THE SHĀH MĪR DYNASTY (1339–1561)

(A. Q. Rafiqi)

It is probable that before the first Muslim sultanate – known as the Shāh Mīr dynasty – was established in Kashmir, Muslims had already settled the area, but the process only accelerated after the establishment of the dynasty in 1339. The Muslim invaders, first Arabs and then Turks, had invaded Kashmir on many occasions, but failed to conquer it. In 713, when the Arab general, Muhammad b. al-Qāsim, occupied Multan, he was said to have marched against 'the frontiers of Kashmir, called Panj Nāhiyat', but any putative threat to Kashmir was removed when Muhammad was recalled by the caliph al-Walīd I (705–15) to his court. Later, some time after 757, Hishām b. °Amr al-Taghlibī, the Arab governor of Sind, in vain attempted to conquer the valley of Kashmir.

Although the mountains proved barriers to would-be conquerors, they did not prevent adventurers and refugees from entering Kashmir. °Alī b. Hamīd al-Kūfī, for example, states in the much later source of the *Chach-nāma* that Muhammad Alāfī, an Arab mercenary who had served Dahīr (d. 712), the ruler of Sind, sought refuge in Kashmir. The ruler of Kashmir, Chandrāpīda, received him well and bestowed on him the territory of Shakalbar. After Alāfī's death, his estate was inherited by one Jahm, who, according to al-Kūfī, built many

mosques there. This account, if true, would imply that there were a number of Muslims already in Kashmir by that time.

We do not, however, find concrete contemporary information regarding Muslim influence until the early eleventh century. Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazna invaded Kashmir on two occasions, in 1014 and 1016, but his efforts to penetrate the valley were defeated by the strong fortresses of Loharkot and a timely snowfall. According to the Ghaznavid historian, Abu 'l-Fadl Bayhaqī, however, Mahmūd – while in pursuit of Narojaipāl (Trilochanpāl), who had received military assistance from Samgrāmraja, the ruler of Kashmir (1003–28) – plundered one of the valleys to the south of Kashmir and converted a large number of its people to Islam. Kalhana's twelfth-century metrical chronicle of Kashmir, the *Rājatarangīnī*, also describes this invasion, but does not speak of a conversion to Islam. The statement of Bayhaqī is doubtless an exaggeration.

It is, however, possible that some of Mahmūd's soldiers, finding it difficult to cross the mountains towards the plains of India, stayed behind and settled in Kashmir. It is after these Turkish invasions that Kalhana refers, for the first time, to the presence of Turkish Muslim soldiers in Kashmir when describing the reign of Harsa (1089–1111); later rulers also employed Turkish mercenaries. From the account of the Venetian traveller, Marco Polo, it appears that by the end of the thirteenth century, there was a colony of Muslims in Kashmir, for he says, 'The people of the province [Kashmir] do not kill animals nor spill blood; so if they want to eat meat they get the Saracens who dwell among them to play the butcher.'<sup>3</sup>

The Hindu rulers of Kashmir seem to have been munificent and hospitable to the Muslim soldiers of fortune, who continued to enter the valley until the establishment of Muslim rule; it was one of these Muslim adventurers, Shāh Mīr, who established the first Muslim sultanate in Kashmir. The Kashmiri and Mughal historians recount different legends about the ancestry of Shāh Mīr. According to Jonarāja, Shāh Mīr was the descendant of Pārtha (Arjuna) of *Mahābhārata* fame. Abu 'l-Fadl 'Allāmī, Nizām al-Dīn and Firishta also state that Shāh Mīr traced his descent to Arjuna, the basis of their account being Jonarāja's *Rājatarangīnī*, which Mullā 'Abd al-Qādir Badā'ūnī translated into Persian at Akbar's orders. It is likely that either Jonarāja, in order to glorify the family of his patron (Zayn al-'Ābidīn, a direct descendant of Shāh Mīr: see below), or Shāh Mīr, after coming to the throne, worked out an apocryphal genealogy connecting himself with the legendary heroes of the past; this was a common practice with rulers and dignitaries of those days. According to some Persian chronicles of Kashmir, Shāh Mīr was a descendant of the rulers of Swat, but it is more probable that his ancestors were of Turkish or Persian origin and had

<sup>3</sup> Yule and Cordier, 1903, p. 167.

migrated to Swat. Shāh Mīr arrived in Kashmir in 1313, along with his family, during the reign of Sūhadeva (1301–20), whose service he entered. In subsequent years, through his tact and ability, Shāh Mīr rose to prominence and became one of the important personalities of the time. Later, after the death in 1338 of Udayanadeva, the brother of Sūhadeva, he was able to assume the kingship himself and thus laid the foundation of permanent Muslim rule in Kashmir. Dissensions among the ruling classes and foreign invasions were the two main factors which contributed towards the establishment of Muslim rule in Kashmir. Because of the long period of weak reigns and internal troubles, the Lavanyas and Dāmaras (the local chiefs) had become the most powerful element in the valley; they continually rose in rebellion and prevented the growth of a strong centralized government. Sūhadeva seems to have played off these chiefs against each other and thereby established his authority over the whole of Kashmir. But at the same time, he alienated the Brahmans, the traditional class of officials, by imposing taxes on them.

Meanwhile, in 1320, Zuljū or Dhu 'l-Qadr Khan invaded Kashmir at the head of a large army. The sources regarding the origin of Zuljū are not unanimous. According to Jonarāja, he was a 'commander of the army of the great King Karmmasena' (who is unidentified). Elsewhere, however, Jonarāja calls Zuljū 'the king of the *mlechchhas*', meaning that he was a Muslim. The Mughal historian Abu 'l-Fadl °Allāmī holds that Zuljū was the 'chief commander' of the ruler of Kandahar, and Nizām al-Dīn and Firishta call him the *mīr-bakhsh* (paymaster-general) of Kandahar. The Persian chronicles of Kashmir assert that Zuljū was a Mongol from Turkistan, which could be correct since the Mongols had not only repeatedly invaded Kashmir prior to this time, but, if we believe Rashīd al-Dīn, had even succeeded in temporarily subjugating the country. The chiefs did not come to the aid of Sūhadeva and he was left alone to face the invader. He tried to save his kingdom by paying the Mongols a large sum of money to withdraw from the country; but Zuljū's appetite for plunder merely increased. Sūhadeva himself fled to Kishtwar, leaving the people at the mercy of the invader. The Mongols plundered and enslaved the people, burnt down buildings and destroyed crops. After a stay of eight months, Zuljū left the valley through the Banihal pass, where he perished along with his prisoners in a heavy snowfall. Famine was the natural consequence of the wholesale destruction of the stores of grain and of standing crops by the invading army.

Zuljū's invasion proved to be a turning-point in the history of Kashmir and contributed towards the establishment of Muslim rule there, for Rinchana rose to power in its aftermath. He was originally from Ladakh, where his father had been chief. Fearing an attack on his life, Rinchana had sought refuge in Kashmir, where he was employed by Sūhadeva's commander-in-chief, who had shut himself up in the fort of Lar during Zuljū's invasion.

After Zuljū's departure, this commander, Rāmchandra, tried to establish his own authority, but Rinchana treacherously had him murdered and his family imprisoned, and seized power himself.

The fact that Rinchana was able to rise from the position of a refugee to that of a sovereign clearly demonstrates the state of anarchy and discord which prevailed in Kashmir at the time. Rinchana, however, proved an able ruler and restored peace and prosperity to the country. The most important event of his reign was his conversion to Islam, which has been variously recorded. According to Jonarāja, Rinchana wanted to become a Hindu, but, on the grounds that he was a 'Bhotta' (Tibetan Buddhist), the Brahman Devasvāmī refused to initiate him into Hinduism. This story seems to have been invented by Jonarāja, however, resentful that Rinchana had accepted Islam, for, if Rinchana had wished to become a Hindu, there should have been no difficulty for him, especially since he was a king. According to a popular version of the story, supported by most of the medieval Muslim scholars of Kashmir, Rinchana accepted Islam because of 'divine grace'. It is said that after Rinchana came to the throne, he held discussions with both Hindu and Buddhist priests, in order to ascertain the 'Truth', but none could satisfy him. Finally, he decided to accept the religion of the first person whom he should see the next morning. That person was Sayyid Sharaf al-Dīn, a Suhrawardī Sufi saint, who at the time was offering prayers near the royal palace. Rinchana immediately went to him, and, after inquiring about his religion, accepted Islam.

In reality, it is more probable that Rinchana's conversion to Islam was prompted by political reasons. In the absence of co-operation from the Hindus, only the Muslims in Kashmir would support Rinchana's newly acquired kingdom. It is not, therefore, unlikely that Shāh Mīr, who, according to Jonarāja, was 'a lion among men', persuaded Rinchana to accept Islam. Abu'l-Fadl °Allāmī, who made a careful study of the history of Kashmir, confirms the fact that Rinchana accepted Islam because of his intimacy and association with Shāh Mīr, whom he appointed his minister. His decision to embrace Islam might also have been influenced by the penetration of Islam into the countries outside Kashmir, particularly with the conversion to Islam of the Mongol II Khanid Ghazan Khan in Persia in 1295. Whatever the truth, Rinchana's conversion to Islam must be seen in a wider context, and not just as the result of either a Hindu refusal to take him into their fold or of a chance meeting with Sayyid Sharaf al-Dīn. Rinchana (or Sadr al-Dīn, the Muslim name which he adopted) died in 1323. Soon after his death, Hindu rule was once again established in Kashmir under Udayanadeva, the brother of Sūhadeva, who nevertheless bestowed the territory of Kramarājya and other districts on Shāh Mīr's two sons, °Alī Shīr and Jamshīd.

Meanwhile, Kashmir was once again threatened by a foreign invasion. According to Jonarāja, the invader was 'Achala', supported by 'the lord of Mugdhapura', whom it is not

possible to identify. The Persian chronicles assert, however, that it was an army of the Turks (*lashkar-i turk*). Modern scholars have not identified the Turks of these chronicles, but it seems likely that they were Turco-Mongols who had previously, and on several occasions, invaded the valley. The incompetent Udayanadeva fled to Ladakh, leaving his wife Kotā Rānī to face the invader. With the help of Shāh Mīr and Bhikshana, a Hindu noble, she repulsed the enemy. After the enemy had withdrawn, Udayanadeva returned and regained the throne, but his cowardly flight had greatly impaired his prestige. His relations with Shāh Mīr did not remain cordial and he began to suspect his loyalty. Because of his heroic stand against the invader, Shāh Mīr had become exceedingly popular among the people. As a result, he became politically ambitious and, according to Jonarāja, he ‘did not deem the king even as grass’. He had already taken steps to win over the leading chiefs to his side. He bestowed on them his daughter and granddaughters in marriage and made large gifts to them, waiting for an opportunity to assume the kingship himself. It came soon, in 1338, as Kotā Rānī took the reins of government into her own hands after the death of Udayanadeva. Realizing the extent of Shāh Mīr’s ambition, she raised Bhikshana to prominence as a counterpoise to him and transferred the capital from Srinagar, where Shāh Mīr had a considerable following, to Andarkot.

The rise to power of Bhikshana was an open challenge to Shāh Mīr. He did not, however, make his feelings public, but feigned illness and soon removed his political rival by having him assassinated. Later, Shāh Mīr sent a proposal of marriage to Kotā Rānī, which she rejected, perhaps thinking it beneath her dignity to marry a man who had been in her service. After Shāh Mīr, with the help of the chiefs, successfully besieged her, however, she surrendered and accepted the proposal of marriage. Even so, as she had married him under pressure, Shāh Mīr suspected her loyalty and imprisoned her. He ascended the throne himself in 1339, under the title of Sultan Shams al-Dīn.

Shāh Mīr’s coup firmly established Muslim rule in Kashmir. The details of the administrative machinery that he created are not known, but drastic changes cannot have been made at that time. The Muslim community of Kashmir was a minority, with no outside contacts or support. Power remained, as before, in the hands of the Hindu chiefs, with whose help Shāh Mīr had established himself on the throne. In order to increase the number of his supporters and to check the ambitious chiefs, who had been the main cause of confusion and disorder in the preceding reigns, Shāh Mīr patronized the families of the Chaks and Magres, who were of indigenous origin. According to Jonarāja, Shāh Mīr made gifts to certain chiefs; it seems that, following the pattern of the Turkish sultans of Delhi, Shāh Mīr assigned *iqtā*<sup>c</sup>s (land grants) to his supporters.

Shāh Mīr was succeeded in 1342 by his eldest son, Jamshīd, who had gained considerable experience in the art of administration during the reigns of his father and Udayanadeva. However, in the field of statesmanship he was no match for his younger brother, °Alī Shīr, who won over a number of important nobles and deposed him within a year (1343); he died two years later. °Alī Shīr styled himself Sultan °Alā' al-Dīn. He ruled for about twelve years, but very little is known about his reign. From Jonarāja's account, it appears that he was a just and able ruler. He founded the town of °Ala' al-Dinpora, now a part of Srinagar, and made it his capital. He died in 1355 and was succeeded by his son Shivasvamika, who assumed the title of Shihāb al-Dīn. Shihāb al-Dīn was one of the ablest rulers of the Shāh Mīr dynasty. From a military point of view, his reign has been described as the most glorious epoch in the history of Kashmir. He not only curbed the growing power of the feudal chiefs and consolidated his position, but also undertook military expeditions.

After Lalitāditya (724–61), Shihāb al-Dīn was the first ruler of Kashmir whose army campaigned outside the kingdom. Jonarāja and the Persian chronicles of Kashmir have given a highly exaggerated account of his conquests; the Kashmiri chroniclers implausibly attribute to Shihāb al-Dīn the conquest of territories such as Pakhli, Swat, Sind, Multan, Kabul, Ghazna, Kandahar, Badakhshan and some parts of Transoxania. It is much more feasible that he conquered and annexed to his kingdom (as is also claimed) Baltistan and Ladakh. His most memorable campaign, however, is said to have been launched against Fīrūz Shāh Tughluq of Delhi, with an encounter on the banks of the Sutlej in which neither side secured a decisive victory: the peace agreement allotted the territories from Sirhind to Kashmir to Shihāb al-Dīn, and the rest, lying to the east, to Fīrūz Shāh; and marriage alliances were also contracted. The Kashmiri chronicles do not corroborate, whether directly or indirectly, Shihāb al-Dīn's supposed external conquests. Moreover, bearing in mind the geographic location of Kashmir and the limited resources and numerical strength of its army, such vast conquests were impossible. In fact, the chronicles magnified his military exploits, which must have been limited to Gilgit and Baltistan in the north, Ladakh in the east and Kishtwar, Jammu and other hill states in the south.

Shihāb al-Dīn was undoubtedly a great ruler who governed his kingdom efficiently. In 1360 the valley suffered badly from a devastating flood. The sultan provided prompt relief and, in order to prevent similar future calamities, built a new town on higher ground near Kohi-Maran, which he named Lakshminagar, after his queen Lakshmi. However, some of his measures were less conducive to the welfare of his people; thus he ordered *hānjīs* (boatmen) to serve him gratis for seven days every month. Towards the end of his reign he came under the influence of Lasa, the daughter of Queen Lakshmi's sister, who succeeded

not only in alienating the sultan from his queen, but also managed to have the sultan's two sons exiled. The last days of Shihāb al-Dīn were not happy and he died in 1373.

Shihāb al-Dīn was succeeded by his younger brother Qutb al-Dīn (Hindāl), who was an efficient and highly cultured ruler. It was during his reign that the great Persian saint and scholar Sayyid °Alī Hamadānī (1314–85) arrived in Kashmir in 1381 and was, with a large number of his followers, warmly received by the sultan. Sayyid °Alī travelled widely in the valley and asked a number of his prominent disciples to settle in places that were great Hindu centres of the time. These followers established *khānaqāhs* (dervish convents), which led to the emergence of a whole network of centres for the preaching and teaching of Islam. Thus Sayyid °Alī's arrival gave a great impetus to the spread of Islam in Kashmir. Because of their different attitudes towards non-Muslims, however, relations between Qutb al-Dīn and Sayyid °Alī did not remain cordial. At the time, the majority of the Kashmiri people were non-Muslims and high government officials were also Hindus. Thus political exigency demanded that the sultan should follow a policy of conciliation towards his non-Muslim subjects. The intransigent Sayyid °Alī did not approve of this, and finding that the sultan was not responsive to his teachings, left the valley in 1385.

Qutb al-Dīn died in 1389 and was succeeded by his son Sikandar (who was a minor), with the latter's mother, Queen Sūra, acting as regent. She appears to have been a woman of courage and ability, but by the time Sikandar took over the reins of government, his chief minister Rāi Magre had grown ambitious and powerful and soon openly challenged the authority of the sultan. However, the latter marched against him and Rāi Magre was captured and imprisoned.

It was during Sikandar's reign that another wave of Sufi saints and °*ulamā'* arrived, headed by Mīr Muhammad Hamadānī (1372–1450), the son of Sayyid °Alī, who arrived in Kashmir in 1393. Mīr Muhammad's arrival in Kashmir marked a turning-point in its history. In the early years of his reign, Sikandar had followed the policy of tolerance towards non-Muslims as practised by his predecessors, but after the arrival of Mīr Muhammad, his attitude changed and a strictly orthodox policy was introduced. The selling of wine, (public) dancing of women, music and gambling were prohibited and the *jizya* (poll tax) on non-Muslims was imposed for the first time. Hindus were prevented from applying the *tilak* (religious mark) on their foreheads and the custom of *sati* (immolation of a Hindu widow on her husband's funeral pyre) was banned. Thus Jonarāja writes, 'The good fortune of the subjects left them and the king forgot his kingly duties and took delight, day and night, in breaking images.'

When Timur invaded India in 1398, however, Sikandar showed great maturity as a statesman. In order to avert the invasion of his kingdom, he sent an envoy to Timur

professing submission. Timur was satisfied with this and directed the envoy to ask Sikandar to join him at Dipalpur. Accordingly, Sikandar left Srinagar, but upon reaching Jabhan, Timur's ministers demanded a contribution of 30,000 horses and 10,000 *durusts* of gold, and he returned to Kashmir to collect the items demanded. When Timur came to hear of this, he reprimanded his ministers for having demanded a tribute far beyond the capacity of the Kashmiri ruler's resources. He informed Sikandar that he should merely present himself to the conqueror on the banks of the Indus. Upon receiving this message, Sikandar again started out from Srinagar, but on reaching Baramulla, he learnt that Timur had already crossed the Indus; hence he returned to Srinagar, providence having saved Kashmir from a great scourge.

After the death of Sikandar in 1413, his eldest son Mīr Khan ascended the throne with the title of °Alī Shāh. °Alī Shāh was ignorant of the art of government and was dominated by his chief minister, Sūha Bhatta (Sayf al-Dīn), who had accepted Islam at the hands of Mīr Muhammad during the reign of Sikandar. But Sūha Bhatta soon died in 1417 and shortly afterwards Shāhī Khan, °Alī Shāh's younger brother, became chief minister. Like his father, °Alī Shāh was very religious and decided to give up the throne to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca, entrusting the reins of government to Shāhī Khan. But upon reaching Jammu, its ruler, who was his father-in-law, persuaded him to return to his kingdom. In °Alī Shāh's absence, Shāhī Khan had revealed his own ambition: he defeated °Alī Shāh at Thana in 1420, and at Srinagar declared himself sultan, assuming the title of Zayn al-°Ābidīn.

Zayn al-°Ābidīn was undoubtedly the greatest of all the Muslim sultans of Kashmir. Although he followed his religious duties strictly and showed great respect for Muslim saints and scholars, he did not allow this to interfere with the administration of the country. Aware that the government needed broad-based support, he allowed complete freedom of worship to all his non-Muslim subjects. He offered high positions to able and meritorious non-Muslims in the administration. He also celebrated the Hindu festivals and banned the slaughter of cows. The *jizya*, which had been imposed by Sikandar, was reduced from 2 *pales* to 1 nominal *māshā* and then dropped altogether. Other taxes which had been imposed only on non-Muslims in previous reigns were also abolished. All Hindus who had left the valley during the reign of Sikandar were encouraged to return to Kashmir and the Brahmins were given rent-free lands. Zayn al-°Ābidīn thus proved to be the most tolerant and benevolent Muslim ruler in the history of Kashmir. His concern for his people's welfare and development led him to lay out a large number of canals which helped not only to reclaim marshy lands for cultivation, but also to provide irrigation facilities for parched areas.

The sultan also reformed the administrative system. Corrupt judges were severely dealt with and venality among the officials was rooted out. Similarly, crime was ruthlessly put down. In order to prevent fraudulent property transactions, Zayn al-<sup>c</sup>Ābidīn introduced a system of registration of important documents. He provided his subjects with a code of laws, which he had engraved on copper plates placed in villages and towns for the information of the general public. The prices of commodities were also inscribed on copper plates and placed in public markets. The sultan was a great patron of learning. He extended royal patronage to both Persian and Sanskrit scholars, establishing a translation bureau in which Sanskrit works were translated into Persian and vice versa. He took a keen interest in the spread of education. One of the famous centres of learning was the seminary of Shaykh Ismā<sup>c</sup>īl Kubrawī, to which students came not only from India but also from Kabul and Transoxania. The sultan was a great builder: among his works were bridges and rest-houses, for the convenience of traders and travellers. His most magnificent edifice, however, was his palace at Rajdan (Nawshahr, in Srinagar), which, according to Mīrzā Haydar Dughlāt, had ‘twelve storeys, some of which contain fifty rooms, halls and corridors. The whole of this lofty structure is built of wood.’

It is, however, for Zayn al-<sup>c</sup>Ābidīn’s encouragement of arts and crafts that his name has become immortal. He not only revived traditional arts and crafts, but also introduced a number of new ones, inviting teachers and craftsmen from Persia and Central Asia to train local artists and artisans. As a result of his liberal patronage, Kashmir became a ‘smiling garden of industry’. The country made significant progress in wood-carving, paper-making, papier mâché, and silk, shawl and carpet weaving. ‘In Kashmir one meets with all those arts and crafts’, writes Mīrzā Haydar, ‘which are in most cities uncommon . . . In the whole of Transoxania, except in Samarkand and Bukhara, these are nowhere to be met, while in Kashmir they are even abundant. This is all due to Zayn al-<sup>c</sup>Ābidīn.’

The sultan had four sons. One of them, Ādam, had fallen out of favour when he revolted against his father in 1459; hence on Zayn al-<sup>c</sup>Ābidīn’s death in 1470, another son, Hājji Khan, ascended the throne with the title of Haydar Shāh. Haydar Shāh appointed his younger brother, Bahrām, as chief minister, and his own son, Prince Hasan Khan, as heir apparent. In order to strengthen his position, he married Prince Hasan to Hayāt Khātūn, the daughter of Sayyid Hasan Bayhaqī, a leading and powerful Sayyid. Yet Haydar Shāh soon succumbed to pleasure and drinking and neglected the administration of the kingdom. This resulted in internal unrest and the declaration of independence of the tributary states, such as Poonch, Rajauri and Jammu; Prince Hasan was asked to proceed against the rulers of these states and successfully subjugated them. In 1472, when Haydar Shāh died after a brief reign, the minister Malik Ahmad Yattū declared Prince Hasan as ruler, with himself

as chief minister. The new sultan (known as Hasan Shāh) began his reign well, but power struggles among the various groups of the nobility started as soon as he had come to the throne.

After the accession of Sultan Qutb al-Dīn in 1373, a large number of saints and scholars had started to pour into Kashmir from Persia and Central Asia. Warmly received by the rulers, these immigrants included the Bayhaqī Sayyids, who had arrived in Kashmir during the reign of Sultan Sikandar. The Hamadānī Sayyids – Sayyid ʿAlī and his son, Mīr Muhammad – and their disciples were mainly teachers and preachers and sought the help of the sultans and their nobles to spread the faith of Islam. But the Bayhaqī Sayyids generally focused their energy on establishing family ties with the ruling house and the high government officials; soon after their arrival in Kashmir, they made matrimonial alliances with the royal family, and with the help of these, they obtained important positions in the administration and also took an active part in the intrigues and rebellions which followed the death of Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn.

Malik Ahmad Yattū, chief minister of Hasan Shāh, although very loyal to the sultan, was over-ambitious. He in time turned against the Bayhaqī Sayyids, who, because of their relationship with Hasan Shāh, had secured a commanding position in the state administration. But before taking on the Sayyids, Malik Ahmad Yattū strengthened his position by marrying his adopted son, Tāzī Bhatt, to the sister of Jahāngīr Magre, the commander-in-chief of the army; Tāzī Bhatt now became the leading figure in the anti-Sayyid campaign. The sultan, fearing an open revolt, exiled all the leading members of the Bayhaqī family, but eventually the Bayhaqī Sayyids were recalled from Delhi and Sayyid Hasan Bayhaqī became chief minister.

Like his father, Sultan Hasan Shāh was a heavy drinker. When the sultan died, on 19 April 1484, Sayyid Hasan Bayhaqī placed his own 7-year-old grandson, Muhammad Shāh (the son of Hasan Shāh and Hayāt Khātūn), on the throne. With the accession of Muhammad Shāh, Kashmir witnessed, on the one hand, a bitter struggle for power between the Kashmiri nobility and the Bayhaqī Sayyids, and, on the other, a civil war between Muhammad Shāh and a rival claimant, Fat’h Khan. For over a quarter of a century, complete confusion and anarchy, involving virtually the entire nobility, existed in the valley.

The Bayhaqī Sayyids, who now enjoyed absolute power, began to harass the prominent Kashmiri nobles. In retaliation, in 1484, the nobles made a surprise attack, killing fifteen Bayhaqī Sayyids, including Sayyid Hasan, the chief minister, who was now succeeded in this office by his son Sayyid Muhammad. The Kashmiri nobles soon reorganized and made another attack on the Sayyids, defeating them and forcing them to leave the country once again, but soon succumbed to internal discord with a series of intrigues and coups.

Eventually, Fat'h Khan (who ruled as Fat'h Shāh) became sultan of Kashmir, actually for the second time in 1505, and appointed Shams Chak as his chief minister. But rivals procured Shams Chak's murder, making Mūsa Raina chief minister in his place. Mūsa Raina was an able administrator, but since he had been converted to Shi'ism by Mīr Shams al-Dīn 'Irāqī, many Sunni nobles turned against him and he was killed while trying to flee from the valley. Thus religious differences were added to the mêlée of personal conflicts. In 1514 Fat'h Shāh was deposed and Muhammad Shāh came to the throne for the third time. He had only ruled for one year when the Chak nobles, headed by Kājī Chak, dethroned him and caused him to flee to Panjab. Fat'h Shāh now became sultan for the third time in 1515, but died in exile shortly afterwards. Muhammad Shāh, already on his way to Kashmir, was warmly received and declared sultan for the fourth time in 1517.

Although the civil war between Muhammad Shāh and Fat'h Shāh had thus come to an end, peace still eluded the country. Ambitious nobles continued to quarrel among themselves. Muhammad Shāh appointed Kājī Chak as chief minister. Disgruntled nobles used Fat'h Shāh's three sons against Kājī Chak, but were unable to overthrow him. In 1528–9, Nāzūk Khan, the third and only surviving son of Fat'h Shāh, with the support of a Mughal army supplied by the emperor Bābur, successfully invaded Kashmir and was briefly hailed as sultan. He only lasted until 1530, for Abdāl Magre, the chief minister, released Muhammad Shāh from prison and enthroned him as nominal ruler again, with the leading nobles dividing the kingdom among themselves. The Mughals were given gifts and requested to leave.

Soon afterwards, Kashmir was attacked from the north-east by Mīrzā Haydar Dughlāt, who, in 1532, was deputed by Sultan Sa'īd of Kashghar to conquer Ladakh. Mīrzā Haydar occupied Ladakh and then proceeded to Kashmir, entering it without much resistance in January 1533. For some three months the ravages of Mīrzā Haydar's army continued relentlessly until the *'ulamā'* encouraged the Kashmiris to defend themselves by issuing a decree which proclaimed that fighting against the invaders was not only permissible but obligatory. Their attacks soon wore down Mīrzā Haydar and his troops: he made peace with the Kashmiri nobles and in May 1533 he left Kashmir by the same route as he had come.

In 1537 Sultan Muhammad Shāh died and his second son, Shams al-Dīn II, was enthroned. But once again power struggles between the different groups of the Kashmiri nobility began. Shams al-Dīn soon died and Ismā'īl, another son of Sultan Muhammad Shāh, became sultan. One group called for help from Mīrzā Haydar, who had entered the service of Humāyūn after the death of Sultan Sa'īd. Since he had, in 1533, conquered Kashmir without much resistance, Mīrzā Haydar prevailed on Humāyūn to let him proceed

to Kashmir once again. He entered Srinagar on 22 November 1540, without encountering any resistance, and Sultan Ismā'īl Shāh fled to seek help from Shīr Shāh Sūr in Delhi.

In the beginning, Mīrzā Haydar showed great respect for the Kashmiri nobles, especially the Chaks, who were mainly Shi'ites. Out of regard for the Chak nobles, he visited the tomb of Mīr Shams al-Dīn 'Irāqī at Zadībal in Srinagar, but relations soon became strained. To uproot the influence of the Chaks, Mīrzā Haydar embarked upon an anti-Shi'ite policy; the tomb of Mīr Shams al-Dīn 'Irāqī was razed to the ground and his son, Shaykh Dāniyāl, was beheaded on the grounds that he had reviled the first three caliphs. Mīrzā Haydar claimed that no one now openly dared to profess Shi'ism as a result of his policy of persecution. Meanwhile, he began to neglect the local nobility and became increasingly dependent on the support of his own followers, whom he appointed to responsible positions in the administration. This led to a revolt in which he was killed in October 1551. There is no doubt that Mīrzā Haydar's intolerant policies brought untold misery upon the people of Kashmir. However, he was not only a brave soldier but also a great patron of culture; he was largely responsible for the revival of arts and crafts, which had been languishing after the death of Zayn al-Ābidīn; it was in Kashmir that he composed the most famous of his works, the *Tārīkh-i Rashīdī*, a history of the Mughals of Central Asia.

Mīrzā Haydar's death did not bring an end to the scramble for power among the nobles. Nāzūk Shāh was allowed to continue as sultan, but the real power was in the hands of his chief minister. Dawlat Chak secured the ascendancy and in late 1552 deposed Nāzūk Shāh and enthroned Ibrāhīm Shāh, the son of Muhammad Shāh, for the second time. Although Dawlat Chak tried to win over other factions of the nobility, he managed to arouse jealousy within his own family, leading to his fall and blinding. Ghāzī Chak became chief minister, eliminated various members of the ruling dynasty and in 1561 himself assumed the title of Sultan Nāsir al-Dīn Muhammad Ghāzī Shāh, thereby laying the foundations of the Chak dynasty. After some 222 years, the rule of the Shāh Mīr dynasty had thus ended. After Zayn al-Ābidīn, a succession of weak and worthless rulers had exposed the country to internal revolts and external invasions. The Shāh Mīr dynasty only paved the way for a powerful faction of the nobility, the Chaks, to unseat it and assume the reins of government.

During the period of the Shāh Mīr dynasty, changes of far-reaching significance took place in the life and conditions of the people of Kashmir. Many elements of Persian and Central Asian culture were introduced into the life of Kashmiris and the continuous waves of Muslim missionaries, artisans and fortune-seekers immigrating from Persia and Central Asia inevitably influenced Kashmiri society. Hindu influence, hitherto dominant in the court, now began to decline, with the place of the Brahmans taken over by newly arrived Muslims. Sanskrit, which had received royal patronage for many years, was replaced by

Persian. The Bayhaqī Sayyids, who wielded great influence in the court, ‘neglected men [who were] learned in the vernacular and in Sanskrit’, in the words of Srivara. However, Sanskrit continued to be the literary language of the Hindu élite, although non-Muslims found that their prospects of employment and promotion were enhanced by a knowledge of Persian and so started to learn it. Bhattavatara, a scholar of Zayn al-‘Ābidīn’s time, who was enamoured of Firdawsī’s *Shāh-nāma*, composed the *Jainavilāsa*, which contains the sayings of the sultan. Srivara translated Jāmī’s *Yūsuf u Zulaykhā* and entitled it *Katha-Kautuka*. Hence, in the course of time, Hindu society was split into two groups: the Persian-speaking Hindus, who were called *Kārkun* (the class of officials), and the Sanskrit-speaking Hindus, who included the *Pandits* (religious scholars). The families of Sanskrit-studying and Persian-studying Hindus did not intermarry, but formed endogamous groups.

The Persianization of the administration had a cultural counterpart. Although Sultan Qutb al-Dīn had refused to promote the missionary activities of Sayyid ‘Alī Hamadānī, he nevertheless followed his advice and gave up dressing in the Hindu fashion. From Jonarāja’s account, it appears that, by the time of Sikandar, Hindus too had adopted Muslim dress. Besides dress, the diet of the Kashmiris also underwent a change. Lamenting these changes, Jonarāja remarks, ‘As the wind destroys the trees, and the locusts the shali crop, so did the Yavanas [Sayyids] destroy the usages of Kashmira.’ Similarly, Srivara ascribes the misfortunes of the people of Kashmir to their acceptance of changes in their way of life. But these protests were in vain; the influence of Persian and Central Asian culture continued to increase day by day. The immigrants from Persia and Central Asia were also responsible for establishing *madrasas*, several of them in Srinagar, which encouraged the dissemination of Islamic spiritual and intellectual values.

On the whole, the attitude of the Shāh Mīr dynasty towards its subjects was one of consideration. Non-Muslims embraced Islam for various reasons and under various pressures, but the administration did not, in general, create a situation in which the people felt forced to abandon their former way of life. The intolerant attitudes adopted by Sultan Sikandar and Mīrzā Haydar Dughlāt were exceptional rather than usual for rulers in Kashmir. The period was, on the whole, one of peaceful change, from the ancient Hindu system to a Persianized form of Islamic society; as a result, culturally, Kashmir became part of the Persian and the Central Asian world.