INTRODUCTION

SULTANATE ARCHITECTURE*

PRE-ISLAMIC TRADITION

At the time of the Muslim conquest, India was a land with a rich artistic tradition: temples and monasteries abounded, Hindu shrines of all descriptions and sizes were found by almost every hillside and spring, cities were rich and well-planned, Hindu rulers had built for themselves forts and palaces, and the remains of earlier phases of Indian civilization—such as the Hindu, Buddhist and Jain cave-temples, and the Buddhist *stūpas* and monasteries—were numerous. Architecture was characteristically of stone, its construction derived from timber prototypes: beams and lintels were supported on columns or brackets, and roofs tended to a stepped pyramidal shape, though having been built in diminishing horizontal courses. Domical shapes were known, often carried on octagonal bases, but were often solid and in any case had little structural affinity with the true voussoir-built dome. The northern temples usually had curvilinear towers, again often solid; these, and some of the domical forms, had a characteristic crowning feature which later became part of the Indian Islamic dome decoration, a ribbed ring known as *āmalaka* (from the fruit it resembles, the Emblic Myrobalan, *Phyllanthus emblica*) surmounted by a pot-shaped moulding, the *kalaśa* (lit. ‘water-jar’); to these a base of stone foliations in the form of lotus-petals might be added. The entire ornamental feature was on occasions supported by ribs on the curvilinear towers, and it has been suggested that at least part of the origin of ribbed domes in India is to be found in this device. The arch is not known at all as a structure, and only rarely as a decorative form; but recesses used freely on both internal and external walls lead to a proliferation of vertical lines and to unnecessary horizontal plinths and mouldings. Window-openings were rare: the interior of the Hindu temple was poorly lighted, its kernel being the secret shrine of an idol god whose mysteries were known only to a few initiated priests and were not for public display. The exterior, however, was as luxuriant and prolix as

* “Hind, vii. Architecture,” *EI*, III, 440–8.

the interior was esoteric and recondite, for all its surfaces were covered with a profusion of exuberant sculpture of iconographic significance, in which the human form preponderated. Free-standing statuary was also known, with the human form again dominant; but frequent also were the vehicles and attendants of the Hindu gods, especially Shiva's bull, and also the *linga*, the representation of the phallus as the generative principle of the world.

EARLIEST ISLAMIC ARCHITECTURE

There is as yet insufficient archaeological evidence of the first Islamic buildings on Indian soil which must have been produced by the conquest of Sindh in the 8th century, although excavation at present being undertaken at Bhambor (Pakistan) and elsewhere may eventually reveal the site of Daybul. The buildings after the 12th century conquest of the north, however, show the Muslims' reaction to indigenous building very plainly; for the traditions of the idol-temples, with their plethora of florid figure representation, their gloom and secrecy, and above all the nature of the worship they implied, were not only anathema to Islam but were its direct antithesis.

The earliest phase of Muslim building is in Delhi, and is here represented by the re-use of pillaged material from Hindu and Jain temples; destruction of the religious buildings of the enemy is known, of course, in many religions other than Islam, and indeed in India there is more than one record of a Hindu king doing just this to his neighbour's lands. Reutilization of the pillaged material is a feature of the initial phase of Muslim occupation in many regions of India, for example, at Ajmer and Jalor in Rajasthan; Bharoch, Cambay (Khambayat) and Patan in Gujarat; Jaunpur; Bijapur, Daulatabad and Warangal in the Deccan; Gaur (Lakhnauti), Pandua and Tribeni in Bengal; Dhar and Mandu in Malwa; and many other sites. The first example, the Masjid Quwwat al-Islām at Delhi, is in fact built on a temple plinth, and some 27 temples were pillaged to provide columns, walls, roofing materials, and paving; sculptured figures were mutilated or were so set in walls that the unworked sides of the stones were all that could be seen. This mosque was at first a plain enclosure, but in 595/1199, eight years after its foundation, a large *maqsūra* screen was erected between the western *liwān* and the courtyard, and the arch appears for the first time: but these arches are corbelled out, not voussoired, and it appears that the work

was done by Hindu artisans working under general Muslim direction and as yet having no mastery over the alien architectonic forms; moreover, the courtyard side of the *maqṣūra* is covered with carving, mostly typical Hindu floral motifs and ornaments, but also some bandeaux of *naskh* calligraphy, in such a way as to suggest that local workmanship was being employed. In the south-east corner of the mosque buildings the minaret known as the *Quṭb Mīnār* presents a stylistic contrast, as its tapering fluted storeys develop the polygonal outline of the *mīnārs* at Ghazni (Afghanistan) which must be its immediate prototype, and features of typically Hindu derivation are almost entirely absent.

The extension of the *Quwwat al-Islām* mosque and the first completion of the *mīnār* were carried out by Iltutmish in the early 13th century, and to his reign belong the *Arhā'ī dīn kā Jhōmprā* mosque at Ajmer, his own tomb of c. 632/1235, and his son's tomb of 629/1231, the earliest monumental tomb in India (there are earlier dated tombstones, as at Hansi); also minor buildings at Delhi and Badaun (the *Jāmi' Maṣjid* has been so much repaired and rebuilt that scarcely any of Iltutmish's fabric is visible), at Bayana, and at Nagaur. In none of these buildings is there a true arch or dome, although all the masonry has well dressed surfaces, often elaborately carved. The tomb of Iltutmish's son, *Nāṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd*, stands within an octagonal cell which seems to be the earliest use of the octagon in Muslim India; it appears next as the phase of transition of Iltutmish's own square tomb, to support, presumably, a dome of which there is now no trace (and which, one must imagine, was also corbelled and not *voussoiré*). In the latter tomb the octagon is formed by simple corbelled squinch arches across each corner. These early buildings are of so heterogeneous and, often, of so makeshift a nature that there is little of a coherent style about them. The buildings of the emperor Balban, similarly, are few and largely uninteresting, except for the significant appearance of the true *voussoiré* arch in his tomb, now a mere unprepossessing lump of decaying masonry.

THE DELHI SULTANATE

With the *Khaljī* dynasty, however, a distinct if short-lived style appears, the keynote of which is provided by 'Alā' al-Dīn's southern doorway into the *Maṣjid Quwwat al-Islām* complex and known as the 'Alā'ī *Darwāza*. This, like other examples of the style, is built with specially quarried stone and not improvised from Hindu materials; its chief

characteristic is the shape of the arch, which is voussoired and of the pointed horseshoe shape and, in the case of external arches, has on the intrados a fringe of conventionalized stone spear-heads. The masonry is well finished and jointed, decoration in the form of bandeaux of calligraphy and a running merlon-like ornament being now more prominent than the diaper and rosette patterns in basso relievo with which the earlier builders were wont to cover entire walls. At the 'Alā'ī Darwāza, but not in the other examples of Khaljī work, the entire surfaces are so treated, and in addition show the use of white marble bandeaux of inscriptions, pilasters and architraves. Works of similar style exist at Delhi (the so-called Jamā'at Khāna mosque at the shrine of Nizām al-Dīn Auliya³) and Bayana; but other buildings of the Khaljī period are found as far afield as Jalor in Rajasthan, at Bharoch, Cambay, Patan and Siddhpur in Gujarat, at Bhilsa in Malwa, in Daulatabad in the northern Deccan, and elsewhere, many of these incorporating much pillaged temple material but showing also many of the characteristics mentioned above, and most significant in pointing out the expansion of this early Sultanate style.

Under the Tughluq dynasty the Delhi empire was greatly extended, and with the expansion came the spread of the Delhi style of all parts of that empire. Of the works of the first ruler, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq, there are insufficient remains to show how early the Tughluq traits developed: besides the ruins of his capital city, Tughluqābād, only his own tomb. But a major work for which he was responsible before his accession to the Delhi throne is the mausoleum of the saint Rukn-i 'Ālam at Multan (Pakistan), originally intended as his own tomb. Some features of this, especially the batter of the walls and the sloping corner turrets, are reflected in the walls of Tughluqābād and in the strong batter of Tughluq's tomb; and perhaps the profile of the dome also is closer to the pointed Multan model than to the shallow domes of the 'Alā'ī Darwāza and the Jamā'at Khāna of the preceding dynasty. The characteristic Multani features of raised tilework and wooden structural courses, described below when the Panjab style is considered, are however absent in the extant Delhi examples; nor is the octagonal shape retained. Tughluq's son Muḥammad b. Tughluq shortly after his accession conceived the grandiose idea of forming a second capital at Daulatabad and transporting there the elite population of Delhi, and the necessary services. The old Hindu fort, the former Devagiri, at the new capital was much extended, and it seems likely that the Khaljī mosque there was modified at this time since its rear wall has tapering

angle turrets, although its interior arrangements seem undisturbed. Muḥammad's occupation of Daulatabad was only for about five years, after which he returned to Delhi, where most of his building projects were carried out. His administration seems to have impoverished the royal treasury, and the fine stonework of earlier reigns almost disappears and is replaced by cheaper material, plaster over a rubble core; but, from the sudden appearance in the 14th century of buildings in the Deccan which are obviously close to the earlier Delhi styles, it is to be supposed that many of the artisans taken to Daulatabad drifted away from that centre and formed other allegiances: certainly the earliest Bahmanī tombs at Gulbarga would support this view. Muḥammad b. Tughluq's royal palaces at Delhi, the Bijay Mandal and the Hazār Sutūn, are now in too ruined a state to permit of certain conclusions as to architectural style; the majority of the remains of his period in Delhi are in fact more commonplace works: the fort walls of 'Adilābād and Jahānpanāh, and the interesting sluice or water-regulator called Sāt Pulāh. The only significant innovation is to be found in the Bijay Mandal remains: the earliest Indian example of intersecting vaulting. Some ceramic fragments are known from the 'Adilābād excavations.

Under Muḥammad's nephew Fīrūz Shāh Tughluq the building art received an enthusiastic patron. Not only did he build extensively on his own account, but he arranged for the renovation or restoration of many of the monuments of his predecessors. But a strict economy had now to be practised, and plans and costings for each projected undertaking came first under the scrutiny of the *dīwān-i wizāra*. Red sandstone and marble were no longer used, and in Delhi the favourite materials were the local quartzite for columns, jambs, arches and reveals, with the other elements built of compact plaster, usually whitewashed, over a random rubble core. Ornament is generally reduced to a minimum, and where it exists it is more usually of moulded plaster than of carved stone. The sombre and ascetic effect of this architecture produced under conditions of financial stringency is in marked contrast to the exuberance of plastic ornament of the preceding regimes, and was certainly foreign to the instincts of the traditional Indian craftsman. But aspects of the Hindu tradition are certainly found in buildings of this phase, exemplified in the use of beam-and-bracket construction for many of the openings—a main doorway tends to show a large arched opening in which a smaller opening of lintel-and-bracket construction is recessed; but this device is met with earlier in Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq's tomb—and in the use of sloping eaves (*chhajjā*) supported on corbels, which now appears for the

first time. An innovation which seems to be of extra-Indian provenance, however, is the machicolation which now appears in fortified works. There seems also to have been some experiment in the planning of mosques: the courtyards of the Sanjar mosque at Nizāmuddīn and the mosque at Khirkī village are both partially covered. Several mosques are now built on a high plinth over a *tahkhāna* storey and are approached by flights of steps, and a frequent device is the flanking of a gateway or a *mihrāb* buttress by a pair of tapering pillars; roofs now begin to show a multiplication of domes, and domed corner turrets appear in many works (those in Sulṭān Ghārī, the tomb of Iletmish's son, are most probably to be attributed to Fīrūz Tughluq's renovations). One innovation, in the mosque of Begampur, is a feature of many later styles and was probably introduced from the region of Jaunpur after Fīrūz's conquest of that region: the central bay of the façade of the western *lūwān* is occupied by a tall arched pylon which completely conceals the large central dome from the courtyard. Most of the tombs of the period are of the square type, including Fīrūz's own, but of great architectural significance is that of his *wazīr* Khān-i Jahān Tilangānī, d. 770/1368–9, which is octagonal; the tomb-chamber is surrounded by a verandah with a shallow dome-like cupola and three arched openings on each of the eight sides, continuous eaves, and a single central dome crowned by the *āmalaka* motif. The tomb is surrounded with a fortified enclosure. Other buildings of Fīrūz Tughluq are known from Jaunpur, Fathabad, where a pillar in the fort records Fīrūz's lineage, and Hisar; many of these, reflecting a stage of new conquest or refoundation, are improvisations from Hindu material, but show in addition some regional trends not apparent in the buildings of the capital: thus the now destroyed Chihil Sutūn at Jaunpur was entirely trabeate, was roofed on its upper storey with a curvilinear ribbed pyramid, and was decorated with stone stringcourses, parapets and plinth. Two buildings of the end of the Tughluq period show perhaps a reaction to the Fīrūzian austerity: the tomb of Kabīr al-Dīn Auliyā' at Delhi, a poor and half-scale copy of the tomb of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq, showing a revival of polychromatic work in red sandstone and white marble, and the Jāmi' Masjid at Irich, entirely arcuate with some good stonework, and exhibiting in its façade arches and squinches a recession of planes, a familiar device under succeeding dynasties.

The sack of Delhi by Tīmūr in 801/1398–9 left the sultanate with little resources and less prestige, and for many years the building art in the region of the capital is represented almost entirely by tombs. The

tombs of the so-called “Sayyid” rulers are octagonal, continuing the tradition of the Tilangānī tomb with structural improvements, especially in raising the springing of the dome by a tall drum; and the shallow domes over the octagonal arcade have been replaced by small pillared kiosks (*chhatrīs*, lit. ‘umbrellas’)—the beginnings of a feature which later is to characterize the architecture of many schools, including the Mughal; and the batter of the outer walls is retained. The Lōdī monuments show the gradual rehabilitation of the building art, although indeed most of these also are tombs. There is a series of monumental tombs, mostly anonymous, at various sites in the southern part of Delhi, all of a square type not previously known in the north, since all their upright lines are truly vertical and there is no batter. The area of their ground-plans is less than that of the octagonal tombs, but their height is greater; and their side walls are often broken up to the eye by dividing each façade with deep stringcourses with sunk blind arches above and below to give the impression of two or three storeys, although the interior is a single square cell; frequently a central bay of each side is extended upwards to enclose a main arch of nearly the whole height of the wall, the actual doorway being set in this arch with a lintel-and-bracket; and the west wall is usually closed to accommodate a *mihrāb*.

But Lōdī tombs also exist in the octagonal style, including—apart from numerous octagonal pillared pavilions—the fine tomb of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Ālam, the largest of the series, at Tijara, and the tomb of Sikandar, c. 924/1518, at the Delhi suburb of Khayrpur. The latter perhaps represents the link between the former habit of placing tombs in a fortified enclosure, of which the Tilangānī tomb is the last extant example, and the Mughal practice of surrounding the mausoleum by a garden; for this tomb stands in a large walled enclosure with decorative corner turrets and an ornamental doorway. Part of the west wall is built upwards and buttressed to form an additional external *mihrāb*, and is presumably a *qānātī* mosque; the feature is known in other tombs of this period. Here, as in some of the square tombs, part of the external surface is embellished with glazed tiles, mostly blues and greens; and the dome, as in the earlier tomb of Shīhāb al-Dīn Taj Khān, c. 906/1501, has an inner and outer shell.

Two Delhi mosques of the period are particularly significant in the development of the Lōdī style which persists until well into the Mughal period; the mosque of Abū Amjad at Khayrpur, of 899/1494, has massive tapering pillars at each rear angle, and also flanking the buttress of the *mihrāb*, each with a band of vertical fluting alternately angled and

rounded as in the lowest storey of the Quṭb Mīnār, the central bay of the façade projected outwards and upwards, a succession of receding architraves and soffits in each arched opening, and incidentally the finest cut-plaster decoration in Delhi. The other mosque approaches more nearly the type of the early Mughal and Sūrī periods; this is the Mōth kī Maṣjid of c. 911/1505, where the tapering buttresses are confined to a position flanking the *mihrāb* projection on the west wall, and the rear angles are furnished with two-storeyed open octagonal towers. The pylon-like frame of the central arch, and the recession of planes in the arch outlines, are similar to those of the Khayrpur mosque; but as well as fine cut-plaster the decoration includes coloured tilework and the contrasting use of red sandstone and white marble. The interior is also remarkable for the stalactite pendentives which support the side domes (the main dome is carried on squinch arches).

This mosque design is continued in the Jamālī mosque of 943/1536—thus in the reign of Humāyūn; but this is the date of completion—where the stonework is of very high quality; the central archway of the façade of the west *lūwān* is very much taller, so that its arch reaches above the parapet level of the side aisles, and the fluted buttresses appear flanking this pylon on the courtyard side; and the intrados of that arch is decorated with the spearhead fringe. Beside the mosque is the tomb of Jamālī, externally unpretentious but still containing the finest coloured decoration in the whole of Delhi. The Jamālī mosque is the immediate model for the mosque built by Shēr Shāh Sūrī in the citadel of his new city of Delhi, where every feature is elaborated and refined, and polychromatic faïence takes its place in the external ornament. Outside Delhi there is a small amount of Lōdī work, much of it still inadequately studied, especially of the time of Sikandar Lōdī, who made Agra his capital; especially noteworthy is the large mausoleum called Chaurāsī Gunbad at Kalpi. One mausoleum at Delhi, that of Īsā Khān Niyāzī, shows the persistence of the octagonal variety of tomb well into the Sūrī period (954/1547–8), its construction being almost identical to that of Muḥammad Shāh erected over a hundred years before; but here there are more traces of encaustic tile decoration, and a large separate mosque stands on the western wall of the outer enclosure, its central dome flanked by two *chhatrīs* over the side bays. This octagonal style goes further: in Delhi it peters out in the tomb of Adham Khān, but receives its supreme developments in the Sūrī monuments at Sasaram in Bihar.

PANJAB

Lahore was a dependency of the Ghaznavids and the Ghūrids long before the conquest of Delhi. No monuments of this early period have survived, although some pieces of woodcarving from doorways in the city, now in the Lahore Museum, retain features derived, through the Ghaznavid tradition, from Seljūq ornament. The earliest extant monuments are in Multan and Ucch (Pakistan), a series of tombs of local saints. The earliest, that of Shāh Yūsuf Gardīzī, of 547/1152, is a solid oblong building covered with blue-and-white tiles to form a plane external surface; but the later buildings are all tall domed buildings, from the tomb of Bahā' al-Ḥaqq, d. 660/1262, a square battered base surmounted by an octagonal drum and the earliest true dome in the subcontinent, to the magnificent mausoleum of Rukn-i 'Ālam, which J. Marshall, *The monuments of Muslim India*, in *CHI*, Cambridge 1937, describes as "one of the most splendid memorials ever erected in honour of the dead"; this resembles the previous examples in being built of baked brick but with some structural bonding courses of wood in addition, with a lofty second storey which forms an octagonal drum, with a hemispherical dome, and with pinnacles at each external angle, but differs from them in its lowest storey which is also an octagon, with battering faces and engaged tapering buttresses terminating in pinnacles at each outer angle. The external decoration is worked out in stringcourses of tile-faced brick and bands of raised diaper pattern, bands of calligraphy in carved brick, and the typical Multan tilework (known also at Ucch but nowhere else) wherein the main geometrical patterns are raised as much as 2 cm. above the tile background; this adds greatly to the richness of the tilework by adding depth and a constant effect of light and shade where the sheen of a plane surface would have become dulled by the dust which pervades Multan in the summer. The interior decoration includes fine woodcarving in *shīsham* wood, with the six-pointed star (a common Ghaznavid motif, but otherwise rare in India until early Mughal times) in the spandrels of the wooden *mihrāb* and scrolls of arabesque ornament similar to that of the *maqṣūra* of the Quwwat al-Islām mosque at Delhi.

BENGAL

Stone in the Bengal region (West Bengal and Bangladesh) is almost confined to the black basalt of the Rajmahall hills in the Malda District; but the fine alluvial clay is freely available, the material for the characteristic Bengali bricks and terracottas. The earliest buildings at Tribeni and Chota Pandua are mostly adaptations of pillaged Hindu temple material, using pillars built of large stones without mortar, and shallow corbelled domes; the tomb of Zafar Khān Ghāzī, of 698/1298, shows an early use of the arch, and *mihrābs* in finely moulded terracotta. The greatest of the early buildings, after the independence of Bengal, is the large Ādīna mosque at Hazrat Pandua, of 776/1374–5, in which again use was made of Hindu materials, although it appears that some of the stonework was original work executed by Hindu craftsmen in Muslim employment; it is enclosed by a multiple arcade which carried nearly 400 small domes, and has a large central *aywān*-like hall in the western *lūwān*, with an elaborate stone *mihrāb* and *minbar*, of which the roof has fallen; the stonework is mostly a thin ashlar veneer over a brick core. In a somewhat later phase, represented by the Ēklākhī mausoleum at Pandua, the other characteristics of the Bengal style make their first appearance, notably a curve on each cornice of the square tomb-chamber which derives from a local method of constructing huts with bamboo rafters, octagonal corner buttresses, and ornament in terracotta and glazed tile; here the interior of the enormously thick chamber is an octagonal room which directly supports the single hemispherical dome. Some similar buildings were erected at Gaur after the 15th century under the later Ilyās Shāhī and the Ḥusayn Shāhī rulers; the decorations became especially lavish, some domes being gilded; besides the square buildings with a curved cornice on each side appears the oblong pitched-roof building with the curved cornice on the long sides and gables at the short sides—a type later taken to Northern India at the time of Shāhjahān. Some buildings of the mid 15th century at Bagerhat (Bangladesh), built by one Khān Jahān, a renegade from the Delhi court, show corner turrets and lintel-and-bracket doors set within pointed arches very similar to those of Fīrūz Shāh Tughluq's buildings in Delhi of a century earlier, although retaining the local curved cornice. Many of these local features persist in the Bengali architecture of the Mughal period.

UTTAR PRADESH

The early buildings of Jaunpur and its suburb Zafarabad in Uttar Pradesh are adaptations of the time of Fīrūz Shāh Tughluq, who laid the foundations of a large mosque on the site of a temple to Atalā Devī. This was completed, however, under the Sharqī kings, with four other mosques of similar style—all the other buildings of this once magnificent city were destroyed by Sikandar Lōdī. Again, Hindu remains were freely utilized in the construction; but the building is in coursed stone, with no plaster facing as in Delhi, and there is an abundance of stone carving of high skill. The special characteristic of the Jaunpur mosques is the immense pylon which fills the central bay of the western *lūwān*, completely concealing the large dome behind it, in some cases three times as high as the other bays of the *lūwān*. The trabeate construction is used freely within the prayer-halls and in the side arcades, although the *lūwān* façades are arcuate, and are freely ornamented with recessed arches which are either blind or carry thick window grilles; and the intrados of the arch are usually decorated with the spearhead fringe. All these mosques are well finished externally, especially the *miḥrāb* walls, and the tapered buttress, so familiar in the Delhi Sultanate buildings, is used freely at the external angles. Similar mosque styles are to be found at Banaras (Varanasi), Etawa, and Kanauj.

GUJARAT

The very rich stone-building tradition of the Hindu and Jain craftsmen was appropriated by the Gujarat Muslims, and made Gujarat at once the richest and the most distinctive of the Indian regions in architecture. The artisans appear to have been less bound here than were their fellows in other regions to the whims of individual rulers or to rigid prescriptions by punctilious *‘ulamā*, and indeed it often appears that the requirements of Islamic building rather emancipated them from the dogma of the schools of temple architecture, for of all the styles of Indian Islamic building that of Gujarat is the most Indian, and its purely local characteristics are obvious, even in the earliest stages where pillaged temple material was being used under the orders of governors of the Delhi Khaljīs. The earliest surviving Muslim building, the tomb of Shaykh Farīd at Patan of c. 700/1300, is merely a converted temple,

and very little more organization appears in the Ādīna mosque there, of the same time, where over 1,000 rich temple pillars are assembled to a mosque plan (the building has now fallen almost entirely). In Bharoch only a little later the Jāmi' Masjid is a planned construction and not a mere improvization, for the outer walls are obviously constructed of stone cut for the purpose; but the western *lūwān* is of three bays which appear to be three temple *mandapas* used unaltered except for the obliteration of figure iconography in the ornament. The arch is not used, so that the *lūwān* has an open pillared façade with no *maqṣūra*-screen—a mosque-type more frequent in Gujarat than in other regions. The Jāmi' Masjid at Cambay, however, of 725/1325, does have an arched wall closing the *lūwān*. The walls of this mosque, of alternate deep and shallow courses, are uncharacteristic of Gujarat and recall the Khaljī workmanship of Delhi. A feature appearing here for the first time, which later becomes a favourite device in Gujarat, is a semicircular engrailed arch, of no structural significance, carried between two pillars inside the central arch of the façade; this directly copies the *torāṇa* doorways of the local Hindu and Jain temples. This Cambay mosque has an entrance porch which is almost an exact copy of that of a temple at Modhera built three centuries before, as is that of Hilāl Khān Qāḍī's mosque at Dholka (733/1333); but here there is another significant innovation: the façade is ornamented with two tall turrets flanking the central arch. These are in fact solid, but are the obvious types from which the Gujarat minarets are derived (isolated *mīnārs*, for example the Quṭb Mīnār at Delhi, are not unknown elsewhere in India, but the Gujarat mosques present their first systematic use). Other buildings of this first phase of Gujarat building are to be found at Mangrol and Petlad.

A second phase in the history of Gujarat Islamic architecture is represented by the buildings of Aḥmad Shāh I in his new capital at Ahmadabad (Ahmedabad), although even there the earliest buildings, Aḥmad Shāh's first mosque and the mosque of Haybat Khān, follow the pattern of the Jāmi' Masjid at Cambay; but soon after them the mosque of Sayyid Ālam, of 814/1412, shows several elements which are developed and perfected in the later Ahmadabad buildings, including heavy projecting cornices, well-built and projecting bases for the minarets with internal stairs (the tops of the minarets above the parapet level of the roof have fallen), and an elevated portion of the roof forming a clerestory to admit more light to the central chamber. Aḥmad's *chef d'œuvre* is his Jāmi' Masjid of ten years later. The western *lūwān* has its

central chamber flanked by a bay on each side raised above the level of the more distant bays of the western façade by a clerestory roof supported on an open colonnade, the central chamber itself having a second such clerestory carrying the main dome; the light thereby admitted to the central chamber has first to pass through carved stone screens, which are another typical feature of Gujarat architecture. The side *riwāqs* are all of the simple pillared construction without arches. This mosque, with Aḥmad Shāh's own tomb and a screened enclosure containing the tombs of the queens, form part of Aḥmad Shāh's careful town planning, all lying on a central royal way to his palace, on which stands a triple-arched triumphal gateway. All these buildings are in the same harmonious style, which was continued in Ahmadabad under his immediate successors, Muḥammad and Quṭb al-Dīn Aḥmad. Muḥammad's reign saw the beginning of building at Sarkhej, on the outskirts of Ahmadabad, with the mosque and tomb of Shaykh Aḥmad Khaṭṭū, the former a vast hypostyle hall with an enormous courtyard, the latter a large square building with arches on all sides filled with stone screens, the central tomb-chamber itself being further surrounded by pierced brass screens. This Gujarat practice of using perforated screens round a tomb-chamber is imitated in later periods in remoter parts of India. Two buildings of Quṭb al-Dīn Aḥmad's time are in sharp contrast to other local architecture, the tomb of Daryā Khān in Ahmadabad and Alif Khān's mosque at Dholka; both are in brick, with arches throughout on heavy piers, with none of the usual Gujarat ornament, and seem to have been built by foreign workmen. They are isolated specimens and had no influence on the local style.

A third stage in Gujarat architecture appears in and after the time of Maḥmūd I 'Begrā', from the middle of the 15th century. The mausoleum of Sayyid 'Uthmān in a village across the river from Ahmadabad shows in the tomb a greater competence in handling the dome, which is carried by pillars in the form of a dodecagon, than previous examples; and the attached mosque, which is entirely of the open-faced trabeate variety, shows minarets for the first time in this type of mosque, placed at the two ends of the prayer-hall. The arcuate mosques of this time, those of Miyyān Khān Chishtī of 860/1456 and Bībī Aḥt Kūkī of 876/1472, show the minarets still centrally placed, flanking the middle bay of the prayer-hall—but by now rather over-elaborate and dominating the structure. An innovation is a type of oriel window, carried on brackets and fitted with a perforated stone screen, set in the *līvān* façade. The Shāh 'Ālam mausoleum, of 880/1475, shows an increased use of the

arch in tomb-buildings, again with outer and inner perforated screens. Some five years later the tomb of Quṭb al-ʿĀlam, at Vāṭvā, 10 km. to the south of Ahmadabad, is not only arcuate throughout but of two storeys; but there are irregularities in the construction, as though the builders were still experimenting with the arch as a structural device. The defects have been remedied in the tomb of Sayyid Mubārak (889/1485) at Mahmudabad, where perhaps an architect from outside Gujarat was concerned, for the parapet and the clerestory roof bear *chhatrīs* similar to those of the Lōḍī buildings in Delhi; but the Gujarati feature of the pierced screens round the tomb-chamber continues. *Chhatrīs* also appear over the entrance porch of the Jāmiʿ Maṣjid in Maḥmūd's new city at Champaner. This mosque is very similar in plan to the Jāmiʿ Maṣjid built at Ahmadabad one hundred years earlier, and has a similar double clerestory; but the decoration is richer, particularly externally: the rear wall of the *ḡwān* shows seven *miḥrāb* buttresses of design similar to the bases of the *mīnārs*, and the four corners bear straight octagonal towers resembling small *mīnārs* without balconies; the oriel windows carried on rich corbels add to the exterior richness, as do the smaller pierced screens in every opening. Other mosques in Champaner are of similar design but smaller and with only a small central clerestory; in particular the Nagīna Maṣjid, which has panels of carved tracery at the bases of the *mīnārs* in the form of intertwining plants. Other works of the time of Maḥmūd include his palaces at Sarkhej and his own tomb there by a lake—which has, in addition to various pavilions, a set of sluices carved with the same attention to detail as the *mīnārs* of Gujarat mosques—and other buildings at Ahmadabad, of which the mosque of Muḥāfiẓ Khān, *ḡawjdar* of the city, is the finest; this is an example of the arcuate style of mosque with the *mīnārs* at the ends of the *ḡwān*. Towards the end of Maḥmūd's long reign the tomb and mosque of Rānī Sabarī shows the usual decorative, almost jewel-like, ornament and tracery to its best advantage by being built on a smaller scale than most of the buildings so far considered; but here the mosque minarets have ceased to be functional, becoming merely slim tapering pinnacles. Other outstanding works, of a different class, are two step-wells (Guj. *vāv*).

The common Ahmadabad mosque style, with arcuate *ḡwān* and central *mīnārs*, is continued by buildings towards the close of the Gujarat Sultanate, for example Rānī Rūpāvati's mosque of c. 921/1515. One late example, from 980/1572–3, the year before Akbar's conquest of Gujarat, is an exquisite mosque built by Shaykh Saʿīd al-Ḥabshī, the

tympana of the arches on the western side filled with stone traceries of filigree-like delicacy, representing palm-trees and creepers, the finest in the Muslim world, of which perhaps the blind traceries of the Nagīna Maṣjid at Champaner are the immediate ancestor.

After the Mughal conquest it would appear that many of the skilled craftsmen were taken by Akbar to North India; certainly there are many features of Gujarati workmanship in Akbar's Fatehpur Sikri.

MALWA

In contrast to Gujarat, the contiguous province of Malwa was comparatively uninfluenced by a prior Hindu artistic tradition. There were certainly temples, for the earliest buildings, at the end of the 14th and beginning of the 15th centuries, are built of temple spoil. These are three mosques at Dhar, all of trabeate construction; but the portico of the Jāmi' Maṣjid shows an interesting attempt to interpose pointed arches between the columns, without any structural significance. The two earliest mosques at Mandu, Dilāwar Khān's of 808/1405–6 and Malik Mughīth's of 835/1432, have similar *ṭiwāns*, but the latter is raised on a high basement in which there is a range of arched cells; here the pillars of the *ṭiwān* have some pointed arches interposed, as at Dhar, but also with the resulting spandrels filled in with plate tracery. The *ṭiwān* is domed, but the phase of transition is crudely effected by lintels and their octagon bases are irregular. There are two domed turrets at the angles of the east (entrance) walls; these, and the shape of the *ṭiwān* domes, recall those of Fīrūz Tughluq's time in Delhi. This second mosque is of the time of Hūshang Shāh, whose own complex of buildings dominates the centre of Mandu: the Jāmi' Maṣjid, the *madrasa* (later nicknamed Ashrafi Maḥall), and his own tomb. The mosque is built on a tall (4.5 m.) plinth, with arched cells on either side of the entrance porch; these and a few open arches, at courtyard level, perhaps originally filled with screens, and two restrained stringcourses, are the only external decoration, except for a band of merlon-like decoration, of a type already noticed at Delhi, above the *chhajjā*. The *ṭiwān* and side aisles are built entirely of true arches on plain slender columns. The *miḥrāb* arches show the spearhead fringe, recalling the Delhi Khaljī style, and the *minbar* is covered by a large stone canopy of obvious Hindu temple design. Hūshang's tomb, a little earlier (the mosque was completed by Maḥmūd I in 858/1454), is a square domed

structure of white marble throughout (the earliest building to be so treated) except for sparing ornament of deep blue glazed tiles, standing in a large enclosure. At each corner of the dome is an engaged domed turret, a common feature in the Mandu tombs and already present over the entrance to the Jāmi‘ Masjid. The domes are characteristic of Malwa—a tall cylindrical drum carries the haunch without any intervening structure or decoration, while above the haunch the dome may be developed as a hemisphere or smaller spherical section or as a shallow cone. Later buildings at Mandu become elegant, and in the final stages even meretricious: palaces, pavilions, fountains and water-channels, kiosks and balconies. The open *chhatrī* appears, and some of the domes are ribbed. In one building, known now as Gadā Shāh’s house, there are the remains of some wall-paintings.

A northern manifestation of the Malwa style is found at Chanderi, where the Jāmi‘ Masjid shows the characteristic stilted domes; the convoluted brackets supporting the *chhajjā* are a somewhat exaggerated form of a type seen in Mandu as early as Hūshang’s tomb, a form which becomes exaggerated and elaborated further in Fatehpur Sikri.

The general characteristics of the Malwa style are, in addition to the stilted dome, the fine masonry of walls and doors, very restrained ornament, and the frequent use of engaged domical turrets round a central dome. The *mīnār*, so prominent in the neighbouring provinces of Gujarat and Khandesh, is not used.

KHANDESH

This small province had a building art with a character of its own, although the mixed origins of that art are to be found in the neighbouring provinces of Gujarat, Malwa, and the Deccan. The Fārūqī *khāns* ruled first from Thalner and later from Burhanpur, and their buildings are mostly at these two places and at Asirgarh and Chikalda. The Thalner tombs are not dissimilar to the typical square Mandu mausolea in general plan, but the dome is usually carried on a separate octagonal drum, and over the wide *chhajjā* there is a high decorated parapet; the door and window openings are better spaced than in the Mandu examples, and there is more external decoration. An octagonal tomb is covered with fine basso-relievo carving in geometric patterns, and its arches bear on the intrados the spearhead fringe. All these tombs date from the first half of the 15th century. Little remains of the palace at

Thalner and the Bādshāhī Qīl'a at Burhanpur, and the next significant buildings are two late 16th century mosques at Burhanpur. The Jāmi' Maṣjid has an arcaded façade with *mīnārs* at the ends, while the Bibī kī Maṣjid has two heavy *mīnārs* flanking the central arch as in the Champaner mosque in Gujarat; the design of these *mīnārs*, however, is original: from octagonal bases they pass to a hexadecagon, above which is a circular storey with oriel windows facing each cardinal point, with a hemispherical dome forming a fourth stage; balconies on heavy brackets separate these four stages. The Jāmi' Maṣjid at Asirgarh, although built after the Mughal conquest, perpetuates the Gujarati tradition. At Chikalda an enormous gateway (Barā Darwāza) has an arch of the wide Gulbarga style but is decorated with the lion-and-elephant motif of the Gond kings (*cf.* similar devices at Gawilgarh).

THE DECCAN

The principal phases of Deccani architecture, that coinciding with the Bahmanī Sultanate, are to be found at Gulbarga and Bidar, although the kingdom was early provided with a powerful system of fortifications and many of the Bahmanī strongholds contain important buildings.

The Jāmi' Maṣjid in the old citadel of Gulbarga, although of a type not reproduced later, since its *ṣahn* is completely roofed over, shows nevertheless some features that were to characterize Bahmanī architecture and to spread some of the styles of the successor sultanates of the Deccan. The arches of the outer arcade are specially noteworthy: of obtuse angle at the apex, of wide span, and springing from very low imposts. An earlier mosque in the city is a mere compilation of temple spoil, as are the two early mosques at Bijapur built by the Bahmanī governors. The earliest group of tombs at Gulbarga, all of the second half of the 14th century, are similar to contemporary examples at Delhi with weak semi-circular domes and battering walls. A later group of tombs, the Haft Gunbad, shows similar sloping walls and domes, but with a refinement of decoration. The outer faces are divided into two apparent storeys with blind arches in each, these arches being of the type which comes to typify the Bahmanī style, stilted above the haunch with straight tangential projections to the apex. Some of these tombs are double—*i.e.*, there are two tomb-chambers with continuous walls but separate domes, standing on a common plinth—and show a few features of Hindu decoration. The tomb of Gīsū Darāz, built after the

transfer of the court to Bidar, is a single square building with upright sides but otherwise similar to the other Gulbarga tombs. At Bidar the early Tughluq influence has been added to by features of Persian inspiration: thus the early royal palace, the Takht Maḥall, while retaining the Bahmanī arch, was profusely decorated with encaustic tiles, including a tiger-and-rising-sun device. The foreign element is most pronounced in the *madrasa* of Maḥmūd Gāwān of 877/1472, which has a prototype in the *madrasa* of Khargird in Khurāsān; its internal façades surrounding a central courtyard show a single arch of the height of the building on each of the three-storeyed sides, the Persian *aywān* pattern. The circular *mīnār* is also of a Persian pattern, as is a detached *mīnār* built c. 840/1437 at Daulatabad. The entire surface of the *madrasa* is covered with multicoloured tiles. The royal tombs at Bidar, ranging over a period of some 80 years from the first example of 839/1436, show the progress of the Bahmanī style. The stilted arches are in general retained, although one tomb unusually shows arches struck from four centres rather like the Mughal arch of North India or the English Tudor arch. Some of the tilework of these tombs is superb, and includes some historically and hagiographically important inscriptions. The domes progress from a hemispherical type stilted over an octagonal drum to a type which, being greater than a hemisphere, shows a tendency towards the bulbous pattern which develops in some of the successor sultanates, and the parapets progress from a line of shield-shaped merlons to a line of stone trefoils. All these tombs have a single entrance doorway, the other sides being either solid or closed by screens, with *mīhrābs* in the western walls; none of them has turrets or *chhatrīs* in addition to the central dome.

The Nizām Shāhīs of Ahmadnagar in the western Deccan, although independent there from the beginning of the 16th century until the Mughal conquest, evolved no distinctive architectural style of their own but perpetuated something like the middle Bahmanī style with decorative borrowings from Hindu art (and later from the style of Bijapur). Nor was the ʿImād Shāhī style of Berar in the northern Deccan significantly different from its Bahmanī parent, except for the use in the mosque façades of a pylon at each end of the *līvān* bearing a square *chhatrī* with deep eaves, heavy brackets, and stone screens in each side, as at Gawilgarh, also Elichpur and Narnala. The buildings of the Barīd Shāhīs, however, the successors of the Bahmanīs in Bidar, do show some notable independent characteristics. The typical Bahmanī stilted arch continues, but the dome becomes even more bulbous,

usually three-quarters of a sphere. A frequent tomb-pattern is a square domed cell with an open arch on all four faces; thus, since there is no integral *mihrāb*, a small mosque is built beside the tomb. The trefoil parapet is commonly used. A common feature of the decoration is a chain-and-pendant motif in plaster, but good tilework is still a frequent ornament. The latest buildings tend to become over-ornate, and the influence of the Hindu mason becomes more apparent.

The style of the 'Ādil Shāhī buildings at Bijapur in Karnataka is the most developed and the most original of the Deccani Sultanates. The earliest dated 'Ādil Shāhī building, a mosque of 918/1512–3, already shows features which characterize this style throughout: the base of the dome surrounded by a ring of vertical foliations, so that the dome resembles a bud surrounded by petals; and a three-arched façade in which the central arch is much wider than the flanking arches. Another early mosque reveals another Bijapur speciality in its arch spandrels, a medallion supported by a bracket-shaped device, moulded in plaster. The works executed before the death of 'Alī I in 987/1579 are mostly in rubble covered with dense and durable plaster, and include the city walls and gates (most of these with the typical wide centre arch flanked by two narrow ones), many palaces and audience halls, and some notable mosques. One of these, in memory of the *sayyid* 'Alī Shahīd Pīr, which unusually has a transverse wagon-vaulted roof, shows the (equal) façade arches surrounded by an outer band of cusping, remarkably similar to that of the recently-discovered Jurjīr mosque in Isfahan. This device recurs in the other buildings, for example the Jāmi' Maṣjid of 985/1576, where it decorates only the central arch of seven, which also bears the medallion-and-bracket device; the great dome of this mosque is supported by an original system of vaulting by which two intersecting squares, both oblique to the square chamber underneath, form an octagon; this system is later used to great effect in the colossal mausoleum of Muḥammad 'Ādil Shāh. This mosque also shows a feature made much of by later Bijapur builders, an elegant exterior. The domes in this early phase are hemispherical; *mīnārs* are not used, although bases for them exist in the Jāmi' Maṣjid; small ornamental pinnacles (*guldasta*), however, are freely used at angles of the parapets and over *mihrāb* buttresses, of a type found on some of the Bahmanī tombs at Bidar.

After 987/1579, under Ibrāhīm II 'Ādil Shāh and later *sultāns* of Bijapur, fine sculptured stonework replaces the earlier rubble-and-plaster. The dome becomes a three-quarter sphere; the cornices and eaves are

supported by intricate carved brackets, often with the added decoration of hanging stone chains and locket-like pendants (is there a connection between these and the chain-and-pendant plaster device of the Barīd Shāhīs?), and the parapets become delicate lace-like borders. But many of the earlier features persist: the band of foliations at the base of the dome, the occasional cusping of a central arch, the medallion-and-bracket motif, now often carved in stone, the characteristic wide central and narrow flanking arches, and the love of vertical projections above the sky-line; but these have often become pseudo-*mīnārs*, in that they appear over solid bases and rise at the sides of mosque façades where in other styles true *mīnārs* are found, although they are slender and solid and hence can only be decorative; they frequently carry miniature domes, and fascicular clusters of minuscule minarets along their shafts, in each case with the petal-like foliation. The enormous mausoleum of Muḥammad (d. 1067/1656), known as the Gol Gunbad, reverts to the hemispherical dome, and has a large staged octagonal turret of the height of the building at each corner; but the prototype of these is the small octagonal pinnacles found in the earliest buildings. In tombs of the closing years of the dynasty, there is a tendency to exaggerate an intermediate stage, a square storey between the parapet of the tomb-chamber and the drum of the dome, so that in extreme cases the globular dome appears almost separated from the ground floor. While the most characteristic features of the ʿĀdil Shāhi style are found in the vast number of buildings at the capital some Bijapur characteristics are encountered further afield, for example in two mosques standing outside Naldurg fort, and at the great entrance arch to the *dargāh* of Ġisū Darāz at Gulbarga.

The Deccan style of the Quṭb Shāhīs, first in Golkonda and later in the adjacent city of Hyderabad in Andhra Pradesh, is distinctive more on account of its luxuriant ornament than any originality in structure. The principal building material is stone, usually grey granite or trap-stone, but rather than being carved this is ornamented with stucco and encaustic tiles. The tombs of the Quṭb Shāhī dynasty at Golkonda, and the mosques and gateways there and at Hyderabad, show the comparative fixedness of the style over a century and a half from the time of Sulṭān Qulī's independence in 924/1518. The tombs are almost all square in shape and constructionally resemble the Bahmanī tombs in Bidar; the earlier ones are single-storeyed, and only once is the outer face divided into two apparent floors by an upper row of blind arches; some of the later tombs have two storeys, the lower one forming a

projecting arcade around the building. The domes are all bulbous, usually a three-quarter sphere, and are foliated at their bases in a similar way to the Bijapur domes; but the later buildings develop this into a double or triple band of foliation. The Quṭb Shāhī buildings emphasize especially the upper parts of walls between the eaves and the parapet, and the rich ornament here is sometimes projected out from the façade to form a balcony carried on brackets. The parapets are crenellated with trefoil-shaped merlons, as in the later Bahmanī and Barīd Shāhī styles, and are frequently interrupted by small *guldastas*; at the corners these may be replaced by small *mīnārs*. The Quṭb Shāhī *mīnār*, whether decorative or functional, has its shaft encircled one or more times with an arcaded gallery, and bears a miniature dome with the characteristic foliations. Designs of Hindu provenance are not infrequent in the ornament, especially in the later periods; but these were accepted in the earliest period, as they occurred freely in the Kākātīya work taken over in the old Bahmanī province of Warangal—for example, in the Bālā Hīṣār Darwāza at Golkonda.

KASHMIR

The architecture of Kashmir is remarkably different from that of all other regions of India, as it is essentially in wood: great logs of *deodār* (*Cedrus deodara*) laid horizontally and joined by crude carpentry, and used also as piers to support any superstructure; the interstices between courses may be filled with brickwork or plaster covered with glazed tile. There is of course a constant fire risk, and many buildings have undergone repeated rebuilding, usually, however, reproducing the form of the original structure. The typical Kashmiri Muslim building is the tomb-shrine (*ziyārat*) of a local saint: a cubical ground floor (sometimes set on a stone or brick plinth), covered by a pyramidal roof which may be in several tiers, topped by a long and slender wooden *flèche*. The same type with flanking courtyards may be used for mosque buildings, with the addition of a square open pavilion between roof and *flèche* to form a platform for the *mu'adhdhin* (the minaret is not used). Such a pattern is used in the mosque of Shāh Hamadān in Srinagar, a two-storeyed building on the plinth of a Hindu temple, with projecting wooden balconies and the eaves supported on a log cornice; the pyramidal tiered roof is covered with an impervious layer of birch-bark and then with turves planted liberally with irises and tulips, above which

rise the *ma'dhīna* platform and the *flèche*. The Jāmi' Masjid in Srinagar, dating from the end of the 14th century, but three times rebuilt, is the most ambitious example of pre-Mughal Kashmiri architecture: a vast square courtyard is surrounded on each side by a wide arched wing which carries a central *ziyārat*-like structure, that on the west having a tall central brick arch. Much of the lower walling is in brick, but the surrounding colonnades are composed entirely of *deodār* trunks on stone plinths. Some fine stone tombs of the 15th century exist, constructed from temple spoil, but domed and covered with glazed tiles.

SINDH

The building style of Sindh (Pakistan), while not so conspicuous as that of Kashmir, stands apart from other provincial Indo-Muslim styles since it has many affinities with the building art of eastern Persia, and where Indian motifs appear they often seem to be used with neither organization nor fluency in their use. They are represented especially by the remaining tombs at Thattha, where some building stone was available, although the characteristic medium of the country was brick. The stonework of one of the earliest remaining tombs, that of Jām Nizām Dīn (d. 915/1509), is in stone which seems to have been carved by Hindu workmen who were not good enough to find work in Gujarat; perhaps they came across the Rajasthan desert with only the memory of the designs, or were the local employees of the Sammās, recent converts to Islam but with rather faded memories of a dilute Hinduism. The carved Arabic inscriptions are in excellent *thulth*, incongruously set next to bandeaux carved with the geese of Hindu mythology. Other stone tombs are ornamented with shallow and often curiously discontinuous geometrical carving. The brick tombs certainly show a great familiarity with the material; solid dense bricks, after all, were known in Sindh at the time of the prehistoric Mohenjodaro. They are built on stone foundations, to counteract the destroying effects of the high salinity of the Thattha soil, and their surfaces are covered with the tilework for which Sindh is renowned. Common tilework patterns include dark blue rectangles outlined with white, to give the effect of an imitation mortar-joint; the tiles themselves are of hand-baked terracotta, very heavy, and the glazes are generally white, light-blue, turquoise, and dark blue, very occasionally also yellow. Generally the design is continuously worked in multicoloured tiles, but occasionally very small tiles, like tes-

serae, each of one colour, are built up to form a mosaic. The design of the tombs, especially their domes, and the few remaining mosques, is essentially Persian rather than Indian, although this may be due to early Mughal influence. Certainly some of the Thattha buildings of later times revert to a trabeate style in sandstone, such as the mausoleum of Īsā Jān Tarkhān the younger, d. 1054/1644, which recalls the buildings of Fatehpur Sikri and also is the only building in which the intrados of the arch is embellished with a spearhead fringe.

MUGHAL ARCHITECTURE*

Shortly after Bābur's arrival in India in 932/1526 he ordered buildings to be erected; he was unimpressed with Indian edifices, and disgusted with the lack of the formal gardens to which he was accustomed. Most of his works were, therefore, secular, consisting of terraced gardens with pavilions and summer houses, hardly anything of which has survived. Two of his mosques exist, one in Panipat and one in Sambhal: works large but utterly undistinguished. Little more can be said about the buildings of Humāyūn's reign (except those works of a previous period now completed); but Humāyūn's importance is in the craft traditions imported with him after his exile rather than the ideas of his own.

THE SŪRĪ INTERREGNUM

In point of time, the Sūr *sultān* Shēr Shāh followed Humāyūn although his buildings are a continuation of pre-Mughal styles. There is, indeed, little characteristic architecture remaining of the first part of Humāyūn's reign from which a comparison might be made, since Shēr Shāh systematically destroyed Humāyūn's city of Delhi called Dīnpanāh. In his tombs at Sasaram in Bihar, Shēr Shāh perfected the octagonal pattern, and may indeed have planned these buildings in the decade before he came to power. The earliest (c. 941/1535) of these, the tomb of his father Ḥasan Khān, is experimental: there is no plinth, and the drum is a bare wall without fenestration or *chhatrīs*. Unlike the Lōdī examples, the Sasaram tombs have vertical, not battered, walls. The next tomb, that of Shēr Shāh himself, is amplified not only from this but also from the Delhi models; it is in five stages, rising to 50 m., and set in the middle of an artificial lake connected to the shore by a causeway to which access is given by a domed guardroom; the lowest stage is a square plinth rising out of the water, the next a vast square platform with a *chhatrī* at each corner, on which stands the octagonal tomb chamber in three further stages, the two lower with *chhatrīs* at

* "Hind, vii Architecture," *EI*, III, 448–51.

the corners. The roof is crowned with a massive lotus finial. The tomb of his successor Islām Shāh also stands within a lake, but smaller; the better preservation of its causeway shows this to have been constructed on a cantilever principle, each pier with projecting balconies and carrying a *chhatrī*. In Narnaul Shēr Shāh built the tomb of his grandfather Ibrāhīm Khān, a square building not unlike the square Lōdī tombs, but finished in better stone and with a shallower dome.

After Shēr Shāh's accession in 947/1540 he started building at Delhi, fortifying first the Purānā Qil'a and adding an exquisite mosque, with the corner turrets already noticed in the Moth kī Maṣjid and the Jamālī mosque, and with a refined form of the recessed arch: a lower arch set back from a taller one. The arches are struck from four centres, and the spearhead fringe is again in evidence. The stonework is very finely jointed, enriched with fillets of white marble, with fine coloured inlay patterns of a type similar to that later found in Akbar's mosque at Fatehpur Sikri. The interior decoration is similar to that of the Moth kī Maṣjid, but with every part refined. Other important building products of Shēr Shāh were at Rohtasgarh in Bihar and his new fortress of Rohtas in the Panjab, as well as many single buildings at other towns.

PERIOD OF AKBAR

The first major building to be erected during Mughal rule is Humāyūn's mausoleum, not begun until 976/1568–9 in the early years of Akbar's reign, and erected, not in his lifetime after the usual practice, but by his widow. The cenotaph-chamber, which stands on a vast high plinth, is essentially square in plan, with each corner of the square chamfered off and with a recessed central bay in each side. Each of these bays contains a deep arch, as high as the walls on either side of the bay, constructed as a half-dome, and smaller arches of varied height and levels fill the remaining façades of each wall. The central chamber is surmounted by a tall drum, which carries a high double dome, with a *chhatrī* of Lōdī type, open and on slender pillars, at each corner, and two smaller square *chhatrīs* over each central arch. The dome is slightly curved at its base, but its general shape echoes that of the arches below; the arches introduce a new shape to North India, as their curves are struck from four centres. The building is in red sandstone with white and grey marble inlay (sparing use of other colours as well), executed

in star-shaped designs at the drum below the dome, well inlaid but not polished *in situ*: this inlay work is to be classified as *opus sectile* rather than as the finely polished marquetry-like *pietra dura* of later Mughal periods. A smaller tomb of not dissimilar design is that of Akbar's foster-father, Atga Khān, at Nizāmuddīn; but Humāyūn's tomb gains enormously in effect not only by the vast plinth (which contains the true tomb immediately below the cenotaph) but by the vaster garden in which it is set—a great square, subdivided into squares and squares again by paths, flower-beds, and parterres. It marks immediately the advent of a new style in India, and is of great importance as the immediate Indian prototype for other monumental mausolea.

Akbar's building projects, many and varied, reflect something of the man. They start at Agra Fort, on the trace of the previous Lōdī fort, with the gateways: a half-octagon flanking tower on each side of the four-centred arch of the gate, the towers decorated with blind arches below and open arches on the upper storey, with *chhatrīs* over towers and gateway; internally, the arch carried a spearhead fringe of a more elaborate and conventionalized form than that of previous reigns; the whole is decorated in *opus sectile*. Palaces inside the fort are in much the same style, and include projecting balconies supported on richly carved corbels, with much beam-and-bracket workmanship; some of the brackets, in sandstone, seem to have been borrowed directly from wood-building techniques. Similar buildings were commenced, in very similar styles, at Lahore and, on a smaller scale, at Allahabad. The new capital, at Fatehpur Sikri, is a sandstone city. The palaces are for the most part built in the trabeate style, with shallow domes and heavy eaves recalling Lōdī work, occasional arches with the spearhead fringe, carved brackets resembling those of Rajasthani temples, and superb carving. There is some inlaid *opus sectile* work in white marble, especially on the mosque; the inside of the mosque, however, is of finely polished marble mosaic inlay, the first attempt towards the technique of *pietra dura*. Some buildings in the city, such as the Dīwān-i Khāṣṣ, with an extraordinary bracketed central column supporting a platform in the middle of the single room, and the Pānch Maḥall, a five-storeyed pyramidal open pavilion, are unique structures, part of Akbar's personal whimsy, with no significance in the development of the Mughal style; but one of interest and archaeological significance is the tomb of Salīm Chishtī, after 979/1571, a square chamber with an outer verandah which is screened with marble lattices on the outside: a feature characteristic not of North India, but familiar in the tombs

of Gujarat. The eaves are supported on convoluted brackets which have a prototype in Chanderi. Another Gujarat feature, apparently, is the reservoir which lies beneath the *ṣaḥn* of the great mosque (on these features see J. Burton-Page, *Fatehpur Sikri*, in R.E. Mortimer Wheeler (ed.), *Splendours of the East*, London 1965, 143–53).

Of Akbar's reign in Delhi is the last of the octagonal tombs, that of Adham Khān, of 969/1562; it is without the wide *chhajjā* which characterizes the earlier octagonal tombs, and, being also without *chhatrīs*, looks curiously insipid. Of about the same time is the Maṣjid Khayr al-Manāzil, with a four-centred arched façade, an imposing gateway with *opus sectile* decoration, and corner turrets at the rear of the *lūwān* similar to those on the Lōdī Moth kī Maṣjid and the Sūrī mosque in the Purānā Qil'a. At Jaunpur is a fine bridge, with screened pavilions over each pier, across the river Gumti, and at Gwalior is the tomb of Muḥammad Ghaus, which has the typical Gujarati screened arcades.

PERIOD OF JAHĀNGĪR

Jahāngīr's interest was more in miniature painting than in architecture, and there are few examples of the buildings of his reign; although it is known that he extended Akbar's buildings at Agra and Lahore Forts, beginning at the latter a "picture wall" in mosaic tiles showing hunting, polo and court scenes, and completed the building of Akbar's tomb: a four-storeyed pyramidal building, over-ornamented with *chhatrīs*, with a large half-dome archway in each face, *opus sectile* ornament, and an open square with a cenotaph, all in marble, at the top, standing in a vast *chār-bāgh* garden. The entrance gateway is imposing, with a tall white marble *mīnār* at each corner—the first appearance of this feature in the north. The two most important buildings of Jahāngīr's reign are the tomb at Agra, begun 1031/1622, of his father-in-law Mīrzā Ghiyāth Beg entitled I'timād ad-Daula, in marble inlaid in Persian motifs (cypresses, vines, flowers, vases, wine-cups) in true *pietra dura*, with four short corner towers, and fine marble tracery screens; and the tomb of 'Abd al-Raḥīm Khān-i Khānān, similar to that of Humāyūn's tomb but without the corner chambers. The former tomb heralds the decorative techniques of the Taj Maḥall; the latter is the immediate prototype of its design.

PERIOD OF SHĀHJAHĀN

The buildings of Shāhjahān show the Mughal style at its height, although the earliest, the completion by Nūrjahān of Jahāngīr's tomb at Shāhdara, near Lahore, continues the *opus sectile* tradition; it is of only a single storey, with a lofty *mīnār* at each corner, again in an immense garden; it is more important for its decoration than for its structure, not only on the surface of the building, but in the *pietra dura* of the cenotaph, in white marble, calligraphy (the 99 names of God) appearing in delicate *pietra dura* here for the first time. Shāhjahān himself replanned the buildings at Agra and Lahore Forts, replacing some of the earlier sandstone structures with marble ones; these are characterized by engrailed arches, tapering supporting columns and *pietra dura* ornament, especially on walls and at the feet of columns and their plinths; and the marble was delicately channelled and carved. There appear at Agra, for the first time in North India, two oblong pavilions with a Bengali-style curved cornice to the roof; and at Lahore Fort also is a pavilion in the style of a Bengali *chau-chalā* hut. These works were perhaps a preliminary essay for Shāhjahān's own grandiose fort, the Lāl Qil'ā (from its red sandstone enclosure walls) in his new city at Delhi called Shāhjahānābād. The palace buildings are distinguished for their symmetrical planning along an ornamental marble canal, with chutes and cascades; in structure they are similar to those at Agra, except that the columns tend to be thicker, and the *pietra dura* work and the marble carving are of the highest quality.

Before the fort was begun, however, the construction of the mausoleum of his queen, Mumtāz-i Maḥall, had been started. This building, known to everyone by its corrupted title of Tāj Maḥall, is in the suburb of Agra now called Tājganj on the bank of the Yamuna river: a complex of buildings with a square mausoleum with a tall *mīnār* at each corner of its plinth, and a red sandstone mosque and an identical *jawāb*, used as a *mihmān-khāna*, flanking it on a platform at the river end of the great oblong garden; the garden divided by paths and parterres, with central crossing water-channels, and an imposing gateway. The entire mausoleum, plinth, and the four *mīnārs* are worked in white marble with *pietra dura* in semi-precious stones, and there is a tall white marble dome, surrounded by four marble *chhatrīs*; the dome is slightly bulbous. This is the perfect culmination of the tomb-type starting with Humāyūn's tomb of a century earlier, through 'Abd al-Raḥīm Khān-i Khānān's

tomb, with decoration of the type started in the tomb of I'timād ad-Daula and perfected at the forts of Agra, Lahore and Shāhjahānābād. In Delhi the plans for the city were completed with the Jāmi' Masjid, 1057–9/1648–50; the *līwān*, in red sandstone with white marbles, has a large central half-dome arch, with five smaller flanking arches on each side, all engrailed; two *mīnārs* at the courtyard ends of the *līwān*; and three bulbous marble domes. A similar mosque, much smaller, was built in Agra at about the same time for his daughter Jahān Ārā; here the arches revert to the plain (not engrailed) four-centred type. Another important building of Shāhjahān's reign, of a different type, is the mosque of Wazīr Khān in Lahore, of c. 1044/1634; here the ornament is more akin to the arts developed in Persia, consisting of true mosaic tile decoration on the external surfaces, floral, calligraphic, geometrical, especially with the cypress (*sarv*) and the plane (*chunār*); the internal surfaces are painted in tempera and cut-plaster. Other buildings of Shāhjahān are at Ajmer (two marble lakeside pavilions) and Kashmir (terraces in the Shālīmār gardens, laid out by Jahāngīr).

PERIOD OF AURANGZĪB

In the reign of Aurangzīb the building art began to lose its vitality, although the Mōtī (pearl) Masjid he added to the fort of Shāhjahānābād, c. 1070/1660, retains the delicacy of earlier craftsmanship (the too-large bulbous domes are a later addition). The effēteness is starting to be apparent in the great Bādshāhī Masjid of c. 1085/1674 added to the west of Lahore Fort, with four tall *mīnārs* at the corners of the courtyard, four short ones at the corners of the *līwān*; the three domes are a little over-bulbous, and the *līwān* façade presents too many blank spaces. A few years later the tomb of Aurangzīb's wife, Rābi'a Daurānī, was built at Aurangabad; it stands in a walled garden, which is its best feature; for it is a half-scale copy of the Tāj Māḥall, with a thin engrailed central arch, bulbous dome, disproportionately heavy *mīnārs*, a cramped skyline with insufficient room for the corner *chhatrīs*, attenuated *guldastas*, which combine to give it an air of assiduous mediocrity. Aurangzīb's mosques at Banaras (Varanasi) and Mathura, on the other hand, are orthodox and well-proportioned, so it must be assumed that he played no personal part in their construction. A far better tomb building is the last of the great square mausolea, the tomb of the *wazīr* Šafdar Jang at Delhi (d. 1166/1753), of good proportions, even if the dome

is a little too bulbous, in finely worked fawn sandstone, and in the last great *chār-bāgh* garden.

POST-MUGHAL STYLES

The Nawwābs of Awadh, in their capital of Lucknow, became the artistic successors to the Mughals. Their earlier buildings are similar to the Aurangzibī buildings, large and impressive, but over-decorated; their later ones, produced in a sort of bastard *château* style under the influence of a French adventurer with magnificent vision and no taste, mixed up with Corinthian capitals, fluted domes, compositions of round romanesque arches, ogee arcades, and odd ideas gathered from the Mughals, Ancient Greeks, and the European “Palladian” school. The Sikh style of the Panjab is at least of consistent late-Mughal extraction, but tends to over-proliferated *chhatrīs* and the fluted dome, and to be too partial to the Bengali cornice. Some of the Rājput palaces have preserved better elements of late Mughal style, especially at Amber and Jaipur, and have combined it with an excellent masonry technique.

In the south a strange hybrid Islamo-Vijayanagara style was evolved at Hampi, and later scions of the Vijayanagara house, after the dissolution of their empire, remembered in some elements in their palace of Chandragiri. The few buildings of the Mysore Sultanate of Ḥaydar ‘Alī and his son Tipū are less bizarre, particularly the tomb of the dynasty at Srirangapattana. Other local Muslim styles are more aberrant: for example, the 19th century tombs at Junagadh in Gujarat, which appear to translate the fancy knobs of a Victorian bedstead into stone, not without skill.

INSCRIPTIONS*

The Indian sub-continent is very rich in Muslim inscriptions, the study of which affords valuable information not only to the archaeologist and historian but also to the geographer, the economist, the student of religions, the linguist, and of course the calligrapher. Most of them are found on religious buildings (tombs, mosques, *īdgāhs*, *imāmbārās*, *madrasas*) and military works (forts, gates, bastions, cavaliers, towers), or on works of public utility (bridges, tanks, *bā'olīs*, dams, sluices, *sarā'īs*); some are also found on palaces, gardens, pavilions, *etc.*; and another class is found on movable objects such as guns and swords, ornamental metalwork including *bīdī* ware, and on crystal and jade. The greatest part of the public inscriptions is carved on stone; often of a stone identical to that of the main building material, but not infrequently a specially selected fine-grained stone is used for the inscription and cemented into the structure.

Here the question of authenticity must be considered. An inscription may indeed be exactly contemporary with the building on which it appears. But it may also be earlier, preserved through the reverence accorded to the written word or through the ascription to it of some special sanctity, and set into a later unrelated building; or else later, marking say the completion of a building project essentially constructed perhaps half-a-century earlier, as at the Jāmi' Masjid of Bijapur, a late 'Ādil Shāhī building whose inscription records its completion by Aurangzīb; or recording a restoration (as in many works in Delhi of Fīrūz b. Rajab, whose inscriptions have to be studied in connection with the problems of interpretation in his own accounts of his restorations in the *Futūḥāt-i Fīrūz-Shāhī*); or it may be fictitious—not necessarily mischievously: for example, the Persian inscription of the Masjid Quwwat al-Islām at Delhi is probably a *pia fraus* of 60 or 70 years after the conquest.

The technique of carving stone inscriptions in Arabic, Persian or Urdū is conspicuously different from that of inscriptions in other Indian languages, where the characters are engraved into the surface of the

* "Kitābāt," *EL*, VI, 231–3.

stone; in the Muslim inscriptions the outline of the letters is first written on the stone, and the ground between the letters then chiselled away leaving the inscription level with the original surface. A similar technique may be applied to inscriptions on crystal and jade, and also to the larger metal pieces, although on any of these fields the letters may be incised and the grooves filled with another material to leave an inscription flush with the surface; in the case of *bīdrī* ware this is regularly of silver bar laid into the base metal. Inscriptions in ceramics may be either of letters in a contrasting colour fired integrally in a regularly-shaped tile (*haft-rangī*), or consist of the individual letter-shapes let into a contrasting ground by a mosaic technique. The former ceramic technique is more commonly employed for simple repetitive motifs (e.g. the names Allāh or Muḥammad), sometimes combined with a moulded base on which the letter-shapes are raised, as on the merlons of Rukn-i 'Ālam's tomb in Multan (Pakistan); mosaic tile inscriptions, which do not appear until the 17th century, are best exemplified in the Mughal buildings of Lahore (Pakistan).

The language of the earliest inscriptions is invariably Arabic. There are no inscriptional records of the 'Abbāsīd presence in Sindh, although a few were engendered by the Muslim communities which lingered on in Sindh and the Panjab, with their occasional offshoots to Kutch and the north coast of Kathiawar in Gujarat, to which were added the small communities which grew up around the *khānqāhs* of individual Ṣūfī saints who drifted in to India before the Ghūrīd conquest, especially in the Panjab and the Ganga valley. After the Ghūrīd conquest of Delhi, dating inscriptions remain in Arabic regularly until towards the end of the 13th century, when they are replaced by Persian; non-historical epigraphs tend to remain in Arabic somewhat longer, and of course Arabic persists up to the present day for Qur'ānic quotations on mosque and tomb inscriptions. This does not, however, apply to the sultanates of Bengal, where the preferred language of dating inscriptions remains in Arabic until Mughal times. In late Mughal times, in North India, Urdū inscriptions appear beside Persian. Away from Delhi, there are many bilingual and trilingual inscriptions, especially in the Deccan (Persian/Sanskrit, Persian/Marāthī, Persian/Kannada, *etc.*); there are a few inscriptions in the Deccan regions in Dakhnī. Not infrequently the date is written in Arabic words in a Persian inscription; and often the Arabic, and to a less extent the Persian, is grammatically incorrect. The date in North Indian inscriptions is regularly expressed in Hījrī years, except for a few inscriptions of the time of Akbar and Jahāngīr which

use the Dīn-i Ilāhī system, or are dated by regnal years. In the Deccan, various solar calendars are occasionally used, especially the *Shuhūr san* in the ‘Ādil Shāhī Sultanate of Bijapur, and a *Faṣṭī san* in Golkonda and under the Nizāms of Hyderabad. In Mysore under Ḥaydar ‘Alī and Tipū Sulṭān, the Maudūdī era is used.

The scripts in use are the common Kūfic, *naskh*, *thuluth*, and *nasta‘īq*. Kūfic is used only in the earliest dating inscriptions, and retained long after its period of active use in Qur’ānic quotations. *Naskh* and *thuluth* are in common use for both Arabic and Persian inscriptions all over India, with some regional modifications. *Nasta‘īq* is regularly used for Persian inscriptions in and after the Mughal period, and for inscriptions in Urdū. Of the regional styles, the most striking is that of Bengal, where the vertical strokes of *alif*, *kāf* and *lām* are much elongated and spaced evenly across the length of the inscription, leaving the significant parts of the remainder of the letters to occupy the lowest quarter or third of the band; sometimes the tails of final or detached *nūn* or *yā’* are so disposed in the top part of the inscription to produce the “bow and arrow” effect. A similar style is seen also on some of the coins of Jaunpur. Elaborate *tughrās* fall more in the domain of *farmāns* and other such documents rather than in public epigraphs, although they are certainly known in ceramic tile inlay and in *pietra dura* in Mughal buildings; but simpler *tughrās*, in the square seal-script, are not uncommon, consisting usually of repetitions of the names Muḥammad or ‘Alī, or both, or the *kalima*. None of these seal-script inscriptions approaches the complexity of the Iranian examples. Simple dating inscriptions are usually unadorned; but many mosque inscriptions, starting with the *maqṣūra* arches of the first stage of the Maṣjid Quwwat al-Islām in Delhi, are engraved against an arabesque pattern also carried in relief on the ground. The finest example of this, however, is a dating inscription of the governor Tughril from a lost building at Bihar Sharif. Similar arabesque patterns may also set off inscriptions in tilework or painted plaster, and occur also on coins of the Mughal period. Many inscriptions are of a high order of calligraphic excellence, and the names of many calligraphers in many regions of India are recorded.

The information which the inscriptions provide for the historian is sometimes very valuable; at times, they furnish the only sources for doubtful points of dynastic chronology; they supply missing details from the literary histories, or enable confusing points to be resolved where the other documents are in conflict; they enable more complete lists to be made of rulers’ families, of the local nobility or court and town

officials; and they are a valuable source of information on the history of the buildings on which they are found (subject to the reservation on their authenticity referred to above). Indirectly, too, their location enables the political status of border regions at certain confused times to be determined, such as the regions in dispute between the Malwa and Jaunpur Sultanates, or the Raichur Dō'āb; in many cases, an inscription is the only evidence for a fort or stronghold having been occupied by a particular power at any time. Even when rulers and governors are known from chronicles, the inscriptions often provide essential information on details of their careers, their promotions and postings, their achievements, even on their families. Tomb-inscriptions frequently mention their subject's birthplace, and thereby provide evidence for the extent of immigration and for the settlement pattern of foreign groups.

Administrative and economic details contained in or implied by the inscriptions can also be invaluable: information on details of departments, names of offices, and designations of office-holders; on the imposition or remission of taxes, and their varied application to certain classes or trades; on the nature and conditions of grants of land, both to holders of an *iqṭā'* and to charitable institutions such as mosque or *madrasa* as *waqf*; on land cultivation or irrigation (well inscriptions, or records of repairs to tanks and dams, often refer to the amount of land intended to be irrigated); on regional boundaries; on markets. Records on works of public utility may include a schedule of expenses or the wages to be paid to employees. Geographical details, including distances, occur in inscriptions relating to roads and bridges, which also provide information on their builders—besides recording the correct forms of place-names, which seem singularly liable to corruption by copyists of the chronicles. Building inscriptions often indicate the cost of construction as well as details of the architects; an unusual inscription in the tomb of Hūshang Shāh at Mandu records a tribute by visiting Mughal architects of the family of master-builders who were later responsible for the Tāj Maḥall. Gun inscriptions, as well as prescribing essential instructions on the quantity of charge and shot required, frequently provide information on gun founding and the gun-founders—often Turks or Europeans—involved in the industry.

The literary contribution of the inscriptions must not be overlooked. Many inscriptions are in verses composed *ad hoc*, some of considerable beauty and skill; but it must be admitted that the verse of a lot of inscriptions is no better than doggerel. This is especially the case

with verses containing a chronogram, where taste is often sacrificed in favour of ingenuity. There are occasional quotations from well-known Persian poets, but frequently the authors are local poets not otherwise recorded. Specimens of Dakhnī poetry are preserved in some Deccan inscriptions. Some prose inscriptions also evince literary merit, and may contain traditions not found in the usual collections of *aḥādīth*, such as the saying ascribed to Jesus in the Jāmi‘ Maṣjid of Fatehpur Sikri (Persian), or the variations on a tradition (Arabic) in the mosque inscriptions of Bengal, basically: “The Prophet, God’s peace be upon him, said ‘He who builds a mosque to God, for him God builds a *qaṣr* in Paradise’”. Sentiments expressed range from strict and self-conscious rectitude through quietist mysticism to wistful nostalgia.

There is also the linguistic contribution of inscriptions. The occurrence of local words (Hindī, Bengali, Marāthī, Gujarātī, Urdū and Dakhnī in particular) is useful in reconstructing the history (and social conditions of use) of Indian languages. Bilingual inscriptions provide evidence on the extent of use of local languages and their place in communication of official instructions to the public, and the status of a particular local language in a border area; this is especially the case in the Deccan, where Muslim inscriptions in Kannada, Marāthī and Telugu are not uncommon besides the usual Persian and Dakhnī.

The Indian sub-continent has been fortunate in the attention which has been paid to Muslim inscriptions for well over a century. Hundreds are recorded in orientalist publications, besides those in specialist journals devoted to epigraphy alone; and India has been well served by highly competent Government Epigraphists appointed specially to oversee Arabic and Persian inscriptions, of whom Ghulam Yazdani and Ziyauddin A. Desai were preeminent. The work of exploration, interpretation and publication is still active.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE

In the 19th century epigraphs were mostly published, usually with translations and notes, in *JASB*. From 1907 the invaluable *EIM* appeared, which continued until 1947. Pre-*EIM* inscriptions are listed in J. Horovitz, *A list of the published Mohamedan inscriptions of India*, in *EIM* (1909–10). Since the cessation of *EIM*, Muslim inscriptions of India have appeared in *EIAPS*, and valuable comments are also found in *ARIE*. Articles and studies are recorded in K.A.C. Creswell, *A bibliography*,

and its Supplements. Many of the earlier *EIM* articles collect the epigraphs of individual *sulṭāns*, but recent discoveries have rendered many of these out of date. V.S. Bendrey, *A Study of Muslim inscriptions*, Bombay 1944, extracts some historical information from epigraphs published in *EIM* to that date. But since the author knew no Arabic or Persian many significant details were not appreciated and the work suffers from the limitations of its corpus. More recently, two valuable compendia have been brought out by Ziyauddin A. Desai: see Bibliography [editor].

1 Delhi, Qutb Mīnār, 595-634/1199-1236. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

2 Ajmer, Arhātīn Kā Jhōmprā mosque, c. 626/1229. (Courtesy George Michell)

3 Delhi, tomb of Iltutmish, c. 632/1235, interior. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

4 Delhi, tomb of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq, 720-5/1320-5. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

5 Delhi, tomb of Fīrūz Shāh Tughluq, c. 790/1388, dome interior.
(Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

6 Delhi, Fīrūz Shāh Kōtlā, 752-90/1351-88. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

7 Delhi, Ḥauz-i Khāṣṣ, c. 791/1352. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

8 Delhi, tomb of Muḥammad Shāh Lōdī, c. 848/1444. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

9 Delhi, Shish Gunbad, 894-923/1489-1517. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

10 Multan, tomb of Rukn-i 'Ālam, mid 14th century. (Courtesy George Michell)

11 Uch, tomb of Bībī Jiwindi, 900/1493. (Courtesy Tanvir Hasan)

12 Jaunpur, Atalā mosque, 810/1408. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

13 Jaunpur, Jāmi' Masjid, 842/1438, interior. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

14 Pandua, Ēklākhī tomb, early 15th century. (Courtesy George Michell)

15 Hazrat Pandua, Ādīna Masjid, 776/1374-5, *mihrāb*. (Courtesy George Michell)

16 Gaur, Fīrūz Mīnār, c. 895/1490. (Courtesy George Michell)

17 Bagha, Jāmi' Masjid, 930/1523. (Courtesy Estate of David McCutcheon)

18 Cambay, Jāmi' Masjid, 725/1325. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

19 Cambay, Jāmi' Masjid, interior. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

20 Ahmadabad, Jāmi' Masjid, 827/1424. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

21 Ahmadabad, mosque of Miyān Khān Chishtī, c. 869/1465.
(Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

22 Ahmadabad, tomb of Az'am-Mu'azzam, late 15th century. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

23 Ahmadabad, tomb of Rānī Sabrāī, 920/1514. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

24 Ahmadabad, Bābā Lulū's mosque, first quarter of the 16th century, façade detail.
(Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

25 Ahmadabad, mosque of Sidī Saʿīd, 980/1572, *jālī*. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

26 Mahmudabad, tomb of Sayyid Mubarak Bukhari, after 966/1588. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

27 Gwalior, tomb of Muḥammad Ghaus, after 969/1562. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

28 Ahmadabad, Bāi Ḥarīr's vāv, 906/1500. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

29 Sarkhej, water sluice, early 16th century. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

30 Dhar, Lāt Masjid, interior, 807/1405. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

31 Mandu, Jāmi' Masjid, 858/1454. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

32 Mandu, tomb of Hūshang Shāh, c. 842/1439. (Courtesy Klaus Rötzer)

33 Chanderi, Jāmi' Masjid, mid 15th century, interior. (Courtesy Klaus Rötzer)

34 Thalner, tombs of Mīrān Mubārak Khān and others, 15th century (Courtesy John Henry Rice)

35 Daulatabad, Chānd Mīnār, c. 849/1445.
(Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

36 Gulbarga, Jāmi' Masjid, 769/1367 (?), interior. (Courtesy John Gollings)

37 Gulbarga, tomb of Fīrūz Shāh Bahmanī, c. 823/1420. (Courtesy John Gollings)

38 Bidar, *madrasa* of Maḥmūd Gāwān, 877/1472. (Courtesy John Gollings)

39 Bidar, Sharza Darwāza, early 15th century. (Courtesy John Gollings)

40 Bidar, tomb of 'Alī Barīd, 987/1579. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

41 Bijapur, Jāmi' Masjid, 985/1576, interior. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

42 Bijapur, Gol Gunbad, 1067/1656. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

43 Bijapur, Ibrāhīm Rauza, 1036/1626, tomb. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

44 Bijapur, Ibrāhīm Rauza, façade detail of tomb. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

45 Ahmadnagar, Damādi mosque, 976/1568. (Courtesy George Michell)

46 Ahmadnagar, Farāh Bakhsh Bāgh, 984-91/1576-83. (Courtesy George Michell)

47 Golkonda, tomb of Muḥammad Quṭb Shāh, 1035/1626. (Courtesy Estate of Mark Zebrowski)

48 Hyderabad, Tōlī mosque, 1082/1671. (Courtesy Estate of Mark Zebrowski)

49 Srinagar, tomb of the mother of Sultān Zayn-al-Ābidīn, early 15th century.
(Courtesy Karoki Lewis and Marg Publications)

50 Srinagar, Shāh Hamadān mosque, 15th century. (Courtesy Karoki Lewis and Marg Publications)

51 Delhi, Purānā Qil'a, c. 947-62/1540-55, west gateway. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

52 Delhi, Qil'a-i-Kuhnā Masjid, 948/1541. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

53 Sasaram, tomb of Shēr Shāh Sūrī, c. 952/1545. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

54 Delhi, tomb of Humāyūn, begun 976-8/1588-9. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

55 Fatehpur Sikri, Pāñch Maḥall, c. 970s/1570s. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

56 Fatehpur Sikri, Hiran Mīnār, 970s/1570s. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

57 Agra, tomb of Akbar at Sikandra, 1022/1613. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

58 Agra, tomb of I'timād ad-Daula, 1036-7/1626-8. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

59 Agra, Tāj Maḥall, 1041-52/1632-43. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

60 Agra, Tāj Maḥall, south portal. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

61 Delhi, Lāl Qil'a, 1048-58/1639-48, Dīwān-i Āmm. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

62 Agra, Jāmi' Masjid, 1060-66/1650-56. (Courtesy American Institute of Indian Studies)

63 Aurangabad, tomb of Rābī'a Daurānī ("Bībī kā Maqbara"), 1071/1661. (Courtesy George Michell)