CHAPTER 14

Elizabeth and Akbar: The Religion of the Ruler?

Can a ruler use religious conflict to strengthen his or her own rule?Can a ruler's religious preference be the basis of unity in a religiously divided state?

It seemed like a great idea at the time. In 1530 Catholic and Lutheran negotiators devised what they thought was a simple plan to end the first of many European religious wars that accompanied the Reformation begun by Martin Luther. It was the Latin phrase "cuius regio, eius religio" ("the religion of the prince is the religion of the people"). These key words of the peace treaty of Augsburg meant that the religion of the ruler would be the only official religion in the ruler's land. If your prince was Lutheran, all churches in your state became Lutheran, and any who wished to remain Catholic had to pack up and move to the nearest state with a Catholic ruler. The reverse was true, of course, if your ruler was Catholic and you were Lutheran.

While this political response to religious conflict was flawed (What if you were neither a Lutheran nor a Catholic but a follower of John Calvin?), it did illustrate the problems faced by rulers in religiously divided states in the sixteenth century. And the political problems posed by religious divisions were not limited to Europe. Muslim armies had swept as far east as western China and south into northwestern India as early as the eighth century. By the late twelfth century, central Asian Turks had established the Delhi Sultanate, a Muslim-dominated state in the northern heartland of the Hindu subcontinent of India, and one in which the native Hindus faced much discrimination.

How important, then, was "the religion of the prince" in the tumultuous sixteenth century? Two major rulers, Queen Elizabeth I

of England (1533–1603) and Emperor Abu-ul-Fath Jalal-ud-Din Muhammad Akbar of Mughal India (1534–1606), give us the opportunity to answer this question. Both consciously tried to create what we might call a hybrid religion as a way of promoting social stability and loyalty to the ruler in their divided states. Elizabeth, daughter of King Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, came to the throne determined to bring religious peace to a country which had experienced years of sometimes violent changes. Although Henry VIII broke with the Roman church in 1532 in order to divorce Queen Catherine and marry Elizabeth's mother, he did not become a Lutheran. He wanted England to remain Catholic, with himself in charge of the English Church. He persecuted Lutherans and other Protestants until his death in 1547. For the next ten years, Elizabeth's half-brother, Edward VI (reigned 1547–1553), and half-sister, Mary (r. 1553–1558), took England on a dizzying religious ride. Edward and his advisors wanted the Church of England to be as much like Protestant churches as possible, while Mary (daughter of Henry's first wife, Catholic Queen Catherine of Aragon) officially returned England to the Catholic fold, executing some 300 Protestants as heretics in the process. Akbar (the name means "Great") faced the task of consolidating and expanding the Mughal Empire, which his father, Humayun, had lost and only partially regained before his untimely death. Unlike other Muslim rulers of India who looked down upon most non-Muslims as pagans or infidels, Akbar came to believe that a state policy of "universal peace," which accepted and appreciated the many different faiths of India (Hindus, Jains, Shia and Sunni Muslims, Zoroastrians [called Parsees in India] and Christians), was the best way to promote loyalty to the ruler.

Both Elizabeth and Akbar had weapons other than religion to control their subjects. Akbar's military skills were considerable and his conquest and rule of northern India from coast to coast was aided by an elaborate system of administration and revenue collection. Elizabeth used her cunning, energy, and intelligence to control friends and enemies alike. She also had a strong base of popular support, which she manipulated to her advantage. Both Elizabeth and Akbar were successful leaders who laid the foundation for the greatness of their respective states. They are generally seen by historians as having that special "something extra, that flash of the eye or turn of the head, which marks the crossing of the gulf between

ability and genius."[1] The extent to which the religious policies of Elizabeth and Akbar promoted unity in their respective states is a complicated question. Historians disagree, especially in their evaluation of the policy of Akbar, and it is clear that neither ruler got exactly what he or she wanted. A look at the careers of these colorful and powerful sixteenth-century leaders can help us better understand their strengths and weaknesses as we attempt to answer the questions posed at the beginning of this essay.

Religion was an issue for Elizabeth from the moment of her birth, which made her the Protestant heir to the throne in place of her Catholic sister, Mary. Her position changed suddenly when she was three; her mother, Anne, was declared a traitor and sent to the block [beheaded], and Elizabeth joined her sister, Mary, in being officially declared a bastard by a law of 1536. Despite this turn of events, Elizabeth was taught to love and honor her father as the king. She spent her early years pleasantly enough with Katherine Parr, Henry's last wife. Katherine brought all of Henry's children together as a family and saw to their education. Elizabeth received a classical education and could read Greek and Latin and speak French, Italian, and Spanish well enough to conduct business with ambassadors from those countries in their own languages. In 1547, shortly after Henry's death, Katherine married Thomas Seymour, and Elizabeth lived with them, experiencing some unwelcome sexual advances from Seymour when she was fourteen. When Katherine died in childbirth in 1548, Seymour wished to marry Elizabeth—by then living elsewhere—but she "replied evasively," a skill she refined in future years.[2] Because of Seymour's intrigues against the government of Edward VI, Elizabeth was briefly viewed with suspicion. She was in much greater danger after 1553 when her sister, Mary, became queen and some members of her household implicated her in some Protestant plots against the new Catholic queen. Elizabeth responded by meeting with Mary, declaring her wish to become Catholic, and asking her sister to send her some vestments, crucifixes, and other Mass "gear" to use in her private chapel. Elizabeth was placed under guard in the Tower of London prison for a time, and many of Mary's advisors wanted her put to death as an enemy of the state. Interestingly, it was Mary's husband, Spanish King Philip II, who protected Elizabeth, something she always remembered, even years later when their countries were at war.[3]

Mary, like her half-brother, Edward, died after a short reign, and Elizabeth became queen on November 17, 1558. Even though her background as the "bastard" daughter of Anne Boleyn seemed to make it a foregone conclusion that she would restore Protestant Christianity as the official religion of England, one of Elizabeth's biographers points out that she could have left England a Catholic country. After all, many English subjects accepted Mary's return to the Catholic fold, and Elizabeth had professed to be a Roman Catholic for five years. Nevertheless, Elizabeth created a "Religious Settlement" in 1559 that made England a Protestant country because (1) she had been raised as a Protestant and was a sincere believer and (2) she would be accepted as the legitimate monarch by Catholics but would be supported more fervently as the "only hope" of the many Protestants, since the next in line to be ruler was Roman Catholic Mary Stuart, Queen of the Scots and Elizabeth's cousin.[4]

Elizabeth's "Religious Settlement," approved by the English Parliament within six months of her coronation, created what we know today as the "Church of England" or (outside of England today) the "Protestant Episcopal" Church. Like the Lutheran Churches in Germany, it was a state church and Elizabeth was declared the "Supreme Governor" of the church.[5] All clergy had to take an oath recognizing the queen's position and promising to "renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdiction . . . and authorities [the Pope] and bear true faith and allegiance to the queen's highness" and to her successors. Parliament also passed, in addition to this "Act of Supremacy," an important "Act of Uniformity." This restored Protestant forms of worship, ratified Elizabeth's earlier decision to put most of the worship service in English, and provided penalties for churchmen who refused to accept these measures and fines for laypeople who refused to attend Sunday services.[6]

Elizabeth's church still looked like the "Catholic" Church of her father's day. It had bishops and priests instead of the ministers and elders used by Calvinists, and they were required by law to wear clerical garb at church services. Churches still had crucifixes, the queen kept candles in her private chapel, and she issued orders retaining stained glass windows and other "popish" elements in churches, even though these were hated by the Calvinists, or "Puritans." The Puritans not only wished a church "purified" of all Roman Catholic ritual and theology but they also wanted a state church which would control, with firm punishments, what people believed, how they worshipped, and all forms of "manners and moral." Elizabeth believed this strict of a policy could lead to a religious civil war in England.[7] Instead, the queen tried to create a church that had, both in appearance and doctrine, "a distinctive character of its own—neither Lutheran, Roman Catholic, nor Reformed [Calvinist or Presbyterian]." In 1563, she supported a group of moderate bishops who drew up a statement of beliefs, the Thirty-nine Articles. This contained many beliefs Catholics could have accepted, some which Lutherans and Calvinists could accept; it remained deliberately ambiguous on controversial issues such as the exact nature of Predestination and the question of whether or not Christ was really present in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.[8] Elizabeth was a sincere Protestant but not a person given to deep theological reflection. She once told the Catholic French ambassador that "there was only one Jesus Christ and one faith, all the rest they disputed about were trifles."[9] Her main concern was religious peace and the unity of her kingdom, not theological subtleties. If English subjects would show their loyalty to God and country by attending church on Sunday, and thereby accept the queen as "the only regulator of public worship and church government,"[10] she did not care much what people said or did in the privacy of their homes.

Elizabeth was not mistaken in fearing the political divisiveness of religion. During her reign, the neighboring country of France was torn apart by religious wars between Catholics and Protestants (Huguenots). The German states and the Netherlands remained divided religiously, and Catholic Spanish King Philip II, her former brother-in-law, was being urged by the pope to undertake a crusade against Protestant England. Elizabeth herself was officially "excommunicated" by the pope in 1570 during one of the several unsuccessful plots against her throne by those who wished to make her cousin, Mary Queen of Scots, the next queen of England.

Given these foreign and domestic threats, it was understandable that Elizabeth would follow a religious policy designed to prevent persecution of Catholics by zealous Protestants in part because she did not want to give Catholic Spain an excuse to attack her. Unlike her sister, Mary, she went out of her way to avoid sending people to the stake for their religious views, even though she was quite firm with any person or group that questioned her royal authority.

When Parliament (which contained many members favorable to Puritanism) passed a law in 1563 stating that any person who twice refused to take the oath recognizing the queen's supremacy over the church was to be executed, Elizabeth instructed Matthew Parker, the Archbishop of Canterbury, to be sure that no one was asked to take the oath more than once.[11] The wisdom of Elizabeth's policy was shown in 1588, when the Spanish sent a massive armada of ships to invade England in hopes of returning England to the Catholic fold. Catholics supported Elizabeth in this moment of national peril; there was no uprising of Catholics to overthrow their Protestant ruler. The Spanish were prevented from landing by the skillful work of English sailors and a timely storm that the English referred to as "a Protestant wind." Although Catholic priests were sent to England to secretly celebrate Mass and administer Sacraments to English Catholics and although over a hundred of these men were executed for treason, most English Catholics remained loyal to the queen, and the total number of Catholics declined during her reign. Elizabeth was also willing to deal harshly with Protestant critics of her policy. Two Dutch Anabaptists attending an illegal prayer meeting in 1575 were judged guilty of heresy for denying that a Christian could be a government official, and they were burned at the stake. And, in 1579, when a lawyer named John Stubbs wrote a work attacking the French royal family and the queen's proposed marriage to the French Catholic Duke of Anjou, she ordered that his right hand be cut off with a meat cleaver. It was said that, after his hand was severed at the wrist, he lifted his hat with his left hand and shouted, "God save the queen" before he fainted.[12] Elizabeth often used marriage negotiations as a diplomatic tool; some believed that she might have married the duke if there had not been such strong objections to this match with a Catholic foreigner.

Her religious policy was not the only reason Elizabeth is fondly remembered and has an era named after her. We speak of "Elizabethan England" because this queen ruled for forty-four years and was able to develop and use her skills as a ruler and a woman to create a strong sense of personal loyalty in her subjects. She had excellent advisors and adventuresome servants, such as Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir Francis Drake, who established England as a strong naval power, The queen also learned early in her reign that she could maintain her control by meeting with her councilors individually

and by asking them for their individual views in writing. Hot-tempered at times, she was known to even slap her courtiers and order them out of her presence. Members of Parliament whose speeches displeased her were sent to prison. Yet she always released them, as she nearly always restored unlucky courtiers to "her favor" by inviting them back to court. This was a person "in which the spontaneous outburst of a high-tempered woman blended with the artifices of a calculating politician."[13] Although Elizabeth was doubtless difficult to work with, she certainly understood how to appeal to her subjects. Each year she moved her court around the country on her colorful "progresses," visiting the homes of her nobles, letting the people see her and entertain her with plays, speeches of praise, and poetry. These journeys allowed people to see their queen in person, as she gratefully acknowledged their devotion. She also used her position as a woman to strengthen this loyalty. Historians disagree on why Elizabeth never married, but, whatever her reason, she did deliberately create the impression among ordinary people that she cared more about them than about having a husband; she could be seen as "married" to England. On the eve of the anticipated Spanish invasion, when the armada had already entered the English channel, Elizabeth visited some of her troops and made one of the most famous speeches in English history, saying, "I know I have the body of a weak and feeble woman, but I have the heart and stomach of a king, and of a king of England too! And [I] think foul scorn that Parma [Spanish general] or Spain, or any prince of Europe, should dare to invade the borders of my realm!" The people loved it; perhaps in that moment she became the "good Queen Bess" remembered fondly by generations of English people.[14]

Since Mughal Emperor Akbar lived in a place so distant and different from Elizabeth's England, it is unusual to find any similarities between the two rulers beyond the dates of their reigns. Yet Akbar, like Elizabeth, experienced a troubled youth, marked by an awareness of religious differences. Descended from the great Mongol and Turkish conquerors Genghis Khan and Tamerlane, he was born in the house of a Hindu ruler, while his father was on the run, trying to recapture land in northeast India. Akbar's father was a Sunni Muslim, while his mother was a Shiite [two large, theologically different branches of Islam]. His tutor, Abul Latif, taught him the principle of "universal peace," which encouraged tolerance of

all religions. While growing up, he was captured and rescued three times as his father and uncles fought for control of the empire. While these struggles were over family inheritance and not over religious issues, it was clear to the young prince that the support of Muslim scholars or holy men (ulema) could help a ruler gain popular support; it was also clear to the young Akbar that anyone who would successfully rule India would have to deal with the fact that most of his subjects would not be Muslims. When his father, Humayun, died in 1556, Akbar was only thirteen. The empire was ruled in Akbar's name by a regent, Bairam Khan, a Shiite Muslim who successfully completed the conquests of much of what is today Pakistan and Afghanistan. Bairam Khan's increasingly arrogant decisions and lavish living led Akbar to replace the regent and begin to rule in his own right in 1560.[15]

The young man who would expand the Mughal Empire to its greatest extent has been described as a broad-shouldered person of "uncommon dignity," with long hair, a loud voice of "peculiar richness," "bright and flashing eyes," and a "powerful, magnetic, and inspiring" personality.[16] Historians have also been impressed by the seeming contradictions in Akbar's personality. Akbar was a deeply spiritual man but also a brutal warrior. He said that "a monarch should be ever intent on conquest, otherwise his neighbors rise in arms against him," yet, when not fighting, he loved to engage in theological and philosophical discussions with learned men from many religions. He loved hunting but spent many years as a virtual vegetarian. He "spent whole nights repeating the name of the Almighty God," had mystical experiences, and went on pilgrimages. Yet this same man authorized the massacre of thousands of people, many of them women and children, after conquering the Hindu fortress of Chitor, and he ordered the building of a mound made from the heads of his fallen enemies after the battle of Panipat in 1556. Akbar could be extremely energetic, humane, and considerate, yet he also suffered from depression.[17] Clearly, this greatest ruler of the Mughal Empire was a complex man.

But Akbar was no more complex than the situation he inherited. Ethnically, the territory of the Mughal Empire contained Turks, Mongols, and Uzbeks (these three known collectively as Turanis), as well as hundreds of independent or semi-independent Hindu rulers (rajas). Some of these were territorial chieftains and others were the heads of large families, or clans. Those noblemen

expected virtual independence and were reluctant to take orders from any central authority, while the Turks who had come from Persia, or Iran, were often skilled bureaucrats used to working in a strongly centralized administration. Both of these groups were composed of Muslims who viewed Hindus as polytheistic "idolaters."[18] When Akbar came to the throne, his territory was quite small; it consisted of a small crescent of land extending from central Afghanistan through the heart of modern Pakistan down to the north central Indian cities of Panipat and Delhi. By the end of his reign, Akbar's empire contained all of north and central India, including the Indus and Ganges river valleys.

Creating and maintaining a large empire inhabited by such varied ethnic groups required a variety of skills. Akbar needed large armies composed of infantry with firearms, artillery, mounted archers, and elephants. The young ruler spent most of the 1560s and 1570s subduing the Hindu (Rajput) kingdoms in central India from coast to coast. In 1580 and 1581, he put down revolts by family members seeking his throne and others in Kabul and elsewhere in the north taking advantage of Sunni Muslim discontent with his religious and administrative policies. Akbar was unable to finish his military consolidation of the empire until 1601, four years before his death.[19]

In the beginning of his career, Akbar was a skilled military leader intent on increasing his power by enlarging his empire. Until the mid-1570s, he was also a traditional Muslim ruler, subduing the armies of Hindu Rajputs in the name of Allah. But, even in his twenties he began to see both personal and political reasons for some changes in social and religious policy. In 1562, he married the daughter of the Rajput ruler of Jaipur after that kingdom submitted to Mughal overlordship. He was the first Mughal ruler to add Hindu princesses (he later married three more) to his harem and to allow them to maintain their religion. The following year, he dropped the Mughal practice of enslaving the families of defeated enemies, and in 1563 he stopped taxing Hindu pilgrimages. Akbar also ended the traditional tax levied on non-Muslims in 1564, a more radical step, since this tax was levied in all Islamic countries.

Since Akbar remained a devout Muslim during these early years, these policy changes were made largely for political reasons, to win the support of the Rajput rulers. However, Akbar's own religious views and practices were beginning to change. In 1562, he became so

impressed by the simple life and wisdom of Muslim mystic Shaikh Salim Chishti that he made a pilgrimage to his shrine each year for seventeen years and even built a new capital, Fatehpur-Sikri, near this site. Shaikh Salim correctly predicted that the emperor, who had difficulty having sons, would have three sons; when the first was born, Akbar named him Salim in honor of the Shaikh. In 1575, the emperor constructed a special building, the Ibadat Khana, in which he brought together thinkers from various religions to discuss the beliefs and practices of each. A Portuguese Jesuit priest, arriving at the court in 1580, recorded this speech by Akbar:

> I perceive that there are varying customs and beliefs of varying religious paths. . . . But the followers of each religion regard the institution of their own religion as better than those of any other. Not only so, but they strive to convert the rest to their own way of belief. If these refuse to be converted, they not only despise them, but also regard them as . . . enemies. And this caused me to feel many serious doubts and scruples. Wherefore I desire that on appointed days the books of all the religious laws be brought forward, and the doctors meet and hold discussions, so that I may hear them, and that each one may determine which is the truest and mightiest religion.[20]

Muslim historians were critical of Akbar's religious policy, which had moved him away from traditional practices by the 1580s, but they admit that he was "deeply religious by nature" and had a soul which "longed for direct spiritual experience." In 1578, Akbar had what has been described as a mystical experience, or "ecstasy," during a royal hunt. He freed all the animals that had been rounded up for him to kill, distributed a large sum of gold to the poor, and cut off his long hair.[21] By 1579, discouraged by Muslim clerical intolerance, he issued a decree that gave him the authority to resolve religious disputes; his decisions would be "binding upon all the people, provided always that such an order is not opposed to the . . . explicit injunction of the Qur'an."[22]

Akbar's beliefs matured quickly. In 1582 he established the *Din-i-Ilahi*, usually translated as "Divine Faith." Its members vowed to dedicate their property, life, and honor to Akbar, espoused a simple monotheism, and renounced "traditional and imitative" Islam. Akbar borrowed rituals from those of the Parsees, Christians, and Hindus. There were initiation ceremonies, feasts on

members' birthdays, and a form of bowing to the emperor previously reserved for prayer in the mosque.[23]

Historians disagree on whether or not *Din-i-Ilahi* was a "new" religion (something assumed by many history textbooks) or a way to appeal to non-Muslims and to focus loyalty on the emperor. Many traditional Muslims, led by court scholar Abdul Qadir Badauni, were bitterly critical of the "Divine Faith," which was supported and directed by Abul Fazl, Akbar's chief counselor, famous flatterer, and court historian. Some Muslim historians today see *Din-i-Ilahi* as a superficial form of emperor worship, forbidden by the Qur'an, which undermined the Muslim character of Akbar's state. More "secular" historians praise the emperor for a religious and social policy which, because it was accepting of many traditions, was far ahead of its time. It did not make loyalty to the state dependent on being a member of any official state religion, including Islam; membership in *Din-i-Ilahi* itself was voluntary and somewhere between two dozen and two thousand (sources vary significantly) noblemen joined.[24]

To better evaluate Akbar's religious policy, we need to understand that his administrative system combined features of the personal relations between rulers and their chief nobles found in early feudalism with the practices of a modern government which employs paid officials who feel more of an obligation to the institutions of government than they do to the ruler. Akbar chose his leading civil and military appointees, known as *mansabdars* [Persian for "office-holder"; *mansab* is an "office"], on the basis of their loyalty to him. They were organized into grades, based on how many troops and horses they were expected to supply to Akbar in time of war. To provide the *mansabdars* with money to help them meet this demand, they were assigned revenue from land (*jagirs*). The emperor retained control of all land and could "fire" *mansabdars* and promote or demote them to higher or lower ranks. Akbar divided his empire into twelve large provinces, each led by a governor, who, aided by other officials, administered justice, collected revenue, recruited troops, and kept order. The whole system was reinforced by spies who reported to the court.[25] In 1572–1573 Akbar introduced "branding regulations" (*dagh*) requiring *mansabdars* to present their troops and horses for muster (only the horses were branded) to prove that they were using their money to actually pay

troops and not for other, non-military, purposes. By the end of the decade, strict implementation of the *dagh*—along with Akbar's *mahzar* and other religious changes—led some of the Turani *mansabdars* to revolt. After that, he eased the enforcement of the branding regulation.[26]

Some scholars see no connection between Akbar's religious policies (his ending of religious taxes and promoting of "universal peace" and the "Divine Faith") and the loyalty of his military and civilian officials. Others disagree and say that the emperor's "liberal religious ideas" were linked to his imperial system of administration. Akbar changed an empire that had been previously ruled by and for Muslims into one in which Hindu Rajputs could and did play a major role. He favored Hindus as much as he could because he could not always depend upon the loyalty of the Turkish and Mongol nobility. Also, by respecting non-Muslim religions, praising the ideal of "universal peace," and marrying Hindu princesses, Akbar, some say, "transformed" the nobility "into a constructive force" and helped erase the "foreign character of the Mughal Empire." From Akbar's time, the Mughal ruling class no longer saw theirs as *only* a Muslim Empire. Muslims continued to hold the majority of the *mansabs*, but the holders of power in the provinces defined themselves as Mughal *mansabdars*, not as mere servants of a Muslim ruling class. Akbar's court rituals, his use of Hindu *mansabdars*, and the *Din-i-Ilahi* created the impression "not [of] Muslims ruling over Hindus but [of] Muslims and Hindus together, serving a ruler who, whatever his personal beliefs, was not merely a Muslim or Hindu." The empire lasted as long as this practice.[27]

Both Elizabeth I of England and Akbar, the "greatest" Mughal, used a hybrid, or "mixed," religion to try to unify their divided states and promote loyalty to the ruler, and each had personal as well as political motives. Elizabeth's personal religious views, considered "heretical" by Catholics and too "Papist" by the Puritans, were nevertheless those of a sincere Protestant Christian; Akbar's personal views, to the extent that we can determine, given the controversy that surrounds them, were those of a sincere seeker after religious truth who clearly disliked the claims to exclusive truth advanced by Muslim theologians.

In both sixteenth-century England and India, the religion of the ruler did matter. Elizabeth's attempt to create a distinctive "Church of England" that was neither Catholic nor Calvinist suffered a

severe setback forty-six years after her death, when the English beheaded Charles I in 1649 and established a Puritan commonwealth under Oliver Cromwell. Akbar's *Din-i-Ilahi* disappeared soon after his death, but his mixed Muslim and Hindu Mughal Empire survived much longer. Religion could be a unifying as well as a divisive force in this period. Perhaps "the religion of the ruler" can only truly become "the religion of the people" in situations in which the ruler's beliefs are only slightly out of step with the beliefs of the majority of his or her subjects. The "Church of England" still exists because Elizabeth did not overreach herself; she was in touch with the sentiment of her people, who would tolerate only a limited amount of religious regulation. The Puritans offered more of this than the English, in the final analysis, would tolerate. Akbar's *Din-i-Ilahi* evaporated after his death because an attempt to join an "inclusive" faith such as Hinduism with an "exclusive" one such as Islam has never succeeded, at least not for long. Akbar's failure perhaps foreshadows that of twentieth-century Indian leader, Mohandas Gandhi, who wished for Hindus and Muslims to live in peace after gaining independence from the British. Gandhi was assassinated in 1947 by a Hindu fanatic. Akbar was spared this fate; only his bones were dug up and burned by an angry mob some fifty years after his death.

Notes

1. Percival Spear, *India: A Modern History*, New Edition, revised and enlarged (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1972), 128. Though included in a chapter on Akbar, Spear's statement also specifically refers to Elizabeth as having this quality.
2. Wallace MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I* (London: Edward Arnold, 1993), 9–10.
3. Jasper Ridley, *Elizabeth I: The Shrewdness of Virtue* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1988), 41, 47–59, 66–67.
4. MaCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, 48–51; see also Ridley, *Elizabeth*, 33, on her "sincere devotion to the Protestant religion."
5. Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), 14.
6. Carl S. Meyer, *Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1960), 39, 45–48.
7. See William Haller, *Elizabeth I and the Puritans* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1964), 1–2, 9–10, 21.

8. William P. Haugaard, *Elizabeth and the English Reformation: The Struggle for a Stable Settlement of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 78, 248–252; Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion* (London: Routledge, 1994), 18–19; Meyer, *Religious Settlement*, 149–167.
9. Haugaard, *Elizabeth and the English Reformation*, 25.
10. MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, 300.
11. Joel Hurtsfield, *Elizabeth I and the Unity of England* (London: English Universities Press, 1960), 57.
12. Ridley, *Elizabeth I: Shrewdness of Virtue*, 119–123, 206–214; MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, 202–205; Hurtsfield, *Elizabeth I and Unity of England*, 103.
13. MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, 360–362; Carolly Erickson, *The First Elizabeth* (New York: Summit Books, 1983), 172–173, 313–314.
14. MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, 376–377; Hurstfield, *Elizabeth and Unity of England*, 157. On the reasons Elizabeth may not have married, see Susan Bassnett, *Elizabeth I: A Feminist Perspective* (New York: Berg, 1988), 2–11, which contains a good summary of the speculation and theories of various historians.
15. S. M. Burke, *Akbar. The Greatest Mogul* (New Delhi: Munshiram Monoharlal Publishers, 1989), 17–25, 39–42, contains a clear account of Akbar's youth and the period of Bairam Khan's regency. See also Ashirbadilal Srivastava, *The History of India (1000 AD–1707 AD)* (Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala, 1964), 469.
16. Burke, Akbar, 32; Khaliq Ahmed Nizami, *Akbar and Religion* (Delhi: Idarah-i-Adabiyat, 1989), 1.
17. Burke, *Akbar*, 58, 104–105; Srivastava, *History of India*, 447; Athar Abbas Rizvi, *Religious and Intellectual History of the Muslims in Akbar's Reign* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 1975), 110; Nizami, *Akbar and Religion*, 2, 165; Muni Lal, *Akbar* (New Delhi: Vikas, 1980), 64, 94, 128, 144–145.
18. Ahsan Raza Khan, *Chieftains in the Mughal Empire* (Simla; Indian Institute Of Advanced Study, 1977), 1–5; Douglas E. Streusand, *The Formation of the Mughal Empire* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989), 23, 26–32.
19. The most convenient summary of Akbar's conquests is in Srivastava, *History of India*, 447–464.
20. Rizvi, *Religious and Intellectual History*, 126–131; Burke, *Akbar*, 102–103. The Ibadat Khana was misnamed the "House of Worship" by earlier historians. It was not a place of worship but a debating hall. For the attitude of the Jesuit missionaries toward Akbar, and their expectations that he would become a Christian, see the fascinating *Letters from the Mughal Court: The First Jesuit Mission to Akbar (1580–83)*, ed. John Corveia-Afonso (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1981).

21. Nizami, *Akbar and Religion*, is the modern historian most critical of Akbar's religious experiments, believing they constituted an unnecessary departure from traditional Islam that separated him from the "Muslim masses"; see pp. 2, 159–160, 232, 245–246. See also the similar views of Ishtiaq H. Qureshi, in *Akbar: Architect of the Mughal Empire* (Karachi: Ma'aref Ltd., 1978), 165–166. See Burke, *Akbar*, 104, on Akbar's "ecstasy."
22. Rizvi, *Religious and Intellectual History*, 147.
23. Spear, *India: A Modern History*, 135; Burke, *Akbar*, 122–125.
24. Srivastava, *Akbar the Great*, vol. II (Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala Publishers, 1967), 313–315, sees *Din-i-Ilahi* as "not a religion" but "a common religious bond for at least the elite of the various sections of India's population"; it was designed to promote imperial unity. See also his *History of India*, 474–475, 526–529; Burke, *Akbar*, 122–129, agrees with Srivastava that "Divine Faith" was not a religion but a Sufi brotherhood; it had no scripture, places of worship, or organization of clergy and was not promulgated among the population at large. Nizami, *Akbar and Religion*, 133, 191–193, 215–216, 243–245, 339–340, sees *Din-i-Ilahi* as a new religion, if a weak one, based on a "haphazard agglomeration of certain rituals, whimsically visualized and pompously demonstrated," and designed to improperly make Akbar a "prophet-king." Qureshi, *Akbar: Architect*, 166, agrees with Nizami that *Din-i-Ilahi* was an ill-conceived attempt to promote loyalty to the ruler; it only alienated the "natural [Muslim] supporters of the Empire." Badauni's attack on Akbar, written in 1595–1596, just before his death, is entitled *Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh* ("History with a Vengeance"); see Harbans Mukhia, *Historians and Historiography During the Reign of Akbar* (New Delhi: Vikas, 1976) for a thorough analysis of Badauni.
25. See Stephen P. Blake, "The Patrimonial-Bureaucratic Empire of the Mughals," in *The State in India*, ed. Hermann Kulke (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995), 278–303; for a description of Akbar's military and the *mansabdari* system, see Srivastava, *Akbar the Great*, II, 217–247; Streusand, *Formation of the Mughal Empire*, 139–148.
26. See Streusand, *Formation of the Mughal Empire*, 154–172, on Akbar's "crisis and compromise."
27. Among those who see little connection between Akbar's religious policy and his success as an imperial ruler is Khan, *Chieftains in the Mughal Empire*, 222–23, who says that Akbar's military "striking capacity" and ability to punish rebels, and not his "liberal religious ideas," kept people loyal; see also Iqtidar Alam Khan, "The Nobility Under Akbar and the Development of His Religious Policy, 1560–80" *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1968; parts

I & II): 29–36, who believes that Akbar's religious concessions to non-Muslims were tactical devices in response to the hostility of the conservative Muslims, and not part of a broader vision of a multi-religious Mughal Empire. The more common view, that his religious policy did matter, is expressed by P. S. Bedi, *The Mughal Nobility Under Akbar* (Jalandhar: ABS Publications, 1985), vii, 22, and in Streusand, *Formation of the Mughal Empire*, 123–153.

Further Reading

BURKE, S. M. *Akbar, the Greatest Mogul*. New Delhi: Munshiram Monoharlal Publishers, 1989. This brief biography of the ruler tries to strike a balance between Hindu and Muslim historians and is written from a modern Western perspective.

DORAN, SUSAN. *Elizabeth I and Religion*. London: Routledge, 1994. A clear, brief account which summarizes much of the research of the past thirty years.

MACCAFFREY, WALLACE. *Elizabeth I*. London: Edward Arnold, 1993. Thoughtful, readable biography.

NIZAMI, KHALIQ AHMED. *Akbar and Religion*. Delhi: Idarah-i-Adabiyat-i-Delhi, 1989. Written by a Muslim scholar hostile to the *Din-i-Ilahi* who offers some good reasons this faith did not last.