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Introduction

Questions have been asked and answered about the role of Hindu temples in India’s history, about their construction, function and meaning to people at various times and places. In both pre-modern and modern times, issues centring on the physical, legal and financial control of temples have been very much part of the local, regional and subcontinental politics in India. Most scholars have tended to read temples straightforwardly as symbols of religious authority, as institutions symbolizing inclusion or exclusion from Hindu society and politics. Richard Eaton, however, analysed them with respect to royal power and politics, arguing that it was those temples patronized by and symbolizing kings, not temples in general, that were raided and attacked by both Hindu and Muslim armies in the past. Just as temples could be raided and attacked for political reasons, they could be supported and patronized for political reasons, by non-Hindu as well as Hindu rulers.

I argue here that Hindu temples in Hyderabad, a city in a territory ruled by Muslims from the fourteenth century until the 1948 incorporation of the princely state of Hyderabad into independent India, were resources in a multi-religious landscape, institutions that reflected the political power of their patrons and often performed functions for the state. Hindu temples in Hyderabad served diverse and multiple functions, only one of which
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centred on religious rituals. Temple patronage reflected the shifting patterns of prominence in the state, as one family of high-ranking officials replaced another over time as the patrons of major temples. Islamic buildings in Hyderabad can be analysed in much the same way.3

Temples were built and managed as part of the Indo-Muslim or Mughlai urban court economy, terms that need definition here. Certainly, the Nizam’s rule was not Islamic, and I use the term Indo-Muslim in preference to Indo-Persian, Persianate or Islamicate. I prefer Indo-Muslim because it modifies Muslim by Indian, thus emphasizing a civilizational not religious culture and one located in India. Although court cultures in the Deccan were modelled on Persian court culture, Urdu became an influential language and the official one of Hyderabad state in the late nineteenth century. Islamicate also emphasizes the civilization rather than the religion, but I use the term Mughlai because, in Hyderabad, it designates the administration developed from the time of the first Nizam, Mughal governor of the Deccan in the early eighteenth century, and distinguishes that administration from the modernizing or Diwani administration initiated by the Diwan Salar Jung (1853–1883) based in the new city of Hyderabad north of the Musi River.4

Hyderabad state developed in the Deccan plateau in the course of the eighteenth century as the Mughal empire in Delhi lost supremacy in the subcontinent. The Mughal Emperor Aurangzeb conquered Bijapur and Golconda, successor sultanates of the Bahmani sultanate,5 in 1686 and 1687. Nizam ul Mulk, the first Mughal governor of the Deccan province, engaged in military battles and diplomatic negotiations with the expanding Marathas in the western Deccan, the new regional powers arising in Mysore and Madras, and the French and English trading companies moving inland from their trading ports. While continuing to profess allegiance to Delhi, the Nizam and his successors established a separate dynasty and administration by the end of the eighteenth century, continuing Mughal administrative practices in a new context and with new sets of participants. Hindus as well as Muslims became leading officials of the state, as Hindustani speakers from northern India as well as Telugu speakers, Marathi speakers and Kannada speakers flocked to the new state. High-caste Hindus, notably Kayasths, Brahmins, Brahma-Khatris and Khatri from northern and western India, ranked among the state’s top nobility.6

My purpose here is not to validate Hyderabad state’s policies and practices with respect to Hindu institutions and events. Rather, I wish to show the development and implementation of an Indo-Muslim ruling tradition, part of a distinctively South Asian tradition of secularism or pluralism (not syncretism or synthesis).7 Anna Bigelow recently noted that in South Asia ‘secularism’ is closer in meaning to pluralism or multiculturalism in the United States, meaning not separation of religion and state but equality in terms of state patronage and the absence of religious favouritism.8 I too wish to emphasize traditions of pluralism and invoke ideas of ‘translation’, appropriate to the time and place, ideas that reinforce South Asian traditions of pluralism. Anthropologists have long discussed ‘translation’ as part of their disciplinary enterprise, seeking to understand and explain contemporary cultures to each other,9 but I am interested here in translations across time (not across cultures at the present time). It is clear, for example, that many contemporary Indians have lost the ability to read the cultural worlds of the past, the Indo-Muslim cultural worlds that were powerful in South Asia in previous centuries.10 Others have also successfully employed translation when looking at the past. Tony Stewart’s article, In Search of Equivalence, and Finbarr Flood’s recent book, Objects of Translation: Material Culture and Medieval ‘Hindu-Muslim’ Encounter, perhaps best present challenges to current notions of bounded and incompatible ‘Hindu’ and ‘Muslim’ worlds in South Asia.
The historical context

Hyderabad’s Indo-Muslim cultural world can be reconstructed from indigenous sources, both written and oral. Persian and Urdu archival materials and histories from the eighteenth through the twentieth centuries, combined with interviews that I conducted in the 1960s and 1970s, provide rich material for analysis, material presented in some detail below. The government of Nizam ul Mulk Asaf Jah I (1724–1748) had assumed responsibility for many religious institutions and events in Hyderabad state as early as 1735, according to Manik Rao Vithal Rao’s multivolume Urdu history of Hyderabad, Bustan-i Asafiyah. Successive Nizams recognized and continued sanads or grants previously issued by rulers in Delhi, Golconda, Bijapur and other territories that came under their rule. The sadr-us-sudur or head of the Ecclesiastical Department gave out cash grants to individuals and money for mosque construction and repair and the dispatch of hajis to Mecca; state money went to Hindus and their institutions as well.

Hindu temple histories in Hyderabad, both oral and written, feature close interaction with the Nizam’s court and administration. Nobles and men who were leaders in the eighteenth-century military regime, nobles and administrators who dominated the Mughlai bureaucracy developing in the nineteenth century, dancing girls patronized by the nobles and the Nizams, and the rulers and agents of the samasthans or petty chiefdoms who were tributary subjects of the Nizams, played major roles. Some religious or charitable institutions, such as ashrakhana (shrines for Shia relics), serais (travellers’ inns) and dharmshalas (pilgrims’ inns), had government support and supervision, but most were supported by wealthy men. Leading nobles and officials of Hyderabad state became, in the course of the nineteenth century, the major patrons of temples and other religious institutions and events (See Figure 1 for locations).

In the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Hyderabad, patronage of religious institutions or events was not exclusively confined to adherents of the religion involved. For example, the locality of Husaini Alam was named after a Shia Muslim alam (relic) kept to commemorate the death of the Prophet’s grandson, Imam Husain, in 680 CE. The langar or chain installed here as an alam by the Qutb Shahi Queen Hayat Bakshi Begum marked her son’s rescue from a runaway elephant and was taken out annually during Muharram in a chaotic procession of military troops through the city. The Sunni Muslim rulers who followed the Qutb Shahis and leading officials of Hyderabad state contributed to the shrine: the Nizams awarded a jagir to support the mosque and well adjoining the ashrakhana in which the alam was kept, and Raja Chandu Lal, a Hindu serving as Diwan under the third and fourth Nizams in the early nineteenth century, gave a clock and a naubat (drum) to the Husaini Alam complex. Thus, a shrine founded by the Shia Muslim Qutb Shahis was patronized by the Sunni Muslim Nizams and by a Hindu state official, and the annual Langar procession continued to symbolize a shared history and identity for people in the city and the state.

Similar patterns of political patronage characterized the sacred complex built on and around Moula Ali Hill or Koh-i-Sharif northeast of the city. There are several versions of the hill’s sanctity. One says that Rang Ali, servant and disciple of a faqir named Moula, began an ashrakhana and urs here in memory of his Pir, assisted by the Qutb Shahi ruler who granted inam land to support the shrine. The Hyderabad government continued the support and granted 2 days holiday for the annual urs. Another relates that a Hindu temple to Ramaswami was on the hill and a jatra was celebrated every year, and once when Sultan Ibrahim Quli Qutb Shah was enjoying the moonlight at Bala Hisar (the top of the Golconda Fort) he saw the light and asked about it. His royal companion, the Brahmin Rai Rao, told
the ruler it was the *alam* of Hazrat Ali, and when the Sultan wanted to see it, Rai Rao replaced the statue of the god with a *chilla* wrapped in green cloth. The Sultan went there and commemorated the Prophet's grandson and fourth Caliph Ali, the first Imam of the Shias, a celebration that continued annually.\(^{19}\) Another story is that an *ashurkhana* was erected in 1578 under the Qutb Shahis to memorialize the Prophet’s son-in-law, Ali, at the top of the hill, but that no *alam* was kept there; the relic kept in the shrine was an impression of Hazrat Ali’s right hand.\(^{20}\) These stories and variations on them discursively link entangled Hindu and Muslim Sunni, Shia and Sufi religious sites and practices to the ruler and state support of the site. Other stories and histories associated with Moula Ali Hill reinforce the focus on the state rather than on bounded religious traditions. Another *ashurkhana* there was erected by Khush-Hal Khan, an early nineteenth-century musician and instructor of Mah Laqa Bai (the court title given by Nizam Ali Khan to Chanda Bai or Bibi, a famous courtesan and literary figure).\(^{21}\) The Moula Ali complex includes a *naqarkhana* (drum platform) built by Raja Chandu Lal\(^{22}\) and a *baradari* (building with central hall and 12 doors in a garden) built by Raja Rao Rumbha, a Maratha military man who led a cavalry
unit against the Marathas and was a favourite of the second Nizam. The tomb of the second Nizam’s Diwan, Ruknuddaula (d. 1775), is in a garden at the foot of this hill, and the tomb of Mah Laqa Bai (d. 1824–1825) is next to her mother’s in another garden there. 

A Persian history published in the 1840s mentions a Hindu Koh-i-Sharif jatra or festival held annually at Moula Ali Hill, one of four Hindu jatras mentioned in that text (the others are discussed below in connection with the related temples).

A Persian court diary from 1720 to 1890, translated as The Chronology of Modern Hyderabad, routinely reported events and observances related to Hindus and Hinduism, as it did those related to Muslims and Islam. Examples included, for the late eighteenth- and very early nineteenth-century, the Nizam’s visit in 1782 to the shrine of Raja Beg Sawar (details unknown) at Emalwada; a thread ceremony in 1789 of Rai Amanath Ram of the Rai Rayan Maharashtrian Brahmin family that presided over the Daftar-i-Diwani (the revenue record office for the western half of the state); the journey of Raja Sham Raj of the Rae Rayan family in 1799 to Ramnath for a jatra (Hindu festival) with the Nizam’s permission; Raja Rajinder’s trip in 1800 to a Balaji jatra; Raja Rajinder Bahadur’s trip in 1802 to bathe in the Ganges (Raja Rajinder or Raghotam Rao, a Maharashtrian Brahmin, served in several important positions). On 1 September 1850, to cite a later example, the Nizam received nazrs or cash offerings for Id and Rakhi Poonam at the same time from leading nobles and officials and also bestowed a rope of pearls on the son of Raja Eshwant Rao on his marriage.

Hindu temples under the military regime

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, when a military regime governed the state and the highest nobles and officials owed their positions to military leadership, temple patronage reflected this political regime. Two temples were patronized by Hindu military men. The patrons were high-ranking Kayasth serrishtahdars (managers, record-keepers) in the Nizam’s military; the Kayasth caste emerged as an administrative or writer caste under Muslim rulers in India and its members knew Arabic, Persian and Urdu well. The fates of these temples of Raja Maya Ram and Raja Buchar Mal (the latter also titled Shamsher Jung) tell much about the milieu in which they were established, the milieu of relatively unstable political power, and point to the importance of securing state rather than individual patronage. Both men were from the Saksena subcaste; they held titles and jagirs and were prominently mentioned in both Persian and English records. Their temples in the Shahalibanda locality, however, did not become major ones; the Rajas supported them from personal funds and left no direct, legitimate, Hindu descendants. Both Buchar Mal and Maya Ram had personal jagirs but no jagirs or other state grants to support the temples, and these local landmarks were not included in the later nineteenth-century Ecclesiastical Department registration records. No hereditary managers came forward to register them on the Endowment List, claim a stipend, and secure approval of successive managers.

What remained of Raja Buchar Mal Shamsher Jung’s Shahalibanda temple (and ashurkhana, in one account) and shops were a tatti (bamboo screen or Imambara), a mosque, and some Muslim graves. Buchar Mal’s son, Ghansur Mal, seems to have been short-lived, and Buchar Mal converted to Islam. When he died, his Kayasth relatives would not carry out his cremation, so finally the family barbers took up a collection and saw to the proper cremation ceremonies. His property passed to a related Saksena Kayasth family, but later on Muslims claimed that Muslim graves were on the land and the property was transferred to the management of a nearby mosque. Some reported that the Muslim graves were those of Buchar Mal’s Muslim descendants.
The Narsimji temple associated with Raja Maya Ram in Shahalibanda was very old, probably dating from Qutb Shahi days (in the 1960s it was a whole ground level below that of surrounding buildings). It had a wooden diwankhana-like frame in an old Maharashtrian style for a Shiva lingam and a jhanda or flag stand in front of the sanctuary. Maya Ram installed the Narsimji murthi or idol in the temple and patronized it in the early nineteenth century, but the temple supposedly became haunted – a Brahmin committed suicide, or was killed, in front of it. There are two versions of the Brahmin’s death. In one, a brother-in-law of Maya Ram took a loan from a Brahmin moneylender and did not repay it, so the Brahmin sat in front of the temple and died, thereby cursing the temple. In the other version, a wealthy Brahmin went on pilgrimage to Benares and left his gold and other valuables with the trusted elder, Maya Ram; he did not return soon so the family used the gold and when he finally returned they killed him and put his body in a well, thereby bringing a curse upon the temple. Whatever the case, the temple fell into degeneration. The Shahalibanda Narsimji image from this temple was shifted to a temple in nearby Uppuguda, which illegitimate or suratval37 Saksena Kayasths managed until a prominent Untouchable caste Congress politician took it over in the 1950s.38

Other temples became important landmarks because of their association with the state. Another military man, the Rajput Jham Singh, a Commander in charge of Remounts or buying horses for the royal family and government, secured state patronage for the Jham Singh Deval, the temple he constructed in Karwan, ensuring its survival. Jham Singh used money entrusted to him to purchase horses to construct this Balaji temple next to a small Qutb Shahi mosque in the time of the third Nizam, Sikander Jah (1803–1829); the Nizam forgave him, visited the temple and presented a jagir to him for its maintenance.39 Jham Singh’s descendants today, in their sixth generation, still receive funding from the Endowment Department (now of Andhra Pradesh state); they have filled in the well that was adjacent to the entrance and have built a rathkhana that blocks one’s view of the old mosque.40

Hindu temples under the Mughlai bureaucracy
As the military regime gave way to a Mughlai bureaucracy in the early nineteenth century, temple patronage reflected the new political realities. Leading Hindu officials and nobles established other temples in and around the old city of Hyderabad, ones that secured state support and have lasted. These temples, as in the case of the Jham Singh Deval, above, sometimes were built in a compound in which a Qutb Shahi mosque or dargah was already established, and sometimes they were built in gardens outside the city walls. Temple grounds were granted to leading Hindu officials to establish order in a suburb of the city and to maintain troops and weapons on the site. When leading Hindu families lost power or had no legitimate descendants, their temple properties were given to others to patronize and maintain. Gardens were significant sites in and around Hyderabad, and sometimes the temples or tombs located in them seemed of secondary importance, as the Nizam of the day made ceremonial visits to the gardens of his leading nobles and officials. An 1845 map featured seven named garden sites, and the Ram Bagh temple site was one of them41; most of these were still major landmarks in the 1911 series of detailed maps prepared under Leonard Munn.42 Hindu noble families like the Malwalas (Mathur Kayasths who headed the Daftar-i-Mal, the revenue record office for the eastern half of the state) used the temple gardens for parties and kite-flying as well as for devotional purposes.
Members of Hyderabad’s leading Hindu administrative or ‘writing’ caste, the Kayasths, built or became managers of at least 13 different temples surviving in the city in the late nineteenth century (Table 1), and other Hindu nobles and officials also constructed or managed temples. The histories of these temples, including oral histories collected in the 1960s after Hyderabad’s 1948 incorporation into India, show the multiple purposes that the temples fulfilled. The oldest Kayasth temple in Hyderabad, Ram Bagh, was built by a Bhatnagar Kayasth (one of six Kayasth subcastes in the old city), Raja Bhavani Pershad, in 1802, at the end of Nizam Ali Khan’s reign. Bhavani Pershad was in charge of salary distribution of the Palace (staff and/or harem). An idol of Ram, being made for a temple of the Raja of Gadwal (one of the samasthans), was not ready in time for the auspicious date set for its installation, the Raja saw in a dream another idol of Ram in a well, found it and installed it in his temple. On the same night, Raja Bhavani Pershad dreamed that the idol being prepared for the Raja of Gadwal should be given to him for Ram Bagh. He requested it, the request was granted, and the idol was installed in Ram Bagh with great ceremony in 1810. The third Nizam, Sikander Jah, attended that ceremony and granted a large jagir for the temple’s support. An annual jatra is celebrated on Ramnavami, when a rath or carriage conveying the idols is taken out in procession. The political relationships involved here were more overt than religious affiliations.

Another early temple, the Chitragupta temple, was built in 1810–1811 by the Srivastava Kayasth military man Duleh Rae, whose family was in Hyderabad by 1750. Duleh Rae constructed the temple in Uppuguda just beyond Shahalibanda and secured a jagir from the Nizam Sikander Jah for its support. The temple honoured Chitragupta, patron deity of the Kayasths, and after the Srivastava family died out in about 1900 (relatives were said to survive in Madras), the temple was transferred to the management of the Mathur Kayasth Malwalas, the family that headed the Daftar-i-Mal (revenue record office for the eastern half of the state) and the highest ranking noble family among the Kayasths.

Table 1. Temples founded or managed* by Kayasths in Hyderabad.47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Kayasth founder or manager*</th>
<th>Date of founding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ram Bagh</td>
<td>West of city</td>
<td>Bhavani Pershad Bhatnagar</td>
<td>1802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chitragupta</td>
<td>Uppuguda</td>
<td>Duleh Rae Srivastava; later, Malwalas*</td>
<td>1806–1811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Deval Bazar Rup Lal</td>
<td>Shahalibanda</td>
<td>Mathur, Malwalas</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Narsimji/Maya Ram</td>
<td>Shahalibanda</td>
<td>Maya Ram Saksera* Old; 1810*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Buchar Mal's temple</td>
<td>Shahalibanda</td>
<td>Buchar Mal Saksera</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lalita/Lalita Devi Bagh</td>
<td>Uppuguda</td>
<td>Mathur, Malwalas*</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Keshavgiri</td>
<td>South of city</td>
<td>Bansi Raja Saksera* Old; 1859*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ramchanderji</td>
<td>By Purana Pul</td>
<td>Bansi Raja Saksera*</td>
<td>1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ram Mandir</td>
<td>Shahalibanda</td>
<td>Bansi Raja Saksera*</td>
<td>1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Kali temple</td>
<td>Uppuguda</td>
<td>Isri Pershad Saksera*</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shankerji</td>
<td>Ghazibanda</td>
<td>Jaswant Rae Gaur</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Shankerji</td>
<td>Mir Jumla tank</td>
<td>Dwarka Pershad Saksera*</td>
<td>c 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Narsingh baba</td>
<td>Uppuguda</td>
<td>‘Khazanchi’ Tulja Ram Saksera*</td>
<td>c 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Shanker Bagh</td>
<td>Usman Ganj</td>
<td>S.K. Bhatnagar*</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = manager.
Malwalas began receiving the *jagir* grant made earlier to the Srivastava family, carrying out the supervision of the temple from around 1910 and sponsoring at least two annual jatras. Interestingly, the second *jatra* cost less because a dancing girl was not paid to perform, as had been customary; instead, *bhajans* on moral subjects were presented. Whether the temple became part of the family’s private estate or was being managed on behalf of the Kayasth community became a contentious issue later on. However, a nearby Kali temple in Uppuguda was by all accounts the temple of much greater religious significance to Kayasths in the past (and present). A cannon is still on the grounds, inscribed ‘first fired on 22 Ramzan 1197 H [1783] Sarkar Nizam Ali Khan’, and the troops of its Saksena patron (*serrishtahdar* of the *Khas Risala* or Special Forces in the mid-nineteenth century) were garrisoned on the temple grounds. A well and a sitting place (*batthak*) were constructed at the temple for the use of the troops and guns and gunpowder were once stored in the temple’s basement.

Not only Kayasths but other Hindu administrative officials built temples with state support, as the next three detailed examples show, and all three examples also demonstrate the state’s pluralistic tradition of religious patronage. Raja Raghu Ram Bahadur, a Brahmo-Khatri by caste, served as *vakil* or agent of several *samasthans* to the Nizam. He built the Kishen Bagh temple in 1822 on grounds that included an old Qutb Shahi mosque. The Nizam Sikander Jah granted a *jagir* for the temple and later granted an additional *jagir* for *naubat* or drum expenses, a rare distinction. The Kishen Bagh temple was dedicated to Lord Krishna and set in a garden outside the old city wall, and next to it was the *dargah* or tomb of Hazrat Syed Shah Najamullah (or Nadimullah) Husaini, a Muslim saint who had lived in the old mosque. Raja Raghu Ram had faith in him and constructed buildings for his *urs* or annual death commemoration, which the Raja’s family still celebrated in 1943. These religious sites reportedly attracted both Hindus and Muslims.

Another such temple was the Sitaram Bagh temple in Begum Bazar constructed by Puran Mal of the leading Marwari Agarwal banking firm, Mahanand Ram Puran Mal, in 1825. The temple’s grounds included a mosque from the earlier Qutb Shahi period, a structure that shared a stepwell with the temple. The temple was funded by *jagirs* granted as *inam* by the government. An Agarwal family history written in Hindi in the 1930s does not mention that the Nizam himself was present at the foundation-laying of the Sitaram Bagh temple, but that was asserted in an 1894 newspaper article on the controversy then over who should be managing the mosque. The family lived in premises in the temple compound, and two impressive *samadhis* or tombs of Mahanand Ram and Puran Mal were erected on the temple grounds.

Raja Shambu Pershad’s famous Kali temple was built near the Bohra Muslim locality in Husaini Alam on the street from Purana Pul to Mir Alam tank. Raja Shambu Pershad was a Marwari Agarwal, the grandson of Raja Roshan Rai, the *mutasaddi* or accountant who assisted the Diwan Azim ul Umra in negotiations with the Marathas in the 1790s. A favourite at court, he was in charge of the Central Treasury and holder of a *mansab* and *jagir* to maintain troops in the 1850s. High walls and a fine gateway sheltered a Dravidian style temple to Kali or Mahadevji; Ram, Hanuman and Tulja Devi were also worshipped. There was a large well, and Shambu Pershad’s *samadhi* was reportedly there (but see below). Kayasth Saksenas went there on Dasera and Marwaris helped support it in the 1960s, although before 1948 Kayasths and Khatris had reportedly been the chief donors. This temple in Devi Bagh survived despite its founder’s conversion to Islam. On 16 August 1857, Raja Shambu Pershad publicly declared his adherence to Islam and took the name Ghulam Rasul; he died on August 17 and was buried the next day at the tomb of Hazrat Moulvi Shuja-ud-din Sahib, whom he had revered. One story is that upon the
Raja’s death without heirs, the Endowment Department took his property and gave it to the Malwala Kayasth family to manage. Another account states that his property, including the temple, passed first to Nawab Khurshed Jah Bahadur in payment of debts owed to that Paigah noble, but the Brahman pujari or mutawali family paid off the debt and got the property released to the management of Raja Inderjit Bahadur, of the Malwala family, in the 1850s. The Malwala family managed the temple for some 80 years, until in about 1935 a court case decision handed the management of the temple to the pujari, now termed the mutawali, and it was registered that way with the Endowments Department in 1953.

The complex history of an old temple to Sri Keshavaswamy or Balaji Maharaj in Keshovgiri, related in several sources, once again shows the significant role of state support in the maintenance of Hindu religious institutions. Said in 1920 to date back 400–500 years, this temple south of the old city walls was patronized and newly endowed by several famous Hindu tawaifs or dancing girls around 1800, especially by the courtesan Chenna or Chana (other names for the locality are Chanarai ghat or Chandryanaguda). The temple pujaris or priests petitioned the Diwan Salar Jung (who took office in 1853) for assistance because the temple and its neighbourhood were infested with dacoits, and in 1859 the Diwan appointed the Saksena Kayasth Raja Girdhari Pershad Mahbub Nawazwunt, popularly known as Bansi Raja, to manage the temple on condition that the surrounding area be improved and settled. Bansi Raja, a resident of Husaini Alam and performer of many important functions for the Nizam’s Mughlai administration, stationed the Irregular Arab troops of which he was serrishtahdar on the temple grounds. Lands were donated to the temple by both Hindus and Muslims, including nobles from the Malwala, Peshkar (Chandu Lal) and Paigah families, and other lands were granted by the government, in one case as grazing land for cavalry units. Bansi Raja also held entertainments in the gardens of the temple, invited the Nizam to set up his hunting camp there, and sent his family there for refuge from plague epidemics in the city. The popular jatra Bansi Raja instituted at this temple, according to his son, was the origin of Hyderabad’s famous annual Industrial Exhibition. In 1887, a ‘wakf deed’ (wakf usually denotes Islamic endowments) provided for a management committee. From 1917 on, disagreements arose between Narsing Raj, Bansi Raja’s son and heir and the temple pujaris, but the latter lost the first case they filed; they tried again after the state’s incorporation into India in 1948, suing Bansi Raja’s grandson Nar Har Raj for control of the temple and its lands. The court documents try to untangle the various parcels of land and their purposes, but they certainly show that this large temple complex and its assets served many purposes.

The view from the state in the early twentieth century

Moving from individual histories of early temples, above, I now draw attention to the lists available in published sources that highlight Hindu temples and festivals in Hyderabad as state projects. The local historian Manik Rao Vithal Rao wrote from the vantage point of the state, making available archival and other government materials to the public. He published his seven-volume Urdu history of Hyderabad, Bustan-i-Asafiyah, from 1909 to 1932. In a section headed ‘Old Religious Fairs, Other Customs, Plays and Spectacles’, he described 15 temples and festivals, 3 of them associated with the Khatri family of Chandu Lal, 3 with business community families (Marwari, Gujarati, Gosain), 3 with Kayasth families, 1 with a Brahmo-Khatri family, 1 with a Rajput family, 1 with a Maharashtrian Brahmin family, and several events of uncertain affiliation. He lists them in this order: Karman Ghat, Ram Bagh, Keshovgiri, Deval Jhamsingh, Deval Jalalguda, Kishen Bagh,
Deval Murlidhar Das, Deval Sitaram Bagh, Deval Lakshman Bagh, Leela Janmashtmi, Nag Panchami, Ashhti Mela, Mela Petla Burj, Alwal Jatra and Mela Raj Bagh. Five of these have been discussed above, and Table 2 contains brief translations of the other 10 descriptions given by Rao, along with a few additional notes. Another local historian, Dr Dharmendra Prasad, briefly described 40 temples in Hyderabad and Secunderabad, working chiefly from oral histories and his own knowledge; a trained geographer, he died in 1988.

Two other lists in Hyderabad government publications emphasize state patronage of multi-religious institutions and events. These lists were put out in the 1940s as India approached independence and the Nizam’s state was threatened by the increasingly divisive role of religion in the Indian nationalist movement. In 1940, the Director of Statistics Mazhar Husain published *A List of Uruses, Melas, Jatras, Etc. in H.E.H. the Nizam’s Dominions*. The 239 page book was deemed useful to not only the Ecclesiastical Department but the Revenue and Local Fund, Police, Medical and Sanitation, Railways and Bus Services, and Agricultural and Industries Departments. In the preface, Husain explained:

In the scheme of life, man has wisely provided some useful diversions from the dreary and monotonous routine of the daily life. Such diversions are in the nature of periodic Festivities, Melas and Jatras. They are associated with agriculture at different stages, or with the memory of saints and heroes or with the fear of evil spirits causing periodical epidemics. Advantage is also taken of such occasions by the village community to exhibit for sale their field produces and industrial wares. Thus the mela or jatra has become a socio-religious-economic institution and has assumed such a degree of importance that Government have framed rules and regulations not only for the comfort and safety of the pilgrims but also for the regular marketing of village produces and wares.

The book even lists the *palkhies* or processions passing through the westernmost districts, presumably on their way to and from festivals in the adjacent Marathi-speaking region. Of the 41 events listed in Hyderabad city, nine were Hindu ones, including one of the nine events connected with Muharram. These events were (note the overlap with many of the temples discussed above or in Table 1): the *jatra* of Ramchander in Murlidhar Bagh, the *jatra* at Sitaram Bagh, Jham Singh Jhanda at Sultan Shahi, Hanuman *mela* at Lingampalli, Narasimlu *rath* at Mallepalli, Kalka Devi at Bagh Shambu Pershad, Sri Ram Mandir at Gawliguda, Mallana at Imliban and *jatra* at Kishan Bagh.

Up until the end of the state in 1948, the state administration continued to fund and supervise important Hindu institutions and events, and it publicly proclaimed its role in the face of increasingly communal politics both within and outside the state. In 1943, the state’s Information Bureau put out another publication highlighting photos and brief descriptions of 26 prominent houses of worship, shrines and religious buildings in Hyderabad. In the city, the temple of Ramchandraj built in the time of the second Nizam by Baba Balak Das is included, with a photo of the cradle donated to the temple by Nizam Ali Khan; the text mentions a *jagir* gifted to it by the fourth Nizam. The Kishen Bagh temple is included; its *jagir* of Rs 18,000 per year and its good relations with the ‘Durgah of Kishen Bagh’ (the Muslim saint is not named) are mentioned. The Sitaram Bagh temple is included; its *jagir* of nearly Rs 50,000 per year, its annual *jatra* and its government-supervised management committee are mentioned. The temple of Jham Singh in the Kulsampura Karwan Sahu locality is included; its *jagir* from the third Nizam of Rs 8408 per year, its *jatra* and its Ecclesiastical Department-supervised management committee are mentioned. Finally, the temple or *math* (monastery) of Baba Khaim Das is included; its grant of Rs 11,521 per...
Karman Ghat. While little is known about the history of the temple and jatra at Karman Ghat, near Sarurnagar, the temple took its name from a nearby village and is thought to be quite old. Maharajah Chandu Lal granted a village (Dharapur) with a revenue collection of Rs 1500 a year for support of the deval, and Raja Eshwant Rao, known as Urub Eshwant Rao, because he was the serrishthahdar of Arab troops, supervised the grant to the temples of Hanuman and Ramechander until 1871–1872 (his death), when the Dharapur revenues were put under control of Parbhani district officials and went into the Government Treasury. It became difficult to get the revenues for the temple then, so the temple establishment, priests and guards, began to be paid from the ‘head of account under daily expenditure’ and the amount was gradually reduced (these reductions were part of the ‘reform’ or phasing out of the Mughlai administration from the late nineteenth century).

Deval Jalalguda. This temple, with an idol of Balaji, was named after the village of Jalalguda near Sarurnagar and was built there by Rani Rukma bibi, mother of Raja Nanak Baksh (the Chandu Lal Peshkari family) and featured a jatra by at least 1241H/1825–1826. Privately supported by the Peshkari family, the grounds include a garden of Maharajah Kishen Pershad.

Murlidhar Das. This temple in Troop Bazar stems from the mid-nineteenth century, when Raja Murlidhar Das purchased a garden in 1260H/1844 from Khalil Nawaz Jung/Khalil-ur Rehman and built a deval there in 1261H/1845. The idol of Deviji or the Goddess was installed in 1262H, 1 year later, and the jatra is celebrated in Poonam of Magh (full moon); it is maintained and managed by the Murlidhar [Gujarati banking] family.

Deval Lakshman Bagh. Near the dargah of Husain Shah Vali in western Hyderabad, this temple holds its annual jatra on the full moon of Magh Shudh. Its founder and year of founding are unknown, although the founder’s name was probably Lakshman. The jatra began in 1885 sanvat bikrami (1829) and the temple is managed by the Marwari Seth Moti Lal and is funded from the ilaqa of Raja Shiv Lal, next head of the firm of Shiv Lal Moti Lal.

Leela Janmashtmi. This festival dramatizing the events of Janmashtami, the birth of Krishna, was begun in 1855–1856 in Aurangabad and brought to Hyderabad by its Saksena Kayasth patron, Raja Isri Pershad, in 1857–1858. Serrishtahdar of the Khas Risala or Special Cavalry (a modernizing military unit rather than a Mughlai one), the Raja helped Salar Jung put down an Afghan uprising in 1857, so Salar Jung arranged partial state funding for the festival. It was held at a temple established in Isri Pershad’s Husaini Alam residence. After the Raja’s death without an heir during the Diwanship of Vikarul Umra, a sum was fixed for the temple and the performance in 1312 1st Rajab H [1894–1895], presumably the same as the government grant of 1206 F [1894–1895].

Nag Panchami. This fair featured worship of a stone serpent and was first documented in 1826–1827 but had been celebrated even earlier; in that year it was held near the deval or palace of the Paigah nobleman, Nawab Rasheeduddin Khan Vikar ul Umra. After his death in 1881, it moved closer to Vikar ul Umara’s son Khurshed Jah’s residence. No state grant seems to have been given, although small shops were set up every year as part of the fair.

Ashtmi Mela. Also known as the Pardeso ka mela, or gathering of northern people, this occurred 8 days after Holi and initially was held near Mahmud Bagh, the garden of Jamadar Qamruddin Khan Mandozi next to Nampalli and Public Garden Road. Later it was held at the tomb of Hazrat Shah Khamosh or Nabi Bagh in Aghapur. When the Shah Sahib died in 1288H/1870, this fair shifted to near Raja Srinivas Rao’s bungalow opposite Chaoni Raja ka Bagh.

Mela Petla Burj. This fair started in 1928 sanvat (1872), during the period of Khaki Baba. The idol of Krishna was placed in the deval by Hari Narayan Gosain, and there were other idols too. In the flood of 1326 H/1908 the temple was seriously damaged.
Table 2. (Continued).

Alwal Jatra. This is held annually at a temple built by Raja Chandu Lal in Alwal village [beyond Secunderabad]; it is in the Peshkari estate, which funds the temple and jatra. Under the supervision of Raja Ghansham Das during Narinder Bahadur’s time [the late 1840s], the date of the jatra was changed and a rath or chariot was built to take the idol of Balaji out in procession; Hindus from the city attended.86

Mela Raj Bagh. The fair takes place at Raj Bagh also known as Chandu Lal’s baradari; it began after Chandu Lal’s death in 1845, when the garden came under the supervision of the government. In 1847, on Dhulandi Day, the day after Holi, the fair was begun, and many Hindus, especially Marwari sahus or bankers, participated. People come singing and playing instruments, preparing sweets in the garden and enjoying themselves. A big house in the middle of the garden features presentations of vocal music, and people sprinkle pink coloured powder on each other (typical of Holi).87

year and the villages granted to it for its upkeep, one in 1240H, one in 1250H (about 1824 and 1834), and one unspecified, are mentioned.88

Conclusion
I have shown the development and maintenance in Hyderabad of an Indo-Muslim ruling tradition that shared in a distinctively South Asian tradition of secularism or pluralism. As the Nizam’s court settled in the old city and the Mughlai administration developed in the early nineteenth century, the sources of temple support and the uses to which the temples and their lands were put provided valuable insights into changing political relationships over time. Military builders and sponsors gave way to patrons from the Mughlai bureaucracy and the nobility. Furthermore, state patronage of temples and jatras persisted even as founders and their lines ended, because state officials called upon new patrons to assume responsibility for temples associated with their own communities or with other prominent Hindus.

Hyderabad state’s patronage of temples and other Hindu institutions and events and the participation of Hindus and their temples in Hyderabad’s Indo-Muslim culture are not to be read as polytropism or cosmopolitanism,89 nor should they be read as syncretism or hybridity.90 The founding and development of Hindu temples in Hyderabad, with the full support of Muslim rulers and the Indo-Muslim state, engaged nobles, officials and other key figures in the Mughlai administration in the creative construction of a plural society. This plural society shared characteristics with earlier Hindu and Indo-Muslim kingdoms in the subcontinent, characteristics arguably adopted by British India and independent India as well. Tony Stewart, Gayatri Spivak and Finbarr Flood have found translation theory useful when analysing changing religious and linguistic landscapes in premodern India.91 Their ideas buttress Richard Eaton’s and other authors’ compelling arguments for the indigenization of Muslims and Islamic traditions ‘as natural elements of India’s cultural landscape’.92 Stewart highlights the role of religion in the Muslim settlement of the Bengali frontier, and he does not mean doctrinal purity or religious practice but religious power, used and understood as imposing meaningful moral order on an unruly landscape.93 Similarly, the Nizams of Hyderabad employed Hindu officials and institutions as well as Muslim ones to expand and tame Hyderabad’s urban frontiers (Bansi Raja and the Keshovgiri temple best exemplify this), mutually empowering both state and religion. As Eaton points out, citing
Muzaffar Alam, the interpretation of Islamic law as requiring a king to ensure the well-being of all the diverse groups in his kingdom, not just the Muslims, was the interpretation inherited by the Mughals in South Asia. The Nizams of Hyderabad inherited and applied that interpretation as well, one that fit well with Indic ruling traditions.

Notes
1. I am especially grateful to Scott Kugle and Alka Patel for their comments.
3. Alison Shah has shown shifts in patronage from Shia ashurkhanas under the Qutb Shahis and the early Nizams to Sufi shrines in the nineteenth century to pan-Islamic hybrid buildings in the twentieth century: Shah, *Islam and the Politics of Heritage*. See also Asher, ‘Mapping Hindu-Muslim Identities’, for a pioneering comparison of temples and mosques in urban landscapes, focusing on architecture and scale rather than politics and patronage.
5. Hyderabad’s cultural history stems from the Shia-ruled Bahmani sultanate from the mid-fourteenth century and several of that sultanate’s five successors sultanates (Bijapur, Golconda, Bidar, Berar and Ahmednagar) from the early sixteenth century.
7. Stewart, ‘In Search of Equivalence’, argues against applying academic models of hybridity and syncretism to encounters between ‘Hindus’ and ‘Muslims’, models assuming the production of things new and different from either ‘original part’, things usually thought unstable and inferior to the highly idealized and rigidly bounded ‘originais’.
9. See the essays in Palsson, *Beyond Boundaries*.
10. Gisli Palsson suggests the term ‘cultural dyslexia’ to describe the ‘inability to read the alien, cultural worlds of other people’, discussing not only ethnographic but transnational political attempts at translation in the contemporary world, p. 23–4, in Palsson, *Beyond Boundaries*. Ulf Hannerz, in the same volume, discusses mediation across cultures, likening cultures to languages: ‘Mediations in the Global Ecumene’.
11. Nasir Khan (1748–1750) and Salabat Jung (1750–1762) were not titled Asaf Jah and are not counted as Nizams; the Nizams II through VII are Nizam Ali Khan (1762–1803), Sikander Jah (1803–1829), Nasiruddaula (1829–1857), Asifuddaula (1857–1869), Mahbub Ali Khan (1869–1911) and Osman Ali Khan (1911–1948).
12. See Gordon, ‘Maratha Patronage of Muslim Institutions’, for a similar situation, where new rulers continued grants from previous rulers.
13. Rao, *Bustan*, vol. I, 308–10. Around 1869, after the delineation of modern administrative districts, a Department of Mutafarriqat (miscellaneous) took over ecclesiastical affairs and the Revenue Secretary sanctioned its actions until about 1875, when the Diwan Salar Jung, unable to establish a separate department of grants and endowments, tried various other administrative arrangements. The Diwan’s son Salar Jung II became Diwan after his father’s death and succeeded in establishing a separate department in 1293 F (1884). The department functioned variously under Mutafarriqat, Judicial, Police and General departments. In 1302 H (1886) serais were included along with mosques, tombs, temples, urs (plural of urs, death anniversary), ashurkhanas, and dharmsalas, and the Wala Jahi grants were also included. Before 1305 H (1888), temples in the districts were supervised by tahuqdar and subahdar; only in 1306 H (1889) did Hyderabad city temples come under supervision of the Ecclesiastical Department, at least for applications for repairs. In 1304 F (1893) an order was issued that the Ecclesiastical Department was to supervise and control the temples in both districts and cities (this meant adding Hindu temples in the districts to its responsibilities, paying more attention to Hindus). Rao, *Bustan*, vol. I, 311–15.
14. In Hyderabad city, only two ashurkhanas were supervised by the government, Husaini Alam and Panjashah, whereas seven dharmsalas or serais were supervised by the government, three affiliated with Hindus and the rest with Muslims or unaffiliated: Serai Miyan Miskh by Purana Pul, Serai Raja Kundaswami in Secunderabad, Serai Math Balakdas in Kachiguda, Serai Sitarambagh, Serai Asafnagar, Serai Karwan and Serai Tipukhan. Rao, *Bustan*, vol. I, 309.


18. Muharram was celebrated in villages by non-Muslims throughout the Telugu-speaking region of the Nizam’s dominions as well as in Hyderabad city, as Naqvi, *Muslim Religious Institutions*; Naqvi, *The Iranian Afaqiques Contribution*; and Naqvi and Rao, *The Muhrram Ceremonies*, show conclusively.


20. This comes from a website terming the central shrine an *ashurkhana*, ‘AshoorKhana’. Scott Kugle points out that there is not an *ashurkhana* at the top of the hill but what would be more appropriately termed a *bargah* (Shia term) or *dargah* (Sufi term), a relic-shrine. A *chilla*, he states, commenting on another version, would be a small shrine commemorating a place where a Muslim saint meditated or visited, a place often but not always associated with Abdul Qadir Jilani, twelfth century Iraqi founder of the Qadiri Sufi order. Commenting further, on the Rang Ali version above, Kugle speculates that this relates to a procession to Moula Ali hill traditionally starting in the old city at ‘Khirk Rang Ali Shah’, probably a small gate in the old city wall, named after a Sufi there who led a procession to Moula Ali hill and who called Hazrat Ali his *pir* or spiritual guide; this procession took place on 17–18 Rajab, not on the death date of Ali (and therefore not an *urs*) but a few days after his birth date: email of 2 July 2010.

21. Kugle, ‘Mah Laqa Bai’, writes that she was born in Hyderabad in 1768 and died in 1824–1825; her family was descended from Sayyids on both sides at the time her grandmother in Ahmedabad in Gujarat was forced to migrate to the Deccan. Her life story carefully explains how Mah Laqa Bai’s mother and her elder stepsister, by a Rajput prince, became dancing girls and became famous and honourable through concubinage and marriage to important nobles in Hyderabad. (Mah Laqa Bai’s elder stepsister reportedly became the third wife of the Diwan Ruknuddaula, whose tomb is near that of Mah Laqa Bai and her mother.) An oral history (Narayan, November 3, 1965) claims she was born a Hindu in the Bogulkunta/Nagula Chinta area of Shahalibanda (to Raj Kunwar Bai, her mother’s name in both versions, but one taken later in life in the first version) but became a Muslim. This version names her four powerful patrons or lovers as Raja Chandu Lal, Ghansyi Miyan, Raja Rao Rumbha and Afzaluddaula; the last name, that of the fourth Nizam is certainly wrong as he was born just after her death (possibly the second or third Nizam was meant).

22. A Punjabi Khatri, this powerful nobleman and state official also patronized Sikhs in the state: he recruited numbers of Akali-Nihang Sikhs from Nanded into his bodyguard and this became the Sikh Irregular unit, the Jamiat-i-Sikhan, by 1820; the Raja also granted a *jagir* of five villages to the Guru Gobind Singh shrine at Nanded in the 1820s: Singh, ‘The Deccani Sikhs’, 82–4.

23. Rao Rumbha had two sons by his Hindu wife and three by a Muslim courtesan. He headed a unit of 600 cavalry and for that and personal expenses he held a *jagir* of 5 lakhs. When he went into debt to the Mehdavi Pathans, Raja Chandu Lal reduced his military unit and put the Raja on a pension: Lal, *Yadgar*, 61.


25. Khan, *Gulzar-i Asafiyah*, 559, mentions three other *jatras*, one at Raja Chandu Lal’s personal temple (probably in Shahalibanda, although he also patronized one at Alwal near Secunderabad), one at Ram Bagh on Ram Navami and one at Kishen Bagh that included a rath or chariot procession that went around the whole city.


27. He became deputy *peshkar* in 1797, then *peshkar* and finally briefly officiated as Diwan in 1822: Government of Hyderabad, *Chronology*, 74, 81, 97, 99, 101, 94, index 27. Raja Rajinder, the son of Hanumant Rao, was also known as Madhavachari; he first got a job under Raja Rai Rayan, after whose death Rae Rayan’s son Raja Sham Raj appointed Raja Rajinder as his *vakil* in Poona during the time of Ghulam Syed Khan Azim ul Umra: Lal, *Yadgar*, 62–3.


32. In 1884 the Ecclesiastical Department was established and began supervising religious establishments, explicitly including religious establishments in the city and suburbs in its jurisdiction in 1889: Rao, *Bustan*, vol. I, 320–11, 315.

33. These temples do not seem to have received funds from the Nizam as many other temples and mosques did. Buchar Mal’s temple had 13 shops nearby, perhaps generating support for the temple as was done for mosques by shops attached to them.

34. Termed *Buchar Mal ki tatti* for its bamboo screen, Buchar Mal’s *ashurkhana* or *imambara* survived for many years. See Hollister, *The Shi’a of India*, 165–8, for a description of such screens in Hyderabad.


36. The former temple premises were rented out for residential purposes in the 1960s when I viewed them with Narayan, February 28, 1965. The two versions were given by the mother of Saksena, February 21, 1965, and Pershad and Suxena, February 21, 1965.

37. The term’s origin is unclear, some deriving it from *suratval*, or ‘those resembling’, and others from *sarhadval* or ‘those on the border’. Other terms used for this group in Hyderabad were *hul hul bacce*, ‘mixed children’, and *khijri*, a mixed rice and pulses dish.

38. The politician’s relatives were living there and managing the temple in the later twentieth century. Interviews with Narayan, February 28 and November 3, 1965, and with Pershad and Suxena, February 21, 1966. The shift of the image to Uppuguda is my conclusion from the interviews.


40. Personal observation and interview with Dr Singh, January 9, 2009.

41. This map has been separated from its book and I have not succeeded in tracing its origin (I bought it separately in the 1960s), but S.P. Shorey, who saw a copy in Shah Manzoor Alum’s now-dispersed collection, dated it 1845 (the Afzal Ganj bridge is not there but the Chaderghat one is). ‘Ram Baug or Mooskapett’ appears as one of seven named gardens; many others are indicated by trees and flowers.

42. Munn, *Hyderabad Municipal Survey*. Leonard Munn, geologist and first head of the Well Sinking Department, brought water to villages in the famine tracts of Raichur; 4 years after his death in 1935 he was being remembered and confused with a local god Manappa, according to Crofton, *List of Inscriptions*, xvi.

43. Rao, *Bustan*, vol. II, 748, gives the *jagir*’s worth at Rs 12,000 per year; Pershad, *Farkhundah Bunyad*, 110–11; ‘Statement of Endowment Register’, serial number 9201, mentions that the temple is in mofussil territory, supervised by the Collector at Khairatabad. Pershad also mentions Devi’s Deval, a temple to Tulja Devi built adjacent to Ram Bagh by the grandson of Bhavani Pershad, Raja Manulal Bhatnagar, with a pillared *mandap* and also a Shiv *lingam* with Nandi before it: 112.
For titles and gifts to this family, see Government of Hyderabad, Chronology, 77, 79, 82, 90. For jagirs to it, Asnad-i-Jagir, vol. 1, no. 12, serial numbers 174/11 and 225/11 and vol. 3, no. 14, serial numbers 360/3 and 330/26; also Asnad-i-Jagir alif-ye, vol. 3, serial number 1288.

45. Pershad, Farkhundah Bunyad, 40–1.


47. Sources: interviews with Narayan (for 1, 2, 6, 11, 12, 13 and 14, February 28 and November 3, 1965); Raj (for 8, 9 and 10, May 30, 1965); Bhatnagar (for 1 and 15, November 4, 1965); Pershad and Saxena (for 4, February 21, 1966); and Nigam (for 13, November 27, 1965). Also Khan, Gulzar-i Asafiyah, 559 (for 1); Rao, Bustan, vol. I, 311–18, and Bustan, vol. II, 748–9 (for 8 and 1); Kamil, The Communal Problem, 42–3 (for 1, 11, 7 and 15); and Pershad, Farkhundah Bunyad, 40–1, 88–9, 96 and 110–12 (for 8, 2, 6 and 13). See also Endowment Office of the AP State Government, ‘Statement of Endowment Register’ serial numbers 9201, 188 and 603, for 1, 7 and 15, and ‘Budget files’ and ‘Current payments’ records, Finance Department and Pension Payments offices for 7 and 15.


49. Serrishta Amur-i-Mazhabi, file number 2633/2, concerning efforts to get the Malwalas to register the temple with the Serrishta and later with the Endowment Office. Letters in the file from the daftar-i mazhabi, the daftar-i Shiv Raj, the daftar-i jagirat, cover 1921–1943 and the Malwalas had not complied by that date. According to Hakim Vicerai, a neighbour of the Srivastava family, when Lal Pershad of Lal Darwaza died without heirs the government took the jagirs. After about ten years heirs appeared who claimed it, but the government instead awarded the temple and jagirs to Raja Shiv Raj of the Malwala family, and then Shiv Raj’s family gave it to the Kayasth Association to manage: Interviews, Vicerai, November 4, and Saxena, May 26, 1965. See also the report that Raja Dharmkaran Bahadur gave the management to the Kayasth Sadr Sabha in 1945, appointing a management committee, ‘Qaumi news’ of 1945.

50. The Chitragupta temple was the only temple to which no non-religious uses were ascribed by Kayasth informants, who testified to the unimportance of the temple to the community: 1965 interviews with Roy Mahboob Narayan, Benkat Pershad and Ishvar Raj Saxena. There was no pujari (priest) there in the 1960s.

51. Visit to the temple with Narayan, November 13, 1965, and again, with his son Mahtab Roy and Dr Alka Patel, January 9, 2009.

52. Khan, Tuzuk-i Mahbubiyah, vol. II, 412; Lal, Yadgar, 182; Rao, Bustan, vol. II, dates the jatra from at least 1242 H/1826–1827; ‘Hyderabad Information Release’; Alikhan, Hyderabad, 170; Mudiraj, Pictorial Hyderabad, vol. II, 233–5. Prasad, Social and Cultural Geography, states (but without giving a source) that while Raghoram’s younger son Raghunathram was entrusted with management of the temple, the older son Dilsukhram built a dargah for the Muslim saint Hazrath Piran Shah and procured a jagir for its support: 66. Trimbak Lal, son of Rae Mohan Lal, custodian of the deval in the early twentieth century, still held the jagir of three villages meant for temple expenditures and the jatra. Minor sons Nand Lal and Mog Raj got equal shares and inheritance was sanctioned to the eldest son Triambak Lal, on condition that he would care for his mother Tulja Bai and care for and marry off his three sisters Tara Bai, Champa Bai and Makdooti Bai, mid-Shaban 1348 H; shares also were fixed for Vasudev and Gyanilal. Ali, Anwar-i-Asafiyah, 333.

53. Alka Patel and I found the same situation at the Jham Singh Deval in Hyderabad, where an earlier mosque on the grounds was hidden behind a new and ugly rathkhana (carriage house) and disavowed by temple authorities in January, 2009.

54. ‘Sitarambagh Temple case’ states that ‘A respectable Hyderabad merchant’ had been preserving the mosque and appointing Muslim managers for some 70 years but then an old mouluvi claimed it and the Hyderabad government got involved, leading to petitions submitted to the Nizam, the Resident and the Viceroy by leading merchants. See also The Bombay Gazette, 12 April 1894, The Deccan Budget, 13 April 1894, and The Hyderabadee, 30 April 1894, all in
the Andhra Pradesh State Archives Clippings Collection, for more details (but no resolution). When Alka Patel and I visited the site and photographed the temple and mosque in January of 2009, some temple authorities denied the presence of an adjacent mosque, while the Muslims living next to the mosque said a wall had been built separating it from the temple grounds just after 1948 (and a stepwell, once one but possibly now also separated, appears on both sides of the wall).

55. According to that invaluable Persian court diary, Government of Hyderabad, Chronology, Mahanand Sahu in 1811 stopped a beggars’ riot near Char Minar by giving out alms, and Mahanand Ram’s son Puran Mal Seth sent manja requisites to the court in 1839 for the marriage of the daughter of Jahanparwar Begum, as did bankers Kishen Das, Lachmi Das and Jaganath Das, Gujaratis of Karwan. The Begum was a consort of Sikandar Jah, Asaf Jah III and granddaughter of the Diwan Arastu Jah. Puran Mal sent his gifts on August 20, the day of the mehndi ceremony, and the Gujaratis sent theirs the next day, August 21, when the bridegroom left for the bride’s residence: index 17, p. 217–18. The manja gifts are of clothes, often yellow garments, in connection with a marriage, bismillah, circumcision or birthday, and the gifts sent by relatives and high dignitaries are taken out in procession: glossary 10.

56. Jagirs were granted in 1832–1833 and the chief idols were Ram and Lakshman, according to Rao, Bustan, vol. II, 751. Family members today maintain property in Lakshmangadh, their place of origin in Rajasthan, and a temple in Pushkar as well, the former seen and photographed by Alka Patel in 2007 and the latter by Alka Patel and me in 2008.

57. Government of Hyderabad, Chronology index 34.


60. The first account comes from Kayasths, from Pershad, Farkhundah Bunyad, 68; and an interview with Saxena, May 26, 1965. For the second, Shantilal, ‘Devi Bagh Temple’. This brief article rebuts an earlier one by Raseel Ahluwalia stating that the temple was a Kayastha one now being managed by the Marwari community (which was what I had been told in the 1960s).

61. These include Bansri Raja’s own memoirs, Pershad, Kulliyat-i Baqi [Baqi was his takhallus or pen name]; Raj, Dard-i Baqi, an Urdu memoir by Bansri Raja’s son; Judgment (Keshovgiri temple case); Pershad, Farkhundah Bunyad; and Rao, Bustan, vol. II, 749.

62. Chenna, alleged to be mistress to the father of Vikarul Umra, one of the Paigah nobles, granted the main garden (other names for the locality are Chanarai ghat or Chandryanaguda) and her samadhi is said to be there, the twaif Venkata gave a mango garden, and another, Padagala Mutam, gave a garden, Pershad, Farkhundah Bunyad, 88; Judgment (Keshovgiri temple case), 11–12.

63. Judgment (Keshovgiri temple case), 1–16.

64. Girdhari Pershad, ‘Keshav Namah’, 1–21, in Kulliyat-i Baqi; Rao, Bustan, vol. II, 749; Raj, Dard-i-Baqi, 21, where Bansri Raja’s interest in temples is attributed partly to his loss of children (he lost four sons between 1886 and 1890, see Leonard, Social History, 184); interview with Raj, August 4, 1965.

65. See Patel, ‘Transcending Religion’, for a fascinating instance of translation in exactly the senses proposed by Stewart, ‘In Search of Equivalence’. She analyses a bilingual mosque inscription of 1264 CE as essentially a wakf deed naming a major Hindu donor as the mutawali of the mosque. Patel sees this as evidence of how ‘socio-religiously disparate communities of the city were found together in a common enterprise: the foundation and subsequent maintenance of a mosque’. She concludes that, rather than evidence of pliant or flexible cultural categories, this was evidence of ‘the spontaneous translation of concepts among groups participating in a shared endeavor’ and of ‘the integrity of social, cultural and religious identities’, Patel, ‘Transcending Religion’, 145.

66. The committee consisted of two members of Bansri Raja’s family, a member of the Malwala family, the temple pujari, members of the families of Murlidhar Tiwari and Bhagat Ram, and the talukdar of Ilqa Keshavpet (Keshovgiri). By farman of the Nizam, at Bansri Raja’s death in 1896 the temple’s management went to The Court of Wards in the Sarfi Khas (Bansri Raja’s son, Narsing Raj, was a minor); it was released to Narsing Raj in 1903, according to Judgment (Keshovgiri temple case), 1–2.

67. Judgment (Keshovgiri temple case) concluded that the plaintiffs were pujaris but the family had not been mutawali, dharmadhikari or rukn-i-deval, while the defendant was the mutawali
or manager whose family had received Crown grants (not jagirs) or held some of the lands as joint family property. The temple was held not by a wakf because it was not registered, and also the management committee had never been convened as no method of appointing the members had been specified. The Endowment Office stated that the defendant as mutawali and as holder of some charitable endowment properties could be sued, but since the case was pending before the High Court, it could not make a legal decision; it recommended settlement by dividing up the assets. Nar Har Raj, grandson of Bansi Raja, told me that he had handed the temple over to the Court to manage in 1958: interview August 4, 1965.

69. Prasad, ‘Temples of the Twin Cities’; see also his ‘Place-Names in Hyderabad City’; and his (Dharmender Pershad) ‘Myths of Twin Cities’.
70. Husain, *List of Uruses, Melas, Jatras*. We see from the contents that, as in Rao’s *Bustan*, vol. II discussion, these three terms simply mean popular religious festivals in Hyderabad, transcending their more circumscribed original connotations of the death anniversaries of Muslim saints, temple or locality fairs, and temple pilgrimages. Scott Kugle and Alka Patel both commented on these more general usages, the former in an email of July 2, 2010, the latter in a note on the draft article, June 30, 2010.
71. Husain, *List of Uruses, Melas, Jatras*, 2–3. In the Atraf-i-Balda, the greater metropolitan area or the five talukas surrounding the city, 26 of the 33 events listed were Hindu, including the Alwal jatra and a Balaji jatra by Falaknuma (this could be the Keshavgiri temple): Husain, *List of Uruses, Melas, Jatras*, 6–10.
72. Government of Hyderabad, *Prominent Houses of Worship*. The introduction offers some statistics about religious institutions in the state, cash and other grants to them, and it states that 125 Muslim institutions are being managed by Hindus paid by the government pays. Then come a poem and a farman from the seventh Nizam about harmonious relations, vii, ix. Among the 26 buildings are ten Muslim mosques and shrines, and five Hindu temples in the city. Buildings in the districts include five Hindu temples, one Jain temple, one Sikh gurdwara, and three Christian churches. Finally, there was a Parsi fire temple in Secunderabad.
73. Rao, *Bustan*, vol. II, 742–53. This section begins with Muslim sites and celebrations: Bibi ka Alam, Nal Saheb, Husaini Alam, Langar, Panjah Shah, Urs Koh-i Moula, Qadam-o-Rasul, Chashma-i Bibi, the alams of Tarban and Sankesar Well. After discussing the Hindu temples and melas, he moves on to the Theosophical Society and other new religious customs and spectacles.
74. His nickname was mentioned by Narayan, November 3, 1965, as we located his residence in Shahalibanda on the 1911 maps of the old city prepared under Leonard Munn; the Raja appears as Raja Aiswant Rao in Government of Hyderabad, *Chronology*, receiving a sarpech and jigha (jewelled headband and ornament) in 1856 and dying in 1872: Government of Hyderabad, *Chronology*, 280, 311; his son Vinayak Rao committed suicide by gun in 1859: Government of Hyderabad, *Chronology*, 287. The garden at Karman Ghat is mentioned in Government of Hyderabad, *Chronology* as a place where the Nizam spent five days for shikar or hunting in January of 1779: 58.
77. Ibid., 750–1.
80. Ibid., 751–2.
81. Isri Pershad migrated from Aurangabad in time to help the Diwan Salar Jung put down an Afghan uprising in 1857. Isri Pershad also instituted the observance of Ramnavami in his Husaini Alam residential neighbourhood, a family tradition brought from Aurangabad. Endowment Office records show a government grant to the temple of Rs 85.70 per month, as of Finance Department circular 3516 dated 9 November 1306 F (1894–1895); Raja Isri Pershad was recorded as mutawali of the deval, its hereditary manager.
83. Ibid.; Jamadar Qamruddin Khan Mandozi led a large unit of Afghan horsemen and loaned money to the state in the early nineteenth century; he died in 1848: Government of Hyderabad,
K. Leonard

84. Khaki Baba’s Udasi or Udaseen math is in Husaini Alam close to the Husaini Alam gateway and Alka Patel and I observed and photographed it in 2009. See also Pershad, ‘Myths of Twin Cities’, vol. II, 10, for more details. Pershad writes that the first Nizam was present when Khaki Baba took samadhi and gave cash and land grants which have continued under the Sarf-i Khas, or the Nizam’s private estate, into the 1980s.


86. Ibid., 752–3.

87. Ibid., 753.


89. Michael Carrithers has proposed polytropy as a term for India’s ‘spiritual cosmopolitanism’, which he also terms ‘Indic eclecticism’, ‘ambiguous [religious] identity’ and ‘religious pluralism’, evidenced at the individual level: Carrithers, ‘On Polytropy’. The quotes are from 833, 831 and 832, respectively. Bigelow, in Sharing the Sacred, beautifully delineates Malerkotla’s civic culture, one based on collective memories of peace and the sharing of sacred sites; she, like Carrithers, is investigating individual understandings of belief and practice.

90. Tony Stewart argues powerfully against applying academic models of hybridity and syncretism to encounter between ‘Hindus’ and ‘Muslims’: ‘In Search of Equivalence’.

91. From Spivak, what is most relevant here is her analysis of the Bengali saint Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa: ‘Islam took its place among his imaginings and his iterations of the self… these moves acknowledged the imperative to translate rather than its denial for the sake of identity… ’ Spivak, ‘Translating into English’, 103. Flood draws heavily on Stewart in his 2009 book. Stewart, ‘In Search of Equivalence’, suggests two levels of translation that I think applicable to Hyderabad, ‘dynamic equivalence’ and ‘shared metaphoric worlds’. I develop these ideas about translation more in another article where they are even more applicable, Leonard, ‘Indo-Muslim Culture in Hyderabad’.

92. Eaton, ‘Introduction’, 1. Eaton also uses the term ‘translation’ as he argues for the many ways in which Islamic traditions thrived and changed in the South Asian environment, the ways in which the double-movement between local cultures and Islam’s universal norms led to enormous variation but overarching themes: 3–9. Eaton and his colleagues in the India’s Islamic Traditions volume focus on the overarching Islamic themes, while I focus here on Indic kingship traditions of pluralism and patronage. Like my analysis here, Sumit Guha’s analysis of pre-modern Marathi records found that religious authorities and institutions of all types could not operate independently of the state and participated in local politics: Guha, ‘Religion, Authority, and Political Power’.


Bibliography


Asnad-i Jagir alif-ye (an alphabetical listing of jagirdars). Section R2 of the Andhra Pradesh State Archives.


Kugle, Scott. Email to author of July 2, 2010.


Lal, Ram Kumar. Interview, January 10, 1966, Hyderabad.


Pershad, Benkat, and Ishwar Raj Saxena. Interview, November 9, 1965, Hyderabad.


Pershad, Satguru, with Mahinder Raj Suxena. Interview, February 21, 1965, Hyderabad.

Persian Records concerning titles given by the Nawab of Arcot. Private collection of Dr. Muhammad Ghaus of Madras.


Raj, Nar Har. Interview, August 4, 1965, Hyderabad.


Serrishta Amur-i-Mazhabi records. Endowment Office, Hyderabad.


Singh, Vinay Kumar. Interview, January 9, 2009, Hyderabad.

‘Sitarambagh Temple Case’. *The Evening Mail*, April 17, 1894, in the Andhra Pradesh State Archives Clipping Collection.