

# HINDU TEMPLES

WHAT HAPPENED TO THEM

VOLUME I

*A Preliminary Survey*

Compiled and Edited by

**SITA RAM GOEL**



## Contents

1. Hideaway communalism
2. The tip of an iceberg
3. Some Historical Question
4. In The Name of Religion
5. A Need to Face The Truth
6. Historians versus History
7. November 9 Will Change History
8. From Shilanyas to Berlin Wall
9. Rama- Janmabhumi Temple & Muslim  
Testimony
10. Let the Mute Witnesses Speak
11. Appendix

## Preface

The movement for the restoration of the Ramajanmabhumi Temple at Ayodhya has brought to the fore a suppressed chapter of India's history, namely, the large-scale destruction of Hindu temples<sup>1</sup> by the Islamised invaders. This chapter is by no means closed. The Appendix to this book provides details of many temples destroyed by Muslims all over Bangladesh as recently as October-November 1989. Currently, temples, or whatever had remained of them, are meeting a similar fate in the Kashmir valley.

This chapter, however, though significant, was only a part of the Muslim behaviour-pattern as recorded by Muslim historians of medieval India. The other parts were: 1) mass slaughter of people not only during war but also after the armies of Islam had emerged victorious; 2) capture of large numbers of non-combatant men, women and children as booty and their sale as slaves all over the Islamic world; 3) forcible conversion to Islam of people who were in no position to resist; 4) reduction to the status of zimmi or non-citizens of all those who could not be converted and imposition of inhuman disabilities on them; 5) emasculation of the zimmi by preventing them from possessing arms; 6) impoverishment of the zimmi through heavy discriminatory taxes and misappropriation of a major part of what the peasants produced; 7) ruination of the native and national culture of the zimmi by suppressing and holding in contempt all its institutions and expressions.

Nor is this behaviour pattern a thing of the past. It persisted even after the Muslim rule was over. The Muslim revivalist movements in the nineteenth century, particularly in Bengal, tried to repeat, as far as they could, the performance of the medieval Muslim swordsmen and sultans. More recently, after the Islamic state of Pakistan was carved out, Hindus have been forced to leave their ancestral homes, en masse from its western wing and in a continuous stream of refugees from its eastern wing, now an independent Islamic state of Bangladesh that came into being with the help of India. Hindu temples and other cultural institutions have more or less disappeared from Pakistan, while they continue to be under constant attack in Bangladesh.

How to understand this behaviour pattern so persistently followed over a thousand years under very different conditions and so consistent in its expression? What is its deeper ideological source?

It is rooted in Islam's religious teachings, its theology and its religious laws; it derives from its peculiar conception of *momins* and *kafirs*, from its doctrines of *Jihad*, *Daru'l-Islam* and *Daru'l-harb*, and from what it regards as the duty of a Muslim state. Hindu

India is called upon to make a deeper study of Islam than it has hitherto done. It can neglect this task at its own peril.

The present volume makes no pretence of presenting such a study, but by choice restricts itself mainly to the study of Hindu temples destroyed and desecrated and converted into mosques and khanqahs without overlooking Muslims' ideology of iconoclasm; here and there, it also mentions other theological props and concomitants of the iconoclastic ideology. In the book Ayodhya retain its importance, but it does not occupy the centre of discussion. In dealing with its subject, it exercises complete fidelity to truth; unlike secularist and Marxist writers, it does not believe in re-writing and fabricating history. Its aim is to raise the informational level of our people and to make them better aware of the more persistent ideological forces at work.

Mahavira Jayanti.  
April 7, 1990

Publisher

**Footnotes:**

<sup>1</sup> "Hindu Temples" in the present context include temples belonging to all sects of Sanatana Dharma - Brahmanical, Buddhist, Jain and the rest.

Chapter One  
**Hideaway Communalism**  
Arun Shourie

**A case in which the English version of a major book by a renowned Muslim scholar, the fourth Rector of one of the greatest centres of Islamic learning in India, listing some of the mosques, including the Babri Masjid, which were built on the sites and foundations of temples, using their stones and structures, is found to have the tell-tale passages censored out;**

**The book is said to have become difficult to get;**

**It is traced: And is found to have been commanded just 15 years a-go by the most influential living Muslim scholar of our country today, the current Rector of that great centre of Islamic learning, and the Chairman of the Muslim Personal Law Board.**

**Evasion, concealment, have become a national habit. And they have terrible consequences. But first I must give you some background.**

The Nadwatul-Ulama of Lucknow is one of the principal centres of Islamic learning in India. It was founded in 1894. It ranks today next only to the Darul-Ulum at Deoband. The government publication, *Centres of Islamic Learning in India*, recalls how the founders “aimed at producing capable scholars who could project a true image of Islam before the modern world in an effective way”; it recalls how “Towards fulfilling its avowed aim in the matter of educational reform, it (the group) decided to establish an ideal educational institution which would not only provide education in religious and temporal sciences but also offer technical training”; it recalls how “It (the Nadwa) stands out today-with its college, a vast and rich library and Research and Publication Departments housed in fine buildings-as one of the most outstanding institutions for imparting instruction in the Islamic Sciences”; it recalls how “A salient feature of this institution is its emphasis on independent research”; it recalls how “The library of the Nadwa, housed in the Central Hall and the surrounding rooms of the main building, is, with more than 75,000 titles including about 3,000 handwritten books mostly in Arabic and also in Persian, Urdu, English etc., one of the finest libraries of the sub-continent.” That was written 10 years ago. The library now has 125,000 books.

**Its Head**

Today the institution is headed by Maulana Abul-Hasan Ali Nadwi. Ali Mian, as he is known to one and all, is almost without doubt the most influential Muslim teacher

and figure today-among the laity, in government circles, and among scholars and governments abroad.

He was among the founders of the Jamaat-e-Islami, the fundamentalist organisation; but because of differences with Maulana Maudoodi, he left it soon.

Today he is the Chairman of the Muslim Personal Law Board.

He is a founder member of the Raabta Alam-e-Islami, the Pan-Islamic body with headquarters in Mecca, which decides among other things the amounts that different Islamic organisations the world over should receive.

He has been the Nazim, that is the Rector, of the Darul Ulum Nadwatul-Ulama since 1961, that is for well over a quarter of a century. The Nadwa owes not a small part of its eminence to the scholarship, the exertions, the national and international contacts of Ali Mian.

Politicians of all hues ---Rajiv Gandhi, V.P. Singh, Chandrashekhar---seek him out.

He is the author of several books, including the well known *Insaani Duniya Par Musalmanon Ke Uruj-o-Zawal Ka Asar* (“The impact of the Rise and Fall of Muslims on Mankind”), and is taken as the authority on Islamic law, jurisprudence, theology, and specially history.

And he has great, in fact decisive, influence on the politics of Muslims in India.

### **His Father and His Book**

His father, Maulana Hakim Sayid Abdul Hai, was an equally well known and influential figure. When the Nadwa was founded, the first Rector, Maulana Muhammad Monghyri, the scholar at whose initiative the original meeting in 1892 which led to the establishment of the Nadwa was called, had chosen Maulana Abdul Hai as the Madadgar Nazim, the Additional Rector.

Abdul Hai served in that capacity till July 1915 when he was appointed the Rector.

Because of his scholarship and his services to the institution and to Islam, he was reappointed as the Rector in 1920. He continued in that post till his death in February 1923.

He too wrote several books, including a famous directory which has just been republished from Hyderabad, of thousands of Muslims who had served the cause of Islam in India, chiefly by the numbers they had converted to the faith.

During some work I came across the reference to a book of his and began to look for it.

It was a long, discursive book, I learnt, which began with descriptions of the geography, flora and fauna, languages, people and the regions of India. These were written for the Arabic speaking peoples, the book having been written in Arabic.

In 1972, I learnt, the Nadwatul-Ulama had the book translated into Urdu and published the most important chapters of the book under the title *Hindustan Islami Ahad Mein* (“Hindustan under Islamic Rule”). Ali Mian, I was told, had himself written the foreword in which he had commended the book most highly. The book as published had left out descriptions of geography etc., on the premise that facts about these are well known to Indian readers.

### **A Sudden Reluctance**

A curious fact hit me in the face. Many of the persons who one would have normally expected to be knowledgeable about such publications were suddenly reluctant to recall this book. I was told, in fact, that copies of the book had been removed, for instance from the Aligarh Muslim University Library. Some even suggested that a determined effort had been made three or four years ago to get back each and every copy of this book.

Fortunately the suggestion turned out to be untrue. While some of the libraries one would normally expect, to have the book-the Jamia Millia Islamia in Delhi; the famous libraries in Hyderabad-those of the Dairutul Maarifal-Osmania, of the Salar Jung Museum, of the Nizam’s Trust, of the Osmania University, the Kutubkhana-i-Saidiya - did not have it, others did. Among the latter were the Nadwa’s library itself, the justly famous Khuda Baksh Library in Patna, that of the Institute of Islamic Studies in Delhi.

The fact that the book was available in all these libraries came as a great reassurance. I felt that if reactionaries and propagandists have become so well organised that they can secure the disappearance from every library of a book they have come not to like, we are in deep trouble. Clearly they were not that resourceful.

The fact that, contrary to what I had been told, the book was available also taught me another reassuring thing: factional fights among Muslim fundamentalists are as sharp

and intense as are the factional fights among fundamentalists of other hues. For the suggestion of there being something sinister in the inaccessibility of the book had come to me from responsible Muslim quarters.

**‘This valuable gift, this historical testament’**

The book is the publication number 66 of the Majlis Tehqiqat wa Nashriat Islam, the publication house of the Nadwatul-Ulama, Lucknow.

The Arabic version was published in 1972 in Hyderabad, the Urdu version in 1973 in Lucknow. An English version was published in 1977. I will use the Urdu version as the illustration.

Maulana Abul-Hasan Ali Nadwi, that is Ali Mian himself, contributes the foreword.

It is an eloquent, almost lyrical foreword.

Islam has imbued its followers with the quest for truth, with patriotism, he writes. Their nature, their culture has made Muslims the writers of true history, he writes.

Muslims had but to reach a country, he writes, and its fortunes lit up and it awakened from the slumber of hundreds and thousands of years. The country thereby ascended from darkness to light, he writes, from oblivion and obscurity to the pinnacle of name and fame. Leaving its parochial ambit, he writes, it joined the family of man, it joined the wide and vast creation of God. And the luminescence of Islam, he writes, transformed its hidden treasures into the light of eyes.

It did not stick away the wealth of the country, he writes, and vomit it elsewhere as western powers did. On the contrary, it brought sophistication, culture, beneficent administration, peace, tranquility to the country. It raised the country from the age of savagery to the age of progress, he writes, from infantilism to adulthood. It transformed its barren lands into swaying fields, he writes, its wild shrubs into fruit-laden trees of such munificence that the residents could not even have dreamt of them.

And so on.

He then recalls the vast learning and prodigious exertions of Maulana Abdul Hai, his 8-volume work on 4500 Muslims who served the cause of Islam in India, his directory of Islamic scholars.



He recalls how after completing these books the Maulana turned to subjects which had till then remained obscure, how in these labours the Maulana was like the proverbial bee collecting honey from varied flowers. He recounts the wide range of the Maulana's scholarship. He recounts how the latter collected rare data, how a person like him accomplished single-handed what entire academies are unable these days to do.

He recounts the structure of the present book. He recalls how it lay neglected for long, how, even as the work of re-transcribing a moth-eaten manuscript was going on, a complete manuscript was discovered in Azamgarh, how in 1933 the grace of Providence saved it from destruction and obscurity.

He writes that the book brings into bold relief those hallmarks of Islamic rule which have been unjustly and untruthfully dealt with by western and Indian historians, which in fact many Muslim historians and scholars in universities and academies too have treated with neglect and lack of appreciation.

Recalling how Maulana Abdul Hai had to study thousands of pages on a subject, Ali Mian writes that only he who has himself worked on the subject can appreciate the effort that has gone into the study. You will get in a single chapter of this book, he tells the reader, the essence which you cannot obtain by reading scores of books. This is the result, he writes, of the fact that the author laboured only for the pleasure of God, for the service of learning, and the fulfilment of his own soul. Such authors expected no rewards, no applause, he tells us. Work was their entire satisfaction. That is how they were able to put in such herculean labours, to spend their entire life on one subject.

We are immensely pleased, he concludes, to present this valuable gift and historical testament to our countrymen and hope that Allah will accept this act of service and scholars will also receive it with respect and approbation.

### **The Explanation**

Such being the eminence of the author, such being the greatness of the work, why is it not the cynosure of the fundamentalists' eyes?

The answer is in the chapter "*Hindustan ki Masjidein*", "The Mosques of Hindustan".

Barely seventeen pages; the chapter is simply written. A few facts about some of the principal mosques are described in a few lines each.

The facts are well-known, they are elementary, and setting them out in a few lines each should attract no attention. And yet, as we shall see, there is furtiveness in regard to them. Why? Descriptions of seven mosques provide the answer.

The devout constructed so many mosques, Maulana Abdul Hai records, they lavished such huge amounts and such labours on them that they cannot all be reckoned, that every city, town, hamlet came to be adorned by a mosque. He says that he will therefore have to be content with setting out the facts of just a few of the well-known ones.

A few sentences from what he says about seven mosques will do:

### **“Qawwat al-Islam Mosque**

According to my findings the first mosque of Delhi is Qubbat all-Islam or Quwwat al-Islam which, it is said, Qutbud-Din Aibak constructed in H. 587 after demolishing the temple built by Prithvi Raj and leaving certain parts of the temple (outside the mosque proper); and when he returned from Ghazni in H. 592, he started building, under orders from Shihabud-Din Ghorī, a huge mosque of inimitable red stones, and certain parts of the temple were included in the mosque. After that, when Shamsud-Din Altamish became the king, he built, on both sides of it, edifices of white stones, and on one side of it he started constructing that loftiest of all towers which has no equal in the world for its beauty and strength...

### **The Mosque at Jaunpur**

This was built by Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi with chiselled stones. Originally it was a Hindu temple after demolishing which he constructed the mosque. It is known as the Atala Masjid. The Sultan used to offer his Friday and Id prayers in it, and Qazi Shihabud-Din gave lessons in it...

### **The Mosque at Qanauj**

This mosque stands on an elevated ground inside the Fort of Qanauj. It is well-known that it was built on the foundations of some Hindu temple (that stood) here. It is a beautiful mosque. They say that it was built by Ibrahim Sharqi in H. 809 as is (recorded) in *‘Gharabat Nigar’*.

### **Jami (Masjid) at Etawah**



This mosque stands on the bank of the Jamuna at Etawah. There was a Hindu temple at this place, on the site of which this mosque was constructed. It is also patterned after the mosque at Qanauj. Probably it is one of the monuments of the Sharqi Sultans.

### **Babri Masjid at Ayodhya**

This mosque was constructed by Babar at Ayodhya which Hindus call the birth place of Ramchanderji. There is a famous story about his wife Sita. It is said that Sita had a temple here in which she lived and cooked food for her husband. On that very site Babar constructed this mosque in H. 963...

### **Mosques of Alamgir (Aurangzeb)**

It is said that the mosque of Benares was built by Alamgir on the site of the Bisheshwar Temple. That temple was very tall and (held as) holy among the Hindus. On this very site and with those very stones he constructed a lofty mosque, and its ancient stones were rearranged after being embedded in the walls of the mosque. It is one of the renowned mosques of Hindustan. The second mosque at Benares (is the one) which was built by Alamgir on the bank of the Ganga with chiselled stones. This also is a renowned mosque of Hindustan. It has 28 towers, each of which is 238 feet tall. This is on the bank of the Ganga and its foundations extend to the depth of the waters.

Alamgir built a mosque at Mathura. It is said that this mosque was built on the site of the Gobind Dev Temple which was very strong and beautiful as well as exquisite..."

#### **“It is said”**

But the Maulana is not testifying to the facts. He is merely reporting what was believed. He repeatedly says, “It is said that...”

That seems to be a figure of speech with the Maulana. When describing the construction of the Quwwatul Islam mosque by Qutubuddin Aibak, for instance, he uses the same “It is said.”

If the facts were in doubt, would a ‘scholar of Ali Mian’s diligence and commitment not have commented on them in his full-bodied foreward? Indeed, he would have decided against republishing them as he decided not to republish much of the original book.

And if the scholars had felt that the passages could be that easily disposed of, why should any effort have been made to take a work to the excellence of which a scholar

of Ali Mian's stature has testified in such a fulsome manner, and do what has been done to this one? And what is that?

Each reference to each of these mosques having been constructed on the sites of temples with, as in the case of the mosque at Benaras, the stones of the very temple which was demolished for that very purpose have been censored out of the English version of the book! Each one of the passages on each one of the seven mosques! No accident that.

Indeed there is not just censorship but substitution. In the Urdu volume we are told in regard to the mosque at Qanauj for instance that "This mosque stands on an elevated ground inside the fort of Qanauj. It is well known that it was built on the foundation of some Hindu Temple (that stood) here." In the English volume we are told in regard to the same mosque that "It occupied a commanding site, believed to have been the place earlier occupied by an old and decayed fort."

If the passages could have been so easily explained away by referring to the "It is said", why would anyone have thought it necessary to remove these passages from the English version-that is the version which was more likely to be read by persons other than the faithful? Why would anyone bowdlerise the book of a major scholar in this way?

### **Conclusions**

But that, though obvious, weighs little with me. The fact that temples were broken and mosques constructed in their place is well known. Nor is the fact that the materials of the temples-the stones and idols--were used in constructing the mosque, news. It was thought that this was the way to announce hegemony. It was thought that this was the way to strike at the heart of the conquered-for in those days the temple was not just a place of worship; it was the hub of the community's life, of its learning, of its social life. So the lines in the book which bear on this practice are of no earth-shaking significance in themselves. Their real significance- and I dare say that they are but the smallest, most innocuous example that one can think of on the mosque-temple business-lies in the evasion and concealment they have spurred. I have it on good authority that the passages have been known for long, and well known to those who have been stoking the Babri Masjid issue.<sup>1</sup>

That is the significant thing; they have known them, and their impulse has been to conceal and bury rather than to ascertain the truth.



I have little doubt that a rational solution can be found for the Babri Masjid-Ram Janmabhoomi tangle, a solution which will respect the sentiments, the essentials, of the religions of all.

But no solution can be devised if the issue is going to be made the occasion for a show of strength by either side, if it is going to be converted into a symbol for establishing who shall prevail.

The fate of Maulana Abdul Hai's passages-and I do, not know whether the Urdu version itself was not a conveniently sanitised version of the original Arabic volume-illustrates the cynical manner in which those who stoke the passions of religion to further their politics are going about the matter.

Those who proceed by such cynical calculations sow havoc for all of us, for Muslims, for Hindus, for all.

Those who remain silent in the face of such cynicism, such calculations help them sow the havoc.

Will we shed our evasions and concealments? Will we at last learn to speak and face the whole truth? To see how communalism of one side justifies and stokes that of the other? To see that these "leaders" are not interested in facts, not in religion, not in a building or a site, but in power, in their personal power, and in that alone? That for them religion is but an instrument, an instrument which is so attractive because the costs of wielding it fall on others, on their followers, and not on them?

Will we never call a halt to them?

**Indian Express, February 5, 1989**

**Footnotes:**

<sup>1</sup> Several other modern Muslim historians and epigraphists accept the fact that many other mosques including the Babari Masjid at Ayodhya stand on the sites of Hindu temples.

Chapter Three  
**Some Historical Questions**  
Sita Ram Goel

Why did Islamic invaders continue to destroy Hindu temples and desecrate the idols of Hindu Gods and Goddesses throughout the period of their domination? Why did they raise mosques on sites occupied earlier by Hindu places of worship? These questions were asked by Hindu scholars in modern times after the terror of Islam had ceased and could no more seal their lips.

In India - and in India alone - two explanations have come forth. One is provided by the theology of Islam based on the Quran and the Sunnah of the Prophet. The other has been proposed by Marxist professors and lapped up by apologists of Islam. We shall take up the second explanation first.

The credit for pioneering the Marxist proposition about destruction of Hindu temples goes to the late Professor Mohammed Habib of the Aligarh Muslim University. In his book, *Sultan Mahmud of Ghaznin*, first published in 1924, he presented the thesis that Mahmud's destruction of Hindu temples was actuated not by zeal for the faith but by "lust for plunder." According to him, India at that time was bursting with vast hoards of gold and silver accumulated down the ages from rich mines and a prosperous export trade. Most of the wealth, he said without providing any proof, was concentrated in temple treasuries. "It was impossible," wrote the professor, "that the Indian temples should not sooner or later tempt some one strong and unscrupulous enough for the impious deed. Nor was it expected that a man of Mahmud's character would allow the tolerance which Islam inculcates to restrain him from taking possession of the gold... when the Indians themselves had simplified his work by concentrating the wealth of the country at a few places" (p. 82).

Professor Habib did not hide any of the salient facts regarding destruction of Hindu temples by Mahmud, though the descriptions Le gave were brief, sometimes only in footnotes. He also narrated how Mahmud's exploits were celebrated at Baghdad by the Caliph and the populace and how the hero was compared to the companions of the Prophet who had achieved similar victories in Arabia, Syria, Iraq and Iran. Only the conclusion he drew was radically different from that drawn by Mahmud's contemporaries as well as latter-day historians and theologians of Islam. "Islam," he wrote, "sanctioned neither the vandalism nor the plundering motives of the invader; no principle of the *Shariat* justifies the uncalled for attack on Hindu princes who had done Mahmud and his subjects no harm; the wanton destruction of places of worship is condemned by the law of every creed. And yet Islam, though it was not an inspiring motive could be utilised as an *a posteriors* justification for what was done. So the precepts of the Quran were misinterpreted or ignored and the tolerant



policy of the Second Caliph was cast aside in order that Mahmud and his myrmidons may be able to plunder Hindu temples with a clear and untroubled conscience” (Pp. 83-84, Emphasis in source).

This proposition of Mahmud’s guilt and Islam’s innocence appealed to the architect of India’s secularism, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. In a letter dated June 1, 1932, he wrote to his daughter, Indira Gandhi, that Mahmud “was hardly a religious man”, that he was “a Mohammedan of course, but that was by the way” and that Mahmud would have done what he did “to whatever religion he might have belonged” (*Glimpses of World History*, 1982 Reprint, p. 155). In fact, Pandit Nehru went much farther than Professor Habib. The latter had written how Mahmud gave orders to burn down thousands of temples at Mathura after he had admired their architectural excellence. Pandit Nehru narrated how Mahmud admired the temples but omitted the fact that they were destroyed by him (*Ibid.*, Pp. 155-156). Thus a determined destroyer of Hindu temples was transformed into an ardent admirer of Hindu architecture! This portrayal of Mahmud remained unchanged in his *Discovery of India* which was published in 1946 (1982 Reprint, p. 235).

In days to come, Professor Habib’s thesis that lust for plunder and not the Islamic theology of iconoclasm occasioned the destruction of Hindu temples, became the party line for Marxist historians who, in due course, came to control all institutions concerned with researching, writing and teaching of Indian history. This was extended to cover all acts of Muslim iconoclasm in medieval Indian history. It became a crime against secularism and national integration even to mention Islam or its theology in this context. Any historian who dared cite facts recorded by medieval Muslim historians was denounced as a “Hindu communalist.” Three Marxist professors wrote a book attacking Dr. R.C. Majumdar in particular, simply because the great historian was not prepared to sacrifice truth at the altar of Communist politics. The book was printed by a Communist publishing house and prescribed for graduate and post-graduate courses in Indian universities.

What was more, the Marxist professors discovered a political motive as well. Hindu temples were seen as centres of political conspiracies which Muslim sultans were forced to suppress. And if the temples got destroyed in the process, no blame could be laid at the door of the sultans who were working hard in the interest of public order and peace. In a letter published in the *Times of India* on October 21, 1985, twelve Marxist professors rallied in defence of Aurangzeb who had destroyed the Keshavdeva temple at Mathura and raised an Idgah in its place. “The Dera Keshava Rai temple,” they wrote, “was built by Raja Bir Singh Bundela in the reign of Jahangir. This large temple soon became extremely popular and acquired considerable wealth. Aurangzeb had this temple destroyed, took its wealth as booty and built an Idgah on the site. His action might have been politically motivated as

well, for at the time when the temple was destroyed he faced problems with the Bundelas as well as Jat rebellion in the Mathura region.”

The climax was reached when the same Marxist professors started explaining away Islamic iconoclasm in terms of what they described as Hindu destruction of Buddhist and Jain places of worship. They have never been able to cite more than half-a-dozen cases of doubtful veracity. A few passages in Sanskrit literature coupled with speculations about some archaeological sites have sufficed for floating the story, sold *ad nauseam* in the popular press, that Hindus destroyed Buddhist and Jain temples on a large scale. Half-a-dozen have become thousands and then hundreds of thousands in the frenzied imagination suffering from a deep-seated anti-Hindu animus. Lately, they have added to the list the destruction of “animist shrines” from pre-Hindu India, whatever that means. And these “facts” have been presented with a large dose of *suppressio veri suggestio falsi*. A few instances will illustrate the point.

A very late Buddhist book from Sri Lanka accuses Pushyamitra Sunga, a second century B.C. king, of offering prizes to those who brought to him heads of Buddhist monks. This single reference has sufficed for presenting Pushyamitra as the harbinger of a “Brahmanical reaction” which “culminated in the age of the Guptas.” The fact that the famous Buddhist stupas and monasteries at Bharhut and Sanchi were built and thrived under the very nose of Pushyamitra is never mentioned. Nor is the fact that the Gupta kings and queens built and endowed many Buddhist monasteries at Bodh Gaya, Nalanda and Sarnath among many other places.

A Pandyan king of Madura is reported to have been a persecutor of Jains. This is mentioned in a book of the Saiva faith to which he belonged. But the source also says that before becoming a convert to Saivism, the king was a devout Jain and had persecuted the Saivites. This part of the story is never mentioned by the Marxist professors while they bewail the persecution of Jains.

According to the *Rajatarirgini* of Kalhana, King Harsha of Kashmir plundered Hindu and Buddhist temples in his lust for the gold and silver which went into the making of idols. This fact is played up by the Marxist professors with great fanfare. But they never mention Kalhan’s comment that in doing what he did Harsha “acted like a Turushka (Muslim)” and was “prompted by the Turushkas in his employ.”

This placing of Hindu kings on par with Muslim invaders in the context of iconoclasm suffers from serious shortcomings. Firstly, it lacks all sense of proportion when it tries to explain away the destruction of hundreds of thousands of Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jain temples by Islamic invaders in terms of the doubtful destruction of a few Buddhist and Jain shrines by Hindu kings. Secondly, it has yet to produce evidence that Hindus ever had a theology of iconoclasm which made this practice a



permanent part of Hinduism. Isolated acts by a few fanatics whom no Hindu historian or pandit has ever admired, cannot explain away a full-fledged theology which inspired Islamic iconoclasm. Lastly, it speaks rather poorly of Marxist ethics which seems to say that one wrong can be explained away in terms of another.<sup>1</sup>

Coming to the economic and political motives for the destruction of Hindu temples, it does not need an extraordinary imagination to see that the Marxist thesis is contrived and farfetched, if not downright ridiculous. It does not explain even a fraction of the facts relating to the destruction of Hindu temples as known from literary and archaeological sources. Even if we grant that Hindu temples in India continued to be rich and centres of political unrest for more than a thousand years, it defies understanding why they alone were singled out for plunder and destruction. There was no dearth of Muslim places of worship which were far richer and greater centres of conspiracy. The desecration of Hindu idols and raising of mosques on temple sites is impossible to explain in terms of any economic or political motive whatsoever. Small wonder that the Marxist thesis ends by inventing facts instead of explaining them.

Professor Habib cannot be accused of ignorance about the theology or history of Islam. The most that can be said in his defence is that he was trying to salvage Islam by sacrificing Mahmud of Ghazni who had become the greatest symbol of Islamic intolerance in the Indian context. One wonders whether he anticipated the consequences of extending his logic to subsequent sultans of medieval India. The result has been disastrous for Islam. In the process, it has been reduced to a convenient cover for plunder and brigandage. The heroes of Islam in India have been converted into bandits and vandals.

It is amazing that apologists of Islam in India have plumped for Professor Habib's thesis as elaborated by succeeding Marxist scribes. They would have rendered service to Islam if they had continued admitting honestly that iconoclasm has been an integral part of the theology of Islam. Their predecessors in medieval India made no bones about such an admission. Nor do the scholars of Islam outside India, particularly in Pakistan.

What we need most in this country is an inter-religious dialogue in which all religions are honest and frank about their drawbacks and limitations. Such a dialogue is impossible if we hide or suppress or invent facts and offer dishonest interpretations. Mahatma Gandhi had said that Islam was born only yesterday and is still in the process of interpretation. Hiding facts and floating fictions is hardly the way for promoting that process.

**Indian Express, April 16, 1989**

## Footnotes:

<sup>1</sup> It is intriguing that the Marxist professors never mention the destruction of Buddhist and Jain establishments in Transoxiana, Sinkiang, Seistan and India which on the eve of the Islamic invasion included present-day Afghanistan, Pakistan and Bangladesh. Every historian and archaeologist of that period knows that the vast Buddhist and Jain establishments at Bukhara, Samarkand, Khotan, Balkh, Bamian, Begram, Jalalabad, Peshawar, Takshasila, Mirpur-Khas, Nagar-Parkar, Sringer, Sialkot, Agroha, Mathura, Hastinapur, Kanauj, Sravasti, Ayodhya, Sarnath, Nalanda, Vikramsila, Vaishali, Rajgir, Odantpuri, Bharhut, Paharpur, Jagaddala, Jajnagar, Nagarjunikonda, Amaravati, Kanchi, Dwarasamudra, Bharuch Valabhi, Palitana, Girnar, Patan, Jalor, Chandrawati, Bhinmal, Didwana, Nagaur, Osian, Bairat, Gwalior and Mandu were destroyed by the swordsmen of Islam. Smaller establishments of these faiths, which met the same fate, add up to several hundred.

Chapter Four  
**In the Name of Religion**  
Sita Ram Goel

We shall now take up the explanation provided by the theology of Islam derived from the Quran and the Hadis.

Ibn Ishaq, the first biographer of the Prophet, devotes many pages to a description of Arab polytheism at the time when Islam started taking shape. Every Arab household, he tells us, had an idol of some God or Goddess. He also gives the names of many idols which were housed in sanctuaries maintained by different tribes across the Arab peninsula. The Ka'ba at Mecca which housed 360 idols was only one of these sanctuaries, though it was the most prestigious. One of the idols in the Ka'ba was named Allah. Though it had some primacy over other idols, it was far from being an exclusive deity. Besides, there were many sacred groves and places of pilgrimage visited by Arabs on special occasions.

At the same time, Ibn Ishaq informs us that Monotheism was becoming an attractive creed among some sections of the Arab elite. It was the creed of the Roman, Iranian and Abyssinian empires which inspired awe and admiration among the Arabs at that time. Many Jews and Christians were present, individually or in communities, in the more important Arab towns. These People of the Book took great pride in their worship of the one and only God and looked down upon the Arabs who had had no Prophet, who possessed no Book and who worshipped stones and stocks. They aroused a sense of inferiority in the minds of those Arabs who came in close contact with them but who were not equipped with an alternate theology that could defend their own Gods and Goddesses. Such Arabs looked forward to the day when Arabia also would have a Prophet and a Book of its own.

Those who have compared the Bible and the Quran know how close the two are in spirit and language on the subject of idols and idol-worshippers. Like Jehovah of the Bible, Allah also advances his claim to be the one and only God. He denounces the *mushriks* (idolaters) as the doubly damned category of *kafirs* (unbelievers) when compared to the other category, the People of the Book. The idols, proclaims Allah while abrogating the so-called Satanic Verses, are mere names invented by the ancestors of the Arabs. They have neither eyes nor ears nor hands nor feet and can, therefore, neither help nor harm. They cannot respond to prayers and will fail to save their worshippers from hell on the Day of Judgement. They will themselves burn in the fire of hell together with those who worship them. Meanwhile, they render their worshippers *napak* (abominable) in the eyes of Allah.



In the early days of Islam, Muslims were too weak to practice iconoclasm at Mecca. They had to rest content with expressing their contempt for idols. Food which had first been offered to idols was spurned. Names which referred to some pagan God or Goddess were changed as soon as the bearers entered the fold of Islam. But the clarion call had come. “Herd them together,” said Allah, “those who commit transgression and those whom they worship, and start them on the road to hellfire” (Quran, 37.22-23). The Prophet saw Amr bin Lubayy “dragging his intestines in Fire.” Amr was a second century king, supposed to have brought idols from Syria and set them up in Arabia.

Medina where Muslims were stronger witnessed some acts of iconoclasm even before the Prophet migrated to that city. Ibn Ishaq tells us how the idol of Amr Ibnul-Jamuh was stolen at night by a group of Muslims and thrown into a cesspit, again and again till Amr lost faith in it and became a Muslim. At nearby Quba, Sahl broke up the idols of his tribe at night and took the pieces to a Muslim woman who used them as fuel.

The Prophet made iconoclasm a pious performance for all Muslims for all time to come when he practised it himself on the very day he conquered Mecca. “When the Prophet,” writes Ibn Ishaq, “prayed the noon prayer on the day of the conquest he ordered that all the idols which were round the Ka‘ba should be collected and burnt with fire and broken up.” Citing some other sources, the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* says, “Muhammad when he entered Mecca as victor is stated to have struck them in the eyes with the end of his bow before he had them dragged down and destroyed by fire.” Pictorial representations of Ali standing on the shoulders of the Prophet and tearing down the idol of Hubal from top of a Ka‘ba wall, have been published by Shias.<sup>1</sup>

Soon after, expeditions were sent to other parts of Arabia for doing what had been done at Mecca. Idols were smashed and temples destroyed or converted into mosques everywhere, Muslim poets vied with each other to record the events in rapturous verse. Fazal bin al-Mulawwih sang:

Had you seen Muhammad and his troops,  
The day the idols were smashed when he entered,  
You would have seen God’s light become manifest,  
In darkness covering the face of idolatry.

And Kab bin Malik:

We foresook al-Lat, al-Uzza and Wudd

We stripped off their necklaces and earrings.

And al-Mustaughir Bin Rabia who was a warrior as well as a poet:

I smashed Ruda so completely that  
I left it a black ruin in a hollow.

“Growing Islam,” concludes the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, “was from the very beginning intent upon the destruction of all traces of pagan idolatry and was so successful that the anti-quarians of the second and third century of the Hadira could glean only very scanty details. Some of the idols were made use of for other purposes, as for example, the idol Dhul-Kalasa... which was worshipped at Tabala, a place on the road from Mekka to Yaman in the time of Ibn al-Kalbi (about 200 A.D.), was used as a stepping stone under the door of the mosque at Tabala. Other stones which had been worshipped as idols were actually used as corner-stones of the Ka‘ba.”

Muslim historians tell us on the authority of the Prophet that idolaters of Arabia had set up idols in places which were meant to be mosques when they were established for the first time by Abraham. The mosque of Ka‘ba, we are told, had been built by Abraham at the very centre of the earth.<sup>2</sup> Those who dismiss Rama as mythological gossip and deny him a place of birth at Ayodhya may well enquire whether Abraham was a historical person who actually presided over the building of the Ka‘ba.

It is, however, recorded history that the armies of Islam did everywhere what had been done in Arabia, as they advanced into Iran, Khorasan, Transoxiana, Seistan, Afghanistan and India. Hundreds of thousands of Fire Temples of the Zoroastrians, Buddhist monasteries and Hindu temples disappeared or yielded place to mosques, ziarats and dargahs. Modern archaeology, has reconstructed what happened along the trail of Islamic invasion of all these ancient lands.

Maulana Minhaj-us-Siraj, the thirteenth century historian, sums up the theology of Islam vis-a-vis idols and idol-temples when he comes to Mahmud of Ghazni in his *Tabqat-i-Nasiri*. “He was endowed,” he writes, “with great virtues and vast abilities; and the same predominant star was in the ascendant at his birth as appeared at the dawn of Islam itself. When Sultan Mahmud ascended the throne of sovereignty his illustrious deeds became manifest unto all mankind within the pale of Islam when he converted so many thousands of idol-temples into masjids and captured many of the cities of Hindustan... He led an army to Naharwala of Gujarat, and brought away Manat, the idol from Somnath, and had it broken into four parts, one of which was cast before the centre of the great masjid at Ghaznin, the second before the gateway of the Sultan’s palace, and the third and fourth were sent to Makkah and Madinah respectively.” Mahmud’s coins struck at Lahore in the seventh year of his reign describe him as the “right hand of the Caliph” and “the breaker of idols.”

This is the simple and straightforward explanation of why Islamic invaders desecrated the idols of Hindu Gods and Goddesses, destroyed Hindu temples and converted them into mosques. It covers all facts, completely and consistently, and leaves no loopholes.

**Indian Express, May 21, 1989**

**Footnotes:**

<sup>1</sup> When Muhammad entered the Ka‘ba after his conquest of Mecca by overwhelming force, he declared, “Truth has come and falsehood has vanished” (*Sahih Muslim*, 4397). Ram Swarup comments, “It takes more than an invading army or crusaders or a demolition squad with sledge-hammers to establish the domain of Truth... Similarly, it is not that easy to get over ‘falsehood’... True spiritual demolition involves the demolition of desire-gods and ego-gods, the demolition of the false gods that reside in conceited theologies, in pretentious revelations and fond belief...” (*Understanding Islam Through Hadis*, Voice of India, Second Reprint, 1987, Pp. 115-16.)

<sup>2</sup> The Prophet of Islam gave not only a new, ‘religion’ to his country-men but also a new history of Arabia, the same as the prophets of Secularism have been doing in India since the days of Pandit Nehru’s dominance.

Chapter Five  
**A Need to Face the Truth**  
Ram Swarup

The article “Hideaway Communalism” (*Indian Express*, February 5, 1989), is unusual. It discusses a question which has been a taboo and speaks on it with a frankness rare among Indian intellectuals.

Similarly, in his articles “The Tip of An Iceberg” and “In the Name of Religion” (February 9, May 21) Sita Ram Goel brings to the subject unequalled research and discusses it in a larger historical perspective.

In the history of Islam, iconoclasm and razing other peoples’ temples are not aberrations - stray acts of zealous but misguided rulers - but are central to the faith. They derive their justification and validity from the Quranic Revelation and the Prophet’s *Sunna* or practice. It is another matter though that these could not always be implemented in their full theological rigour due to many unfavourable circumstances - an exigency for which Islamic theology makes ample provisions.

**Early Islam**

Shrines and idols of the unbelievers began to be destroyed during the Prophet’s own time and, indeed, at his own behest. *Sirat-un-Nabi*, the first pious biography of the Prophet, tells us how during the earliest days of Islam, young men at Medina influenced by Islamic teachings repeatedly crept into a house every night and carried its idol and threw “it on its face into a cesspit.”

However, desecration and destruction began in earnest when Mecca was conquered. Ali was chosen to destroy the idols at Ka’ba which, we are told, he did mounting on the shoulders of the Prophet. Umar was chosen for destroying the pictures on the walls of the shrine. After this, as *Tarikh-i-Tabari* tells us, raiding parties were sent in all directions to destroy the images of deities held in special veneration by different tribes including the images of al-Manat, al-Lat and al-Uzza, intercessories of the Satanic Verses. Sa’d was sent to destroy the shrine of al-Manat, the deity of the tribes of Aus and Khazraj. When the shrine of al-Lat was invaded, its devotees resisted. But finding themselves overpowered, they surrendered and became Muslims. The women-worshippers wept to see how their deity was

“Deserted by Her servants,  
Who did not show enough manliness in defending Her.”



Similarly, Walid was sent by the prophet to destroy the idol of al-Uzza at Nakhla, venerated by the tribes of Kinan and Nadar. Overawed, the guardians left the deity to defend herself. They called out:

O Uzza! make an annihilating attack on Khalid,  
O Uzza! if you do not kill the man Khalid  
Then bear a swift punishment or become a Christian.

Why **Christian**? The word should have been **Muslim**. It seems the tradition belongs to the very early period of Islam when at least, on the popular level, Christians and Muslims were mistaken for each other. For, both shared a common outlook, both indulged in forced conversions and both destroyed shrines belonging to others.

### **Semitic Revelation**

The fact is that the Revelation of the Prophet of Islam does not stand alone. It is rooted in the older Judaic Revelation from which Christianity also derives. The two Revelations differ in some particulars but they have important similarities. The God of both is exclusive and brooks no rivals, no partner. He demands exclusive loyalty and commands that his followers would “worship no other God.” But though so demanding in their worship, he does not make himself known to them directly. On the other hand, he communicates his will to them indirectly through a favourite messenger or prophet, or a special incarnation.

This God is so different from God in other religious traditions. For example, in Hindu tradition, a God is not exclusive. He lives in friendliness with other Gods. In fact, “other” Gods are His own manifestations. In this tradition, He also has no rigid form and is conceived in widely different ways: plurally, singly, monistically. He also recognises no single favourite intermediary but reveals Himself to all who approach Him with devotion and in wisdom. No Semitic protocol here. The Hindu tradition also accords fullest freedom of worship. Not only every one has a right to worship his God in his own way but every God is also entitled to the worship of His own devotees. Freedom indeed, both for men as well as for Gods. It was on this principle that early Christians enjoyed their freedom of worship.

### **“Chosen” People**

The other side of the coin of a “Jealous God” is the concept of a “Chosen People” or a Church or *Ummah*. The chosen God has a chosen people (and even his chosen enemies). Both assist each other. While their God helps the believers in fighting their neighbours, the believers help their God in fighting his rival-Gods.

It is common for men and women everywhere to invoke the help of their Gods in their various undertakings, big or small. But the God of the believers also calls upon them to fight for his greater glory, to fight his enemies and to extend his dominion on the earth. In short, they are to become his swordsmen and salesmen, his “witnesses”, his martyrs and *Ghazis*. They must fight not only their unbelieving neighbours but also, even more specifically, their (neighbours’) Gods. For these Gods are not only the Gods of their enemies, but they are also the enemies of their God, which is even worse.

The believers have taken this god-given mission seriously. The *Hedaya* (Guidance), the Muslim Law Book *par excellence*, quotes the Prophet and lays down: “We are directed to make war upon men until such time as they shall confess. There is no God but Allah.”

### **Earthly Reward**

However, it is not all God and his glory all the time. The undertaking has its practical side too. The crusaders are not without their earthly rewards. They work to extend the sovereignty of their God and, in the process, their own too. A pious tradition proclaims that the earth belongs to Allah and his Prophet. Therefore, the inescapable conclusion is that the infidels are merely squatters, and they should be dispossessed and the land returned to its rightful owners, the believers.

Today, the intellectual fashion is to emphasize the political and economic aims of imperialism and to neglect its theological component. But history shows that the most durable imperialisms have been those which had the support of a continuing theological motive. Such imperialisms dominated without a conscience - or, rather, whatever conscience they had supported their domination. The power of faith killed all possible doubts and self-criticism.

“Hideaway Communalism” quotes extensively from the Foreword of Maulana Abul-Hasan Ali Nadwi which he contributed to the book, *Hindustan under Islamic Rule*. These quotes show that in its self-estimation and self-righteousness, the white-man’s burden of civilising the world is a poor match to Islam’s responsibility of bringing the earth under Allah and his Prophet.

### **Iconoclasm**

Semitic “My-Godism” described as Monotheism has another dimension: Iconoclasm. In fact, the two are two sides of the same coin. When worshippers of the Semitic God came into Contact with their neighbours, it was not clear what they abhorred more, their Gods or their idols. In point of fact, they made no such fine distinction. Trained as they were, they made war on both indiscriminately.

The Judaic God commands his worshippers that when they enter the land of their enemies, they will “destroy their altars, and break their images, and cut down their groves, and burn their graves images with fire” (*Bible*, Deut. 7.5). Perhaps the Judaic Revelation was meant to apply only to the territory of the Promised Land; but when Christianity and, in due course, Islam became its proud inheritors and adopted the Biblical God, its operation became university. Wherever the two creeds went, temple-raiding followed. Today, Christianity seems to present a different face but during the better part of its career it was stoutly iconoclastic. In the Mediterranean countries, in Northern Europe, in Asia and the two Americas, it destroyed shrines of the pagans with unparalleled thoroughness and perfect self-satisfaction. When America was discovered, the Benedictine monks who came in the train of Columbus boasted of having destroyed single-handed 170,000 images in Haiti alone. Juan de Zummarage, the first Bishop of Mexico, writing as early as 1531, claimed that he destroyed 500 temples and 20,000 idols of the heathens. In our own country, in Goa, Jesuit fathers destroyed many Hindu temples.

Islam did the same. Wherever it went, it carried fire and sword and destroyed the temples of the conquered people. Goel has documented some of the cases but as he himself says they represent merely the tip of an iceberg.

### **Islam’s Religious Policy**

Like its monotheism, Semitic iconoclasm too was essentially a hegemonistic idea. No imperialism is secure unless it destroys the pride, culture and valour of a conquered people. People who retain their religions, their Gods and their priests make poor subjects and remain potential rebels.

Islam knew this and it developed a full-fledged theory of Religious domination. Temples were destroyed not for their “hoarded wealth” as Marxist historians propagate - who ever heard of Hindus being specially in the habit of hoarding their wealth in their temples? - nor were they destroyed by invaders in the first flush of their victory. On the other hand, these formed part of a larger policy of religious persecution which was followed in peace-time too when the Muslim rule was established. The policy of persecution had a purpose-it was meant to keep down the people and to disarm them culturally and spiritually, to destroy their pride and self-respect, and to remind them that they were *Zimmi*s, an inferior breed.

According to this policy, *Zimmi*s were allowed to exercise their religion in low key so long as they accepted civic and political disabilities and paid *Jizya* “in abasement”. There were many restrictions, particularly in cities. The Muslim Law (*Hedaya*) lays down that “as the tokens of Islam (such as public prayers, festivals, and so forth) appear in the cities, *Zimmi*s should not be permitted to celebrate the tokens

of infidelity there.” Some of these restrictions placed on Hindu processions and celebrations still continue. This is a legacy of the Muslim period.

The same law laid down that the infidels could not build new temples though they could repair old ones. Probably this explains why there is no record of a worthwhile Hindu temple built since 1192 in Delhi. The first such temple Lakshmi Narayan Mandir, inaugurated by Mahatma Gandhi, came up in 1938, after a lapse of more than seven hundred years.

### **No Easy Solution**

The foregoing discussion shows that the problem is not that of the Rama Janmabhumi Temple of Ayodhya, or the Krishna Temple of Mathura or the Visveshvara Temple of Varanasi. In its deeper aspect, the problem relates to an aggressive theology and political ideology which created an aggressive tradition of history. Needless to say that the problem in all its huge dimensions admits of no easy solution. In an ordinary situation, one could appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober, from a man’s passion to his reason and conscience. But in the present case when Islamic theology is on the side of its historical practice and its more aggressive aims, this option is hardly available. But even then while showing, by exercising firmness, that aggression will not pay, we must yet be patient and understanding. We must realize that the problem is not **Muslims** but **Islam** or **Islamic theology**. Therefore, this theology needs a more critical examination than has been hitherto done. We must properly study Revelatory religions, their Gods and their prophets, their theories of special covenants and favoured *ummahs*, their doctrine of **one God** and **two humanities**, their categories of believers and infidels or pagans, their theory of Prophetism, their divinely ordained mission to convert and crusade.

It is a task which needs the creative labour of all seekers and articulators of truth. Closed creeds are a threat both to deeper spirituality and to deeper humanity, and they badly need some sort of *glasnost*, openness and freedom. A wider discussion will help them to open up.

In this task, Muslim intellectuals can play an important role. In fact, it is expected of them. It may start a new process of rethinking among the Muslims on their fundamentals - a different and truer sort of fundamentalism than they have hitherto known.

It is also a task which imposes an inescapable duty on Hindu-Buddhist thinkers with their inheritance of Yoga. In fact, India’s Yoga has a lot to contribute to the discussion. We are told that Revelations come from Gods. But from another angle, Revelations and Gods themselves come from man and his psyche, as Yoga teaches



us. This psyche in turn has its various levels of purity and inwardness and every level projects its own God, Revelation and Theology. Therefore, not all Gods and Revelations have the same purity. In fact, some of them are not worthy enough and they support an equally questionable politics.

Such a conclusion may disappoint many Hindu wise men who fondly cling to the belief that all religions are the same and all prophets preach and say the same things. But they must learn not to evade issues and even while seeking unities, they must yet learn to recognise differences where they exist.

At the end, we again return to “Hideaway Communalism” which tells us of “evasion and concealment” and the need to “face the truth.” However, the sorry fact is that in order to avoid facing truth we have built up an elaborate system of evasion and concealment which protects not merely “hideaway communalism”, but also shields and even fosters more sinister forces of a “hideaway Imperialism” and a “hideaway theology” which distorts relations between man and Gods and between man and man. The need is to become aware of the problem at a deeper level and in its larger antecedents and consequences.

**Indian Express, June 18, 1989**

Chapter Six  
**Historians Versus History**  
Ram Swarup

Wole Soyinka, African Nobel Laureate, delivering the 20th Nehru Memorial Lecture on November 13, 1988, made an important though by no means a new observation - that the colonial histories have been written from the European viewpoint. Speaking about Indian histories, he said that “there is a big question mark on everything that the British historians have written”. He added that serious efforts are being made by historians back home “to rewrite African history.”

We do not know what this project involves and how it is faring in Africa, but in India efforts in this direction have yielded meagre results. Not that there has been a dearth of rewriters, but their talent has not been equal to their zeal.

The phrase “re-writing of history” leaves a bad taste in the mouth and it is offensive to our sense of truth. Recent instances of rewriting have not helped to improve the image of the task and they inspired little confidence. In most cases one did not know where legitimate rewriting ended and forgery began. In practical terms, it has meant that history is written to support the latest party line, or the latest dictator.

What does, therefore, the rewriting of history mean? How far can we go in that direction? Does it mean saying good-bye to all sense of truth and objectivity, or does it mean only restoring some neglected truths and perspective? Some have looked at our present through the eyes of the past, but will it be any better to look at our past through the eyes of the present, or even go further and write about our past and present-in the spirit of “socialist realism”-in terms of the future, in terms of tasks conceived and planned by our *avante garde* for the future of the country?

There are other related questions. Is the European history of Asia and Africa all wrong and does it need wholesale replacement? Or does it also have some valuable elements, particularly in its methodology if not in its conclusions, which should be retained and even further developed? In the Indian context, is the British history of India monolithic, all painted black by motivated historians? Or, is it also pluralistic and contains many views, some of them highly appreciative of the country’s culture, philosophy and artistic creations?

And also, looked at objectively, apart from the intentions of the writers and even in spite of their jaundiced views, have not their histories sometimes helped us to become better aware of our past and made us in some ways rediscover ourselves in the limited sense in which the words ‘past’ and ‘rediscovery’ are understood today?

To hold that all British history of India was wrong will be highly unrealistic and will have few buyers. True, many British, historians were prejudiced. But there were also others who had genuine curiosity and in spite of their pre-conceived notions, they tried to do their job faithfully in the spirit of objectivity. In the pursuit of their researches, they applied methods followed in Europe. They collected, collated and compared old manuscripts. They deciphered old, forgotten scripts and in the process discovered an important segment of our past. They developed linguistics, archaeology, carbon-dating, numismatics; they found for us ample evidence of India in Asia. They discovered for us much new data, local and international. True, many times they tried to twist this data and put fanciful constructions on it, but this new respect for facts imposed its own discipline and tended to evolve objective criteria. Because of the objective nature of the criteria, their findings did not always support their prejudices and preconceived notions. For example, their data proved that India represented an ancient culture with remarkable continuity and widespread influence and that it had a long and well-established tradition of self-rule and self-governing republics, and free institutions and free discussion.

However, while admitting these positive factors, it is also true that the British historians distorted Indian history on some most essential points. The distortion was not conscious but was unconscious; however, it was not less real and potent on that account.

### **British Historians**

The mind of British scholars was shaped by their position as rulers of a fast-expanding Empire and by its need to consolidate itself ideologically and politically. As rulers, they felt a new racial and cultural superiority and, reinforced by their religion, developed a strong conviction of their civilizing mission. Many of them also felt a great urge to bring the blessings of Christian morals and a Christian God to a benighted paganism, as long as the attempt did not endanger the Empire.

The rulers had also more palpable political needs. The subject people should have no higher notion of their past beyond their present status, which they should also learn to accept without murmur and even with thankfulness. The British rulers had an interest in telling the Indian people that the latter had never been a nation but a conglomerate of miscellaneous people drawn from diverse sources and informed by no principle of unity; that their history had been an history of invaders and conquerors and that they had never known indigenous rule; and that, indeed, they were indifferent to self-rule and that so long as their village-life was intact, they did not bother who ruled at the Centre. All these lessons were tirelessly taught and dutifully learnt, so much so that even after the British have left, these assumptions and categories still shape our larger political thinking and historical perspective. That India is multi-racial, multi-national,

multi-linguistic, multi-cultural painfully trying to acquire a principle of unity under their aegis is also the assumption of our own new leaders and elite.

These were the basic attitudes and unspoken interests that shaped the minds of the British historians, but within this framework there was room enough for individual preferences and temperamental peculiarities. Some of them could show their genuine appreciation for Hindu language, grammar, architecture, and other, cultural achievements, but this appreciation would not go beyond a certain point, nor in a direction which began to feed the people's wider national consciousness and pride in themselves as an ancient nation. In this respect too, our intellectual elite follow the lead of the British scholars. Many of them-unless they are Marxists or Macaulayists - are not without a measure of appreciation and pride for some of our old cultural creations. But this appreciation does not extend to that larger culture itself which put forth those creations, and that religion and spirit in which that culture was rooted and those people and that society which upheld that religion and that culture.

We are told that the British highlighted Hindu-Muslim differences. They certainly did. But they had no interest in telling the Indians that their forefathers shared a common religion, that some of them got converted under peculiar circumstances, that those circumstances were no longer valid, and that they should not lose their consciousness of their original and wider fold. On the other hand, the way the British wrote their history perpetuated the myth of a Muslim rule and a Muslim period which could not but accentuate Hindu-Muslim differences and promote Muslim separatism.

The main interest of the British was to write a history which justified their presence in India. They were imperial rulers and by their situation and function they felt a bond of sympathy and affinity with the rulers that had preceded them. They held India by the right of conquest; therefore, they had to recognise the legitimacy of this right in the case of the Moghuls, the Afghans and the Arabs too.

But this justification was too crude and naked for the British conscience. To assuage it, the British offered a legal and moral alibi. They held that they were legitimate successors of the Moghuls and represented continuity with India's past. The Moghuls were presented as empire builders, those who united India and gave it law and order, peace and stability - the natural blessings of an Imperial order. And the British themselves were merely the successors of the Imperial rights of the Moghuls and upheld the Imperial authority of Delhi. Whatever elevated Moghul authority at Delhi, elevated their imperial authority too.

Facts sometimes compelled the British historians to speak of cruelties and vandalism of the Muslim rule but this did not stop them from upholding its authority. For they knew that the myth of Imperialism is one and that the glory of the Moghul rulers and



the myth of their invincibility added to the glory and the myth of the British Empire itself.

Thus all these factors made the British give a new boost to the Muslim rule in India. While trying to legitimise their own rule, they also gave to their predecessor a kind of legitimacy which they never had in the eyes of the Indian people. In fact, in the larger national consciousness, the Muslim rule had as little legitimacy as the British rule had later on. Both were considered as foreign impositions and resisted as such as far as time, opportunity and the prevailing power equation allowed it.

But by the same token and for the same reason this resistance, long and stubborn, was underplayed by British historians and presented as “revolts” or “rebellions” against the legitimate Imperial authority of the Centre. They felt, and quite rightly from their viewpoint, that Indian history should have nothing to show that its people waged many battles and repulsed many invaders. Thus, in this way, India came to have a history which is the history of its invaders, whose dominion its people accepted meekly.

### **Muslim Historians**

Even before the British came on the stage, Muslim historians had written similar histories. Those histories were mostly annals written by scribes or *munshis* employed by Muslim kings. The task of these annalists was to glorify Islam and their immediate patrons, a task which they performed with great zeal and rhetoric. In the performance of this task, they resorted to no moral or intellectual disguise. The glory of Islam and the extension of *Darul-Islam* (the Muslim equivalent of the British “Empire”) was self-justified and needed no artificial props. They spoke of the massacres of the infidels, of their forcible conversions, of their temples rased and of similar tyrannies perpetrated with great rejoice, as Sir H.M. Elliot points out.

### **“Hindu” Historians**

The results were no better when the annalist employed happened to be a Hindu. Elliot again observes that from “one of that nation we might have expected to have learnt what were the feelings, hopes, faiths, fears, and yearnings, of his subject race,” but this was not to be. On the other hand, in his writing, there is “nothing to betray his religion or his nation... With him, a Hindu is an ‘infidel’, and a Muhammadan ‘one of true faith’,... With him, when Hindus are killed, ‘their souls are despatched to hell’, and when a Muhammadan suffers the same fate, he ‘drinks the cup of martyrdom’... He speaks of the ‘light of Islam shedding its refulgence on the world’.”

But what comes next intrigues Elliot even more. Even after the tyrant was no more and the falsification of history through terror was no longer necessary (Elliot quotes Tacitus : *Teberii ac Neronis res ob metum falsae*), he finds that there is still “not one of this slavish crew who treats the history of his native country subjectively, or presents us with the thoughts, emotions, and raptures which a long oppressed race might be supposed to give vent to.”

This tribe of Hindu *munshis* or the “slavish crew” of Elliot have a long life and show a remarkable continuity. Instead of diminishing, their number has multiplied with time. Today, they dominate the universities, the media and the country’s political thinking.

They were reinforced by another set of historians - those who carry the British tradition. One very important thing in common with them is that they continue to look at India through the eyes of Muslim and British rulers even long after their rule has ceased.

Elliot regards the problem with moral indignation but the phenomenon involves deep psychological and sociological factors. It is more complex than the question of patronage enjoyed or tyranny withdrawn.

Hindus have lived under very trying circumstances for many centuries and during this time their psyche suffered much damage. Short term tyranny may prove a challenge but long-term, sustained tyranny tends to benumb and dehumanize. Under continued military and ideological attack, many Hindus lost initiative and originality; they lost naturalness and self-confidence; they lost pride in themselves, pride in their past and in their history and in their nation. They learnt to live a sort of underground life, furtively and apologetically. Some tried to save their self-respect by identifying themselves with the thoughts and sentiments of the rulers. They even adopted the rulers’ contempt for their own people.

These attitudes imbibed over a long period have become our second nature, and they have acquired an independence and dynamism of their own. We have begun to look at ourselves through the eyes of our rulers.

### **Post-Independence Period**

One would have thought that all this would change after we attained Independence, but this did not happen. It shows that to throw off an intellectual and cultural yoke is far more difficult than to throw off a political yoke.

By and large we have retained our old history written by our rulers. The leaders of the nationalist movement are quite content with it, except that they have added to it one more chapter at the end which depicts them in a super-heroic role. The new leaders have no greater vision of Indian history and they look forward to no greater task than to perpetuate themselves.

In fact they have developed a vested interest in old history which propagates that India was never a nation, that it had not known any freedom or freedom-struggle in the past. By sheer contrast, it exalts their role and proves something they would like to believe - that they are the first nation-builders, that they led the first freedom struggle India has ever known and, indeed, she became free for the first time under their aegis. This highly flatters their ego, and to give themselves this unique status we find that their attacks on India's past are as vicious and ignorant as those of the British and Muslim historians. No wonder histories continue to be written with all the contempt we learnt to feel for our past, and with all the lack of understanding we developed for our culture during the days of foreign domination.

A new source of distortion was opened during the period of the freedom struggle itself. Nationalist leaders strove to win Muslim support for the Independence struggle. In the hope of achieving this end, Indian nationalism itself began to rewrite the history of medieval times. Under this motivation, Muslim rule became 'indigenous', and Muslim kings became 'national' kings, and even nationalists, those who fought them began to receive a low score. R.C. Majumdar tells us how, under this motivation, national leaders created an "imaginary history", one of them even proclaiming that "Hindus were not at all a subject race during the Muslim rule," and how "these absurd notions, which would have been laughed at by Indian leaders at the beginning of the 19th century, passed current as history... at the end of that century".

### **Marxist Distortions**

Marxists have taken to rewriting Indian history on a large scale and it has meant its systematic falsification. They have a dogmatic view of history and for them the use of any history is to prove their dogma. Their very approach is hurtful to truth. But this is a large subject and we would not go into it here, even though it is related intimately to the subject under discussion.

The Marxists' contempt for India, particularly the India of religion, culture and philosophy, is deep and theoretically fortified. It exceeds the contempt ever shown by the most die-hard imperialists. Some of the British had an orientalist's fascination for the East or an administrator's paternal concern for their wards, but Marxists suffer from no such sentimentality. The very "Asiatic mode of production" was primitive

and any, “superstructure” of ideas and culture built on that foundation must be barbaric too and it had better go.

Not many realize how thoroughly European Marx was in his orientation. He treated all Asia and Africa as an appendage of the West and, indeed, of the Anglo-Saxon Great Britain. He borrowed all his theses on India from British rulers and fully subscribed to them. With them he believes that “Indian society has no history at all, at least no known history,” and that what “we call its history, is the history of successive intruders.” With them he also believes that India “has neither known nor cared for self-rule.” In fact, he rules out self-rule for India altogether and in this matter gives her no choice. He says that the question is “not whether the English had a right to conquer India, but whether we are to prefer India conquered by the Turk, by the Persian, by the Russian, to India conquered by the Briton.” His own choice was clear.

Indian Marxists fully accept this thesis, except that they are also near-equal admirers of the “Turkish” conquest of India. Indian Marxists get quite lyrical about this conquest and find quite fulfilment in it. Let us illustrate the point with the example of M.N. Roy. We are told that he gave up Marxism but he kept enough of it to retain his admiration for Muslim Imperialism. He admires the “historical role of Islam” in a book of the same name and praises the “Arab Empire” as a “magnificent monument to the memory of Mohammad.” He hails Muslim invasion of India and tells us how “it was welcomed as a message of hope and freedom by the multitudinous victims of Brahmanical reaction.”

Earlier, Roy had spoken of “our country” which “had become almost liberated from the Moslem Empire.” But that was long ago when he was merely a nationalist and had not come under the influence of Marxism. Marxism teaches a new appreciation for Imperialism; it idealises old Imperialisms and prepares a people for a new one. Its moving power is deep-rooted self-alienation and its greatest ally is cultural and spiritual illiteracy.

Marxist writers and historians of a sort are all over the place and they are well entrenched in the academic and media sectors. They have a great say in University appointments and promotions, in the awarding of research grants, in drawing up syllabi, and in the choosing and prescribing of text-books. No true history of India is possible without countering their philosophy, ideas and influence.

**Indian Express, January 15, 1989**

Chapter Six  
**Historians Versus History**  
Ram Swarup

Wole Soyinka, African Nobel Laureate, delivering the 20th Nehru Memorial Lecture on November 13, 1988, made an important though by no means a new observation - that the colonial histories have been written from the European viewpoint. Speaking about Indian histories, he said that “there is a big question mark on everything that the British historians have written”. He added that serious efforts are being made by historians back home “to rewrite African history.”

We do not know what this project involves and how it is faring in Africa, but in India efforts in this direction have yielded meagre results. Not that there has been a dearth of rewriters, but their talent has not been equal to their zeal.

The phrase “re-writing of history” leaves a bad taste in the mouth and it is offensive to our sense of truth. Recent instances of rewriting have not helped to improve the image of the task and they inspired little confidence. In most cases one did not know where legitimate rewriting ended and forgery began. In practical terms, it has meant that history is written to support the latest party line, or the latest dictator.

What does, therefore, the rewriting of history mean? How far can we go in that direction? Does it mean saying good-bye to all sense of truth and objectivity, or does it mean only restoring some neglected truths and perspective? Some have looked at our present through the eyes of the past, but will it be any better to look at our past through the eyes of the present, or even go further and write about our past and present-in the spirit of “socialist realism”-in terms of the future, in terms of tasks conceived and planned by our *avante garde* for the future of the country?

There are other related questions. Is the European history of Asia and Africa all wrong and does it need wholesale replacement? Or does it also have some valuable elements, particularly in its methodology if not in its conclusions, which should be retained and even further developed? In the Indian context, is the British history of India monolithic, all painted black by motivated historians? Or, is it also pluralistic and contains many views, some of them highly appreciative of the country’s culture, philosophy and artistic creations?

And also, looked at objectively, apart from the intentions of the writers and even in spite of their jaundiced views, have not their histories sometimes helped us to become better aware of our past and made us in some ways rediscover ourselves in the limited sense in which the words ‘past’ and ‘rediscovery’ are understood today?



To hold that all British history of India was wrong will be highly unrealistic and will have few buyers. True, many British, historians were prejudiced. But there were also others who had genuine curiosity and in spite of their pre-conceived notions, they tried to do their job faithfully in the spirit of objectivity. In the pursuit of their researches, they applied methods followed in Europe. They collected, collated and compared old manuscripts. They deciphered old, forgotten scripts and in the process discovered an important segment of our past. They developed linguistics, archaeology, carbon-dating, numismatics; they found for us ample evidence of India in Asia. They discovered for us much new data, local and international. True, many times they tried to twist this data and put fanciful constructions on it, but this new respect for facts imposed its own discipline and tended to evolve objective criteria. Because of the objective nature of the criteria, their findings did not always support their prejudices and preconceived notions. For example, their data proved that India represented an ancient culture with remarkable continuity and widespread influence and that it had a long and well-established tradition of self-rule and self-governing republics, and free institutions and free discussion.

However, while admitting these positive factors, it is also true that the British historians distorted Indian history on some most essential points. The distortion was not conscious but was unconscious; however, it was not less real and potent on that account.

### **British Historians**

The mind of British scholars was shaped by their position as rulers of a fast-expanding Empire and by its need to consolidate itself ideologically and politically. As rulers, they felt a new racial and cultural superiority and, reinforced by their religion, developed a strong conviction of their civilizing mission. Many of them also felt a great urge to bring the blessings of Christian morals and a Christian God to a benighted paganism, as long as the attempt did not endanger the Empire.

The rulers had also more palpable political needs. The subject people should have no higher notion of their past beyond their present status, which they should also learn to accept without murmur and even with thankfulness. The British rulers had an interest in telling the Indian people that the latter had never been a nation but a conglomerate of miscellaneous people drawn from diverse sources and informed by no principle of unity; that their history had been an history of invaders and conquerors and that they had never known indigenous rule; and that, indeed, they were indifferent to self-rule and that so long as their village-life was intact, they did not bother who ruled at the Centre. All these lessons were tirelessly taught and dutifully learnt, so much so that even after the British have left, these assumptions and categories still shape our larger political thinking and historical perspective. That India is multi-racial, multi-national,

multi-linguistic, multi-cultural painfully trying to acquire a principle of unity under their aegis is also the assumption of our own new leaders and elite.

These were the basic attitudes and unspoken interests that shaped the minds of the British historians, but within this framework there was room enough for individual preferences and temperamental peculiarities. Some of them could show their genuine appreciation for Hindu language, grammar, architecture, and other, cultural achievements, but this appreciation would not go beyond a certain point, nor in a direction which began to feed the people's wider national consciousness and pride in themselves as an ancient nation. In this respect too, our intellectual elite follow the lead of the British scholars. Many of them-unless they are Marxists or Macaulayists - are not without a measure of appreciation and pride for some of our old cultural creations. But this appreciation does not extend to that larger culture itself which put forth those creations, and that religion and spirit in which that culture was rooted and those people and that society which upheld that religion and that culture.

We are told that the British highlighted Hindu-Muslim differences. They certainly did. But they had no interest in telling the Indians that their forefathers shared a common religion, that some of them got converted under peculiar circumstances, that those circumstances were no longer valid, and that they should not lose their consciousness of their original and wider fold. On the other hand, the way the British wrote their history perpetuated the myth of a Muslim rule and a Muslim period which could not but accentuate Hindu-Muslim differences and promote Muslim separatism.

The main interest of the British was to write a history which justified their presence in India. They were imperial rulers and by their situation and function they felt a bond of sympathy and affinity with the rulers that had preceded them. They held India by the right of conquest; therefore, they had to recognise the legitimacy of this right in the case of the Moghuls, the Afghans and the Arabs too.

But this justification was too crude and naked for the British conscience. To assuage it, the British offered a legal and moral alibi. They held that they were legitimate successors of the Moghuls and represented continuity with India's past. The Moghuls were presented as empire builders, those who united India and gave it law and order, peace and stability - the natural blessings of an Imperial order. And the British themselves were merely the successors of the Imperial rights of the Moghuls and upheld the Imperial authority of Delhi. Whatever elevated Moghul authority at Delhi, elevated their imperial authority too.

Facts sometimes compelled the British historians to speak of cruelties and vandalism of the Muslim rule but this did not stop them from upholding its authority. For they knew that the myth of Imperialism is one and that the glory of the Moghul rulers and

the myth of their invincibility added to the glory and the myth of the British Empire itself.

Thus all these factors made the British give a new boost to the Muslim rule in India. While trying to legitimise their own rule, they also gave to their predecessor a kind of legitimacy which they never had in the eyes of the Indian people. In fact, in the larger national consciousness, the Muslim rule had as little legitimacy as the British rule had later on. Both were considered as foreign impositions and resisted as such as far as time, opportunity and the prevailing power equation allowed it.

But by the same token and for the same reason this resistance, long and stubborn, was underplayed by British historians and presented as “revolts” or “rebellions” against the legitimate Imperial authority of the Centre. They felt, and quite rightly from their viewpoint, that Indian history should have nothing to show that its people waged many battles and repulsed many invaders. Thus, in this way, India came to have a history which is the history of its invaders, whose dominion its people accepted meekly.

### **Muslim Historians**

Even before the British came on the stage, Muslim historians had written similar histories. Those histories were mostly annals written by scribes or *munshis* employed by Muslim kings. The task of these annalists was to glorify Islam and their immediate patrons, a task which they performed with great zeal and rhetoric. In the performance of this task, they resorted to no moral or intellectual disguise. The glory of Islam and the extension of *Darul-Islam* (the Muslim equivalent of the British “Empire”) was self-justified and needed no artificial props. They spoke of the massacres of the infidels, of their forcible conversions, of their temples rased and of similar tyrannies perpetrated with great rejoice, as Sir H.M. Elliot points out.

### **“Hindu” Historians**

The results were no better when the annalist employed happened to be a Hindu. Elliot again observes that from “one of that nation we might have expected to have learnt what were the feelings, hopes, faiths, fears, and yearnings, of his subject race,” but this was not to be. On the other hand, in his writing, there is “nothing to betray his religion or his nation... With him, a Hindu is an ‘infidel’, and a Muhammadan ‘one of true faith’,... With him, when Hindus are killed, ‘their souls are despatched to hell’, and when a Muhammadan suffers the same fate, he ‘drinks the cup of martyrdom’... He speaks of the ‘light of Islam shedding its refulgence on the world’.”

But what comes next intrigues Elliot even more. Even after the tyrant was no more and the falsification of history through terror was no longer necessary (Elliot quotes Tacitus : *Teberii ac Neronis res ob metum falsae*), he finds that there is still “not one of this slavish crew who treats the history of his native country subjectively, or presents us with the thoughts, emotions, and raptures which a long oppressed race might be supposed to give vent to.”

This tribe of Hindu *munshis* or the “slavish crew” of Elliot have a long life and show a remarkable continuity. Instead of diminishing, their number has multiplied with time. Today, they dominate the universities, the media and the country’s political thinking.

They were reinforced by another set of historians - those who carry the British tradition. One very important thing in common with them is that they continue to look at India through the eyes of Muslim and British rulers even long after their rule has ceased.

Elliot regards the problem with moral indignation but the phenomenon involves deep psychological and sociological factors. It is more complex than the question of patronage enjoyed or tyranny withdrawn.

Hindus have lived under very trying circumstances for many centuries and during this time their psyche suffered much damage. Short term tyranny may prove a challenge but long-term, sustained tyranny tends to benumb and dehumanize. Under continued military and ideological attack, many Hindus lost initiative and originality; they lost naturalness and self-confidence; they lost pride in themselves, pride in their past and in their history and in their nation. They learnt to live a sort of underground life, furtively and apologetically. Some tried to save their self-respect by identifying themselves with the thoughts and sentiments of the rulers. They even adopted the rulers’ contempt for their own people.

These attitudes imbibed over a long period have become our second nature, and they have acquired an independence and dynamism of their own. We have begun to look at ourselves through the eyes of our rulers.

### **Post-Independence Period**

One would have thought that all this would change after we attained Independence, but this did not happen. It shows that to throw off an intellectual and cultural yoke is far more difficult than to throw off a political yoke.

By and large we have retained our old history written by our rulers. The leaders of the nationalist movement are quite content with it, except that they have added to it one more chapter at the end which depicts them in a super-heroic role. The new leaders have no greater vision of Indian history and they look forward to no greater task than to perpetuate themselves.

In fact they have developed a vested interest in old history which propagates that India was never a nation, that it had not known any freedom or freedom-struggle in the past. By sheer contrast, it exalts their role and proves something they would like to believe - that they are the first nation-builders, that they led the first freedom struggle India has ever known and, indeed, she became free for the first time under their aegis. This highly flatters their ego, and to give themselves this unique status we find that their attacks on India's past are as vicious and ignorant as those of the British and Muslim historians. No wonder histories continue to be written with all the contempt we learnt to feel for our past, and with all the lack of understanding we developed for our culture during the days of foreign domination.

A new source of distortion was opened during the period of the freedom struggle itself. Nationalist leaders strove to win Muslim support for the Independence struggle. In the hope of achieving this end, Indian nationalism itself began to rewrite the history of medieval times. Under this motivation, Muslim rule became 'indigenous', and Muslim kings became 'national' kings, and even nationalists, those who fought them began to receive a low score. R.C. Majumdar tells us how, under this motivation, national leaders created an "imaginary history", one of them even proclaiming that "Hindus were not at all a subject race during the Muslim rule," and how "these absurd notions, which would have been laughed at by Indian leaders at the beginning of the 19th century, passed current as history... at the end of that century".

### **Marxist Distortions**

Marxists have taken to rewriting Indian history on a large scale and it has meant its systematic falsification. They have a dogmatic view of history and for them the use of any history is to prove their dogma. Their very approach is hurtful to truth. But this is a large subject and we would not go into it here, even though it is related intimately to the subject under discussion.

The Marxists' contempt for India, particularly the India of religion, culture and philosophy, is deep and theoretically fortified. It exceeds the contempt ever shown by the most die-hard imperialists. Some of the British had an orientalist's fascination for the East or an administrator's paternal concern for their wards, but Marxists suffer from no such sentimentality. The very "Asiatic mode of production" was primitive

and any, “superstructure” of ideas and culture built on that foundation must be barbaric too and it had better go.

Not many realize how thoroughly European Marx was in his orientation. He treated all Asia and Africa as an appendage of the West and, indeed, of the Anglo-Saxon Great Britain. He borrowed all his theses on India from British rulers and fully subscribed to them. With them he believes that “Indian society has no history at all, at least no known history,” and that what “we call its history, is the history of successive intruders.” With them he also believes that India “has neither known nor cared for self-rule.” In fact, he rules out self-rule for India altogether and in this matter gives her no choice. He says that the question is “not whether the English had a right to conquer India, but whether we are to prefer India conquered by the Turk, by the Persian, by the Russian, to India conquered by the Briton.” His own choice was clear.

Indian Marxists fully accept this thesis, except that they are also near-equal admirers of the “Turkish” conquest of India. Indian Marxists get quite lyrical about this conquest and find quite fulfilment in it. Let us illustrate the point with the example of M.N. Roy. We are told that he gave up Marxism but he kept enough of it to retain his admiration for Muslim Imperialism. He admires the “historical role of Islam” in a book of the same name and praises the “Arab Empire” as a “magnificent monument to the memory of Mohammad.” He hails Muslim invasion of India and tells us how “it was welcomed as a message of hope and freedom by the multitudinous victims of Brahmanical reaction.”

Earlier, Roy had spoken of “our country” which “had become almost liberated from the Moslem Empire.” But that was long ago when he was merely a nationalist and had not come under the influence of Marxism. Marxism teaches a new appreciation for Imperialism; it idealises old Imperialisms and prepares a people for a new one. Its moving power is deep-rooted self-alienation and its greatest ally is cultural and spiritual illiteracy.

Marxist writers and historians of a sort are all over the place and they are well entrenched in the academic and media sectors. They have a great say in University appointments and promotions, in the awarding of research grants, in drawing up syllabi, and in the choosing and prescribing of text-books. No true history of India is possible without countering their philosophy, ideas and influence.

**Indian Express, January 15, 1989**



Chapter Seven  
**November 9 Will Change History**  
Jay Dubashi

What is the need of the hour, someone asked me the other day. Is it stability, is it unity, is it communal peace? It is none of these things, I told him. The need of the hour is COURAGE.

We Hindus have become a timid race, almost a cowardly race. We lack the courage of our convictions. Some of us don't even have any convictions, and have been trying to hide our shame under high-sounding but empty phrases like secularism. For the last so many centuries, the history of the Hindus has been created by non-Hindus, first the Moghuls, then the British. Even today, the Hindus are being denied their right to write their own history, which, to me, is almost like genocide. Until we write our own history, this land cannot be ours.

Upendra Baxi, director of the Indian Law Institute and a noted jurist, said the other day that “when the foundation of the proposed Ram Temple will be put up in Ayodhya, it will change decisively the history of India and no amount of condemnation of the Indian psyche or public self-flagellation will change that history.” He is right. The whole purpose of the Ram Janmabhoomi movement is to change the history of India, nothing less, nothing more.

Those who do not see this do not know what India is. For the first time in several centuries, the history of India is being made by Indians, call them Hindu, call them anything else, if the word Hindu sticks in your gullet, as it did in Nehru's. The Ayodhya movement is therefore a historic movement, far more historic than Gandhi's Dandi March or the Quit India Movement.

Freedom does not mean flying your own flag or having your own government. *Freedom means making your own history, writing it in your own blood on the pages of Time.* As I said earlier, fate precluded us from doing so for so many centuries. Now the time has come to open up the pages of Time and begin writing what every great race in this world has been doing for so long, every great race except the Hindus.

Small-minded people like Namboodiripad or editors of Indo-Anglian papers who bring out special editions at Christmas time but never on Diwali, will not understand this, because they do not know Indian history. Whatever little they understand has been learnt from foreign historians, and from foreign books like *Das Capital*. We must pity these men. Namboodiripad thinks that the Ayodhya movement is communal, a word he has learnt from the British, for whom some of his friends spied, and he

repeats it parrot-like, as children do their lessons in schools. Communists are political parrots who have been intoning Marx for years without realising that the man is already out of date. All over Europe, his corpse is being exhumed for public exhibition. But Indian communists are half a century behind everybody else, including their own brethren elsewhere. Because their own faith has come down crumbling, and that too in less than three quarters of a century, they have started cursing other faiths.

But we Hindus were not born yesterday. We were not born in the British Museum and did not emerge from dog-eared copies of ancient history books. We are history personified, history with a capital H. And we are going to survive for another five thousand years, not just fifty years, as Namboodiripad's gods did.

I simply cannot understand what is so communal about a community trying to build a temple, the most honourable of acts, in their own land. Would anyone deny Catholics their right to put up a church in Rome? Would anyone say no if the Saudis wanted to build a mosque in Mecca? Why on earth should there be a mosque in Ayodhya of all places? How would they feel if someone tried to build a Rama temple in Mecca? The Babari mosque was built by Babar who had no business to be in India. He came here as a conqueror but the right of a conqueror ceases as soon as he ceases to be a conqueror. This country is now ours, not Babar's and what is all this freedom worth if we cannot undo a wrong? That is also what history is, the undoing of a patently wrong act committed by a conqueror in the full flush of power. This is what I meant when I said that we are going to re-write history, for, I repeat again, that is precisely the meaning of freedom.

I consider the time we were under foreign conquerors, no matter where they came from and who they were-and also how they came-as the most shameful time of our history. This is what Gandhi also said and that is why we vowed to throw the British out. If the British were foreigners, so were the Moghuls, and so is everything they left behind. We have taken over old British firms and Indianised them. We have taken over their railways, their ports and harbours, their buildings, their offices, even their vice-regal house. We would have been perfectly within our rights to demolish their leftovers including the vice-regal house. Mahatma Gandhi actually wanted to turn that house into a hospital.

Surely, if we can do all that, we can also take over their churches and cathedrals, as also those of other conquerors that preceded them. We have not, done that, but I do not see why not. If the descendants of these conquerors believe that their houses of worship are too important to be treated like other buildings they left behind, surely you cannot blame the Hindus if they think that their houses of worship are also too important to be defiled by foreigners. What is good for others, is also good for

us. You cannot have one law for others, just because they happen to be in a minority, and another for the majority because it happens to be too generous, or too timid to fight back.

Make no mistake. We are going to change history and we have begun doing so on November 9, 1989.

**Organiser, November 19, 1989**

Chapter Eight  
**From Shilanyas to Berlin Wall**  
Jay Dubashi

History has its quirks but there is a method behind the madness. I said in my last column that November 9, 1989, would go down in Indian history as one of those dates that actually make history. I was not aware at the time that on the very same day the first brick of the Ramshila foundation was being laid at Ayodhya, the Berliners were removing bricks from the Berlin Wall. While a temple was going up in Ayodhya, a communist temple was being demolished five thousand miles away in Europe. If this is not history, I do not know what is.

There hasn't been a squeak out of our commie friends on Berlin Wall, or, for that matter, on the turmoil in the communist world that now lies as shattered as Hitler's fascist empire after the last war. Where is our great Mr. Know-All, the ultra-verbose pandit of Kerala who only the other day was lecturing us poor Hindus on the pitfalls of communalism? Where is Harkishan Singh Surjeet, the great oracle of Punjab, who since his operation in Moscow, seems to have given up the ghost altogether? Even their great Natural Ally, the one and only Vishwanath Pratap Singh, has not said a word about the Berlin Wall, though he keeps advising us about what to do in Ayodhya, or rather what not to do.

The two events, one at Ayodhya and the other in Berlin, are not unrelated. They are like the two events in Einstein's relativity theory which appear totally unconnected but are not.

They mark the end of the post-Nehru era and the beginning of a truly national era in India on the one hand, and the end of the post-communist era and the beginning of a truly democratic era in Europe on the other. History has rejected Nehru in India and also overthrown communism in Europe. It is not an accident that the two events are taking place at the same time. Both Nehruism and communism were phoney creeds, though it has taken us a long time to see through the phoneyess. Some of us had seen it a long ago, but there were others, the so-called leftists and progressives, who had not. The scales have still not fallen from their eyes, but that is now only a matter of time.

The phoniest are the so-called radical humanists in India, who have given up communist clothes but not the authoritarian way of thinking, which is the hallmark of communism. Their reaction to all popular movements is authoritarian. These men helped the British during the Quit India Movement-just as their brethren the commies did-on the ground that an Allied victory was more important than freedom for India. Now they are saying the same thing.

According to the Tarkundes and other phoneyes, the Nehru version of secularism is more important than full-blooded Hindu nationalism, which is what the Ayodhya movement signifies. The Tarkundes even went to the court on the issue asking its help in stopping the Shilapujan.

The Pujan was a perfectly democratic affair carried on peacefully by citizens of this country who happen to be in a majority. If Indians do not have a right to have temples in their own country, who has?

But this is not the way these secular worthies look upon the issue. These men are elitist by nature and for them any *popular* movement, no matter how democratic and mass-based, is almost *ipso facto* suspect if it does not meet their prejudiced convictions. This is Stalinism of the worst kind, the kind that led to the building of the Berlin Wall, one of the ugliest structures in the world.

Who is Tarkunde to decide that a temple in Ayodhya is anti-social? Who was M.N. Roy to decide that Gandhi's Quit India Movement was anti-national and not in national interest? Who are these men who mock history and then are bloodied by it? They belong to the same class as Stalin in Soviet Russia and Hitler in Nazi Germany, who presume to know what is good for you and me, the ordinary mortals. And these men will go the same dusty way as the tyrants whose bodies are now being exhumed all over the Soviet empire and thrown to the vultures.

The men who presume to think what is good for the man in the street are the most dangerous species and should be locked up in asylums. Jawaharlal Nehru was one such man. He knew what was good for you and me, just as Stalin and Hitler did, and for almost 20 years went on forcing his ideas on this hapless country. He and his advisers decided how much steel we should have and how much electricity. They decided who should get paid what, and who should import what. They laid down laws for who should produce what and where, and whether a particular industry should be given to Tatas or Birlas or some babus in the government. What was the basis for these decisions? None at all. Simply an arrogant assumption that the Big Brother knows best what is good for you, and you should not ask too many questions.

Those who went to court on the Ayodhya issue are the same Mr. Know-Alls, the arrogant busybodies who presume to know what is good for us. This presumptuousness-that masses do not matter and do not count-was the core of the Marxist doctrine of which Nehru's phoney socialism and Tarkunde's equally phoney radical humanism are offshoots. What they have not still grasped-but Mikhail Gorbachev has-is that this is precisely the reason Marxism failed wherever it has been put to work, and why Nehruism has failed in India.

That is also the reason why there was no enthusiasm whatsoever for the *sarkari* jamboree in the name of the Nehru centenary year, for the common man in India is a victim of this Nehruism just as the common man in Russia is the victim of communism. And in healthy societies, victims don't celebrate centenaries of tyrants.

There are a number of Nehru men in India, not only in the ruling party<sup>1</sup> but also in the opposition and we must be on guard against them. But this generation is on its way out, though their flame may flicker for a while.

The post-Nehru era began at Ayodhya on November 9, and it will gather momentum in the years to come, just as the post-communist era in Europe and elsewhere. It will not be an easy task, but no great task is easy.

**Organiser, November 26, 1989**

**Footnotes:**

<sup>1</sup> The ruling Party, at the time this article was written, was the Indian National Congress.



Chapter Nine  
**Rama-Janmabhumi Temple Muslim Testimony**  
Harsh Narain

All relevant British government records followed by the District Gazetteer Faizabad compiled and published by the Congress government in 1960 declare with one voice that the so-called Babari mosque at Ayodhya is standing on the debris of a Ramjanmasthan temple demolished by the order of Babar in 1528. Syed Shahabuddin, JNU historians, and self-styled 'secular' scholars and leaders are hotly contesting that the existence and demolition of such a temple is a myth floated by the British in pursuance of their policy of 'divide and rule'. Syed Shahabuddin and many Muslim divines go a step further and assert that neither Babar nor any other Muslim for that matter would take into his head to erect a mosque by displacing a temple, for, they argue, such a mosque would not be a mosque in the eye of the Shari'ah and would be liable to demolition by the Muslims themselves.

With this idea in mind, Syed Shahabuddin is going about proclaiming that, if it is shown independently of the British sources that the Babari mosque has displaced a temple, he would pull it down with his own hands and hand it over to the Hindus.

The challenge is worth taking, and I hereby do it with good grace, on behalf of those who place truth above politics.

Well, granting for the nonce that the Babari mosque cannot be shown to have displaced a temple, there are certain other mosques which can indisputably be shown to have done so. Is Syed Shahabuddin prepared to keep his word in the case of such mosques? It is common knowledge that most of the mosques built by the Muslim invaders stand on land grabbed or extorted from the Kafirs. And what about the Ka'bah itself?

Sayyid Shahabuddin Abdur Rahman, the well known Muslim historian who died in an accident recently, modifies the stand of the Muslim divines thus: 'It is also thinkable that some mosque was erected close to or at a short distance from a temple demolished for some special reason, but never was a mosque built on the site of a temple anywhere.' (See his *Babri Masjid*, 3rd print, Azamgarh: Darul Musannifin Shibli Academy, 1987, p. 19.)

As regards the verdict of the Shari'ah, it is true that there are theologico-juristic rulings to the effect that no mosque can be built on land grabbed or illegally/illegitimately acquired. See for example the great *Fatawa-i Alamgiri*, Vol. 16, p 214. But the question is, Do they hold true for land acquired in Jihad as well? The answer has to be an emphatic 'No'. The Prophet has made it clear that all land belongs

to God or the Prophet (*A'lamu ann'l-arza li'llah-i wa rasul-i-hi*), and, obviously, through the Prophet to the Muslims (Bukhari, II, Kitab al-Jibad wa's- Siyar, Hadith 406). Iqbal puts the following words, in a Persian verse, into the mouth of Tariq, the great conqueror of Spain : *Har mulk mulk-i ma'st ki mulk-i Khuda-i ma'st*. That is, all land belongs to the Muslims, because it belongs to their God. Ibn Taymiyyah, the 14th century theologian and jurist, argues that Jihad simply restores lands to the Muslims, to whom they rightly belong. This serves to vouchsafe to them the moral right to extort lands in Jihad from others.

Thus, the argument from the Shari'ah has no leg to stand upon.

Now, I proceed to cite certain purely Muslim sources beyond the sphere of British influence to show that the Babari mosque has displaced a Hindu temple-the Ramjanmasthan temple, to be precise-wholly or partly.

First, an indirect evidence. In an application dated November 30, 1858, filed by one Muhammad Ashghar, Khatib and Mu'azzin, Babari Masjid, to initiate legal proceedings against 'Bairagiyan-i Janmasthan', the Babari mosque has been called 'masjid-i Janmasthan' and the courtyard near the arch and the pulpit within the boundary of the mosque, 'maqam Janmasthan ka'. The Bairagis had raised a platform in the courtyard which the applicant wanted to be dismantled. He has mentioned that the place of Janmasthan had been lying unkempt/in disorder (*parishan*) for hundreds of years and that the Hindus performed worship there (*maqam Janmasthan ka sad-ha baras se parishan para rahta tha. Ahl-i Hunud puja karte they*). See Sayyid Shahabuddin Abdur Rahman, op, cit., pp. 29-30. Well, if the Babari mosque is the Janmasthan mosque, its courtyard is the Janmasthan, and the Hindus had all along been carrying out their worship, all that implies that there must have been some construction there as part of a (Janmasthan) temple, which Mir Baqi partly demolished and partly converted into the existing Babari mosque, with or without Babar's approval. And the Hindus had no alternative but to make do with the temple-less courtyard. Otherwise, it is simply unthinkable that they might have been performing worship for such a long time and on such a sacred place without a proper temple.

### **Failure of Jihad**

My second document is the *Hadiqah-i Shuhada* by one Mirza Jan, an eyewitness as well as active participant in the Jihad led by Amir Ali Amethawi during Wajid Ali Shah's regime in 1855 for recapture of Hanuman Garhi (a few hundred yards from the Babari mosque) from the Hindus. The book was ready just after the failure of the Jihad and saw the light of day in the following year, viz. in 1856, at Lucknow. Ra'is Ahmad Jafari has included it as chapter IX in his book entitled *Wajid Ali Shah aur*

*Un-ka Ahd* (Lucknow: Kitab Manzil, 1957), after, however, omitting what he considered unnecessary but without adding a word from his side.

Now, let us see what information we gather from it, germane to our enquiry. Mirza Jan states that ‘wherever they found magnificent temples of the Hindus ever since the establishment of Sayyid Salar Mas’ud Ghazi’s rule, the Muslim rulers in India built mosques, monasteries, and inns, appointed mu’azzins, teachers, and store-stewards, spread Islam vigorously, and vanquished the Kafirs. Likewise, they cleared up Faizabad and Avadh, too, from the filth of reprobation (infidelity), because it was a great centre of worship and capital of Rama’s father. Where there stood the great temple (of Ramjanmasthan), there they built a big mosque, and, where there was a small *mandap* (pavilion), there they erected a camp mosque (*masjid-i mukhtasar-i qanati*). The Janmasthan temple is the principal place of Rama’s incarnation, adjacent to which is the Sita ki Rasoi. Hence, what a lofty mosque was built there by king Babar in 923 A. H. (1528 A.D.), under the patronage of Musa Ashiqan! The mosque is still known far and wide as the Sita ki Rasoi mosque. And that temple is extant by its side (*aur pahlu mein wah dair baqi hai*)’ (p. 247).

It must be borne in mind that Mirza Jan claims to write all this on the basis of older records (*kutub-i sabiqah*) and contemporary accounts.

My third document is a chapter of the *Muraqqah-i Khusrawi*, otherwise known as the *Tarikh-i Avadh*, by Shykh Azamat Ali Kakorawi Nami (1811-1893), who happened to be an eyewitness to much that happened during Wajid Ali Shah’s regime. The work was completed in 1869 but could not see the light of day for over a century. Only one manuscript of it is extant and that is in the Tagore Library of Lucknow University. A press copy of it was prepared by Dr. Zaki Kakorawi for publication with the financial assistance of the Fakhruddin Ali Ahmad Memorial Committee, U.P., Lucknow. The committee vetoed the publication of its chapter dealing with the Jihad led by Amir Ali Amethawi for recapture of Hanuman Garhi from the Bairagis, from its funds, on the ground that its publication would not be opportune in view of the prevailing political situation, with the result that Dr. Kakorawi had to publish the book minus that chapter in 1986, for the first time. Later, however, he published the chapter separately, and independently of any financial or other assistance from the committee in 1987 from the Markaz-i Adab-i Urdu 137, Shahganj, Lucknow-3, under the title ‘*Amir Ali Shahid aur Ma’rakah-i Hanuman Garhi*’.

It is a pity that, thanks to our thoughtless ‘secularism’ and waning sense of history, such primary sources of medieval Indian history are presently in danger of suppression or total extinction. Dr. Kakorawi himself laments that ‘suppression of any part of any old composition or compilation like this can create difficulties and misunderstandings for future historians and researchers’ (p. 3).

Well, what light does our author, Shykh Muhammad Azamat Ali Kakorawi Nami, have to throw on the issue of demolition versus non-existence of the Janmasthan temple? The opening paragraph of his book is akin to the passage quoted above from Mirza Jan's *Hadiqah-i Shuhada*. I give below the paragraph in the author's own words, omitting very few details: 'According to old records, it has been a rule with the Muslim rulers from the first to build mosques, monasteries, and inns, spread Islam, and put (a stop to) non-Islamic practices, wherever they found prominence (of kufr). Accordingly, even as they cleared up Mathura, Bindraban, etc., from the rubbish of non-Islamic practices, the Babari mosque was built up in 923(?) A.H. under the patronage of Sayyid Musa Ashiqan in the Janmasthan temple (*butkhane Janmasthan mein*) in Faizabad-Avadh, which was a great place of (worship) and capital of Rama's father' (p. 9). 'Among the Hindus it was known as Sita ki Rasoi' (p. 10). The passage has certain gaps, thanks to the wretched condition of the manuscript, which I have tried to fill within brackets.

Dr. Kakorawi has appended to the book an excerpt from the *Fasanah-i Ibrat* by the great early Urdu novelist. Mirza Rajab Ali Beg Surur (1787-1867), which constitutes our fourth document. It says that 'a great mosque was built on the spot where Sita ki Rasoi is situated. During the regime of Babar, the Hindus had no guts to be a match for the Muslims. The mosque was built in 923(?) A.H. under the patronage of Sayyid Mir Ashiqan... Aurangzeb built a mosque on the Hanuman Garhi... The Bairagis effaced the mosque and erected a temple in its place. Then idols began to be worshipped openly in the Babari mosque where the Sita ki Rasoi is situated,' (pp. 71-72). The author adds that 'formerly, it is Shykh Ali Hazin's observation which held good' and quotes the following Persian couplet of the Shykh:

Bi-bin karamat-i butkhanah-i mara aiy Shaikh!  
Ki chun kharab shawad khanah-i Khuda garded

Which means: O Shykh! just witness the miracle of my house of idols, which, when desecrated, or demolished, becomes the house of God (a mosque). So, purporting to mean that formerly temples were demolished for construction of mosques, the author, Surur, laments that 'the times have so changed that now the mosque was demolished for construction of a temple (on the Hanuman Garhi)' (p. 72).

### **Clinching the Issue**

The forming four-fold documentary evidence leads us to certain incontrovertible conclusions, which can be stated as under:

1. That, in their zeal to hit Hinduism and spread Islam, the Muslim rulers had the knack of desecrating or demolishing Hindu temples and erecting mosques, etc., in

their place-bigger mosques in place of bigger temples and smaller mosques in place of smaller temples.

2. That there did exist a temple called the temple of Janmasthan at Ayodhya, where Rama is believed to have incarnated and that adjacent to it was what is called Sita ki Rasoi, which might originally have been part of it.

3. That, like Muslim rulers who desecrated Mathura, Vrindavana, etc., Babar chose Ayodhya for spread of Islam and replacement of temples by mosques, thanks to its supreme importance as a holy place of the Hindus, and in 1528, under the patronage of Sayyid Mir Musa Ashiqan, got the so-called Babari mosque erected in displacement of the Rama Janmasthan temple, certain relics of which appear to have persisted at least till 1855.

4. That the Babari mosque was also called 'masjid-i Janmasthan' and 'masjid-i Sita ki Rasoi' from long before 1855.

5. That the Hindus had long been carrying on worship at the Rama Janmasthan even after the replacement of the Janmasthan temple by the Babari mosque.

6. That the foregoing facts are yielded by authentic Muslim records and have not been fabricated by the much-maligned British to 'divide and rule'.

These conclusions are irresistible and should clinch the issue of demolition versus non-existence of the Ramjanmasthan temple.

**Indian Express, February 26, 1990**

Chapter Ten  
**Let the Mute Witnesses Speak**  
Sita Ram Goel

The cradle of Hindu culture<sup>1</sup> on the eve of its Islamic invasion included what are at present the Sinkiang province of China, the Transoxiana region of Russia, the Seistan province of Iran and the sovereign states of Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Nepal and Bangladesh. The Islamic invasion commenced around 650 A.D., when a Muslim army secured a foothold in Seistan, and continued till the end of the eighteenth century, when the last Islamic crusader, Tipu Sultan, was overthrown by the British. Hordes of Arabs, Persians, Turks, and Afghans who had been successively inspired by the Theology of Islam poured in, in wave after wave, carrying fire and sword to every nook and corner of this vast area. In the process, Sinkiang, Transoxiana region, Seistan and Afghanistan became transformed into *daru'l-Islām* where all vestiges of the earlier culture were wiped out. The same spell has engulfed the areas which were parts of India till 1947 and have since become Pakistan and Bangladesh.

We learn from literary and epigraphic sources, accounts of foreign travellers in medieval times, and modern archaeological explorations that, on the eve of the Islamic invasion, the cradle of Hindu culture was honeycombed with temples and monasteries, in many shapes and sizes. The same sources inform us that many more temples and monasteries continued to come up in places where the Islamic invasion had yet to reach or from where it was forced to retire for some time by the rallying of Hindu resistance. Hindus were great temple builders because their pantheon was prolific in Gods and Goddesses and their society rich in schools and sects, each with its own way of worship. But by the time we come to the end of the invasion, we find that almost all these Hindu places of worship had either disappeared or were left in different stages of ruination. Most of the sacred sites had come to be occupied by a variety of Muslim monuments-masjids and *îdgâhs* (mosques), *dargâhs* and *ziârats* (shrines), *mazârs* and *maqbaras* (tombs), *madrasas* and *maktabs* (seminaries), *takiyās* and *qabristāns* (graveyards). Quite a few of the new edifices had been built from the materials of those that had been deliberately demolished in order to satisfy the demands of Islamic Theology. The same materials had been used frequently in some secular structures as well-walls and gates of forts and cities, river and tank embankments, caravanserais and stepwells, palaces and pavilions.

Some apologists of Islam have tried to lay the blame at the door of the White Huns or Epthalites who had overrun parts of the Hindu cradle in the second half of the fifth century A.D. But they count without the witness of Hiuen Tsang, the famous Chinese pilgrim and Buddhist savant, who travelled all over this area from 630 A.D. to 644. Starting from Karashahr in Northern Sinkiang, he passed through Transoxiana, Northern Afghanistan, North-West Frontier Province, Kashmir, Punjab, Haryana,



Himachal Pradesh, North-Eastern Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Nepal, Bengal, Assam, Orissa, Mahakosal and Andhra Pradesh till he reached Tamil Nadu. On his return journey he travelled through Karnataka, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Madhya Bharat, Sindh, Southern Afghanistan and Southern Sinkiang. In most of these provinces he found in a flourishing state many Buddhist establishments consisting of *vihāras* (monasteries), *chaityas* (temples) and *stūpas* (topes), besides what he described as heretical (Jain) and deva (Brahmanical) temples. The wealth of architecture and sculptures he saw everywhere confirms what we learn from Hindu literary sources. Some of this wealth has been recovered in recent times from under mounds of ruins.

During the course of his pilgrimage, Hiuen Tsang stayed at as many as 95 Buddhist centres among which the more famous ones were at Kuchi, Aqsu, Tirmiz, Uch Turfan, Kashagar and Khotan in Sinkiang; Balkh, Ghazni, Bamiyan, Kapisi, Lamghan, Nagarhar and Bannu in Afghanistan; Pushkalavati, Bolar and Takshasila in the North-West Frontier Province; Srinagar, Rajaori and Punch in Kashmir; Sialkot, Jalandhar and Sirhind in the Punjab; Thanesar, Pehowa and Sugh in Haryana; Bairat and Bhinmal in Rajasthan, Mathura, Mahoba, Ahichchhatra, Sankisa, Kanauj, Ayodhya, Prayag, Kausambi, Sravasti, Kapilvastu, Kusinagar, Varanasi, Sarnath and Ghazipur in Uttar Pradesh; Vaishali, Pataliputra, Rajgir, Nalanda, Bodhgaya, Monghyr and Bhagalpur in Bihar; Pundravardhana, Tamralipti, Jessore and Karnasuvarna in Bengal; Puri and Jaj Nagar in Orissa; Nagarjunikonda and Amaravati in Andhra Pradesh; Kanchipuram in Tamil Nadu; Badami and Kalyani in Karnataka; Paithan and Devagiri in Maharashtra; Bharuch, Junagarh and Valabhi in Gujarat; Ujjain in Malwa; Mirpur Khas and Multan in Sindh. The number of Buddhist monasteries at the bigger ones of these centres ranged from 50 to 500 and the number of monks in residence from 1,000 to 10,000. It was only in some parts of Eastern Afghanistan and the North-West Frontier Province that monasteries were in a bad shape, which can perhaps be explained by the invasion of White Huns. But so were they in Kusinagar and Kapilavastu where the White Huns are not known to have reached. On the other hand, the same invaders had ranged over Punjab, Haryana, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and most of Uttar Pradesh where Hiuen Tsang found the monasteries in a splendid state. They had even established their rule over Kashmir where Hiuen Tsang saw 500 monasteries housing 5,000 monks. It is, therefore, difficult to hold them responsible for the disappearance of Buddhist centres in areas where Hiuen Tsang had found them flourishing. An explanation has to be found elsewhere. In any case, the upheaval they caused was over by the middle of the sixth century. Moreover, the temples and monasteries which Hiuen Tsang saw were only a few out of many. He had not gone into the interior of any province, having confined himself to the more famous Buddhist centres.

What was it that really happened to thousands upon thousands of temples and monasteries? Why did they disappear and/or give place to another type of monuments? How come that their architectural and sculptural fragments got built into the foundations and floors and walls and domes of the edifices which replaced them? These are crucial questions which should have been asked by students of medieval Indian history. But no historian worth his name has raised these questions squarely, not to speak of finding adequate answers to them. No systematic study of the subject has been made so far. All that we have are stray references to the demolition of a few Hindu temples, made by the more daring Hindu historians while discussing the religious policy of this or that sultan. Sir Jadunath Sarkar<sup>2</sup> and Professor Sri Ram Sharma<sup>3</sup> have given more attention to the Islamic policy of demolishing Hindu temples and pointed an accusing finger at the theological tenets which dictated that policy. But their treatment of the subject is brief and their enumeration of temples destroyed by Aurangzeb and the other Mughal emperors touches only the fringe of a vast holocaust caused by the Theology of Islam, all over the cradle of Hindu culture, and throughout more than thirteen hundred years, taking into account what happened in the native Muslim states carved out after the British take-over and the formation of Pakistan after partition in 1947.

Muslim historians, in India and abroad, have written hundreds of accounts in which the progress of Islamic armies across the cradle of Hindu culture is narrated, stage by stage and period by period. A pronounced feature of these Muslim histories is a description-in smaller or greater detail but always with considerable pride-of how the Hindus were slaughtered *en masse* or converted by force, how hundreds of thousands of Hindu men and women and children were captured as booty and sold into slavery, how Hindu temples and monasteries were razed to the ground or burnt down, and how images of Hindu Gods and Goddesses were destroyed or desecrated. Commandments of Allah (*Quran*) and precedents set by the Prophet (*Sunnah*) are frequently cited by the authors in support of what the swordsmen and demolition squads of Islam did with extraordinary zeal, not only in the midst of war but also, and more thoroughly, after Islamic rule had been firmly established. A reference to the Theology of Islam as perfected by the orthodox Imams, leaves little doubt that the citations are seldom without foundation.

The men and women and children who were killed or captured or converted by force cannot be recalled for standing witnesses to what was done to them by the heroes of Islam. The apologists for Islam-the most dogged among them are some Hindu historians and politicians-have easily got away with the plea that Muslim "court scribes" had succumbed to poetic exaggeration in order to please their pious patrons. Their case is weakened when they cite the same sources in support of their own speculation or when the question is asked as to why the patrons needed stories of

bloodshed and wanton destruction for feeding their piety. But they have taken in their stride these doubts and questions as well.

There are, however, witnesses who are not beyond recall and who can confirm that the “court scribes” were not at all foisting fables on their readers. These are the hundreds of thousands of sculptural and architectural fragments which stand arrayed in museums and drawing rooms all over the world, or which are waiting to be picked up by public and private collectors, or which stare at us from numerous Muslim monuments. These are the thousands of Hindu temples and monasteries which either stand on the surface in a state of ruination or lie buried under the earth waiting for being brought to light by the archaeologist’s spade. These are the thousands of Muslim edifices, sacred as well as secular, which occupy the sites of Hindu temples and monasteries and/or which have been constructed from materials of those monuments. All these witnesses carry unimpeachable evidence of the violence that was done to them, deliberately and by human hands.

So far no one has cared to make these witnesses speak and relate the story of how they got ruined, demolished, dislocated, dismembered, defaced, mutilated and burnt. Recent writers on Hindu architecture and sculpture—their tribe is multiplying fast, mostly for commercial reasons—ignore the ghastly wounds which these witnesses show on the very first sight, and dwell on the beauties of the limbs that have survived or escaped injury. Many a time they have to resort to their imagination for supplying what should have been there but is missing. All they seem to care for is building their own reputations as historians of Hindu art. If one draws their attention to the mutilations and disfigurements suffered by the subjects under study, one is met with a stunned silence or denounced downright as a Hindu chauvinist out to raise “demons from the past”<sup>4</sup> with the deliberate intention of causing “communal strife.”

We, therefore, propose to present a few of these witnesses in order to show in what shape they are and what they have to say.

### **Tordi (Rajasthan)**

“At Tordi there are two fine and massively built stone *baolis* or step wells known as the Chaur and Khari Baoris. They appear to be old Hindu structures repaired or rebuilt by Muhammadans, probably in the early or middle part of the 15th century... In the construction of the (Khari) Baori Hindu images have been built in, noticeable amongst them being an image of Kuber on the right flanking wall of the large flight of steps...”<sup>5</sup>

### **Naraina (Rajasthan)**

“At Naraina... is an old pillared mosque, nine bays long and four bays deep, constructed out of old Hindu temples and standing on the east of the Gauri Shankar tank... The mosque appears to have been built when Mujahid Khan, son of Shams Khan, took possession of Naraina in 840 A.H. or 1436 A.D... To the immediate north of the mosque is the three-arched gateway called Tripolia which is also constructed with materials from old Hindu temples...”<sup>6</sup>

### **Chatsu (Rajasthan)**

“At Chatsu there is a Muhammadan tomb erected on the eastern embankment of the Golerava tank. The tomb which is known as Gurg Ali Shah’s *chhatri* is built out of the spoils of Hindu buildings... On the inside of the twelve-sided frieze of the *chhatri* is a long Persian inscription in verse, but worn out in several places. The inscription does not mention the name of any important personage known to history and all that can be made out with certainty is that the saint Gurg Ali (wolf of Ali) died a martyr on the first of Ramzan in 979 A.H. corresponding to Thursday, the 17th January, 1572 A.D.”<sup>7</sup>

### **SaheTh-MaheTh (Uttar Pradesh)**

“The ruined Jain temple situated in the western portion of MaheTh... derives the name ‘Sobhnāth’ from Sambhavanātha, the third TîrthaMkara, who is believed to have been born at Śrāvastî...”<sup>8</sup>

“Let us now turn our attention to the western-most part of Sobhnāth ruins. It is crowned by a domed edifice, apparently a Muslim tomb of the Pathān period...”<sup>9</sup>

“These remains are raised on a platform, 30’ square, built mostly of broken bricks including *carved* ones... This platform, no doubt, represents the plinth of the last Jain temple which was destroyed by the Muhammadan conquerors... It will be seen from the plan that the enclosure of the tomb overlaps this square platform. The tomb proper stands on a mass of *debris* which is probably the remains of the ruined shrine...”<sup>10</sup>

“3. Sculpture... of buff sandstone, *partly destroyed*, representing a TîrthaMkara seated cross-legged in the attitude of meditation on a throne supported by two lions couchant, placed on both sides of a wheel...”

“4. Sculpture... of buff sandstone, *partly defaced*, representing a TîrthaMkara seated cross-legged (as above)...”

“8. Sculpture... of buff sandstone, *defaced*, representing a TîrthaMkara standing between two miniature figures of which that to his right is seated.

“9. Sculpture... of buff sandstone, *defaced*, representing a TîrthaMkara, standing under a parasol...

“12. Sculpture... of buff sandstone, *much defaced*, representing a male and a female figure seated side by side under a palm tree.

“13. Sculpture... of buff sandstone, *broken in four pieces*, and carved with five figurines of TîrthaMkaras... seated cross-legged in the attitude of meditation. The central figure has a Nāga hood. The sculpture evidently was the top portion of a large image slab.”<sup>11</sup>

Coming to the ruins of a Buddhist monastery in the same complex, the archaeologist proceeds:

“In the 23rd cell, which I identify with the store-room, I found half-buried in the floor a big earthen jar... This must have been used for storage of corn...

“This cell is connected with a find which is certainly the most notable discovery of the season. I refer to an inscribed copper-plate of Govindachandra of Kanauj... The charter was issued from Vārānasî on Monday, the full moon day of ĀshāDha Sam. 1186, which... corresponds to the 23rd of June, 1130. The inscription records the grant of six villages to the ‘Community of Buddhist friars of whom Buddhahattāraka is the chief and foremost, residing in the great convent of the holy Jetavana,’ and is of a paramount importance, in as much as it conclusively settles the identification of MaheTh with the city of Śrāvastî...”<sup>12</sup>

He describes as follows some of the sculptures unearthed at SrAvastî:

“S.1. Statuette in grey stone... of Buddha seated cross-legged in the teaching attitude on a conventional lotus. *The head, breast and fore-arms as well as the sides of the sculpture are broken.*

“S.2. Lower portion... of a blue schist image of Avalokiteśvara in the sportive attitude (*līlāsana*) on a lotus seat.

“S. 3. Image... of Avalokiteśvara seated in ardhaparyanka attitude on a conventional lotus... *The head and left arms of the main figure are missing.*”<sup>13</sup>

### **Sarnath (Uttar Pradesh)**

The report of excavations undertaken in 1904-05 says that “the inscriptions found there extending to the twelfth century A.D. show that the connection of Sarnath with

Buddhism was still remembered at that date.” It continues that “the condition of the excavated ruins leaves little doubt that a violent catastrophe accompanied by willful destruction and plunder overtook the place.”<sup>14</sup> Read this report with the Muslim account that Muhammad Ghurī destroyed a thousand idol-temples when he reached Varanasi after defeating Mahārājā Jayachandra of Kanauj in 1193 A.D. The fragments that are listed below speak for themselves. The number given in each case is the one adopted in the report of the excavation.

a.42. Upper part of sculptured slab...

E.8. Architectural fragment, with Buddha (?) seated cross-legged on lotus...

a.22. Defaced standing Buddha, hands missing.

a.17. Buddha head with halo.

a. 8. Head and right arm of image.

E.22. Upper part of image.

E.14. Broken seated figure holding object in left hand.

a.11. Fragment of larger sculpture; bust, part of head, and right overarm of female chauri-bearer.

E.25. Upper part of female figure with big ear-ring.

E.6. Fragment of sculpture, from top of throne (?) on left side.

n.19. Seated figure of Buddha in *bhūmisparśamudrā*, much defaced.

n.221. Torso, with arms of Buddha in *dharmachakramudrā*.

n.91. Lower part of Buddha seated cross-legged on throne. Defaced.

n.142. Figure of Avalokiteśvara in relief. Legs from knees downwards wanting.

n.1. Relief partly, defaced and upper part missing. Buddha descending from the TrāyastriMśā Heaven Head and left hand missing.

i.50. Lower half of statue. Buddha in *bhūmisparśamudrā* seated on lotus.

i.17. Buddha in attitude of meditation on lotus. Head missing.

- i.46. Head of Buddha with short curls.
- i.44. Head of Avalokiteśvara, with Amitābha Buddha in headdress.
- n.10. Fragment of three-headed figure (? Mārîchî) of green stone.
- i.49. Standing figure of attendant from upper right of image. Half of face, feet and left hand missing.
- i.1. Torso of male figure, ornamented.
- i.4. Female figure, with lavishly ornamented head. The legs from knees, right arm and left forearm are missing. Much defaced.
- i.105. Hand holding Lotus.
- n.172. Torso of Buddha.
- n.18. Head of Buddha, slightly defaced.
- n.16. Female figure, feet missing.
- n.97. Lower part of female figure. Feet missing.
- n.163. Buddha, seated. Much defaced.
- K.4. Fragment of seated Buddha in blue Gayā stone.
- K.5. Fragment of large statue, showing small Buddha seated in *bhūmisparśamudrā*
- K.18. Fragment of statue in best Gupta style.
- J.S.18. 27 and 28. Three Buddha heads of Gupta style.
- J.S.7. Figure of *Kubera* in niche, with halo behind head. Partly defaced.
- r.67. Upper part of male figure, lavishly adorned.
- r.72. a and b. Pieces of pedestal with three Buddhas in *dhyānamudrā*.
- r.28. Part of arm, adorned with armlet and inscription in characters of 10th century, containing Buddhist creed.



B.22. Fragment of Bodhi scene (?); two women standing on conventional rock. Head and right arm of left hand figure broken.

B.33. Defaced sitting Buddha in *dhyānamudrā*.

B.75. Lower part of Buddha in *bhūmisparśamudrā* seated cross-legged on lotus.

B.40. Feet of Buddha sitting cross-legged on lotus on throne.

B.38. Headless defaced Buddha seated cross-legged on lotus in *dharmachakramudrā*.

Y.24. Headless Buddha seated cross-legged on throne in *dharmachakramudrā*.

B.52. Bust of Buddha in *dharmachakramudrā*. Head missing.

B.16. Standing Buddha in *varadamudrā*; hands and feet broken.

Y.34. Upper part of Buddha in *varadamudrā*.

B.24. Bust of standing Buddha in *abhayamudrā*; left hand and head missing.

B.31. Defaced standing Buddha in *abhayamudrā*. Head and feet missing.

B.48. Feet of standing Buddha with red paint.

B.15. Lower part of AvalokiteSvara seated on lotus in *lilāsana*.

Y.23. Bust of figure seated in *lilāsana* with trace of halo.

B.59. Legs of figure sitting cross-legged on lotus.

B.7. Female bust with ornaments and high headdress. Left arm and right forearm missing.<sup>15</sup>

### **Vaishali (Bihar)**

“In the southern section of the city the fort of Rājā Bisāl is by far the most important ruin... South-west of it stands an old brick Stūpa, now converted into a Dargāh... The name of the saint who is supposed to have been buried there was given to me as Mîrān-Jî...”<sup>16</sup>

### **Gaur and Pandua (Bengal)**

“In order to erect mosques and tombs the Muhammadans pulled down all Hindu temples they could lay their hands upon for the sake of the building materials...

“The oldest and the best known building at Gaur and Pandua is the Ādīna Masjid at Pandua built by Sikandar Shāh, the son of Ilyās Shāh. The date of its inscription may be read as either 776 or 770, which corresponds with 1374 or 1369 A.D... The materials employed consisted largely of the spoils of Hindu temples and many of the carvings from the temples have been used as facings of doors, arches and pillars...”<sup>17</sup>

### **Devikot (Bengal)**

“The ancient city of Kotivarsha, which was the seat of a district (*vishaya*) under Pundra-varadhana province (*bhukti*) at the time of the Guptas... is now represented by extensive mounds of Bangarh or Ban Rajar Garh... The older site was in continuous occupation till the invasion of the Muhammadans in the thirteenth century to whom it was known as Devkot or Devikot. It possesses Muhammadan records ranging from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century...”<sup>18</sup>

“The Rajbari mound at the South-east corner is one of the highest mounds at Bangarh and must contain some important remains. The Dargah of Sultan Pir is a Muhammadan shrine built on the site of an old Hindu temple of which four granite pillars... are still standing in the centre of the enclosure, the door jambs having been used in the construction of the gateway.

“The Dargah of Shah Ata on the north bank of the Dhal-dighi tank is another building built on the ruins of an older Hindu or Buddhist structure... The female figure on the lintels of the doorway now, fixed in the east wall of the Dargah appears to be Tara, from which it would appear that the temple destroyed was Buddhist...”<sup>19</sup>

### **Tribeni (Bengal)**

“The principal object of interest at Tribeni is the Dargāh of Zafar Khān Ghāzī. The chronology of this ruler may be deduced from the two inscriptions of which one has been fitted into the plinth of his tomb, while the other is inside the small mosque to the west of the tomb. Both refer to him and the first tells us that he built the mosque close to the Dargāh, which dates from A.D. 1298; while the second records the erection by him of a Madrasah or college in the time of Shamsuddīn Fīroz Shāh and bears a date corresponding to the 28th April, 1313 A.D. It was he who conquered the Hindu Rājā of Panduah, and introduced Islam into this part of Lower Bengal... The tomb is built out of the spoils taken from Hindu temples...”<sup>20</sup>

“The eastern portion of the tomb was formerly a *maNDapa* of an earlier Krishna temple which stood on the same spot and sculptures on the inner walls represent scenes from the *RāmāyaNa* and the *Mahābhārata*, with descriptive titles inscribed in proto-Bengali characters... The other frieze... shows Vishnu with Lakshmî and Sarasvatî in the centre, with two attendents, and five *avatāras* of VishNu on both flanks... Further clearance work has been executed during the year 1932-33 and among the sculptures discovered in that year are twelve figures of the Sun God, again in the 12th century style and evidently reused by the masons when the Hindu temple was converted into a Muslim structure...”<sup>21</sup>

### **Mandu (Madhya Pradesh)**

“MāNDû became the capital of the Muhammadan Sultāns of Mālvā who set about buildings themselves palaces and mosques, first with material pilfered from Hindu temples (already for the most part desecrated and ruined by the iconoclastic fury of their earlier co-religionists), and afterwards with their own quarried material. Thus nearly all the traces of the splendid shrines of the ParamAras of MAIvA have disappeared save what we find utilized in the ruined mosques and tombs...”<sup>22</sup>

“The date of the construction of the Hindola Mahall cannot be fixed with exactitude... There can, however, be no doubt that it is one of the earliest of the Muhammadan buildings in MāNDû. From its outward appearance there is no sign of Hindu workmanship but the repairs, that have been going on for the past one year, have brought to light a very large number of stones used in the structure, which appear, to have been taken from some pre-existing Hindu temple. The facing stones, which have been most accurately and smoothly cut on their outer surfaces, bear in very many cases on their inner sides the under faced images of Hindu gods, or patterns of purely Hindu design, while pieces of Hindu carving and broken parts of images are found indiscriminately mixed with the rubble, of which the core of the walls is made.”<sup>23</sup>

### **Dhar (Madhya Pradesh)**

“...The mosque itself appears from local tradition and from the numerous indications and inscriptions found within it to have been built on the site of, and to a large extent out of materials taken from, a Hindu Temple, known to the inhabitants as Rājā Bhoja’s school. The inference was derived sometime back from the existence of a Sanskrit alphabet and some Sanskrit grammatical forms inscribed in serpentine diagrams on two of the pillar bases in the large prayer chamber and from certain Sanskrit inscriptions on the black stone slabs imbedded in the floor of the prayer chamber, and on the reverse face of the side walls of the mihrāb.”<sup>24</sup>

“The Lāt Masjid built in A.D. 1405, by Dilāwar Khān, the founder of the Muhammadan kingdom of Mālvā... is of considerable interest not only on account of the Iron Lāt which lies outside it... but also because it is a good specimen of the use made by the Muhammadan conquerors of the materials of the Hindu temples which they destroyed...”<sup>25</sup>

### **Vijayanagar (Karnataka)**

“During the construction of the new road-some mounds which evidently marked the remains of destroyed buildings, were dug into, and in one of them were disclosed the foundations of a rectangular building with elaborately carved base. Among the debris were lumps of charcoal and calcined iron, probably the remains of the materials used by the Muhammadans in the destruction of the building. The stones bear extensive signs of having been exposed to the action of fire. That the chief buildings were destroyed by fire, historical evidence shows, and many buildings, notably the ViThalaswAmin temple, still bear signs, in their cracked and fractured stone work, of the catastrophe which overtook them...”<sup>26</sup>

“The most important temple at Vijayanagar from an architectural point of view, is the ViThalaswāmin temple. It stands in the eastern limits of the ruins, near the bank of the TuNgabhadra river, and shows in its later structures the extreme limit in floral magnificence to which the Dravidian style advanced... This building had evidently attracted the special attention of the Muhammadan invaders in their efforts to destroy the buildings of the city, of which this was no doubt one of the most important, for though many of the other temples show traces of the action of fire, in none of them are the effects so marked as in this. Its massive construction, however, resisted all the efforts that were made to bring it down and the only visible results of their iconoclastic fury are the cracked beams and pillars, some of the later being so flaked as to make one marvel that they are yet able to bear the immense weight of the stone entablature and roof above...”<sup>27</sup>

### **Bijapur (Karnataka)**

“No ancient Hindu or Jain buildings have survived at Bijapur and the only evidence of their former existence is supplied by two or three mosques, viz., Mosque No. 294, situated in the compound of the Collector’s bungalow, Krimud-d-din Mosque and a third and smaller mosque on the way to the Mangoli Gate, which are all adaptations or re-erectments of materials obtained from temples. These mosques are the earliest Muhammadan structures and one of them, i.e., the one constructed by Karimud-d-din, must according to a Persian and Nagari inscription engraved upon its pillars, have been erected in the year 1402 Saka=A.D. 1324, soon after Malik Kafur’s conquest of the Deccan.”<sup>28</sup>

## **Badami (Karnataka)**

“Three stone lintels bearing bas-reliefs were discovered in, course of the clearance at the second gateway of the Hill Fort to the north of the Bhûtnāth tank at Badami... These originally belonged to a temple which is now in ruins and were re-used at a later period in the construction of the plinth of guardroom on the fort.

“The bas-reliefs represent scenes from the early life of KRISHNA and may be compared with similar ones in the BADAMI CAVES...”<sup>29</sup>

### **The Pattern of Destruction**

The Theology of Islam divides human history into two periods-the Jāhiliyya or the age of ignorance which preceded Allah’s first revelation to Prophet Muhammad, and the age of enlightenment which succeeded that event. It follows that every human creation which existed in the “age of ignorance” has to be converted to its Islamic version or destroyed. The logic applies to pre-Islamic buildings as much as to pre-Islamic ways of worship, mores and manners, dress and decor, personal and place names. This is too large a subject to be dealt with at present. What concerns us here is the fate of temples and monasteries that existed on the eve of the Islamic invasion and that came up in the course of its advance.

What happened to many “abodes of the infidels” is best described by a historian of Vijayanagar in the wake of Islamic victory in 1565 A.D. at the battle of Talikota. “The third day,” he writes, “saw the beginning of the end. The victorious Mussulmans had halted on the field of battle for rest and refreshment, but now they had reached the capital, and from that time forward for a space of five months Vijayanagar knew no rest. The enemy had come to destroy, and they carried out their object relentlessly. They slaughtered the people without mercy; broke down the temples and palaces, and wreaked such savage vengeance on the abode of the kings, that, with the exception of a few great stone-built temples and walls, nothing now remains but a heap of ruins to mark the spot where once stately buildings stood. They demolished the statues and even succeeded in breaking the limbs of the huge Narsimha monolith. Nothing seemed to escape them. They broke up the pavilions standing on the huge platform from which the kings used to watch festivals, and overthrew all the carved work. They lit huge fires in the magnificently decorated buildings forming the temple of Vitthalswamin near the river, and smashed its exquisite stone sculptures. With fire and sword, with crowbars and axes, they carried on day after day their work of destruction. Never perhaps in the history of the world has such havoc been wrought, and wrought so suddenly, on so splendid a city: teeming with a wealthy and industrious population in the full plenitude of prosperity one day, and on the next

seized, pillaged, and reduced to ruins, amid scenes of savage massacre and horrors beggaring description...<sup>30</sup>

The Muslim victors did not get time to raise their own structures from the ruins of Vijayanagar, partly because the Hindu Raja succeeded in regrouping his forces and re-occupying his capital and partly because they did not have the requisite Muslim population to settle in that large city; another invader, the Portuguese, had taken control of the Arabian Sea and blocked the flow of fresh recruits from Muslim countries in the Middle East. What would have happened otherwise is described by Alexander Cunningham in his report on Mahoba. "As Mahoba was," he writes, "for some time the headquarters of the early Muhammadan Governors, we could hardly expect to find that any Hindu buildings had escaped their furious bigotry, or their equally destructive cupidity. When the destruction of a Hindu temple furnished the destroyer with the ready means of building a house for himself on earth, as well as in heaven, it is perhaps wonderful that so many temples should still be standing in different parts of the country. It must be admitted, however, that, in none of the cities which the early Muhammadans occupied permanently, have they left a single temple standing, save this solitary temple at Mahoba, which doubtless owed its preservation solely to its secure position amid the deep waters of the Madan-Sagar. In Delhi, and Mathura, in Banaras and Jonpur, in Narwar and Ajmer, every single temple was destroyed by their bigotry, but thanks to their cupidity, most of the beautiful Hindu pillars were preserved, and many of them, perhaps, on their original positions, to form new colonnades for the masjids and tombs of the conquerors. In Mahoba all the other temples were utterly destroyed and the only Hindu building now standing is part of the palace of Parmal, or Paramarddi Deva, on the hill-fort, which has been converted into a masjid. In 1843, I found an inscription of Paramarddi Deva built upside down in the wall of the fort just outside this masjid. It is dated in S. 1240, or A.D. 1183, only one year before the capture of Mahoba by Prithvi-Raj Chohan of Delhi. In the Dargah of Pir Mubarak Shah, and the adjacent Musalman burial-ground, I counted 310 Hindu pillars of granite. I found a black stone bull lying beside the road, and the *argha* of a lingam fixed as a water-spout in the terrace of the Dargah. These last must have belonged to a temple of Siva, which was probably built in the reign of Kirtti Varmma, between 1065 and 1085 A.D., as I discovered an inscription of that prince built into the wall of one of the tombs."<sup>31</sup>

Many other ancient cities and towns suffered the same tragic transformation. Bukhara, Samarkand, Balkh, Kabul, Ghazni, Srinagar, Peshawar, Lahore, Multan, Patan, Ajmer, Delhi, Agra Dhar, Mandu, Budaun, Kanauj, Biharsharif, Patna, Lakhnauti, Ellichpur, Daulatabad, Gulbarga, Bidar, Bijapur, Golconda-to mention only a few of the more famous Hindu capitals-lost their native character and became nests of a closed creed waging incessant war on a catholic culture. Some of these places lost even their



ancient names which had great and glorious associations. It is on record that the Islamic invaders coined and imposed this or that quranic concoction on every place they conquered. Unfortunately for them, most of these impositions failed to stick, going the way they came. But quite a few succeeded and have endured till our own times. Reviving the ancient names wherever they have got eclipsed is one of the debts which Hindu society owes to its illustrious ancestors.

On the other hand, a large number of cities, towns and centres of Hindu civilization disappeared from the scene and their ruins have been identified only in recent times, as in the case of Kāpiśī, Lampaka, Nagarahāra, Pushkalāvati, UdbhāNDapura, Takshśilā, Ālor, Brāhmanābād, Debal, Nandana, Agrohā Virātanagara, Ahichchhatra, Śrāvastī, Sārnāth, Vaiśālī, Vikramśila, Nālandā, KarNasuvarNa, PuNDravardhana, Somapura, Jājanagar, DhānyakaTaka, Vijayapurī, Vijayanagara, Dvārasamudra. What has been found on top of the ruins in most cases is a mosque or a dargāh or a tomb or some other Muslim monument, testifying to Allah's triumph over Hindu Gods. Many more mounds are still to be explored and identified. A survey of archaeological sites in the Frontier Circle alone and as far back as 1920, listed 255 *dheris*<sup>32</sup> or mounds which, as preliminary explorations indicated, hid ruins of ancient dwellings and/or places of worship. Some *dheris*, which had been excavated and were not included in this count, showed every sign of deliberate destruction. By that time, many more mounds of a similar character had been located in other parts of the cradle of Hindu culture. A very large number has been added to the total count in subsequent years. Whichever of them is excavated tells the same story, most of the time. It is a different matter that since the dawn of independence, Indian archaeologists functioning under the spell or from fear of Secularism, record or report only the ethnographical stratifications and cultural sequences.<sup>33</sup>

Muslim historians credit all their heroes with many expeditions each of which “laid waste” this or that province or region or city or countryside. The foremost heroes of the imperial line at Delhi and Agra such as Qutbu'd-Dîn Aibak (1192-1210 A.D.), Shamsu'd-Dîn Iltutmish (1210-36 A.D.), Ghiyāsu'd-Dîn Balban (1246-66 A.D.), Alāu'd-Dîn Khaljī (1296-1316 A.D.), Muhammad bin Tughlaq (1325-51 A.D.), Fīruz Shāh Tughlaq (1351-88 A.D.) Sikandar Lodī (1489-1519 A.D.), Bābar (1519-26 A.D.) and Aurangzeb (1658-1707 A.D.) have been specially hailed for “hunting the peasantry like wild beasts”, or for seeing to it that “no lamp is lighted for hundreds of miles”, or for “destroying the dens of idolatry and God-pluralism” wherever their writ ran. The sultans of the provincial Muslim dynasties-Malwa, Gujarat, Sindh, Deccan, Jaunpur, Bengal-were not far behind, if not ahead, of what the imperial pioneers had done or were doing; quite often their performance put the imperial pioneers to shame. No study has yet been made of how much the human population declined due to repeated genocides committed by the swordsmen of Islam. But the count of cities and

towns and villages which simply disappeared during the Muslim rule leaves little doubt that the loss of life suffered by the cradle of Hindu culture was colossal.

Putting together all available evidence-literary and archaeological-from Hindu, Muslim and other sources, and following the trail of Islamic invasion, we get the pattern of how the invaders proceeded vis-a-vis Hindu places of worship after occupying a city or town and its suburbs. It should be kept in mind in this context that Muslim rule never became more than a chain of garrison cities and towns, not even in its heyday from Akbar to Aurangzeb, except in areas where wholesale or substantial conversions had taken place. Elsewhere the invaders were rarely in full control of the countryside; they had to mount repeated expeditions for destroying places of worship, collecting booty including male and female slaves, and for terrorising the peasantry, through slaughter and rapine, so that the latter may become a submissive source of revenue. The peasantry took no time to rise in revolt whenever and wherever Muslim power weakened or its terror had to be relaxed for reasons beyond its control.

1. *Places taken by assault:* If a place was taken by assault-which was mostly the case because it was seldom that the Hindus surrendered-it was thoroughly sacked, its surviving population slaughtered or enslaved and all its buildings pulled down. In the next phase, the conquerors raised their own edifices for which slave labour was employed on a large scale in order to produce quick results. Cows and, many a time, Brahmanas were killed and their blood sprinkled on the sacred sites in order to render them unclean for the Hindus for all time to come. The places of worship which the Muslims built for themselves fell into several categories. The pride of place went to the Jāmi‘ Masjid which was invariably built on the site and with the materials of the most prominent Hindu temple; if the materials of that temple were found insufficient for the purpose, they could be supplemented with materials of other temples which had been demolished simultaneously. Some other mosques were built in a similar manner according to need or the fancy of those who mattered. Temple sites and materials were also used for building the tombs of those eminent Muslims who had fallen in the fight; they were honoured as martyrs and their tombs became mazārs and rauzas in course of time. As we have already pointed out, Hindus being great temple builders, temple materials could be spared for secular structures also, at least in the bigger settlements. It can thus be inferred that all masjids and mazārs, particularly the Jāmi‘ Masjids which date from the first Muslim occupation of a place, stand on the site of Hindu temples; the structures we see at present may not carry evidence of temple materials used because of subsequent restorations or attempts to erase the evidence. There are very few Jāmi‘ Masjids in the country which do not stand on temple sites.

2. *Places surrendered:* Once in a while a place was surrendered by the Hindus in terms of an agreement that they would be treated as *zimmis* and their lives as well as



places of worship spared. In such cases, it took some time to eradicate the “emblems of infidelity.” Theologians of Islam were always in disagreement whether Hindus could pass muster as *zimmis*; they were not People of the Book. It depended upon prevailing power equations for the final decision to go in their favour or against them. Most of the time, Hindus lost the case in which they were never allowed to have any say. What followed was what had happened in places taken by assault, at least in respect of the Hindu places of worship. The *zimmi* status accorded to the Hindus seldom went beyond exaction of *jizya* and imposition of disabilities prescribed by Umar, the second rightly-guided Caliph (634-44 A.D.).

3. *Places reoccupied by Hindus*: It also happened quite frequently, particularly in the early phase of an Islamic invasion, that Hindus retook a place which had been under Muslim occupation for some time. In that case, they rebuilt their temples on new sites. Muslim historians are on record that Hindus spared the mosques and mazārs which the invaders had raised in the interregnum. When the Muslims came back, which they did in most cases, they re-enacted the standard scene vis-a-vis Hindu places of worship.

4. *Places in the countryside*: The invaders started sending out expeditions into the countryside as soon as their stranglehold on major cities and towns in a region had been secured. Hindu places of worship were always the first targets of these expeditions. It is a different matter that sometimes the local Hindus raised their temples again after an expedition had been forced to retreat. For more expeditions came and in due course Hindu places of worship tended to disappear from the countryside as well. At the same time, masjids and mazārs sprang up everywhere, on the sites of demolished temples.

5. *Missionaries of Islam*: Expeditions into the countryside were accompanied or followed by the missionaries of Islam who flaunted pretentious names and functioned in many guises. It is on record that the missionaries took active part in attacking the temples. They loved to live on the sites of demolished temples and often used temple materials for building their own dwellings, which also went under various high-sounding names. There were instances when they got killed in the battle or after they settled down in a place which they had helped in pillaging. In all such cases, they were pronounced *shahîds*(martyrs) and suitable monuments were raised in their memory as soon as it was possible. Thus a large number of *gumbads*(domes) and *ganjs* (plains) commemorating the martyrs arose all over the cradle of Hindu culture and myths about them grew apace. In India, we have a large literature on the subject in which Sayyid Sālār Mas‘ûd, who got killed at Bahraich while attacking the local Sun Temple, takes pride of place. His mazAr now stands on the site of the same temple which was demolished in a subsequent invasion. Those Muslim saints who

survived and settled down have also left a large number of masjids and dargahs in the countryside. Almost all of them stand on temple sites.

6. *The role of sufis*: The saints of Islam who became martyrs or settled down were of several types which can be noted by a survey of their *ziārats* and *mazārs* that we find in abundance in all lands conquered by the armies of Islam. But in the second half of the twelfth century A.D., we find a new type of Muslim saint appearing on the scene and dominating it in subsequent centuries. That was the sufi joined to a *silsila*. This is not the place to discuss the character of some outstanding sufis like Mansūr al-Hallāj, Bāyazīd Bistāmī, Rūmī and Attār. Suffice it to say that some of their ancestral spiritual heritage had survived in their consciousness even though their Islamic environment had tended to poison it a good deal. The common name which is used for these early sufis as well as for the teeming breed belonging to the latter-day *silsilas*, has caused no end of confusion. So far as India is concerned, it is difficult to find a sufi whose consciousness harboured even a trace of any spirituality. By and large, the sufis that functioned in this country were the most fanatic and fundamentalist activists of Islamic imperialism, the same as the latter-day Christian missionaries in the context of Spanish and Portuguese imperialism.

Small wonder that we find them flocking everywhere ahead or with or in the wake of Islamic armies. Sufis of the Chishtīyya *silsila* in particular excelled in going ahead of these armies and acting as eyes and ears of the Islamic establishment. The Hindus in places where these sufis settled, particularly in the South, failed to understand the true character of these saints till it was too late. The invasions of South India by the armies of Alāu’ d-Dīn Khaljī and Muhammad bin Tughlaq can be placed in their proper perspective only when we survey the sufi network in the South. Many sufis were sent in all directions by Nizāmu’ d-Dīn Awliyā, the Chishtīyya luminary of Delhi; all of them actively participated in *jihāds* against the local population. Nizāmu’ d-Dīn’s leading disciple, Nasīru’ d-Dīn Chirāg-i-Dihlī, exhorted the sufis to serve the Islamic state. “The essence of sufism,” he versified, “is not an external garment. Gird up your loins to serve the Sultān and be a sufi.”<sup>34</sup> Nasīru’ d-Dīn’s leading disciple, Syed Muhammad Husainī Banda Nawāz Gesūdarāz (1321-1422 A.D.), went to Gulbarga for helping the contemporary Bahmani sultan in consolidating Islamic power in the Deccan. Shykh Nizāmu’ d-Dīn Awliyā’s dargāh in Delhi continued to be and remains till today the most important centre of Islamic fundamentalism in India.

An estimate of what the sufis did wherever and whenever they could, can be formed from the account of a pilgrimage which a pious Muslim Nawwāb undertook in 1823 to the holy places of Islam in the Chingleput, South Arcot, Thanjavur, Tiruchirapalli and North Arcot districts of Tamil Nadu. This region had experienced renewed Islamic invasion after the breakdown of the Vijayanagar Empire in 1565 A.D. Many sufis had flocked in for destroying Hindu temples and converting the Hindu

population, particularly the Qādirīyyas who had been fanning out all over South India after establishing their stronghold at Bidar in the fifteenth century. They did not achieve any notable success in terms of conversions, but the havoc they wrought with Hindu temples can be inferred from a large number of ruins, loose sculptures scattered all over the area, inscriptions mentioning many temples which cannot be traced, and the proliferation of mosques, dargāhs, mazārs and maqbaras.

The pilgrim visited many places and could not go to some he wanted to cover. All these places were small except Tiruchirapalli, Arcot and Vellore. His court scribe, who kept an account of the pilgrimage, mentions many masjids and mazārs visited by his patron. Many masjids and mazārs could not be visited because they were in deserted places covered by forest. There were several graveyards, housing many tombs; one of them was so big that “thousands, even a hundred thousand” graves could be there. Other notable places were takiyās of faqirs, sarāis, dargāhs, and several houses of holy relics in one of which “a hair of the Holy Prophet is enshrined.” The account does not mention the Hindu population except as “harsh kafirs and marauders.” But stray references reveal that the Muslim population in all these places was sparse. For instance, Kanchipuram had only 50 Muslim houses but 9 masjids and 1 mazār.

The court scribe pays fulsome homage to the sufis who “planted firmly the Faith of Islam” in this region. The pride of place goes to Hazrat Natthar Wall who took over by force the main temple at Tiruchirapalli and converted it into his khānqāh. Referring to the destruction of the Sivalinga in the temple, he observes: “The monster was slain and sent to the house of perdition. His image namely *but-ling* worshipped by the unbelievers was cut and the head separated from the body. A portion of the body went into the ground. Over that spot is the tomb of Wall shedding rediance till this day.”<sup>35</sup> Another sufi, Qāyim Shāh, who came to the same place at a later stage, “was the cause of the destruction of twelve temples.”<sup>36</sup> At Vellore, Hazrat Nūr Muhammad Qādirī, “the most unique man regarded as the invaluable person of his age,” was the “cause of the ruin of temples” which “he laid waste.” He chose to be buried “in the vicinity of the temple” which he had replaced with his khānqāh.<sup>37</sup>

It is, therefore, not an accident that the masjids and khānqāhs built by or for the sufis who reached a place in the first phase of Islamic invasion occupy the sites of Hindu temples and, quite often, contain temple materials in their structures. Lahore, Multan, Uch, Ajmer, Delhi, Badaun, Kanauj, Kalpi, Biharsharif, Maner, Lakhnauti, Patan, Patna, Burhanpur, Daulatabad, Gulbarga, Bidar, Bijapur, Golconda, Arcot, Vellor and Tiruchirapalli—to count only a few leading sufi center-shave many dargāhs which display evidence of iconoclasm. Many masjids and dargāhs in interior places testify to the same fact, namely, that the sufis were, above everything else, dedicated soldiers

of Allah who tolerates no other deity and no other way of worship except that which he revealed to Prophet Muhammad.

*7. Particularly pious sultans:* Lastly, we have to examine very closely the monuments built during the reigns of the particularly pious sultans who undertook “to cleanse the land from the vices of infidelity and God-pluralism” that had cropped up earlier, either because Islamic terror had weakened under pressure of circumstances or because the proceeding ruler (s) had “wandered away from the path of rectitude.” Fîruz Shâh Tughlaq, Sikandar Lodî and Aurangzeb of the Delhi-Agra imperial line belonged to this category. They had several prototypes in the provincial Muslim dynasties at Ahmadabad, Mandu, Jaunpur, Lakhnauti, Gulbarga, Bidar, Ahmadnagar, Bijapur and Golconda. There is little doubt that all masjids and mazârs erected under the direct or indirect patronage of these sultans, particularly in places where Hindu population predominates, stand on the sites of Hindu temples.

### **A Preliminary Survey**

We give below, state-wise and district-wise, the particulars of Muslim monuments which stand on the sites and/or have been built with the materials of Hindu temples, and which we wish to recall as witnesses to the role of Islam as a religion and the character of Muslim rule in medieval India. The list is the result of a preliminary survey. Many more Muslim monuments await examination. Local traditions which have so far been ignored or neglected, have to be tapped on a large scale.

We have tried our best to be exact in respect of locations, names and dates of the monuments mentioned. Even so, some mistakes and confusions may have remained. It is not unoften that different sources provide different dates and names for the same monument. Many Muslim saints are known by several names, which creates confusion in identifying their mazârs or dargâhs. Some districts have been renamed or newly, created and a place which was earlier under one district may have been included in another. We shall be grateful to readers who point out these mistakes so that they can be corrected in our major study. This is only a brief summary.

### **ANDHRA PRADESH**

#### **I. Adilabad District.**

*Mahur*, Masjid in the Fort on the hill. Temple site.

## II. Anantpur District.

1. *Gooty*, Gateway to the Hill Fort. Temple materials used.
2. *Kadiri*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
3. *Konakondla*, Masjid in the bazar. Temple materials used.
4. *Penukonda*
  - (i) Fort. Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Masjid in the Fort. Converted Temple.
  - (iii) Sher Khān’s Masjid (1546).<sup>38</sup> Converted Temple.
  - (iv) Dargāh of Babayya. Converted Īśvara Temple.
  - (v) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1664-65). Temple site.
  - (xi) Dargāh of Shāh Fakbru’d-Dīn (1293-94). Temple site.
5. *Tadpatri*
  - (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1695-96). Temple site.
  - (ii) Idgāh completed in 1725-26. Temple site.
6. *Thummala*, Masjid (1674-75). Temple site.

## III. Cuddapah District

1. *Cuddapah*
  - (i) Bhāp Sāhib-kī-Masjid (1692). Temple site.
  - (ii) Idgāh (1717-18). Temple site.
  - (iii) Bahādur Khān-kī-Masjid (1722-23). Temple site.
  - (iv) Dargāh of Shāh Amīnu’d-Dīn Gesū Darāz (1736-37). Temple site.
2. *Duvvuru*, Masjid. Temple site.
3. *Gandikot*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1690-91). Temple site.
4. *Gangapur*, Masjid. Temple site.
5. *Gundlakunta*, Dastgīrī Dargāh. Temple site.
6. *Gurrukonda*, Fort and several other Muslim buildings. Temple materials used.
7. *Jammalmadugu*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1794-95). Temple site.
8. *Jangalapalle*, Dargāh of Dastgīr Swāmī. Converted Jangam temple.
9. *Siddhavatam*
  - (i) Qutb Shāhī Masjid (restored in 1808). Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1701). Temple materials used.
  - (iii) Dargāh of Bismillāh Khān Qādirī. Temple materials used.
  - (iv) Fort and Gateways. Temple materials used.
  - (v) Chowk-kī-Masjid. Temple site.
10. *Vutukuru*
  - (i) Masjid at Naligoto. Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid at Puttumiyyapeta. Temple site.

#### IV. East Godavari District.

*Bikkavolu*, Masjid. Temple materials used.

#### V. Guntur District.

1. *Nizampatnam*, Dargāh of Shāh Haidrī (1609). Temple site
2. *Vinukonda*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1640-41). Temple site.

#### VI. Hyderabad District.

1. *Chikalgoda*, Masjid (1610). Temple site.
2. *Dargah*, Dargāh of Shāh Walī (1601-02). Temple site.
3. *Golconda*
  - (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid on Bālā Hissār. Temple site.
  - (ii) Tārāmatī Masjid. Temple site.
4. *Hyderabad*
  - (i) Dargāh of Shāh Mūsā Qādirī. Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid on the Pirulkonda Hill (1690). Temple site.
  - (iii) Tolī Masjid (1671). Temple materials used.
  - (iv) Dargāh of Miān Mishk (d. 1680). Temple site.
  - (v) Dargāh of Mu‘min Chup in Aliyābād (1322-23). Temple site.
  - (vi) Hājī Kamāl-kī-Masjid (1657). Temple site.
  - (vii) Begum Masjid (1593). Temple site.
  - (viii) Dargāh of Islām Khān Naqshbandī. Temple site.
  - (ix) Dargāh of Shāh Dā‘ūd (1369-70). Temple site.
  - (x) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1597). Temple site.
4. *Maisaram*, Masjid built by Aurangzeb from materials of 200 temples demolished after the fall of Golconda.
5. *Secunderabad*, Qadam RasUl. Temple site.
6. *Sheikhpeta*
  - (i) Shaikh-kī-Masjid (1633-34). Temple site.
  - (ii) SarāiwAlī Masjid (1678-79). Temple site.

#### VII. Karimnagar District.

1. *Dharampuri*, Masjid (1693). TrikuTa Temple site.
2. *Elangdal*

- (i) Mansûr Khân-kî-Masjid (1525). Temple site.
- (ii) Alamgîrî Masjid (1696). Temple site.
- 3. *Kalesyaram*, Ālamgîrî Masjid. Temple site.
- 4. *Sonipet*, Ālamgîrî Masjid. Temple site.
- 5. *Vemalvada*, Mazâr of a Muslim saint. Temple site.

#### VIII. Krishna District.

- 1. *Gudimetta*, Masjid in the Fort, Temple materials used.
- 2. *Guduru*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1497). Temple materials used.
- 3. *Gundur*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Converted temple.
- 4. *Kondapalli*

(i) Masjid built in 1482 on the site of a temple after Muhammad Shāh Bahmanî had slaughtered the Brahmin priests on the advice of Mahmûd Gawān, the great Bahmanî Prime Minister, who exhorted the sultan to become a Ghāzî by means of this pious performance.

(ii) Mazâr of Shāh Abdul Razzāq. Temple site.

#### 5. *Kondavidu*

- (i) Masjid (1337). Temple materials used.
- (ii) Dargāh of Barандаula. Temple materials used.
- (iii) Qadam Sharîf of Ādam. Converted temple.

#### 6. *Machhlipatnam*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Idgāh. Temple site.
- 7. *Nandigram*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
- 8. *Pedana*, Iama‘il-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
- 9. *Rajkonda*, Masjid (1484). Temple site.
- 10. *Tengda*, Masjid. Temple site.
- 11. *Turkpalem*, Dargāh of Ghālib Shahîd. Temple site.
- 12. *Vadpaili*, Masjid near NarsiMhaswāmîn Temple. Temple materials used.
- 13. *Vijaywada*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

#### IX. Kurnool District.

#### 1. *Adoni*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1668-69). Materials of several temples used.
- (ii) Masjid on the Hill. Temple materials used.
- (iii) Fort (1676-77). Temple materials used.

## 2. *Cumbum*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1649). Temple site.
- (ii) Gachinālā Masjid (1729-30). Temple site.
3. *Havli*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple materials used.
4. *Karimuddula*, Dargāh. Akkadevi Temple materials used.
5. *Kottakot*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1501). Temple site.
6. *Kurnool*
  - (i) Pīr Sāhib-kā-Gumbad (1637-38). Temple site.
  - (ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1667). Temple site.
  - (iii) Lāl Masjid (1738-39). Temple site.
7. *Pasupala*, Kalān Masjid. Temple site.
8. *Sanjanmala*, Masjid. Temple sites.
9. *Siddheswaram*, Ashurkhāna. Temple materials used.
10. *Yadavalli*, Mazār and Masjid. Temple sites.
11. *Zuhrapur*, Dargāh of Qādir Shāh Bukhārī. Temple site.

## X. Mahbubnagar District.

1. *Alampur*, Qalā-kī-Masjid. Temple materials used.
2. *Jatprole*, Dargāh of Sayyid Shāh Darwish. Temple materials used.
3. *Kodangal*
  - (i) Dargāh of Hazrat Nizāmu’d-Dīn. Temple site.
  - (ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
4. *Kundurg*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1470-71). Temple site.
5. *Pargi*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1460). Temple site.
6. *Somasila*, Dargāh of Kamālu’d-Dīn Baba (1642-43) Temple site.

## XI. Medak District.

1. *Andol*, Old Masjid. Temple site.
2. *Komatur*, Old Masjid. Temple site.
3. *Medak*
  - (i) Masjid near Mubārak Mahal (1641). VishNu Temple site.
  - (ii) Fort, Temple materials used.
4. *Palat*, Masjid. Temple site.
5. *Patancheru*
  - (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Shykh Ibrāhīm known as Makhdūmji (1583). Temple site.
  - (iii) Ashrufkhāna. Temple site.
  - (iv) Fort (1698). Temple materials used.



## XII. Nalgonda District.

### 1. *Devarkonda*

- (i) Qutb Shāhî Masjid. Temple materials used.
- (ii) Dargāh of Sharîfu'd-Din (1579). Temple site.
- (iii) Dargāh of Qādir Shāh Walî (1591). Temple site.

### 2. *Ghazinagar*, Masjid (1576-77). Temple site.

### 3. *Nalgonda*

- (i) Garhî Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Shāh Latîf. Temple site.
  - (iii) Qutb Shāhî Masjid (Renovated in 1897). Temple site.
- ### 4. *Pangal*, Ālamgîrî Masjid. Temple site.

## XIII. Nellore District.

### 1. *Kandukuru*, Four Masjids. Temple sites.

### 2. *Nellore*, Dargāh named Dargāmittā. Akkasālîšvara Temple materials used.

### 3. *Podile*, Dargāh. Temple site.

### 4. *Udayagiri*

- (i) Jāmi' Masjid (1642-43). Temple materials used.
- (ii) Chhotî Masjid (1650-51). Temple materials used.
- (iii) Fort. Temple materials used.

## XIV. Nizambad District.

### 1. *Balkonda*

#### (i) Patthar-kî-Masjid. Temple site.

#### (ii) Idgāh. Temple site.

### 2. *Bodhan*

#### (i) Deval Masjid. Converted Jain temple.

#### (ii) Patthar-kî-Masjid. Temple site.

#### (iii) Ālamgîrî Masjid (1654-55). Temple site.

### 3. *Dudki*, Ashrufkhāna. Temple materials used.

### 4. *Fathullapur*, Mu'askarî Masjid (1605-06). Temple site.

## XV. Osmanabad District.

*Ausa*, Jāmi' Masjid (1680-81). Temple site.

XVI. Rangareddy District.

*Maheshwar*, Masjid (1687). Madanna Pandit's Temple site.

XVII. Srikakulam District

1. *Ichchapuram*, Several Masjids. Temple sites.

2. *Kalingapatnam*, DargAh of Sayyid Muhammad Madnî Awliyã (1619-20). Temple materials used.

3. *Srikakulam*

(i) Jāmi' Masjid (1641- 42). Temple site.

(ii) Dargāh of Bande Shāh Walî (1641- 42). Temple site.

(iii) Atharwālî Masjid (1671-72). Temple site.

(iv) Dargāh of Burhānu'd-Dîn Awliyã. Temple site.

XVIII. Vishakhapatnam District.

1. *Jayanagaram*, Dargāh. Temple site.

2. *Vishakhapatnam*, Dargāh of Shāh Madnî. Temple site.

XIX. Warangal District.

*Zafargarh*, Jāmi' Masjid. Temple site.

XX. West Godavari District.

1. *Eluru*

(i) Fort. Temple materials used.

(ii) Sawāi Masjid. Converted temple.

(iii) Qāzi's House. Somešvara Temple materials used.

2. *Nidavolu*, Masjid. Mahādeva Temple materials used.

3. *Rajamundri*, Jāmi' Masjid (1324). Converted VeNugopālaswāmin Temple.

**ASSAM**

District Kamrup

*Hajo*

- (i) Poã Masjid (1657). Temple site.
- (ii) Mazâr of a Muslim saint who styled himself Sultân Ghiyãsu'd-Dîn Balban. Temple site.

## BENGAL

### I. Bankura District.

*Lokpura*, Mazâr of Ghâzî Ismâil. Converted Venugopala temple.

### II. Barisal District.

*Kasba*, Masjid. Temple site.

### III. Birbhum District.

1. *Moregram*, Mazâr of Sayyid Bâbã. Temple materials used.
2. *Patharchapuri*, Mazã of Dâtã, or Mahbûb Sâhib. Temple site.
3. *Rajnagar*, Several Old Masjids. Temple sites.
4. *Sakulipur*, Jâmi' Masjid. Temple site.
5. *Siyana*, Dargâh of Makhdûm Shâh (1221). Materials of many temples used.

### IV. Bogra District.

#### *Mahasthan*

- (i) Dargâh and Masjid of Shâh Sultân Mahîswâr. Stands on the ruins of a temple.
- (ii) Majid on Šilãdevî Ghat. Temple materials used.

### V. Burdwan District.

1. *Inchalabazar*, Masjid (1703). Temple site.
2. *Kasba*, Rãjã, Masjid. Temple materials used.
3. *Kalna*
  - (i) Dargâh of Shâh Majlis (1491-93). Temple site.
  - (ii) ShâhI Masjid (1533). Temple site.

4. *Mangalkot*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1523-24). Temple site.

5. *Raikha*, Talāb-wālī Masjid. Temple site.

6. *Suata*

(i) Dargāh of Sayyid Shāh Shahîd Mahmûd Bahmanî. Buddhist Temple materials site.

(ii) Masjid (1502-02). Temple site.

VI. Calcutta District.

*Bania Pukur*, Masjid built for Alāud-Dîn Alāu’l Haqq (1342). Temple materials used.

VII. *Chatgaon* District.

Dargāh of Badr Makhdûm. Converted Buddhist Vihāra.

VIII. Dacca District.

1. *Dacca*

(i) Tomb of Bîbî Parî. Temple materials used.

(ii) Saif Khān-kî-Masjid. Converted temple.

(iii) Churihattā Masjid. Temple materials used.

2. *Narayanganj*, Qadam Rasûl Masjid. Temple site.

3. *Rampal*

(i) Masjid. Converted temple.

(ii) Dargāh of Bābā. Adam Shahîd (1308). Temple materials used.

4. *Sonargaon*, Old Masjid. Temple materials used.

IX. Dinajpur District.

1. *Basu-Bihar*, Two Masjids. On the ruins of a Buddhist Vihāra.

2. *Devatala*

(i) Dargāh of Shykh Jalālu’d-Dîn Tabrizi, Suhrawardîyyia sufi credited in Muslim histories with the destruction of many, temples. Temple site.

(ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1463). VishNu Temple site.

3. *Devikot*

(i) Dargāh and Masjid of Pîr Atāu’llah Shāh (1203). Temple materials used.

(ii) Dargāh of Shāh Bukhārî. Temple materials used.

- (iii) Dargāh of Pîr Bahāu'd-Dîn. Temple materials used.
- (iv) Dargāh of Shāh Sultān Pîr. Temple materials used.
- 4. *Mahisantosh*, Dargāh and Masjid. On the site of a big VishNu Temple.
- 5. *Nekmard*, Mazār of Nekmard Shāh. Temple site.

X. Faridpur District.

*Faridpzir*, Mazār of Farīd Shāh. Temple site.

XI. Hooghly District.

- 1. *Jangipura*, Mazār of Shahīd Ghāzī. Temple materials used.
- 2. *Pandua*
  - (i) Masjid. Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Mazār of Shāh Safiu'd-Dîn. Temple site.
  - (iii) Fath Minār. Temple materials used.
- 3. *Santoshpur*, Masjid near Molla Pukur (153-310). Temple site.
- 4. *Satgaon*, Jāmi' Masjid. Temple materials used.
- 5. *Tribeni*
  - (i) Zafar Khān-kî-Masjid (1298). Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Zafar Khān. Temple materials used.
  - (iii) Masjid (1459). Temple site.

XII. Howrah District.

*Jangalvilas*, Pîr Sāhib-kî-Masjid. Converted temple.

XIII. Khulna District.

- 1. *Masjidkur*
  - (i) Shāt Gumbaz. Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Mazār of Khanjā Ali or Khān Jahān. Temple site.
- 2. *Salkhira*, Dargāh of Maī Chāmpā. Temple materials used.

XIV. Malda District.

- 1. *Gangarampur*

- (i) Dargāh of Shāh Atā. Śiva Temple site.
- (ii) Masjid on the river bank (1249). Temple site.

2. *Gaur*, Muslim city built on the site and with the ruins of LakshmaNāvati, Hindu capital destroyed by the Muslims at the end of the twelfth century A.D. Temple materials have been used in the following monuments:

- (i) Chhotī Sonā Masjid.
- (ii) Qadam Rasūl Masjid (1530)
- (iii) Tāntipārā Masjid (1480)
- (iv) Lāttan Masjid (1475)
- (v) Badī Sonā Masjid (1526)
- (vi) Dargāh of Makhadūm Akhī Sirāj Chishtī, disciple of Nizāmu'd-Dīn Awliya of Delhi (1347)
- (vii) Darsbārī or College of Theology.
- (viii) Astānā of Shāh Niāmatu'llāh.
- (ix) Chāmkattī Masjid (1459).
- (x) Chikkā Masjid.
- (xi) Gunmant Masjid. Converted temple.
- (xii) Dākhil Darwāzā.
- (xiii) Kotwālī Darwāzā.
- (xiv) Fīruz Minār.
- (xv) ChaNDipur Darwāzā.
- (xvi) Bārāduārī Masjid.
- (xvii) Lukāchuri Masjid.
- (xviii) Gumtī Darwāzā.

### 3. *Malda*

- (i) Jāmi' Masjid (1566). Temple materials used.
- (ii) Sak Mohan Masjid (1427). Temple site.

4. *Pandua*, Another Muslim city built with the ruins of LakshmaNāvati. Temple materials have been used in the following monuments.

- (i) Ādina Masjid (1368)
- (ii) Yak lakhī Masjid.
- (iii) Chheh Hazārī or Dargāh of Nūr Qutb-i-Ālam (1415).
- (iv) Bāis Hazārī or Khānqāh of Jalālu'd-Dīn Tabrizī (1244).
- (v) Sonā Masjid.
- (vi) Barn-like Masjid.
- (vii) Qadam Rasūl.

XV. Midnapur District.

1. *Gagneswar*, Karambera Garh Masjid (1509). Šiva Temple site.
2. *Hijli*, Masnad-i-Ālā-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
3. *Kesiari*, Masjid (1622). Mahādeva Temple materials used.
4. *Kharagpur*, Mazār of Pîr Lohāni. Temple site.

XVI. Murshidabad District.

1. *Chuna Khali*, Barbak-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
2. *Murshidabad*, Temple materials have been used in the following monuments:
  - (i) Katrā Masjid.
  - (ii) Motîjhîl Lake Embankments.
  - (iii) Sangî Dālān.
  - (iv) Mahal Sarā‘.
  - (v) Alîvardî Khān-kî-Masjid.
  - (vi) Hazārduārî Mahal.
3. *Rangamati*, Dargāh on the Rākshasî DāNgā. Stands on the ruins of a Buddhist Vihāra.

XVII. Noakhali District.

*Begamganj*, Bajrā Masjid. Converted temple.

XVIII. Pabna District.

*Balandu*, Madrasa. Converted Buddhist Vihāra.

XIX. Rajshahi District.

1. *Bhaturia*, Masjid. Šiva Temple materials used.
2. *Kumarpura*, Mazār of Mukarram Shāh. Converted temple.
3. *Kusumbha*, Old Masjid (1490-93). Constructed entirely of temple materials.

XX. Rangpur District.

*Kamatpur*

- (i) BaDā Dargāh of Shāh Ismāil Ghāzī. Temple site.
- (ii) Idgāh on a mound one mile away. Temple materials used.

XXI. Sylhet District.

1. *Baniyachung*, Famous Masjid. Temple site.
2. *Sylhet*
  - (i) Masjid of Shāh Jalāl. Temple site.
  - (ii) Mazārs of Shāh Jalāl and many of his disciples. Temple sites.

XXII. 24-Parganas District.

1. *Barasat*, Mazār of Pīr Ekdil Sāhib. Temple site.
2. *Berchampa*, Dargāh of Pīr GorāchāNd. Temple site.

**BIHAR**

I. Bhagalpur District.

1. *Bhagalpur*
  - (i) Dargāh of Hazrat Shāhbāz (1502). Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid of Mujahidpur (1511-15). Temple site.
  - (iii) Dargāh of Makhdûm Shāh (1615). Temple site.
2. *Champanagar*
  - (i) Several Mazārs. On ruins of Jain temples.
  - (ii) Masjid (1491). Jain Temple site.
3. *Sultanganj*, Masjid on the rock on the river bank. Temple site.

II. Gaya District.

1. *Amthua*, Masjid (1536). Temple site.
2. *Gaya*, Shāhî Masjid in Nadirganj (1617). Temple site.
3. *Kako*, Dargāh of Bîbî Kamālo. Temple site.

III. Monghyr District.



1. *Amoljhorī*, Muslim Graveyard. VishNu Temple site.
2. *Charuanwan*, Masjid (1576). Temple site.
3. *Kharagpur*
  - (i) Masjid (1656-57). Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid (1695-96). Temple site.
4. *Monghyr*
  - (i) Fort Gates. Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Shāh Nafa‘ Chishtī (1497-98). Temple site.

#### IV. Muzaffarpur District.

*Zaruha*, MamûN-BhāNjā-kā-Mazār. Temple materials used.

#### V. Nalanda District.

1. *Biharsharif*, Muslim capital built after destroying UdaNDapura which had a famous Buddhist Vihāra. Most of the Muslim monuments were built on the site and from materials of temples. The following are some of them:

- (i) Dargāh of Makhdûmu’l Mulk Sharīfu’d-Dîn. (d. 1380).
  - (ii) BaDā Dargāh.
  - (iii) Chhotā Dargāh.
  - (iv) Bārādarī.
  - (v) Dargāh of Shāh Fazlu’llāh GosāiN.
  - (iv) Mazār of Malik Ibrāhim Bayyû on Pîr PahāDî.
  - (vii) Kabîriu’d-Dîn-kî-Masjid (1353).
  - (viii) Mazār of Sayyid Muhammad Siwistāni.
  - (ix) Chhotā Takiyā containing the Mazār of Shāh Dîwān Abdul Waghāb.
  - (x) Dargāh of Shāh Qumais (1359-60).
  - (xi) Masjid in Chandpur Mahalla.
  - (xii) Jāmi‘ Masjid in Paharpur Mahalla.
2. *Parbati*, Dargāh of Hājī Chandar or ChāNd Saudāgar. Temple materials used.
  3. *Shaikhupura*, Dargāh of Shykh Sāhib. Temple materials used.

#### VI. Patna District.

1. *Hilsa*
  - (i) Dargāh of Shāh Jumman Madārīyya (repaired in 1543). Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid. (1604-05). Temple site.

2. *Jana*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1539). Temple site.
3. *Kailvan*, Dargāh and Masjid. Temple site.
4. *Maner*, All Muslim monuments stand on temple sites. The following are prominent among them:
  - (i) BaDā Dargāh of Sultānu’l Makhdûm Shāh Yāhyā Manerî.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Makhdûm Daulat Shāh.
  - (iii) Jāmi‘ Masjid.
  - (iv) Mazār of Hājî Nizāmu’ d-Dîn.
5. *Muhammadpur*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1510-11). Temple site.
6. *Patna*
  - (i) Patthar-kî-Masjid (1626). Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Begû Hajjām-kî-Masjid (1510-11). Temple materials used.
  - (iii) Muslim Graveyard outside the Qiladari. On the ruins of Buddhist Vihāras.
  - (iv) Dargāh of Shāh Mîr Mansûr. On the ruins of a Buddhist Stûpa.
  - (v) Dargāh of Shāh Arzāni. On the site of a Buddhist Vihāra.
  - (vi) Dargāh of Pîr Damariyā. On the site of a Buddhist Vihāra.
  - (vii) Mirza Māsûm-kî-Masjid (1605). Temple materials used.
  - (viii) Meetan Ghât-kî-Masjid (1605). Temple site.
  - (ix) Katrā Masjid of Shāista Khān. Temple site.
  - (x) Khwāja Ambar Masjid (1688-89). Temple site.
  - (xi) Bābuganj Masjid (1683-86). Temple site.
  - (xii) Sher-Shāhî Masjid near Purab Darwaza. Temple site.
  - (xiii) Chamnî Ghât-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
7. *Phulwarisharif*
  - (i) Dargāh of Shāh Pashmînāposh. Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Minhāju’ d-Dîn Rastî. Temple site.
  - (iii) Dargāh of Lāl Miān. Temple site.
  - (iv) Sangî Masjid (1549-50). Temple site.

## VII. Purnea District.

1. *Hadaf*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
2. *Puranea*, Masjid in Keonlpura. Temple site.

## VIII. Saran District.

1. *Chirand*, Masjid (1503-04). Temple site.
2. *Narhan*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
3. *Tajpur-Basahi* Mazār of Khwāja Bādshāh. Temple materials used.

## IX. Shahabad District.

### 1. *Rohtasgarh*

- (i) Masjid of Aurangzeb. Part of a temple converted.
  - (ii) Mazār of Sāqî Sultān. Temple site.
2. *Sasaram*, Mazār of Chandan Shahîd Pîr. Temple site.

## X. Vaishali District.

### 1. *Amer*, Mazār of Pîr Qattāl. Temple materials used.

### 2. *Chehar*

- (i) Fort. Temple materials used.
- (ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple materials used.

### 3. *Hajipur*

- (i) Hājî Ilyās-kî- Masjid. Converted temple.
- (ii) Dargāh of Barkhurdār Awliyā. Temple site.
- (iii) Dargāh of Pîr Shattārî. Temple site.
- (iv) Dargāh of Hājîu’l Harmain. Temple site.
- (v) Dargāh of Pîr Jalālu’ d-Dîn. Temple site.

### 4. *Basarh*

- (i) Dargāh of Pîr Mîrān. On top of a Buddhist Stûpa.
- (ii) Mazār of Shykh Muhammad Faizu’ llāh Ali alias Qāzin Shattārî. Temple site.
- (iii) Graveyard. Many tombs built with temple materials.
- (iv) Masjid. Temple site.

## XI. District to be determined.

### 1. *Hasanpura*, Mazār of Makhdûm Hasan. On the site of a Buddhist Stûpa,

### 2. *Jhangira*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

## DELHI

Islamic invaders destroyed the Hindu cities of Indarpat and Dhillikā with their extensive suburbs and built seven cities successively. The following Muslim monuments stand on the site of Hindu temples; temple materials can be seen in some of them.

### I. *Mehrauli*

1. Quwwatu'l Islām Masjid (1198).
2. Qutb Mīnār.
3. Maqbara of Shamsu'd-Dīn Iltutmish (1235.)
4. Dargāh of Shykh Qutbu'd-Dīn Bakhtyār Kākī (d. 1236).
5. Jahāz Mahal.
6. Alāi Darwāzā.
7. Alāi Mīnār.
8. Madrasa and Maqbara of Alāu'd-Dīn Khaljī.
9. Maqbara of Ghiyāsu'd-Dīn Balban.
10. Masjid and Mazār of Shykh Fazlu'llāh known as Jamālī-Kamālī.
11. MaDhī Masjid.

## II. *Sultan Ghari*

Maqbara of Nāsiru'd-Dīn, son of Sultān Shamsu'd-Dīn Iltutmish (1231).

## III. *Palam*

Bābrī (Ghazanfar) Masjid (1528-29).

## IV. *Begumpur*

1. Masjid.
2. Bijai Mandal.
3. Kālu Sarāi-kī-Masjid.
4. Mazār of Shykh Najību'd-Dīn Mutwakkal Chishtī (d. 1272).

## V. *Tughlaqabad*

Maqbara of Ghiyāsu'd-Dīn Tughlaq.

## VI. *Chiragh-Delhi*

1. Dargāh of Shykh Nasīru'd-Dīn Chirāgh-i-Dehlī (d. 1356).
2. Maqbara of Bahlul Lodī.

## VII. *Nizamu'd-Din*

1. Dargāh and Jama't-Khāna Masjid of Shykh Nizāmu'd-Dīn Awliyā (d. 1325).
2. Kalān Masjid.
3. ChauNsaTh-Khambā.
4. Maqbara of Khān-i-Jahān Tilangānī.
5. Chillā of Nizām'd-Dīn Awliyā.
6. Lāl Mahal.

## VIII. *Hauz Khas*

1. Maqbara and Madrasa of Fīruz Shāh Tughlaq.
2. Dādī-Potī-kā-Maqbara.
3. Biran-kā-Gumbad.
4. Chhotī and Sakrī Gumtī.
5. Nīlī Masjid (1505-06).
6. Idgāh (1404-00).
7. Bāgh-i-Ālam-kā-Gumbad (1501).
8. Mazār of Nūru'd-Dīn Mubārak Ghaznawī (1234-35).

## IX. *Malviyanagar*

1. Lāl Gumbad or the Mazār of Shykh Kabīru'd-Dīn Awliyā (1397).
2. Mazār of Shykh Alāu'd-Dīn (1507).
3. Mazār of Shykh Yūsuf Qattāl (d. 1527).
4. Khirkī Masjid.

## X. *Lodi Gardens*

1. Maqbara of Muhammad Shāh.
2. BaDā Gumbad Masjid (1494).
3. Shīsh Gumbad.
4. Maqbara of Sikandar Lodī.

## XI. *Purana Qila*

1. Sher Shāh Gate.
2. Qalā-i-Kuhna Masjid.
3. Khairu'l Manzil Masjid.

## XII. *Shahjahanabad*

1. Kālī Masjid at Turkman Gate.
2. Maqbara of Raziā Sultān.
3. Jāmi' Masjid on Bhojala PahāDī.
4. Ghatā or Zainatu'l Masjid.
5. Dargāh of Shāh Turkmān (1240).

## XIII. *Ramakrishnapuram*

1. Tīn Burjī Maqbara.
2. Malik Munīr-kī-Masjid.
3. Wazīrpur-kā-Gumbad.
4. Mundā Gumbads.
5. Barā-Lāo-kā-Gumbad.
6. Barje-kā-Gumbad.

## XIV. *The Ridge*

1. Mālchā Mahal,
2. Bhūlī Bhatiyāri-kā-Mahal.
3. Qadam Sharīf.
4. Chauburzā Masjid.
5. Pīr Ghaib.

## XV. *Wazirabad*

Masjid and Mazār of Shāh Ālam.

## XVI. *South Extension*

1. Kāle Khān-kā-Gumbad.
2. Bhūre Khān-kā-Gumbad.

3. Chhote Khān-kā-Gumbad.
4. BaDe Khān-kā-Gumbad.

#### XVII. *Other Areas*

1. Maqbara of Mubārak Shāh in Kotla Mubarakpur.
2. Kushk Mahal in Tin Murti.
3. Sundar Burj in Sundarnagar.
4. Jāmi‘ Masjid in Kotla Fīruz Shāh.
5. Abdu’n-Nabî-kî-Masjid near Tilak Bridge.
6. Maqbara of Raushanāra Begum.

### DIU

Jāmi‘ Masjid (1404). Temple site.

### GUJARAT

#### I. Ahmadabad District.

1. *Ahmadabad*, Materials of temples destroyed at Asaval, Patan and Chandravati were used in the building of this Muslim city and its monuments. Some of the monuments are listed below :

- (i) Palace and Citadel of Bhadra.
- (ii) Ahmad Shāh-kî-Masjid in Bhadra.
- (iii) Jāmi‘ Masjid of Ahmad Shāh.
- (iv) Haibat Khān-kî-Masjid.
- (v) Rānî Rûpmatî-kî-Masjid.
- (vi) Rānî Bāi Harîr-kî-Masjid.
- (vii) Malik SāraNg-kî-Masjid.
- (viii) Mahfûz Khān-kî-Masjid.
- (ix) Sayyid Ālam-kî-Masjid.
- (x) Pattharwāli or Qutb Shāh-kî-Masjid.
- (xi) Sakar Khān-kî-Masjid.
- (xii) Bābā Lûlû-kî-Masjid.
- (xiii) Shykh Hasan Muhammad Chishtî-kî-Masjid.
- (xiv) Masjid at Isānpur.
- (xv) Masjid and Mazār of Malik Sha‘bān.
- (xvi) Masjid and Mazār of Rānî Sîprî (Sabarai).

(xvii) Masjid and Mazār of Shāh Ālam at Vatva.

(xviii) Maqbara of Sultān Ahmad Shāh I.

2. *Dekwara*, Masjid (1387). Temple site.

3. *Dholka*

(i) Masjid and Mazār of Bahlol Khān Ghāzī. Temple site.

(ii) Mazār of Barkat Shahīd (1318). Temple site.

(iii) Tanka or Jāmi‘ Masjid (1316). Temple materials used.

(iv) Hillāl Khān Qāzī-kī-Masjid (1333). Temple materials used.

(v) Khīrnī Masjid (1377). Converted Bāvan Jinālaya Temple.

(vi) Kālī Bazar Masjid (1364). Temple site.

4. *Isapur*, Masjid. Temple site.

5. *Mandal*

(i) Sayyid-kī-Masjid (1462). Temple site.

(ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

6. *Paldi*, Patthar-kī-Masjid. Temple site.

7. *Ranpur*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1524-25). Temple site.

8. *Sarkhej*

(i) Dargāh of Shykh Ahmad Khattū Ganj Baksh (d. 1445). Temple materials used.

(ii) Maqbara of Sultān Mahmūd BegaDā. Temple materials used.

9. *Usmanpur*, Masjid and Mazār of Sayyid Usmān. Temple site.

## II. Banaskantha District.

1. *Haldvar*, Mazār of Lūn Shāh and Gūjar Shāh. Temple site.

2. *Halol*

(i) Ek Mīnār-kī-Masjid. Temple site.

(ii) PāNch MuNhDā-kī-Masjid. Temple site.

(iii) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1523-24). Temple site.

3. *Malan*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1462). Temple materials used.

## III. Baroda District.

1. *Baroda*

(i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1504-05) Temple site.

(ii) Dargāh of Pīr Amīr Tāhir with its Ghāzī Masjid. Temple site.

(iii) Mazār of Pīr GhoDā (1421-23). Temple site.

2. *Dabhoi*

(i) Dargāh of PāNch Bībī. Temple materials used.

(ii) Mazār of Māī Dhokrī. Temple materials used.

(iii) Fort. Temple materials used.



- (iv) Hira, Baroda, MabuDa and NandoDi Gates. Temple materials used.
- (v) MahuNDi Masjid. Temple materials used.
- 3. *Danteshwar*, Mazār of Qutbu'd-Dîn. Temple site.
- 4. *Sankheda*, Masjid (1515-16). Temple site.

#### IV. Bharuch District.

- 1. *Amod*, Jāmi' Masjid. Temple materials used.
- 2. *Bharuch*
  - (i) Jāmi' Masjid (1321). Brahmanical and Jain temple materials used.
  - (ii) Ghaznavî Masjid (1326). Temple site.
  - (iii) Idgāh (1326). Temple site.
  - (iv) ChunāwāDā Masjid (1458). Temple site.
  - (v) Qāzî-kî-Masjid (1609). Temple site.
  - (vi) Mazār of Makhdûm Sharîfu'd-Dîn (1418). Temple site.
- 3. *Jambusar*, Jāmi' Masjid (1508-09). Temple site.
- 4. *Tankaria*, BaDî or Jāmi' Masjid (1453). Temple site.

#### V. Bhavnagar District.

- 1. *Botad*, Mazār of Pîr Hamîr Khan. Temple site.
- 2. *Tolaja*, Idgāh and Dargāh of Hasan Pîr. Temple site.
- 3. *Ghoda*, Masjid (1614). Temple site.

#### VI. Jamnagar District.

- 1. *Amran*, Dargāh of Dawal Shāh. Temple materials used.
- 2. *Bet Dwarka*, Dargāh of Pîr Kirmānî. Temple site.
- 3. *Dwarka*, Masjid (1473). Temple site.

#### VII. Junagarh District.

- 1. *Junagarh*
  - (i) BorwāD Masjid (1470). Temple site.
  - (ii) Jāmi' Masjid in Uparkot. Jain Temple site.
  - (iii) Masjid at Māi GaDhechî. Converted Jain temple.

2. *Loliyana*, Dargāh of Madār Shāh. Temple site.

3. *Kutiana*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

4. *Mangrol*

(i) Rahmat Masjid. Temple materials used.

(ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1382-83). Temple materials used.

(iii) JūnI Jail-kî-Masjid (1385-86). Temple site.

(iv) Revālî Masjid (1386-87). Temple materials used.

(v) Masjid at Bandar. Temple materials used.

(vi) Dargāh near Revāli Masjid. Temple materials used.

(vii) Mazār of Sayyid Sikandar alias Makhdûm Jahāniyā (1375). Temple materials used.

(viii) GaDhi Gate. Temple materials used.

5. *Somnath Patan*

(i) Bāzār Masjid (1436). Temple site.

(ii) Chāndnî Masjid (1456). Temple site.

(iii) Qāzî-kî-Masjid (1539). Temple site.

(iv) PathānwaDi Masjid (1326). Temple site.

(v) Muhammad Jamādār-kî-Masjid (1420). Temple site.

(vi) MiThāshāh Bhang-kî-Masjid (1428). Temple site.

(vii) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple materials used.

(viii) Masjid made out of the SomanAtha Temple of Kumārapāla.

(ix) Masjid at the back of the Somanātha Temple. Converted temple.

(x) Motā Darwāza. Temple materials used.

(xi) Māîpurî Masjid on the way to Veraval. Temple materials used.

(xii) Dargāh of Manglûri Shāh near Māîpurî Masjid. Temple materials used.

(xiii) Shahîd Mahmûd-kî-Masjid (1694). Temple site.

6. *Vanasthali*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Converted VAmāna Temple.

7. *Veraval*

(i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1332). Temple site.

(ii) Nagîna Masjid (1488). Temple site.

(iii) Chowk Masjid. Temple site.

(iv) MāNDvî Masjid. Temple site.

(v) Mazār of Sayyid Ishāq or Maghribî Shāh. Temple site.

(vi) Dargāh of Muhammad bin Hājî Gilānî. Temple site.

VIII. Kachchh District.

1. *Bhadreshwar*

- (i) Solākhambî Masjid. Jain Temple materials used.
- (ii) ChhoTî Masjid. Jain Temple materials used.
- (iii) Dargāh of Pîr Lāl Shāhbāz. Jain Temple materials used.

2. *Bhuj*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Gumbad of Bābā Guru. Temple site.

3. *Munra or MunDra*, Seaport built from the materials of Jain temples of Bhadreshwar which were demolished by the Muslims; its Safed Masjid which can be seen from afar was built from the same materials.

IX. Kheda District.

1. *Kapadwani*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1370-71). Temple site.
- (ii) Sām Shahîd-kî-Masjid (1423). Temple site.

2. *Khambhat*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1325). Jain Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Masjid in Qaziwara (1326). Temple site.
  - (iii) Masjid in Undipet (1385). Temple site.
  - (iv) Sadi-i-Awwal Masjid (1423). Temple site.
  - (v) Fujrā-kî-Masjid (1427). Temple site.
  - (vi) Mazār of Umar bin Ahmad Kāzrûnî. Jain Temple materials used.
  - (vii) Mazār of Qābil Shāh. Temple site.
  - (viii) Mazār of Shykh Alî Jaulāqî known as Parwāz Shāh (1498). Temple site.
  - (ix) Mazār of Shāh Bahlol Shahîd. Temple site.
  - (x) Maqbara of Ikhtiyāru’ d-Daula (1316). Temple site.
  - (xi) IdgAh (1381-82). Temple site.
3. *Mahuda*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1318). Temple site.
4. *Sojali*, Sayyid Mubārak-kî-Masjid. Temple site.

X. Mehsana District.

1. *Kadi*

- (i) Masjid (1384). Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid (1583). Temple site.
2. *Kheralu*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1409-10). Temple site.
3. *Modhera*, Rayadi Masjid. Temple site.
4. *Munjpur*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1401-02). Temple site.
5. *Patan*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1357). Temple materials used.
- (ii) Phûtî Mahalla or Pinjar Kot-kî-Masjid (1417). Temple site.
- (iii) Bāzār-kî-Masjid (1490). Temple site.
- (iv) Masjid in a field that was the Sahasralinga Talav. Temple materials used.
- (v) Masjid and Dargāh of Makhdûm Husāmu’d-Dîn Chishtî, disciple of Shykh Nizāmu’d-Dîn Awliya of Delhi. Temple materials used.
- (vi) GûmDā Masjid (1542). Temple site.
- (vii) RangrezoN-kî-Masjid (1410-11). Temple site.
- (viii) Dargāh of Shykh Muhammad Turk Kāshgarî (1444-45). Temple site.
- (ix) Dargāh of Shykh Farîd. Converted temple.
- 6. *Sami*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1404). Temple site.
- 7. *Sidhpur*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Built on the site and with the materials of the Rudra-mahālaya Temple of Siddharāja JayasiMha.
- 8. *Una*, Dargāh of Hazrat Shāh Pîr. Temple site.
- 9. *Vijapur*
- (i) Kalān Masjid (1369-70). Temple site.
- (ii) Mansûrî Masjid. Temple site.

## XI. Panch Mahals District.

- 1. *Champaner*
- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1524). Temple site.
- (ii) Bhadra of Mahmûd BegDā. Temple site.
- (iii) Shahr-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
- 2. *Godhra*, Masjid. Temple site.
- 3. *Pavagadh*
- (i) Masjid built on top of the Devî Temple.
- (ii) PāNch MuNhDā Masjid. Temple site.
- (iii) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site,
- 4. *Rayania*, Masjid (1499-1500). Temple site.

## XII. Rajkot District.

- 1. *Jasdan*, Dargāh of Kālû Pîr. Temple materials used.
- 2. *Khakhrechi*
- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Dargāh of Kamāl Shāh Pîr. Temple site.
- 3. *Mahuva*, Idgah (1418). Temple site.
- 4. *Malia*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

5. *Morvi*, Masjid (1553). Temple site.
6. *Santrampur*, Masjid (1499-1500). Temple site.

### XIII. Sabarkantha District.

1. *Hersel*, Masjid (1405). Temple site.
2. *Himmatnagar*, Moti-Mohlat Masjid in Nani Vorwad (1471). Temple site.
3. *Prantij*
  - (i) Fath or Tekrewālī Masjid (1382). Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Sikandar Shāh Shahīd (d. 1418). Temple materials used.

### XIV. Surat District.

1. *Navasari*
  - (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1340). Temple site.
  - (ii) Shāhī Masjid. Temple site.
2. *Rander*, The Jains who predominated in this town were expelled by Muslims and all temples of the former were converted into mosques. The following mosques stand on the site of and/or are constructed with materials from those temples:
  - (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid.
  - (ii) Nit Naurī Masjid.
  - (iii) Miān-kī-Masjid.
  - (iv) Khār-wā Masjid.
  - (v) Munshī-kī-Masjid.
3. *Surat*
  - (i) Mirzā Sāmi-kī-Masjid (1336). Temple site.
  - (ii) Nau Sayyid Sāhib-kī-Masjid and the nine Mazārs on Gopi Talav in honour of nine Ghāzīs. Temple sites.
  - (iii) Fort built in the reign of Farrukh Siyār. Temple materials used.
  - (iv) Gopi Talav (1718). Temple materials used.
4. *Tadkeshwar*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1513-14). Temple site.

### XV. Surendranagar District.

1. *Sara*, DarbargaDh-kī-Masjid (1523). Temple site.
2. *Vad Nagar*, Masjid (1694). Stands on the site of the Hātakeshvara Mahādeva temple.
3. *Wadhwan*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1439). Temple site.

## HARYANA

### I. Ambala District.

1. *Pinjor*, Temple materials have been used in the walls and buildings of the Garden of Fidāi Khān.

#### 2. *Sadhaura*

- (i) Masjid built in Khaljî times. Temple materials used.
- (ii) Two Masjids built in the reign of Jahāngîr. Temple materials used.
- (iii) Qāzi N-kî-Masjid (1640). Temple site.
- (iv) Abdul Wahāb-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
- (v) Dargāh of Shāh Qumais. Temple site.

### II. Faridabad District.

1. *Faridabad*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1605). Temple site.

2. *Nuh*, Masjid (1392-93). Temple materials used.

#### 3. *Palwal*

- (i) Ikrām-wālî or Jāmî‘ Masjid (1221). Temple materials used.
- (ii) Idgāh (1211). Temple material is used.
- (iii) Mazār of Sayyid Chirāgh. Temple site.
- (iv) Mazār of Ghāzî Shihābu’-d-Dîn. Temple site.
- (v) Mazār of Sayyid Wārah. Temple site.

### III. Gurgaon District.

1. *Bawal*, Masjid (1560). Temple site.

2. *Farrukhnagar*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1276). Temple site.

#### 3. *Sohna*

- (i) Masjid (1561). Temple site.
- (ii) Mazārs known as Kālā and Lāl Gumbad. Temple sites.

### IV. Hissar District.

1. *Barwala*, Masjid (1289). Temple site.

#### 2. *Fatehabad*

- (i) Idgāh of Tughlaq times. Temple materials used.
- (ii) Masjid built by Humānyûn (1539). Temple site.

### 3. *Hansi*

- (i) Idgāh built in the reign of Shamsu'd-Dîn Iltutmish. Temple site.
- (ii) JulāhoN-kî-Masjid built in the same reign. Temple site.
- (iii) Bû Alî Baksh Masjid (1226). Temple site.
- (iv) Ādina Masjid (1336). Temple site.
- (v) Masjid in the Fort (1192). Temple site.
- (vi) Shahîd-Ganj Masjid. Temple site.
- (vii) Humāyûn-kî-Masjid. Temple materials used.
- (viii) Dargāh of Niāmatu'llāh Walî with adjacent Bārādarî. Temple materials used.
- (ix) Dargāh of Bû Alî Qalandar (1246). Temple site.
- (x) Dargāh of Shykh Jalālu'd-Dîn Haqq (1303). Temple site.
- (xi) Dargāh of Mahammad Jamîl Shāh. Temple site.
- (xii) Dargāh of Wilāyat Shāh Shahîd (1314). Temple site.
- (xiii) Chahār Qutb and its Jāmi' Masjid. Temple materials used.
- (xiv) Fort and City Gates. Temple materials used.

4. *Hissar*, This city was built by Fîruz Shāh Tughlaq with temple materials brought mostly from Agroha which had been destroyed by Muhammad Ghurî in 1192.

- (i) Lāt-kî-Masjid. Temple materials used.
- (ii) Humayûn's Jāmi' Masjid (1535). Temple site.
- (iii) Masjid and Mazār of Bahlul Lodî. Temple site.
- (iv) Humāyûn's Masjid outside Delhi Gate (1533). Temple site.
- (v) Dargāh of Bābā Prān Pîr Pādshāh. Temple materials used.
- (vi) Fort of Fîruz Shāh Tughlaq. Temple materials used.
- (vii) Jahāz Mahal. Converted Jain Temple.
- (viii) Gûjarî Mahal. Temple materials used.

### 5. *Sirsa*

- (i) Masjid in the Mazār of Imām Nāsir (1277). Temple materials used.
- (ii) Bābarî Masjid in the Sarai (1530). Temple site.
- (iii) QāzIzāda-kî-Masjid (1540). Temple site.

## V. Karnal District.

### *Panipat*

- (i) Masjid opposite the Mazār of Bû Alî Qalandar's mother (1246). Temple site.
- (ii) Bābarî Masjid in Kābulî Bāgh (1528-29). Temple site.
- (iii) Mazār of Shykh Jalālu'd-Dîn (1499). Temple site.
- (iv) Mazār of Bû Alî Qalandar (1660). Temple site.

## VI. Kurukshetra District.

### 1. *Kaithal*

(i) Dargāh of Shykh Salāhu'd-Dîn Abu'l Muhammad of Balkh (d. 1246). Temple materials used.

(ii) Shāh Wilāyat-kî-Masjid (1657-58). Temple site.

(iii) Jāmi' Masjid. Temple materials used.

(iv) Madrasa. Temple materials used.

2. *Kurukshetra*, Madrasa on the Tila. Temple site.

### 3. *Thanesar*

(i) Dargāh and Madrasa of Shykh Chillî or Chehalî Bannurî. Temple materials used.

(ii) Pathariā Masjid near Harsh-kā-Tîlā. Temple materials used.

(iii) Chînîwālî Masjid. Temple materials used.

## VII. Mahendergarh District.

*Narnaul*, Mazar of Pîr Turk Shahîd or Shāh Wilāyat (d. 1137). Temple site.

## VIII. Rohtak District.

1. *Jhajjar*, Kālî Masjid (1397). Temple site.

### 2. *Maham*,

(i) PirzādoN-kî-Masjid built in Bābar's reign (1529). Temple site.

(ii) Humāyûn's Jāmi' Masjid (1531). Temple site.

(iii) QasāiyoN-kî-Masjid. Temple site.

(iv) Masjid (1669). Temple site.

(v) Daulat Khān-kî-Masjid (1696). Temple site.

### 3. *Rohtak*

(i) Dînî Masjid (1309). Temple materials used.

(ii) Masjid in the Fort (1324). Temple site.

(iii) Bābar's Masjid-i-Khurd (1527-28). Temple site.

(iv) Bābar's RājputoN-kî-Masjid. (1528). Temple site.

(v) Second or Humāyûn's Masjid in the Fort (1538). Temple site.

(vi) Masjid at Gokaran (1558). Temple site.

(vii) DogroN Wālî Masjid (1571). Temple site.

(viii) Mast Khān-kî-Masjid (1558-59) Temple site.

## IX. Sonapat District.



1. *Gohana*, Dargāh of Shāh Ziāu'd-Dîn Muhammad. Temple site.
2. *Sonepat*
  - (i) Masjid and Mazār of Imām Nāsir (renovated in 1277). Temple site.
  - (ii) Bābar's ShykhzādoN-kî-Masjid (1530). Temple site.
  - (iii) Mazār of Khwāja Khizr. Temple site.
  - (iv) Humāyūn's Masjid (1538). Temple site.

## HIMACHAL PRADESH

*Kangra*, Jahāngîrî Gate. Temple materials used.

## KARNATAKA

### I. Bangalore District.

1. *Dodda-Ballapur*, Dargāh of Muhiu'd-Dîn Chishtî of Ajodhan (d. 1700). Temple materials used.
2. *Hoskot*
  - (i) Dargāh of Saballî Sāhib. Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Qāsim Sāhib. Converted temple.

### II. Belgaum District.

1. *Belgaum*
  - (i) Masjid-i-Safa in the Fort (1519). Temple site.
  - (ii) Jāmi' Masjid (1585-86). Temple site.
  - (iii) Mazār of Badru'd-Dîn Shāh in the Fort (1351-52). Temple site.
2. *Gokak*, Masjid. Temple site.
3. *Hukeri*
  - (i) Mān Sahib-kî-Dargāh (1567-68). Temple site.
  - (ii) Kālî Masjid (1584). Temple materials used.
4. *Kudachi*
  - (i) Dargāh of Makhdûm Shāh Walî. Temple site.
  - (ii) Mazār of Shykh Muhammad Sirāju'd-Dîn Pîrdādî. Temple site.
5. *Madbhavi*, Masjid. Šiva Temple materials used.
6. *Raibag*, Jāmi' Masjid. Temple site,
7. *Sampgaon*, Masjid. Temple site.

### III. Bellary District.

1. *Bellary*, Masjid built by Tîpû Sultân (1789-90). Temple site.
2. *Hampi*, Masjid and Idgâh in the ruins of Vijayanagar. Temple materials used.
3. *Hospet*, Masjid in Bazar Street built by Tîpû Sultân (1795-96). Temple site.
4. *Huvinhadgalli*, Fort. Temple materials used.
5. *Kanchagarabelgallu*, Dargâh of Husain Shâh. Temple site.
6. *Kudtani*, Dargâh. Durgešvara Temple materials used.
7. *Sandur*, Jâmi' Masjid. Temple site.
8. *Siruguppa*, Lâd Khân Masjid (1674). Temple site.
9. *Sultanpuram*, Masjid on the rock. Temple site.

### IV. Bidar District.

1. *Bidar*, Ancient Hindu city transformed into a Muslim capital. The following monuments stand on temple sites and/or temple materials have been used in their construction:

- (i) Solâ Khambâ Masjid (1326-27).
  - (ii) Jâmi' Masjid of the Bahmanîs.
  - (iii) Mukhtâr Khân-kî-Masjid (1671).
  - (iv) Kâlî Masjid (1694).
  - (v) Masjid west of Kâlî Masjid (1697-98).
  - (vi) Farrah-Bâgh Masjid, 3 km outside the city (1671).
  - (vii) Dargâh of Hazrat Khalîlu'llâh at Ashtûr (1440).
  - (viii) Dargâh of Shâh Shamsu'd-Dîn Muhammad Qâdirî known as Multânî Pâdshâh.
  - (ix) Dargâh of Shâh Waliu'llâh-al-Husainî.
  - (x) Dargâh of Shâh Zainu'l-Dîn Ganj Nishîn.
  - (xi) Dargâh and Masjid of Mahbûb Subhânî.
  - (xii) Mazâr of Ahmad Shâh Walî at Ashtûr (1436).
  - (xiii) Mazâr of Shâh Abdul Azîz (1484).
  - (xiv) Takht Mahal.
  - (xv) Gagan Mahal.
  - (xvi) Madrasa of Mahmûd Gawân.
2. *Chandpur*, Masjid (1673-74). Temple site.
  3. *Chillergi*, Jâmi' Masjid (1381). Temple site.
  4. *Kalyani*, Capital of the Later Châlukyas. All their temples were either demolished or converted into mosques.
    - (i) Jâmi' Masjid (1323). Temple site.
    - (ii) Masjid (1406). Temple site.
    - (iii) Masjid in Mahalla Shahpur (1586-87). Temple site.

- (iv) Dargāh of Maulāna Yāqûb. Temple site.
- (v) Dargāh of Sayyid Pîr Pāshā. Temple site.
- (vi) Fort Walls and Towers. Temple materials used.
- (vii) Nawāb's Bungalow. Temple materials used.

#### 5. *Kohir*

- (i) Jāmi' Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargāhs of two Muslim saints. Temple sites.
6. *Shahpur*, Masjid (1586-87). Temple site.
7. *Udbal*, Jāmi' Masjid (1661-62). Temple site.

### V. Bijapur District.

1. *Afzalpur*, Mahal Masjid. Trikûta Temple materials used.
2. *Badami*, Second Gateway of the Hill Fort. VishNu Temple materials used.
3. *Bekkunal*, Dargāh outside the village. Temple materials used.
4. *Bijapur*, Ancient Hindu city transformed into a Muslim capital. The following monuments are built on temple sites and/or temple materials have been used in their construction:
  - (i) Jāmi' Masjid (1498-99).
  - (ii) Karîmu'd-Dîn-kî-Masjid in the Ārk (1320-21).
  - (iii) ChhoTā Masjid on way to Mangoli Gate.
  - (iv) Khwāja Sambal-kî-Masjid (1522-13).
  - (v) Makka Masjid.
  - (vi) AnDû Masjid.
  - (vii) Zangîrî Masjid.
  - (viii) Bukhārā Masjid (1536-37).
  - (ix) Dakhînî Idgah (1538-39).
  - (x) Masjid and Rauza of Ibrāhîm II Adil Shāh (1626).
  - (xi) Gol Gumbaz or the Rauza of Muhammad Adil Shāh.
  - (xii) JoD-Gumbad.
  - (xiii) Nau-Gumbad.
  - (xiv) Dargāh of Shāh Mûsā Qādiri.
  - (xv) Gagan Mahal.
  - (xvi) Mihtar Mahal.
  - (xvii) Asar Mahal.
  - (xviii) Anand Mahal and Masjid (1495).
  - (xviii) Sāt Manzil.
  - (xix) Ārk or citadel.
  - (xx) Mazār of Pîr Ma'barî Khandāyat.

(xxi) Mazār of Pîr Jumnâ.

(xxii) Dargâh of Shâh Mîrânji Shamsu'l-Haq Chishtî on Shahpur Hill.

5. *Hadginhali*, Dargâh. Temple materials used.

6. *Horti*, Masjid. Temple materials used.

7. *Inglesvara*, Muhiu'd-Dîn Sâhib-kî-Masjid. Muniyâ Samâdhi materials used.

8. *Jirankalgi*, Masjid. Temple materials used.

9. *Kalleeri*, Masjid near the village Chawdi. Kešavadeva Temple materials used.

10. *Mamdapur*

(i) Jâmi' Masjid. Temple site.

(ii) Mazâr of Kamâl Sâhib. Temple site.

(iii) Mazâr of Sadle Sâhib of Makka. Temple site.

11. *Naltvad*, Masjid (1315). Temple materials used.

12. *Pirapur*, Dargâh. Temple site.

13. *Salvadigi*, Masjid. Temple materials used.

14. *Sarur*, Masjid. Temple materials used.

15. *Segaon*, Dargâh. Temple site.

16. *Takli*, Masjid. Temple materials used.

17. *Talikota*

(i) Jâmi' Masjid. Jain Temple materials used.

(ii) Pânch Pîr-kî-Masjid and Ganji-i-Shahîdân. Temple site.

18. *Utagi*, Masjid (1323). Temple site.

## VI. Chickmanglur District.

*Baba Budan*, Mazâr of Dâdâ Hayât Mîr Qalandar. Dattâtreyâ Temple site.

## VII. Chitaldurg District.

*Harihar*, Masjid on top of Harîharešvara Temple.

## VIII. Dharwad District.

1. *Alnavar*, Jâmi' Masjid. Jain Temple materials used.

2. *Bankapur*

(i) Masjid (1538-39). Temple site.

(ii) Jâmi' Masjid (1602-03). Temple site.

(iii) Graveyard with a Masjid. Temple site.

(iv) Dongar-kî-Masjid. Temple site.

- (v) Dargāh of Shāh Alāu’ d-Dīn-Qādirī. Temple site.
- (vi) Fort (1590-91). Temple materials used,
- 3. *Balur*, Masjid. Temple materials used.
- 4. *Dambal*, Mazār of Shāh Abdu’llāh Walī. Temple materials used.
- 5. *Dandapur*, Jāmi’ Masjid. Temple materials used.
- 6. *Dharwad*, Masjid on Mailarling Hill. Converted Jain Temple.
- 7. *Hangal*
  - (i) Jāmi’ Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid in the Fort. Temple site.
- 8. *Hubli*, 17 Masjids built by Aurangzeb in 1675 and after Temple sites.
- 9. *Hulgur*
  - (i) Dargāh of Sayyid Shāh Qādirī. Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid near the above Dargāh. Temple site.
- 10. *Lakshmeshwar*, Kālī Masjid. Temple site.
- 11. *Misrikot*, Jāmi’ Masjid (1585-86). Temple site.
- 12. *Mogha*, Jāmi’ Masjid. Ādityadeva Temple materials used.
- 13. *Ranebennur*, Qalā, Masjid (1742). Temple site.
- 14. *Savanur*
  - (i) Jāmi’ Masjid reconstructed in 1847-48. Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Khairu’llāh Shāh Bādshāh. Temple site.
  - (iii) Dargāh and Masjid of Shāh Kamāl. Temple site.

#### IX. Gulbarga District.

- 1. *Chincholi*, Dargāh. Temple site.
- 2. *Dornhalli*, Masjid. Temple site.
- 3. *Firozabad*
  - (i) Jāmi’ Masjid (1406). Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Shāh Khalīfatu’r-Rahmān Qādirī (d. 1421). Temple site.
- 4. *Gobur*, Dargāh. Ratnarāya Jinālaya Temple materials used.
- 5. *Gogi*
  - (i) Araba’a Masjid (1338). Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Pīr Chandā, Husainī (1454). Temple site.
  - (iii) Chillā of Shāh Habību’llāh (1535-36). Temple site.
- 6. *Gulbarga*, Ancient Hindu city converted into a Muslim capital and the following among other monuments built on temple sites and/or with temple materials:
  - (i) Kalān Masjid in Mahalla Mominpura (1373).
  - (ii) Masjid in Shah Bazar (1379).
  - (iii) Jāmi’ Masjid in the Fort (1367).
  - (iv) Masjid-i-Langar in the Mazār of Hājī Zaida.

- (v) Masjid near the Farman Talab (1353-54).
- (vi) Dargāh of Sayyid Muhammad Husainî Bandā, Nawāz Gesû Darāz Chishtî, disciple of Shykh Nasîru'd-Dîn Mahmûd ChîrAgh-i-Dihlî.
- (vii) Mazār of Shykh Muhammad Sirāju'd-Dîn Junaidî.
- (viii) Mazār of Hājî Zaida of Maragh (1434)
- (ix) Mazār of Sayyid Husainu'd-Dîn Tigh-i-Barhna (naked sword).
- (x) Fort Walls and Gates.

7. *Gulsharam*, Dargāh and Masjid of Shāh Jalāl Husainî (1553). Temple site.

8. *Malkhed*, Dargāh of Sayyid Ja'far Husainî in the Fort. Temple site.

9. *Sagar*

(i) Dargāh of Sûfi Sarmast Chishtî, disciple of Nîzāmu'd-Dîn Awlîya of Delhi. Temple site.

(ii) Dargāh of Munawwar Bādshāh. Temple site.

(iii) Āshur Khāna Masjid (1390-91). Temple site.

(iv) Fort (1411-12). Temple materials used.

10. *Seram*, Jāmi' Masjid. Temple materials used.

11. *Shah Bazar*, Jāmi' Masjid. Temple site.

12. *Shahpur*

(i) Dargāh of Mûsā Qādirî (1667-68). Temple site.

(ii) Dargāh of Muhammad Qādirî (1627). Temple site.

(iii) Dargāh of IbrAhIm Qādirî. Temple site.

13. *Yadgir*

(i) Āthān Masjid (1573). Temple site.

(ii) Jāmi' Masjid. Temple site.

## X. Kolar District.

1. *Mulbagal*, Dargāh of Hyder Walî. Temple site.

2. *Nandi*, Masjid east of the village. Temple site.

## XI. Mandya District.

1. *Pandavapur*, Masjid-i-Ala. Temple site.

2. *Srirangapatnam*, Jāmi' Masjid built by Tîpû Sultān (1787). Stands on the site of the Āñjaneya Temple.

## XII. Mysore District.

*Tonnur*, Mazār said to be that of Sayyid Sālār Mas'ûd (1358). Temple materials used.

### XIII. North Kanara District.

1. *Bhatkal*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1447-48). Temple site.
2. *Haliyal*, Masjid in the Fort. Temple materials used.

### XIV. Raichur District.

1. *Jaladurga*, Dargāh of Muhammad Sarwar. Temple site.
2. *Kallur*, Two Masjids. Temple sites.
3. *Koppal*
  - (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Araboñ-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
  - (iii) Dargāh of Sailānî Pāshā. Temple site.
4. *Manvi*, Masjid (1406-07). Temple materials used.
5. *Mudgal*
  - (i) Masjid at Kati Darwaza of the Fort. Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Naī Masjid (1583-84). Temple site.
  - (iii) Two Ashur Khānas built by Ali I Adil Shah. Temple site.
  - (iv) Fort (1588). Temple materials used.
6. *Raichur*
  - (i) Yak Mīnār Masjid in the Fort (1503). Temple site.
  - (ii) Daftarī Masjid in the Fort (1498-99). Temple materials used.
  - (iii) Hazār Baig Masjid (1511-12). Temple site
  - (iv) Jāmi‘ Masjid in the Fort (1622-23). Temple materials used.
  - (v) Jāmi‘ Masjid in Sarafa Bazar (1628-29). Temple site.
  - (vi) Kālī Masjid in the Fort. Temple materials used.
  - (vii) Masjid inside the Naurangi. Temple materials used.
  - (viii) Chowk-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ix) Jahāniyā Masjid (1700-01). Temple site.
  - (x) Dargāh of Shāh Mīr Hasan and Mīr Husain. Temple materials used.
  - (xi) Dargāh of Sayyid Abdul Husainī at Sikandari Gate. Temple site.
  - (xii) Pāñch Bībī Dargāh at Bala Hissar. Temple materials used.
  - (xiii) Mazār of Pīr Sailānī Shāh in the Fort. Temple materials used.
  - (xiv) Fort. Temple materials used.
7. *Sindhanur*, Ālamgīrī Masjid near the Gumbad. Temple site.
8. *Tawagera*, Dargāh of Bandā Nawāz. Temple site.

### XV. Shimoga District.

1. *Almel*, Mazâr of Ghâlib Shâh. Temple site.
2. *Basavpatna*, Masjid near the Fort. Temple site.
3. *Nagar*, Masjid built by Tîpû Sultân. Temple materials used.
4. *Sante Bennur*, Randhullâ Khân-kî-Masjid (1637). Materials of the Rañganâtha Temple used.
5. *Sirajpur*, Masjid built on top of the Chhinnakešava Temple for housing Prophet Muhammad's hair. Images defaced and mutilated. Part of the temple used as a laterine.

#### XVI. Tumkur District,

1. *Sira*
  - (i) Ibrâhîm Rauza with many Mazârs and a Jâmi' Masjid. Converted temples.
  - (ii) Dargâh of Malik Rihân. Temple site.
2. *Sirol*, Jâmi' Masjid (1696). Temple site.

### KASHMIR

1. *Amburher*, Ziârat of Farrukhzâd Sâhib. Temple materials used.
2. *Badgam*
  - (i) Ziârat of Abban Shâh in Ghagarpur. Temple site.
  - (ii) Ziârat of Sayyid Swâlia Shâh in Narbai. Temple site.
3. *Bijbehra*, Masjid. Temple site.
4. *Bumzu*
  - (i) Ziârat of Bâbâ Bâmdîn. Converted Bhîmakešava. Temple.
  - (ii) Ziârat of Ruknu'd-Dîn Rishî. Converted temple.
  - (iii) Ziârat farther up the valley. Converted temple.
5. *Gulmarg*, Ziârat of Bâbâ Imâm Dîn Rishî. Temple materials used.
6. *Gupkar*, Ziârat of Jyesther and other monuments. Temple materials used.
7. *Hutmar*, Jâmi' Masjid. Temple materials used.
8. *Khonmuh*, Several Ziârats. Temple materials used.
9. *Kitshom*, Two Masjids. Stand amidst temple ruins.
10. *Loduv*, Ziârat. Temple materials used.
11. *Lohar*, Ziârat of Sayyid Chânan Ghâzî. Temple site.
12. *Lokbavan*, Garden Pavilion. Temple materials from Lokabhavana Tîrtha used.
13. *Marsus*, Ziârat of Shâh Abdu'llâh. Temple site.
14. *Pampor*



- (i) Ziārat of Mîr Muhammad Hamadāni. VishNusvāmin Temple materials used.
- (ii) Several other Ziārats. Temple materials used.
15. *Pandrethan*, Masjid. Meruvarghanaswāmin Temple materials used.
16. *Sangar*, Ziārat. Temple materials used.
17. *Sar*, Ziārat of Khwāja Khîzr. Temple materials used.
18. *Shalmar Garden*, Pavilion on the 4th terrace. Temple materials used.
19. *Srinagar*, Ancient Hindu city converted into a Muslim capital. The following monuments stand on temple sites and most of them have been constructed with temple materials.
- (i) Ziārat of Bahāu'd-Dîn SAhib. Jayasvāmin Temple converted.
- (ii) Graveyard and its Gate below the 4th Bridge.
- (iii) Dargāh and Masjid of Shāh-i-Hamadānî in Kalashpura. On the site of the Kālî Temple.
- (iv) Nau or Patthar-kî-Masjid built by Nûr Jahān.
- (v) Graveyard near the Nau Masjid.
- (vi) Ziārat of Malik Sāhib in Didd Mar. On the site of Diddā Matha.
- (vii) Masjid and Madrasa and Graveyard near Vicharnag. On the site and from materials of the Vikramešvara Temple.
- (viii) Madnî Sāhib-kî-Masjid at Zadibal.
- (ix) Ziārat south-west of Madnî Sāhib-kî-Masjid.
- (x) Jāmi' Masjid originally built by Sikandar Butshikan and reconstructed in later times.
- (xi) Ziārat named Nûr Pirastān. NarendrasāAmin Temple converted.
- (xii) Maqbara of Sultān Zain'ul-Abidin.
- (xiii) Maqbara of Zainu'l-Ābidin's mother, queen of Sikandar Butshikan.
- (xiv) Ziārat of Pîr Hājî Muhammad Sāhib, south-west of the Jāmi' Masjid. VishNu RaNasvāmin Temple converted.
- (xv) Ziārats of Makhdûm Sāhib and Akhun Mulla on Hari Parbat. Bhîmasvamin Temple converted.
- (xvi) Masjid of Akhun Mulla built by Dārā Shikoh.
- (xvii) Ziārat of Pîr Muhammad Basûr in Khandbavan. On the site of Skandabhavana Vihāra.
- (xviii) Graveyard north-east of Khandbavan.
- (xix) Dargāh of Pîr Dastgîr.
- (xx) Dargāh of Naqshbandî.
- (xxi) Ramparts and Kathi Gate of the Fort built by Akbar.
- (xxii) Stone embankments on both sides and for several miles of the Jhelum river as it passes through Srinagar.
- (xxiii) Astāna of Mîr Shamsu'd-Dîn Syed Muhammad Irāqî.
20. *Sudarbal*, Ziārat of Hazrat Bāl. Temple site.
21. *Tapar*, Bund from Naidkhai to Sopor built by Zainu'l-Ābidin. Materials from

Narendrešvara Temple used.

22. *Theda*, Ziārat near Dampor. Temple materials used.

23. *Vernag*, Stone enclosure built by Jahāngîr. Temple materials used.

24. *Wular Lake*

(i) Suna Lanka, pleasure haunt built by Zainu'l-Ābidîn in the midst of the Lake. Temple materials used.

(ii) Dargāh of Shukru'd-Dîn on the western shore. Temple site.

25. *Zukur*, Several Ziārats and Maqbaras. Temple materials used.

## KERALA

1. *Kollam*, (Kozhikode District), Jāmi' Masjid. Temple materials used.

2. *Palghat*, Fort built by Tîpû Sultān. Temple materials used.

## LAKSHADWEEP

1. *Kalpeni*, Muhiu'd-Dîn-Pallî Masjid. Temple site.

2. *Kavarati*, Prot-Pallî Masjid. Temple site.

## MADHYA PRADESH

I. Betul District.

1. *Pattan*, Dargāh of Sulaimān Shāh. Temple site.

2. *Umri*, Dargāh of Rahmān Shāh. Temple site.

II. Bhopal District.

1. *Berasia*, Masjid (1716). Temple site.

2. *Bhopal*, Jāmi' Masjid built by Qudsia Begum. SabhāmaNDala Temple site.

III. Bilaspur District.

*Khimlasa*

- (i) Dargāh of Pāñch Pîr. Temple site.
- (ii) Nagînā Mahal. Temple site.
- (iii) Idgāh. Temple site.
- (iv) Masjid with three domes. Temple site.

#### IV. Damoh District.

- (i) Dargāh of Ghāzî Miān. Temple site.
- (ii) Fort. Temple materials used.

#### V. Dewas District.

##### 1. Dewas

- (i) Masjid (1562). Temple site.
- (ii) Masjid (1705). Temple site.
- (iii) Masjid (1707). Temple site.
- 2. *Gandhawal*, Graveyard inside the village. Jain Temple materials used.

##### 3. Sarangpur

- (i) Madrasa (1493). Temple site.
- (ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1640). Temple site.
- (iii) Pîr Jān-kî-Bhātî Masjid. Temple site.
- (iv) Fort. Temple materials used.
- 4. *Unchod*, Idgāh (1681). Temple site.

#### VI. Dhar District.

1. *Dhar*, Capital of Rājā Bhoja Paramāra converted into a Muslim capital. The following Muslim monuments tell their own story:

- (i) Kamāl Maulā Masjid. Temple materials used.
- (ii) Lāt Masjid (1405). Jain Temple materials used.
- (iii) Mazār of Abdu’llāh Shāh Changāl. Temple site.

2. *Mandu*, An ancient Hindu city converted into a Muslim capital and the following monuments built on the sites of and/or with materials from temples

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1454).
- (ii) Dilāwar Khān-kî-Masjid (1405).
- (iii) ChhoTî Jāmi‘ Masjid.
- (iv) Pahredāroñ-kî-Masjid (1417).
- (v) Malik Mughîs-kî-Masjid.
- (vi) Maqbara of Hushāng Shāh.

- (vii) Jahâz Mahal.
- (viii) Tawîl Mahal.
- (ix) Nâhar Jharokhâ.
- (x) Hindolâ Mahal.
- (xi) Rupmatî Pavilion.
- (xii) Ashrafî Mahal.
- (xiii) Dâi-kî-Chhotî Bahen-kâ-Mahal.
- (xiv) Bâz Bahâdur-kâ-Mahal.
- (xv) Nîlkanth Mahal.
- (xvi) Chhappan Mahal.
- (xvii) Fort and Gates.
- (xviii) Gadâ-Shâh-kâ-Mahal.
- (xix) Hammâm Complex.

## VII. Dholpur District.

*Bari*, Masjid (1346 or 1351). Temple site.

## VIII. East Nimar District.

1. *Bhadgaon*, Jâmi‘ Masjid (1328). Temple site.
2. *Jhiri*, Masjid (1581). Temple site.
3. *Khandwa*, Masjid (1619-20). Temple site.

## IX. Guna District.

1. *Chanderi*, Muslim city built from the ruins of the old or Budhi Chanderi nearby. The following monuments stand on the sites of temples and/or have temple materials used in them:

- (i) Masjid (1392).
- (ii) Motî Masjid.
- (iii) Jâmi‘ Masjid.
- (iv) PãñchmûhñDâ Masjid.
- (v) Qurbâni Chabûtrâ.
- (vi) Dargâh of Mewã Shâh.
- (vii) Mazâr known as BaDâ Madrasa.
- (viii) Mazâr known as ChhoTã Madrasa.
- (ix) Râjã-kâ-Maqbara.
- (x) Rãnî-kâ-Maqbara.

- (xi) Battîsî BãoDî Masjid (1488).
- (xii) Hãthîpur-kî-Masjid (1691).
- (xiii) Mazâr of Shykh Burhanu'd-Dîn.
- (xiv) Fort.
- (xv) Kushk Mahal.
- (xvi) Idgãh (1495).
- 2. *Pipari*, Masjid (1451). Temple site.
- 3. *Shadoragaon*, Jãmi' Masjid (1621-22). Temple site.

#### X. Gwalior District.

##### 1. *Gwalior*

- (i) Dargãh of Muhammad Ghaus. Temple site.
- (ii) Jãmi' Masjid near Gûjarî Mahal. Temple site.
- (iii) Masjid near Ganesh Gate. Gawãlîpã Temple site.
- (iv) Graveyards on east and west of the Fort. Temple sites.
- 2. *Jajao*, Lãl Patthar-kî-Masjid, Temple materials used.
- 3. *Mundrail*, Several Masjids (1504). Temple sites.
- 4. *Sipri*, Several Masjids and Mazãrs. Temple materials used.

#### XI. Indore District.

- 1. *Depalpur*, Masjid (1670). Temple site.
- 2. *Maheshwar*
- (i) ShãhI Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Fort. Temple materials used.
- 3. *Mehdipur*
- (i) Mazâr of Godãr Shãh. Temple site.
- (ii) Fort. Temple materials used.
- 4. *Sanwar*, Masjid (1674). Temple site.

#### XII. Mandsaur District.

##### 1. *Kayampur*

- (i) Masjid (1676). Temple site.
- (ii) Idgãh (1701-02). Temple site.
- 2. *Mandsaur*
- (i) Jãmi' Masjid. Temple materials used.
- (ii) Fort. Temple materials used.

3. *Rampura*, Pādshāhî BāoDi. Temple materials used.

XIII. Morena District.

*Alapur*

(i) Masjid (1561-62). Temple site.

(ii) Masjid (1586-87). Temple site.

(iii) Masjid (1697-98). Temple site.

XIV. Panna District.

1. *Ajaigarh*, Fort. Temple materials used.

2. *Nachna*, Masjid. Converted temple.

XV. *Raisen* District.

Palmyka Mandir-Masjid. Temple materials used.

XVI. Rajgarh District.

*Khujner*, Mazār of Dāwal Shāh. Temple materials used.

XVII. Ratlam District.

*Barauda*, Masjid (1452-56). Temple site.

XVIII. Sagar District.

1. *Dhamoni*, Dargāh of Bāl Jatî Shāh (1671). Temple site.

2. *Kanjia*

(i) Khān Sāhib-kî-Masjid (1594-95). Temple site.

(ii) Idgāh (1640). Temple site.

(iv) Alamgîrî Masjid (1703). Temple site.

(iii) Qalā-kî-Masjid (1643). Temple site.

3. *Khimlasa*, Pāñch Pîr. Temple site.

XIX. *Sehore* District.

Masjid (1332). Temple site.

XX. *Shajapur* District.

*Agartal*, Masjid. Temple site.

XXI. *Shivpuri* District.

1. *Narod*, Zanzārī Masjid. Temple site.

2. *Narwar*

(i) Dargāh of Shāh Madār. Temple site.

(ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1509). Temple materials used.

(iii) Masjid inside Havapaur Gate (1509). Temple site.

3. *Pawaya*

(i) Fort. Temple materials used.

(ii) Several other Muslim monuments. Temple materials used.

4. *Ranod*

(i) Masjid (1331-32). Temple site.

(ii) Masjid (1441). Temple site.

(iii) Masjid (1633). Temple site.

(iv) Masjid (1640). Temple site.

5. *Shivpuri*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1440). Temple site.

XXII. *Ujjain* District.

1. *Barnagar*, Masjid (1418). Temple site.

2. *Ujjain*,

(i) Jāmi‘ Masjid known as Binā-nîv-kî-Masjid (1403-04). Temple site.

(ii) Masjid unearthed near Chaubis Khamba Gate. Temple materials used.

(iii) MochI Masjid. Converted temple.

XXIII. *Vidisha* District.

1. *Basoda*, Masjid (1720-21). Temple site.

2. *Bhonrasa*,

- (i) Qalandarî Masjid. Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Jāgîrdār-kî-Masjid (1683). Temple site.
  - (iii) BaDî Masjid in Bada Bagh (1685). Temple site.
  - (iv) Bandi Bagh-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
  - (v) Bārā-Khambā Masjid. Temple site.
  - (vi) Ek-Khambā Masjid. Temple site.
  - (vii) Binā-nîv-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
  - (viii) Graveyard in Bandi Bagh. Amidst temple ruins.
  - (ix) Idgāh. Temple site.
  - (x) Fort (1594). Temple materials used.
3. *Parasari*, Masjid (1694-95). Temple site.
4. *Renkla*, Masjid. (1647-48). Temple site.
5. *Shamsabad*, Masjid (1641). Temple site.
6. *Sironj*
- (i) Ālamgîrî Masjid (1662-63). Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid in Mahalla Rakabganj (1657-58). Temple site.
  - (iii) DargAh of Shykh Sāhib (d. 1657). Temple site.
7. *Tal*, Masjid (1644-45). Temple site.
8. *Udaypur*
- (i) Masjid (1336). Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Masjid built by Aurangzeb. Temple materials used.
  - (iii) Motî Masjid (1488-89). Temple site.
  - (iv) Masjid (1549). Temple site.
  - (v) Two Masjids of Shāh Jahān. Temple sites.
  - (vi) Masjid of Jahāngîr. Temple site.
9. *Vidisha*
- (i) Ālamgîrî or VijaimaNDal Masjid (1682). Converted temple.
  - (ii) Masjid on Lohangi Hill (1457). Temple site.
  - (iii) Shāh Jahāni Masjid (1650-51). Temple site.
  - (iv) City Wall. Temple materials used,

#### XXIV. West Nimar District.

##### 1. *Asirgarh*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1584). Temple site.
- (ii) Masjid built in the reign of Shāh Jahān. Temple site.
- (iii) Idgāh (1588-89). Temple site.
- (iv) Fort. Temple materials used.



2. *Bhikangaon*, Idgāh (1643-44). Temple site.
3. *Baidia*, Masjid (1456-57). Temple site.
4. *Burhanpur*
  - (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1588-89). Temple site.
  - (ii) Bîbî Sāhib-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
  - (iii) Shāh Mas‘ûd-kî-Masjid (1582-83). Temple site.
  - (iv) Dargāh and Masjid of Shāh Bahāu’d- Dîn Bājan. Temple site.
  - (v) Dargāh of Sûfi Nûr Shāh. Temple site.

## MAHARASHTRA

### I. Ahmadnagar District.

1. *Amba Jogi*, Fort. Temple materials used.
2. *Bhingar*, Mulla Masjid (1367-68). Temple site.
3. *Gogha*
  - (i) Idgāh (1395). Temple site.
  - (ii) Morakhwada Masjid (1630). Temple site.
4. *Jambukhed*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1687-88). Temple site.
5. *Madhi*, Dargāh of Ramzān Shāh Mahî Sawār. Temple site.

### II. Akola District.

1. *Akot*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1667). Temple site.
2. *Balapur*, Masjid (1717-18). Temple site.
3. *Basim*, Kākî Shāh-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
4. *Jamod*
  - (i) Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Pîr Paulād Shāh. Temple site.
5. *Karanj*
  - (i) Astān Masjid (1659). Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid (1669-70). Temple site.
  - (iii) Masjid (1698-99). Temple site.
6. *Manglurpir*
  - (i) Qadîmî Masjid. Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Pîr Hayāt Qalandar (d. 1253). Temple site.
  - (iii) Dargāh of Sanam Sāhib. Temple site.
7. *Narnala*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1509). Temple site.
- (ii) Ālamgîrî Masjid. Temple site.
- 8. *Patur*, Dargāh of Abdul Azîz alias Shykh Bābû Chishtî (d. 1388). Temple site.
- 9. *Uprai*, Dargāh of Shāh Dāwal. Temple site.

### III. Amravati District.

- 1. *Amner*, Masjid and Mazār of Lāl Khān (1691-92). Temple site.
- 2. *Ellichpur*
  - (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid reconstructed in 1697. Temple site.
  - (ii) Dāru‘shifa Masjid. Temple site.
  - (iii) Chowk-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
  - (iv) Idgāh. Temple site.
  - (v) Mazār of Shāh Ghulām Husain. Temple site.
  - (vi) Mazār of Abdul Rahmān Ghāzî known as Dūlhā Shāh. Temple site.
- 3. *Ritpur*, Aurangzeb’s Jāmi‘ Masjid (reconstructed in 1878). Temple site.

### IV. Aurangabad District.

- 1. *Antur Fort*, Qalā-kî-Masjid (1615). Temple site.
- 2. *Aurangabad*
  - (i) Jāmi Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Lāl Masjid. Temple site.
  - (iii) Maqbara of Aurangzeb. Temple site.
- 3. *Daulatabad*
  - (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1315). Converted Jain Temple.
  - (ii) Yak Minār-kî-Masjid in the Fort. Temple site.
  - (iii) Masjid-i-Hauz at Kazipura (1458). Temple site.
  - (iv) Idgāh (1359). Temple site.
  - (v) Dargāh of Pîr Kādû Sāhib. Converted temple.
  - (vi) Fort. Temple materials used.
- 4. *Gangapur*, Masjid (1690-91). Temple site.
- 5. *Kaghzipura*, Dargāh of Shāh Nizāmu’d-Dîn. Temple site.
- 6. *Khuldabad*
  - (i) Dargāh of Hazrat Burhānu’d-Dîn Gharîb Chishtî (d. 1339). Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargāh on Pari-ka-Talao. Converted temple.
  - (iii) Mazār of Halîm Kākā Sāhib. Converted temple.
  - (iv) Mazār of Jalālu’l-Haqq. Temple site.
  - (v) Bārādarî in Bani Begum’s Garden. Temple site.
- 7. *Paithan*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1630). Converted temple.
  - (ii) Maulāna Sāhib-kî-Masjid. Converted ReNukādevî Temple.
  - (iii) Alamagîrî Masjid. Temple materials used.
  - (iv) Dargāh of Makhdûm Husain Ahmad (1507). Temple site.
8. *Taltam Fort*, Fort. Temple materials used.
9. *Vaijapur*
- (i) Mazārs in Nau Ghazi. Temple site.
  - (ii) Mazār of Syed Ruknu’ d-Dîn. Temple site.

#### V. Bid District.

##### *Bid*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Qāzî Sāhib-kî-Masjid (1624). Temple site.
- (iii) Masjid in Mahalla Sadr (1704-05). Temple site.
- (iv) Masjid and Dargāh of Shāhinshāh Walî. Temple site.
- (v) Idgāh (1704). Temple site.

#### VI. Bombay District.

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Mazār at Mahim. Temple site.
- (iii) Mazār of Mainā Hajjām. Converted Māhālakshmî Temple.

#### VII. Buldana District.

1. *Fathkhelda*, Masjid (1581). Temple site.
2. *Malkapur*, Masjid near Qazi’s house. Temple site.

#### VIII. Dhule District.

##### 1. *Bhamer*

- (i) Masjid (1481-82). Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid (1529-30). Temple site.
2. *Erandol*, Jāmi‘ Masjid in Pandav-vada. Temple materials used.
  3. *Nandurbar*

- (i) Manyār Masjid. SiddheŚvaradeva Temple materials used.
- (ii) Dargāh of Sayyid Alāu'd-Dîn. Temple site.
- (iii) Several Masjids amidst ruins of Hindu temples.
- 4. *Nasirabad*, Several old Masjids. Temple sites.
- 5. *Nizamabad*, Masjid. Temple site.

#### IX. Jalgaon District.

- 1. *Jalgaon*. Masjid. Temple site.
- 2. *Phaskhanda*, Masjid. Temple site.
- 3. *Shendurni*, Masjid-i-Kabîr (1597). Temple site.

#### X. Kolhapur District.

- 1. *Bhadole*, Masjid (1551-52). Temple site.
- 2. *Kagal*, Dargāh of Ghaibî Pîr. Temple site.
- 3. *Kapshi*, Masjid-e-Husainî. Temple site.
- 4. *Panhala*
  - (i) Jāmi' Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Shykh Saidu'd-Dîn. Temple site.
  - (iii) Dargāh of BaDā Imām in the Fort. Temple site.
  - (iv) Mazār of Sādobā Pîr. Parāśara Temple site.
- 5. *Shirol*, Jāmi' Masjid (1696). Temple site.
- 6. *Vishalgarh*, Mazār of Malik Rihān Pîr. Temple site.

#### XI. Nagpur District.

*Ramtek*, Masjid built in Aurangzeb's reign. Converted temple.

#### XII. Nanded District.

- 1. *Bhaisa*
  - (i) Jāmi' Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Three Dargāhs. Temple sites.
- 2. *Deglur*, Mazār of Shāh Ziāu'd-Dîn Rifai. Temple site.
- 3. *Kandhar*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1606). Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid and Dargāh inside the Fort. Temple materials used.
  - (iii) Causeway of the Fort. Temple materials used.
4. *Nanded*, Idgāh in Khas Bagh. Temple site.

### XIII. Nasik District.

#### 1. *Galna*

- (i) Dargāh of Pîr Pûlād (1581). Temple site.
  - (ii) Fort. Temple materials used.
2. *Gondengaon*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1703). Temple site.
3. *Malegaon*, Dargāh of Khākî Shāh. Temple site.
4. *Nasik*, Jāmi‘ Masjid in the Fort. Converted Māhālakshmî Temple.
5. *Pimpri*, Mazār of Sayyid Sadrau’d-Dîn. Temple site.
6. *Rajapur*, Masjid (1559). Temple site.

### XIV. Osmanabad District.

1. *Ausa*, Masjid (1680). Temple site.
2. *Naldurg*, Masjid (1560). Temple site.
3. *Parenda*
- (i) Masjid inside the Fort. Built entirely of temple materials.
  - (ii) Namāzgāh near the Talav. Converted Mānakešvara Temple.

### XV. Parbhani District.

1. *Khari*, Mazār of Ramzān Shāh. Temple site.
2. *Latur*
- (i) Dargāh of Mabsû Sāhib. Converted Minapurî Mātā Temple.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Sayyid Qādirî. Converted Somešvara Temple.
3. *Malevir*, KhaDu Jāmi‘ Masjid. Converted temple.

### XVI. Pune District.

1. *Chakan*, Masjid (1682). Temple site.
2. *Ghoda*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Built in 1586 from materials of 33 temples.
3. *Junnar*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple Site.
- (ii) Diwān Ahmad-kî-Masjid (1578-79). Temple site.
- (iii) GunDi-kî-Masjid (1581). Temple site.
- (iv) MadAr Chillā-kî-Masjid. (1611-12). Temple site.
- (v) Kamāni Masjid on Shivneri Hill (1625). Temple site.
- (vi) Fort. Temple materials used.
- 4. *Khed*, Masjid and Mazār of Dilāwar Khān. Temple site.
- 5. *Mancher*, Masjid at the South-Western Gate. Temple site.
- 6. *Sasvad*, Masjid. Built entirely of Hemadapantī temple materials.

#### XVII. Ratnagiri District.

- 1. *Chaul*
  - (i) Mazār of Pīr Sayyid Ahmad. Converted Sāmba Temple.
  - (ii) Maqbara near Hinglaj Spur. Temple site.
  - (iii) Graveyard. Temple site.
- 2. *Dabhol*, Patthar-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
- 3. *Rajpuri*, Aidrusia Khānqāh. Temple site.
- 4. *Yeshir*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1524). Temple site.

#### XVIII. Sangli District.

- 1. *Mangalvedh*, Fort. Temple materials used.
- 2. *Miraj*
  - (i) Masjid (1415-16). Temple site.
  - (ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1506). Temple site.
  - (iii) Kālī Masjid. Temple site.
  - (iv) Namāzgāh (1586-97). Temple site.
  - (v) Dargāh of BaDā Imām. Temple site.

#### XIX. Satara District.

- 1. *Apti*, Masjid (1611-12). Temple site.
- 2. *Karad*
  - (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1575-76). Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Qadamagāh of Alī (1325). Temple site.
- 3. *Khanpur*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1325). Temple materials used.
- 4. *Rahimatpur*,

- (i) Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Maqbara known as that of Jahāngîr's Mother (1649). Temple site.

XX. Sholapur District.

- 1. *Begampur*, Maqbara near Gadheshvar. Temple site.
- 2. *Sholapur*, Fort, Temple materials used.

XXI. Thane District.

- 1. *Kalyan*
  - (i) Dargāh of Hazrat Yāqûb, Temple site.
  - (ii) Makka Masjid (1586). Temple site.
- 2. Malanggadh, Mazār of Bābā MalaNg. Temple site.

XXII. Wardha District.

- 1. *Ashti*
  - (i) Jāmi' Masjid (1521). Temple site.
  - (ii) Lodî Masjid (1671-72). Temple site.
- 2. *Girad*, Mazār of Shykh Farîd. Converted temple.
- 3. *Paunar*, Qadîmî Masjid. Converted Rāmachandra. Temple.

**ORISSA**

I. *Baleshwar* District.

Jāmi' Masjid in Mahalla Sunhat (163-74). Šrî ChanDî Temple site.

II. *Cuttack* District.

- 1. *Alamgir Hill*, Takht-i-Sulaimān Masjid (1719). Temple materials used.
- 2. *Cuttack*
  - (i) Shāhî Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjids in Oriya Bazar. Temple sites.
  - (iii) Qadam Rasûl Masjid. Temple site.

(iv) Masjid (1668-69). Temple site.

(v) Masjid (1690-91). Temple site.

3. *Jajpur*

(i) DargAh of Sayyid Bukhāri. Materials of many temples used.

(ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid built by Nawwāb Abu Nāsir. Temple materials used.

4. *Kendrapara*, Masjid. Temple site.

5. *Salepur*, Masjid. Temple site.

III. Ganjam District.

*Lalapet*, Masjid (1690). Temple site.

**PUNJAB**

I. *Bhatinda* District.

Mazār of Bābā Hājī Rattan (1593). Converted temple.

II. Gurdaspur District.

*Batala*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

III. Jalandhar District.

*Sultanpur*, Bādshāhi Sarai. Built on the site of a Buddhist Vjhāra.

IV. *Ludhiana* District.

(i) Dargāh and Masjid of Alī Sarmast (1570). Temple site.

(ii) Qāzī-kī-Masjid (1517). Temple site.

V. Patiala District.

1. *Bahadurgarh*, Masjid in the Fort (1666). Temple site.

2. *Bawal*, Masjid (1560). Temple site.

3. *Samana*



- (i) Sayyidoñ-kî-Masjid (1495). Temple site.
- (ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1614-15). Temple site.
- (iii) Masjid near Imāmbāra (1637). Temple site.
- (iv) Pîrzāda-kî-Masjid (1647). Temple site.

#### VI. *Ropar* District.

Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

#### VII. *Sangrur* District.

##### *Sunam*

- (i) Qadīmī Masjid (1414). Temple site.
- (ii) Ganj-i-Shahîdān. Temple site.

## RAJASTHAN

#### I. *Ajmer* District.

It was a Hindu capital converted into a Muslim metropolis. The following monuments stand on the site of and/or are built with materials from temples.

1. ADhāi-Dîn-kA-Jhoñprā (1199).
2. Qalandar Masjid at Taragarh.
3. Ganj-i-Shahîdān at Taragarh.
4. Dargāh of Muinu’d-Dîn Chistî (d. 1236).
5. Chilia-i-Chishtî near Annasagar Lake.
6. Dargāh and Mazār of Sayijid Husain at Taragah.
7. Jahāngîrî Mahal at Pushkar.
8. Shāhjahānî Masjid (1637).
9. Annasagar Bārādari.

#### II. *Alwar* District.

1. *Alwar*, Mazār of Makhdûm Shāh. Temple site.
2. *Bahrar*
  - (i) Dargāh of Qādir Khān. Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid near the Dargāh. Temple site.
3. *Tijara*

- (i) Bhartari Mazâr. Converted temple.
- (ii) Masjid near the Dargâh. Temple site.

### III. Bharatpur District.

1. *Barambad*, Masjid (1652-53). Temple site.
2. *Bari*
  - (i) Graveyard of Arabs and Pathans. Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid (1510). Temple site.
3. *Bayana*
  - (i) Ūkha or Nohâra Masjid. Converted Ūshâ Temple.
  - (ii) Qazîpârâ Masjid (1305). Temple materials used.
  - (iii) Faujdârî Masjid. Temple materials used.
  - (iv) Syyidpârâ Masjid. Temple materials used.
  - (v) Muffonkî Masjid. Temple materials used.
  - (vi) Pillared Cloister at Jhâlar Bâolî. Temple materials used.
  - (vii) Idgâh near Jhâlar Bâolî. Temple site.
  - (viii) Taletî Masjid in the Bijayagarh Fort. Converted temple.
  - (ix) Abu Qandahâr Graveyard. Temple site.
  - (x) Masjid in Bhitari-Bahari Mahalla. VishNu Temple materials used.
4. *Etmada*, Pirastân. Temple site.
5. *Kaman*
  - (i) Chaurâsî Khambâ Masjid. Converted Kâmyakesvara Temple.
  - (ii) Fort. Temple materials used.

### IV. Chittaurgarh District.

1. Mazâr of Ghâibî Pîr and the surrounding Graveyard. Temple sites.
2. Qanâtî Masjid in the same area. Temple site.

### V. Jaipur District.

1. *Amber*, Jâmi‘ Masjid (1569-70). Temple site.
2. *Chatsu*
  - (i) Chhatrî of Gurg Alî Shâh (d. 1571). Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Nilgaroñ-kî-Masjid (1381). Temple site.
3. *Dausa*, Jâmi‘ Masjid (1688-89). Temple site.
4. *Naraina*

(i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1444). Temple materials used.

(ii) Tripolia Darwaza. Temple materials used.

5. *Sambhar*

(i) Ganj-i-Shahîdân. Temple site.

(ii) DargAh of Khwāja Hisāmu’d-Dîn Jigarsukhta. Temple site.

(iii) Masjid in Mahalla Nakhas (1695-96). Temple site.

(iv) Masjid in Rambagh (1696-97). Temple site.

4. *Tordi*, Khāri Bāolî. Temple materials used.

VI. Jaisalmer District.

1. *Jaisalmer*, Faqiron-kā-Takiyā. Temple site.

2. *Pokaran*, Masjid (1704-05). Temple site.

VII. Jalor District.

1. *Jalor*

(i) Shāhî or Topkhānā Masjid (1323). Pārshvanātha Temple materials used.

(ii) Idgāh (1318). Temple site.

(iii) Bāoliwāli Masjid (1523). Temple site.

2. *Sanchor*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1506). Temple site.

VIII. Jhalawar District.

*Sunel*, Masjid (1466-67). Temple site.

IX. Jhunjhunu District.

*Narhad*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple materials used.

X. Jodhpur District.

1. *Jodhpur*, Yak-Minār-kî-Masjid (1649). Temple site.

2. *Mandor*

(i) Shāhî Masjid. Temple materials used.

(ii) Ghulām Khān-kî-Masjid. Temple materials used.

(iii) Dargāh of Tannā Pîr. Temple materials used.

3. *Pipar City*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1658). Temple. site.

#### XI. Kota District.

1. *Baran*, Masjid (1680). Temple site.

2. *Bundi*, Mîrān Masjid on the hill east of the town. Temple site.

3. *Gagraun*

(i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1694). Temple site.

(ii) Dargāh of Hazrat Hamîdu’ d-Dîn known as Mitthā Shah. Temple site.

4. *Shahabad*

(i) Sher Shāh Sûrî-kî-Masjid. Temple site.

(ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid. (1671-72). Temple site.

(iii) Dargāh of Rahîm Khān Dātā (1534-35). Temple site.

5. *Shergarh*, Fort of Sher Shāh Sûrî. Brāhmanical, Buddhist and Jain temple materials used.

#### XII. Nagaur District.

1. *Amarpur*, Masjid (1655). Temple site.

2. *Bakalia*, Masjid (1670). Temple site.

3. *Balapur*, Masjid. Temple site.

4. *Badi Khatu*

(i) Shāhî Masjid (around 1200). Temple materials used.

(ii) Qanātî Masjid (1301). Temple site.

(iii) Pahāriyoñ-kî-Masjid and Chheh Shahîd Mazārs. Temple materials used.

(iv) Jāliyābās-kî-Masjid (1320). Temple site.

(v) BaDî and ChhoTî Masjid in Mahalla Sayiddan. Temple site.

(vi) Khānzādoñ-kî-Masjid (1482). Temple site.

(vii) Masjid and Dargāh of Muhammad Qattāl Shahîd (1333). Temple materials used.

(viii) Dhobiyōñ-kî-Masjid. Temple site.

(ix) Masjid-i-Sangatrāshān (1639). Temple site.

(x) Dargāh of Bābā Ishāq Maghribî (1360). Temple site.

(xi) Dargāh of Samman Shāh. Temple sites.

(xii) Ganj-i-Shahîdān. Temple site.

(Xiii) Mominoñ-kî-Masjid (1667). Temple site.

(xiv) Fort. Temple materials used.

4. *Basni*, BaDî Masjid (1696). Temple site.

5. *Chhoti Khatu*, Dargāh of Shāh Nizām Bukhārî (1670). Temple site.

6. *Didwana*

- (i) Qāzioñ-kî-Masjid (1252). Temple site.
- (ii) Masjid in Gudri Bazar (1357). Temple site.
- (iii) Band (closed) Masjid (1384). Temple site.
- (iv) Shaikoñ-kî-Masjid (1377). Temple site.
- (v) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
- (vi) Qālā-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
- (vii) Havālā Masjid. Temple site.
- (viii) Sayyidoñ-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
- (ix) Takiyā-kî-Masjid (1582-83). Temple site.
- (x) Kachahrî Masjid (1638). Temple site.
- (xi) Dhobioñ-kî-Masjid (1662).
- (xii) Julāhoñ-kî-Masjid (1664). Temple site.
- (xiii) Lohāroñ-kî-Masjid (1665). Temple site.
- (xiv) Bisātiyoñ-kî-Masjid (1675-76). Temple site.
- (xv) Mochioñ-kî-Masjid (1686). Temple site.
- (xvi) Shāh Chāngî Madārî Masjid (1711). Temple site.
- (xvii) Idgāh. Temple site.
- (xviii) Graveyard near Delhi Darwaza. Temple site.
- (xix) Dîn Darwaza (1681). Temple site.
- (xx) Mazār of Rashîdu’ d-Dîn Shahîd. Temple site.

7. *Kathoti*, Masjid (1569-70). Temple site.

#### 8. *Kumhari*

- (i) Masjid and Dargāh of Bālā Pîr (1496-97). Temple site.
- (ii) Qalandarî Masjid. Temple site.

#### 9. *Ladnun*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1371). Temple materials used.
- (ii) Hazirawālî or Khaljî Masjid (1378-79). Temple site.
- (iii) Shāhî Masjid. Temple materials used.
- (iv) Dargāh of Umrāo Shahîd Ghāzî (1371). Temple site.
- (v) Graveyard near the above Dargāh. Temple site.
- (vi) Mazār-i-Murād-i-Shahîd. Temple site.

#### 10. *Loharpura*

- (i) Dargāh of Pîr Zahîru’ d-Dîn. Temple site.
- (ii) ChhoTî Masjid (1602). Temple site.

#### 11. *Makrana*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. (Sher Shāh). Temple site.
- (ii) Masjid near Pahar Kunwa (1653). Temple site.
- (iii) Masjid in Gaur Bas (1678). Temple site.
- (iv) Masjid (1643). Temple site.

#### 12. *Merta*

- (i) Masjid in Salawtan (1625-26). Temple site.
- (ii) Masjid in Gaditan (1656). Temple site.
- (iii) Jāmi‘ Masjid. (1665). Temple site.
- (iv) Mochiyōñ-kî-Masjid (1663). Temple site.
- (v) Ghosiyōñ-kî-Masjid (1665). Temple site.
- (vi) Mominoñ-kî-Masjid (1666). Temple site.
- (vii) Masjid in Mahārāj-kî-Jāgîr (1666). Temple site
- (viii) Chowk-kî-Masjid (1670). Temple site.
- (ix) Hajjāmoñ-kî-Masjid (1686-87). Temple site.
- (x) Miyāñjî-kî-Masjid (1690-91). Temple site.
- (xi) Sabungaroñ-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
- (xii) Dargāh of Ghaus Pîr. Temple site.
- (xiii) Takiyā Kamāl Shāh. Temple site.

### 13. Nagaur

- (i) Mazār of Pîr Zahîru’ d-Dîn. Temple site.
- (ii) Dargāh of Bābā Badr. Temple site.
- (iii) Dargāh of Sûfî Hamîdu’ d-Dîn Nagauri Chishtî. Temple site.
- (iv) Dargāh of Shykh Abdul Qādîr Jilānî. Temple site.
- (v) Dargāh of Makhdûm Husain Nāgaurî. Temple site.
- (vi) Dargāh of Ahmad Alî Bāpjî. Temple site.
- (vii) Dargāh of Sayyid Imām Nûr (1527). Temple site.
- (viii) Dargāh of Shāh Abdu’s-Salām. Temple site.
- (ix) Dargāh of Mîrān Sāhib. Temple site.
- (x) Shams Khān Masjid near Shamsi Talav. Temple materials used.
- (xi) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1553). Temple site.
- (xii) Ek Mînār-kî-Masjid (1505-06). Temple site.
- (xiii) Dhobiyoñ-kî-Masjid (1552). Temple site.
- (xiv) Chowk-kî-Masjid (1553). Temple site.
- (xv) Mahawatoñ-kî-Masjid (1567-68). Temple site.
- (xvi) Hamaloñ-kî-Masjid (1599-1600). Temple site.
- (xvii) Shāh Jahānî Masjid at Surajpole. Converted temple.
- (xviii) Masjid outside the Fort (1664). Temple site.
- (xix) Kharādiyōñ-kî-Masjid (1665). Temple site
- (xx) Ghosiyōñ-kî-Masjid (1677). Temple site.
- (xxi) Masjid near Maya Bazar (1677). Temple site.
- (xxii) Qalandroñ-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
- (xxiii) Kanehri Julāhoñ-kî-Masjid (1669). Temple site.
- (xxiv) Sayyidoñ-kî-Masjid (1433-34). Temple site.
- (xxv) Akhā Dewālî Masjid (1475). Temple site.

14. *Parbatsar*, Mazār of Badru’ d-Dîn Shāh Madār. Temple site.

15. *Ren*, Masjid (1685). Temple site.

16. *Rohal*, Qāzioyñ-kî-Masjid (1684). Temple site.
17. *Sojat*, Masjid (1680-81). Temple site.

### XIII. Sawai Madhopur District.

1. *Garh*, Qalā-kî-Masjid (1546-47). Temple site.
2. *Hinduan*
  - (i) Rangrezoñ-kî-Masjid (1439). Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid in the Takiyā of Khwāja Alī. Temple site.
  - (iii) Kachahrî Masjid (1659-60). Temple site.
  - (iv) Bārā Khambā Masjid (1665). Temple site.
  - (v) Graveyard east of the Talav. Temple site.
  - (vi) Masjid and Mazār of Rasûl Shāh. Temple site.
3. *Ranthambor*, Qalā-kî-Masjid. Temple materials used.

### XIV. Sikar District.

*Revasa*, Masjid. Temple materials used.

### XV. Tonk District.

*Nagar*, Ishākhān Bāolī. Temple materials used.

### XVI. Udaipur District.

*Mandalgarh*, Alāi Masjid. Converted Jain Temple.

## TAMIL NADU

### I. Chingleput District.

1. *Acharwak*, Mazār of Shāh Ahmad. Temple site.
2. *Kanchipuram*
  - (i) Large Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Eight other Masjids. Temple sites.
  - (iii) Gumbad of Babā Hamîd Walī. Temple site.

3. *Karkatpala*, Mazār of Murād Shāh Mastān. Temple site.
4. *Kovalam*, Dargāh of Malik bin Dinār (1593-94). Temple site.
5. *Munropet*
  - (i) Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Mazār of Shāh Alī Mastān. Temple site.
6. *Pallavaram*
  - (i) Hill of Panchapandyamalai renamed Maula Pahad and central hall of an ancient Cave Temple turned into a Masjid for worshipping a panjā (palm).
  - (ii) Mazār of Shykh Husain Qādirī alias Būdū ShahId. Temple site.
  - (iii) Poonmalle, Mīr Jumla’s Masjid (1653). Temple materials used.
7. *Rajkoilpetta*, Mazār of Hāji Umar. Temple site.
8. *Rampur*, Takiyā of the Tabqātī order of Faqirs. Temple site.
9. *Rayapeta*, Walājāhī Masjid. Temple site.
10. *Walajahbad*, Masjid. Temple site.

## II. Coimbatore District.

1. *Annamalai*, Fort. Repaired by Tîpû Sultān with temple materials.
2. *Coimbatore*, Large Masjid of Tîpû Sultān. Temple site.
3. *Sivasamudram*, Dargāh of Pîr Walī. Temple site.

## III. Madras District.

Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

## IV. Madura District.

1. *Bonduvarapetta*, Masjid. Temple materials used.
2. *Devipatnam*, Large Masjid. Temple site.
3. *Goripalaiyam*, Dargāh of Khwāja Alāu’d-Dîn. Temple site.
4. *Madura*, Dargāh of Khwāza Alāu’d-Dîn. Temple site.
5. *Nimarpalli*
  - (i) Masjid. Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Makhdûm Jalālu’d-Dîn. Temple materials used.
6. *Puliygulam*, Masjid. Temple site.
7. *Soravandam*, Masjid. Temple site.
8. *Tiruparankunram*, Sikandar Masjid on top of the Hill. Stands admist ruins of Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jain temples.



## V. North Arcot District.

1. *Arcot*, A city of temples before its occupation by Muslims.

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Tomb of Sadatu’llah Khān. Atreya Temple materials used.
- (iii) Masjid and Mazār of Tîpû Awliyā. Temple site.
- (iv) Dargāh of Sayyid Husain Shāh. Temple site.
- (v) Qalā-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
- (vi) Masjid of Shāh Husain Chishtî. Temple site.
- (vii) Masjid and Gumbad of Pāpā ShahId. Temple site.
- (viii) Gumbad of Shāh Sādiq with a graveyard. Temple site.
- (ix) Masjid and Mazār of Shāh Azmatu’llāh Qādirî. Temple site.
- (x) Masjid of Shykh Natthar. Temple site.
- (xi) Masjid of Murād Shāh. Temple site.
- (xii) Masjid of Mîr Asadu’llāh Khān. Temple site.
- (xiii) Masjid of Maulawî Jamāl Alî. Temple site.
- (xiv) Masjid and Gumbad of Sayyid Ahmad alias Yār Pîr. Temple site.
- (xv) Masjid of Chandā Sāhib. Temple site.
- (xvi) Masjid of Miskîn Shāh with Gumbad of Amîn Pîr. Temple site.
- (xvii) Masjid and Mazār of Hazrat Usmān Khān Sarwar. Temple site.
- (xviii) Masjid in the Maqbara of Mughlānî. Temple site.
- (xix) Masjid of Ghulam Rasûl Khān. Temple site.
- (xx) Masjid of Shāh Ghulam Husain Dargāhi. Temple site.
- (xxi) Masjid of Hāfiz Abdul Azîz. Temple site.
- (xxii) Masjid of Hāfiz Karîmu’llāh. Temple site.
- (xxiii) Masjid and Gumbad in Tajpura. Temple site. Outside the city
- (xxiv) Takiyā of Qātil Pāndû Sarguroh. Temple site.
- (xxv) Masjid and Gumbad of Ahmad Tāhir Khān. Temple site.
- (xxvi) Masjid, Khānqāh, Graveyard and Gumbad in Hasanpura. Temple site.
- (xxvii) Gumbad of Hazrat Antar Jāmi with the Idgāh. Temple site.
- (xxviii) Takiyā, of Sābit Alî Shāh. Temple site.
- (xxix) Masjid and Mazār of Sayyid Karîm Muhammad. Qādirî. Temple site.
- (xxx) Masjid of Sā‘datmand Khān. Temple site.
- (xxxii) Masjid of Abu’l-Hasan Zākir. Temple site.
- (xxxiii) Masjid of Da‘ûd Beg. Temple site.
- (xxxiv) Masjid and Gumbad of Hazrat Shāh Nāsir. Temple site.
- (xxxv) Masjid of Punjî. Temple site.
- (xxxvi) Mazār of Yadu’llāh Shāh. Temple site.
- (xxxvii) Rangîn Masjid. Temple site.
- (xxxviii) House of Relic which has a footprint of the Holy Prophet. Converted temple.

## 2. *Arni*

(i) Two Masjids. Temple sites.

(ii) Dargāh of Seven Shahîds. Temple site.

3. *Kare*, Naulakh Gumbad. Converted Gautama and Viśvamisra. Temple

## 4. *Kaveripak*

(i) Idgāh. Temple site.

(ii) Takiyā. Temple site.

(iii) Three Masjids. Temple sites.

5. *Nusratgarh*, Many Masjids and Mazārs in the ruined Fort. Temple sites.

6. *Pirmalipak*, Mazār of Wājid Shāh Champār Posh. Temple site.

## 7. *Ramna*

(i) Masjid of Kamtu Shāh. Temple site.

(ii) Takiyā of Shāh Sādiq Tabqāti. Temple site.

## 8. *Vellore*

(i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

(ii) ChhoTî Masjid. Temple site.

(iii) Mazār of Nûr Muhammad Qādirî who “laid waste” many temples. Temple site.

(iv) Mazār of Shāh Abu’l-Hasan Qādirî.

(v) Mazār of Abdul Latîf Zauqî. Temple site.

(vi) Mazār of Alî Husainî Chishtî. Temple site.

(vii) Mazār of Hazrat Alî Sultān. Temple site.

(viii) Mazār of Amîn Pîr. Temple site.

(ix) Mazār of Shah Lutfu’llah Qādirî. Temple site.

(x) Mazār of Sāhib Pādshāh Qādirî. Temple site.

9. *Walajahnagar*, Masjid and Mazār of Pîr Sāhib on the Hill. Temple site.

10. *Wali-Muhammad-Petta*, Masjid. Temple site.

## VI. Ramanathapuram District.

### 1. *Eruvadi*

(i) Dargāh of Hazrat Ibrāhîm Shahîd. Temple site.

(ii) Mazār of Hazrat Fakhru’d-Dîn Shahîd alias Kātbābā Sāhib. Temple site.

### 2. *Kilakari*

(i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

(ii) Dargāh of Muhammad Qāsim Appā. Temple site.

(iii) Apparpallî Masjid. Temple site.

3. *Periyapattanam*, Dargāh of Sayyid Sultān Walî. Temple site.

### 4. *Valinokkam*

(i) Pallivāsal Masjid (1417-18). Temple site.

(ii) Dargāh of Katupalli (1425). Temple site.

5. *Ramanathapuram*, Old Masjid. Temple site.

VII. Salem District.

*Sankaridurg*, Masjid on the ascent to the Fort. Temple site.

VIII. South Arcot District.

1. *Anandapur*, Masjid. Temple site.

2. *Chidambaram*

(i) Lālkhān Masjid. Temple materials used.

(ii) Nawal Khān Masjid. Temple materials used.

(iii) Idgāh. Temple site.

(iv) Mazār of Amīnu'd-Dīn Chishtī. Temple site.

(v) Mazār of Sayyid Husain. Temple site.

3. *Gingee*

(i) Masjid (1718). Temple site.

(ii) Masjid (1732). Temple site.

(iii) Masjid in the Fort. Temple site.

4. *Kawripet*, Mazār of Qalandar Shāh. Temple site.

5. *Manjakupham*, Mazār of Shāh Abdu'r-Rahīm. Temple site.

6. *Mansurpeta*, Itibār Khān-kī-Masjid. Temple site.

7. *Nallikuppam*

(i) Masjid. Temple site.

(ii) Mazār of Shykh Mīrān Sāhib. Temple site.

8. *Pannuti*

(i) Masjid. Temple site.

(ii) Gumbad of Nūr Muhammad Qādirī. Temple site.

9. *Swamiwaram*, Masjid. Temple site.

10. *Tarakambari*

(i) Masjid. Temple site.

(ii) Mazār of Shykh Ismāil Sāhib. Temple site.

11. *Tirumalarayanapatnam*, Mazār of Abdul Qādir Yamīnī. Temple site.

12. *Warachkuri*, Mazār of Shāh Jalāl Husainī. Temple site.

IX. Thanjavur District.

1. *Ammapettah*

- (i) Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Mazār of Muīnu’ d-Dīn Husain Qādirī. Temple site.
- (iii) Mazār of Shah Jāfar. Temple site.
- 2. *Ilyur*
- (i) Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Mazār of Ināyatu’ llāh Dirwesh. Temple site.
- (iii) Mazār of Muhammad Mastān. Temple site.
- (iv) Mazār of Mīrān Husain. Temple site.
- 3. *Karambari*
- (i) Mazār of Arab Sāhib. Temple site.
- (ii) Mazār of Mubtalā Shāh. Temple site.
- 4. *Kurikyapalayam*
- (i) Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Mazār of Makhdūm Hājī. Temple site.
- (iii) Mazār of Makhdūm Jahān Shāh. Temple site.
- 5. *Kurkuti*, Gumbad of Hasan Qādirī alias Ghyb Sāhib. Temple site.
- 6. *Kushalpalayam*
- (i) Mazār of Hazrat Tāj Firāq Badanshāhī. Temple site.
- (ii) Mazār of Hidāyat Shāh Arzānī. Temple site.
- (iii) Mazār of Yār Shāh Husainshāhī. Temple site.
- 7. *Nagur*
- (i) Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Dargāh of Qādir Walī Shāh. Temple site.
- 8. *Urancheri*, Mazār of Pīr Qutbu’ d-Dīn. Temple site.
- 9. *Vijayapuram*, GumbaD of Sultān Makhdūm. Temple site.
- 10. *Wadayarkari*, MazAr of Bāwā SAhib Shāhid. Temple site.

## X. Tiruchirapalli District.

- 1. *Puttur*, Mazār. Temple materials used.
- 2. *Tiruchirapalli*
- (i) Dargāh of NātThār Shāh Walī. Converted Šiva Temple. Lingam used as lamp-post.
- (ii) Masjid-i-Muhammadī. Temple site.
- (iii) Mazār of Bābā Muhiu’ d-Dīn Sarmast. Temple site.
- (iv) Mazār of Hazrat Fathu’ llāh Nūrī. Temple site.
- (v) Mazār of Shams Parān. Temple site.
- (vi) Mazār of Sayyid Abdul Wahhāb. Temple site.
- (vii) Mazār of Shāh Fazlu’ llah Qādirī. Temple site.
- (viii) Mazār of Shāh Nasīru’ d-Dīn. Temple site.

- (ix) Mazār of Farīdu’ d-Dīn Shahīd. Temple site.
- (x) Mazār of Hazrat Chānd Mastān. Temple site.
- (xi) Mazār of Sayyid Zainu’ l-Ābidīn at Tinur. Temple site.
- (xii) Mazār of Sayyid Karīmu’ d-Dīn Qādirī. Temple site.
- (xiii) Mazār of Alīmu’ llāh Shāh Qādirī called Barhana Shamsīr (Nāked Sword). Temple site.
- (xiv) Mazār of Shāh Imamu’ d-Dīn Qādirī. Temple site.
- (xv) Mazār of Kākī- Shāh. Temple site.
- (xvi) Mazār of Khwāja Aminu’ d-Dīn Chishtī. Temple site.
- (xvii) Mazār of Khwāja Ahmad Shāh Husain Chishtī. Temple site.
- (xviii) Mazār of Shāh Bhekā. Converted temple.
- (xix) Mazār of Shāh Jamālu’ d-Dīn Husain Chishtī. Temple site.
- (xx) Mazār of Qāyim Shāh who destroyed twelve temples. Temple site.
- (xxi) Mazār of Munsif Shāh Suhrawardīyya. Temple site.
- (xxii) Mazār of Itiffāq Shāh. Temple site.
- (xxiii) Mazār of Sayyid Jalāl Qādirī. Temple site.
- (xxiv) Mazār of Mahtab Shah Shirāzī Suhrawardīyya. Temple site.
- (xxv) Masjid of Hājī Ibrāhīm where NāTThār Shāh Walī (see i above) stayed on his arrival. Temple site.

### 3. *Valikondapuram*

- (i) Masjid opposite the Fort. Converted temple.
- (ii) Mazār near the Masjid. Converted temple.
- (iii) Sher Khān-kī-Masjid (1690). Temple site.
- (iv) Old Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

## XI. Tirunelveli District.

- 1. *Ambasamudram*, Mazār of Hazrat Rahmtu’ llāh near the ruined Fort. Temple site.
- 2. *Kayalpattanam*
  - (i) Periyapallī Masjid (1336-37).
  - (ii) Sirupallī Masjid. Temple site.
  - (iii) Dargāh of Nainār Muhammad. Temple site.
  - (iv) Marukudiyarapallī Masjid. Temple site.
- 3. *Tirunelveli*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple materials used.

## UTTAR PRADESH

### I. Agra District.

## 1. *Agra*

- (i) Kalān Masjid in Saban Katra (1521). Temple materials used.
- (ii) Humāyûn-kî-Masjid at Kachhpura (1537-38). Temple site.
- (iii) Jāmi‘ Masjid of Jahānārā (1644). Temple site.
- (iv) Dargāh of Kamāl Khān Shahîd in Dehra Bagh. Temple material uses.
- (v) Riverside part of the Fort of Akbar. Jain Temple sites.
- (vi) Chînî kâ Rauzā. Temple site.

2. *Bisauli*, Masjid (1667-68). Temple site.

## 3. *Fatehpur Sikri*

- (i) Anbiyā Wālî Masjid and several others in Nagar. Converted temples.
- (ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple materials used.
- (iii) Dargāh of Shykh Salîm Chishtî. Temple site.
- (iv) Fatehpur Sikri Complex. Several temple sites.

4. *Firozabad*, Qadîm Masjid. Temple site.

5. *Jajau*, Masjid. Temple site.

6. *Rasulpur*, Mazār of Makhdûm Shah. Temple site.

## 7. *Sikandra*

- (i) Maqbara of Akbar. Temple site.
- (ii) Masjid in the Mission Compound. Temple site.

## II. Aligarh District

### 1. *Aligarh*

- (i) Idgāh (1562-63). Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Shykh Jalālu’d-Dîn Chishtî Shamsul-Arifîn. Temple site.
  - (iii) Graveyard with several Mazārs. Temple site.
  - (iv) Shershāhî Masjid (1542). Temple site.
  - (v) Masjid (1676). Temple site.
2. *Pilkhana*, Bābarî or Jāmi‘ Masjid (1528-29). Temple: materials used.
3. *Sikandara Rao*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1585). Temple site.

## III. Allahabad District.

### 1. *Allahabad*

- (i) Fort of Akbar. Temple sites.
- (ii) Khusru Bagh. Temple sites.
- (iii) Dargāh of Shāh Ajmal Khān with a Graveyard. Temple site.

- (iv) Masjid (1641-22). Temple site.
- (v) Gulabbari Graveyard. Temple site.
- 2. *Koh Inam*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1384). Temple site.
- 3. *Mauima*, Qadīm Masjid. Temple site.
- 4. *Shahbazpur*, Masjid (1644-45). Temple site.

#### IV. Azamgarh District.

- 1. *Dohrighat*, Kalān Masjid. Temple site.
- 2. *Ganjahar*, Masjid (1687-88). Temple site.
- 3. *Mehnagar*, Tomb of Daulat or Abhimān. Temple site.
- 4. *Nizambad*
  - (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Mazār of Miān Maqbūl and Husain Khān Shahīd (1562). Temple sites.
- 5. *Qasba*, Humāyūn’s Jāmi‘ Masjid (1533-34). Temple site.

#### V. Badaun District.

- 1. *Alapur*, Ālamgīrī Masjid. Temple materials used.
- 2. *Badaun*
  - (i) Shamsī or Jāmi‘ Masjid (1233). Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Shamsī Idgāh (1209). Temple materials used.
  - (iii) Hauz-i-Shamsī (1203). Temple materials used.
  - (iv) Dargāh of Shāh Wilāyat (1390). Temple site.
  - (v) Several other Masjids and Mazārs. Temple sites.
- 3. *Sahiswan*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1300). Temple site.
- 4. *Ujhani*, Abdullāh Khān-kī-Masjid. Temple site.

#### VI. Bahraich District.

DargAh of Sālār Mas‘ūd Ghāzī. Sūryadeva Temple site.

#### VII. Ballia District.

##### *Kharid*

- (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Dargāh of Ruknu’d-Dīn Shāh. Temple site.

## VIII. Banda District.

1. *Augasi*, Masjid (1581-82). Temple site.
2. *Badausa*, Masjid (1692). Temple site.
3. *Kalinjar*
  - (i) Masjid in Patthar Mahalla (1412-13). Converted Lakshmî-NārāyaNa Temple.
  - (ii) Masjid (1660-61). Temple site.
  - (iii) Several other Masjids and Mazārs. Temple sites.
4. *Soron*, Dargāh of Shykh Jamāl. Temple site.

## IX. Bara Banki District.

1. *Bhado Sarai*, Mazār of Malāmat Shāh. Temple site.
2. *Dewa*
  - (i) Dargāh of Hājī Wāris Alī Shāh. Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid (1665). Temple site.
3. *Fatehpur*
  - (i) Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Imambārā. Temple site.
4. *Radauli*
  - (i) Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Shāh Ahmad and Zuhrā Bîbî. Temple site.
5. *Rauza Gaon*, Rauza of Da‘ūd Shāh. Temple site.
6. *Sarai-Akbarabad*, Masjid (1579-80). Temple site.
7. *Satrikh*, Dargāh of Sālār Sāhû Ghāzî. Temple site.

## X. Bareilly District.

1. *Aonla*
  - (i) Begum-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Maqbara of Alī Muhammad Rohilla. Temple site.
2. *Bareilly*, Mirzai Masjid (1579-80). Temple site.
3. *Faridpur*, Fort built by Shykh Farîd. Temple materials used.

## XI. Bijnor District.

1. *Barmih-ka-Khera*, Masjid. Temple materials used.
2. *Jahanabad*, Maqbara of Nawāb Shuja‘at Khān. Temple site.



3. *Kiratpur*, Fort with a Masjid inside. Temple materials used.
4. *Mandawar*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple materials used.
5. *Najibabad*, Patthargarh Fort. Temple materials used.
6. *Nihtaur*, Masjid. Temple site.
7. *Seohara*, Masjid. Temple site.

## XII. Bulandshahar District.

1. *Aurangabad Sayyid*, All Masjids stand on temple sites.
2. *Bulandshahar*
  - (i) Dargāh. Temple site.
  - (ii) Fort. Materials of many temples used.
  - (iii) Idgāh. Temple site.
  - (iv) Masjid (1311). Temple site.
  - (v) Masjid (1538). Temple site.
  - (vi) Masjid (1557). Temple site.
3. *Khurja*, Mazār of Makhdûm Sāhib. Temple site.
4. *Shikarpur*, Several Masjids built in Sikandar Lodī’s reign. Temple sites.
5. *Sikandarabad*, Several Masjids built in Sikandar Lodī’ a reign. Temple sites.

## XIII. Etah District.

1. *Atranjikhhera*, Mazār of Hazrat Husain (or Hasan). Temple site.
2. *Jalesar*
  - (i) Mazār of Mīrān Sayyid Ibrāhīm (1555). Temple site.
  - (ii) Fort. Temple materials used.
3. *Kasganj*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1737-38). Temple site.
4. *Marahra*, Masjid and Mazār. Temple site.
5. *Sakit*
  - (i) Qadīm Masjid (1285). Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Akbarī Masjid (1563). Temple site.

## XIV. Etawah District.

1. *Auraiya*, Two Masjids. Temple sites.
2. *Etawah*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Converted temple.
3. *Phaphund*, Masjid and Mazār of Shāh Bukhārī (d. 1549). Temple site.

XV. Farrukhabad District.

1. *Farrukhabad*, Several Masjids. Temple materials used.
2. *Kannauj*
  - (i) Dînā or Jāmi‘ Masjid (1406). Sîtā-kî-Rasoî. Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Makhdûm Jahāniān. Temple materials used.
  - (iii) Dargāh of Bābā Hāji Pîr. Temple site.
  - (iv) Masjid (1663-64). Temple site.
  - (v) Dargāh of Bālā Pîr. Temple site.
3. *Rajgirhar*, Mazār of Shykh Akhî Jamshed. Temple site.
4. *Shamsabad*, All Masjids and Mazārs. Temple sites.

XVI. Fatehpur District.

1. *Haswa*, Idgāh (1650-51). Temple site.
2. *Hathgaon*
  - (i) Jayachandi Masjid. Temple materials used.
  - (ii) Dargāh of Burhān Shahîd. Temple site.
3. *Kora (Jahanabad)*
  - (i) Daraāh of Khwāja Karrak. Temple site.
  - (ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1688-89). Temple site.
4. *Kot*, Lādin-ki-Masjid (built in 1198-99, reconstructed in 1296). Temple site.

XVII. Fyzabad District.

1. *Akbarpur*
  - (i) Qalā-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid (1660-61). Temple site.
2. *Ayodhya*
  - (i) Bābarî Masjid. RAmā-Janmabhûmi Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid built by Aurangzeb. Swargadvāra Temple site.
  - (iii) Masjid built by Aurangzeb. Tretā-kā-Thākur Temple site.
  - (iv) Mazār of Shāh Jurān Ghurî. Temple site.
  - (v) Mazārs of Sîr Paighambar and Ayûb Paighambar near Maniparvat. On the site of a Buddhist Temple which contained footmarks of the Buddha.
3. *Fyzabad*, Imāmbārā. Temple site.
4. *Hatila*, Mazār of a Ghāzî. Aśokanātha Mahādeva. Temple site.
5. *Kichauchha*, Dargāh of Makhdûm Ashraf in nearby Rasulpur. Temple site.

## XVIII. Ghazipur District.

### 1. *Bhitri*

- (i) Masjid and Mazār. Temple materials used.
- (ii) Idgāh. Temple site.
- (iii) Bridge below the Idgāh. Buddhist Temple materials used.

### 2. *Ghazipur*

- (i) Mazār and Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Chahal Sitûn Palace. Temple site.

### 3. *Hingtar*

- (i) Qala-kî-Masjid. Temple materials used.
- (ii) Fort. Temple materials used.

### 4. *Khagrol*, Bārā Khambā or Dargāh of Shykh Ambar. Temple site.

### 5. *Saidpur*, Two Dargāhs. Converted Buddhist Temples.

## XIX. Gonda District.

### *Sahet-Mahet (Śrāvastī)*

- (i) Maqbara. On the plinth of Sobhnāth Jain Temple.
- (ii) Mazār of Mîrān Sayyid. On the ruins a Buddhist Vihāra.
- (iii) Imlî Darwāzā. Temple materials used.
- (iv) Karbalā Darwāzā. Temple materials used.

## XX. Gorakhpur District.

### 1. *Gorakhpur*, Imāmbārā. Temple site.

### 2. *Lar*, Several Masjids. Temple sites.

### 3. *Pava*, Karbalā. On the ruins of a Buddhist Stûpa.

## XXI. Hamirpur District

### 1. *Mahoba*

- (i) Masjid outside Bhainsa Darwaza of the Fort (1322). Converted temple.
- (ii) Masjid built on a part of the Palace of Parmardideva on the Hill. Temple materials used.
- (iii) Two Maqbaras. Temple materials used.
- (iv) Dargāh of Pîr Muhammad Shāh. Converted Siva temple.

(v) Dargāh of MubArak Shāh and Graveyard nearby. Contain no less than 310 pillar from demolished temples.

2. *Rath*, Two Maqbaras. Temple materials used.

## XXII. Hardoi District.

### 1. *Bilgram*

(i) Sayyidoñ-kî-Masjid. Temple materials used.

(ii) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1438). Temple materials used.

(iii) Several other Masjids and Dargāhs. Temple materials used.

2. *Gopamau*, Several Masjids. Temple sites.

### 3. *Pihani*

(i) Abdul Gafūr-kî-Masjid. Temple site.

(ii) Dargāh of Sadr-i-Jahān (1647-48). Temple site.

### 4. *Sandila*

(i) Qadīm Masjid. Temple site.

(ii) Mazār in Bārah Khambā. Temple site.

## XXIII. Jalaun District.

### 1. *Kalpi*

(i) Chaurāsî Gumbad complex of tombs. Many temple sites.

(ii) Dargāh of Shāh Abdul Fath Alāi Quraishi (1449). Temple site.

(iii) Dargāh of Shāh Bābû Hājî Samad (1529). Temple site.

(iv) DeoDhi or Jāmi‘ Masjid (1554). Temple site.

2. *Katra*, Masjid (1649). Temple site.

## XXIV. Jaunpur District.

### 1. *Jaunpur*

(i) Atālā Masjid (1408). Atala DevI Temple materials used.

(ii) Daribā Masjid. Vijayachandra’s Temple materials used.

(iii) Jhāñjarî Masjid. Jayachandra’s Temple materials used.

(iv) Lāl Darwāzā Masjid. Temple materials from the Viśveśvara Temple at Varanasi used.

(v) HammAm Darwāzā Masjid (1567-68). Temple materials used.

(vi) Ibrāhîm Bārbak-kî-Masjid inside the Fort (1360). Temple materials used.

(vii) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Pātāla Devî Temple site.

(viii) Fort. Temple materials used.

- (ix) Akbarî Bridge on the Gomatî. Temple materials used.
- (x) Khâlis Mukhlis or Châr Angulî Masjid. Temple site.
- (xi) Khân Jahân-kî-Masjid (1364). Temple site.
- (xii) Rauzâ of Shâh Fîruz. Temple site.

#### 2. *Machhlishahar*

- (i) Jâmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Karbalâ. Temple site.
- (iii) Sixteen other Masjids. Temple sites.

#### 3. *Shahganj*, Dargâh of Shâh Hazrat Alî. Temple site.

#### 4. *Zafarabad*

- (i) Masjid and Dargâh of Makhdûm Shah (1311 or 1321). Temple materials used.
- (ii) Ibrâhîm Barbak-kî-Masjid. Converted temple.
- (iii) Zafar Khân-kî-Masjid (1397). Converted temple.
- (iv) Ganj-i-Shahîdân. Temple materials used.
- (v) Fort. Temple materials used.
- (vi) Early Sharqî buildings including many Maqbaras. Temple materials used.
- (vii) Dargâh of Asaru’d-Dîn. Temple materials used.

### XXV. Jhansi District.

- 1. *Irich*, Jâmi‘ Masjid (1412). Temple materials used.
- 2. *Lalitpur*, Bâsâ Masjid (1358). Materials of four temples used.
- 3. *Talbhat*
  - (i) Masjid (1405). Temple site.
  - (ii) Dargâh of Pîr Tâj Bâj. Temple site.

### XXVI. Kanpur District.

- 1. *Jajmau*
  - (i) Dargâh of Alâu’d-Dîn Makhdûm Shâh (1360). Temple site.
  - (ii) Idgâh (1307). Temple site.
  - (iii) Qalâ-kî-Masjid. Temple site.
  - (iv) Jâmi‘ Masjid (renovated in 1682). Temple site.
- 2. *Makanpur*, Mazâr of Shâh Madâr. Converted temple.

### XXVII. Lucknow District.

- 1. *Kakori*, Jhânjharî Rauza of Makhdûm Nizâmu’d-Dîn. Temple materials used.
- 2. *Lucknow*

- (i) Tîlewâlî. Masjid Temple site.
- (ii) Āsafu'd-Daula Imambara. Temple site.
- (iii) Dargāh of Shāh Muhammad Pîr on Lakshmana Tila renamed Pir Muhammad Hill. Temple site.
- (iv) Mazār of Shykh Ibrāhîm Chishtî Rahmatullāh. Temple materials used.
- (v) Nadan Mahal or Maqbara of Shykh Abdu'r-Rahîm. Temple site.
- (vi) Machchi Bhavan. Temple sites.
- 3. *Musanagar*, Masjid (1662-63). Temple site.
- 4. *Nimsar*, Fort. Temple materials used.
- 5. *Rasulpur*, Masjid (1690-91). Temple site.

## XXVIII. Mainpuri District.

### *Rapri*

- (i) Jāmi' Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Idgāh (1312). Temple site.
- (iii) Dargāh of Pîr Faddû. Temple site.

## XXIX. Mathura District.

- 1. *Mahaban*, Assî Khambā Masjid. Converted temple.
- 2. *Mathura*
  - (i) Idgāh on the Katrā Mound. Keśvadeva. Temple site.
  - (ii) Jāmi' Masjid built by Abdu'n-nabi (1662). Temple materials used.
  - (iii) Mazār of Shykh Farîd. Temple materials used.
  - (iv) Mazār of Makhdûm Shāh Wilāyat at Sami Ghat. Temple materials used.
- 3. *Naujhil*, Dargāh of Makhdûm Shykh Saheti Sāhib. Temple materials used.

## XXX. Mecrut District.

- 1. *Barnawa*, Humāyun's Masjid (1538-39). Temple site.
- 2. *Garhmuktesar*, Masjid (1283). Temple site.
- 3. *Hapur*, Jāmi' Masjid (1670-71). Temple site.
- 4. *Jalali*, Jāmi' Masjid (1266-67). Temple materials used.
- 5. *Meerut*
  - (i) Jāmi' Masjid. Stands on the ruins of a Buddhist Vihāra.
  - (ii) Dargāh at Nauchandi. Nauchandî Devî Temple site.
- 6. *Phalauda*, Dargāh of Qutb Shāh. Temple site.

XXXI. Mirzapur District.

1. *Bhuli*, Masjid in Dakhni Tola. Temple site.
2. *Chunar*
  - (i) Mazār of Shāh Qāsim Sulaimān. Temple site.
  - (ii) Fort. Temple materials used.
3. *Mirzapur*, Several Masjids. Temple sites.

XXXII. Moradabad District.

1. *Amroha*
  - (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Converted temple.
  - (ii) Dargāh and Masjid of Shykh Saddū. Temple site.
  - (iii) Dargāh of Shykh Wilāyat. Temple site.
  - (iv) Masjid (1557-58). Temple site.
  - (v) Many other Masjids. Temple sites.
2. *Azampur*, Masjid (1555-56). Temple site.
3. *Bachhraon*, Several Masjids. Temple sites.
4. *Moradabad*, Jāmi‘ Masjid (1630). Temple site.
5. *Mughalpura-Agwanpur*, Masjid (1695-96). Temple site.
6. *Sirsi*, Qadīmī Masjid. Temple site.
7. *Ujhari*, Mazār of Shykh Da‘ūd. Temple site.
8. *Sambhal*
  - (i) Jāmi‘ Masjid. Converted VishNu Temple.
  - (ii) Masjid in Sarai Tarim (1503). Temple site.
  - (iii) Mazār of Miān Hātim Sambhali. Temple site.
  - (iv) Mazār of Shykh Panjū. Temple site.

XXXIII. Muzaffarnagar District.

1. *Daira Din Panah*, Mazār of Sayyid Dīn Panāh. Temple site.
2. *Ghausgah*, Fort and Masjid. Temple materials used.
3. *Jhinjhana*
  - (i) Dargāh (1495). Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid and Mazār of Shāh Abdul Razzāq (1623). Temple site.
4. *Kairana*
  - (i) Dargāh. Temple site.
  - (ii) Masjid (1551). Temple site.
  - (iii) Masjid (1553-54). Temple site.

- (iv) Masjid (1617-18). Temple site.
- (v) Masjid (1630-31). Temple site.
- (vi) Masjid (1651-52). Temple site.
- 5. *Majhera*, Masjid and Mazâr of Umar Nûr. Temple site.
- 6. *Sambhalhera*, Two Masjids (1631-32). Temple site.
- 7. *Thana Bhawan*, Masjid (1702-03). Temple site.

XXXIV. *Pilibhit* District.

Jâmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

XXXV. *Pratapgarh* District.

*Manikpur*, Many Masjids and Mazârs. On the ruins of demolished temples.

XXXVI. *Rampur* District.

Jâmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

XXXVII. *Rae Bareli* District.

1. *Datmau*

- (i) Idgâh (1357-58). Temple site.
- (ii) Fort. On the ruins of Buddhist Stûpas.
- (iii) Masjid (1616). Temple site.

2. *Jais*

- (i) Jâmi‘ Masjid. Temple materials used.
- (ii) Masjid (1674-75). Temple site.

3. *Rae Bareli*

- (i) Jâmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.
- (ii) Jahân Khân Masjid. Temple site.
- (iii) Dargâh of Makhdûm Sayyid Jâfari. Temple site.
- (iv) Fort. Temple materials used.

XXXVIII. *Saharanpur* District.

1. *Ambahata*



(i) Masjid (1533-34). Temple site.

(ii) Masjid (1534-35). Temple site.

2. *Deoband*

(i) Masjid (1510). Temple site.

(ii) Masjid (1557). Temple site.

(iii) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1677-78). Temple site.

3. *Gangoh*

(i) Mazār of Shykh Abdul Quddūs. Temple site.

(ii) Three Masjids. Temple sites.

4. *Jaurasi*, Masjid (1675-76). Temple site.

5. *Kaliyar*, Dargāh of Shykh Alāu’-d-Dîn Alî bin Ahmad Sābrî, a disciple of Bābā Farîd Shakar Ganj of Pak Pattan. Temple site.

6. *Manglaur*

(i) Masjid (1285). Temple site.

(ii) Dargāh of Shāh Wilāyat. Temple site.

7. *Rampur*, Mazār of Shykh Ibrāhîm. Temple site.

8. *Saharanpur*, Jāmi‘ Masjid. Temple site.

9. *Sakrauda*, Dargāh of Shāh Ruknu’-d-Dîn or Shāh Nachchan. Temple site.

10. *Sirsawa*, Mazār of Pîr Kilkilî Shāh. On top of temples destroyed.

XXXIX. Shahjahanpur District.

1. *Kursi*, Masjid (1652). Temple site.

2. *Shahjahanpur*, Bahadur Khān-kî-Masjid (1647). Temple site.

XL. Sitapur District.

1. *Biswan*, Masjid (1637-38). Temple site.

2. *Khairabad*, Several Masjids. Temple sites.

3. *Laharpur*, Mazār of Shykh Abdu’r-Rahmān. Temple site.

XLI. Sultanpur District.

1. *Amethi*, Mazār of Shykh Abdul Hasan. Temple site.

2. *Isuli*

(i) Jāmi‘ Masjid (1646-47). Temple site.

(ii) Mazār of Sayyid Ashraf Jahāngîr Simnānî. Temple site.

## XLII. Unao District.

### 1. *Bangarmau*

- (i) BaDi Dargāh of Alāu'd-Dîn Ghanaun (1320). Temple materials used.
- (ii) Dargāh of Jalālu'd-Dīn (d. 1302). Temple site.
- (iii) ChhoTī Dargāh (1374). Temple site.
- (iv) Jāmi' Masjid (1384). Temple site.

### 2. *Rasulabad*, Alamgîrī Masjid. Temple site.

### 3. *Safipur*

- (i) Dargāh of Shāh Shafī. Temple materials used.
- (ii) Dargāh of Qudratu'llāh. Temple materials used.
- (iii) Dargāh of Fahīmu'llāh. Temple materials used.
- (iv) Dargāh of Hāfizu'llāh. Temple materials used.
- (v) Dargāh of Abdu'llāh. Temple materials used.
- (vi) Fourteen Masjids. Temple sites.

## XLIII. Varanasi District.

### 1. *Asla*, Shāh Jahānī Masjid. Temple site.

### 2. *Varanasi*

- (i) Masjid at Gyanavapi. Viśveśvara Temple material used.
- (ii) Masjid at Panchaganga Ghat. KirīTaviśveśvara Temple materials used.
- (iii) Masjid and Dargāh of Sayyid Fakhru'd-Dīn Sāhib Alvī (1375) Temple site.
- (iv) Bindu Madhava Masjid (1669). Converted Biñdu-Mādhava Temple.
- (v) Masjid and Mazār at Bakariya Kund. Temple materials used.
- (vi) ADhāi Kāñgrā-kī-Masjid in Adampura. Temple site.
- (vii) Darharā Masjid. Temple site.
- (viii) Mazār of Lāl Khān at Rajghat. Temple site.

## Footnotes:

<sup>1</sup> The word "Hindu" in the present context stands for all schools of Sanatana Dharma-Buddhism, Jainism, Saivism, Shaktism, Vaishnavism and the rest.

<sup>2</sup> *History of Aurangzeb*, Calcutta, 1925-52.

<sup>3</sup> *Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors*, Bombay, 1962.

<sup>4</sup> Advice tendered to this author by Dilip Padgaonkar, editor of *The Times of India*, in the context of quoting correct history. Small wonder that he has converted this prestigious daily into a platform for communist politicians masquerading as historians. “Perhaps you want,” wrote a reader, “to invest them with some kind of academic glory by using the legend of JNU, but their best introduction, intellectually speaking, is that they are Stalinist historians... Their ideological brothers in the press make sure, through selective reporting and publishing, that their views are properly advertised. *The Times of India*, too, is in this rank; its editorials, leading articles, special reports-all breathe venom, not just against Ram Janmabhumi but any Hindu viewpoint. Anything in sympathy with this viewpoint is conscientiously kept out” (*The Times of India*, November 11, 1989, Letters).

<sup>5</sup> Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report 1925-26. Pp. 129-30.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 129.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 128.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 1907-08, p. 113.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, Pp. 114.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 114-15. Technical details have been omitted and emphasis added.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 116.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 120.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 126.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 1907-08, Pp. 47, to 72.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 1903-04, p. 86.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 1902-3, p. 52.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 1921-22, p. 83.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 84.

- <sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 1902-03, p. 56.
- <sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 1933-34, Pp. 36-37.
- <sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 1902-03, Pp. 16-17.
- <sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 1993-4, Pp. 31-32.
- <sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 1902-03, Pp. 17-18.
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 1903-04, p. 43.
- <sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 63.
- <sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 1904-05, p. 24.
- <sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 1929-30, p. 29.
- <sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 1928-29, Pp. 167-68.
- <sup>30</sup> Robert Sewell, *A Forgotten Empire*, New Delhi Reprint, 1962, Pp. 199-200.
- <sup>31</sup> Archaeological Survey of India, Volume I : *Four Reports Made During the Years 1862-63-64-65*, Varanasi Reprint, 1972, Pp. 440-41.
- <sup>32</sup> Ratan Pribhdas Hingorani, *Sites Index to A.S.I. Circle Reports* New Delhi 1978, Pp. 17-262.
- <sup>33</sup> A decision to this effect was taken by the *Archaeological Survey of India* soon after independence, ostensibly under guidelines laid down by an international conference.
- <sup>34</sup> S.A.A. Rizvi, *History of Sufism in India*, Volume 1, New Delhi, 1978, P. 189.
- <sup>35</sup> Ghulām Abdul Qādir Nazîr, *Bahr-i- 'Azam or Travels of 'Azam Shāh Nawwāb Walājāh*, 1823, Madras, 1960, p. 128.
- <sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 64.
- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 128.
- <sup>38</sup> Dates given in brackets refer to the Christian era

## Appendix

Using the Babari Masjid-Ramajanmabhumi controversy as a pretext, Muslim mobs went on a rampage all over Bangladesh. They attacked and burnt down Hindu houses and business establishments in many places, murdered some Hindus and inflicted injuries on many others. Hindu temples and monasteries invited their special attention everywhere.

Starting on October 29, 1989, the mob fury reached its climax on November 9 and 10 after the Shilanyas ceremony at Ayodhya. Many temples were demolished or burnt down or damaged in various ways. Images of deities were broken and thrown out. Temple priests were beaten up.

The Government of Bangladesh kept on looking the other way for almost two weeks. Then it called off the operation. It also ordered repairs to a dozen temples in order to maintain the pretence that what had been done was not a command performance.

We reproduce below a report received by us.

### **INCIDENTS OF COMMUNAL REPRESSION IN BANGLADESH**

#### **Occurred on the Pretext of Babri-Masjid / Ram-Mandir Situation in India**

(Translated from original in Bengali published by the Hindu, Buddhist and Christian Unity Council, 53, Tejturi Bazar, Dhaka, Bangladesh)

District: Narsingdi

1. On November 11, 1989: The 400-year-old historic Kali-Temple at Chinishpur was looted and set on fire.
2. On the same day the Shiv-Temple of Brahmanadi was looted and set on fire.
3. On the same day the Kali-Temple of Bhelanagar was looted and set on fire.
4. In the market place of Bhelanagar near Narsingdi town a good number of shops were looted, broken in, and some of the houses were set on fire on the same day.
5. In the town of Narsingdi, the Bhagbat Ashram was attacked on the same day.

6. The Kali-Temple of Narsingdi town was attacked with arms on the same day (11-11-89).
7. On the 8th of November 1989, the Milan Kali-Temple of Srirampur Bazar in the Raipur Upajila was attacked and the image of the deity broken up.
8. On the same day the Raipur Bazar Temple was attacked and the image of the deity broken up.
9. On the same day at the village of Hashimpur under Raipur Upajila many houses were attacked, looted, and set on fire.

**District: Tangail**

10. On November 10 and 11, 1989, in the town of Tangail several temples were attacked and set on fire, and many shops were looted.
11. In the village of Bajitpur near Tangail many houses belonging to the religious minorities were attacked, looted, and set on fire, and the temples and the images of the deities were broken up.
12. The temple in the village of Pakrail under Delduar Upajila was attacked, and acts of breaking up and setting on fire were carried out.
13. In several other villages under Delduar Union the temples were set on fire.
14. One temple in the village of Pakutia in Tangail was attacked, set on fire and destroyed.
15. House-to-house attacks were made on the traditional makers of handloom sarees belonging to the members of religious minorities in the village of Bajitpur, and their handlooms were destroyed.
16. In the village of Akua in Tangail a temple was destroyed and its foundations removed.
17. A similar incident took place in the village of Kalihati.
18. Mr. Dinesh Ch. Basak, deputy chief medical officer of the Meghna Textile Mills, under Bangladesh Textile Industry Corporation, died on November 10 in Tongi. The Mill authorities sent his body to Tangail for cremation, and there a group of miscreants attacked the car carrying the dead body. They also obstructed carrying out

of the cremation.

### **District: Moulavi Bazar**

19. On November 10, 1989, in the District of Moulavi Bazar, at Srimangal Upajila several temples including Ramkrishna Mission, Mangaleswari Kali-Bari, Durga-Bari, Jagannath Dev's Akhra, and Kalachand Mandir were attacked, broken in, and set on fire. At present no temple exists at Srimangal.

20. On November 10, 1989, the Ramkrishna Mission in the city of Moulavi Bazar was attacked and burnt down.

21. On the same day several Hindu houses and shops in the Srimangal Upajila were attacked, structurally damaged and looted. This happened in front of the officers responsible for law and order.

### **District: Naogaon**

22. On November 10, 1989, several temples in the city of Naogaon were attacked and structurally damaged.

23. Fear and panic spread in the Hindu villages near the city of Naogaon and many villagers went into hiding for fear of life and prosecution.

### **District: Sirajganj**

24. On November 11, 1989, at dusk, attackers as a large group emerged from a mosque at Chanyaikona in Upajila Raigarh with agitating slogans, and they attacked many nearby shops and residential places.

### **District: Rangpur**

25. On November 10, 1989, Friday at 4 pm in the city of Rangpur a huge group in a procession shouting slogans with excitement went on attacking places of worships belonging to the minority communities.

26. On the same day, the famous Rangpur Dharma Shava building at the Station Road was attacked and severely damaged.

27. The main Kali Temple in Rangpur known as Sri Sri Karunamoyee Kali-Bari was attacked.

28. Sri Sri Anandamoyee Ashram at College Road was attacked and massively damaged.

**District: Netrokona**

29. The Kali-Mandir at Bara Bazar in the city of Netrokona was attacked, looted, structurally damaged and set on fire.

**District: Magura**

30. In Magura Sadar Upajila, Bagia Union, at Bagia Thakur-Bari at the performance of Puja in the Jagadhatri Temple on November 6, 1989, armed attacks were made and, Ranjit Roy and Jagadish Roy were killed, and the image of the deity was broken up and thrown away. Seriously wounded Samar Roy had to be transferred to a Hospital for Disabled in Dhaka.

**District: Barishal**

31. On November 15 in the city of Barishal the temple of Chandan Nagar Para was attacked, broken up and set on fire.

32. On November 2, 1989 in the village of Dhamura in Uzirpur Upajila a Kali Temple was attacked by an armed group under Haji Mobashar Uddin at 8 pm, the image of the deity was broken up and thrown away and the temple was set on fire.

33. On November 17, the Hindu Hostel under B.M. College was attacked and students were indiscriminately beaten up and forced out of the Hostel.

34. On November 13, at the Sadar Betagi Upajila, temples were broken in and shops belonging to Hindu community were looted. In Agoyeeljhara, the Kali-Mandir was destroyed and the image of the deity disappeared.

**District: Chittagong**



35. On November 10, in the city of Chittagong, procession took place shouting communal slogans.

36. In Raujan Upajila at the Jagatpur Ashram attacks were made.

37. At the historic Kaibalyadham Ashram in Chittagong attacks were made.

38. At the villages of Sadhanpur and Lankarchar in Patia Upajila some 25 temples were attacked and set on fire and the images of the deities in these temples were broken. Many houses and shops belonging to the members of minority communities were attacked and looted.

39. In the villages of Uttar Satta and Fate Nagar in Raujan Upajila, and in Nanupur, Baktapur, S. Rosong Giri and Ajadi Bazar under Fatikchar Upajila several temples were attacked.

40. On October 29 and 31, in the village of Unainagar Patia Upajila on the Chittagong-Kox's Bazar Highway, a bus was stopped and the Buddhist and Hindu passengers were beaten up. In many Buddhist temples the statues of Buddha were broken up.

41. Under Rajaun Upajila in the village of Gujra on October 29 and November 9, the Jalakumari House, Radha-Gobinda Ashram and other temples were attacked and set on fire repeatedly.

42. The Kali Temple of Bashkhali Upajila was attacked.

43. On November 10, in the region called Patenga Kath-Ghar many Hindu families abandoned their homes for fear of communal persecution. In the city of Sandwip the images of the deities in the Jagannath-Bari, Kali-Bari, and Char-Ani Shidheswari Kali-Bari were broken up and scattered.

#### **District: Kox's Bazar**

44. Many temples in the various Upajilas of Kox's Bazar were attacked.

#### **District: Noakhali**

45. In the city of Hatia several temples were attacked. In Bazra under Begumganj Upajila the Hari-Mandir was destroyed.

**District: Jamalpur**

46. The temple at Basakpara in the city of Jamalpur was destroyed.

**District: Chadpur**

47. On November 10, at the Purana Bazar area in the city of Chadpur many shops and businesses and many temples in the suburb of Chadpur were attacked. The temple of Raja Lakshmi-Narayan in Habiganj has been destroyed.

**District: Nilfamari**

48. In Saidpur area many temples have been attacked and severely damaged.

**District: Jhalakati**

49. On November 9, in the city of Jhalakati almost all temples and the houses and shops belonging to the members of the minority communities were attacked.

50. The living quarters and a temple belonging to the famous folk poet (Charan Kabi) Mukunda Das was attacked and broken up.

**District: Narayanganj**

51. On November 10, the Ramakrishna Mission and several shops belonging to the members of the minority communities were attacked.

**District: Dhaka**

52. Several temples in Dhamrai and Savar were attacked. On November 10, at night, the Dhaka Ramakrishna Mission was attacked. In Demra an ancient cremation structure has been destroyed. In Lal-bag police station in Nagar-Bel-Tali Rishi-Para several shops and businesses were attacked, looted and structurally damaged.

**District: Laksmipur**

53. On November 14, 1989, in the Union of Charbadam, Char Alexander, Char Algi and Hajarihat under Ramgati Upajila of Laksmipur District, some 36 houses, shops and businesses belonging to the minority communities were attacked, looted and set on fire, and women were raped and rendered destitute. Besides these, some 11 temples were attacked and destroyed by setting on fire including the temple of Rama-Thakur and Ashram of Burakarta.

**District: Sylhet**

54. The historic Akhra of Mahaprabhu in Chhatak was attacked and the statue of the Mahaprabhu was broken and damages were done to the Akhra.

**District: Khulna**

55. On November 17, 1989 in the city of Khulna. Dharma-Shava Temple, Koylaghat Kalibari, Barabazar Kalibari, and many other temples were attacked and set on fire. At the corner of Barabazar and Picture Palace all shops and businesses belonging to the Hindu community were looted. In the localities inhabited by many Hindus including Tutpara, Baniakhamar and Banargati, armed attacks were made and acts of looting, breaking-in and setting-on-fire were carried out.

**District: Bagerhat**

56. On November 17, 1989, the entire temple complex at the Ramakrishna Mission in Bagerhat including Hari-Mandir was attacked and structures and the statue of Ramakrishna were broken up. Besides these attacks, acts of destruction were carried out on Fatepur Kalibari, Bemta Kali-Temple Giletala Hari and Kali temples, Karapara Kali Temple, and Patarpara Kali-Temple, and a famous black-stone Siva-Linga was looted.

**District: Maimensing**

57. Hindu houses in the vicinity of the Zamidar-bari of Muktagachha were attacked with arms and looted and acts of breaking-up were carried out.

### **District: Feni**

58. On November 9, in the Union of Radhanagar, and on November 14 in the Union of Dhalia, under Chhagal-Naiya Upajila, temples were attacked and acts of breaking-up were carried out.

59. In the village of Char Sonapur under Sonagachhi Upajila, a temple was attacked and acts of breaking-up carried out on November 12. In the villages of Desherhat and Semerkhil several temple statues were broken up.

60. The image of Goddess Kali in the village of Hirapur in Daganbhuia Upajila was broken up.

61. In the village of Daulatpur under Feni police station the image of Goddess Kali was broken up.

62. The image of Goddess Kali in the temple of Dakshineswari at Shubhapur Bazar in Chhagal-Naiya, was broken up and the place was looted and set on fire.

### **District: Bhola**

63. On November 17, in the city of Bhola, several shops belonging to the religious minorities were attacked and money was collected through threats of violence.

### **District: Comilla**

64. On November 11 at Muradpur, under Sadar Upajila, a temple was destroyed. In the village of Ramaganj a similar incident happened.

65. On November 11, at the festival of Rama-Thakur in the city of Comilla, attacks were made using stones and bricks and several people were injured.

66. On November 12, a Kali-Temple in the village of Gahin-khali under Barmbara Upajila was set on fire. Under Muradnagar Upajila at Ramachandrapur Bazar, a temple was totally destroyed.

### **District: Brahmanbaria**

67. In the villages of Shyamgram and Srigram under Nabinagar Upajila several temples were attacked.

**District: Madaripur**

68. On November 11, the Hari-Temple of Puranabazar in the city of Madaripur was broken up and a procession against the religious minorities was taken out.

69. The Dhamusa's Ashram of Kalkini was broken up.

**District: Munshiganj**

70. The Kali-Temple at Baligaon was broken up.

**District: Manikganj**

71. In Saduria Upajila at Saduria itself and in the village of Buriara temples were attacked and acts of breaking-up were committed.

**District: Pabna**

72. Temples and shops and businesses in the city of Pabna were attacked and looted.

**District: Habiganj**

73. Several temples in the District of Habiganj were attacked.