

Centre for Anatolian and East Mediterranean Studies
University of St Andrews

Workshop programme for:

**Rum and Hind: relations and shared experiences of conquest,
acculturation and Turkish rule in pre-modern India and Anatolia**

25 – 26 May 2017, St Andrews

Thursday 25 May (Venue: Hebdomadar's Room, Hebdomadar's Block, North St.)

1.15pm – 2.00pm, Informal lunch

2.00pm – 3.45pm, Session 1

Welcome and Introductory remarks – Andrew Peacock (University of St Andrews)

- Prof. Stephen Dale (The Ohio State University): 'Turks, Turks and türk Turks: Anatolia, Iran and India in Comparative Perspective'.
- Prof. Sunil Kumar (University of Delhi): 'When the Turks became the Servitors of Islam: acculturation in the fourteenth century Delhi Sultanate'.

3.45pm – 4.00pm, Tea break

4.00pm – 5.00pm, Session 2

- Prof. Blain Auer (University of Lausanne): 'The "Advent of the Turks" and the Problem of Turkish/Turkic Identity in the Courts of Delhi in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries'.
- Dr George Malagaris (University of Oxford): 'What is a raid? Ghaznavids and Seljuqs in war and statecraft'.

7.15pm – , Dinner for workshop participants in local restaurant

Friday 26 May (Venue: Senate Room, St Mary's College, South St.)

9.30am - 10.30am, Session 3

- Dr Shailendra Bhandare (University of Oxford): 'Transregional Connections: The 'lion and sun' motif between Anatolia and India'.
- Dr Richard McClary (University of Edinburgh): 'When Brick meets Stone: Turko-Iranian brick architecture and its interaction with the lithic traditions of India and Anatolia'.

10:30am – 11.00am, Coffee Break (Venue: St Mary's College Hall)

11.00am - 1.00pm, Session 4

- Assoc. Prof. Pinar Emiralioglu (Sam Houston State University): 'Mapping the Boundaries of the World: India in the Early Modern Ottoman Geographical and Imperial Consciousness'.
- Prof. Dr. Suraiya Faroqi (Istanbul Bilgi University): 'An attempt to view early modern Ottoman crafts from an Indian perspective'.
- Asst. Prof. Amanda Phillips (University of Virginia): 'An overview of the textile trade between the Ottoman Empire and India, 1450-1800'.

1.00pm – 2.00pm, Lunch (Venue: Parliament Hall)

2.00pm – 3.30pm, Session 5

- Dr Roy Fischel (SOAS, University of London): 'Turkomans of the Deccan: Historical Memory and Political Identity in Early Modern India'.
- Prof. Ali Anooshahr (UC Davis, California): 'The Lesser Mogul'.

3.30pm – 4.00pm, Tea Break (Venue: St Mary's College Hall)

4.00pm – 5.15pm, Session 6

- Dr Maya Petrovich (University of Oxford): 'Merchants, Young Heroes and Caliphs: Reading Mahmud Gavan'.
- Dr Benedek Peri (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest): 'Turkish Language and Literature in Late Mughal India as Reflected by a Unique Collection of Texts'.

7.00pm – Dinner for workshop participants hosted by the University of St Andrews

Rum and Hind: relations and shared experiences of conquest, acculturation and Turkish rule in pre-modern India and Anatolia

Abstracts

Prof. Ali Anooshahr (UC Davis, California): 'The Lesser Mogul'.

While the state founded by Babur in 1525 and ruled by his descendants into the nineteenth century is universally known as "Mughal" or "Indo-Timurid", there were other contemporary states, especially in the earlier periods, that legitimately rivalled the Baburids for these names. This paper analyses the other Timurid and Mongol states of South Asia particularly in Sind, Punjab, and Afghanistan who ruled prior to or at the same time as the Baburids.

Prof. Blain Auer (University of Lausanne): 'The "Advent of the Turks" and the Problem of Turkish/Turkic Identity in the Courts of Delhi in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries'

The thirteenth-century emergence of Delhi as a capital of Muslim rulers in Northern India was a transformational moment in the history of South Asian polities. In modern history writing, as well as in medieval Persian historiography, this event is understood to be the foundation for the Delhi Sultanate, the rule of three successive Islamic dynasties (Shamsi, Ghiyasi, Tughluq) that spanned the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. A significant portion of contemporary history writing has framed the identity of these three dynasties in ethnic terms referring to the "advent of the Turks" and the "Turkish state." However, the picture of Turkish/Turkic identities in the medieval sources is ambiguous. While medieval historians discussed the Turkish/Turkic identity of the Delhi sultans, it is not the central organizing feature of the political and cultural systems established during this period. This paper will deal with two fundamental questions. What is the meaning of a "Turkish state" in the Delhi Sultanate? What was the role and influence of Turkish/Turkic identity in the politics and culture of the sultans of Delhi?

Dr Shailendra Bhandare (University of Oxford): 'Transregional Connections: The 'lion and sun' motif between Anatolia and India'.

In his study entitled 'Objects of Translation', Barry Flood has emphasized the role of contacts, networks and people in circulation in transmission and dissemination of not only textual or epistemological works but also material objects. Much like the texts that adopt a 'mutually intelligible language' in translation, the objects too can be 'translated' on the basis of analytical frameworks generated through transmission and 'transculturation' facilitated by their movements along these networks. They are also bearers of visual constructs, symbolisms and motifs which move with the objects. As such, objects can be viewed as vehicles of a language which is composed not of the written or spoken word but of semiotics, consisting of 'visual phenotypes' which deliver a message to their consumers, much like written texts, but encoded in matrices which 'speak through sight'. Coins, by their very nature as a monetary medium of exchange, circulate across different regions and thus can be an excellent category of objects to study the dissemination of visual motifs.

The motif of 'lion and sun' is mainly attributed to the ancient Iranian solar symbolism and thus believed to have been spread in the wider Islamic world from Iran. It is seen not only on Iranian and Afghan coins but the Mughal Emperor Jahangir of India also adopted it as a numismatic design on specially produced coins, as his dynastic emblem. The occurrence of the motif on Central Asian buildings (such as the 'Sher Dor Madrassa of Samarkand, where it lends the monument its name) is also extremely well-known. So far the *raison d'être* for it to occur on thought to have been the

increasing 'Persianisation' of the Mughal court during the reign of Akbar (1556-1605). But the recent discovery of a 13th century coin from Sindh has pushed the chronology of numismatic consumption of this motif back almost by three centuries. More interestingly, the inspiration of the design on the Sindhi coin has evidently come from similar coins struck by the Seljuq Sultans of Anatolia.

It is this particular discovery that I intend to discuss in my paper, adopting the broader investigative framework outlined by Flood. I will attempt to unpick the connections between Sindh and Anatolia, which almost represent the two antipodes of the Islamicate world in early part of the second Millennium AD, and pose some ideas about which cultural and economic processes might have been behind such a transmission.

[Prof. Stephen Dale \(The Ohio State University\): 'Turks, Turks and türk Turks: Anatolia, Iran and India in Comparative Perspective'](#)

From the tenth to the twentieth centuries the presence and influence of Turks has been a prominent aspect of the history of the territories stretching from the Bosphorus to the Bay of Bengal. Beginning with the enslavement of Central Asian Turks and their employment as military slaves, known variously as *ghulams* or *mamluks*, the number of Turks in these regions increased exponentially with the Oghuz tribal migrations/invasions of the tenth and eleventh centuries. Mongol armies of the thirteenth century brought in more Turks and the example of Chinggis Qan inspired the final invasion of Turks led by Temür, (Timur-i lang or Tamerlane) in the fourteenth century. The political consequence of this turkification was marked by the founding of three Turkic dominated Muslim empires, the Ottomans, Safavids and Timurid-Mughals. Yet, the political role and social and cultural influence of Turks in Ottoman, Safavid and Timurid-Mughal dominions was distinctly different, depending on their numbers, political structures, cultural proclivities and the political, social and cultural topography of their conquests. The consequence of these differences is manifest in the relative influence of Turks in these territories after these three empires collapsed.

This paper will compare these differences and their long-term historical consequences, beginning with the original Central Asian meaning of the term Turk. It will give special attention to the Timurid-Mughal case, for which there are comparatively lavish literary and political sources that illuminate both the notion of a Turkic consciousness as well as the various ways in which the term Turk was used. In particular the paper will utilize the uniquely valuable evidence, which the founder of the Empire Zahir al-Din Muhammad Babur, provides in his remarkable autobiography, known variously as the *Babur-Namah* or *Vaqayi'* ("Events"), a text that offers unusual examples of the variant meanings of the word Turk that must be taken into account in any survey of Turks in this so-called "early-modern" era.

[Assoc. Prof. Pinar Emiralioglu \(Sam Houston State University\): 'Mapping the Boundaries of the World: India in the Early Modern Ottoman Geographical and Imperial Consciousness'](#)

Historians of the early modern empires have long been investigating the political, intellectual, and economic ties between the Ottoman Empire and Mughal India. These studies focus on the networks of political, economic, and knowledge exchange between these two regions and emphasize the increasing intensity of interactions between the Ottoman Empire and Mughal India in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. My paper aims to contribute to this literature by investigating the ways in which the Ottoman geographers and ruling elites located India in the Ottoman geographical consciousness and imperial project in the early modern period.

Through a historical analysis of a select body of Ottoman geographical and cartographical works on India from sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, my paper will demonstrate the extent to which Ottoman geographers took part in the early modern global networks of knowledge exchange and how participation in these networks formed their ideas about India and its place in Ottoman geographical knowledge. It will argue that the development of a heightened sensitivity to geographical knowledge about India in this period was intimately related to the articulation of the

Ottoman claims to universal imperial sovereignty. By narrating and depicting the geographical features of the Ottoman realm and India, Ottoman geographers repositioned their Empire to the centre and established links to the geographical boundaries of the known world.

[Prof. Dr. Suraiya Faroqhi \(Istanbul Bilgi University\): 'An attempt to view early modern Ottoman crafts from an Indian perspective'](#).

For many years, Ottomanist historians studied the Ottoman Empire and/or its constituent regions as entities more or less insulated from the outside world, except when it came to 'campaigns and conquests' on the one hand, and 'incorporation into the European-dominated world economy' on the other. Where India is concerned, the Turkic ethnicity and identity of many rulers of the Delhi Sultanate, and of Babur as well, have attracted the attention of historians, sometimes with nationalist preoccupations.

However, this perspective is limited and limiting; and now many scholars have come to accept that the Ottoman Empire was one of the -- not very numerous -- long-lived 'world empires' that have emerged in history. In consequence, it is of interest to view the Ottoman domain in the light of what researchers in other sub-disciplines of history have brought out about other world empires, including the Roman, Chinese, and Mughal varieties. When we take the social histories of these empires into consideration, it becomes easier to see Ottoman artisans not merely as the prey of state building projects and early modern capitalism in the Mediterranean world. Rather, with some good fortune, we may better understand what these craftspeople had in common with their colleagues working in diverging political contexts. Put differently, we will become more sceptical about 'Ottoman exceptionalism' (biz bize benzeriz), a perspective that has characterized many Ottomanists over the decades and permitted the virtual idolatry of 'the state' still common in a large part of the historiography.¹ In the present study, the change of perspective has become possible thanks to a focus on the Mughal Empire, not least because of the impressive English-language bibliography with which our Indianist colleagues have supplied us.

However, there is a problem of geographical delimitation, as the Mughal Empire in Akbar's time (r. 1556–1605), encompassed Northern and Central India, while under his descendant Aurangzeb (r. 1668–1707), only a small region at the tip of the peninsula remained outside of the imperial borders. While a choice for one or another border seems straightforward, a major complication arises from the fact that during the reign of Aurangzeb, Shivaji Bhonsle, who died in 1680, established a power base against the Mughals in Central India, and after gaining recognition as a member of the governing military caste (Kshatriya), even assumed the crown as a king. Thus, Aurangzeb's control over certain supposedly conquered sections of India was under dispute, and villagers and townspeople, artisans included, must have needed to manoeuvre between commanders supporting one or the other side. However, to simplify matters, for our purposes, the Mughal Empire will encompass Northern and Central India, disregarding the territories briefly conquered by Aurangzeb. As for the Ottoman borders, we will take the extension reached under Selim II (r. 1566-1575) as our norm, making allowance for the decentralization affecting the Ottoman lands from the mid-1600s onward.

Within these parameters, we attempt to bring out the similarities and differences between the artisan worlds of the Ottoman and Mughal Empires, although surely, the time for a formal comparison has not yet arrived. As a model, I have been inspired by the study of Peter Bang, who has used Mughal economic history to make sense of the often hard-to-interpret data concerning the Roman economy.² As my hypothesis, I would propose that in empires in whose economies market transactions were crucial, we might expect certain similarities in socio-political structures. At the

¹ 'We resemble [no one but] ourselves'.

² Peter Bang, *The Roman Bazaar: A comparative study of trade and markets in a tributary empire* (Cambridge: CUP, 2008).

same time, Indian social organization differed strongly from its Ottoman counterpart; and in consequence, similarities are especially remarkable because they appear in such differing contexts.

At the present stage, it is prudent to avoid all speculation as to how the similarities in artisan life observed here may have come into being. Historians will need to avoid the temptation of deriving them from a presumed Turkic, Iranian, or Central Asian tradition of imperial rule. When dealing with state ideology, the legitimization of imperial control, or the regulation of succession to the position of monarch, we can trace certain continuities over time and place. On the other hand, scholars apparently know so little about the practices of mediaeval artisans in Samarkand, Isfahan or Kabul that if we try to explain the genesis of artisan practices in the Ottoman or Mughal worlds, we risk drawing upon an 'unknown phenomenon' to explain another 'phenomenon that remains largely unknown'. This study therefore treats the period of two hundred years, which begins in the late sixteenth century, and ends in the late eighteenth, as a separate entity, without relating it to what may have happened before that time. In any case, dealing with the artisans of two different social and political worlds, whose documentation presents formidable challenges is difficult enough without compounding the problem by speculation.

Our investigation focuses on the following topics: we begin with a discussion of the attempts of Indianists and Ottomanists to picture 'the economy' of the relevant regions during the sixteenth century, and the place that artisans must have occupied in it. As a second topic, craft workshops producing manufactured goods for the ruler and his palace, both in the Ottoman world and in India, occupy centre stage, followed by the difficult question of artisan remuneration. Payments received by artisans are so difficult to deal with because both in India and in the Ottoman world, the data are very 'spotty', and conclusions therefore have to remain quite general. Next, after briefly introducing the role of sub-castes in the Indian craft context and of artisan guilds in the Ottoman world, we proceed to a treatment of the 'moral economy', which in different yet comparable ways, functioned both in early modern Central India and in the core provinces of the Ottoman Empire as well. To conclude the discussion, we show how artisan migrations might serve the families concerned in protecting their livelihoods, even if the respective governmental apparatuses had quite different priorities.

[Dr Roy Fischel \(SOAS, University of London\): 'Turkomans of the Deccan: Historical Memory and Political Identity in Early Modern India'](#)

Migration to the Deccan Plateau in India has been central to state formation in the region. From the very beginning of Muslim rule in the Deccan in the early fourteenth century, elite migrants from West and Central Asia joined state service in growing numbers, occupying central positions in local courts. Based on their migratory background, these elites were often referred to as a monolith, treated as a collective of "Foreigners". The migrants, however, were far from homogenous, and included Iranians, Afghans, Arabs, and others. A somewhat confusing element among the migratory groups were the Turkomans. Relatively few in numbers, they were mostly side-lined by those identified as Iranians. Yet, Turkomans founded the two most successful dynasties of the early modern Deccan, namely the 'Adil Shahis of Bijapur and the Qutb Shahis of Golkonda. This paper examines the complex position of the two dynasties vis-à-vis their Turkoman past. This legacy was not only foreign to the locality, but also disadvantageous in relation to other migrants. Yet, as they were operating within a cultural environment that was highly sensitive to origins and identity frames, rulers of these dynasties could not conceal their origins. Rather, they utilised their background to a certain degree, but did not turn it into a central theme in their political imagination. Such uneasy relations with the past shed light on the ways in which legitimacy and political identity were constructed under the rulers of early modern minor dynasties, who lacked universal claims or illustrious origins.

Prof. Sunil Kumar (University of Delhi): 'When the Turks became the Servitors of Islam: acculturation in the fourteenth century Delhi Sultanate'.

While Sultanate historians sometimes draw attention to processes of acculturation, they are usually guided by relatively simple foreign-indigenous / Muslim-Hindu binaries, a reading that erases both, the complex composition of 'Muslims' in the Delhi Sultanate and the history of acculturation through which 'rustic' Turk and Mongol émigrés were gradually Persianised and Islamicised. A large number of Turks and Mongols immigrated at the turn of the thirteenth century into the Delhi Sultanate where the Persian chroniclers of the day deprecatingly referred to them as *nau-Musalman*, deliberately ignoring that the background of the Khalaji and Tughluq dynasts was amidst a body of people of a similar profile. This paper studies two ends of the fourteenth century, the reign of Ghiyas al-Din Tughluq (1320-24) when there was considerable immigration of frontiersmen into Delhi, and the reign of Firuz Tughluq (1351-88), a monarch eulogized for his piety and great conformity to the textual traditions of Islam. My paper considers the new capitals constructed by the two monarchs, Ghiyas al-Din's Tughluqabad (still largely extant) and the ways in which its organization and planning could have communicated hierarchy and power familiar to a Turkic and Mongol political cohort. It also reads structures from the largely destroyed palace of Firuzabad of Firuz Shah Tughluq which redeploys a similar iconography to communicate a Perso-Islamic world, distant from the frontier world to which the Tughluqs had once belonged. While Persian chroniclers often reconfigured protagonists as Muslim heroes, the evidence of the Tughluqabad and Firuzabad more clearly suggests the ways in which two monarchs imagined their realms as belonging to a contiguous but different sense of order.

Dr George Malagaris (University of Oxford): 'What is a raid? Ghaznavids and Seljuqs in war and statecraft'.

The early Ghaznavids and Seljuqs, contemporaries and adversaries in medieval Central Asia, expanded east and west, establishing themselves as the dominant powers through Iran and across the central band of Eurasia. Turkic and Muslim alike, yet irreducibly different, they went on campaign with separate means, motives, and results. The urban and steppe mixtures in their armies were fundamental to their mode of conquest, whether by raiding, occupying, or administering territories. In their formal and external aspects, the distinctions are striking: the use of fortresses or encampments, the numbers and types of units, and the capacity and will to hold land. Yet after these distinctions have been realised, others appear in politics and culture: Persianate and Islamic traditions upheld by the Ghaznavids as integral to their rule were little appreciated, let alone followed, by the early Seljuqs. These subjective elements, particularly in terms of the literary culture of Islam, may show their greatest distinction, despite the reputation of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazna as against Persian tradition. Indeed, the fundamental difference between these two Central Asian Turko-Persian polities may be their perception of Islam. This paper will compare their conquests and describe their varying experiences of those events.

Dr Richard McClary (University of Edinburgh): 'When Brick meets Stone: Turko-Iranian brick architecture and its interaction with the lithic traditions of India and Anatolia'.

At around the same time, in the late 12th and early 13th centuries, the brick tradition of building Islamic architecture, which had developed in Iran and Central Asia in the previous three centuries, was introduced by Turko-Iranian Muslims into the indigenous lithic building traditions of Hindu India and Christian Anatolia. This paper examines specific details, including the adoption and adaptation of the arch into the previously trabeated architecture of the Hindu temple, and the integration of brick *hazar baf* patterns into the stone monuments of Anatolia. A number of similarities, both decorative and formal, can be identified by examining structures from as far afield as Divriği in Anatolia and Delhi in India. Based on fieldwork conducted across Gujarat, Haryana and Rajasthan, alongside surveyed monuments located across Anatolia and Central Asia, this wide ranging paper attempt to

take a more holistic view of the phenomenon of translating brick into stone than has been previously attempted.

Dr Benedek Peri (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest): 'Turkish Language and Literature in Late Mughal India as Reflected by a Unique Collection of Texts'.

Though the steady flow of Turkish migrants to India started as early as the 11th century hardly anything is known about the role Turkish language played during the rule of the Ghaznavids and the Delhi Sultans. It appears however that Turkish was used primarily for communication purposes, mainly in the army and in court circles. The situation seems to have changed with the advent of the Indian Timurids for whom the cultivation of and support for Turkish as a literary medium was an important component of their dynasty's cultural legacy. Pieces of data provided by contemporary sources suggest that the knowledge of Turkish including the ability both to communicate and appreciate literary works, was an inseparable part of the evolving Mughal ethos which heavily influenced the development of the concept of being "cultured" in 17th-18th century Muslim North India. Through a detailed analysis focusing on the Turkish sections of a recently discovered voluminous *majmū`a* of Persian and Turkish texts compiled somewhere in North India in the 18th century and preserved in the Oriental Collection of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, present paper endeavours to offer a glimpse at the world of "Indian Turkish" and the role it played in 18th century India.

Dr Maya Petrovich (University of Oxford): 'Merchants, Young Heroes and Caliphs: Reading Mahmud Gavan'.

While the Ottoman expedition to Gujarat in 1538 has been revisited numerous times, most histories of Ottoman contacts with India start some eighty years earlier. Ever since diplomatic exchanges between Ottomans and Indian rulers attracted academic interest, the name of Mahmud Gavan has been evoked as the first Indian official to write a letter to the Ottoman court in the 1460s. This claim seems to be indisputable, although the implication that the first Indians arrived in Anatolia merely because of Gavan's commercial designs is mistaken. Similarly, his use of the term "caliph" has been misread from the perspective of 19th century Indian Muslim idealization of the Ottomans.

Mahmud Gavan, a Gilani by birth, was emblematic of his age. He participated in the flow of men between western Asia and India, having arrived in India as a horse merchant. His upbringing and reputation had already brought him lucrative offers of state employment in Khorasan and Iraq, but he decided to become involved in state matters under the Bahmanid sultan Humayun (1458-61), who bestowed upon him the title of the *mâlik al-tudjdjâr*. It was under the young Muhammad III (1463-82) that he also became the *vazîr-i saltanat* in 1466, de facto putting him in charge of the Bahmanid state.

By war and diplomacy with Muslim and Hindu neighbours, Gavan extended the Bahmanid influence across the Deccan. Yet his main claim to fame is his manual of writing, the *Manâzir al-Inshâ'*, highly respected by Katib Çelebi. This presentation will focus on a rereading of that work, as well as the *Riyâd al-Inshâ'*, a collection of Gavan's personal letters to the luminaries of his time. Instead of merely highlighting his commercial activities and his tragic ending, as most authors have done, the presentation will seek to place his correspondence with Ottomans within a wider context of the Deccan and the Islamic world in the 15th century.

Asst. Prof. Amanda Phillips (University of Virginia): 'An overview of the textile trade between the Ottoman Empire and India, 1450-1800'.

The textile trade between South Asia and the Ottoman Empire endured over the long durée, but unsurprisingly changed over the centuries between about 1450 and 1800. This presentation gives an overview of the trade, mostly focusing on cottons, silks, and mixed fabrics from the subcontinent which ended up in the central cities of Istanbul, Bursa, and Edirne and their larger regions. Archival

documents, extant textiles, and narrative sources, as well as manuscript painting and other visual media help show several different aspects of the textiles' consumption by Ottoman subjects.

From colourful *çit* (chintz) to heavy-weight compound silks to airy gauzes to textiles made of silk wefts and cotton warps, some Indian fabrics competed directly with their local counterparts, while others found no Ottoman equivalent. The formal qualities of the textiles comprise a critical part of the conversation about imports and their uses. Changing fashions in dress and furnishing textiles played a role, and this paper argues tentatively that shifts in the styles of South Asian textiles and in the larger textile trade c. 1700 impacted on the production of Ottoman textiles themselves.