III. FIRUZ SHAH TUGHLUQ

ELECTION; MARCH TO DELHI

When Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq died on 20 March 1351 (21 Muharram a.h. 752) on the east bank of the Indus some eighteen karohs from Thatta after an illness of some ten days, the men and women in his camp, about two hundred thousands, according to Barani, knew two things for certain—the deceased Sultan had left no son and he had appointed no successor.

For educated persons in the camp, whether civil or military, the situation was extremely delicate, which if not properly handled could lead to a war of succession. Under the general conventions of Muslim monarchies, the new sultan had to be elected by the high officers and other leading men from among the members of the royal family. But only a part of these ‘notables’ were in the camp. The officers of the central government at Delhi could not be ignored. Then there were the governors of the provinces, whose active assent was also necessary, if the peaceful accession of the new ruler was to be assured. What saved the situation was the general conviction, to which Barani refers, that the only member of Tughluq Shah’s family who deserved to be considered was Kamaluddin Firuz, son of Tughluq’s younger brother, Malik Rajab, who had also been the third highest officer of the late Sultan.

Immediately after the Sultan’s death, his high officers arranged with Altun Bahadur, the commander of the Mongols whom Amir Qazghan, the ruler of Trans-Oxiana, had sent to help the late Sultan, by such payment as they could manage, that his men would remain at a distance from the royal camp. 21 March was spent in mourning.

1 Barani, 531-48; Afl, 38-88, Mubarak Shahi, 118-22; Dr. Riyazul Islam, Professor of History, Karachi, typed Ph.D. thesis on Firuz Shah.

2 Isam’s statement, made during the reign of Muhammad bin Tughluq, to the effect that he lacked all human feelings because he had no son, must be considered conclusive on the issue (433).

Barani, trying to please Firuz Shah, declares that he had a claim on the basis of all the three counts that mattered—nomination by his predecessor, unchallengeable personal qualifications and election by the ‘notables’. But if Firuz had been nominated, the nobles would have asked him to ascend the throne and take charge before the leaderless march of two harassing days, to which Barani refers in detail; also if Sultan Muhammad had nominated a successor, there would be no sense in Khudawandzada’s claim for her son.
After performing the rites of *siyyum*\(^3\) on the morning of 22 March the leaderless army started in utter confusion for Siwistan, marching on the east side of the river. On that day, Nauroz Kargan, a son-in-law of Tarmshirin Khan, who had been promoted by the late Sultan in the service of the Delhi empire, decided to rejoin his own people and invited the Mongols to attack the leaderless army. The Mongol attacks on 24 and 25 March were very severe, and on one occasion it was with difficulty that the ladies of the royal *haram* and the imperial treasures were saved from falling into their hands. Meanwhile the Thattians were attacking the marching army from the south.

Two days' experience of anarchic marching convinced all concerned that they could not proceed further without an *iman* or leader. There was a consensus of opinion in favour of Kamaluddin Firuz, but Khudawandzada, the sister of the late Sultan, wanted her son, Dawar Malik, to be elected. Malik Saifuddin Khuja was sent to give her a scolding, but he went beyond his commission and promised the office of *amir-i hajib* to Dawar Malik, and this promise was not kept. Firuz Shah, on his part, showed real reluctance in accepting the most dangerous post then available, but Tatar Khan, the captured child of a Mongol prince whom Tughluq Shah had adopted and educated, closed the argument by catching hold of Firuz's arm and threatening to enthrone him by force. Firuz Shah asked for time to say two *rakats* (genuflections) of prayer and then ascended the throne with the royal robes over his mourning dress. He then mounted an elephant and proceeded to his cousin, Khudawandzada, who as a sign of her acceptance of his accession, embraced him and placed the royal *kulah* (hat), valued at one lakh of *tankas*, over his head (24 March).

Affif, whose ancestors had been connected with the Tughluq family since the days of Alauddin Khalji, gives us an account of the marriage of Firuz's father and the early life of Firuz. When Malik Tughluq was governor of Dīpalpur, Affif's great-grandfather, Malik Shihab Affif, was his subordinate in charge of Abohar district. Tughluq had two younger brothers, Sipah Salar Rajab and Abu Bakr. Whether Chiyasuddin Tughluq was the son of a Jat woman has not been proved or disproved. But he wanted a Hindu lady of status for Rajab, and was told that Bibi Nala (or Naila), the daughter of Rai Ranmal Bhatti, was the best match he could find. But when the proposal was sent to the Rai, he refused it with indignation. Shihab Affif advised Tughluq to proceed to the Rai's territory and demand arrears

\(^3\) The *siyyum*, performed on the third day after the burial, consists in reading the Quran for the sake of the dead and praying for his salvation. The time after the morning prayer is generally preferred.
of tribute from the Rai and his muqaddams. This threw the Rai’s family into distress, but after two or three days the young lady, much to the Rai’s relief, decided to accept the offer. ‘Send me to them’, she said, ‘think that one of your daughters has been seized by the Mongols.’ Kamaluddin Firuz was born in A.H. 709 (1309-10) but he was only seven years old when Malik Rabab died, and Tughluq promised the weeping young widow that he would treat Firuz as his own son. This promise was nobly kept.

Rajab left two other sons, Qutbuddin and Ibrahim, by other wives, but Firuz took precedence on account of his mother. When Sultan Muhammad ascended the throne, Firuz had reached the age of eighteen; Sultan Muhammad kept his father’s promise and gave Firuz a thorough training in all the civil departments of the government—state policy, administration, account-keeping, appointments, etc. Firuz held the office of amir-i hajib or barbek, but the Sultan assigned to him many duties unconnected with his office. The Sultan was a faddist for efficiency and Firuz was certainly overworked. ‘Amir-i Hâjib! Tomorrow is Id’, the Sultan would remark, and Firuz had to make all necessary arrangements in the short time at his disposal. Asif would have us believe that the Sultan’s real object was to give Firuz a thorough training. But though Muhammad bin Tughluq was a professional soldier, he put Firuz to no military duties and even complained of his being too fond of hunting. Firuz obeyed his Sultan-cousin loyally and faithfully, and retained the greatest possible affection for him after his death. Asif, who saw him frequently, states that Firuz Shah had a white complexion with a prominent nose and a broad beard, and was medium in height and weight.

Persons who saw Firuz Shah ascend the throne at the mature age of forty-five lunar years could hardly have predicted that he would give India thirty-eight years of peace, the chief features of which would be—(a) cheap prices and high wages, (b) no famines and no epidemics, (c) no serious foreign invasion, (d) no rebellions or serious internal tensions, (e) one attempt to assassinate the Sultan and some attempts to poison him, but no serious intrigues and no danger of a palace revolution at any time. Concerning the other side of the picture, the chief feature of Firuz’s administration was that it gave security to all depending upon the government—to the members of the royal family, who for the first and last time in medieval Indian history stood in no danger from the occupant of the throne, and to all the employees of the state, high and low, who were guaranteed that their offices would go to their sons and who, in practice, found that the government would only exercise a formal supervision over their accounts.
If the Insha of Ain-i Mahru is any guide to the professions of the age, all government officers prided themselves on the fact that they injured no human beings; they only plundered the state and the reign of Firuz Shah is perhaps the greatest age of corruption in the whole history of medieval India. Firuz Shah was a man of average intelligence but of great and varied experience. He was not a weak man but neither was he of the stuff of which despots are made. The reasons for his failure and success can be put in one simple sentence: He injected into the hideous, but necessary, institutions of the despotic Muslim monarchy the principles of the Quran, of the Prophet's teachings and of the humanity common to all peoples and all religions, which were quite incompatible with the basic principles of that monarchy. He prided himself on the fact that the prestige of his government was not only maintained but increased without the use of 'fear and terror'. It could do so during his reign, but after him everything would collapse. Firuz was not ignorant of what was happening; he saw but overlooked as a matter of policy. It was not in his nature to be cruel and despotic; and for a man of his character and capacity no other policy was possible.

On the day after his accession the army marched in proper order. Three days later he was in a position to send a contingent, which defeated and drove away the Mongols and set free the Indians they had captured. The Thattians also retired. At Siwistan, where the army stopped for a week or more, the Friday Khutba was read in Firuz Shah's name for the first time. The most important state function was to inform the country of Firuz Shah's accession. For this purpose, first, a general proclamation was issued for circulation in the whole country; secondly, special messengers with robes of honour were sent to important officers. In particular, Saiyvid Alaud-din Rasulkar and Malik Saifuddin shahna-i pil were sent to Khwaaja-i Jahan at Delhi. Foreigners from Muslim countries, whom the late Sultan had collected together, were given such presents as was possible and requested to leave for their homelands. Firuz appointed his step-brother, Ibrahim, as amir-i hijib or barbek, and his slave, Bashir, as ariz-i mamalik with the title of Imadul Mulk. 'The body of the late Sultan had been put in a coffin which, with the royal chari mounted on it, was placed on the back of an elephant and taken to Delhi with the army.' Barani is probably right in stating that at Siwistan and throughout his march, Firuz won over religious people by calling on mystics of distinction, praying at the tombs of saints and restoring the land-grants of the learned and the pious.

The army proceeded to Bhakkar and thence to Uchich. Soon after starting from Uchich Firuz received information of the 'rebellion' of
Khwaja-i Jahan, the wazir, at Delhi. He had on 1 April 1351 (3 Safar A.H. 752) placed a boy of six on the throne with the title of Ghiyasuddin Mahmud, declared him to be the son of Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq and sent messages to all important officers asking them to accept the boy-king. Firuz kept the information secret till he had reached Multan, where the matter could be properly discussed and the army kept pacified. But when the facts were revealed, all officers present asked with one voice: 'Sultan Muhammad had only a daughter, who was born in the reign of Tughluq Shah; he had no son; how, then, has Ahmad Ayaz found a son for him?'

Rebellion of Khwaja-i Jahan Ahmad Ayaz

'Ahmad Ayaz, the wazir, had reached the age of eighty-four; he was a mere civilian and had never shot an arrow or mounted a troublesome horse.' Why should such a man embark on a hopeless rebellion when the amirs and the army had accepted Firuz Shah? Afif admits that people in general believed that Ahmad Ayaz had rebelled after hearing of the election of Firuz Shah, but affirms that this opinion was not correct. On the basis of his own investigations and of what he had heard from Kishwar Khan, son of Bahram Aiba Kishlu Khan, Afif gives the following account of what happened. Khwaja-i Jahan had a confidential slave, Malih Tutun, whom he had sent to Sultan Muhammad. Tutun left the army-camp when it was being plundered by the Mongols and gave the following report to Khwaja-i Jahan at Delhi: 'Sultan Muhammad is dead; the Mongols have attacked the main market and plundered it; the whereabouts of Firuz and Tatar Khan are not known; and it is not certain whether they have fallen into the hands of the Mongols or have been killed.' Khwaja-i Jahan wept both for Sultan Muhammad and Firuz. 'There was', Afif assures us, 'a great affection between Khwaja-i Jahan and Firuz Shah—such affection that no third person could come in between them; the wife of Khwaja-i Jahan used to call Firuz Shah her son and did not observe purdah from him.' So believing that Firuz Shah was dead, 'Khwaja-i Jahan took an initiative (ijtihad) and placed the boy on the throne.' This initiative proved to be an error, but most of the officers at Delhi seem to have agreed with him at the time.4

Now the plan of putting a minor on the throne as a temporary measure and removing him afterwards was a well-known trick of the middle ages; with a minor on the throne, a regent (naib-i mamlakat) elected by the nobles could act with full or absolute powers and the machine of the state kept working. Still Khwaja-i Jahan had acted

4 Habib & Afar, Political Theory of the Delhi Sultanat, 159-60.
too hastily; without waiting for further and more reliable evidence, he had taken upon himself the very grave responsibility of putting a boy of unknown paternity on the throne barely ten days after Sultan Muhammad’s death. Secondly, when messengers conveying the news of Firuz Shah’s accession reached Delhi, the majority of the high officers, led by the naib wazir, Malik Maqbul Qawamul Mulk, vowed allegiance to the new Sultan and informed him of the fact in their confidential letters. Khwaja-i Jahan should also have vowed allegiance to the new Sultan and sent ‘the boy’ to him as a token of his loyalty. Whether this would have saved him from destruction may be doubted, but his action would have been technically correct. But instead of confessing his error, Khwaja-i Jahan pursued three contradictory policies. Firstly, he prepared for war. There was little money in the treasury; so he had to sell the gold and silver plate and the precious jems of the state. But all he could collect was 20,000 unreliable and inexperienced horsemen. Secondly, (according to the Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi) he also attempted fruitless negotiations. Firuz’s reply was flat—If Khwaja-i Jahan submitted, he would be forgiven. ‘If the late Sultan had a son’, Firuz declared, ‘it could not have been kept a secret from me and no one could have nurtured him with more affection and family feeling.’ Lastly, he was always thinking of submission and expected Firuz Shah to forgive him for the sake of old days; even if the worst was to happen, he was a disciple of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya and would know how to die.

On Thursday 23 August 1351 (29 Jamadi II a.h. 751) the naib wazir, Qawamul Mulk, along with Amir-i Azam Qatbugha fled from Delhi and joined the Sultan at Agroha, a place near which the city of Fathabad was constructed later. It was a fortunate day for Firuz; his son, Fath Khan, was born on that day; also on the same day (according to the Sirat-i Firuz Shahi) news was brought to him that three of his officers—Malik Neki Sardawatdar, Malik Bahram Ghazni and Malik Nawa—had at last succeeded in putting the rebel, Taghi, to

5 The rift among the nobles at Delhi could only have occurred after the accession of Firuz Shah was known. According to the Mubarak Shahi (120) the following officers preferred to follow the Khwaja-i Jahan—Malik Nathu, who was appointed hajib-i khas, Azam Malik Husamuddin, Shaikhzada Bustami, Malik Hasan Multani and Malik Husamuddin Adhak.

The officers who, in addition to Qawamul Mulk, sent confidential letters of loyalty to Firuz Shah are listed as follows—Sharful Mulk, Malik Dilan, Amir Qatbugha, Malik Khaljin, Malik Hasan amir-i mutan, Qazi-i Misr, Khwaja Bahauddin Thekara, Malik Muntakhab Balkhi and Malik Badruddin Butahari.

Some names in the first list are given by Barani; Mubarak Shahi does not quote any authority for the second list, but some officers in this list are found holding offices under Firuz.
death. Firuz’s position had been getting stronger since he had left Multan. The population at large, including the Hindu rais, accepted him. Mahmud Bek, governor of Sunam, Khudawandzada Qawamuddin and Ainul Mulk Mahrur from Multan reached his camp at various places, and at Dipalpur he was joined by thirty-six rais. At Ajudhan he prayed at the tomb of Shaikh Fariduddin Ganj-i Shakar, and at Sarsati (the modern Sirsa), which Aff puts as 90 karahs from Delhi, the grocers and bankers presented him with several lakhs of tankas. Firuz badly needed the money for his soldiers, but he would only accept it as a loan and ordered Bashir to see to its repayment after reaching Delhi. At Hansi he made the mistake of calling on the famous mystic, Shaikh Qutbuddin Munawwar, at the wrong time—that is, just when the Shaikh had come out of his house and was going to the Friday prayer—and got a well-deserved reprimand.

Khwaja-i Jahan decided to submit; starting after the Friday prayer next day (14 August), he reached the royal camp at Dhanswa, the next stage after Agroha. Here, after the manner of criminals who are offering themselves to justice, Khwaja-i Jahan, with a skull cap instead of a pagree or turban on his head and with a sword tied to his neck, took his stand among the hajibs (attendants) at Firuz Shah’s afternoon court.

Firuz desired to forgive Khwaja-i Jahan and to appoint him to the post of wazir again. But his design was definitely vetoed by his officers. It is a safe surmise that one of the chief topics discussed by the high officers during their long march must have been the policy of the late Sultan and the relation of the officers and the crown. Firuz Shah had till now only made two high appointments; all other officers were men of Sultan Muhammad’s regime, whom Firuz had confirmed. They had served the late Sultan loyally, but one and all they were determined that his despotic ways should not be continued, and that the high officers must regain their privilege of advising the Sultan. There had been too many tensions, too many rebellions, too much bloodshed. They were united in demanding that Khwaja-i Jahan as the greatest representative of the old regime must be destroyed. Coming to Firuz’s court, they requested for an audience through Bashir, the minister of war. Since Bashir had been brought up as a slave by Firuz, he could act as their mouthpiece without any misunderstanding. When Firuz Shah admitted them, they showed excessive reverence: “The Haj was binding on every Muslim; they wanted his permission to go on the sacred pilgrimage. Small faults, like revenue offences, may be pardoned, but not treason.” The term Haj meant everything but the real pilgrimage: officers could paralyse the government by simultaneous resignations or by refusal to obey orders; it also implied possibility of rebellion.
'Firuz Shah', says Afsf, 'was intelligent enough to understand that unanimously and with one voice they were demanding the destruction of Khwaja-i Jahan. He became pale with excessive thought and caution.' The meeting probably ended with the formula 'that the king would take thought of it'. Firuz reflected on the matter for several days. During the reigns of Iltutmish, Balban, Alauddin or Sultan Muhammad, the nobles would not have ventured to behave like this. And if they did, the leaders would have been publicly executed and the rest terrorized into abject submission. But Firuz may also have reflected that many rulers of Delhi, like Aram Shah and the successors of Iltutmish, had been elected and destroyed by the nobles. For the present he had no alternative but to yield; but as soon as possible, he had to frame a policy that would prevent the conflict of the officers and the crown. Firuz summoned Bashir and asked him to inform the officers confidentially that they could deal with Khwaja-i Jahan as they liked. The officers informed Khwaja-i Jahan on behalf of the Sultan that the iqta of Samana had been assigned to him. But they also sent behind him Mahmud Bek Sher Khan. 'He has been sent to destroy me', Khwaja-i Jahan said, and decided to anticipate the event. He put on the kulah (cap) and dastar ( turban) he had received from Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya, recited two rakats of prayer and then, after he had put his forehead on the ground and was reciting the 'Oath of Affirmation', a kindly friend, whom he had requested to do so, took a sharp sword and cut off his head.

The road to Delhi was now clear. Firuz established himself in the royal palace in Rajab (August-September 1351). Barani assures us that the death penalty was only inflicted on four or five persons—Malik Nanthu Sondhar, Hasan (Multani), Husam Adhak, and two slaves of Ahmad Ayaz—but the innocent members of their families were not injured. Shaikhzada Bustami, who was a brother-in-law of the late Sultan, was asked to leave the country.

FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE ACTS AND REFORMS

Firuz's entry into Delhi was celebrated for twenty-one days and this period was observed during all future celebrations. But the Sultan had to attend to urgent work immediately. The 'reforms' or administrative and legislative measures of the reign are not dated, but in some cases the sequence is clear and in other cases it will be convenient to follow the order of our authorities.

(i) Washing of the Loan-Registers:

Khwaja Fakhir Shadi, the majmu'adar of accounts in the wizarat (or finance department), had kept his papers in order. His registers
and lists, according to Aff, gave the names of all persons to whom the late Sultan had advanced loans (sondhar) amounting to two crores of tankas, and also the names of persons to whom Khwaja-i Jahan had given the cash, gold and silver plate and the precious jems of the state. As in duty bound, Fakhr Shadi placed the lists in the hands of Firuz Shah. Firuz Shah was perplexed and consulted Qawamul Mulk. 'There is widespread distress and want', Qawamul Mulk remarked, 'it is, therefore, inadvisable to attempt the recovery of the loans; not a copper coin will be really recovered and the only result of the attempt to recover will be badnami.' He suggested, further, that all these registers should be washed away before the royal durbar in the presence of the old and the young'. The Sultan accepted the advice and the registers were duly washed in water to assure all concerned that the claims of the state had been cancelled. Many dishonest persons at Delhi, who had spent away the money loaned to them for rehabilitating agriculture, were satisfied.

(ii) Appointment of Malik Maqbul Qawamul Mulk as Wazir:

On the same day Malik Maqbul was appointed wazir. The farman of appointment is general in character; it asks all officers to obey him but does not declare the post to be hereditary.6 His full titles and name as given by the farman were—'Masnad-i A'ali Ulugh Qutlugh Azam-i IIumayun Khan-i Jahan Maqbul'.

Aff gives the following account of his early career. 'The Khan-i Jahan was from Telang and his name before his conversion to Islam was Kannu (flower). He was a man of the greatest honour in his own community and had a position of distinction before the Rai of Telang. Muhammad bin Tughluq captured the Rai and sent him to Delhi, but the Rai died on the way. Khan-i Jahan came obediently to Muhammad bin Tughluq and recited the 'Oath of Affirmation' (kalima). The Sultan gave him the name of Maqbul (Accepted) and treated him with favour. Later on, when the Sultan saw all signs of intelligence and wisdom in Khan-i Jahan, he appointed him naib wazir for the city of Delhi and opened the door of promotion to him. When Khan-i Jahan sealed a document, his name was inscribed as follows—'Maqbul, the slave of Muhammad Tughluq'. Though the distinguished wazir did not know how to read and write, still he was the wisest of men and through his wisdom he adorned the capital of the empire. The title of Qawamul Mulk was given to him during his early career. The governorship of

6 Insha-i Mahrur, 8-11 (No. 2). The only reason for incorporating a few farmans in this collection and a few forms, with the names left blank, seems to have been that they were drafted by Ain-i Mahrur.
Multan was assigned to him and later on he was appointed naib wazir of the empire; Khwaja-i Jahan was the wazir of Sultan Muhammad.

Khan-i Jahan, as naib wazir, made laws and regulations and put the department of revenue in perfect order. The governors of the provinces had not much fear of Khwaja-i Jahan but they stood in mortal dread of Khan-i Jahan. If Khwaja-i Jahan wanted the governor of a territory to be severely treated, he handed him over to Khan-i Jahan; and the latter treated him with excessive sternness in accordance with the regulations. Also when Khwaja-i Jahan, a religious man, retired from the diwan (for his devotions), Khan-i Jahan sat in his place; he dealt severely with the governors and collected plenty of cash and commodities for the royal treasury. Khwaja-i Jahan had nothing but the title of wazir; all the work of the diwan-i wizarat (revenue ministry) was carried on through the experience and intelligence of Khan-i Jahan.\(^7\)

Concerning his work as wazir, Afs writes: 'In accordance with the traditions of the great wazirs, Khan-i Jahan sat before the pillow of his office every day; he carefully investigated the accounts of the governors and other officers and realized the share of the treasury. The income and expenditure of the treasury were placed daily before him. He insisted and reinsisted that money beyond reckoning should be daily put into the treasury. If on any day the money received by the treasury was not sufficient, he would be extremalv harsh towards all his officers and would go without food owing to his thoughtfulness and anxiety. "The stability of the government", he would say on such occasions, "depends upon the treasury. If there is not enough money in the treasury, or if the money is improperly spent, the foundations of the government will be shaken. If, God forbid, the treasury of a far-sighted king becomes empty owing to any cause, the maintenance of the government becomes impossible." For this reason the wazir was bent on collecting treasures night and day.'\(^8\) Khan-i Jahan, as wazir, collected a haram of two thousand slave-girls and had plenty of children. Firuz made him an annual grant of eleven thousand tankas for every son and five thousand tankas for every daughter.

Khan-i Jahan seems to have taken no part in the demand for the destruction of his predecessor. Firuz Shah, who must have known him intimately during the late reign, decided to appoint him wazir soon after. Till Khan-i Jahan's death in 1368-69 (A.H. 770), the Sultan and the wazir acted in the closest cooperation with each other. Khan-i Jahan carried on the day-to-day administration of the country

---

7 Afs, 394-96; translated in Habib and Afsar, Political Theory of the Delhi Sultana, 168.
8 Afs, 397-98; translated in Political Theory, 166-67.
and acted as a buffer between the king and the bureaucracy. He worked hard, bore many insults of the nobles with patience and saw to it that the Sultan's dignity and honour were maintained. Firuz, on his part, allowed the wazir to enjoy many privileges which had been royal monopolies in the past. Both showed the greatest possible regard for the other in public. 'The real king of Delhi', Firuz Shah used to say, 'is Azam-i Humayun Khan-i Jahan.' But Khan-i Jahan never forgot his position. The Sultan's favour had made him rich and he could afford to be personally incorruptible, but he knew that his power had no foundation except in the Sultan's favour. He was sternly loyal and there was no question of his not referring any important matter to the Sultan or evading his orders. The policy of the state was a matter for the Sultan but he would give due weight to the wazir's advice.

(iii) Prohibition of Bloodshed and Torture:

Ziyauddin Barani says that the first great factor which contributed to the stability of Firuz Shah's government was the prohibition of siyasat. In his Fatawa-i Ikhani Barani explains that siyasat originally meant 'putting things right' but was used in his time generally for the infliction of the death penalty. The matter is clarified in a small booklet, the Futuhat of Firuz Shah, which, according to the Tabuqat-i Akbari, was an inscription put up by Firuz Shah on an octagonal tower inside the Jama Mosque of Firuzabad; the internal evidence of the work clearly reveals that it was meant for a purely Sunni Muslim audience with the artisans forming a majority.9

'First, in past times much Muslim blood has been shed, and varieties of tortures have been used, such as cutting hands, feet, ears and noses, plucking the eyes, pouring molten lead down the throats of men, breaking the bones of hands, feet and chests by strokes of iron nails, burning (living) men in fire, flaying alive, thrashing by whips with iron nails, cutting a man into two with a saw and other kinds of mutilations. God strengthened my heart and I resolved in gratitude for His favours that no Muslim blood shall be shed without just cause or excuse, that there shall be no tortures, and that no human beings shall be mutilated.'10

9 Hodivala, Studies, 399-40. Afl (20) says that this inscription was in the Kushak-i Nuzul before the darbar of the city of Firuzabad, but this is probably an error. Firuz Shah put up many inscriptions about his hunting feats, etc. possibly (as Afl guesses) because he could not find a proper historian for his reign after Barani's death. The Hindus would not care much about what was said against them in Persian inside a mosque, but the Shias and other non-Sunnis would certainly be interested in destroying the Sultan's inscription of which the Futuhat is a copy.

10 Persian text, edited by Professor S. A. Rashid, Aligarh, 1954,
The punishment of crimes had for centuries been a function of state law. Since the shari'at did not recognize monarchy, it prescribed no punishment for treason or crimes against the king. These barbarous measures were taken mostly against rebels and persons from whom state dues had to be realized. The reference to Musalmans is relevant insofar as they were almost the only offenders with reference to these two crimes. ‘All these harsh things were done’, Firuz continues, ‘so that the affairs of the government may be put right by injecting fear and terror into the hearts of the people. Owing to Divine kindness in the reign of this weak person, these terroristic severities have been replaced by mildness, kindness and affection. The fear and prestige of the government has increased in the hearts of the people without resorting to the death-penalty, flogging and the infliction of pain through tortures.’

With reference to their non-political crimes the Musalmans were to be punished in accordance with the judgements of the qazis, and Afs affirms us that Firuz was relentless in the punishment of thefts and murders. Firuz Shah’s abolition of torture is to be approved, but unfortunately he put nothing in its place for political offences. So embezzlers of public revenue went unpunished. Imprisonment as a universal form of punishment would have been the proper remedy, but a national system of state-prisons is not contemplated by the Muslim scriptures and had not been evolved by state law. It has come to us from the West and is the result of Benthamite reforms during the nineteenth century.

(iv) Deeds of Forgiveness for Sultan Muhammad:

Both Firuz and Khan-i Jahan had been favoured and promoted by the late Sultan. They wanted to manifest their great respect for him and also to make it clear that their policy would be different. The following lines of the Futuhat, therefore, require no comment. Further, God in His kindness has enabled this sinful creature by payment of money on behalf of the late Sultan to get deeds of satisfaction concerning the receipt of compensations (istirza), duly witnessed, from the heirs of all persons who, according to Divine destiny, had been put to death during the reign of the late king, Sultan Muhammad, my master, leader and patron, and also from those persons who had been deprived of their eyes, noses, hands and feet. These letters of good-will (khushnudi), placed in a box, were put at the head of the cenotaph of the late Sultan (May God hallow his grave!) in the Darul Aman; so that the grace of God may draw my

11 For a contemporary discussion of punishment for political offences, see Habib and Afsar, Political Theory, 55-63, (Advice XIII of Barani’s Fatawa-i Jahanadi).
master and patron in His mercy and with His favours reconcile these people to my patron.\textsuperscript{12} When the Sirat-i Firuz Shahi was written in 1370-71 (A.H. 772) this box was still there.

(v) Taxation according to Production:

According to Barani, the second factor that contributed to the stability of Firuz Shah's government was the order that khiraj (land-tax) and jizya (other taxes) be levied according to produce (bar hukm-i hasil).

It must be clearly understood that according to the sharī'at books of the middle ages the jizya meant a personal tax on a non-Muslim for remaining a non-Muslim. But by Barani, Amir Khusrau, Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya and others, the term jizya is used to mean any tax, which is not a land-tax. In a story related by Shaikh Nizamuddin and recorded by Amir Hasan, a tax-collector asks a Muslim mystic, who had brought virgin land under his plough: 'Either show me a miracle or pay the jizya'. Jizya in the sense of the medieval sharī'at has not been levied in India except by Aurangzeb. When a medieval writer talks of the jizya as being levied on non-Muslims, he is confusing the sharī'at-sense of the term with its actual meaning during the middle ages in India as a tax, which is not a land-tax.

'The income (mahsul) of the kingdom', says Aţf, 'was considered afresh (az sar bastah). The duty of fixing this income was assigned to the late Khwaja Husamuddin Junaid. He travelled through the kingdom for six years and according to the rule of inspection (bar hukm-i mushahida) he fixed the income of the whole realm at six crore and seventy-five lakhs of tankas. During the forty years\textsuperscript{13} of Firuz Shah's reign this was the total income of the Delhi sultanat.'\textsuperscript{14}

Mr. Moreland says that he has not come across the term, 'rule of inspection' (hukm-i mushahida), anywhere else in the literature of the period. Junaid must have had a large staff with him and his figures were obviously based on a rough estimate. Aţf must not be understood to mean that the income of the country did not increase. There was an increase in agricultural production and in the income of some of the assignees. Junaid had obviously calculated the share of the state in terms of tankas and jitals. The governors may have had to revise this owing to change in the price of grain. Thus we find Ain-i Mahru, governor of Multan, stating at one place that he had ordered the assignments of the soldiers to be paid half in silver and half in kind. Later on, while keeping this rule for the 'old peasants', he

\textsuperscript{12} Futuhat, Prof. Rashid's edition, 16.
\textsuperscript{13} Only 32 years of the reign would be left after Junaid's work.
\textsuperscript{14} Aţf, 94.
ordered 'new peasants' to pay the whole of the state share in the grain they produced. But, as Moreland points out, the share of the produce taken by the state is not recorded by our authorities anywhere, and this was probably due to the fact that there was no uniform rule with reference to the state share of the produce for the whole country.

(vi) Assignment of Land Revenue:

Afif claims that Firuz Shah was generous in assignments of land revenue for livelihood (nan); that he made assignments of 10,000, 5,000 and 2,000 tankas; and that the whole army was paid by assignments of land revenue (wajh). This was a peculiar procedure of Firuz Shah. The earlier kings of Delhi had not permitted this. 'Sultan Alaaddin', he says, 'declared that a village should not be assigned in salary (wajh); there may be 200 or 300 men living in a village and they would be under one assignee (wajhdar); and if a few assignees combined, they could create trouble. For this reason Alaaddin never assigned a village to anyone but paid his whole army in cash.' Afif goes on to declare that Firuz assigned 'all villages, khatats (districts) and towns of the kingdom to the army' and then attributes the financial survival of kingdom to the fact that Firuz Shah was a saint. All this is sheer exaggeration and nonsense. It must be clearly understood that the convention, or rather the law, of Firuz Shah's reign was that when land revenue was given on paper to an assignee, the government officers in charge of revenue collection would only give him one-half of the amount assigned. The collection of land revenue continued to be a function of the state. Further, these assignments must have been made in 'tankas' and 'jitalas'; so with the increase of agricultural production, the state-half of the land revenue would keep on increasing. A large number of soldiers were paid in cash, as Afif himself admits elsewhere.

Soldiers and military officers to whom assignments were made could either go to the villages with their assignment-orders (ittlaqs) and there the officers-in-charge would give to them half the amount (of cash) specified in the assignment-order, or, in the alternative, they could sell the assignment-orders to brokers in the city and get one-third of this amount from them. Many brokers became rich by purchasing assignment-orders or itfaqis. The army officers were not

15 Ibid., 94-96.
16 Ibid., 220.
17 Ibid., 286-97. Mr. Moreland was needlessly hesitant about the meaning of this passage. Aln-i Mahru in his Insha makes it clear that it was he, who as governor, saw to the payment of the soldiers, half in silver and half in kind (75-76).
given administrative charge of the villages. Ain-i Mahru, however, gives us one case in which the assignees had illegally taken charge of a village on behalf of one Ziyauddin, who was absent owing to military service in Lakhnauti. Ain-i Mahru records his serious complaints against them. They even levied the jizya on the Hindus without state authority.\(^\text{18}\)

Concerning non-military assignments, a clear distinction must be made between assignments of land revenue to government officers from the villages and territories under their jurisdiction, and assignments to other persons—mystics, ulama, pensioners, etc.

There was no provision in Firuz Shah’s system to prevent his officers from making enormous fortunes by overtaxing the peasants in lands assigned to them and withholding money due to the state. A few of these great fortunes, based on corruption, are recorded by Affi with great regret.

But it was different with other assignees. Ain-i Mahru tells us that three lakhs of tankas (a year) were assigned to various persons from the revenues of Multan. He told the assignees that he could put to their credit inhabited villages with cultivated and uncultivated lands; the assignments from the cultivated lands would suffice for their livelihood, and the uncultivated lands would serve to maintain their claims. ‘This is possible, but if they demand everything in cash, that is quite impossible.’

The assignment system of Firuz Shah and the official corruption, which it shielded, were the two greatest causes of the fall of the sultanat. The third greatest cause was the declaring of all offices to be hereditary.

(vii) Hereditary Assignments:

Affi continues: ‘After Firuz Shah had given the income of the whole realm (?) in assignments (wajh) to the army,\(^\text{19}\) he made another rule: “If an army man died, his office (istiqamat) would go permanently to his son; if he had no son, then to his son-in-law; if he had no son-in-law, then permanently to his slave; if he had no slave, then permanently to his woman.” This rule was maintained throughout the forty years of Firuz Shah’s reign.’\(^\text{20}\) Many years later Firuz issued an additional farman to the effect that a soldier who was ‘too old to ride’ would be kept in service, but he was to send as his ‘agent’ his

---

18 Insha-i Mahru, No. 28, 62-63.

19 This, as has been shown, was absolutely impossible. It is probably a slip of the pen.

20 Aff, 98. Aff admits that Firuz reigned for thirty-eight (lunar) years only, but nevertheless repeatedly refers to his reign as covering forty years.
son to serve in his place; if he had no son, then his son-in-law; and if he had no son-in-law, then his slave.\textsuperscript{21}

Further, while Afs only refers to posts in the army being made hereditary, Firuz in his \textit{Futuhat} claims that he applied this principle to all his officers. ‘When a person holding an office (\textit{ashab-i shughl}) died, I transferred his office and its dignities to his son, and the status, perquisites and dignities of the office were not reduced in any way.’\textsuperscript{22}

Lastly, if a government employee left more than one son, his private property would be divided among his heirs after his death, but it was for the state to decide, in the case of higher offices at least, as to which of his sons would be assigned his office. After these and other ‘reforms’ to which reference will be made had been implemented, all employees of the state had good reasons for praying for Firuz’s long life and good health. He had given them great guarantees but they were sure to lapse after him.

(viii) \textit{Names of Past Kings in the Friday ‘Khutba’}:

Hitherto only the name of the reigning Sultan was referred to in the Friday \textit{Khutba} (sermon). Firuz directed after his arrival in Delhi that reference to the following sultans should be made before his name in the Friday sermon—Shihabuddin bin Sam, Shamsuddin Iltutmish, Nasiruddin Mahmud, Ghiyasuddin Balban, Jalaluddin Firuz, Alauddin Khalji, Quutbuddin Mubarak, Ghiyasuddin Tughluq Shah and Muhammad bin Tughluq. The non-inclusion of Quutbuddin Aibek is surprising. At the time when Afs composed his work, the names of two successors of Firuz—(Nasiruddin) Muhammad bin Firuz Shah and Alauddin Sikandar Shah—had been added to this list in the Friday sermon.

It was Firuz Shah’s custom to go to see Khudawandzada, sister of Muhammad bin Tughluq, after every Friday prayer. Some time before Firuz started on his first Bengal campaign, she and her son took advantage of this privilege to attempt his assassination by placing armed men in the neighbouring rooms and at the gate. But Firuz Shah was warned, probably by a sign from Khusrau Malik, the lady’s second son; he left her room in haste, took his sword from his maternal uncle, Rai Bhirhu Bhatti, marched bravely to his own palace and ordered Khudawandzada’s residence to be searched. The armed men were caught and they confessed. Khudawandzada’s enormous

\textsuperscript{21} Afs, 302-3.

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Futuhat}, Prof. Rashid’s edition, 18 (para 25). It has to be added that in all cases referred to by Afs, the high offices, to which he generally confines himself, went to the sons of the deceased officers.
The Tughluqs

properties, owing to which she had hoped to put her son on the throne, were confiscated and she was directed to lead a secluded life; her son, Dawar Malik, was exiled, and her second son, Khusrau Malik, was directed to pay his respects to the king like other persons on the first of every month. 23

First Bengal Campaign 24

Not much space can be given to the campaigns of Firuz Shah in a general history of India. He was not the stuff conquerors are made of; he did not delight in leading his people to martyrdom; killing enemy soldiers, who had only enlisted for wages, was for him just ‘multitudinous murder’. Still Sultan Muhammad had lost Ma’abar, the Deccan and Bengal, and Firuz was determined to prove that no part of the remaining empire of Delhi could be seized by a neighbouring power. Under the circumstances of the time he could only do so by taking the offensive. He led two campaigns to distant Ikdala in Bengal and on both occasions he made peace without attempting annexation. He attacked the Hindu rulers of Orissa (Jajnagar) and Kangra, but concluded treaties honourable to both sides on the principle of status quo ante bellum. His longest campaign led him to Thatta and thence to Gujarat; he bitterly regretted the sufferings of his soldiers and determined not to go on a campaign again. But his purpose had been served; after 1367 he could reign in peace with no fear of attacks by neighbouring rulers. He neither gained nor lost any territory and he never tried to develop ‘a taste for conquests’.

When Firuz ascended the throne, Lakhnauti and Sonargaon had been brought under the power of Haji Ilyas Sultan Shamsuddin,

23 I have tried to follow Aif so far as possible, but the matter is not without difficulties owing to the errors of the copyists of Aif, and the errors of Aif himself, who confuses Dawar Malik with Khusrau Malik. Barani (351) says that Sadruddin Arif, the head qazi of Delhi in the reign of Alauddin Khalji, was the father of Dawar Malik and the son of a daughter of Minhaj Jurjani. The Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi (98) says that Muhammad bin Tughluq gave a daughter of his in marriage to Maulana Yusuf and gave the Maulana the title of Dawar Malik. Sultan Muhammad had only one daughter, who was born in the reign of Tughluq Shah. Dr. Riyazul Islam, after considering all authorities, sums up as follows: ‘Dawar Malik was the son of Khudawandzada (sister of Sultan Muhammad) by Qazi Sadrudin Arif. Dawar’s personal name was Maulana Yusuf, but when Sultan Muhammad married Yusuf to his daughter, Yusuf was given the title of Dawar Malik. Khusrau Malik was in all probability the son of Khudawandzada by another husband; it is very unlikely that he was her husband.’ Dr. Riyazul Islam claims that he agrees with Professor Hodivala, who writes: ‘Yusuf must have been chosen as the Sultan’s son-in-law because he was the Sultan’s sister’s son’ (Studies, 309).

24 Aif, 109-24; Barani, 586-97; Sirat-i Firuz Shahi, f. 15(a)-17(b); Insha-i Mahru, 15-17; Mubarak Shahi, 124-25.
who was given to eating bhang and was suffering from leprosy (pars). The capital had been removed from Lakhnauti to Pandua. In the past revolutions had taken place in Bengal without any reference to Delhi, and Haji Ilyas thought he could extend his power in the west. He attacked Tirhut and then marched via Banaras to Bahraich on the pretence that he had to pray for his recovery at the famous tomb of Salar Mas'ud Ghazi. It was feared that, on the same pretext, he might also come to Delhi to pray at the more sacred tomb of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya.25

After appointing Khan-i Jahan as naib-i ghibat (regent in absence), Firuz Shah started on his march against Bengal on 8 November 1353 (10 Shawwal A.H. 754). The rais of eastern UP joined his army with their soldiers; the most important of these chiefs was Udai Singh, the Rai of Gorakhpur and Champaran, who paid 20 lakhs of tribute that were due from him and got Firuz's favours in return. The Rai of Tirhut welcomed Firuz and consented to become a tributary as before, but he and his subordinate rais and ranas did not join the march. Firuz when starting had issued a proclamation, drafted by Ain-i Mahr, which seems to indicate a firm purpose that the country would be annexed. Firuz declared that he would not demand any land-tax or tribute during the current year; next year only the customary taxes would be demanded. The land assignments of Bengal government officers and of Hindu chiefs, who brought all their followers to him, would be doubled; but if they could bring half of their followers only, their assignments would be increased by 50 per cent. Firuz claimed right of inheritance (irs) over the land; so all inhabitants were deemed his subjects, and they need have no fear unless they took up arms against him.26

Haji Ilyas tried to prevent Firuz's eastward march by opposing him at a ford of the river Kosi, but Firuz got the better of him by marching about a hundred karohs north and crossing the stream at Jiaram, with the help of the friendly rai of the place to whom he gave the privilege of a chatt. Firuz's road to the heart of West Bengal was now clear. Ilyas had no alternative but to fly back to his capital, Pandua, and to take at least its leading inhabitants with him to Ikdala.

Afif refers to Ikdala as an island, on which there was a large mud fort and also a city, and he says there was a river seven karohs from it. According to the modern authorities, quoted by Professor Hodivala, the village of Ikdala is in the Dhanjar pargana of Dinajpur

25 Strat-i Firuz Shahi, 15(a)-17(b).
26 Insha-i Mahr, 15-17, No. 6. (Summarised).
district; it is 23 miles north of Pandua in Malda district, 42 miles north of Lakhnauti or Gaur and 15 miles west of Ghoraghat on the Malda side of the river Tangan. 'Ikda occupied an area of about 25 miles; it was enclosed within a broad moat, which was formed by linking up the Chiramati and the Buliya rivers by canals.'27 Firuz Shah pitched his camp south of Ikda about the end of April 1354, and directed his soldiers to construct a wooden stockade (kath-garh) round it. To understand Firuz's changed mental attitude we have to remember that the soldiers on both sides now consisted of three categories—Muslims, 'tax-paying' Hindus in the service of the Delhi or the Bengal government, and 'protected' Hindus who were in the service of their rai's, and that the last category had definitely increased owing to the number of rai's who had joined Firuz. A battle between soldiers was the utmost Firuz was prepared for; he would not permit his soldiers to plunder enemy civilians or to capture, rape and enslave Muslim women.

Ilyas had calculated that the rains would flood Firuz's camp and compel him to retreat. But Firuz's officers managed to deceive Ilyas by suddenly marching back seven karohs to the river-bank; to prove that they were in real flight, they burnt part of their baggage, left a few tents standing and bribed some qalandars to tell Ilyas that the army of Delhi was flying back in distress. Ilyas decided to pursue the retreating enemy and came out of Ikda with 10,000 horsemen, 50 elephants and plenty of footmen. The Delhi army consisted of 90,000 horsemen, who were divided into three equal units commanded by Malik Wilan, the amir-i shikar, Malik Husam Nawa and Tatar Khan. Heavily out-numbered, the Bengal horsemen were defeated and fled back to Ikda; the Delhi army captured the city of Ikda but not the fort. Aff's statement that the footmen of Ilyas amounted to two lakhs and that 180,000 'good men of Bengal' were slain is an obvious exaggeration.

But Firuz had enough of killing. 'These poor men are dead today', he remarked with tear-filled eyes, 'because they wanted to find a means of livelihood for themselves and their families.' The purdah-keeping Muslim women appealed to him with their bared heads from the top of the Ikda mud-ramparts, and he decided to end the war. 'If I allow my soldiers to capture these helpless women', he asked Tatar Khan, 'what difference will there be between me and the Mongols?' And he added, more pertinently, that the attempts of all previous sultans of Delhi to keep Bengal within their control had failed. He gave the name of Azadpur (Free-city) to Ikda and

27 Hodivala, Studies, 311-12.
marched back to Pandua, which he named Firuzabad. Before leaving the frontiers of Bengal, he ordered his soldiers to set free any Bengalis they may have captured; the Hindu chiefs were allowed to depart when their territories were reached; and Firuz entered Delhi in triumph on 1 September 1354 (12 Sha’ban A.H. 755). As symbols of victory he could show forty-seven out of the fifty elephants captured from Haji Ilyas along with some horses as well as the officers of Ilyas. Some treaty with Ilyas must have been made, for we find the two rulers exchanging presents till Ilyas’s death. It is also a fair guess that the officers of Bengal were allowed to go home.

ACHIEVEMENTS IN CIVIL ENGINEERING

The real sphere of Firuz’s genius—for he had a genius—was his capacity for construction, the putting up of buildings and the digging of canals. The subject of medieval architecture belongs to Vol. VI of the present series. Here Firuz’s achievements, which in mass and in cost, exceeded that of all other sultans of Delhi will only be described or listed and no attempt will be made to assess their aesthetic or architectural value.

(i) Early Repair Works:

‘One of God’s favours to me’, Firuz says in his Futuhat, ‘has been the fact that I have been able to repair and renew the buildings of past kings and great amirs, and I have given this repair-work precedence over my own constructions.’ He gives the following list of the buildings he had repaired. (i) The Jama Mosque of old Delhi. (ii) The Minar of Delhi. ‘It had been struck by lightning. It was made better than it had been before and also raised higher.’ (iii) The Shamsi Tank. Dishonest people had filled up the channels that brought water to it; Firuz ordered these channels to be reopened. (iv) The Ala-i Tank (or Hauz-i Khas). It had been filled up with earth and become dry. People carried on agriculture within it; they had also dug wells in it and sold the water. Firuz ordered the tank to be dug up afresh. (v) The Madrasa of Sultan Shamsuddin Iltutmish. (vi) The Jahan Panah. ‘The foundation of it had been laid by the late Sultan Muhammad Shah, my master and patron, by whom I was brought up and promoted. I completed it.’

Affi says that Firuz Shah never left Delhi for any considerable time without prostrating himself—that is, putting his forehead on the ground—before the tombs of the great shaikhs and great sultans of the past. In the Futuhat Firuz claims that he repaired the mauso-

28 Affi, 124-37; Barani, 561-65; Mubarak Shahi, 125-26; Futuhat-i Firuz Shahl, 12-15 (Professor Rashid’s edition).
leums of the following: (a) Shamsuddin Iltutmish.29 ‘I had it repaired where necessary. Doors of sandalwood were put in. The pillars supporting the dome (of the mausoleum) had fallen down; I put better pillars than before. The sahn (floor) of the mausoleum had been left kacha at the time of construction; I had it made pucca (gach-karda). A staircase of carved stone leading to the dome was constructed and pillars of mortar supporting the four towers were built.’ (b) Sultan Mu'izzuddin (Bahram), son of Sultan Shamsuddin, at Malikpur. (c) Sultan Ruknuddin (Firuz), son of Sultan Shamsuddin, at Malikpur. (d) Sultan Jalaluddin. (e) Sultan Alauddin. This was a large building, with a madrasa (college) attached, for the Futuhat says: ‘Doors of sandalwood were put in; and the wall of the abdar-khana (room for keeping water) and the western wall of the mosque, which is within the madrasa, down to the foundations were repaired as well as the floor.’ (f) Tajuddin Kafuri. It is significant that Firuz says: ‘He commanded fifty-two thousand horsemen and was a loyal servant.’ (g) ‘Darul Aman, the mausoleum of my masters. I had sandalwood doors put in. An awning of cloth, which had covered the Holy Ka’aba, was put over their graves. The old endowments for the maintenance and repair of the mausoleum were confirmed and I made new assignments for carpets, lighting and other expenses of those who frequented the place.’ (h) Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya. The Shaikh, according to his own wishes, was buried in an open plain, but Sultan Muhammad, according to the Siyarul Auliya, built a high dome over it. The Futuhat says: ‘I had doors and lattice-works (ja’fariha) of sandalwood put in. Golden chandeliers with golden chains were hung from the four corners of the dome. I constructed a new Jama’at Khana such as had not existed there before.’ According to the Siyarul Auliya this Jama’at Khana was in the form of a quadrangle round the mausoleum in the rooms of which the Shaikh’s disciples could live. Lastly, with reference to the ‘madrasas, graves and mazars (mausoleums) of the great kings and great shaikhs of the past’, Firuz confirmed the old grants and made new grants where necessary.30

29 A line or two are missing here in Professor Rashid’s printed text. We are not told here of the work done on the Madrasa of Iltutmish, and the heading, Maqbara-i Sultan Shamsuddunya waddin Iltutmish, is also not given. It is difficult to identify Firuz’s description with the grave and the room with a fallen dome, which are at present attributed to Iltutmish.

30 Futuhat-i Firuz Shahi, 12-15. I have ignored what are obviously copyist errors —(i) Reference to the grave of Mu’izzuddin Sam at Delhi, (ii) attributing the construction of the Delhi Minar to Mu’izzuddin Sam, (iii) references to the graves of the sons and grandsons of Alauddin Khalji.

I have slightly changed the order in which the buildings have been listed in the Futuhat so as to bring all mausoleums in one list.
(ii) Early Buildings and Fathabad:

Barani, who finished his work in the sixth year of Firuz's reign, refers to three constructions of the Sultan in Delhi. He does not tell us where the Jama Mosque built by Firuz was situated, but assures us that it was overcrowded in spite of competing mosques. The Madrasa-i Firuz Shahi was built by the side of the Hauz-i Ala-i and put in charge of Maulana Jalaluddin Rumi. The third structure above the Siri Dam, Barani says, may be called a palace (qasr) or a khanqah (house for mystics), but it would be most appropriate to call it a madrasa; it was put in charge of Maulana Saiyyid Najmuddin Samarqandi. Barani also says that the hisar (fort) of Fathabad between Hansi and Sarsati was completed while the foundations of the fort of Firuzabad by the side of the Jumna were laid. The Mubarak Shahi says that the Jama Mosque and the madrasa above the Hauz-i Khas (or Alauddin's Tank) were built in 1352 (A.H. 752).

(iii) Construction of Hisar-Firuzah and the Canals:

Some ten karohs from Hansi there were two villages: Laras-i Buzurg with 50 pastures and Laras-i Khurd with 40 pastures (khark). There was scarcity of water in the region; during the summer foreigners coming to India had to pay four jitals for a pot of water. Owing to paucity of rainfall only the coarse grains of the kharif season could be grown in the area; the wheat of the rabi crop requires more water than was available.

Firuz Shah spent two and a half years in constructing the fortified city of Hisar-Firuzah on the site of Laras-i Buzurg and irrigating the whole region by his canals. During this period he only paid short visits to Delhi.

Though Aff's father worked as a shab-navis (writer at night) during this period, a more detailed account of Firuz Shah's canal system is given by the Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi. In A.H. 756 (1355) Firuz Shah went to Dipalpur and dug a canal from the Sutlej to Jahbaz (?), a distance of forty-eight karohs. Next year he dug a canal from the Jumna in the precincts of Mandal and Sirmur, and after causing the water of seven more canals to fall into it, he took it (i.e. the main canal) to Hansi and thence to Arasin (or Baralisan) and further on to the place where he built a strong fort, to which he gave the name of Hisar-Firuzah; he constructed a large tank near the royal palace (kushak) and filled it with water from this canal. He dug another canal from Kahkhar and took it, passing by the side of Sarsati (Sirs) fort, to Harni Khera, and here he constructed a fort which he called

31 For the meaning of khark see Hodivala, Studies, 313-14.
Firuzabad. Another canal was dug from the Jumna at Budhai (or Budhni) to Hisar-Firuzah; it flowed into the tank there but was also taken further.

A principle enunciated by Ain-i Mahru, as governor of Multan, was probably applied to the whole canal system. Building the main canals was the function of the state; the minors, feeders, etc., that took the water to the fields, would be constructed and maintained by state officers, but the cost of their construction and maintenance would have to be borne by the assignees or the cultivators. They had to pay for this or go without water.

The city of Hisar-Firuzah, as described by Aṣif, consisted of a rampart surrounded by a ditch; within the rampart Firuz constructed a royal palace (kushak) and a tank (hauz); the officers also built their houses there and Hisar-Firuzah became 'a large, populous and flourishing city'. It was made the capital of a province (shiq), which included the territories of Hansi, Agroha, Fathabad, Sarsati (Sirs) up to Salura, Khizrabad and other areas. The charge of the province was given to Malik Wilan.

When the system had been put into working order, both the kharif and the rabi crops could be grown. The level of the subsoil water also rose and a well could be made by digging four gaz deep. An assembly of religious scholars declared that owing to the labour and capital he had put in, Firuz Shah had personal claims to haqq-i shurb (water-right) as distinct from the claims of the public treasury. This was interpreted to mean that he could claim about one-tenth of the gross produce of lands, which had been under some sort of cultivation before, and the whole revenue of villages the establishment of which had been made possible by his canals. Firuz's personal income from the canals was about two laks of tankas a year. But this was only a part of the king's personal income. 'No king of Delhi', says Aṣif, 'had so much personal property as Firuz Shah; ultimately a separate department with its own officers had to be established to take charge of his personal properties.'

(iv) The City of Firuzabad on the Jumna:

The canal-system apart, the greatest achievement of Firuz, his officers and his people in the sphere of construction was the city of Firuzabad (now extinct) in the Delhi area. The king first selected the village of Kawin on the Jumna as the proper site for his palace. Then his officers, great and small, began to build their houses in the city, and the rich members of the public also contributed to the growth of the city by building pucca houses. Twelve out of the eighteen areas (mawazi) that were included in the city of Firuzabad have been
enumerated by Aff— the town of Indpat, Serai of Malik Yar Parran, Serai of Shaikh Abu Bakr Tusi, the areas of Kawin, Kathiwar, Lahrawat, Andheoli, Serai Malika, mausoleum of Sultan Razia, Bihari, Mahrauli and Sultanpur. The city, when completed, extended for five karohs from Indpat to Firuz Shah's Kushaki Shikar or the Ridge. Karoh after karoh the city was full of people. Aff enumerates eight jama mosques, each of which could accommodate a Friday congregation of about 10,000. There was a brisk movement of people over the five karohs that separated Firuzabad from old Delhi, and Aff gives us the following 'fixed charges' for transport—one seat in a cart, 4 jitals; hire of a buffalo or a bullock (sutur), 6 jitals; hire of a horse, 12 jitals; hire of a litter (dula), half a tanka. But Aff lived to see the almost total destruction of Firuzabad. 'God be praised!' he remarks, 'A city so great, so populous and so prosperous has, in accordance with Divine destiny, been ruined in a number of ways. Most of the inhabitants were destroyed by the (Timurid) Mongols and the survivors fled in various directions. All this is God's wisdom; complaining is not permitted. An order of Destiny cannot be deflected by any human foresight.' Today the kotla of Firuz Shah in New Delhi and his kushak on the Ridge are the sole remnants of Firuz Shah's great capital.

THE SECOND BENGAL CAMPAIGN 32.

On the day of Id, Zil Hij A.H. 756 (17 December 1355) Firuz received the robes of honour and a manshur (order) assigning India to him from the Caliph Al-Hakim bi-Amrillah Abul Fath Abi Bakr bin Abi Rabi Sulaiman from the capital of Egypt. In 1357 Zafar Khan, a Persian by birth and a son-in-law of Sultan Fakhruddin of Sunargaon, came to Firuz Shah at Hisar-Firuzah with two elephants. 33 He complained that Haji Ilyas had attacked Sonargaon suddenly, put Fakhruddin to death and crushed all his followers. Zafar Khan could only reach Delhi by sea-route; after going round the whole of the Indian peninsula, he had come to Delhi by way of Thatta.

32 Aff, 137-63; Mubarak Shahi, 126-28.
33 So in the Mubarak Shahi; Aff says that he had one thousand (Bengali) horsemen and a large number of foot-soldiers. This seems improbable. Dr. Riyazul Islam rejects the detailed account of Zafar Khan's coming via Thatta and his audiences in Firuz's court, which Aff gives us, on the ground that it is 'chronologically absurd'. Fakhruddin was overthrown in 1340-41. What was Zafar Khan doing all these years? Zafar Khan's character and qualifications must have been well known in Delhi; otherwise he would not have been placed among the highest officers so soon after his arrival. His history during the preceding years remains to be discovered, but the Delhi government was obviously prepared to receive him on the basis of his known personal merits. He had no following and no influence to back him.
Zafar Khan, as the future was to show, was a man of ability and character. Firuz at the first interview gave him 30,000 tankas for ‘washing his clothes’; later on he gave Zafar four lakhs of tankas for himself and his followers, confirmed him in the title of Zafar Khan and appointed him naib wazir. But as to Zafar Khan’s request that justice should be done to him by the punishment of Haji Ilyas, Firuz said that the matter would require consideration. When Zafar Khan went to meet Khan-i Jahan at Delhi, he found him equally friendly. In 1358 (A.H. 759) the Mongols came up to Dipalpur, but were driven off by an army sent under Malik Qabul, the sar-pardahdar. In November 1358 (end of A.H. 759), Firuz’s officers, who were carrying presents to Haji Ilyas, learnt on reaching Bihar that Ilyas had died and had been succeeded by his son, Sultan Sikandar. They asked Sultan Firuz for his instructions; he directed them to return the presents to Delhi, to hand over the horses to the imperial army in Bihar and to keep the Bengal envoys at Kara.

In 1359 (A.H. 760) Firuz Shah once more appointed Khan-i Jahan as nabi-i ghabat and started for Bengal with 80,000 horsemen and 470 elephants. He had marched a few stages when Tatar Khan came to see him after the morning prayers, discovered the wine-vessels the Sultan had tried to hide, and extracted from him the promise that ‘he would not touch any liquor while Tatar Khan was in the camp’. Firuz considered that Tatar’s attitude had been too presumptuous and he also wished to regain his freedom; consequently, he sent Tatar Khan as governor of Hisar-Firuzah after a few days. Marching by way of Awadh and Kanauj, Firuz spent six months (including the monsoon season) in building the town of Jaunpur, named after his cousin, Sultan Muhammad, who had held the title of Malik Jauna at one time.34 Sultan Sikandar’s envoys failed to satisfy him and so he decided to march eastwards. Sikandar, like his father, took refuge in the fort of Ikdala. During this march Firuz nominated his son, Fath Khan, aged about eight years, as his successor and ordered his name also to be superscribed on the coins.

It is hard to discover the real reason for the second Bengal campaign. The Sirat-i Firuz Shahi says that Firuz was annoyed at Sikandar’s insolence, but Sikandar did all he could to maintain good relations. Affi writes on the assumption that Firuz wanted to establish Zafar Khan at Sonargaon, but that, as the sequel was to show, was clearly impossible so long as Sikandar held West Bengal. Dr. Riyazul Islam suggests that Firuz expected that Sikandar was so

34 It is also said that Jaunpur was named after a Hindu rishi.
weak that he could conquer without bloodshed; if so, he made a serious miscalculation.

It seems that the Delhi army was able to cross the water-barrier and surround the Ikclala mud-fort. One day a bastion of the fort fell down and Firuz's soldiers wanted to break into the fort. But Firuz ordered them to wait for a day. 'Husamuddin Nawa!' he told his commanding officer. 'I want this place to come into my hands without my soldiers having to go into it.' He referred to the havoc they would cause and to the sufferings of Muslim women who fell into their hands. During the night the Bengalis rebuilt the bastion and the siege dragged on.

Sikandar asked his ministers to find some means of inducing the 'dragon' (aszdaha) to withdraw as the sufferings of his people were very great. His ministers by a letter and a messenger got into touch with the ministers of Firuz, and Firuz assented to terms of peace, provided Sonargaon was handed over to Zafar Khan. Haibat Khan, a Bengali officer in Firuz's service, who had two sons in the service of Sikandar, was sent to make matters clear. If Afif is to be trusted, Sikandar said to Haibat Khan: 'Sultan Firuz is my master, my patron and my uncle. I could not dream of fighting him. If my uncle wants Sonargaon for Zafar Khan, I hereby give it to him. Also, it was not necessary to march here with an army; I would have obeyed my uncle's written farman to this effect.' As a final proof of the 'uncle-nephew relationship', Firuz sent Malik Qabul Torabund35 with a royal robe, a hat (kulah) or crown worth 80,000 tankas and other presents. Malik Qabul dressed Sikandar in this royal robe, and after walking seven times round his throne, he put the crown on Sikandar's head. But Zafar Khan, after consulting his friends, decided not to leave the secure safety of Firuz's service for the doubtful throne of Sonargaon; the party of the late Sultan Fakhruddin had been completely uprooted in 1341 and could not be revived. Even Firuz's offer to stay on in the area for such time as may be necessary could not induce Zafar Khan to change his mind.

THE JAJNAGAR CAMPAIGN36

Since the time when Ulugh Khan attacked it during the reign of Tughluq Shah, Jajnagar or Orissa had acknowledged the supremacy

35 For an attempt to find the meaning of this Hindi word, see Hodivala, Studies, 317.
36 Afif, 169-74; Mubarak Shahi, 129-30; Insha-i Mahru, 27-35, No. 14. Mahrū's arzdaash is a petition sent to Firuz Shah after the receipt of his Fathnama (Message of Victory). It is a contemporary work, but the facts in it were probably culled from the Fathnama.
or suzerainty of Delhi and sent a regular supply of elephants. But when Firuz started on his second Bengal campaign, the Gajpati of Jajnagar, Viranbhuanudeva III (Saka 1274-1300, A.D. 1351-78) was won over to the Bengal side and in this act of insubordination or 'declaration of independence' he was supported by his wazirs or mehtas, who in Orissa were called paturis. They assured him that Delhi was far off. So Firuz Shah left his baggage at Kara in charge of his brother, Qutbuddin, and marched with some 40,000 horsemen by way of Bihar to Jajnagar. Aiff, whose father was with the army, assures us that the country was remarkably prosperous. The houses were large with good orchards and there was plenty of cultivated land. The invading army lacked nothing. Slaves could be purchased for two copper coins; no one cared to buy cattle, for they could be had for the asking. At every stage the invading army found enough goats for its food. There was no Musalman in the land. Firuz would fight and forgive; he would desecrate some ancient temples to gain the applause of Muslim fanatics, though he knew that the shari'at prohibited this; and, above all, he would enjoy hunting elephants. If Aiff's father told him about the route of Firuz's march, our author forgot it, and we have to depend on other authorities.

The first fort attacked by Firuz was Sekhar or Sekhan, which Dr. Riyazul Islam identifies with the modern Panchet hill and the old Panchkot fortress. The name of the rai is given as Salmin by Mahru and as Sadhan by the Mubarak Shahi. The Rai of Sekhar, according to the Sirat, had thirty subordinate rai and offered a stiff resistance, but he was compelled to fly and his daughter fell into the hands of the invaders and was adopted by Firuz Shah. The next important place was Tinianagar, to which Mahru refers as 'Aztasaran, whose wilayat (territory) is Tinia'; according to Mahru the inhabitants had never paid taxes to any authority. Konianagar, which may be identified with Jajpur, was the next stage, according to the Sirat; here the inhabitants were peaceful Brahmins and Firuz ordered his soldiers not to molest them. The next stages given are—Kalkalghati (or Kalkalla), 15 miles north of Cuttack; Sarangarh (referred to by Mahru), a fort now in ruins, 5 miles south-west of Cuttack; Chattragarh (referred to by the Sirat); and Ahramin (referred to by Mahru).

Our authorities (Mahru, Mubarak Shahi and Aiff) agree in stating that Firuz captured Cuttack-Banarsi and that he destroyed the idol of Jagannath at Puri. After that, if Aiff is to be believed, Firuz built a wall of earth and wood (kath-garh) round a forest of about ten or eleven miles in which eight elephants used to live and captured the brutes after they had become helpless owing to hunger and thirst.

The Gajpati had wisely preferred flight to fighting. He sent
Ahmad Khan, a Bengali Muslim officer in his service, along with one of his own patus, named Baki, with twenty-eight elephants to Firuz Shah. But they failed to cut any ice. Rana Sahasmal, the superintendent of the Gajpati’s elephant-stables, was also captured. Ultimately Rai Dahir, the Gajpati’s father-in-law, intervened, and Raghu Jita Pandit was sent to assure the Gajpati. The Gajpati (according to Mahrū) ‘prostrated himself in the Hindu way, declared that he and his father had been obedient servants of the (Delhi) court and promised to hand over to Firuz’s officers all elephants that were captured and brought to Cuttack-Banarsi’. Firuz assured the Gajpati that he had only come to hunt elephants, and that the Gajpati’s flight had been unnecessary.

Both Mahrū and Mubarak Shāhi state that Firuz returned directly to Kara. He reached Delhi in May or June 1361 after an absence of two and a half years. It is impossible to believe in Afīf’s account of Firuz Shah losing his way for six months.

**FOUR YEARS OF PEACE**

Firuz Shah’s return to Delhi was duly celebrated; qubbās were built and the seventy-three elephants he brought were properly displayed. The city of Firuzabad had been built; Firuz Shah now proceeded to construct the royal palace (kushak) and the ramparts. He also built a kushak at Mahendwari (or Chandwari). Among the good acts of this period (according to Afīf) Firuz Shah made a grant of 36 lakhs of tankas to scholars, shaikhs and other religious people, while 100 lakhs of tankas were granted to ‘poor persons without capital’ so that they may bring cultivable land (zamin-i akhal) under the plough. ‘The non-Muslims’, Afīf tells us, ‘whether “tax-paying” (subjects of the empire) or “protected persons” (i.e. subjects of the rais) passed their days in prosperity under the shadow of the royal canopy of Firuz Shah.’

The Mubarak Shahi gives us some idea of Firuz’s canal digging activity during this period. The river Sarsati (Saraswati) comes from the great mountains and falls into the Sutlej. An earthen hillock near a place called Barwar, Firuz was informed, separated the river Saraswati from the Salima canal (of Firuz Shah). If this hillock was dug up, the water of the Saraswati would flow into the canal, which could then be taken to Sahrind (or Sirhind), Mansurpura and further on to

---

37 Afīf, 175-85; Mubarak Shāhi, 130-1.
38 It is impossible to correct the figures about elephants given by our authorities. They give us a total of 101 at least, but the question is of no particular importance to the history of India.
Sunam. Firuz went to the place and began digging up the hillock. 'He took ten karohs of land' out of the province of Samana and assigned it to Ziyaul Mulk Shamsuddin Abu Raja, so that he may bring it under cultivation. He also built a fort there, which he named Firuzpur.' Firuz Shah found it impossible to dig up the hillock, but plenty of fossils, the nature of which was not then understood, were discovered during the process of excavation. 'The records of the reign', says Sir Wolseley Haig, 'have led to the discovery of the fossil bones of sixty-four genera of mammals which lived at the foot of the Himalayas in Pliocene (Siwalik) times, of which only thirty-nine genera have species now living. Of eleven species of the elephant only one now survives in India, and of six species of bos but two remain.'

The Kangra Campaign

Nagarkot-Kangra was one of the strongest forts of medieval India. 'Nagarkot', says the Ain-i Akbari, 'is a city situated on a hill; its fort is called Kangra.' Towards the end of the winter, 1365, Firuz ordered an advance of 10 per cent to be given to those of his soldiers who were employed on a salary-basis and started towards the Deccan. But on reaching Bayana, he stayed there for a short while, returned to Delhi and then started for Nagarkot. The reason for this expedition is hard to discover. Perhaps a new rai had ascended the gaddi, who was not as loyal as his predecessor. Firuz on his way is said to have visited the temple of Jvalamukhi. The Rai withdrew to his fort; the countryside, as usual, fell into the hands of the Delhi army, who plundered the neighbouring temples and collected a stock of Sanskrit works.

After the siege had dragged on for six months, a fortunate incident led to peace, for which apparently both sides were prepared. While Firuz was going round to inspect the siege-operations, his eyes fell on the Rai; the Rai folded his hands and bowed; the Sultan waved his handkerchief and motioned to the Rai to come down. The

---

39 Cambridge History of India, 179.
40 Afif, 185-90; Sirat-i Firuz Shahi, ff. 177-82.
42 On the basis of Afif's assertion that after reaching Delhi in May-June 1361, Firuz did not go on any campaign for full four years, Professor Hodivala (Studies, 822) makes the following suggestions about dates. (a) Firuz could not have left Delhi for Nagarkot before Rajab A.H. 766 (March-April 1365). (b) As that stronghold held out for six months, he could not have reached Thatta before the middle of A.H. 767 (April 1366). The rainy season of that year was passed in Gujarat. (c) The conquest of the town (of Thatta) ...... could not possibly have taken place before the middle of A.H. 768 (March 1367).
Rai’s mehtas advised him to trust the Sultan. When the Rai appeared before the Sultan and prostrated himself according to the court-customs of the day, the Sultan placed his hands on the Rai’s back and bestowed on him a robe of honour and a char. The Rai returned to his fort and sent such presents as he could. Nagarkot was not conquered, for neither the Sultan nor his army entered the fort. The suzerainty of Delhi was recognized and the Rai retained the authority his ancestors had exercised.

Affi is concerned to insist, on the basis of what his father told him, that it is wrong to say that either Firuz Shah, or Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq before him, placed a char over the idol of Jwalamukhi. Various historians have accepted or rejected the statement. But, as Dr. Riyazul Islam correctly points out, Affi was confused and has confused others. The interior of the temple consists of a square pit, about three feet deep. In the middle the rock is slightly hollowed out about the principal fissure, and on applying a light the gas bursts into a flame. There is no idol of any kind, the flaming fissure being considered as the fiery mouth of the goddess, whose headless body is said to be in the temple of Bhawan. 43 There could be no question of putting a char on the flame. The Sirat says that fifty temples were spared in accordance with the rules of the shari’at.

The Thatta Campaign (1365-67)44

The rulers of lower Sind and Thatta at the time were Jam Alauddin Juna, brother of the late Jam Unnar, and Sadruddin Banbhina, son of Jam Unnar. Ain-i Mahru, as governor of Multan, had complained bitterly of the behaviour of Banbhina, who had repeatedly tried to induce the Mongols to invade the country. The Jam, in Mahru’s opinion, was not so bad, but he was incapable of controlling his nephew and the men around him. Firuz, remembering how Sultan Muhammad had died before Thatta, decided to invade the territory. It was to be the most mismanaged military campaign in the whole history of the Delhi sultanat.45

After appointing Khan-i Jahan as his naib-i ghribat, Firuz started with 90,000 horsemen and 480 elephants. Two of his great officers, Tatar Khan and Ain-i Mahru, were no more. After praying at the grave of Shaikh Farid at Ajudhan, Firuz reached Siwistan and Bhakkar. Since the Thatta of those days consisted of two cities on both banks of the Indus and both cities were protected by strong

44. Affi, 194-254; Mubarak Shahi, 131.
45 Affi is our main authority for the details of this campaign, but there is no reason for distrusting him.
mud-ramparts, Firuz ordered 5,000 boats to be collected and taken down the stream, while he and the army marched by land. Afif says that the control of 1,000 boats was assigned to his father and uncle. While the siege of Thatta was prolonged, the besiegers had to face two misfortunes of which at least one could have been foreseen and provided for. More than three-fourths of the horses died of an epidemic, and there was such scarcity of grain that it was sold at two or three tankas a man. The majority of invading horsemen were starving and on foot. After a series of skirmishes, the Thattians decided to risk a battle. They came out with 20,000 horsemen and a large number of footmen. Firuz and his officers with their weakened forces were only saved from dire defeat by a timely dust-storm. But that evening Firuz explained to his officers: 'Thatta will not fall this time, but I am not going to return to Delhi without taking it. We will march to Gujarat and return when the rabi crop is ready.' So the march to Gujarat began. The pursuing Thattians were driven away, but they composed a Sindhi verse, which Professor Hodivala translates as follows: 'By the blessing of Shaikh Patha (Ibrahim Shah Alam)46 one (Muhammad Tughluq) died and one (Firuz Tughluq) fled away.' The boats of Firuz Shah fell into the hands of the Thattians, and they began cultivating their fields in peace.

In the retreating army of Firuz Shah the price of grain rose to two or three tankas a sir and after that it could not be had at any price. Add to it, the Sindhi guides purposely misled the army into the Rann of Cutch, where there was nothing but salt water as far as the eye could see. Firuz directed his soldiers to take with them as much fresh water as was possible. But the sufferings of his men were terrible. They tried to live on carrion and boiled hide. All the horses perished and the highest officers had to walk on foot. 'At every stage a large number of people and horses died.' After the terrible Rann had been crossed, they came to a desert of sand which could sustain no form of life—no grass, no bushes, no birds and no trees. Finally, they were rescued by a shower of rain and the survivors managed to reach Gujarat.

At Delhi there had been no official news of Firuz Shah and his army for six months. It is to the credit of Khan-i Jahan that he kept the government going. He perambulated Delhi as if nothing had happened; he took all valuable commodities from the royal palace and stocked them for safety in his own house. Finally, he forged and circulated a farman declaring that the king was safe and victorious.

46 Ibrahim Shah Alam was a disciple and successor (khalifa) of Shaikh Bahauddin Zakariya, the founder of the Suhrawardi Order of Indian mystics; Shah Alam's grave at Thatta has been revered through the ages.
and ordered a celebration of twenty-one days. Later, a real farman came to him describing the distress of the army.

The governor of Gujarat, Nizamul Mulk Amir Husain, son of Amir Miran, was the husband of Firuz Shah's sister. He had been doing his work well and it is to his credit that he had two crores of tankas in the Gujarat treasury. But he had taken absolutely no notice of Firuz and his misfortunes. Firuz was naturally angry. 'If you had come to the help of my army and kept sending me grain by instalments,' Firuz told him, 'my soldiers would not have perished.' Amir Husain was sent to Delhi to await appointment to the first high office that fell vacant and Firuz, for the time being, seems to have kept the government of Gujarat in his own hands. The two crores of tankas in the treasury were spent in re-equipping the army. Soldiers employed on a salary-basis were given an extra grant of 60 per cent; soldiers to whom land revenue had been assigned were given loans varying from 500 to 1,000 tankas from the royal treasury. Khan-i Jahan cooperated by sending Firuz such products of the royal karkhanas as could not be procured locally. Afif says that the price of one type of weapon sent amounted to 70 lakhs. But many soldiers of Firuz Shah, after being re-equipped, decided to return home. Firuz, out of regard for what they had suffered, would not establish military posts (thanas) to prevent them from leaving, but he sent orders to Delhi that soldiers and officers in the direct service of the state were to be subjected to 'moral punishments' (tadaruk-i ma'navi)—that is, put in stocks and displayed in the public markets for a day or two—but their salaries and assignments were to be left untouched.

The flight of the horsemen, whose number is not given, certainly weakened Firuz's army and he could not be sure of his success in a pitched battle in the next campaign. Zafar Khan was appointed governor of Gujarat, though he was required to serve with the army during the campaign. Bahram Khan, son-in-law of Alauddin Hasan Kangu, who had rebelled at Daulatabad, sent messengers appealing to Firuz for assistance, but Firuz replied that he could not attend to any other enterprise till Thatta had been conquered.

When Firuz with his army appeared again on the east bank of the Indus, the inhabitants were taken by surprise. The crops which they had sown were ready to be reaped, but in their great panic they left the east bank of the Indus, fled across the river to the west bank, and left their crops standing. There were plenty of villages on the east bank of the river; these villages were captured and probably the city of eastern Thatta also. The Delhi army reaped what the Sindhis had sown. The price of grain, which had been eight or ten
jitals for five sirs at first, fell further when the crop was cut. Some
four thousand Sindhis, who had been unable to fly back, were col-
lected together and put on rations—three sirs of coarse grain per
head per day.

But how to reach the greater Thatta on the western bank? The
Thattians, who had captured the boats of Firuz Shah, controlled all
fords of the Indus for about eighty karohs. After much discussion
Firuz directed Imadul Mulk Bashir and Zafar Khan to march 120
karohs north, cross the Indus at Bhakkar 47 and then march down
the same distance on the west bank and attack western Thatta
from the north. The two officers carried out their orders. But on the
day of battle, Firuz Shah, who could only see the fort of Thatta
and the dust raised by the armies across the broad expanse of the
river, felt disturbed about the consequences of the conflict, for his
army had been weakened by sufferings and reduced by desertions.
At nightfall he sent a malik in a boat and ordered Imadul Mulk and
Zafar to return by the route they had travelled. Obedient to their
orders, the two generals returned to Firuz’s camp after 480 karohs of
quite useless marching.

Firuz felt brave and talked brave. What did the Thattians think
of themselves? He would remain encamped till they surrendered; if
necessary, he could even build a city there. More to the point, he sent
Imadul Mulk Bashir to Khan-i Jahan for fresh troops; and Khan-i
Jahan, in the shortest time possible, collected soldiers on the royal
pay-roll from Lahore to Bihar and Tirhut and sent them to Firuz
Shah under Bashir. There was at last a turn of affairs in favour of
Firuz. Owing to famine in Thatta, the price of grain rose to one or
two tankas a sir, and the Thattians in their distress began to cross the
Indus in their boats and submit to Firuz Shah. The Jam and Banhbina
realized that they could struggle no further and appealed to the famous
mystic, Saiyyid Husain Bukhari of Uchch. The Saiyyid came to Firuz
Shah’s camp, was well received by the Sultan and the soldiers, and
got the best possible terms for the Jam and Banhbina. It was obviously
impossible for Firuz Shah to leave the country in their charge. But
he treated them fair; after they had surrendered unconditionally in
accordance with the accepted protocol of the day, he took them to
Delhi, fixed a pension of two lakhs of tankas a year on each of them
and settled them in the quarter of Delhi known as Serai Malika, the
name of which the public changed to Serai Thatta. No service was
required of Banhbina except attendance at the formal darbar; but

47 ‘Bhakkar is an island fortress in the Indus between Sakkar and Rohri.’ (Dr.
Riyazul Islam).
here, as a rare privilege, he was allowed to sit cross-legged on the
second carpet on the right side of the royal throne. The government
of lower Sind was assigned by Firuz Shah to a son of the Jam and to
Tamachi, the brother of Banhbina; they paid four lakhs in gratitude
and promised to send some lakhs as tribute in future years. After
some time Tamachi rebelled, and the Jam, whom Firuz sent to Sind,
captured Tamachi and sent him to Delhi. Banhbina remained in Delhi
after the death of Firuz. Tughluq Shah II allowed him to go back to
Sind but he died on the way.

Firuz Shah returned to Delhi after two and a half years. There was
rejoicing in some houses and wailing in others. 'It would have been
better', Firuz observed, 'if I had not gone to Thatta.' According to
Asif he issued the following instructions concerning the soldiers who
had gone on the campaign.

'The assignments of all persons, who have died in the Thatta
campaign or in the Rann of Cutch, are to be continued—perma-
nently and unconditionally—to their heirs; they are not to be
harassed in any way and it is not necessary to put the matter before
me again. As to those who have opposed me by taking 60 per cent
in Gujarat and then flying back to Delhi, their salaries and assign-
ments are also to be continued. I do not wish any person to have
a grievance.'

THE TAS-GHARIYAL

According to Asif, Firuz Shah with the help of astronomers
invented the tas-ghariyal—a metal cup perforated at the bottom which
when put in a tub of water would be filled up and sink after a ghari
or twenty-four minutes. When this happened, the public was informed
by the beating of a gong; after every four hours (pass) there was a
gajar or double-beating of the gong. The errors of the metal-cup were
corrected by reference to a sun-dial. The cup and its tub, the gong
and the sun-dial were put on the top of the gate of the Firuzabad
palace. This method of reckoning time seems to have become quite
popular.

Messengers came from Ma'abar to ask for Firuz's help against
Bukka, who had captured their city with its Muslim women, but
Firuz Shah reminded them that at his accession they had decided to
ally themselves with the Bahmani kingdom; and now his soldiers
were too tired for a far-off campaign. The idea of attacking the
Deccan had been haunting Firuz's mind, but Khan-i Jahan now

48 Asif, 234-67.
succeeded in finally convincing him that a campaign against the Bahmanis would be inadvisable.

THE COLLECTION OF ‘SLAVES’

With reference to the energy with which Firuz Shah collected slaves, Aff quotes the Quranic verse: ‘It is possible that you consider a thing to be good and it is injurious to you.’ At first he instructed his governors that whenever they attacked a place (for realizing the revenue), ‘selected, handsome and well-born young boys’ should be brought to him. The governors saw to it that they were also neat, presentable and well-dressed. In former days the governors used to make such presents to the king as they could, and the king was expected to remember this with reference to their transfers and promotions. Firuz now made a general rule that the price of the presents brought by the governors was to be estimated, and to that extent the demand made from them was to be reduced. But as the presents Firuz Shah preferred were slaves, the governors brought slaves to him till the number of royal slaves amounted to 180,000. Having made all offices hereditary, it is possible that Firuz wanted a body of men who would be loyal to him and his successors. But this is only a supposition. What we can be certain about is the desire of Firuz Shah to give to every one of his slaves the salary and status he deserved. Under these conditions many fathers would have been willing to give their sons to Firuz Shah to be brought up as his slaves, for this slavery was not legal in any sense. The most fortunate slaves were given to the nobles, who were ordered: ‘to bring them up as their own sons and to present them before the throne once a year’.49 The next fortunate group was selected for education and some were even sent to the Haj pilgrimage.

A separate department—not directly under the wizarat—was organized for the slaves so that they had their own treasury, majmu’adar and officers. Some of the slaves were sent to the provincial capitals while others were kept at Delhi. The slaves were paid either by assignments on land revenue (like the soldiers) or in cash; their salaries ranged from 10 tankas to 100 tankas,50 but no slave got less than 10 tankas. Their salaries were paid without fail by the treasury every third, fourth or sixth month. About twelve thousand slaves were trained for various crafts. The slaves were to be found in all ministries, departments and karkhanas, but the nucleus of the whole organization consisted of the forty thousand slaves, who mounted guard at the

49 Aff, 267-73.
50 The context shows that these salaries were annual.
royal palace; they developed a strong *esprit de corps* without any loyalty to the head of the state. ‘God be praised!’ says Aff, ‘Since Destiny had ordered from the beginning of time that the Muslim factions of Delhi would declare war on each other a few years after Firuz’s death, this misfortune afflicted the public through the slaves... Ultimately, the slaves became so bold that they unhesitatingly severed the heads of the princes of Firuz’s family and hung them up at the *darbar* gate.’

**Later Constructions; Asoka’s Pillars**

After returning to Delhi in 1367, Firuz Shah gave up the idea of marching beyond the frontiers and consoled himself with hunting campaigns on which his officers and slaves were expected to accompany him. These hunting campaigns cannot be described here, but we may note in passing, as a symbol of the corruption of the age, that no artisan was allowed to accompany the king unless he got a permit from the *rais-i shahr* (city-officer) on the payment of a bribe (*khidmati*).

Among the new cities built by Firuz Shah, Aff notes Firuzabad Harni Khera, Tughluqpur Sapdam and Tughluqpur Kasna.52 ‘In 1385 (A.H. 787), the *Mubarak Shahi* tells us, ’he built a fort at the village of Bewli, seven *karohs* from Badaun, and gave it the name of Firuzpur, but people have been calling it Akhirinpur (the Last City).’53 Aff gives us a list of nine palaces or *kushaks* built by Firuz Shah, but it is difficult to say which of them was built after the Thatta campaign.54 He also gives a list of seven dams (*bands*) built by the king and says that strong dams were also built at many necessary places.55 Firuz also built *khanqahs* (mystic houses) and inns maintained at state cost. A traveller was by custom entitled to free board and lodging at an inn for three days, and the wits said that the king built 120 inns at Delhi and Firuzabad, so that a traveller by changing his residence could live in these inns all the year round free of cost. It is obvious

---

51 Aff, 329-31 and 305-21 for Asoka’s pillars.
52 There seems to be a copyist error about the two Tughluqpur.
54 ‘Kushak-i Firuzabad, Kushak-i Nuzul, Kushak-i Mahendwari, Kushak of the city of Hisar-Firuzah, Kushak-i Fathabad, Kushak-i Jaunpur, Kushak-i Shikar, Kushak-i Band-i Fath Khan, and Kushak-i Salura.’ The Kushak-i Nuzul seems to have been a small palace on the bank of the Jumna, opposite to Firuzabad; Firuz used to stay here for a short time on returning from his hunting trips while the royal palace at Firuzabad was being prepared for his residence.
that Firuz’s public works department must have been a huge enterprise. Artisans of all types had to be brought together and every group of artisans was put under a shahna (officer) of its own. The chief officers were Malik Ghazi, director of the department of public works, and Abdul Haqq alias Jahir Sondhar. Asif, who was destined to see everything crumble down, could not help remarking: ‘Lakhs and lakhs of “tankas” were spent on the buildings; in fact, money beyond measure was wasted!’

Firuz discovered two pillars of Asoka—the larger in the village of Nawira in the district (shiq) of Salura and Khizrabad at the foot of the hills about ninety karohs from Delhi and the smaller near Meerut city. He did not know what they were, but decided to bring them to Delhi. Asif gives us some idea of how the larger stone-pillar, which Firuz called the ‘golden pillar’, was brought and put up at Delhi. Thousands of men from mere labourers to artisans and engineers of the highest type were employed. Raw hides and reeds were wound round the pillar to prevent it from breaking. On digging up the foundation, they found that the pillar had been firmly fixed in a hole in a square stone. This stone was also dug up and brought with the pillar. Tree trunks were piled up by the side of the pillar and the top of the pile was covered with cotton wool. The pillar was made to lean gently on this tree-trunk pile; then one by one the tree-trunks were removed and the pillar placed on a cart with forty-two wheels; and two hundred men dragging each wheel by ropes brought the pillar to the bank of the Jumna. In those days the Jumna was a great means of traffic, and boats carrying 2,000 to 5,000 mans of grain were available. The larger boats were tied together and the pillar brought on them to Firuzabad. Here a new structure had to be constructed for the pillar. Wooden pulleys were used to make the pillar stand vertically and then to make it rise vertically at the rate of half a gaz per day by enormous human labour. The building was constructed as the pillar was raised, and ultimately the pillar was put at the top of the building. Asif, who was twelve years old at the time, states that the pillar was 32 gaz in length, of which eight gaz were under the building and 24 gaz above it. The open length of the pillar can be measured; it is 37 feet. The gaz of Firuz Shah must, therefore, have been 18.54 inches in length.

The second pillar was placed on the Kushak-i Shikar on the Ridge. The five pieces into which it was broken have been now put together. It is 32% feet in length.\(^56\)
THE ‘KARKHANAS’; FRUIT GARDENS, MEASURES OF RELIEF FOR MUSLIMS

Firuz Shah had thirty-six karkhanas divided into ratibi, which provided daily food for men and animals, and ghair ratibi, which dealt with commodities produced by human labour.) Aśf says that his father and uncle were in charge of the alam-khana (concerning the insignia of royalty, etc.), the rakab-khana (dealing with the equipment for horses) and the elephant-stables of the left wing, and that he worked with them. In the ratibi karkhanas, 160,000 tankas a month were spent on the provision of food alone; this amount did not include the salaries of officers and servants employed. The figures of expenditure given by Aśf for other karkhanas are—jamdar-khan, 600,000 tankas for winter clothes alone; alam-khana, 18,000 tankas a year (exclusive of salaries); and farrash-khana (for carpets), 200,000 tankas.

The formal charge of the karkhanas was given to khans and great maliks, but the actual control of every karkhana was vested in a mutasarrif (director) appointed by Firuz Shah personally.) Khwaja Abul Hasan was the chief mutasarrif or director-general of the karkhanas and all royal orders went to him in the first instance.) Aśf quotes Firuz Shah as saying: ‘Just as lakhs of revenue are collected in the provinces, similarly lakhs are collected in the karkhanas. The turn-over (tasarruf) of a karkhana of mine is not less than the turn-over of the city of Multan.’

The karkhanas had their separate diwan; the wizarat, to which their accounts were submitted, was as lax in controlling the accounts of the karkhanas as it was in controlling the accounts of the iqtas. There was plenty of hashiya (marginal corruption and mal-expenditure) in every karkhana. Never during the thirty-eight years of Firuz’s reign, Aśf asserts repeatedly, were the accounts of provinces or of karkhanas examined in accordance with the correct principles of accountancy. ‘It is not that Firuz Shah was ignorant of the principles of accountancy,’ Aśf remarks, ‘he knew them only too well. But he saw everything and preferred to close his eyes; so the auditors (ahl muhasibah) also overlooked the acts of the officers-in-charge (ummal).’

Firuz Shah, according to Aśf, was very fond of planting orchards or fruit-gardens.57 In those days there were 1,200 fruit-gardens in the suburbs of Delhi alone, but Firuz Shah did not appropriate the property of others. He had his fruit-gardens throughout the empire and their total income, after deducting the share of the gardeners,
came to 180,000 tankas. It might be noted that grapes were then grown in the Delhi area, and the cultivation of grapes was so extensive that they sold at one jital a sir.

Reference may here be made to some relief measures of Firuz. (1) Unemployment—Firuz asked the kotwal of Delhi, Malik Nek Amdi, to bring to him such persons as wanted employment. The kotwal passed on the order to the officers in charge of the mohallas. Attempts were made by Firuz—or rather by officers commissioned by him—to do something for those who applied. (2) Shifa-khana—Firuz organized a hospital in which a number of physicians were employed to give free treatment to the people. Medicines were free and in some cases food also. The king endowed some villages for the maintenance of the hospital. (3) The Marriage Bureau—This was meant for Muslims only. Fathers of marriageable girls, who could not afford their wedding expenses, would (if the officers-in-charge were satisfied) be given a lump grant of 50, 30 or 25 tankas according to their need or family status.

Prices and Wages

Asif and the persons, whose conversations he has recorded, repeatedly assert that there was no real famine in the reign of Firuz Shah and, consequently, thanks to the labour of the peasants and the artisans, production had greatly increased and the income of some lucky assignees went up even ten times. 'In the Doab from the hills of Sakroda (?) and Kahrola (?) to Koil there was no village desolated even nominally,' Asif states with commendable inaccuracy, 'and not a cubit of land remained uncultivated. In those days there were 52 prosperous parganas in the Doab. The same was the condition in territories outside the Doab. In every iqta or shiq (Samana for example) there were four villages in every karoh and happy people in every village.'

A comparison with the regime of Alauddin Khalji naturally suggests itself, for no Indian government, whatever its achievements in other directions, has succeeded in freezing wages and prices on a normal basis—the basis of production-cost (nirh-i baraward)—to the same extent as the Khalji Sultan. Asif admits that there has not been the same prosperity during the reign of any other king. But the low prices of Alauddin were due to his great efforts; he gave capital to the merchants, fixed their salaries and supported them in every way. The low prices in the reign of Firuz Shah, however, were not due to

58 Asif, 293-95. On page 383 Malik Abdullah confesses that the income (khira and mabsul) from the two parganas assigned to him had gone up ten times.
his efforts but to Divine favour, or, as we would now say, to the working of the law of supply and demand in a period of peace. Aur gives the price of some basic commodities—wheat, eight jitals a man; gram and barley, four jitals a man; ghi or rughan-i sutur, two and a half jitals per sir; sugar three and a half jitals per sir. The price of cloth and other commodities, Aur claims, were also low. He admits, however, that when rainfall was scarce, the prices of cereals rose to one tankah a man, but the prices came down again for there was no real famine in the reign.

At present we have only two contemporary accounts, both earlier than Aur, to compare with what he says—the Insha-i Mahru and the Khairul Majalis or the conversations of Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh, recorded by Hamid Qalandar in the first decade of Firuz Shah’s reign.

In his Letter No. 20 Ain-i Mahru, the governor of Multan, admits that soldiers on duty were probably not so prosperous as in Alauddin’s days, but he insists that the artisans had raised their wages eight or ten times higher than in Alauddin’s reign on the ground that the price of grain was unstable. Regrating by merchants and artisans had become common, specially with reference to ghi, cloth, sugar and wood. Ain-i Mahru quotes the Arabic proverb: ‘They buy for fifty and sell for hundred.’ In Alauddin’s time the maximum price of a good horse was 120 tankas; but in the account he submits to Delhi, Ain-i Mahru fixes the price of every horse at 500 tankas. The price of other commodities may have risen also.

Concerning the second of our contemporary authorities, Professor Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, the editor of the Khairul Majalis, writes: 59 The age of Firuz Shah Tughluq has generally been depicted as an age of peace and plenty for the masses. The Khairul Majalis, however, creates a different impression. It appears that economic distress was very acute during the early years of Firuz Shah’s reign. The Shaikh often contrasts the conditions during the reign of Firuz Shah (who is not mentioned by name) with the conditions prevalent during the time of Alauddin Khalji. As one who had lived in Delhi during both these regimes and had looked at the economic structure from the point of view of the common man, his observations deserve careful consideration. He says that during the time of Alauddin Khalji there was an all-round cheapness. One man of wheat could be had for 7½ jitals; an equal quantity of (crystal) sugar for half a tanka; ordinary sugar was available at the rate of one jital (a sir). Cloth and other articles were also cheap. A quilt could be prepared for a few tankas. There were a number of langars (free kitchens) in

59 K. A. Nizami: English Introduction to the Persian text of the Khairul Majalis (32), published by the History Department, Aligarh Muslim University.
Delhi, like the langar of Malik Yar Parran, where food was freely distributed. Then referring to his own time (the reign of Firuz Shah), the Shaikh said, "These days neither those langardars nor those people have survived; all have been ruined."

It would not be fair to forget the terrible famine of the time of Mohammad bin Tughluq in comparing the figures of the two reigns, and when Ain-i Mahru says that the prices of commodities have come down but not wages, he is probably referring to the famine figures of the previous reign. Both Affif and Ain-i Mahru admit that the price of grain was not stable, though they seem to differ about the frequency and degree of instability. Ain-i Mahru is very clear about his charge of regrating against the merchants; Affif, who tells us so much about the official corruption of the reign, forgets to refer to the regrating of merchants, probably by oversight. If we are to be guided by the price of horses, a matter which the government could not ignore, then the average price for the consumer was about five times higher in the middle of Firuz Shah's reign than in the last ten years of Alauddin Khalji.

VANISHING OF THE INVINCIBLE ARMY OF DELHI

The efforts of the Delhi sultans from Qutbuddin Aibek onwards had greatly strengthened the army of Delhi. Alauddin Khalji had broadened its base by discarding all irrelevant considerations and looking exclusively to military merit and discipline, and under him and his son, Mubarak Shah, it had become invincible. The sultans of Delhi had some forts on the north-western frontier, but the sultans, unlike the rais, did not depend upon the strength of their forts but upon the striking power of their army as an offensive weapon for knocking down all opposition and controlling the open country. Unlike the Hindu chiefs, the Delhi sultans have left us no great fort—except the fort of Tughluqabad, which was not completed.

The strength of the Delhi army rested upon the stern enforcement of the rules of the arz or the annual review of the horsemen. The government had no organization for training its horsemen; it would only employ them if they had been already properly trained. A man who wanted to enlist in the army, of which the horsemen were the effective core, had to provide himself with one or, if possible, two horses and all necessary weapons of which he had to learn the use. After he had been trained and equipped, he could appear at the arz, where his horse, equipment and his capacity of using his weapons would be carefully tested by the minister of war or an officer appointed by him; if the government needed his services and he was up to
the standard required, he would be paid the price of his horse and his weapons and also his salary for a year. The horse would be branded with a mark (dagh) to show that it was the property of the government, and a descriptive roll (hulia, chehra) of the horseman would be put in the records for identification. If a soldier lost his horse in government service, it would be replaced at government cost, but not otherwise. Now this arz was a stern annual affair on which the efficiency of the army—and, in fact, the effective government of the country—depended.

Alauddin had been very stern in the matter and condign punishments were meted out to horsemen, who having taken their salaries and the price of their horses, failed to turn up at the arz. He paid the soldiers in cash, thus concentrating the power of command and dismissal in the hands of the minister of war, who was expected normally to accept the recommendations of the officer in immediate charge. The standard of Alauddin's army was maintained by Mubarak Shah and Tughluq Shah. Sultan Muhammad lost the Deccan, but he was a professional soldier and would tolerate no relaxation of military discipline.

With the accession of Firuz Shah everything changed. We have only to compare the campaigns of Firuz Shah with those of Malik Kafur to realize the difference. An officer of Alauddin Khalji, who conducted his campaigns as inefficiently as Firuz Shah, would have been dismissed and severely punished. The laws of Firuz Shah, already referred to, would have led to the degeneration of any army. When Firuz Shah made the posts of the horsemen and their officers hereditary, he gave up the basic right of the government to see to the efficiency of its military personnel. The effect would not be felt immediately, but no considerations for the financial security of the military man and his descendants, which Afif advances, can justify a measure so patently stupid and idiotic. From a remark attributed by Afif to the minister of war, Imadul Mulk Bashir, it seems that 80 per cent of the horsemen were paid by assignments of land revenue.60 On paper the whole land revenue of the country was assigned to the army; the repeated statements of Afif to this effect are 'fictionally correct'. But when the officer or horseman took the itlaq-nama (assignment-order) to the local officer in charge of collecting land revenue, he would get only 50 per cent of the cash assigned to him. The other half, we have to assume, was kept for the other expenses of the state. If the military men were on duty at Delhi or elsewhere, they could sell their itlaq-namas for immediate

60 Afif, 220. Wa in taifa wajh dar hashtad bi hashtad dar in mulk rasida.
cash for 30 per cent of their fictitious amount to brokers who, generally through their agents, got the 50 per cent to which the military men were entitled. It may be assumed, therefore, that the living wage of a horseman was one-third of the fictional amount assigned to him in his *iltaq-nama*. The system did not lead to feudalism of any sort; its evil effect lay in the fact that the descendants of military men ceased to be military men and became pensioners entitled to land revenue from specified villages.

The great feature of the period after Firuz Shah’s death was the fact that this land revenue could no longer be collected by Delhi owing to rebellious governors, *muqaddams* and Hindu chiefs; for the army, fear of which had made them obedient in the payment of land revenue and tribute, had completely vanished. The *iltaq*s became pieces of waste paper in the hands of pensioners, who had lost all military qualities and to whom the penniless central government could pay nothing.

After the return of the army from Thatta, its visible disintegration began and twenty years of peace enabled this disintegration to pass almost unobserved. There may have been some 80,000 horsemen in the central imperial service, but the officers knew that no service outside the sultanat would be required of them. So worthless horses were brought to the review and passed as fit on payment of bribes. The same lax standards must have been applied to weapons. Another difficulty was that a whole year would pass and the men had no horses to bring to the *arz*. Firuz ordered an extension of about fifty-one days to be given to them, because the offices had not worked on Fridays. When this period did not suffice, Firuz gave a further extension of two months. When this period also passed, Malik Razi, the deputy minister of war, found a permanent excuse. The horsemen, he represented, had sent their *iltaq*s to the villages and they could not bring their horses to the *arz* till they had received the salary that was due to them. But, of course, they would bring their horses for the *arz* next year! After that the *arz* was only continued for the corruption it made possible.

In fact, the whole organization of the army was honeycombed with corruption. Firuz Shah was informed of the correct facts, but he preferred to close his eyes. Afif relates the case of a horseman to whom the king gave a *tanka* of gold so that he may bribe the clerk in charge and have his horse passed at the *arz*. It is usual for junior state employees to secure themselves against punishments by passing on a part of the bribes they have taken to their superiors; it is also the custom of dishonest superior officers not to demand bribes directly, except where the amount is very large, but to leave the
dirty work to their subordinates and to demand a fixed sum or percentage in the form of presents. Now we are told that the estimated yearly income of Firuz Shah’s government was 6 crores and 75 lakhs of tankas, while the wealth collected by Imadul Mulk Bashir, the minister of war, who had started his career as an inherited slave of Firuz Shah, amounted to 13 crores—slightly less than the total income of the state for two years. The iqta of Rapri had been assigned to him, but out of regard for him the office of the wazir made no demand for revenue from his agents at Rapri. All recommendations of Bashir with reference to appointments and dismissals, assignments of land grants and their cancellations were accepted by Firuz, and, like other officers of Firuz, Bashir too may have accepted presents and bribes from petitioners. Still the thirteen crores of tankas, which Bashir stored in dry pucca wells in the same way as peasants store grain, could only have been collected together by plundering the military budget on such a stupendous scale that the great and historic army of the Delhi empire gradually ceased to exist.61

VISIT TO BAHRAICH; FANATICAL AND REACTIONARY MEASURES; ABOLITION OF ‘NON-SHARI’AT’ TAXES

In 1374-75 (A.H. 776) Firuz went to pray at the tomb of Salar Mas’ud Ghazi at Bahraich, saw the alleged martyr in a dream and became definitely cruel, communalistic and fanatical. He ordered all mural paintings in his palaces to be erased, and the gold and silver vessels to be melted; the use of pure silk fabrics and pure brocade was also prohibited. The Sultan’s stupid ‘conversion’ led to an atrocious deed. A Brahman, who used to assemble Muslims and Hindus in his house and was alleged to have converted a Muslim woman, was brought before him. Firuz offered him two alternatives—acceptance of Islam or being burnt alive. The brave Brahman preferred the latter alternative. We can only affirm that Islam definitely prohibits the infliction of the death-penalty by burning, whatever the crime; and that Firuz was really guilty of a cruel and unpardonable murder. Aiff also asserts that Firuz imposed the jizya on the Brahmans of Delhi, but on this point his memory was probably playing him false.

61 Neither the income of Rapri nor the presents of petitioners can explain Bashir’s enormous fortune. We have no documentary evidence but the following is not perhaps a bad guess of what really happened. When a horseman died or became ‘too old to ride’, the war office kept on demanding his salary from the finance department as before, but nothing was paid to his son or heir, who was not called upon to serve. It is not possible to say how this dishonest money was distributed between the war minister and other high officers. But if Bashir got one-fifth of it, it would explain his enormous fortune. Aiff states that Bashir’s son, Ishaq, also knew how to become rich.
for he confuses the _shari'at-sense_ of the _jizya_ with its current use as a non-agricultural tax. The figures he gives for the three grades of _jizya_—10, 20 and 40 _tankas_—are also incorrect. And what sense could there be in realizing the _jizya_ from the Brahmans of the cities of Delhi only? But in the last fifteen years of his reign Firuz was an incurable and degenerate fanatic.

To the new fanatical attitude of Firuz we may also attribute the following measures of persecution to which he refers with pride in his _Futuhat_—(a) Destruction of three _new_ Hindu temples, one at the pond (_hauz_) of Malwa, the second at Salihpur and the third in the town of Gohana; (b) Order that Muslim women were not to come out of their houses or go to visit tombs outside the city of Delhi; (c) Punishment of the Shias and the burning of their religious books; no details are given but it is incorrectly claimed that the sect was completely suppressed; (d) Infliction of the death-penalty on the leaders of the _mulhidan_ and _ibahatiyan_, i.e. the Ismaili group of Shias; (e) Execution of Ahmad Bihari, whom his followers declared to be God, along with one of his disciples; (f) Execution of a man, named Rukn, who claimed to be the Mahdi along with his followers; the public joined in the good work and tore their bones and flesh to pieces; (g) Execution of a servant of Ain-i Mahrir who used to declare, 'I am the Truth (_Haq_)', and had written a pamphlet to prove his claim; (h) Granting the soldiers of the army four-fifths of the spoils instead of one fifth, which had been the custom of previous kings. The Quran orders four-fifths of the spoils to be given to the fighting men, but this order was with reference to volunteers and not paid soldiers.

Firuz Shah in the _Futuhat_ claims that he ordered the remission of a number of octroi taxes on the ground that the _shari'at_ had not permitted them. Repeated attempts to interpret these taxes have been made. Professor K. A. Nizami’s interpretation of these taxes is given below:

(1) _Mandavi-barg_ (Professor Hodivala and Professor S. A. Rashid interpret it as a tax on the produce of kitchen gardens. But the tax on vegetables and fruits, called _khizrawat_, is referred to as a separate tax in the _Sirat-i Firuz Shahi_ (f.61); Roy considers it as a tax on betel-leaves and Dr. I. H. Quraishi as tax ‘on corn sold in the state market’. It would be safest to take it in the literal sense as a tax on leaves and grass (fodder) brought for sale in the market). (2) _Dalail-i_
bazarha (tax on brokerage in the markets). (3) Jazari (tax on butchers at the rate of twelve jitals for every cow or bullock slaughtered by them). (4) Amir-i tarab (amusement tax, probably paid to the amir-i tarab, an officer appointed by the state to regulate festivals and maintain order in places of public amusement). (5) Gul faroshi (tax on the sale of flowers). (6) Jizya-i tambol (tax on the sale of betel-leaves). (7) Chungi-i ghalla (tax on grain and cereals; chungi means a handful). (8) Khayyali (Dr. I. H. Quraishi and Prof. S. A. Rashid and others have read it as kitabi and interpreted it as a tax on scribes. But it has to be read as khayyali or a tax on those who weighed corn in the markets). (9) Bilgari (Roy reads it as Bilgari; Dr. Quraishi and Prof. S. A. Rashid read it Nilgari, a tax on the manufacture of indigo, which seems to be the safest interpretation. Dr. Chaghtai considers it a preparation of bail, used in buildings). (10) Mahi faroshi (a tax on the sale of fish). (11) Naddafi (a tax on carders of cotton). (12) Sabun-gari (a tax on soap-making). (13) Risman-faroshi (a tax on selling ropes). (14) Rughan-gari (a tax on oil-making). (15) Nakhud-i biryan (a tax on parched gram). (16) Tahbazari (a tax levied from stall-keepers for the use of public lands). (17) Chappa (Some scholars, like Prof. Hodivala, have read it as chappa, meaning a tax on printed cloth; others have read it as chatta or a balcony that abets on a public road. The former appears to be more satisfactory). (18) Dadbekt (fee on law-suits; but only in excess of 10 per cent of the property involved, according to Prof. Hodivala). (19) Qimar Khana (tax on gambling houses). (20) Kotwali (Dr. I. H. Quraishi interprets it as 'police dues' but it may have included many taxes charged by the kotwali office). (21) Ihtisabi (charges made by the muhtasib or officers in charge of public morals (ihtisab). The muhtasib was in the service of the government and not entitled to tax the public for his services). (22) Qassabi (a professional tax on butchers, apart from jazari). (23) Kuza wa khisht pazi (a tax on brick-kilns and potteries). (24) Ghari (house-tax). (25) Charai (grazing-tax). (26) Musadarat (fines of various kinds). (27) Kababi (tax on minced meat). (28) Khizrawat (taxes on vegetables and fruits).  

63 Mawardi tells us in his Akhunas Sultaniyah that under the later Abbasids the muhtasibs were officers in charge of public morals. They could not enter a house; also they could not try a case, for this was the function of the qazi or judge. But all the external aspects of city-life were in their charge. According to Mawardi, respect for the muhtasibs had decayed owing to their dishonesty and lack of character. In India we do not find a special body of officers, known as muhtasibs; it was found more convenient to assign the duties of the muhtasibs to officers with real executive authority, like the maqta or the kotwal.  

64 The copyists through the ages have worked havoc both with the number of
Aff says that Qazi Nasrullah was directed by the king to announce the list of the prohibited taxes publicly from the back of an elephant in 1375-76 (A.H. 777). Aff was present at the time of the announcement. The total of the abolished (octroi) taxes amounted to thirty lakhs. They concerned Delhi and its suburbs only. It was not possible for Firuz Shah to change the tax-structure of the whole empire.

The Shari'at has not contemplated octroi duties, whether good or bad, for the simple reason that the Prophet did not have to manage the affairs of a really large city. The Futuhat-inscription would guarantee the Delhi citizens against the reimposition of the abolished taxes; on the other hand, city-officers, who wanted to reimpose those or similar taxes, would see to the destruction of the inscription. Also octroi taxes could be imposed by the officers of other cities without the permission of the Sultan or even of his governors. Ain-i Mahr, in his Letter No. 20, expresses surprise at the fact that taxes at Uchch, which had been abolished by Sultan Muhammad, had been reimposed by some officers without his knowledge or permission as governor. It is impossible to say in what other cities the same thing took place.

Firuz's action was probably based on the demand of the ulama throughout the middle ages that the state should only collect taxes prescribed by the shari'at, though he could not go beyond the abolition of the octroi duties of Delhi. The question was considered and dismissed in a few sentences by Ain-i Mahr. 'If you confine your taxes to those prescribed by the shari'at—that is, taxes levied by the Prophet—then you must confine your expenditure also to items prescribed by the shari'at. If both these conditions are fulfilled, then your budget will balance. But if for various reasons, which are too obvious to be discussed, the shari'at-taxes do not suffice for the expenditure of the present-day state, then your course must be to follow not what the shari'at prescribes, but what it permits.'

taxes and their spellings. The Tabaquit-i Akbari adds two more taxes to the above—nikah (a tax on marriages) and darogha (a tax for the perquisites of the darogha).

Aff refers to three or more taxes—like dangana, mustaghil, and dauri—and explains their character. Two examples should suffice. If a merchant brought a beast of burden to old Delhi, the government officers compelled it to carry building-material without payment at least once from Delhi to Firuzabad. After a merchant's goods had paid the import-duty (called zakat) at the Sutat-i Adl, it was taken to the khazzana and kept there for a further charge of one dang (copper coin) per tanka for a long period. Though dangana is referred to in the Sirat-i Firuz Shahi, the other taxes were probably remitted after the Futuhat-i Firuz Shahi had been inscribed.

65 Insha-i Mahr, 48.
66 Ibid., 69 (No. 30).
THE GREAT OFFICERS OF FIRUZ SHAH

When Firuz Shah held his public darbar, some ten or twelve great officers were allowed to sit but the rest, including members of the royal family, had to stand. The curious privilege of sitting during the darbar, but on the uncarpeted floor, was given to three Hindu rais—Rai Madar Deva, Rai Sabir and Rawat Adharan. The normal seat of the minister of war was on the left of the royal throne, but Bashir was not allowed to sit there because he was legally a slave of the Sultan. Convention required that Firuz should talk only to the wazir during the darbar; even when he wished to talk to others, it had to be through the wazir.

Space will only permit brief references to the leading officers of the reign.

(i) Tatar Khan:

Though Khan-i Jahan was appointed wazir, Tatar Khan was believed to be the senior-most officer and sat on the right of the royal throne while Khan-i Jahan sat on the left. He seems to have died soon after the second Bengal campaign. To posterity Tatar Khan is known by two encyclopaedic compilations—the Tafsir-i Tatar Khani and the Fatawa-i Tatar Khani. The former gave all the differences in the interpretations of the Quran (tafsir) within the orthodox (Sunni) creed and referred each opinion to the author who had propounded it. Similarly the Fatawa-i Tatar Khani collected all the differences in the Hanafi law as propounded by different jurists. Both must have been convenient works of reference, but they were too voluminous to last. The Fatawa-i Tatar Khani consisted of 30 volumes, according to Afif. Some parts of it have survived and references to it are found in the Fatawa-i Alamgiri.

(ii) Khan-i Jahan Maqbul:

According to Afif, Khan-i Jahan worked as wazir for eighteen years and died in 1368-69 (A.H. 770) after he had reached the age of eighty. He was succeeded as wazir by his son, who had been named Jauna by Sultan Muhammad and was also given the title of Khan-i Jahan by Firuz.

Apart from the grants to Khan-i Jahan's officers, soldiers and members of his family, Firuz seems to have assigned lands yielding about thirteen lakhs of tankas a year to Khan-i Jahan personally; and with the growth of agricultural production during the reign, this amount must have increased considerably. The great wazir took the customary presents from the maqtas (governors), but he made a
careful list of these presents, placed the list before the royal throne and deposited the total amount in the treasury of the royal karkhanas, which was not under his direct control. He also, like other good wazirs, presented four lakhs of tankas to the Sultan every year. Apart from this, he was incorruptible. 'Khan-i Jahan', Aśif assures us, 'did not demand a copper coin from the maqtaš or from any one else.' The king left all affairs of the state in the hands of the wazir, but the wazir never forgot his place. When Firuz was residing at Salura, Khan-i Jahan and his officers used to go to him every Saturday to place the official papers before him and to obtain his instructions. Though each trusted the other, occasional misunderstandings were inevitable. On one occasion when Khan-i Jahan thought that Firuz wished to appoint Zafar Khan in his place, he sent to the Sultan the original letter he had written with his own hand promising to make the post of wazir hereditary in Khan-i Jahan's family. When they met after a few days, Firuz succeeded in explaining that he had been misunderstood.

Two examples given by Aśif show us how the Khan-i Jahan used to 'manage' the Sultan. It was reported to the king by two spies that the silver shashganis (one-sixth of a tanka) issued by the mint, of which one Kajar Shah was in charge, was less by one grain in weight. Khan-i Jahan insisted on an immediate inquiry in the presence of the Sultan. Since the charge was correct, Khan-i Jahan advised Kajar Shah to arrange with the goldsmiths that they would transfer into the crucible the necessary silver, which would be brought in a piece of charcoal, while he engaged the sultan in conversation. The weight of the shashgani was found correct and this fact was officially proclaimed. But Khan-i Jahan soon after dismissed Kajar Shah on another pretext. At another time Khan-i Jahan found Firuz Shah, while sitting on the throne, scolding a number of officers. A pair of socks ornamented with precious stones and valued at 80,000 tankas were missing; the officers had put them in the list of articles sent to Lakhnauti but had really divided the proceeds among themselves. Khan-i Jahan caught hold of the sleeves of the officers in great anger and dragged them out of the throne-room. Then by threatening them with the death-penalty, he realized the embezzled money immediately. When Firuz asked him about the matter next day, he could reply with a smile, 'Eighty thousand tankas have been deposited in the treasury; whether the socks were sent to Lakhnauti or not is a different question.'

These two instances, purposely selected by Aśif, should not lead us to conclude that Khan-i Jahan continued the discipline and good work of the sultanat in its palmy days. It was easy to punish the
smaller fry, but when it came to the big guns, Khan-i Jahan had to be careful. Firuz used to embrace him and address him as 'brother', but other high officers also had a pull with the Sultan. Khan-i Jahan was on the best of terms with Bashir, the minister of war, and made no inquiries into his ill-gotten wealth. The same was true of Malik Shahin, the officer (shahna) in charge of the Sultan's private maflis (maflis-i khas), who left a legacy of 50 lakhs of tankas in cash along with a lot of jems and valuables. 'The khans and maliks of the reign grew rich and collected enormous quantities of gold and precious stones.' Afif is correct in stating that Khan-i Jahan controlled all officers of the regime, but it was unfortunately obtained by overlooking their corruption and their withholding of money, which should have been deposited in the public treasury. There was, however, one exception. Ain-i Mahrū objected to this shielding of corruption.

(iii) Ain-i Mahrū: 67

Ain-i Mahrū had a brilliant career as an administrator during the reign of Muhammad bin Tughluq. Firuz Shah appointed him mushrif-i mamlāk and as such he was in charge of collecting the taxes of the whole empire; the auditing of expenditure was in charge of another high officer, the mustawf-i mamlāk; and both were subordinate to the wazir, who was in charge of the finance department. The surviving letters of Ain-i Mahrū, which have been so carefully edited by Professor S. A. Rashid, prove that he was a highly educated man of remarkable politeness and great charm and a master of the mild answer that turns away wrath. But he could not pull on with Khan-i Jahan; the two used hard words for each other publicly in the wazir's office and also in the presence of the Sultan. 68 Ultimately Firuz allowed Khan-i Jahan to dismiss Ain-i Mahrū from the office of mushrif-i mamlāk. But three days later he appointed Ain-i Mahrū governor of the three provinces of Multan,

67 He must be clearly distinguished from Ainul Mulk Multani to whom Barani refers first during the siege of Ranthambhore in 1301. Ain-i Mahrū died some time after the second Bengal campaign of 1360. To identify them—as Prof. S. A. Rashid has done—would mean giving over 75 years of working life to one man. Secondly, while Ainul Mulk Multani was a general of great repute, Barani declares (389-390) that Ainul Mulk (Mahrū) and his brothers 'knew nothing of warfare and had no military experience'. Ain-i Mahrū gives his name as Abdullah Muhammad Sharif; the title of Ainul Mulk was probably given to him after the death of Alaaddin's great general. His father's name was Amir Mahrū and in his Insha-i Mahrū he refers to himself as 'Ain-i Mahrū' to prevent being identified with the great general, whose title had been bestowed upon him.

68 Afif, whose sympathy seems to have been with Khan-i Jahan, describes these quarrels in detail. The quarrel began with Khan-i Jahan's refusal to let Ain-i Mahrū see the audit papers to which he was by custom entitled.
Bhakkar and Siwistan with 'full powers' (*mutlaq*); since he was not prepared to work in subordination to Khan-i Jahan, these provinces were taken out of the control of the wizarat and put directly under the king. He was scrupulously honest. 'I am not one of those servants of the king,' he says in one of his letters, 'who can be turned from the path of duty by bribery or influence.' *69* Ain-i Mahru was appointed governor before the second Bengal campaign. In one of his letters he refers to the fact that he had been governor for three years.

(iv) *Imadul Mulk Bashir Sultan*:  

Bashir's enormous wealth, and the means by which it was accumulated, must have been well known to Firuz Shah, but he refused to take any steps. 'Bashir's property is my property,' he remarked. Bashir placed in his hands a list of his properties—the silver *tankas* alone amounting to thirteen crores. Firuz read through the list and returned it. Bashir then brought one crore of *tankas* in gunny bags and Firuz accepted the money as a reserve fund for state. When Bashir grew too old for any work, he handed over the office of the *diwan-i arz* to his son, Ishaq, and got a letter of manumission from Firuz Shah; he also set free four thousand slaves he had purchased and gave them some money to establish themselves. When Bashir died, Firuz Shah took nine out of the twelve crores he had left, and allowed the remaining three crores to be distributed among Bashir's heirs. Afif's remarks are significant. 'In no age has any khan or malik possessed so much wealth as Bashir... God be praised! They have to account (to God) for the wealth they have collected honestly and dishonestly (*wajh wa na wajh*)—and left behind them... The rebellion of the royal slaves against Sultan Muhammad Shah, son of Firuz, was for the possession of the money collected by Bashir.'

(v) *Ziyaul Mulk Shamsuddin Abu Raja*:

The meteoric career of Abu Raja, covering some three years (1381-83), gives us the only instance when Firuz Shah made an attempt to prevent the further deterioration of the financial system of the empire. After his appointment as *mustauf-i mamalik* (auditor-general), Abu Raja begun to inform the Sultan secretly of the dishonesty and corruption that prevailed in the finance department and implanted in his mind the hope that he (Abu Raja) would put things right. Firuz ordered all papers to be put before Abu Raja; the wazir, Khan-i Jahan II, was paralysed and issued all orders according to Abu Raja's wishes. Unfortunately Abu Raja, though very able, had

*69 Insha-i Mahru, 213, No. 120.*
been dishonest in the past, and now he began to make dishonest demands even from persons who had access to the king. Instigated by Khan-i Jahan II, the clerks of the revenue office brought charges of corruption against Abu Raja confidentially before Firuz Shah, and proved them conclusively on the basis of documents and witnesses. Firuz's confidence in his favourite gave place to dislike. Abu Raja's houses were searched; 80,000 silver tankas were found in one house and 3,000 gold tankas in another. For six months Abu Raja was brought daily before the wazir's office and beaten with a stick till the stick itself broke into pieces. This is the only case of a recorded torture in Firuz's reign. Finally, Firuz ordered him to be exiled to 'Marut and Tahluk'(?), some places in the waterless desert of western India. Muhammad Shah brought him back to Delhi, but he died soon after.

LAST YEARS OF THE REIGN 70

In 1371-72 (A.H. 773) Zafar Khan died in Gujarat and his governorship along with the title of Zafar Khan was granted to his son, Darya Khan. On 23 July 1374 (12 Safar A.H. 776) Fath Khan, the heir-designate, died at Kanthur; Firuz Shah was deeply affected by this misfortune but he did not nominate another heir. In 1376-77 (A.H. 778) Shamsuddin Damghani was appointed governor of Gujarat. His promise was that he would, in addition to the usual mahsul (payment to Delhi), give forty lakhs of tankas more along with 100 elephants, 200 horses and 400 slaves from among the sons of muqaddams and Abyssinians. He was unable to keep his promise and rebelled. But the sadah amirs of Gujarat cut off his head and sent it to Firuz Shah. This is the only rebellion of a governor in Firuz Shah's reign and no army was needed to suppress it. Gujarat was then assigned to Malik 'Mufarrin Sultani with the title of Farhatul Mulk.

In 1377-78 (A.H. 779) Rai Sabir, Rai Adharan and the muqaddams of Etawah rebelled but capitulated after a defeat. They were brought with their families and settled in Delhi. The duty of keeping the area in order was assigned to Malikzada Firuz, son of Tajuddin Turk, and Malik Bali Afghan.

Rai Kharko, chief of the Katehr Rajputs, invited Saiyyid Muhammad, governor of Badaun, and his brother, Saiyyid Alauddin, to a feast at his place and then put them to death. His action, as reported by the historians, was indefensible. But both the Quran and common sense are at one on this point—no one is responsible for the

70 Alf, 492-503; Mubarak Shahi, 131-41.
crimes of another. Firuz Shah’s actions, amounting almost to madness, indicate the incurable moral and theological degeneration his character had suffered. He marched to Katehr and desolated the whole territory. Rai Kharko fled to the chiefs of Kamaun at the foothill of the Himalayas; Firuz desolated that region also, but Kharko could not be found. Firuz then appointed two strong governors at Badaun and Sambhal, and under the pretext of hunting he desolated the area of Sambhal every year. ‘Nothing was left there except the game.’

As the Sultan neared the age of ninety and became weak and infirm, he relied more and more on Khan-i Jahan II. The wazir put into the Sultan’s mind the suspicion that his eldest surviving son, Shahzada Muhammad, was conspiring to rebel with the help of certain nobles, the chief of whom was Darya Khan, son of Zafar Khan. Firuz Shah, without giving a second thought to the matter, ordered Khan-i Jahan to arrest the nobles. The wazir succeeded in getting hold of Darya Khan on the pretext of settling the accounts of Mahoba, but the other nobles eluded him. Shahzada Muhammad succeeded in reaching his father in his *haram* in the litter of his wife, and explained the real situation to him. Firuz then ordered the Shahzada to suppress Khan-i Jahan. The great officers, the royal slaves, the amirs and the majority of the citizens were in favour of Shahzada Muhammad. In July-August 1387 (A.H. 789) the Shahzada and his followers attacked Khan-i Jahan’s house in the late hours of the night, plundered it and executed his leading supporters. Khan-i Jahan, after killing Darya Khan, fled to Koka Pradhan at Mahari in Mewat for safety. Firuz first appointed Shahzada Muhammad as wazir, but later on transferred all the paraphernalia of royalty to him. The *khutba* was read in the names of both kings.

In August-September 1387, Shahzada Muhammad ascended the throne in the Jahan Numa Palace with the title of Nasiruddin Muhammad Shah. He confirmed the old officers in their posts, but some new appointments were made. Malik Yaqub, who had been *akhur-bek*, was given the title of Sikandar Khan and appointed governor of Gujarat; but before he could take up his governorship, he was required to suppress Khan-i Jahan. The affairs of the *diwan* or wizarat were assigned to Malik Samauddin and Malik Kamaluddin. When Sikandar with his army reached Mahari, Koka Pradhan sent Khan-i Jahan as a prisoner to him. Sikandar cut off his head, brought it to Delhi and then proceeded to Gujarat. But provincial governors could not now be dismissed merely by a written *farman* from Delhi, and only a weak army could be sent with Sikandar. Farhatul Mulk and the *sadah* amirs of Gujarat and Khambayat defeated and killed
Sikandar, and the Delhi soldiers, who had gone with him, came back wounded and plundered. Sultan Nasiruddin, who had been hunting in the foothills of Sirmur for two months, returned to Delhi on hearing this news, but there was little he could accomplish for the great army of the Delhi sultanat had been reduced to his personal retinue.

Two months later the Firuzi slaves rebelled. There were a hundred thousand of them living in Delhi and Firuzabad, and their real object, as Afif suggests, was the great hoard of coins collected by Bashir. Firuz Shah, it seems, had left the main palace in Firuzabad and retired to the Kushak-i Nuzul, and it was in the plain before the Kushak-i Nuzul that the slaves collected together. Nasiruddin fought with them for two days with such soldiers as he could muster. On the third day the slaves brought out Firuz Shah, and on seeing their old master, all elephant-drivers and soldiers left the Shahzada and joined the Sultan. Nasiruddin fled to the Sirmur hills; the slaves plundered his house, and ‘the scenes of the Day of Judgement were enacted in Delhi’. When the situation became calmer, Firuz Shah appointed Tughluq Shah II, son of Fath Khan, as his heir and left all matters under his control. Tughluq beheaded Amir Hasan Ahmad Iqbal; he also exiled Ghalib Khan, governor of Samana and a partisan of Nasiruddin, to Bihar, and gave the governorship of Samana to Malik Sultan Shah Khushdil. On 21 September 1388 (18 Ramazan A.H. 790) Firuz Shah breathed his last.
IV. SUCCESSORS OF FIRUZ SHAH TUGHLUQ

GHIYASUDDIN TUGHLUQ SHAH II, 1388-89

Firuz Shah had left two successors. Sultan Muhammad, his son, had been properly crowned, but the Firuzi slaves had driven him to Sirmur, and Firuz Shah had assigned all affairs of state to Tughluq Shah, son of Fath Khan. But Tughluq II had never been properly crowned, and the Firuzi slaves, who had put him on the throne, arranged for his coronation ceremony on the day of Firuz Shah's death (21 September 1388). The title of 'Ghiyasuddin' was found appropriate for him.¹

Tughluq II sent an army under his wazir, Malikzada Firuz, against his uncle in October 1388, but it completely failed in the enterprise. Sultan Muhammad moved from Sirmur via Bakhnari and Sikh to Nagarkot, where he seems to have found a safe asylum.

'Tughluq Shah', says the Mubarak Shahi, 'was an inexperienced young man, who did not know how to govern. Unaware of the deceitfulness of the sky, he passed his time in drinking and dissipation and the affairs of state were totally neglected. The Firuzi slaves became bold and heedless to such an extent that the authority of the king completely vanished.' Tughluq II imprisoned his brother, Salar Shah, without any reason, and Abu Bakr Shah, son of Shadi Khan,² son of Firuz Shah, sought to escape from him.

Led by Ruknuddin Jundah, the naib wazir, the Firuzi slaves rebelled against Tughluq Shah. On 24 February 1389, they first killed a high officer in broad daylight, and when Tughluq and his wazir, Malikzada Firuz, tried to escape from the Firuzabad palace by a door leading to the Jumna, they captured and killed them and hung up their severed heads on the palace gate.

ABU BAKR SHAH, 1389-90

Abu Bakr Shah, a grandson of Firuz, was put on the throne with Ruknuddin Jundah as his wazir. Jundah, it was suspected, wanted

¹ It is convenient to use the term 'sultan' for Shahzada Muhammad and his successors and the term 'shah' for the other claimants. It is impossible to distinguish between the legitimate king and the pretender. Both were really claimants.

² Our best authority for the period is the Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi.
to kill Abu Bakr and mount the throne; so the well-wishers of Abu Bakr put Jundah and the slaves of his party to death. 'Abu Bakr Shah obtained control of Delhi and of the elephants and treasures of former kings.' But it was different with the provinces. On 27 February 1389, the sadah amirs of Samana slew Sultan Shah Khushdil, who had been appointed governor by Tughluq II, plundered his house and the houses of his supporters and sent his severed head to Sultan Muhammad at Nagarkot.

Sultan Muhammad proceeded to Samana and had himself enthroned a second time (4 April 1389). 'He was joined by the sadah amirs of Samana and all the muqaddams of the hill-tract.' He proceeded to Delhi and established himself there for a time, but all the Firuzi slaves were against him and they drove him out. Muhammad then established himself at Jalesar on the bank of the Ganges and about 50,000 indifferent soldiers collected round him. In August 1389 he again marched against Delhi but was again defeated. It was now clear that the Firuzi slaves were definitely against Muhammad and he took a drastic step against such of them as were outside Delhi and within his reach. 'On 19 Ramazan A.H. 791 (11 September 1389) all Firuz Shahi slaves, who were living in districts and cities, such as Multan, Lahore, Samana, Hisar-Firuzah and Hansi, were, by the order of Sultan Muhammad, martyred without reason by the governors and the inhabitants of the cities.' An attack of Humayun Khan, the second son of the Sultan, on Delhi in January 1390, was again repulsed. There was a political stalemate; the city of Delhi acknowledged Abu Bakr, but such neighbouring district officers as still desired a central authority preferred Sultan Muhammad. Abu Bakr tried to solve the problem by marching against Jalesar; but Muhammad marched at the same time to Delhi and captured it, and Abu Bakr had to return to evict his rival from the city.

Ultimately, however, the majority of the Firuz Shahi slaves became dissatisfied with Abu Bakr, and led by Mubashir, the hajib, they offered their allegiance to Sultan Muhammad. The reasons for their dissatisfaction are not recorded but can be easily guessed; it was impossible for Abu Bakr with the resources of the cities of Delhi only to give to the slaves the standards of life which Firuz Shah had guaranteed them. But the Firuzi slaves forgot that they were handing

3 Mubarak Shaht, 145.
4 Ibid., 147. If the inhabitants (sakanah) also took part in the killing, the Firuzi slaves must have made themselves quite unpopular.
themselves over to an implacable enemy. Abu Bakr fled to the Kotla (fortress) of Bahadur Nahir in Mewat. On 8 September 1390, the slaves informed Sultan Muhammad of Abu Bakr’s flight and he reached Delhi within three days. Mubashir was appointed wazir with the title of Islam Khan. But one of the first acts of Sultan Muhammad was to take the royal elephants from the Firuzi slaves and hand them over to their old keepers. The slaves realized that the days of their supremacy were over. Many of them fled with their families during the night to the Kotla of Bahadur Nahir. ‘Such of the Firuzi slaves as were still in the city were directed to leave within three days; and the city was cleared of these dirty people.’

It is said that many helpless persons, who fell into the hands of Sultan Muhammad after the passage of these three days, claimed that they were free men. He said that every one who could correctly pronounce ‘Kharha Kharhi Kajna’ would be considered a free man. Owing to this test, many Hindustanis were disgraced and the Firuzi slaves were put to the sword. ‘This story’ says the Mubarak Shahi, ‘is well known through Hind and Sind.’

Many amirs came to the capital, and an army under Shahzada Humayun and Islam Khan was sent against Abu Bakr Shah, Bahadur Nahir and the fugitive Firuzi slaves. When the army reached the town of Mahendri in January 1391, the enemy came forward to fight but was defeated and pursued. The Delhi army encamped near the Kotla on the bank of the Dahind. The Sultan also came on hearing of the victory. Bahadur Nahir and Abu Bakr capitulated; the former was offered a robe of honour and allowed to return; Abu Bakr was sent to Amroha where he died in prison. He had reigned for a year and a half.

The next two years of the reign were spent in fighting the Hindu chiefs of the Doab—Bir Singh, Sabir, Adharan, Jit Singh Rathor, Bir Bhan, muqaddam of Bhanugaon, and Abhay Chand, muqaddam of Chandwar. It is not possible to go into details, but ultimately Malik Muqarrabul Mulk succeeded in getting all these chiefs, with the exception of Rai Sabir, under the pretext of a conference into the Kanauj fort and murdering them there.

In the summer of 1392 Islam Khan, the wazir, was unjustly executed. In 1393 the Sultan developed a mortal disease, but in spite of it he captured the Kotla of Bahadur Nahir and despatched his son, Shahzada Humayun Khan, against Shaikha Khokar, who had rebelled and captured the fort of Lahore. But the Sultan died at Jalesar, where he had built a fort, named Muhammadabad after

5 Ibid., 150,
him, on 20 January 1394, and Shahzada Humayun had to return from Delhi. He had reigned for six years and seven months.

ALAUDDIN SIKANDAR SHAH

Shahzada Humayun, the second son of Sultan Muhammad, ascended the throne with the title of Sultan Alauddin Sikandar Shah on 22 January 1394, at Delhi. Khwaja-i Jahan was confirmed in the post of wazir, and other officers of his father were also reappointed to their posts. The coffin of the late Sultan was brought to Delhi and buried in the mausoleum of Badr (?) by the side of the Hauz-i Khas. But Sikandar was only destined to reign for one month and sixteen days; he died on 7 March 1394.

ACCESSION OF NASIRUDDIN MAH Mud

The circumstances of the accession of Nasiruddin Mahmud give us an idea of how the Delhi empire had shrunk during the last six or seven years. It was with considerable difficulty that Khwaja-i Jahan, the wazir, succeeded in inducing the officers to enthrone Nasiruddin Mahmud on 23 March 1394, before they left Delhi. Three high officers of the central government are mentioned—Muqarrabul Mulk was given the title of Muqarrab Khan and appointed heir to the throne; Abdur Rashid Sultani was given the title of Sa‘adat Khan and appointed to the office of barbek; Malik Daulat Yar Dahir was given the title of Daulat Khan and appointed ariz-i mamalik. The great provinces had become independent and their rulers did not need even a formal confirmation from Delhi. The territories to the east and west of the capital were in disorder owing to the power of Hindu chiefs and disobedient Muslim amirs. In earlier days a serious attempt would have been made to bring them under the direct control of Delhi. But now a different programme was followed. The policy of the king and the unity of India did not matter. Khwaja-i Jahan, the wazir, got from his fellow-officers the title of Sultanus Sharq (Sultan of the East) and the privilege of governing all districts from Kanauj to Bihar. The excuse for this partition of the already shrunken kingdom was that the Hindu chiefs were too powerful to be controlled from Delhi. Khwaja-i Jahan succeeded in his enterprise and the Sharqi kingdom of Jaunpur was established.

CAREER OF SARANG KHAN

Sarang Khan, to whom Dipalpur was assigned by the Delhi authorities, may have expected a similar good fortune. He proceeded to Dipalpur and succeeded in bringing it under his control. Then at a battle at Samothala, twelve karohs from Lahore, he defeated
Shaikh Khokar and appointed Adil Khan, his younger brother, governor of Lahore. In A.H. 798 (1395-96) Sarang attacked Khizr Khan, governor of Multan, and succeeded in capturing the place. He next attacked Ghalib Khan, the amir of Samana; Ghalib fled to Tatar Khan, wazir of Nusrat Shah, one of the rival kings at Delhi, and Tatar, at the command of his master, defeated Sarang Khan on 8 October 1397, at the battle of Kotla (or Kohla) and drove him back to Multan. In November-December 1397, Pir Muhammad, grandson of Timur crossed the Indus and captured Uchch. He then proceeded to besiege Multan and Sarang Khan surrendered unconditionally after a siege of six months.

**Events at Delhi, 1394-98**

It is to the credit of Sultan Nasiruddin Mahmud that, in spite of aggressive officers who left him neither power nor territory, he managed to remain king of a sort for twenty lunar years and two months. In June 1394, he left Muqarrab Khan at Delhi, and taking Sa'adat Khan with him, he marched to Bayana. When they were near Gwaior, Sa'adat Khan discovered that Malik Alaeddin Dharwal, Mubarak Khan, son of Raju, and Mallu, brother of Sarang Khan, were conspiring against him; he captured and executed Alaeddin and Mubarak, but Mallu succeeded in flying for protection to Muqarrab Khan at Delhi. Sa'adat Khan decided to return to Delhi and brought Sultan Mahmud back with him. But Muqarrab preferred to stand a siege, which lasted for three months or more, and Sa'adat Khan could not enter Delhi. In October-November 1394, Sultan Mahmud's well-wishers succeeded in carrying him into Delhi but his elephants, baggage and all royal paraphernalia had to be saved in the hands of Sa'adat Khan.

At the approach of the rainy season of 1395 Sa'adat seized Firuzabad, but to give legality to his independent power he had to find a king. So Nasiruddin Nusrat Shah, son of Fath Khan, son of Firuz Shah, was brought from Mewat and put in the royal panel (kushak) at Firuzabad. 'He was only kept as a puppet (namuna) as all affairs of state were managed by Sa'adat Khan.' But after a few days there was a sudden revolution against Sa'adat Khan; taken unawares, he fled to Muqarrab Khan for protection and was put to death by him. The government of Nusrat Shah at Firuzabad was reconstituted, and Muhammad Muzaffar (son of the governor of Gujarat) was appointed wazir with the title of Tatar Khan.

Thus there were two kings, Sultan Mahmud at Delhi and Nusrat Shah at Firuzabad. Muqarrab Khan kept Bahadur Nahir and his men with him and assigned to him the old fort of Delhi. He gave Mallu th
title of Iqbal Khan and put Siri in his charge. There was fighting between the inhabitants of Delhi and Firuzabad every day; the Musalmans (of the two cities) killed each other, but neither faction could overpower the other. Parts of the Doab, Panipat, Sonpat, Rohtak and Jhajjar (till twenty karohs from Delhi) were under the control of Nasiruddin Nusrat Shah. Sultan Mahmud only controlled the two forts (old Delhi and Siri) mentioned above. The amirs and maliks of the great provinces of the empire had become kings and spent their income as they liked.6

This stalemate was ended by Mallu Iqbal Khan, one of the most unconscientious adventurers who have disgraced the Indian political scene. First, by a sacred oath on the grave of Shaikh Qutbuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki he brought Nusrat Shah to Jahan Panah; but on the third day he suddenly attacked his royal guest, who fled first to Firuzabad and then to his wazir, Tatar Khan, at Panipat. Iqbal captured Firuzabad, fought against Muqarrab for two months and then made peace with him. Nevertheless, he attacked Muqarrab’s house suddenly and put him to death, regardless of all his past favours. It suited Mallu Iqbal’s policy not to injure Sultan Mahmud in any way. ‘But he kept all affairs of state under his personal control and the Sultan was only a puppet.’ Iqbal’s next move was to march against Tatar Khan at Panipat, and Tatar hearing of this marched on Delhi. But while Iqbal was able to reduce Panipat in two or three days, Tatar was unable to make any impression on Delhi and went in his disappointment to his father in Gujarat.

This was the condition of the government of Delhi at the time of Timur’s invasion. That invasion has been described in a previous chapter and it is not necessary to give an account of it here.

Khizr Khan, whom Sarang had deprived of Multan and who for that reason may have been entitled to Timur’s consideration, had fled to Mewat from fear of the invaders. Timur summoned him along with Bahadur Nahir, Mubarak Khan and Zirak Khan with a promise of safety, but apart from Khizr Khan, the rest were imprisoned. ‘I assign to you Delhi and all I have conquered’, he told Khizr Khan when setting him free in the Siwaliks. ‘But plague and famine were rampant at Delhi and in the regions through which the Mongols had passed; Delhi, in particular, was quite uninhabitable for two months.’7 So Khizr established himself at Multan and Dipalpur and very unwisely left Delhi to others.

6 Mubarak Shahi, 160-1.
7 Ibid., 166-87.
CAREER OF MALLU IQBAL KHAN, 1399-1405

Nusrat Shah, who had taken refuge from Timur somewhere in the Doab, came to Meerut and then proceeded to take possession of Delhi 'such as it was'. But he made the mistake of sending an expedition against Mallu Iqbal Khan to Baran; Shihab Khan, the commander of the expedition, was slain by some Hindu footmen, and Mallu Iqbal Khan, in his turn, marched on Delhi. Nusrat Shah fled to Mewat and died there. Delhi came under the control of Iqbal Khan and he took up his residence in the fort of Siri. Some Delhi citizens, who had escaped the Mongol massacres, came and settled in the city again. In a very short time Siri was full of people once more. Iqbal Khan was able (by his efforts) to bring a part of the Doab and some districts round Delhi within his power; but the great provinces of the Delhi empire remained under the control of their independent rulers.8

In the winter of 1399-1400 Iqbal Khan marched against Shams Khan of Bayana and extracted two elephants from him; then proceeding to Katehr he got a tribute from Rai Ilar Singh. In 1400-1401 a number of Hindu chiefs, led by Rai Sabir, fought a battle against Iqbal near Patiali; he defeated them and pursued them till Etawah and then proceeded to Kanauj. Mubarak Shah of Jaunpur came out against him, but neither army was able to cross the Ganges and they returned after camping on the opposite sides of the river for two months. Iqbal had induced Shams Khan and Mubarak Khan to join him in this campaign, but with his usual faithlessness he now seized them and put them to death.

In A.H. 804 (1401-2) Sultan Mahmud, who had tasted the unwilling hospitality of the independent rulers of Gujarat and Dhar (Malwa), decided to return to Delhi. 'Iqbal Khan went out to welcome him and gave him the royal palace (kushak-i humayun) in the Jahan Panah for his residence; but he kept in his own hands all affairs appertaining to the government and there was, consequently, a conflict between him and the Sultan.' Nevertheless, the two marched against Jaunpur and Ibrahim Shah Sharqi came forward with his army to fight them. Under the pretext of hunting, Sultan Mahmud managed to get out of Iqbal Khan's camp; he had an interview with Ibrahim Shah with whom he could come to no terms; then he suddenly attacked and captured Kanauj from Malikzada Harwi, the Sharqi governor of the place. The Sharqi and Delhi armies returned home without fighting. So long as Mallu Iqbal

8 Ibid., 168.
Khan was alive, Sultan Mahmud remained content with his city-
kingdom of Kanauj.

During the disorder following Timur’s invasion, the strong fort
of Gwalior had been seized by Narsingh Deva, who had been suc-
cceeded by his son, Biram Deva. For a general with Iqbal’s poor
resources, the fort of Gwalior was quite impregnable; also the Rai
of Gwalior could help other Hindu chiefs in their struggle against
Delhi. Iqbal Khan spent the next two years in fruitless campaigns
against Gwalior and its allied rais. His attempt to capture Kanauj
also proved fruitless.

In Muharram A.H. 808 (June-July 1405) Iqbal Khan marched to
Samana, where Bahram Khan Turk-bacha had rebelled against
Iqbal’s nephew, the son of Sarang Khan. But Shaikh Ilmuuddin,
grandson of Saiyyid Jalaluddin Bukhari, intervened, and relying on
his promise, Bahram Khan came to see Iqbal. Further, on reaching
Talaundhi (fortress) of Kamal Ma’in, Iqbal also took Rai Daud,
Kamal Ma’in and Rai IImu, son of Khul Chain Bhatti, with him.
But he broke his promise on the third day. He had Bahram Khan
flayed alive, while the others with hands and feet bound and a yoke
round their necks were carried along with him. The object of Iqbal’s
campaign was to crush the increasing power of Khizr Khan, who
came forward to meet him. In a battle by the river Dhandha in
Ajudhan district, Iqbal Khan was defeated and killed by Khizr’s
army on 14 October 1405, and his severed head was sent to Fatehpur,
the capital of Khizr Khan.

Restoration of Sultan Mahmud, 1405-12

The amirs of Delhi, left leaderless, invited Sultan Mahmud from
Kanauj and he came and took possession of the city with a small
army. “The family and followers of Mallu Iqbal Khan were sent to
Koil, and the good-natured king did not injure them in any way.”9
Daulat Khan was appointed faujdar (army-commander) of the terri-
tories held by the king in the Doab, and Ikhtiyar Khan was put in
charge of the Firuzabad palace.

Sultan Mahmud had two dangerous neighbours—the Sharqi king
in the east and Khizr Khan in the west. In November 1406, Sultan
Mahmud marched in the direction of Kanauj and sent Daulat Khan
with an army against Samana. The Delhi and Sharqi armies en-
camped against each other on the opposite banks of the Ganges and
then returned; Ibrahim Sharqi, however, kept his army intact and,
after the Delhi soldiers had been allowed to go home, he attacked

9 Ibid., 174-75.
Kanauj and took it after a siege of four months. In September 1407 Ibrahim Shah Sharqi marched against Delhi and was planning to cross the Jumna at the Kija ford; but on hearing a rumour that Zafar Khan, ruler of Gujarat, had conquered Dhar and was proceeding against Jaunpur, he decided to go back to his capital. Sultan Mahmud succeeded in recapturing Baran and Sambhal, where Ibrahim Shah had placed his officers.

Meanwhile in a battle fought near Samana in December 1406 (or January 1407), Daulat Khan succeeded in defeating Bairam Khan Turk-bacha, who had seized Samana after the death of Bahram Khan Turk-bacha. But as Bairam Khan had vowed allegiance to Khizr Khan as his overlord, the latter marched against Daulat Khan with a powerful force. Daulat Khan fled across the Jumna, but the maliks and amirs, who were with him, offered their allegiance to Khizr Khan. Khizr assigned the shiq of Hisar-Firuzah to Qawam Khan; Samana and Sunam were taken from Bairam Khan and assigned to Majlis-i A'ali Zirak Khan, but Sirhind and a few parganas were assigned to Bairam Khan. ‘Nothing was left in the hands of Sultan Mahmud except his territories in the Doab and the district (iqta) of Rohtak.’

The great, if unfortunate, strategic advantage of the Delhi area, as the next few years were to show, lay in the fact that the Mongol massacres had been so thorough that even after a decade it could not produce the grain and fodder needed by an invading army. In December 1408 Sultan Mahmud marched to Hisar-Firuzah and Qawam Khan submitted to him. But Khizr, the overlord of Qawam Khan, was naturally annoyed. He sent Malik Tufa with an army to plunder the Doab, while he marched directly on Delhi and besieged Sultan Mahmud in Siri and Ikhtiyar Khan in Firuzabad. But lack of provisions prevented Khizr Khan from continuing the sieges and he returned to his capital, Fathpur (or Fathabad).

Sultan Mahmud undertook no campaigns in A.H. 812 (1409-1410). In 813 (1410-11) Khizr Khan conquered Rohtak after besieging it for three months. ‘The affairs of Mahmud’s kingdom had totally collapsed; he could think of no means for stabilizing his power and gave himself up to enjoymets and pleasures.’ In 814 (1411-12) Khizr Khan desolated a great part of Mewat and then besieged Sultan Mahmud in Siri. Ikhtiyar, who held Firuzabad on behalf of Sultan Mahmud, submitted to Khizr Khan, and thus both the Doab and the precincts of Delhi came within Khizr Khan’s control. Nevertheless, owing to lack of grain and fodder, Khizr had no alternative but to return to Fathpur via Panipat in April 1412.

Sultan Mahmud died in October 1412, and his amirs vowed
allegiance to Daulat Khan as their king. In November-December 1413, Khizr Khan marched towards Delhi and, after subduing various places, besieged Daulat Khan in Siri. After the siege had dragged on for four months Daulat Khan found himself helpless and capitulated. Khizr sent him as a prisoner to Hisar-Firuzah and obtained possession of Delhi in May 1414. The central government of India, after reaching the vanishing point, was destined to rise slowly once more.