

‘Ulama’ and Politics During the Tughluq Period (721/1321- 801/1399)

Fouzia Farooq Ahmed

Assistant Professor

Department of History

Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad

fouzia@qau.edu.pk

Abstract:

This article explains the efforts of the Delhi sultans to control the ‘*ulamā*’ during the Tughluq period. The article postulates that the Tughluq sultans controlled the ‘*ulamā*’ through patronization, punishment and reward. Muḥammad b. Tughluq (r. 720-752 / 1325-1351)’s era was the most documented era of Delhi Sultanate. The ‘*ulamā*’ and Sufis that documented this era report the Sultan’s aggression against religious classes. The article also embarks upon travels of ‘*ulamā*’, their trans regional networks and professional mobility.

Keywords: ‘*ulamā*’, Delhi Sultanate, networks, patronage

Introduction

There was a visible pattern to the interaction between the Tughluq rulers and the ‘*ulamā*’. First, the sultans generally held the upper hand in their dealings with ‘*ulamā*’ and were often in a position to co-opt religious leaders through patronage, intimidation, and at times, outright coercion. Second, the ‘*ulamā*’ constituted a reserve of educated manpower that the Sultanate drew upon to fulfill important ritual, judicial, and executive functions. Third, the ‘*ulamā*’ were divided into many competing categories, of which relatively recent arrivals from Central Asia, the Middle East, and West Asia, were consciously cultivated by the sultanate (Niaz, 2015, pp.12-58). Fourth, the politics of the ‘*ulamā*’ devolved into two broad types where one group sought to achieve worldly importance through collaboration with the sultanate while the other sought to achieve renown for its piety by abstaining from over association with the regime.

Interestingly, sultans were at times eager to win greater legitimacy for themselves by winning over 'ulamā' who fell in the latter category. Fifth, when faced with overt coercion by the ruler, something that was especially evident during the reign of Muhammad Tughluq, the 'ulamā' were unable to mobilize social support to resist the sultan successfully. Taken together, we can say that the prestige attached to the status of the 'ulamā' gave them greater influence over the sultanate than other social groups outside the military elite, but this did not translate into autonomy from the regime or the ability to defy it when a confrontational situation arose. By delving upon above mentioned deliberations, present article provides an analysis of the culture of power that existed in the Tughluq period (721/1321- 801/1399)

Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq (r. 721-725/1321-1325)'s rule maintained politics of command and control for the 'ulamā' by 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī (695-715/1296-1316). Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn capitalized on the existing rift between Sufis and the 'ulamā' on the issue of *samā'* in order to settle scores with Niẓām al-Dīn. The sultan called for a *manāẓara* (public debate) on the issue of *samā'* between Niẓām al-Dīn Awliyā', Shaykh 'Umar Sunāmī, a Ḥanafī preacher and jurist, Qāḍī Jalāl al-Dīn Walwājī (who served as qāḍī from the period of 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī), Shaykh Ḥamīd al-Dīn of Nāgaur, and other 'ulamā' of Delhi (Barani, 2004, p.356; Abdul Haq, n.d, p, 109; Hasani, n.d , pp. 97-8; Bhatti, 1974, pp. 200-1, 256).

This *manāẓara* was attended by different religious groups from all over the Delhi Sultanate. Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn Multanī, a Ḥanafī 'ālim from Delhi from 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī's era, like the majority of 'ulamā' in Delhi preferred not to participate in the debate and was instead a silent spectator (Barani, 2005, p.353; Ḥasanī, n.d, pp.59,60; Bhatti, 1974, p.227). The sultan had appointed Shaykh Sulaymān b. Zakariyyā of Multan, a maternal grandson of Bahā' al-Dīn Zakariyyā of Multan, as the judge of the *manāẓara*. He decided in favor of Niẓām al-Dīn Awliyā'. Later, Niẓām al-Dīn Awliyā' expressed amongst his confidants that the 'ulamā' of Delhi were jealous and held a grudge against him (Bhatti,

1974, pp.278-9). Furthermore, Nizām predicted during the *manāẓara* that the discourteous *‘ālim* would be dismissed from his job. The *‘ālim* was dismissed from his job on the twelfth day, something that is discussed as a miracle by the devotees who have recorded the incident. (Ḥasanī, n.d, pp.59,60; Bhatti, 1974, pp.278-9)

Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq’s son and successor Muḥammad b. Tughluq (r. 720-752 / 1325-1351) was undoubtedly the most educated sultan of the Delhi Sultanate, with expertise in logic, fiqh, theology, mathematics and astrology (Husain ,1938, p.171). Since an early age, the sultan had been in the company of poets like Najm, Intishār and ‘Ubayd, atheist philosophers like Sa’d, and the metaphysician and unorthodox religious scholar ‘Ālam al-Dīn. (Husain, 1938, p.192). To the dismay of the orthodox *‘ulamā’*, this company had made a deep impact on the Sultan.

The *‘ulamā’* in the Delhi Sultanate saw Muḥammad b. Tughluq as their nemesis because of his unorthodox views about Islam and the finality of the Prophet Muḥammad. The sultan explicitly refused to accept the preceding Sultans of Delhi, except for his own father, as legitimate rulers (Husain, 1938, p.172). This era is marked by a growing conflict between the Sultan and the *‘ulamā’*. Ḍiya al-Dīn Baranī, who expressed the views of many *‘ulamā’*, regarded him as a Nimrūd and Fir‘aun (Pharaoh), and simply advised him to abdicate (Husain, pp.174, 231). Moroccan traveler Ibn Baṭṭūṭah, who was appointed as the qāḍī of Delhi by the sultan shortly after arriving in the Delhi Sultanate, reported a sizable number of *‘ulamā’* in Delhi. (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 1986, pp. 70-90; Shihab al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Fadlullah al-‘Umarī, 2002, p.49) The Sultan had a preference for Hanafi scholars since according to Al Umri, there were 1000 madrasas in Delhi under Tughlaq rule, out of which only one belonged to the Shāfi‘ī madhhab and the rest were Ḥanafī madhhab. (Shihab al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Fadlullah al-‘Umarī, 2002, p.49) He particularly mentioned four prominent *‘ulamā’* of this era: Maḥmūd al-Ka‘ba, Shaykh ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Nilī, Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Khurāmī, Kāmāl al-Dīn ‘Abdullāh (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 1986, pp. 70-90; Shihab al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Fadlullah al-‘Umarī, 2002,

p.49). Like his predecessors, the sultan enjoyed the company of 'ulamā' at his food table, while many were anxious to avoid him due to his erratic behavior (Qalshqandī, 1915, p.95). For example, much to the dismay of Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Khurāmī, the sultan along with his entourage regularly visited him (Husain, 1938, p. 121).

The sultan not only engineered the existing networks of 'ulamā' through his change of capital from Delhi to Deogir and his strategies of reward, patronization and punishment, but also created new networks by encouraging foreign 'ulamā' to settle in India. The sultan's decision to transfer his capital from Delhi to Deogir, and the consequent forced migration of the mashāyikh and 'ulamā' transformed the formerly passive and sporadic resistance of the 'ulamā' into a popular movement (Husain, 1938, pp.123, 203).

The Sultanate intelligentsia, including the 'ulamā', the Sayyids, the mashāyikh, and the Sufis, saw Muḥammad b. Tughluq's administrative fiascos including his failed Qarachil expedition, coupled with the disbandment of a large portion of the Khorasan army and consequent social unrest caused by unemployed soldiers, as well as the famine and rebellion of the Doab, with great resentment (Husain, 1938, p.157). They considered the sultan a blasphemer who had the audacity to employ and treat the 'ulamā' and Sufis like ordinary men (Husain, 1938, p.157). Due to his unorthodox religious policies and harsh treatment of orthodox 'ulamā', the sultan had become very unpopular (Raḥmān, 1914, pp. 35-6; Wains, 2012, pp. 284-8).

According to Ibn Battutah Muḥammad b. Tughluq respected Arabs and announced that all the Arabs in his realm should be addressed to as Sayyids. (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 1986, p. 75) Other sources however, contest this statement and posit that the Sultan had a reputation for his disregard of the Sayyids, 'ulamā' and Sufis, whom he tortured and killed as a public spectacle. In 728/1328, the sultan successfully suppressed a rebellion by the governor of Multan, Kūshlū Khān (Anna, 2004, p.150). The rebel and his supporters, which had included

'*ulamā*', Sayyids, and Sufis, were killed ruthlessly (Husain, 1938, p. 131). As well, the sultan did not hesitate to displace '*ulamā*' to check their power. For example, he wanted Shaykh Muḥammad b. Yahyā Awadhī to go to Kashmir, however he fell ill and died before he could go. The sultan refused to believe this and ordered an investigation (Bhatti, 1974, p. 290; Abdul Haq, n.d, 97; Ḥasanī, n.d, p. 147).

Because the sultan was unable to control existing '*ulamā*' networks, he invited foreign '*ulamā*' and superimposed new networks on the older ones. The sultan was central to those new networks (Husain, 1938, p. 229). He appointed new officials to the highest offices. 'Izz al-Dīn qāḍī Majd al-Dīn of Shiraz, Nazīr al-Dīn of Tirmidh, Burhān al-Dīn Wā'iz, and Shams al-Dīn Malik Sanjar of Badakhshān were all granted largess and enjoyed good relations with the sultan (Al-'Umarī, pp, 95-7; Ā'zamī, 1985, p.35; Husain, nd, p.131). Shaykh 'Abd al-'Azīz Ardabīlī originated from Damascus and was taught by notable '*ulamā*' of his time. He came to India and became close with Muḥammad b. Tughluq. The sultan even kissed the 'ālim's feet and gave him a gold tray (*sīnī*) filled with two thousand tankas (Bhatti, 1974, pp. 237-8; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 1986, p. 67). Some officials already working in higher posts at other Muslim courts came to Delhi for better prospects. Qāḍī Faṣīh al-Dīn Harwī Khurāsānī was the qāḍī of Herat and an affluent man who came to India during Muḥammad b. Tughluq's period and was appointed as *hākim* (administrator) of the region of Sind (Bhatti, 1974, pp. 267-70). The local '*ulamā*' resented the sultan's preference for foreign elements. Perhaps their jealousies were unwarranted, however. Despite such rivalries and jealousies, foreign '*ulamā*' often failed the sultan (Husain, 1938, p. 229).

Muḥammad b. Tughluq's treatment of qāḍī Ḍiya al-Dīn Simnānī best explains how the sultan used one faction of the '*ulamā*' to humiliate rival groups, and the ease with which the sultan punished foreign '*ulamā*'. First the sultan ordered a local '*ālim*', qāḍī Ḍiya al-Dīn Samnānī to pull the beard of a foreign '*ālim*', Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn of Jam (Abdul Haq, n.d, pp. 358-61). Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn was respected by Muḥammad's

predecessors Qutb al-Dīn Mubarak Shāh and Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq, but he refused Muḥammad b. Tughluq's offer to join government service. Consequently, qāḍī Ḍiya al-Dīn Samnānī a local 'ālim was asked to publicly disgrace the offender by pulling his beard, which he refused to do. Both the 'ulamā' were punished and their beards were pulled publicly. After this, qāḍī Ḍiya al-Dīn Samnānī was exiled to Telangana and was later appointed as the qāḍī of Warangal (Bhatti, 1974, p.233). Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn was sent to Daulatābād where he lived for seven years. He was appointed as dīwān to collect taxes from the 'ulamā' and all the government officers were ordered to respect and obey him. Later the 'ālim refused to serve the sultan and called him *zālim* (callous) because of his policy of transfer of capital (Qadir, 2012, pp. 5-10). The sultan tortured him for several days, forced him to eat cow's dung, and later beheaded him (Bhatti, 1974, pp.233-5; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 1986, pp.113-20). Mawlānā Fakhr al-Dīn Zarādī was a critic of the sultan's decision to transfer the capital to Deogir. The sultan met with him and wanted to punish him. The 'ālim apprehended that the sultan might kill him, but the sultan refrained from doing so because of the 'ālim's diplomacy (Abdul Haq, n.d, p.199; Bhatti, 1974, pp. 260-3).

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's six years (735-741/1334-1341) sojourn in South Asia as the qāḍī of Delhi illustrates the meteoric rise and fall of foreign 'ulamā'. The traveler received royal favors including appointment as an important government functionary (qāḍī), largess, slaves and household including wife as he immediately gained sultan Muḥammad b. Tughluq's favorable attention. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa quickly mingled with the ruling elite and attended many official and personal royal celebrations. He also interacted with fellow *udabā'*, 'ulamā' and *umarā'* and witnessed the sultan's erratic behavior: occasionally generous and mostly harsh. Within a few years he fell from royal favor and the sultan suspected him of treason. Consequently, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa like many others feared for his life and decided to leave the Delhi Sultanate (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 1986).

The new networks of 'ulamā' were not enough for the sultan, who contacted the 'Abbāsīd Caliph of Cairo to seek legitimacy

for his rule. He issued multiple gold and copper coins to proclaim his connections (Ehab Younis Ali, 2015: pp.1-19; Ernst, 1992, pp. 55-8; Aziz Ahmed, 1964, pp. 3-11). The sultan publicly celebrated the arrival of 'Abbāsīd emissaries and royalties in a cynical bid to recapture the support and confidence of the masses and counter his unpopularity amongst the religious classes (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 1984, p.94; Husain 1938, p. 175).

Muḥammad b. Tughluq could not control the '*ulamā*' through reward or patronage, so he turned to violence. The list of those whom he tortured and killed is fairly long. For instance, Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn Zahidī Mīrthī (known as 'haq-go', the truthful) threw his shoe at the sultan's face when the latter expressed his disbelief on the finality of the Prophet Muḥammad (Abd al-Haqq, n.d, p.236; Shattari Mandwi, n.d, pp. 46-7). The '*ālim*' was brutally killed in retribution, thrice thrown from the ramparts of a fort (Bhatti, 1974, p.228; Ḥasanī, n.d: p. 61). A note of disagreement by Mawlānā 'Imād al-Dīn Ghaurī of Narnaul on the same issue got him beheaded after having his tongue pulled out (Bhatti, 1974, p.251; Ḥasanī, n.d, p.94).

Those who fell from favour were forced to live in misery. Ḍiya al-Dīn Baranī was also an '*ālim*' who authored the magnum opus, *Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī*, a century-long history of eight Delhi sultans from the reign of Balaban to Fīrūz Shāh (r. 752-790/1351-1388). Baranī came from the family of administrators and scholars. He held a high position under Muḥammad b. Tughluq for over a decade, yet eventually lost it. He dedicated his work to Sultan Fīrūz Shāh (Bhatti, 1974, pp.230-1).

Nonetheless, there were a handful of '*umarā*' in general and '*ulamā*' in particular who survived the twenty-six-year long reign of Muḥammad b. Tughluq. For instance, Tātār Khān survived the transfer of power during the Tughluq era. Amīr Tātār Khān was a foster son of Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq and served Muḥammad b. Tughluq as a successful military commander. He at one point incurred the wrath of the sultan, however, relations between the two were soon normalized. In the era of Muḥammad's successor Fīrūz Shāh, he was given the

title Khān-i Ā'zam, and enjoyed protocol otherwise reserved for royalty. Tātār Khān was the compiler of the tafsīr of Tātār Khān and had excellent relations with the 'ulamā' (Baranī, 2005, p.579; Bhatti, 1974, pp. 192-196). Mawlānā 'Ālam b. 'Alā' Indarpatī was patronized by Fīrūz Shāh; he dedicated one of his three volume books on the topic of fiqh, titled Fatāwa-i Tātār Khāniyya, to Tātār Khān (Ibn al-'Allā', n.d.; Bhatti, 1974, pp.236-7).

Qāḍī Muḥammad b. Burhān Hanswī was also amongst the few 'ulamā' who remained close to Muḥammad b. Tughluq and survived his entire career, even serving as the qāḍī al-qaḍā (Ḥasanī, n.d: p.129; Bhatti, 1974, p.282). There were others, including Shaykh Muḥammad b. Shams 'Usmānī's father Shaykh Shams al-Dīn Ṣāliḥ, who came to India from Iraq and was appointed as qāḍī of Satrikh in the time of 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī. He was made qāḍī of Amethi during Muḥammad b. Tughluq's reign, and his offspring remained in Amethi (Ḥasanī, n.d, ,p. 57; Bhatti, 1974,p.293). Shaykh Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad Bukhari Uchī Makhdum Jahāniyān Jahān Ghasht was appointed as Shaykh al-Islām of Sind by Muḥammad b. Tughluq and continued to play an influential role into the era of Fīrūz Shāh (Bhatti, 1974, pp.207-8).

By contrast with his cousin, Fīrūz Shāh was a supporter of the 'ulamā' and had journeyed in their company to Thatta in the last days of Muḥammad b. Tughluq (Husain, 1938, p.210). The historian Agha Mehdi Hussain is of the opinion that the *umarā'*, and especially the 'ulamā', had conspired to depose Muḥammad b. Tughluq and enthrone Fīrūz Shāh. 'ulamā' and Sufis such as Shaykh Nāṣir al-Dīn Chirāgh-i Dihlī, a disciple of Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā', influenced this shift in power (Husain,1938,p.179). In Delhi, a group of *umarā'* declared a young boy as successor to Muḥammad b. Tughluq, on which the 'ulamā' responded by upholding Fīrūz Shāh's claim as legitimate (Barani, 2005, pp.503-24). The 'ulamā' preferred the company of Sultan Fīrūz Shāh, for example, Shaykh Aḥmad b. Yahya Manirī, who had avoided Muḥammad b. Tughluq and his officers, even advised Fīrūz Shāh and his officials. In instances where he accepted grants, he quickly

distributed them among the deserving (Bhatti, 1974, pp. 184-6; Abdul Haq, n.d, p.251). The '*ulamā*' could communicate with the sultan without fearing for their lives. Tātār Khān even rebuked Sultan Fīrūz Shāh for his drinking habit (Barani, 2005, p. 579; Bhatti, 1074, pp.192-6). Fīrūz Shāh also welcomed new '*ulamā*' from outside India. Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rumī came from Rūm and was appointed as *mudarris* of the madrasa -i Fīrūz Shāhī (Bhatti, 1974, pp. 198-200). Fīrūz Shāh awarded the '*ulamā*' with wealth and privilege. He gave qāḍī Jalāl al-Dīn Kirmānī the office of Ṣadr us-Ṣadūr. He held great authority to distribute wazā'if (plural of wazīfā alms) and rewards amongst his fellow '*ulamā*' (Baranī, 2005, pp579, 580; Abdul Haq, n.d, p.161; Bhatti, 1974, p.202; Zafar Iṣlāhī, 2002, p.85). Similarly, a North African '*ālim*' Shaykh Ishāq Maghribī (660-776/1261-1374) who was a disciple of Abu 'Abbās Aḥmad Qarshī, Abu Muḥammad Sālih Diqaqī, and Shaykh Abū Madyan Maghribī came to India during Fīrūz Shāh's reign and settled in Ajmer (Bhatti, 1974, pp.186-7).

These networks of '*ulamā*' demonstrated their power in the enthronement of Fīrūz Shāh. The rise of Fīrūz Shāh was the rise of the '*ulamā*', and the production of Fatāwā-i Fīrūz Shāhī was its climax. Fīrūz Shāh had lax policies towards orthodox '*ulamā*' however, he dealt with the heterodox Abāḥī and Mahdavī religious groups with an iron hand through imprisonment, exile and killing on the recommendations of the orthodox '*ulamā*' who considered these groups apostates. (Raḥmān, 1964, 35-6).

'*ulamā*' networks thrived on friendships, discipleships and, in some cases, familial relations. Often '*ulamā*' married their daughters to their disciples, who became their intellectual heirs and thus took over the madrasas where their mentors had formerly taught. For example, Sālār (warlord) Fakhr al-Dīn, after coming to India from Iraq, married Bahā'al-Dīn Zakariyyā of Multan who died issueless. Then Fakhr al-Dīn married Mawlānā Sayyid Ni'mat ullah Ḥamdānī's sister Bībī Hāfizah Jāmāl, who gave birth to Shaykh Abu 'Alī Qalandar Panipatī (Bhatti, 1974, pp.179-80). Shaykh Aḥmad b. Yahya Manerī was married to Bībī Bādām, the daughter of his teacher

Mawlānā Sharaf al-Dīn Abu Tawama Bābā Farīd married his daughter to his student Shaykh Ishāq ‘Alī Bukharī, also known as Badr al-Dīn Ishāq (http://www.makhdoomejahan.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=46&Itemid=53 (3/27/2020); Bhatti, 1974, pp.123, 184). Shaykh Badr al-Dīn Bhakarī married two of his daughters Zahra and Fatima in succession to Shaykh Husyan b. ‘Alī Bukhārī (Bhatti, 1974, pp. 137-65).

The powerful presence of some ‘*ulamā*’ changed the social and economic fabric of the places they visited and settled. Shaykh Yaḥyā Manerī (661-783/1263-1381) came from a family of scholars from Maner. He had built important networks as he was connected to both the Firdawsī order as well as the Chishtī order (Bhatti, 1974, p.183). He came to Delhi and met different ‘*ulamā*’ and Sufis. He did not become the disciple of Niẓām al-Dīn Awliyā’, but on his instruction went to Shaykh Najīb al-Dīn and took bayat. He traveled extensively into Bihar and engaged in teaching and conversion for the next sixty years (Bhatti, 1974, pp.184-6). Shaykh ‘Alī b. Shihāb Hamdānī was a travelling Sufi and ‘*ālim*’ from Hamadan (714-786/1314-1384) who went to Hījāz, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, China, Syria, and Turkestan, building social networks along the way. He visited Kashmir three times. On his third visit he came with 700 disciples in his entourage (Bhatti, 1974, pp.247-248; Ḥasanī, n.d, pp. 87-90). He also wrote prolifically. His presence changed the social and economic fabric of Kashmir, helping to spread Muslim presence as far as Ladakh. He was engaged in teaching and supporting the skills of the textile industry, particularly the handling of refined (pashmīna) wool, and of minting and writing (H. Fewkes, 2008, pp.44-5).

Travels and mobility almost always brought great professional opportunities for ‘*ulamā*’. Sayyid Aḥmad Ghaznavī was among the grand ‘*ulamā*’ of the Delhi Sultanate. When he travelled to the Deccan, the Bahmanid ruler ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Ḥasan (749-759/1347-1358) appointed him as a teacher in Gulbarga where he spent the rest of his life. (Bhatti, 1974, p.186; M. Eaton, 2005, pp.33-58).

Many scholars visited the Ḥijāz and were able to build networks outside India that added to their social capital. Shaykh Jahāniyān Jahān Ghasht travelled from Uch to Ḥijāz and stayed in the holy city of Medina for two years. He studied the famous treatise 'Awārif al-Ma'ārif of Shaykh 'Umar Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī from 'Afīf al-Dīn Abdullah Maṭrī, and then proceeded to Egypt and Iraq (Bhatti, 1974, pp.207-8). Shaykh Sulaymān b. Zakariyyā of Multan also travelled to the Ḥijāz, Jerusalem, Baghdad, and Iraq. As mentioned above, he returned to India in the era of Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq, who appointed the 'ālim as one of the moderators of the historical *manāẓara* on *samā'* between Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā' and qāḍī Jalāl al-Dīn Walwājī (Bhatti, 2012, p. 219; Ḥasanī, n.d, p.50).

Qāḍī Sāmā' al-Dīn Bijnaurī (d. 776/1374), Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Damishqī, Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Dhārāswanī of Khorasan, Shaykh 'Umar b. Muḥammad Hindī, Shaykh Maḥmūd b. Yusuf Kīrānī, and Shaykh Dawūd b. Ḥusayn of Shiraz (b. 701/1301) also travelled to the Ḥijāz from India. (Abdul Haq, n.d, p.110; Ḥasanī, n.d, pp. 42-3, 50, 56, 94, 161; Bhatti, 2012, pp. 219, 212-213, 234-5, 251-2, 300). Mawlānā Fakhr al-Dīn Zarādī was a travelling teacher who moved extensively between the cities and jungles of India and later went to the Ḥijāz and Iraq. He was able to build extensive social networks along the way (Bhatti, 2012, pp. 259-61).

There were some '*ulamā'* who left India and settled in the Ḥijāz for good. Shaykh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Kābilī belonged to Kabul and came to India in 753/1352. He brought many treatises with him and built networks. Later he moved to Makkah (Bhatti, 2012, p.287; Ḥasanī, n.d, p. 145). Shaykh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Sighānī Hindī went to the Ḥijāz and then Cairo. He had political differences with the administrator of Medina and went to Makkah where he started teaching in the madrasa -i Ḥanafīyya (Bhatti, 2012, pp, 285-6; Ḥasanī, n.d, pp.143-4). Similarly, Shaykh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Hindī left India and settled in Makkah, eventually dying in Cairo. (Bhatti, 2012, p.291; Ḥasanī, n.d, 148). Shaykh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Damrājī Hindī (also known as Najīb al-Dīn Hindī) left India and went to the Ḥijāz. Because he had an Arab accent

he was able to find work there as a teacher (Bhatti, 2012, p.291; Hasanī, n.d, 148).

However, not all of the '*ulamā*' successfully continued their career outside India. Shaykh Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Rahīm Armavī Hindī Ṣafī al-Dīn, who was an 'ālim, author, and a scribe, travelled extensively. He went to Yemen where the ruler gifted him 900 dinars. Later, he went to Ḥijāz to perform Ḥajj and stayed there for three months. He then travelled to Cairo, Rome, Konya and Damascus. In Cairo, he was made supervisor of Imām Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn- Taymiyyah's (661-728/1263-1328) *manāẓara* but could not satisfy the organizers. With limited Qur'anic and Arabic knowledge, he clearly was no match for Imām Ibn Taymiyyah's intellectual caliber and was soon replaced with another '*ālim*'. To the horror of many, he did not have an authentic Arabic accent. It was said that his accent had a Hindī touch (Bhatti, 2012, pp.284-5). Shaykh 'Umar b. Ishāq Ghaznavī (c. 708/1308) was the imām from Delhi and cultivated a great number of connections. He went to the Ḥijāz and then Cairo where he became qāḍī of the Egyptian army but was eventually dismissed from this position (Bhatti, 2012, pp. 252-3).

To conclude, in the Delhi Sultanate, proximity to power was an opportunity for some groups of '*ulamā*' and an ordeal for others. Sultans paid special attention to the '*ulamā*' since they were the opinion makers. The '*ulamā*' were a divided group, many among them competed for power and authority. The sultans endeavored to keep them divided through strategies like patronage, reward and punishment. They frequently transferred the '*ulamā*' employed in government positions in order to counter their influence. Since the '*ulamā*' were the chroniclers of the Delhi Sultanate's history, their likes and dislikes have shaped the imagination of their readers regarding Sultanate personalities. (Ahmed, 2016, p. 10-14) Sultan Muḥammad b. Tughluq's forced migration from Delhi to Deogir was an extreme reaction to counter the growing influence of *umarā*' on the locals. This migration brought great misery to the '*ulamā*', who documented the sultan's callousness by giving him an everlasting sobriquet of *zālim* (cruel). Also, the

religious groups of Sufis and 'ulamā' travelled far and wide; it was not just a means to an education but an opportunity to build networks and social capital, and to explore better prospects for employment.

References

1. Abd al-Haqq Muhaddith Dehlavi, *Akhbār al-Akhyār fi Asrār al-Abrār*. Urdu trans. *Anwar-i Sufiya*. Muslim Ahmad Nizami. Delhi: Kutubkhana Naziriyya Dehlavi n.d.
2. Ā'zamī, Shoaib. *Fārsī Adab ba- 'Ahd-i-Salātīn-i-Tughluq*. Delhi: Naumani Press, 1985.
3. 'Afif, Shams Sirāj. *Tarīkh Firūz Shāhī*. Hyderabad: Dār al-Taba' -i Jāmia-i Uthmāniya, 1938.
4. Agha Mehdi Husain, *The Rise and Fall of Muḥammad Bin Tughluq* (London: Luzac & Co, 1938).
5. Ahmed, Aziz. *Studies in Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment*. Aberdeen: Oxford University Press, 1964.
6. Ahmed, Fouzia Farooq. *Muslim Rule in Medieval India: Power and Religion in the Delhi Sultanate*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2016.
7. Ali, Ehab Younis and Latif, Mervat Abd El-Hady Abd El. "Coins from India with names of Abbasid Caliphs in Cairo and Sultans of Delhi Tughluq Shah and Muhammad ibn Tughluq" (720-752 AH / 1320-1351 AD)". *Journal of Association of Arab Universities for Tourism and Hospitality*, Article 15, Volume 12, Issue 1 (2015): 1-19.
8. Ali, Rehman. *Tadhkaria-i-'ulamā' Hind*. (Persian) Lucknow: Naval Kishore Press, 1914.
9. al-'Umarī, Shihab al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Faḍlullah. *Māsālik al-Absār fī Mamālik al-Amsār*, vol 3, ed. Abdullah b. Yāhyā Sarīhī. Abu Ḍahbi, Al-Majmā-i Thāqāfī, 2002.
10. Baranī, Ḍiya al-Dīn. *Fīrūz Shāhī*, translated into Urdu by Syed Mū'īn al-Haq. Lahore: Urdu Science Board, 2004.
11. Baranī, Ḍiya al-Dīn. *Tarikh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī*, (reprint. Persian), ed. Sir Syed Ahmad Khān. Aligarh: Sar Sayyid Akaidmī, 2005.
12. Baṭṭūṭah, Ibn. *Safarnāmah-i ibn-i-Baṭṭūṭah*, trans. Urdu, Ra'īs Ahmad J'āfry. Karachi: Na'fis Academy, 1986.
13. Bhatti, Muhammad Ishāq. *Fuqhā-i-Hind*, voll. Lahore: Idārah-i-Saqāfat-i-Islāmiya, 1974.
14. Bhatti, Shaikh Dawūd b Yusuf al-Khaṭīb Ishāq. *Barray Saghīr mein Ilm Fiqh*. New Delhi: al-Balāgh Publications, 2012.
15. Dehlvi, Shykh Abdul Ḥaq Muhaddith. *Akhbar al-Akhyar*, trans. Mawlana Subhan Mahmud and Mawlana Muhammad Fazil. Karachi, n.d.
16. Eaton, Richard M. *A Social History of the Deccan, 1300-1761: The New Cambridge History of India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
17. Ernst, Carl W. *Eternal Garden: Mysticism, History, and Politics at a South Asian Sufi Center*, New York: State University of New York Press, 1992.

18. Fewkes, Jacqueline H. *Trade and Contemporary Society Along the Silk Road: An Ethno-history of Ladakh*. New York: Routledge Contemporary Asia, 2008.
19. Ḥasanī, Fakhar al-Dīn. *Nuzhat al-Khawātir* vol. 2, trans. Karachi: Anwar Al Haq Qāsmī, n.d.
20. http://www.makhdomejahan.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=46&Itemid=53 (3/27/2020)
21. Husain, Agha Mehdi. *The Rise and Fall of Muhammad Bin Tughluq*. London: Luzac & Co, 1938.
22. Indirpati, Maulana 'Alim ibn al-'Alla' al. *Fatawa-i-Tātār Khāniya*. Karachi: Idaratul Quran Wal Uloom Al Islamiyyah, n.d.
23. Iṣlāhī, Zafar. *Salātīn-i-Delhi aur Shar'iyat-i-Islamiyah*. Aligharh: Educational Book House, 2002.
24. J. Dering. (1995) art. "Samā' ". Part I "In Music and Mysticism." In *The Encyclopedia of Islam*. New ed. Vol. VIII. Leiden: E. J. Brill. Encyclopedia.
25. Muhammad Ghothi Shattari Mandwi, *Adhkār-i Abrār [Gulzār-i Abrār]*, composed in 1014 AH, trans. Urdu, Faḍl Ahmad Jewari (Lahore: Islamic Book Foundation, n.d.),
26. Niaz, Ilhan. *Old World Empires: Cultures of Power and Governance in Eurasia*. New York: Routledge, 2014.
27. Qaḍīr, Khurram. "Public Opinion in Pre-Modern Times: Muḥammad bin Tughluq the Genesis of a Zalim Sultan", *Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society* part 1 and 2 (July-September 2012).
28. Qalshqandi, Abul Abbas Ahmad al. *Subhul A'sha*, Part 5. Cairo: Ameeriah Cairo, 1915.
29. Raḥmān, Sayyed Sabahuddīn Abdul. *Hindustān Kay Salātīn 'Ulamā' Aur Mashāyikh Ke Ta'alluqat Par Ayk Naẓar*. Āzamgarh: Ma'ārif Press, 1964.
30. Siddiqi, Iqtidar Husain. *Indo-Persian Historiography Up to The Thirteenth Century*. Delhi: Primus Books, 2010.
31. _____ *Authority and Kingship Under the Sultans of Delhi: Thirteenth-fourteenth Centuries*. Manohar Publishers & Distributors, 2006.
32. Suvorova, Anna. *Muslim Saints of South Asia: The Eleventh to Fifteenth Centuries*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
33. Wains, David. "Ibn Battutah on Shedding of Blood in the Delhi Sultanate," *Al Masaq Journal of Medieval Mediterranean*, vol. 23, no 3 (2012): 284-88.