ASSIGNMENT No. 2

Q. 1   Explain problems we faced by Sultan Khizr Khan Saiyyid when he ascended the throne of Delhi?

On the death of Muhammad Tughluq, the throne of Delhi was occupied by Daulat khan Lodhi, who governed the country for about two years. In 1414, he was defeated by Khizar Khan, who was governor of Multan at the time of Taimur's invasion and had been appointed by him as a governor of Lahore. After the defeat of Dualat Khan, Khizar Khan became the king of Delhi. For nearly fifteen years after the invasion of Timur there was no regular Sultan's government at Delhi. From 1414 to 1450 A.D. Khizar Khan and his three successors administered Delhi and the territory adjoining to it. The dynasty founded by him is known as the Sayyid dynasty, but his claims to be the descendent of the Prophet of Arabia were dubious and rested chiefly on its casual recognition by the famous saint Jalal-ud-din of Uch. Secondly, Khizar khan was a pious, generous and truthful man these are the excellences of the Prophet's character that was the reason he was considered as Sayyid. The history of the period is a record of numerous raids to collect revenue or tribute and of futile attempts to subjugate the kingdom of Jaunpur in the east.

Khizar Khan's rule united the Punjab with Delhi. In his seven year rule Khizar Khan attacked the Raja of Etawah four times. Those of Katehar and Gwaliar thrice and several fief holders once or twice. The Khokars from the north Punjab frequently raided the territory of Delhi, he suppressed them. He also defeated the Rajput Etawah and compelled him submit again to the Delhi government. Apart from that, in 1421, the rebels of Mewat were crushed and the ruler of Gwaliar was forced to pay the tribute. He also crushed the rebellions of Khar, Kambila and Sakit in 1414 A.D. Khizar Khan died on his way to Delhi from Gwaliar. After his death his son Mubarak Khan ascended the throne of Delhi.

The Sayyid Dynasty was founded by Khizr Khan, who was the governor of Multan and Timur's deputy in India. This dynasty ruled for 37 years from 1414 to 1451 AD by four rulers- Khizr Khan, Mubarak, Muhammad Shah, Alam Shah. Here, we are giving a complete detailed summary on the Sayyid Dynasty of Delhi Sultanate.

A contemporary writer Yahya Sirhindi mentions in his Takhrikh-i-Mubarak Shahi that Khizr Khan was a descendant of Muhammad, but his conclusion was based only on a testimony of the saint Syed Jalal-ud-Din Bukhari of Uchh Sharif. Malik Mardan Daulat, the Governor of Multan, adopted Khizr Khan's father, Malik Sulaiman, as his son. Sulaiman succeeded Malik Shaikh, another son of Malik Mardan, to the governorship. After his death, Firuz Shah Tughlaq appointed Khizr Khan as governor. But in 1395, he was expelled from Multan by Sarang Khan, brother of Mallu Iqbal Khan. He fled to Mewat and later joined Timur. It is believed that before his departure, Timur appointed Khizr Khan his viceroy at Delhi although he could only establish his control over Multan, Dipalpur and parts of Sindh. Soon he started his campaign and defeated Mallu Iqbal Khan. After defeating Daulat Khan Lodi, he entered Delhi victoriously on 6 June 1414. After his accession to the throne, Khizr Khan appointed Malik-us-Sharq Tuhfa as his wazir and he was given the title of Taj-ul-Mulk and he remained in office until 1421. The fief of Saharanpur was given to Sayyid Salim. Abdur Rahman received the fiefs of Multan and Fatehpur. In 1414, an army led by Taj-ul-Mulk was sent to suppress the rebellion of Har

Singh, the Raja of Katehar. Raja fled to the forests but finally was compelled to surrender and agree to pay tributes in future. In July, 1416 an army led by Taj-ul-Mulk was sent to Bayana and Gwalior where it plundered the peasants in the name of realizing the amount equivalent to the tributes to be paid.[3] In 1417, Khizr Khan obtained permission from Shah Rukh to have his own name also suffixed to that of Shah Rukh.[4] In 1418, Har Singh revolted again but was defeated completely by Taj-ul-Mulk.

Khizr Khan (1414- 1421 A.D.)

1. He was the founder of Sayyid Dynasty

2. He did not swear any royal title.

3. He was the Governor of Multan.

4. He took advantage of the disordered situation in India after Timur's invasion.

5. In 1414 A.D. he occupied the throne of Delhi.

6. He brought parts of Surat, Dilapur, and Punjab under his control.

7. But he lost Bengal, Deccan, Gujarat, Jaunpur, Khandesh and Malwa.

8. In 1421 he died.

9. Mubarak Shah Khizr Khan's son succeeded him.

Q. 2   Write down a comprehensive note on the political philosophy of the Sultans of Delhi.

Delhi sultanate, principal Muslim sultanate in north India from the 13th to the 16th century. Its creation owed much to the campaigns of Muʿizz al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Sām (Muḥammad of Ghūr; brother of Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn of Ghūr) and his lieutenant Quṭb al-Dīn Aibak between 1175 and 1206 and particularly to victories at the battles of Taraōrī in 1192 and Chandawar in 1194.

The Ghūrid soldiers of fortune in India did not sever their political connection with Ghūr (now Ghowr, in present Afghanistan) until Sultan Iltutmish (reigned 1211–36) had made his permanent capital at Delhi, had repulsed rival attempts to take over the Ghūrid conquests in India, and had withdrawn his forces from contact with the Mongol armies, which by the 1220s had conquered Afghanistan. Iltutmish also gained firm control of the main urban strategic centres of the North Indian Plain, from which he could keep in check the refractory Rajput chiefs. After Iltutmish's death, a decade of factional struggle was followed by nearly 40 years of stability under Ghiyāth al-Dīn Balban, sultan in 1266–87. During this period Delhi remained on the defensive against the Mongols and undertook only precautionary measures against the Rajputs. The power of the Delhi sultanate in north India was shattered by the invasion (1398–99) of Turkic conqueror Timur (Tamerlane), who sacked Delhi itself. Under the Sayyid dynasty (c. 1414–51) the sultanate was reduced to a country power continually contending on an equal footing with other petty Muslim and Hindu principalities. Under the Lodī (Afghan) dynasty (1451–1526), however, with large-scale immigration from Afghanistan, the Delhi sultanate partly recovered its hegemony, until the Mughal leader Bābur destroyed it at the First Battle of Panipat on April 21, 1526. After 15 years of Mughal rule, the Afghan Shēr Shah of Sūr reestablished the sultanate in Delhi, which fell again in 1555 to Bābur's son and successor, Humāyūn, who died in January 1556. At the Second

Battle of Panipat (November 5, 1556), Humāyūn's son Akbar definitively defeated the Hindu general Hemu, and the sultanate became submerged in the Mughal Empire.

The Delhi sultanate made no break with the political traditions of the later Hindu period—namely, that rulers sought paramountcy rather than sovereignty. It never reduced Hindu chiefs to unarmed impotence or established an exclusive claim to allegiance. The sultan was served by a heterogeneous elite of Turks, Afghans, Khaljīs, and Hindu converts; he readily accepted Hindu officials and Hindu vassals. Threatened for long periods with Mongol invasion from the northwest and hampered by indifferent communications, the Delhi sultans perforce left a large discretion to their local governors and officials.

Q. 3   The Muslim rulers in India paid special attention to the development of trade and commerce in India, analyze.

As for the Hindus, their social life was relatively unchanged, although during military operations they suffered losses in property and life. Even when the harsh laws of war gave place to peace, the Hindus were burdened by certain handicaps. The loss of sovereignty itself was a major loss, especially in the case of the Brahmans and the Kshatriyas. The sultanate period was more difficult for them than any other period of Muslim rule. The liberal and conciliatory policy adopted by Muhammad ibn Qasim had given place to a new relationship, and the integration of the Hindu population into the political and administrative structure was not to come about until later. Muslim conquest of Sind and Multan and even of Lahore and Peshawar had not led to the same tensions and conflicts which followed their domination over the heart of Aryavarta. Even the indirect effect of the Mongol invasion of Muslim lands led to a stiffening of attitude, as the Muslim refugees, who had suffered so much at the hands of the pagan Mongols, were not disposed to be friendly towards the non-Muslims of India.

All these factors make the sultanate a period of tensions and conflicts. The theory of Turkish racial superiority which held sway during the rule of early Slave kings was not favorable to the employment of Hindus—or even indigenous Muslims—in high civil and military appointments, as was the case under the Arabs in Sind or even under the Ghaznavids. It would, however, be wrong to think that the Hindus were completely excluded from service. In rural areas the Hindu landed aristocracy still occupied a position of prestige and power, and the muqaddams, the chaudharis, and the khuts had important roles in the administration. The land system was not altered, and the Hindu peasant must have led much the same kind of life as he did before the coming of the Muslims. Trade and commerce also remained in Hindu control, for to the Muslim invader from Central Asia, the complex Hindu banking system would be unfamiliar and unworkable. The Hindu merchant might be heavily assessed, or, during a war have his movable goods confiscated, but he was too much a part of the intricate commercial structure to be easily replaced. The money-lender thrived under the new, as under the old, dispensation. We hear, for example, about the large incomes of the Muslim grandees and the splendor of their households, but Barani leaves us in no doubt that most, if not all, borrowed from the Hindu money lenders. "The maliks and the khans and the nobles of those days were constantly in debt, owing to their excessive generosity, expenditures, and beneficence. Except in their public halls no gold or silver could be found, and

they had no savings on account of their excessive liberality. The wealth and riches of the Multani merchants and the shahs [money lenders] were from the interest realized from the old maliks and nobles of Delhi, who borrowed money from them to the maximum limit, and repaid their debts along with additional gifts from their [lands]. Whenever a malik or a khan held a banquet and invited notables, his agents would rush to the Multanis and shahs, sign documents, and borrow money with interest." That the money lenders recovered their money along with interest (forbidden under Islamic law), is an indication of how vital they were to the system. Even the powerful Ala-ud-din Khalji who, seeing the danger to his government from the power of the Hindu rural chiefs, made a determined attempt to curb their power and reduce their wealth, found it necessary to make Hindu traders the main instrument of his price control measures.

Hindus occupied an important role in foreign, as in domestic, trade, although foreign Muslim merchants, known as khurasani, also had a large share of it. The rulers of the coastal kingdoms in the Deccan accorded to foreign merchants certain extra-territorial rights and special concessions, in consideration of the heavy taxes which they paid to the treasury. An organized class of brokers handled the business on the coast and inside the country. The imports consisted mainly of certain luxury items for the upper classes, and a general supply of all kinds of horses and mules, in which India was deficient. Hindus had never attached any importance to cavalry, but seeing the success of the Muslim horsemen, they started to substitute horses for elephants. The exports included large quantities of food-grains and cloth. Among the agricultural products were wheat, millet, rice, pulses, oilseeds, scents, medicinal herbs, and sugar. Some of the countries around the Persian Gulf depended on the subcontinent for their entire food supply. Cotton cloth and other textiles were especially important items of export, particularly to Southeast Asia and East Africa, although some reached Europe. They were carried by the Arabs to the Red Sea and from there found their way to Damascus and Alexandria, from where they were distributed to the Mediterranean countries and beyond.

Many industries of considerable size and importance developed during this period, the most important of which were textiles, various items of metal work, sugar, indigo, and in certain localities, paper. The Indian textile industry is very old, but the variety of cloth produced was originally limited. Taking advantage of the local talent, the Muslims introduced a number of fine varieties of textiles, most of which had Persian or Arabic origin. Bengal was the main center of this industry, but Gujarat rivaled it as a supplier of the export trade during the sultanate period.

Next in importance were a number of industries connected with metal work: the manufacture of swords, guns, and knives, as well as household needs such as trays and basins. Manufacture of sugar was also carried on on a fairly large scale, and in Bengal enough was produced to leave a surplus for export after meeting the local demand. Paper-making was a minor industry, of which little is known except that Delhi was the center of a considerable market.

These industries were mainly privately owned, but the government equipped and managed large-scale karkhanas, or factories, for supplying its requirements. The royal factories at Delhi sometimes employed as

many as four thousand weavers for silk alone. The example of the sultan of Delhi was followed by the rulers of the regional kingdoms, and the contribution of the state to the development of the industry was not a minor one.

In certain aspects of social life, the Hindus had virtual autonomy during the sultanate. This was in accordance with the established axiom of Islamic law that while Muslims are governed by the Shariat, non-Muslim zimmis are subject to their own laws and social organization, but it was also a product of the Indian situation. The Muslim rulers from the days of the Arab occupation of Sind accepted the right of the village and caste panchayats to settle the affairs of their community. This meant that the Hindu villages remained small autonomous republics, as they had been since ancient times, and in commerce and industry the Hindu guilds were supreme. This position continued throughout the Muslim rule, but during the sultanate, when the provincial administration had not been properly organized, Hindu autonomy outside the principal towns was particularly effective.

It is often forgotten—and Muslim court chroniclers were not anxious to mention it—that a large number of independent or quasi-independent Hindu chiefs remained after the establishment of the sultanate. Some of them were rajas, or kings; others were only petty chieftains, controlling a few villages. Many of them belonged to old families, but new principalities grew up even after the establishment of Muslim power at Delhi. Rajputs often found new kingdoms for themselves in remote, easily defended areas in Rajputana and the Himalayas. From such movements during the sultanate come also some of the large landed estates still held by Rajputs in Oudh and in Bihar. In these predominantly Hindu areas the old religion was fostered, and its cultural expressions kept alive even in the periods of greatest Islamic power.

Q. 4 The Muslim scholars played important role in the reformation of Indian society during the Sultanate period, discuss.

In the beginning, historiography in medieval India remained confined to the political history or biographical memoirs. The concept of history, soon crossed its boundaries previously restricted to the court life and entered the study of a common man's life in relation to his environment without any social distinction. Increasingly, the non-political features like the cultural impact of the Persian and Central Asian immigrants, literature and art, social and economic life also initiated an appeal to the consideration of the scholars. Thus, history is not to be merely considered as a narrative of kings and wars, but also acknowledged as a record of the activities of other categories of people including the ulema and Sufis. This concept of recognizing the significance of Süfi literature as a non-political genre of history, though took time to grow. Some of the contemporary historians, who are well acquainted with the knowledge of techniques and approaches of modem European historiography lay emphasis on the need of employing these literary compositions as an alternative source for reinterpretation of political and social history.1

The tradition of recording maljuzät, which includes the records of audiences and the question and answer sessions of notable scholars or Süfis can be traced back to the seventh century C.E., when the Khutbät (sermons) of Hadrat 'All (d. 661 C.E.), the fourth Pious Caliph were recorded and compiled by Sayyid Razi

under the title Nahj al-Baläghah in 400 A.H./1009 C.E. In the tenth century C.E., the sayings of outstanding personalities like Abü Yazld Bistämi and al-Halläj were collected posthumously in Arabic in monograph forms like the Kitäb al-Nür min Kalimät Abi Tayfür and the Akhbär al-Halläj. Similar compilations in Persian, comprising the actions and sayings of the eminent Süfis like Shaykh Abü Sa'id Fadl Allah bin Abi'I Khayr (d. 1049 C.E.) entitled the Hälät wa Sukhanän-i Shaykh Abü Said bin Abi'I Khayr al-Maihani and the Asrär al-Tawhïd fi Maqämät Abï Said written by the Shaykh's descendants more than a century after his demise.2

Islamic mysticism came to have a firm footing in India and attained its fullest development. It became a revitalizing force and a flowing current of socio-religious and religio-ethical progress as a result of teachings of a group of intellectuals. It was considered a matter of pride to introduce oneself as a disciple of a Süfi. The situation encouraged the disciples to share the anecdotes and teachings of the Süfis among the others. Consequently, writing of informal discourses and hagiographies started. Various authors have categorized the Süfi literature on different bases. Most of the historians have divided the Süfi literature into two categories based on the time period.3 The earlier period of Süfi literature (like the Kitäb al-Luma, Risälah-i-Qushayriyah, Kashf al-Mahjüb) was a 'seminal period' while the later period witnessed emergence of tadhkirahs, malfüzät and maktübät etc.

For decades scholars have remained engaged with these sources and have formulated historical writings on these aspect of the history of medieval India. However, the literal meaning of malfiiz is 'words, sayings, utterances or discourses' but it is generally used for the table-talks of Süfi saints or proceedings of their regular periodic meetings, assemblies and audiences given to the disciples and admirers popularly.4 These are a sort of dialogical compendiums indicative of the interchange and decisions on a variety of subjects, not treated necessarily in all their fullness. These are discursive rather than compact; however, some of them are arranged chronologically.5

The malfiiz literature is a category in itself that is idiosyncratic from all other varieties in its spirit, methodology and literary treatment. It works as an important vehicle to spread mystical thoughts and offers historians many insights into the socio-religious conditions which are usually not found in official chronicles.

As we have seen, Azad sympathized with those who complained about the tazkirah tradition. Tazkirahs provided too little information: they described "neither a poet's biography, nor his temperament and character"; sometimes they even went so far as to "omit the dates of his birth and death." Hali agreed, maintaining that tazkirah writers often "didn't even try" to seek out this "necessary information." Instead, they engaged in "meaningless and petty" critical discussion.[1] Nor, according to Azad, did tazkirahs shed sufficient light on each poet's achievement—on "the merits of his work, its strong and weak points, or its relationship to that of his contemporaries" (4). Moreover, tazkirahs sometimes gave an unrepresentative selection from a poet's work, so that his real qualities did not clearly appear (88-89).

Yet Azad made it plain that he considered Water of Life a "tazkirah of poets" (408), and himself a "tazkirah writer" (499). He defined his territory clearly: he decided, for example, that it was "not the task of an

Urdu tazkirah writer" to deal with what poets had written in Persian (499). Certainly the greater part of Azad's material came from tazkirahs. He also drew heavily on oral sources—just as tazkirah writers had always done. He was thus confronted by many of the same problems that other tazkirah writers had faced: accounts given by different earlier tazkirahs were contradictory (118); anecdotes were sometimes vague and poorly told and had "with regret" to be omitted (410); his cherished oral sources conflicted with one another (369). Yet even while oral sources posed special problems, they were a unique treasure of information: verses missing from poets' written volumes were often known orally, by heart, to contemporaries (230-31).

Hali praised Water of Life—tendentiously, from his stance as a modernizer—as "the first Urdu tazkirah in which the responsibilities of tazkirah writing have been carried out."[2] Scholars nowadays see Water of Life as a kind of hinge. It is both the last work on the list of classical tazkirahs—of which about sixty-eight, out of what was certainly a much larger number, are currently known to be extant—and the first modern literary history. Despite Azad's criticism of the tazkirah tradition, it is not surprising that he placed himself within the most important genre of literary record and commentary that existed in Urdu—a genre, moreover, with a long and rich history.

Like so many other Urdu genres, tazkirahs were taken over from Persian. Indeed, until about 1845 most tazkirahs of Urdu poetry were themselves written in Persian. Etymologically, tażkirah is derived from an Arabic root meaning "to mention, to remember." Historically, the literary tazkirah grows out of the ubiquitous little "notebook" (bayāẓ) that lovers of poetry carried around with them for recording verses that caught their fancy. A typical notebook would include some verses by its owner, and others by poets living and dead, both Persian and Urdu. Azad himself kept just such a private notebook; it was published some years after his death.[3] The concise two-line length of shi'rs, and the speed with which Urdu script can be written, make it possible to record such verses very conveniently and to memorize and recite them with ease. Lovers of Urdu poetry still frequently keep notebooks, and favorite verses still commonly circulate in conversation.

More serious, or more organized, students might compile notebooks devoted only to certain kinds of poetry: to the work of living poets, for example, or the finest poets, or poets from a particular city, or women poets, or poets in a certain genre. In a pre-print culture such compilations were of the greatest interest and value, for they were often the only means of preserving and disseminating poetry over time and space. There were, as we have seen, a great many occasional poets, but only a few of them were "possessors of a volume" (ṣāḤib-e dīvān)—poets who had had a substantial body of their own poetry systematically collected and arranged for dissemination in manuscript form.[4] Compilers of notebooks were thus often moved to perform a public service by sharing their work with a wider circle. With the addition of a certain amount—sometimes a very small amount—of introductory or identifying information about the poets, a notebook could become a tazkirah. Tazkirahs circulated in manuscript form, and as printing developed in North India they began to be printed as well.[5]

The tazkirahs' roots in the "notebook" tradition explain one of their most conspicuous traits: their individuality, their insouciance, the insistence of each one on defining its own approach to its own group of poets. As we might expect from their origins, the earlier ones tend to be more like anthologies, with only brief critical commentary and minimal information about the poets; later ones tend to include more extensive biographical data, anecdotal asides, and/or critical comment. But even then, they are by no means consistent: if the compiler didn't have certain information, or wasn't interested in it, he simply didn't provide it, and there was an end of the matter. After all, if a poet had composed one or two good verses, it was a valuable and enjoyable task to preserve them, even if little or nothing was known about the poet. Sometimes, in an oral culture, even the poet's pen name was lost—yet the worth of the verses themselves remained, along with the pleasure of reciting them and sharing them with others.

The tazkirahs' idiosyncrasies can be clearly seen in their various styles of organization. Although the majority had their contents arranged in alphabetical order by the first letter of each poet's pen name, this scheme was by no means universal; no fewer than twenty out of the sixty-eight extant tazkirahs adopt other arrangements. The earliest three surviving tazkirahs (including a famous one by Mīr), which were all completed around 1752, present the poets in a largely random order; as late as the mid-1830s another tazkirah (no. 29) used the same haphazard approach.[6]

Already by 1755, however, "Qā'im" Chāndpūrī had introduced in his tazkirah (no. 5) a division of poets into three chronologically defined periods: early, middle, and late. One early tazkirah (no. 7) put its poets into order according to the traditional abjad system used for chronograms. The writer of another tazkirah (no. 8) used "classes" based on chronology but divided the last class into five subgroups that he identified as follows: "leading new poets; poets of royal or noble lineage and their ministers and courtiers; poets who are local Afghan nobles and non-Afghans from nearby areas; poets who are dear friends of mine; dear friends and relatives and brothers of mine, and novices who haven't yet written much poetry but are vain enough to regard themselves as poets."[7] Mīr Ḥasan's tazkirah (no. 9) integrated both main systems, listing the poets alphabetically but then subdividing the poets within each letter into early, middle, and late. The writer of one tazkirah (no. 12) appended to his alphabetical list a separate category for his close friends; the writer of another tazkirah (no. 17) appended to his alphabetical list what was apparently his own "notebook" of three hundred favorite shi'rs, with no attributions at all.

Among the nineteenth-century tazkirahs, alphabetical organization by pen name continued to predominate. Chronological division offered the main alternative, and the scheme most commonly adopted was the tripartite early-middle-late one. One tazkirah (no. 31) that used the chronological scheme introduced it with a kind of handbook of basic poetic knowledge, including sections on Persian grammar and usage, Urdu grammar, Urdu usage, meter, the arts of discourse and poetics, and discussion of the development of the Urdu language. [8] Another (no. 37) arranged the poets as much as possible into poetic lineages starting from the three principal ustads, Mīr, Saudā, and MuṣḤafī, but then adding a large group—poets with unknown ustads—who were left

over. Another (no. 45) began with a group of verses by known poets, and then included a separate group for which the authors were not known. Another (no. 49) was divided into three parts: first an Arabic one, then a Persian one, then an Urdu one. One huge tazkirah (no. 40) aspired to be all-encompassing, dividing its 999 poets into four chronological groups.

Others prided themselves on their selectiveness: one (no. 35) confined itself to a mere twelve poets. Another (no. 43) included only verses that had as their refrain (radīf) the name of some part of the body—and arranged them in order by body part, working from "head," "mind," "hair," downward to "foot," "heels," "soles." Another (no. 54) focused only on the vāsoḵht genre. Several tazkirahs confined their attention to women poets. Two of these (nos. 52 and 62) were alphabetical, while the third and largest (no. 58) was divided into two sections: the first section contained 102 bāzārī women poets, the second 49 women poets who lived in respectable seclusion (pardah). Two other tazkirahs (nos. 59 and 59a) concerned themselves exclusively with poets from Rampur; one small one (no. 55) was divided into four "gardens," of which three were devoted to poets from Bhopal. The tradition even includes a tazkirah of Urdu poets in French (no. 34) by Garcin de Tassy, and one in English (no. 41) by Aloys Sprenger.

Enough has been said to show that tazkirah writers were a remarkably diverse and freewheeling group. This was only to be expected: since the real value of a tazkirah lay in the poetry it preserved and disseminated, the nature of the presentation was a relatively minor point, left to the personal taste of the compiler. The genre began, after all, with Mīr's brief, mostly randomly organized tazkirah Nikāt ush-shuʿarā (Fine points about the poets, 1752), which became notorious for the acerbic adjectives Mīr applied to the many poets he disliked.[9] The Garden of Poetry (1855), the last tazkirah published before the Rebellion, contained, as we have seen, extravagant praise of the emperor—yet Ṣābir allotted only a little over two pages to Ẓafar, while he devoted over eight pages of floridly humble rhetoric to his own life and career. Ṣābir also saw fit to begin his tazkirah with a record-breaking 111-page introduction: first a description of his own desperate search for an ustad; then various lengthy—but unfortunately not very coherent—accounts of the origin of the world, poetry, social organization, and so forth, drawn from Arabic, Persian, and also Hindu sources; then theoretical discussions about poetry, including his ideas about meter, rhyme, and genre.

Other tazkirah writers approached their task much more lightly. Many enjoyed the chance to display their own literary virtuosity by writing an elaborate prose full of elegantly rhyming phrases. Some, as we have seen, felt free to make special sections for their close friends and relations. Even more disarmingly, Abu'l-Ḥasan Amrullāh Illāhābādī, author of the early Taẕkirah-e masarrat afzā (The enjoyment-enhancing tazkirah, 1780), confides his fears and hopes in his introduction:

May it not happen that this cruel and powerful age should inflict on me a change in fortune, and I should forget those things that are sheltered in my heart, and that are now prepared to manifest themselves! With this thought I took courage, and made the attempt.…I beseech the fair-minded and enlightened reader: if you stroll through this garden, please don't wound its flowers with the fingernails of nit-picking. Because arrangement and

9

pruning (iṣlāḤ) are difficult, while tearing apart and scattering are not hard. This tazkirah is a gift—one fit for young poets, to give them joy.

The author shows this candidly personal touch throughout. He tells an occasional corny joke; he confesses ruefully how a dancing girl outdid him in repartee; he complains of a fellow tazkirah writer who won't share material; and he devotes fully eight affectionate pages to his brother, the poet "Ḥasrat." His tazkirah lives up to its title: it is both enjoyable and full of joy.

For our present purposes, one tazkirah in particular, An Elegant Encounter (Ḳhush maʿrikah-e zebā) (no. 37) by Saʿādat Ḳhān "Nāṣir," deserves a closer look. It is one of the largest tazkirahs, with 809 poets; its pre-Rebellion date (1846), its focus on Lucknow, its unique arrangement according to poetic lineages, all make it a useful cross-check on Water of Life. It proves to be a very consistent supporting witness. Whatever may be the historical reliability of any individual anecdote, Nāṣir's underlying assumptions about the literary life, and about the roles and activities that constitute it, are manifestly the same as Azad's.

Q. 5   Explain the term court histories and also analyze their strengths and weaknesses.

Judicial restraint, a procedural or substantive approach to the exercise of judicial review. As a procedural doctrine, the principle of restraint urges judges to refrain from deciding legal issues, and especially constitutional ones, unless the decision is necessary to the resolution of a concrete dispute between adverse parties. As a substantive one, it urges judges considering constitutional questions to grant substantial deference to the views of the elected branches and invalidate their actions only when constitutional limits have clearly been violated. Compare judicial activism.

In U.S. federal courts, several doctrines operate to promote procedural restraint. Federal courts will not hear suits pursuing generalized grievances or seeking abstract legal guidance, and this aspect of restraint is linked to the view of courts as institutions designed to resolve disputes rather than to promulgate legal norms. (By contrast, in some other countries [e.g., Germany] and some American states, courts regularly decide legal issues in the absence of adversary proceedings.) Similarly, the doctrine of ripeness prevents plaintiffs from seeking judicial relief while a threatened harm is merely conjectural, and the doctrine of mootness prevents judges from deciding cases after a dispute has concluded and legal resolution will have no practical effect.

Even if cases may properly be heard in federal court in the United States, judicial restraint offers limiting procedural devices. The canon of constitutional avoidance directs courts to decide constitutional questions only as a last resort. Thus, if a case may be decided on multiple grounds, judges should prefer one that allows them to avoid a constitutional issue. The canon of constitutional doubt advises courts to construe statutes so as to avoid constitutional questions. If two readings of a statute are possible, and one raises doubt about the statute's constitutionality, the other should be preferred.

Last, if a constitutional issue must be faced, a restrained judge will presume the constitutionality of government action and strike it down only if the constitutional violation is clear. Restrained judges are also less willing to overturn the precedents of prior judicial decisions.

Judicial restraint counsels judges to be cautious in enforcing their views of the meaning of the Constitution. It does not tell them how to arrive at those views, and it thus has no necessary connection to any particular method of constitutional interpretation. Arguments that a particular method of interpretation produces greater restraint are usually actually arguments that the method produces greater constraint on judges, leaving them less freedom to decide cases on the basis of their policy preferences.

Judicial restraint has a long history in American legal theory and case law. U.S. Supreme Court decisions as early as Fletcher v. Peck (1810) state that judges should strike down laws only if they "feel a clear and strong conviction" of unconstitutionality. Early scholars also endorsed the idea; one notable example is Harvard law professor James Bradley Thayer (1831–1902), who observed that a legislator might vote against a law because he believed it unconstitutional but nonetheless, if he later became a judge, properly vote to uphold it on the grounds of restraint.

The general effect of judicial restraint is to allow the legislature and executive greater freedom to formulate policy. Its political valence has thus varied depending on the relative positions of the Supreme Court and the elected branches. In the first half of the 20th century, judicial restraint was generally invoked by liberals in the hopes of preventing courts from striking down Progressive and New Deal economic regulation. Supreme Court justices associated with progressive restraint include Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. (served 1902–32), Louis Brandeis (1916–39), and Felix Frankfurter (1939–62).

In the second half of the century, during the tenure of Chief Justice Earl Warren (1953–69), the Supreme Court began taking positions more liberal than the states and the federal government, and restraint became a common conservative political theme. Justices endorsing restraint during this period included John Marshall Harlan (1955–71) and Frankfurter, who continued to endorse the principle even as its politics shifted around him.

As with its political valence, judicial restraint does not have a consistent normative value. In general, restraint is typically considered desirable on the grounds that in a democracy elected officials should play the primary role in making policy. Courts that are insufficiently deferential to elected legislators and executives may usurp that role and unduly constrain democratic self-governance. On the other hand, protection of constitutional rights, particularly those of minorities, demands a certain degree of judicial assertiveness. A restrained court may decline to interfere with serious infringements on such rights, and indeed some of the Supreme Court's most reviled decisions—including Plessy v. Ferguson (1896), in which the court upheld racial segregation of railroad cars and established the "separate-but-equal" doctrine, and Korematsu v. United States (1944), in which the court upheld race-based discrimination against Japanese Americans during World War II—fit this pattern.