2

Firoz Shah (Tughlaq) A Personality Study

By Khurram Qadir*

Born in 707 A.H. Firoz Shah Tughlaq was the son of a Qarauna Turk father and a Bhatti mother. Very little is known about the character of his parents and much of their influence on Firoz's life must have been due to what Firoz learnt of them from others rather than by direct contact. This would be particularly true in the case of the father's influence, who died when Firoz was only seven years old. The general atmosphere at the time and the state of his own family were probably more influential in developing the character of young Firoz or Kamaluddin, as he was then called, than any individual, barring his mother, in early stage of the development of his character. After these, came the influence of his uncle's (Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq) personality and character. In fact, even at the earlier period of his life, Kamaluddin (Firoz) must have imbibed more influence from his uncle (Tughlaq) than from his father (Rajab). His father in fact appears in the form of a care-free person not given to taking responsibility or social progress seriously[1]. He probably did not take an active interest in his offspring either considering that "Tughlaq made a liberal distribution of gifts among the nobles and commons"[2] at Firoz's birth. There is no evidence to the effect that Firoz's father also made any special arrangements for celebration. It appears that Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq bore[3] full responsibility of the household while his brother led a care-free life. Special favour is shown to Firoz (Kamaluddin) by his uncle at the death of his father. Though Firoz had no real brother he had two step brothers neither of whom appears to have received the degree of elevation in court as Firoz and none was given as much protection by their

*Mr. Khurram Qadir is teaching at the Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan.

uncle — the sovereign.

Information regarding Firoz's early life is very scanty. Only four specific incidents of Kamaluddin's youth are recorded apart from general statements to the effect that he remained in apprenticeship to Ghiyasuddin (Ghazi Malik) and Muhammad bin Tughlaq.

Thus a reconstruction of the influences on his character during early life must be based on generalities and rough outline. This inevitably is culled from histories written after Firoz had become king. Discernment of individual influences of personalities and occurrences during this period is virtually impossible. An attempt will be made here to take the general nature of influences in his early life and recreate the broad characteristics of personality as they are likely to have developed. It is interesting to note that four of these incidents relate to prophecies made by holy men to the effect that Firoz would one day become king. Another interesting feature of these incidents is that at least two of them took place while Firoz was under his uncle's guardianship and in the company of his cousin Muhammad bin Tughlaq.[4]

Born in a family familiar with mixed marriages between Hindus and Muslims, himself the son of a Muslim Father and Hindu Mother, it is reasonable to say that Firoz's early childhood must have been exposed to conflicting religio-cultural influences. A look at Firoz Shah's lineage appears to show that it was only in the generations immediately preceding his own that his family came to be considered a noble one. This apparent lack of 'nobility' betrays a laxity of tradition in civilization and identifies Firoz with a basically tribal culture. Thus even the 'Islamic' traditions of previous dynasties were probably not a part of the mental construct of the Tughlaqs. In addition to this laxity, the existence of a non-Muslim mother and a care-free Muslim Father as well as the sufistic inclinations — be they ever so slight — of his uncle, who apparently had a strong influence on Kamaluddin, must have created a confused sort of picture of Islam in his mind. There is no evidence that his mother made any attempt to cajole him into the fold of her own religion. Had she done so, it was probable that Firoz would have felt the irrevocable superiority of Islam because his father's coreligionists were victorious over his mother's. None-the-less, the cultural influence of maternal upbringing would, and apparently did, exert itself on the child's mind as we shall see in the expression of Firoz's concept of Islam. Firoz's concept of victory was perhaps derived from the example i.e. proof of victory is capture and preservation of a favourite, valuable, or revered possession of the enemy.

The nature of much of the evidence available to us is also dependent on the point of view of our prime sources. Both Afif and Barani have attempted to project Firoz in the light of a religious reformer. This seems to have been a preoccupation of the age considering that most of the historical literature of the Tughlaq period has the undertone of religion. The Hindu ascendancy is also criticized in most literature of the entire fourteenth century in India. Of all the

possible incidents regarding Firoz's early life that may and probably did come to Afif's notice his narrative relates only the prophecies of sufis. Surely some other trifling incidents regarding Firoz must have came to the notice of the authors of the Tarikh(s)-i-Firoz Shahi but no mention is made of them. No effort is made to substantiate the sagacity, valour or humanity of Firoz in his early life which is referred to later. It would thus appear that during that time the Muslim mind of South Asia was preoccupied with Islam, particularly as propagated by the sufis. This must also have reinforced Firoz's concept of Islam such as it was.

Born in a family which was rising out of obscurity of history and particularly to that branch (the house of Rajab) which was the recipient of reflected glory rather than directly participant in the rise of Tughlaq fortunes, Firoz probably never acquired a strong sense of responsibility. He probably never had a strong sense of security and confidence. As such, in all probability, he acquired, early in his youth, the lack of confidence and willpower to regulate his life to suit his station. This lack of confidence was probably magnified by the early demise first of his father and then of his mother. The over-shadowing influence of two powerful personalities of Ghiyasuddin and Muhammad Tughlaq probably further suppressed his personality. Dependent almost entirely after the death of his father, on the support and benevolence of his uncle, Firoz Shah must have passed a rather timid youth. The timidity and lack of self confidence probably became an integral part of Firoz's nature. We have no proof that Ghiyasuddin gave to Firoz the sense of security which a fatherless child must get in order to compete with the world. We only have reiterations of Ghiyasuddin's benevolence without incidents to substantiate the claim. Though the benevolence may have been there Firoz probably remained in awe of his uncle. Historians agree that Firoz is known to have held his uncle and cousin in esteem and never put himself directly in opposition to them. It is reasonable to assume that the nature of Ghazi Malik's treatment of his nephew was never discouraging or belittling but never actively elevating either. He was probably treated just as he would have been had his father been alive and Ghiyasuddin had been on cordial terms with his brother Rajab. Such behaviour would yield a person weak in will, under-confident, confused (without being fully aware of his own confusion), given to following the path of least resistance i.e. taking any course dictated by circumstances and forced by the power of the popular will at a given time in a given place. Dr. Riazul Islam states that upto the age of fourteen Firoz,

> "...Probably lived all the time at Dipalpur and may have visited Delhi once or twice.... After his accession Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq used to keep Firoz in his train out of affection as well as a desire to educate him in the art of Government".[5]

One may deduce further that the purpose of such training was to make him a trusted aid in the government and not, as might be implied, to equip him to rule in future. This then was probably the cornerstone of Ghiyasuddin's beha-

viour towards Firoz, not that of a Father to a son but that of a benevolent uncle towards a beloved nephew.

An incident of his adolescent years recounted from the Seerat-i-Firoz Shahi gives numerous clues to the nature of Firoz's personality and its development.

> "After a successful hunt of the wild asses he (Firoz) recounted his exploits with pride to the Daya-i-Khas. She objected to this and told him how his father Rajab used to hunt lions in large numbers but never uttered boastful words. She advised him to emulate his Father. This had such an effect.... that he henceforth resolved to hunt elephants."[6]

The boastfulness of the youth shows some spark of vitality but it also shows a lack of confidence. The quick subsiding vitality apparent in his acquiesance to admonition further substantiates the lack of confidence and the limited vitality of the boy. In addition, his preoccupation with hunting and the hidden carefreeness of his nature appear to be the most powerful of the influence of his father that Kamaluddin imbibed. It is also interesting to note that Firoz's confidant was the Daya which lends support to the suspicion that Firoz was not on easy and confident terms with his 'peers!

Probably from his adolescent years onwards Firoz was influenced and impressed by the Sufis and saints. The nature of his duties in the time of Ghiyasuddin seems to pertain essentially the public relationing with the saints.

A strange feature of most of the accounts regarding Firoz and particularly of the two histories of his name (by Barani and Afif) is that little or no mention is made of his life prior to his accession to the throne. Due to this omnission it seems reasonable to infer that his life in this period was colourless, prosaic and mundane. It also makes one feel that he was an extremely mediocre person whose own historians could weave no colourful stories around the facts of his early life to project his image for posterity. Even elevation to the monarchy lends no vivacity or spark to his personality. His cousin appears to have taken a livelier interest in him than his uncle. The former thus made him an important officer and pillar of state.[7] More reliance was placed upon him and he probably became an advisor early in Muhammad's reign. The nature of his importance, however, appears to be more at the executive level in matters of administration and not at the policy making level. This may be seen in Riaz-ul-Islam's treatment of Firoz's career during his cousin's reign.[8]

> "As Naib Barbak he was very prompt in attending to the needs of the supplicants who came to him. As master of ceremonies his duties were 'to marshal the nobles and officials in accordance with the precedents of their ranks and to safeguard their functions. Firoz himself....stood behind the Katib (Secretary) who stood behind the vazir who stood before the Sultan."

and "In his capacity of Amir Hajib Firoz had also to record complaints at the

biweekly court of justice held by the Sultan....Firoz also used to be present at the private royal dinner (Khasa) though it is not clear as to whether he was there on duty as Ameer Hajib or as a member of the family."[9]

The confidence and statecraft thus acquired by Firoz lacked brilliance and lustre and related more to detail than to ideas. His abilities were confined to organization on the basis of traditions or ideas conceived by others. Apparently honours conferred upon him are not clearly for his ability nor entirely for his relationship with the King but due to a mixture of the two. Firoz's main assets were dedicated obedience and trustworthiness. Muhammad probably utilized Firoz for control of certain sections of administration in order to make him a partial substitute (amongst others) for the sultan in case of need. It appears that Muhammad felt that if he needed to leave the capital for any reason a group of nobles working in cooperation should fulfill his functions. Thus he said:

"If I succeed in settling the affairs of my kingdom according to my wishes; it is my desire to hand over the territories of Delhi to three men, i.e., to Firoz Shah, Malik Kabeer and Ahmed Ayaz and myself proceed to the House of Kaba."[10]

It seems from this statement that Firoz alone was either not sufficiently important or not sufficiently capable to manage affairs in Muhammad's absence. Firoz, however, was affectionately disposed towards Muhammad and held him in reverence, regard and love.[11]

This was probably the first time that Firoz received sufficient importance and responsibility and got his first taste in power. Clearly unlike most persons born to command, his training in administration, war, valour, and leadership came to him late in life and at secondary level of command. Neither his birth, nor his upbringing, nor his training had been such as befits a man who is to become king. Nor in fact did he belong to that class of kings who have to struggle for attaining that high office. The sub-continent has known three kinds of Kings among Muslim rulers. Firstly those who, like Ghiyasuddin; Babur and other founders of dynasties, struggled to attain their kingdom. Others like Muhammad Tughlaq, Jahangir, Shah Jahan and others were born and or bred as princes destined to rule and as such received fairly rigorous training in leadership. The third like Firoz who were forced by circumstances to take the throne. Each of these three kinds of kings have had certain typical characteristics. The first who were schooled in adversity have had at their command extreme strength and vitality and have concentrated their energy on acquisition of territory and at the most have proceeded, marginally, with its consolidation. These have been men of determination. The second, trained through experience as well as through education have had brilliance at their side and have sought new ways and methods of consolidation and government. They have developed empires. The third variety to which Firoz belonged has in most cases been weak men who work at the mundane and prosaic level. Firoz belonged to this group but lacked the solidity and pragmatism as well as the

confidence that some others of his category were blessed with.

As a result of these various personal and general influences upon his life upto the time of his accession Firoz appears to be a man lacking in both ideas and confidence. Constrained to choose his path as dictated by circumstances, his decision would be had according to archaic and traditional procedures. Whenever faced by new and unfamiliar problems, such persons are liable to revert to simplification of the problem, reducing it to elementary forms which may be solved by the conventional remedies. Complex problems are thus diffused but not resolved. Firoz appears to be a confused person whose greatest strength may have been in sincerity and honesty but who could not distinguish the contradictions between various traditions and as such took conflicting points of view at different times.

His accession to the throne clearly indicates that he was neither the heir apparent nor the most likely choice nor even a serious contender for the throne. Although Barani claims that:

> "When sultan Muhammad.....fell ill then the lord of the world (Feroz) nursed him.... Therefore, Muhammad.... was greatly pleased.... and that affection.... grew a thousand fold and he made the lord of the world his heir (Mustakhdlaf) and when his situation became critical then he gave to the lord of the world essential instructions (briefed him) on matters of state and specifically made him his heir".[12]

Yet the truth of this statement is highly dubious. It is quite obvious that he was pushed to the throne due to the urgency of the situation. The empire was faced with a crisis and needed a king immediately. The most convenient and immediate choice was Firoz and he was virtually elected to the office. Barani still attempts to clothe the accession in legality of Monarchial tradition and a matter of right rather than election.[13] His own narrative, however, betrays the truth under the veneer. It appears that Afif is more reliable when he says:

> "In this critical situation, all the Khans and Maliks and all the Alims and Shaikhs who were with Sultan Muhammad at Thatta held a consultative council "
>
> "All these elders decided that no solution is possible without a leader. It is obvious that Delhi is far off; accident has taken sultan Muhammad to heaven; the Mughals have taken arms against us, they have plundered the camp and are still lurking in the vain hope of getting something more. Thus both the secular and the religious persons decided to place Sultan Firoz on the throne."[14]

Typically, weak and ineffective, Firoz shirked responsibility and as such the throne, but was finally forced by circumstances to accept. The probable reasons for considering him the logical choice seems to be his immediate presence, his relationship to the dead sultan, his trustworthiness, honesty and sincerity, the fact that he was one of the trio whom Muhammad had considered wor-

thy of collective rule in his absence coupled with the urgency of the situation. For a man of Firoz's general character the turbulence and insecurity of the Tughlaq throne was in the nature of a warning not to stir up too much trouble and let sleeping dogs lie. He probably remained an even more timid ruler than he may have been had he not come to power under immediate stress. During this time he needed, even more than he had probably imagined, the aid and advice of his nobles. Basically an administrator, used to rely on advice, his early problems probably made him acutely conscious of the utility of advisors and as such he relied on them more than on his own judgement throughout his career.

The lack of confidence and insecurity developed early in life may have remained a private problem relating only to his private life had he had a trouble free accession. With early problems on accession, however, it was brought into his public life by the contention of the throne by Khudawand Zad[15] for her son. The revolt of Ahmed Ayaz must also have shaken Firoz.[16] In order to strengthen his own position Firoz gave, first and foremost, security, (from personal experience this was probably of prime importance), second came gifts.[17] The distribution of gifts, however, was normal and natural even though they came from impoverished royal coffers. By Afif's evidence

> "The Army of sultan Muhammad had undergone many hardships at Thatta: his liberalities had emptied the royal treasury and the Army was feeling oppressed and weak for want of money....."[18]

This state of affairs made the timid Firoz even more cautious and wary. Although he did not display any close fistedness yet this very fact leads one to believe that he probably had a lively fear of its becoming known that the monarchy was insolvent. Hence his large heartedness in distribution of riches. However this seems to be accompanied by a sense of economy in other ventures such as his architecture.[19] The role of advisors, administrative convenience, and economy, wherever possible, without tarnishing the imperial image, were the three main features of Firoz's government and personality. He preferred quantity rather than quality in most of his architectural ventures unless it was to raise the royal prestige or essential for the monument itself. He preferred to simplify all or most of the governmental procedures which bothered him and he relied almost totally on his advisors, right from the start, as is apparent from the Khudawandzada incident. Firoz neither interfered in the giving of the promise nor did he directly involve himself in its fulfilment or lack of it.

Firoz was weak but kind hearted and well meaning. A man who prefered to avoid confrontation and conflict on the weakest of excuses. The leaning toward Pirs and Saints that appears to exist in his family seems to be heightened in him. The Hindu influence on the maternal side of his descent, generation after generation, brought to Firoz a superstitious version of Islam which placed heavier reliance on the goodwill of 'Pirs' and 'Aulias' than on the rigorous practice of Islam. Instances of both these are found in the opening period of his reign from the evidence of Barani and Afif. Of his gentle nature we see an

example in his lenient dealing with Ahmed Ayaz.[21] An incident, that probably increased Firoz's sense of security to some extent, was the birth of a son and heir. He would have considered it a good omen, considering his superstitious nature.

The incident with Khwaja-i-Jahan, however, brings out the more complex and also more revealing aspects of Firoz's personality. In the first place is his magnanimity and kindheartedness when Afif says:

> "The sultan at once sent some trusted men to wind a turban round his head and to say that the sultan never thought that Khwaja-i-Jahan could be guilty of such a thing."[22]

On the other is the power that his nobles weild over him and the realm as is apparent from the conference of the Maliks:

> "Your highness knows that, Heaven forbid, if we had not been more powerful Khwaja-i-Jahan would have employed all open and secret means to kill us, realizing his own weakness he has submitted. We have expressed what our limited intelligence prompted and leave the rest to your better judgement. When the sultan saw that they were unanimous in their desire for their destruction of Khwaja-i-Jahan his face turned pale on account of sympathetic care for him and he remained in a state of extreme anxiety for some days."[23]

At the end of which he made the following statement:

> "Go and tell my nobles that I authorize them to decide the case of Khwaja-i-Jahan; they may do what they think best."[24]

Here we see numerous clues to Firoz's character: the act of shirking responsibility, of choosing the path of least resistance, of letting circumstances over-ride his own convictions, his kindheartedness and his weakness, his heavy reliance on his advisors and his timidity. However, being kind, Firoz did not allow unnecessary bloodshed. As Barani observes that:

> "traditionally so long as the new sovereign does not put to death all the supporters, associates, friends and well wishers of the last sovereign (or contender) he does not consider himself secure but in the case of Firoz, the total number of persons killed from the first and second categories does not come to more than five or six."[25]

This last statement is probably an under estimation also it pertains to a specific set of instances. It may, however, easily be believed that the amount of bloodshed was very little and compassion and mercy were shown widely:

> "The name of punishment never came to the lips of a single person. The king had granted many other facilities. Hundreds received salaries without moving even their little finger. If any of the Amirs or their clerks misappropriated the salaries of soldiers they had to supply, such salaries were paid by the king, entered in the account of his disbursements and retaken from the amirs when their accounts were being finally settled."[26]

Both Barani and Afif early in their account of Firoz's reign relate incidents

of his inclination towards the sufis. Khanqahs and their care takers and the families of great sufis received financial aid from the sultan. He himself went to see great sufis and pay his respect to them.[27] This did not entail any accompanying rigorous obedience to the cannons of Muslim beliefs and practices.[28] Drinking, normal adherence to prayer, etc. were not governed by the Islamic code in the sultan's private life. Also the sultan, while paying lipservice to reverence for sufis, was neither fully aware of their customs nor did he in fact pay much heed to what they said.[29] Unaware that the sufis would not wear expensive and ornate clothing and, not repentant of his drinking, King Firoz made gestures of religious fervour by attending the Friday prayer, asking the Shaikh (Qutbuddin Munawwar) to pray for him and sending him rich robes. This in essence depicts the nature of Firoz's Islam. He was confused and subscribed to mutually conflicting views. He knew little or nothing of the norms of various shades of opinion but subscribed to them because he was aware that such gesture would increase his popularity amongst the Muslims and as such his power.

The incidents related to his devotion to holy men, lead us to believe that perhaps the basis of the claims of piety made on behalf of Firoz by his historians rest essentially on them and the so called Fatuhat of Firoz. Afif for example observers:

> "It was Firozshah's virtuous practice to visit the tombs of all sheikhs and famous saints whenever he had to go out of Dehli, even for a month or two.
>
> "Unconscious of his own powers the sultan invoked their help and cast himself on their protection and this is a quality found in walis."[30]

Afif was probably additionally prejudiced because Firoz visited Afif's own pir.[31]

Among the reasons for Firoz's faith in Pirs may be stated two things; the first his warped concept of Islam, probably an influence of his Hindu heritage from his Hindu wife, mother and even paternal grandmother, and secondly the favourable effects of such practices on the morale of his people particularly the army.

Interestingly some names of former kings such as Aibak are missing from the list of those Firoz had read in the Khutba.[32] This is possibly due to his approach to religion and his view of its observance by former rulers. The names omitted suggest that those rulers whose religious practice did not conform with his own ideal were eliminated.

An interesting feature of Firoz's character is his inclination towards luxury, worldly pleasures and festivity. His arrival in Delhi was marked by festivity of a very lavish order. Afif's description leads us to believe that:

> "In every pavilion a sum of a hundred thousand tankas was spent on food sherbet etc. People came from all directions to see these pavilions and by

order of Sultan Firoz received what they desired. The pavilions were decorated with beautiful cloth and paintings. Musicians and dancers amused the people by their performance. Festivities lasted for 21 days".[33]

It is interesting to note that the religious taboos of purdah and dancing etc; were totally ignored. The poverty of the kingdom was ignored for the secuirty of the throne by lavishness of gifts to the 'impoverished' and burdened populace.[34]

Of the administrative measures taken by the sultan it is hard to decide how far he took them due to expediency and how far due to his own nature. In showing generosity[35], for example, to the population in the grant of land in lieu of service it is difficult to say whether he did this entirely due to the leniency of his personality. What seems most likely is that the circumstances made it difficult for Firoz to control the affairs effectively and according to his habit, and choosing the path of least resistance, he made concessions. This, however, resulted in a decentralization of power which was dangerous to the empire:

"Instead of giving them salaries, he made a law that if a member of the Army died, his grant was to be continued to his son,....son in law,.....slave,... nearest relation,.....(or) women."[36]

Probably part of the reason for his emphasis on giving security to his nobles and soldiers is because he had felt strongly the lack of it.

The only real basis for Firoz's religious fervour appears to be his firm belief in death and the day of judgement.[37] This was probably brought home to him by the fate of the preceeding dynasty whose fall he witnessed at an impressionable age and the early death of his nearest relations (mother and father). Also perhaps the constant realization of the infirmity of his own throne and incidents like the plot by Khusru Malik and Khudawandzada.[38] Perhaps this plot also heightened the 'spiritual' inclination of the sultan by bringing home once again the imminent and constant threat of death over mankind.

Firoz's character displays one very interesting feature in respect of valour and courage. He was apparently very desirous of projecting an image of a valiant fighting man, the image of a sportsman and hunter, probably a legacy of his father's image and personality. His father is known to be a man fond of hunting and sport, full of valour, courage and self confidence. In his conscious recognition of self Firoz probably estimated himself in a similar fashion. In fact he was weak and timid, fond of security and safety. This is apparent from the account of both his wars and his hunts. The account of the battle with Sultan Shamsuddin and particularly the decision to return without conquering the fort[39] appears to have been dictated by the lack of ability to retain the area captured as much as by the personal cowardice of the sultan who, being cognisant of his inability to conrol his men, did not have the courage to see personally the havoc wrought by war. True, that part of it must have been due to the humane part of his nature — which is obvious in the nature of his lament for the dead when he said "If they had no care for their stomach and their dependents and children they would not have suffered this day[40]." But to what extent is humanity to be lauded and cowardice derided is questionable. A humane but strong

man would have pursued his aim to its conclusion in order to avoid future recurrence of the problem.

Firoz's ego manifests itself in a very interesting form. It appears that to him the best legend or image a king may leave is by associating his own name with towns and buildings etc. His ego was however not involved with the permanence of his accomplishments. Thus while returning from Bengal he stopped to name Akdalah as Azadpur and Pandua as Firozabad.[41] He offered no protection to those who had helped him in his campaign and let Shamsuddin recapture his territories without any hindrance.[42] This appears to show a large discrepancy between Firoz's aims and acts. While he wanted to leave a good name behind him he did not believe in actually striving for it. Apparently he felt that people have short memories and while the deeds will be forgotten, the institutions will be remembered. This is also apparent in his behaviour of lending support to public works and involving himself in them[43] but not making an active attempt to rectify matters himself as will further be seen in his treatment of the swindling case of the public treasury.[44] The construction of Hisar Firoza[45] and the Mazina in it are similar examples of Firoz's warped concept of projecting his image. This also shows the lack of self confidence and the weakness of his character which are manifested time and again in the two histories of his reign.

It seems that personally riding out into the battle field was not a normal practice for Firoz as is apparent in the campaign against Sikandar Shah at the request of Zafar Khan.[46] Wine and prayers were freely mixed.[47] An orthodox well-wisher's admonition on this account was taken ill and therefore the Army was deprived of a capable general in battle.[48] Time was wasted on the way to put off the crucial moment as long as possible.[49] When finally the time for battle came Afif reports:

> "The Sultan called for his dress, saying that he would personally ride forth to the scene. Having dressed and armed himself with fortyfour weapons the Sultan was about to mount his horse....." It would be better if somehow we could sieze the place without resorting to an assault,....."[50]

It seems from this statement that the sultan's personally riding out was an abnormal event and the fact of numerous weapons seems to indicate both a lack of reliance on few weapons, a weakness, and the possible ability to use numerous weapons, a strength. Whether the desire to abstain from assault was motivated by a fear of God or a fear of battle is equally questionable. Seeing the norm, however the latter seems more likely. The claim of fear of God is also anomalous as he does not desist from use of the sword against Muslims till politically fruitful.[51] However, this choice seems to have made the difference between a victory and a mere peace and even the peace being made under conditions of stale-mate[52] One improvement which we may notice in Firoz's general character as a monarch is his increased security and, as a result of it, his ability to provide security to his friends and helpers.[53] Firoz was obviously not a man who changes circumstances and conditions to suit his own purpose, convictions, aims and hopes but rather one who changed himself to suit the given conditions. This also is done with strict regard to his own safety and security

before all else which seems to be his firmest conviction.

As Firoz's sense of security grew greater his inclination to luxury found greater expression on every excusable occasion.[54] His return to Dehli from Rajnagar was accompanied by festivities to equal the festivities of his accession. It also, simultaneously, developed the inclination towards conquest but the habit of caution and reliance on ministers remained strong.[55] The one matter, however, in which Firoz remained more powerful and strong than his ministers was the matter of economic administration in which he displays the intellectual capabilities which be possessed, but could not use effectively. In regard to the building of his first two cities Afif remarks:

"He brought many canals to these places (from long distance).... watering on their way numerous qasbahs and villages.

"Every qasbah and village began to derive immense profits by the water supplied by these canals.

"....the sultan ordered all the qazis, alims and shaikhs...to...decide...whether or not he was (lawfully) entitled to recompense for his troubles. The learned answered that he was entitled to receive *sharb* (1/10)[56].

In this particular matter, however, personal interest also appears to have a hand, since Firoz received large personal revenues (two lakh tankas) as a result. Afif claims that no sovereign of Delhi had as large a personal holding as Firoz[57]. This also displays Firoz's personal insecurity as he built up his reserve of personal property to buttress his position if ever he fell upon evil times in the manner of ordinary citizens. The making of the vow by Firoz to visit the "Sheikhs of Multan on his way to Delhi" may have been (as seems likely from a statement of its after effects[58]) mainly for the benefit of the Army. The army having suffered in its former campaign and Firoz having shared their distress equally (an incident in which we find strong reason to support the claim that Firoz was a humane person) was in need of a sense of security to the effect that some superior divine aid was available.[59] Firoz had not been born to the crown nor truly bred to it. He therefore could probably face the vicissitudes of life with equanimity. However, this incident of the Thatta campaign may also be held partially responsible for Firoz's urgent desire to do something to improve his chances in the hereafter. Though no direct evidence is available such as the timing of the Fatuhat vis-a-vis the campaign some changes are apparent in Firoz's attitude after this war. And further changes were visible after the Run-incident. In the first case he deals magnanimously with Banabh and[60] and with the families of the soldiers who died at Thatta[61]. In the second case a war was taken to avoid war, the results of which are seen in the sultan's abstinence from the Mabar campaign.[62] Of course it is also probably true that seeing his own inability to succeed in war[63] (Firoz had so far enjoyed no outright victory in any expedition) he finally learnt his lesson that he was not capable of competing with the past generations in valour and war. "Thus having excused himself,

Sultan Firoz sent back the messenger from Mabar and devoted himself to the affairs of government[64]."

After the arrival of robes from the Khalifa (unasked)[65] there appears to be a change in the Sultan's behaviour towards pirs and saints whom he now appears to meet on a quasi-equal footing.[66] Just as the Sultan himself did not strictly observe the tenets of Islam in his own private life he made no such demands on his ministers and nobles.[67] Even moral laxity and misuse of power was condoned.[68] This was partly due to his weakness and partly due to his magnanimity. After the investiture from the Khalifa also came a sense of relaxation in Firoz's personaity, perhaps due to a false sense of security. Relaxation and hunting brought out the best in Firoz's personality. Afif notes that requests made at that time were granted." Extra-ordinary interest was taken by Firoz in the preparations for festivity partly, it seems, because of the fact that earlier he was master of ceremonies and partly because of his misconception that such festivity was part of religious ritual and expressed fervour. However, the religious fervour and fanaticism ascribed to Firoz is cast into serious doubt by such instances. Music after friday prayers seems highly incongruous.

The charges of bigotry on the one hand and the claims of Firoz as a defender of the faith on the other are laid at his door by instances such as the erection of the *lat*[69] and the burning of Brahmans.[70] The truth of these things appears to be rather different when viewed in the perspective of Firoz's general life style and evolution of his character. The true purpose of the erection of the *lat* appears in the translation of its inscription. While the rendering is apparently spurious, the purpose implied is that, of all the preceding kings the divine guidance and great ability of Firoz was beyond compare. This displays the superstitious nature of Firoz who would rely more on such proofs than on pragmatic practice of religion. The proof being finally rendered by the uprooting of a Hindu monument and its retention in the form of a trophy of the triumph of Islam over Hinduism, the capture of the opponent's symbol of power. This symbolism being epitomised by placing one pillar under the shadow of a mosque and the other near the king's hunting lodge. Even Afif hints at this when he says that Firoz wanted that "a memorial of me should remain after my death.....[71] And so, Afif claims they remained as a memory of sultan Firoz to speak eloquently of Firoz's super human stature as a monarch.[72]

As regards the incident of the burning of a Brahman is concerned it is obviously a special circumstance. The measures taken here are, in the first place preceded by numerous complaints and mounting public pressure and secondly the verdict on the case was pronounced by religious men and merely endorsed by the sultan. And here Afif brings out the truth about Firoz's religious views which essentially relate to Tariqat:

"Behold the majesty of the Shariat; even the Tariqat-loving emperor did not deviate an inch from it...."[73] The story here is, however, not preceded by an account of ministerial advice which in the main is normal for Afif's account of

Firoz's administration. Had such advice been reported considering the type of advice generally rendered it would have been to the effect that: if appropriate measures are not taken, the faith of Muslims in the emperor as a Muslim king would be shattered, vastly diminishing the power and prestige of the emperor, also that such practices would become highly common which might even result in the diminution of the Muslim population of the empire by gradual stages. The imposition of jizya[74] may have been triggered off by this very incident. Afif's account gives first the incident of burning and immediately follows it up with the imposition of jizya.

In order to see the highest manifestation of Firoz shah's lack of confidence and reliance on his ministers for advice, guidance and the actual practical execution of government as well as his gullibility in being duped by his ministers is visible in two instances: The first is the issue of below par coins by the treasury department under Khan-i-Jahan (the first)[75] and the second is the almost absolute surrender of power, its verbal admission by the sultan himself, to Khan-i-Jahan (the second)[76].

A most interesting feature of Firoz's character is exposed by his accumulation of slaves:

"As God inspired the sultan with a passion for collecting faithful slaves, he sent repeated and urgent messages to the muqtas and to the officers of the empire commanding them to capture slaves wherever they plundered a place and to send to him such of them as were fit for the service of the court.

"The custom of making limitless presents was an innovation of Firoz Shah.... in the time of past sultan...the muqtas offered them what they could afford. Moreover, the cost of presents was not deducted from the revenues.

"The sultan lavished unbounded gifts on those of the muqtas who presented large number of slaves... Thus through the effort of the virtuous sultan...many slaves were selected .... he sent some...to...Multan,...Some to Gujrat and various other Iqtas. He made liberal arrangements for their provision in the Iqtas, where "The slaves who remained in the city received full monthly salaries... Some of the slaves were engaged in studying... the holy Quran,... Others in religious study....some were put under charge of craftsmen,.... 40000 slaves were everyday ready to.... guard the palace.

"As a result of the sultan's taking particular care of them, the stability and power of the slaves took firmroot.... separate departments were opened to manage their affairs (directly under Firoz's own control).

"Whenever the sultan proceeded on a campaign distinct corps of slaves preceded the royal procession.... (they were employed in all walks of life).

"As the Almighty had written... all those calamities (after Firoz's death) should appear on account of these slaves.[77]"

Some of these slaves were put under the wing of Amirs and maliks for training them.

This lengthy extract gives us some ideas regarding Firoz's personality. He apparently took a perverse pleasure in human bondage. Had this not been true why should he have taken them as slaves rather than as employees, especially if they were to receive pays despite their 'slavery'. Perhaps by this means he hoped to obtain greater loyalty from them than he could expect from mere employees. The vast range of uses they were put to also indicates that they were, to the sultan, an alternative power base or a security force, a self created fifth column for reasons of personal security particularly when seen installed within the Army in such large numbers and given so much security and power. The fact that they were kept under direct control and went out of hand after his death lends support to this view. The fact that the burden of this was borne by the emperor and the benefit acrued to the emperor alone is also an additional proof. Spread out through the length and breadth of the kingdom as well as in all the activities of the court without being answerable to any department but their own gives an impression of secret service activities by them. If these conjectures are valid, as they seem to be, reading between the lines of the evidence available, further support is provided to the theory that Firoz's personal cowardice and fear of well being and the hereafter was the cornerstone of his life, his government, his administration and personality as a whole. It also indicates administrative acumen in placing a parallel administrative control in all departments through the slaves.

A part of the reason for slavery may also be economy — Although comparative scales are not available for equivalent occupations of non slaves and only the pay scale of the slaves is given.[78] This conjecture can be made generally on the basis of Firoz's economic administration. Firoz's main achievement as a monarch (noted earlier) is his administrative acumen in detail and organizing ability. 'He built 1200 gardens in the neighbourhood of Delhi..... Apart from the share of the gardeners, the gardens yielded to the Diwan a revenue of 180000 tanks[79]! His administrative policies were geared for economy and utility without long term consideration of political effects.[80] The same is true for his handling of crime and misdemeanours in his government.[81] Also with respect to his personal and private character of sagacity and kind heartedness we may see the incident of the report of Imadulmulk's son[82] about the army and the royal command. The incident displays Firoz as a sagacious and kind man with an eye for practical detail — rather than for high flown ideas. Also, at the same times, it makes him out as mediocre, in adventure and government, who did not have the strength to shed dead weight in the growth of his kingdom. The incident may, nevertheless, be put forward as an example of his Godfearing nature. The care for the unemployed[83] may also be read similarly. His economic sagacity however, is best displayed by the section on coinage in which Afif reports:

> "For the benefit of the poor and the indigent, therefore, Sultan Firoz odered that half-jital, which is called adha, and dang-jital, which is calld bigha should also be coined."[84]

His administrative acumen is best projected in the account of the conflict between ministries and their resolution. The division of ministerial and administrative systems into a deliberate and meaningful pattern expresses sagacity, caution and statecraft.[85] Firoz Tughlaq seems to possess a genius for the administrative aspect of statecraft. The juxtaposition of functional duties and demarcation of rights and privileges between ministers and other offices is masterly.[86] It probably derives its origin from a deep insight of actual administrative problems experienced during the course of the functions in his charge during the earlier reign. The break up of function under Firoz complicated the administrative process but also streamlined it. Other administrative measures such as the account of hospitals displays public care and a desire for the welfare of his subjects. The same is true for charity departments.[87]

Firoz's public works bear ample testimony of his true character.[88] They display the incongruities and confusion of his character in fairly close approximation to his actual self. The aberrations are most likely due to the influences of the architects etc. Conspicuous amongst the buildings erected by him are tombs, mosques and edifices projecting superiority and victory of Firoz as a Muslim over the Hindus. Within themselves, how ever, they portray his cultural subjugation to the Hindus. The Madrasa and college in the Bala Band of Siri show the only proof of Firoz's love for learning in all the available accounts. The canals like his gardens show his practical sense, interest in economic development and welfare as well as his administrative bent of mind.

The laws initiated by him, similarly, speak eloquently of his character. Barani reports that the first law 'was the prohibition of punishment[89]! The second:

"by the enactment of which the countries.... have become flourishing and prosperous.... orders the incidence of land revenue on the basis of actual produce".[91]

The third "was the selection of generous, obliging, just and fair minded.... officials...."[91]

These laws display Firoz as a kind and weak man with economic and administrative sense who put human virtues above efficiency and competence. Barani's evidence regarding the position of ministers and trusted friends and the surrender of power, by the sultan, to them reiterates the extra-ordinary decentralization of power and the weakness of the sultan as well as his tendency to shirk responsibility.[92] The two investitures by the Khalifa reported by Barani show Firoz's insecurity without them and hint at their favourable psychological effects on the people.[93]

For an analysis of the aims and objectives as well as the hopes and aspirations on which Firoz built his public life the Futuhat-i-Firoz Shahi is most revealing. He appears to be Godfearing and compassionate but weak hearted. A man devoid of the concepts and ideals of valour of his time. The taxation policy developed in the Futuhat appears primarily geared to facilitate tax collection.

Numerous taxes are eliminated and larger taxes from the same sources (mainly) are introduced. As has been noted earlier Firoz possessed considerable practical sense of economics and administration. Also the reversal of the practice regarding spoils of war lends support to this hypothesis since this measure, essentially in conflict with the Islamic method, aided in securing greater loyalty from soldiers.

Firoz's ideal of Islam is a system of kindness, recognition of former greatness and the spread of Muslim world domination, conformity with Islamic laws of taxation, elimination of Shi-ite thought to facilitate the expansion of the 'true' (sunni) Islam. The charge of adultery he brought against some Shia thinkers appears to be rather meaningless since adultery appears to have gone unchecked in his own court. The religious strictness appears to be directed more against Muslims who did not believe in the Imperial concept rather than Hindus and non-Muslims. The ban on women to visit the tombs of saints[95] is probably to prevent a given class of women from doing so. Since dancing of unveiled women in court and ceremonies was permitted it does not seem reasonable to consider it as a general ban to protect the virtue of women. The destruction of temples, absence of pictures and conversion of non-Muslims are also partially acts of faith. The destruction of temples was probably done with a multiple purpose of expressing imperial power and continued suppression of locals as well as an act of faith. Firoz's claim to austerity in the Futuhat is unbelievable in the light of Afif's and Barani's account. Absence of pictures, construction of public works, preservation of tombs, material remains of earlier Muslims and their history were all autos-da-fe in Firoz's warped concept of Islam. By Firoz's own estimate the simplification and the levy of jizya caused some conversion — these then may have been merely apparent conversions. Some interesting observations regarding the personality of Firoz may be made through its reconstruction on the basis of the stamp borne by the architecture he inspired and had constructed. The most interesting of these structures is the *lat* re-erected by Firoz!

> "One monument in the Kotla is, however, unique, and strikes a romantic note. This is a large structure occupying a prominent position towards the centre and consists of a series of square arcaded terraces, diminishing as they ascend to produce a kind of stepped pyramid, on the summit of which the Tughlaqian ruler raised one of Asoka's famous pillars, removed from its original site near Amballa where it had remained unmolested and had defined (sic. defied) the elements for sixteen hundred years."[96]

Afifs account, Kism IV, 9th muqaddama has been translated on this account as:

> "When Firoz Shah beheld these columns, he was filled with admiration and resolved to remove them with great care as *trophies* to Delhi."[97]

And Brown observes:

> "In installing this Buddhist column as a dominating feature of his scheme,

Firoz was endeavouring to emulate his predecessor Qutb-ud-din Aibuk when some one hundred and fifty years before he had placed the iron pillar of Kumaragupta as a central feature of the Qutb Mosque."[98]

This in fact gives an idea of Firoz's Islamic feelings and the extent of their being only partially Islamic, partially for his personal and partially for the imperial glory. Also while Brown gives the extravagances of Firoz's predecessor as the reason he acknowledges that Firoz's architecture "resolves itself into a some what dull and featureless form of expression.[99]" It seems unreasonable to suppose that the problem was economy though it may have been a consideration. The abundance of Firoz's architecture and his numerous projects as well as his frivolity and luxury in certain matters belies the poverty of the crown supposed by Brown. It seems far more likely that the very nature of the monarch caused the dullness and featurelessness.

Generally reviewing the personality of Firoz Shah we see numerous strains and threads, some relating to his inner self, some to his social self and some to his public self. Some of these threads are the basis of his personality forming an undercurrent visible in all that he did; others, from the different selves, contradicting one another at times and confluent at others. Each thread influencing the rest and being influenced by all in its own turn.

In his inner self Firoz was a weak man who lacked confidence and shirked responsibility. Labouring under an inferiority complex in his worldly abilities and a superiority complex in his spiritual abilities he laid more stress on humanity than on ability and strength, kind and gentle, generous and benevolent under normal circumstances he was capable of extreme callousness and, as such, inhumanity when the demands or conditions required a personal effort. Dr. Riaz-ul-Islam evaluates his personal innerself:

"...he was not brilliant enough to be complex. He was a weak willed good natured, mediocre type of man."[100]

Although, truly not brilliant enough to be complex, he was weak enough to be complex. For weakness accompanied by an illusion of strength does breed complexity.

In his social self he was at his best, his qualities of kindness and pragmatism, his mediocre stature, his ability to associate at a common level and his physical health all contributed to make him a likeable person for his associates. "Thus both goodness and weakness were interwoven in his nature."[101]

It is in his public self that he displays his complexity. Here comes into conflict the innate weakness of his self and the exaggerated strength that he desires to project. This complexity was accentuated by a similar complexity in the empire and its throne. The throne was still secure and so was the Thughlaq 'dynasty' but which scion of the house would have the crown was not a securely settled matter.

Firoz, having been deputy grand usher in the court of his cousin and having attained maturity and power under his guidance "had a tender regard for

his cousins' reputation"[102] And although "the king makers saved Firoz Shah from the rivalry of his two elder brothers, Malik Qutbuddin and Malik Ibrahim, both sons of Rajab by his *Muslim* wives[103] ...." Firoz made one the Barbak and the other Amir-ul-Umara. Justifying the claim of benevolence and family feeling made on his behalf. At the same time he was capable of craftiness in assuring his safety as: "He was the first of Dehly kings who brought forward, by patronage, the race of Afghans, before whose time they were not held in esteem"[104]. His weakness is similarly apparent and so is his reactionary attitude towards the personality of Mohammad Bin Tughlaq despite his love for him.

> "The drama of reaction or exit Zalim Padshah which had opened with the coronation of Firoz Shah runs now into its second part. The first part of about twenty years which was full of retrogressive tendencies closed with the death of the Wazir Khan Jahan I in 1370/72. Then the curtain dropped. When it rose again Khan Jahan II had become the Wazir and a new nobility... had been formed."[105]

It is here also painfully clear that Firoz was ruled by his ministers. Apart from his ministers he was influenced by his Hindu wife and at least one Hindu brother in law. Even though he had lost his Hindu mother at an early age, so many Hindu contacts did have an effect on him because he was family oriented thus: "during the reign of Firoz Shah some Hindi verses were ceremoniously recited from the pulpit in the mosque".[106]

Firoz's coins appear quite simple bearing the titles:[107] (1) Abul Muzaffar Firoz Shah As-Sultani, (2) Firoz Sultani (3) Firoz Shah. While this may be due to his simplicity and humanity it seems more likely that it was due to "The Policy of Firoz Tughlaq of minimum interference with ordinary administration of the state, of placing confidence and wide powers in the hands of ministers"[108], in short, of shirking responsibility. This kind of weakness bore fruit at the time of his third nomination of his successor after the death of the first two when tussle "soon took a violent turn which led to the murder of the prime minister and the virtual abdication of Firoz."[109]

These trends are endorsed by Sirhindi who records in the Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi:

> "....Every instance of ruination of the country, and rebellion of the people that had been manifest in the reign of the deceased Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq was substituted[110]..." 'and later
>
> "The Firoz Shahi amirs and Maliks were entirely subservient to him (Khan-i-Jahan-II).... At length matters came to such a pass, that whatever did Khan-i-Jahan say, the Sultan used to do."[141]

It was not, however, only his ministers who rendered him powerless, the established orthodoxy and pirs also had similar power over the weak king:

> "When Syed Jalaluddin Bukhari expired his younger brother pursued the matter further and reached Delhi in order to persuade Sultan Firoz to execute Nawabun. Though some scholars of the capital did not agree with

the point of view of Raju Qattal, the latter prevailed upon Firoz Shah, obtaining his permission for Nawabun's execution as a renegade."[112]

Banerjee endorses this when he says:

"He(Firoz) was a weak personality, which gave a chance to the religious order to gain their lost ascendancy.... To strengthen his hands to meet the political crisis through which the empire was passing, Firoz made a frantic appeal to religion[113].

This partly because "Quite early in his life he came under the influence of mystics.... Thus both by conviction and expediency, Firoz was inclined to a policy basically different from Muhammad[114], and partly because he wanted to create an image of a Godfearing king. Thus "Firoz Shah proudly records his belief in the necessity of obtaining recognition from the Abbasi caliphs[115]..."

Firoz's inefficiency is also apparent in his private social life for "like Alauddin Khilji, Sultan Firoz Shah gave his sons no efficient training.[116]."

The only redeeming feature of Firoz's public self was his ability in economic administration. Here alone it is visible that not merely were there contributions made in this field during Firoz's reign but Firoz himself was responsible for much that happened. The sultan's conquests for example "brought a large number of prisoners who were all offered for sale and did not cost more than eight tankas"[117] while this had been happening before Firoz's time as well, no one put them to such efficient use in such large numbers. Also we see that among the histories of the age, which were written particularly because Firoz was fond of having them written, Barani is conscious of this appeal.

"Then he (Barani) refers to the advantages and facilities that had been provided for the officers and soldiers of the army on the one hand and the trades and artisans on the other. These measures had resulted in the extension of agriculture and the growth of business and wealth."[118].

The Fatawa-i-Jahandari which "is really a continuation of the author's famous Tarikh-i-Firoz Shahi"[119] renders advice on taxes[120] which displays the consciousness of the author, i.e. Barani of the need for it. It would seem then that upto this point Firoz was not conscious of the need and may not have reverted to the Islamic system. Afif's account of the imposition of Jizya follows immediately after the incident of the Brahman being burnt. It may therefore be reasonable to assume that this like other 'religious' measures by Firoz was due to expediency.

Firoz was always weak, motivated by expediency, with a high regard for his own life. "He could not exercise his power with firmness and courage. His greatest handicap was his lack of resolution.[121]" And this remained the bane of his life. It reduced his accomplishments, sapped his self confidence, poisoned his benevolence, deprived his personality of luster and weakened his kingdom. Throughout his life he shirked responsibility even when it was thrust upon him, allowing to devolve upon those who took the opportunities he passed. Being king he was no stronger, no securer and under certain conditions no more powerful than the Ameer-i-Barbak that he had been under Muhammad bin

Tughlaq. He was confused about religion, impressed by it but lacking the resolution to mould himself according to it and even lacking the basic knowledge to comprehend its nature, spirit of form properly. Fond of his family, friends and a care-free life but without the basic strength required to stand by his friends in their hour of need unless his own safety was essentially guaranteed.

1. Dr. Riazul-Islam, *A History of Firoz Shah Tughlaq*, Ph.D. Thesis, U.P., Aligarh, 1946. P.19 relates the preoccupation of Rajab with Hunting, the Kings warning and his brothers advice both of which were rejected. The nature of his marriage is similarly irresponsible for which counter measures were taken by his brother.
2. Shams Siraj Afif, *Tarikh-i-Firoz Shahi*, (Urdu) Maulvi Mohammad Fida Ali Talib, Karachi, 1965. P. 38.
3. *Ibid.*, P. 38.
4. Afif, *Op. Cit.*, P. 31 ff
5. Riaz-ul-Islam, Op. Cit., P. 20.
6. *Ibid.* P.20.
7. *Ibid.*, P.21.
8. *Ibid.*, P. 21.
9. *Ibid.*, P. 22.
10. Barani, *Tarikh-i-Firoz Shahi*, tr. S. Moin-ul-Haq, (Urdu) Lahore, 1969, P. 10 & P. 738; simultaneously reference to these three persons has been made at other places in the text as well.
11. *Riazul Islam.* Op. Cit., P. 25.
12. Barani, *Op. Cit.*, P. 750-57.
13. *Ibid.*, P. 155-56.
14. Afif, *Op.Cit.*, P. 41-42.
15. Riaz-ul-Islam. P. 31 also Afif P. 42. f.f. Riazul Islam here makes an interesting remark: "He (Malik Saifuddin) promised her that the title and office of Naib Berbeki would be conferred upon her son. Whether this proposal was made with the knowledge of Firoz on the concurrence of the nobles is not clear. The promise which silenced Khudawandzada was not kept".
16. Barani, P. 759 f.f & Afif PP. 46-50.
17. Barani, PP. 779-780
18. Afif, *Op. Cit.*, P. 52.
19. Percy Brown has laid this directly at the doors of the poverty of the empire which for the later period of the reign is not true. In fact the blame should be laid at the nature of economy practiced by Firoz.
20. Afif, Op. Cit., P. 54-55.
21. Barani, *Op. Cit.*, P. 767.
22. Afif. P.P.61-2 *Op.Cit.*,
23. *Ibid.*, P. 64.
24. *Ibid.*,
25. Barani, *Op, Cit;* PP.774-75.
26. Barani, PP. 776-777.
27. Afif, P. 67.
28. *Ibid.*,
29. *Ibid.*, P. 68-69.
30. *Ibid.*, PP. 127-9.

31. *Ibid.*, P. 138-9.
32. *Ibid.*, P. 84.
33. Afif. PP. 72, 73.
34. *Ibid.*, P. 73.
35. *Ibid.*, P.77.
36. *Ibid.*, P. 77.
37. *Ibid.*, P. 78.
38. *Ibid.*, P. 80-81.
39. *Ibid.* P. 90-93.
40. *Ibid.*, P. 94.
41. *Ibid.*, P. 94.
42. *Ibid.*, P. 95.
43. *Barani.* PP 787-793 gives a fairly extensive account of numerous public works undertaken, a list of which will come later in the architectural evidence.
44. *Afif.* PP. 204-207.
45. *Ibid.*, PP, 95-98.
46. *Ibid.*, P. 105-6
47. *Ibid.*, P. 109.
48. *Ibid.*, PP. 109-10.
49. *Ibid.*, P. 111.
50. *Ibid*, P. 112.
51. *Ibid.*, P. 114.
52. *Ibid.*, P. 115.
53. *Ibid.*, P. 116FF
54. *Ibid.* PP. 127-9
55. *Ibid.*, P. 138-9.
56. *Ibid.*, P. 99.
57. *Ibid.*, P. 99.
58. *Ibid.*, P. 172.
59. *Ibid.*, P. 156.
60. *Ibid.*, P. 175.
61. *Ibid.*, P. 176.
62. *Ibid.*, P. 185-86.
63. *Ibid.*, P. 171.
64. *Ibid.*, P. 186.
65. *Ibid.*, PP 193-95.
66. *Ibid.*, PP. 202.
67. *Ibid.*, P. 203.
68. *Ibid.*, P. 99-100.
69. *Ibid.*, P. 214 FF
70. *Ibid.*, P. 258.
71. *Ibid.*, P. 216.
72. *Ibid.*, P. 219-220.
73. *Ibid.*, PP. 258-259.
74. *Ibid.*, PP. 259-260.
75. *Ibid.*, P. 239.
76. *Ibid.*, P. 273.
77. *Afif.*, PP. 189-193.
78. *Ibid.*, P. 191.
79. *Ibid.*, P. 208.
80. *Ibid.*, P. 209.
81. *Ibid.*, P. 210.
82. *Ibid.*, P. 212-36
83. *Ibid.* ,P. 232-33.

84. *Ibid.*, P. 239.
84. *Ibid.*, P. 276-77.
88. *Ibid.*, P. 280.
87. *Ibid.*, PP. 242-247.
88. *Barani. PP. 783-798.*
89. *Ibid.*, P. 800
90. *Ibid.*, PP. 802-3.
91. *Ibid.*, P. 803-4.
92. *Ibid.*, PP. 805-808.
93. *Ibid.*, PP. 832-33.
94. Sh. Abdur-Rashid, Tr., *Futuhat-i-Firoz Shahi*, Aligarh, 1954, P. 109.
95. *Ibid.*, P. 112-113.
96. Percy Brown, *Indian Architecture (the Islamic Period)*., 3rd ed., Bombay, N.D., P.24.
97. Elliot and Dawson, *History of India as told by its own Historians, Vol.III*, Lahore, 1976.P.350.
98. Brown, *Op.Cit.*, P. 24.
99. *Ibid.*, P 23
100. Riazul-Islam, *Op. cit.*, P. 174.
101. *Ibid.*, P. 182.
102. Ishwari Prashad, *A history of the Qaruna Turks in India, Vol I*, Allahabad, 1936, P. 31.
103. Agha Mehdi Hussan, *Tughlaq dynasty*, Calcutta, 1963, P. 387.
104. M.K.Ferishta, Tr. T. Briggs, *The History of the rise of Muhammadan Power in India*, Vol I, London, 1829. PP. 461-62.
105. Mehdi Hussain, *Op. Cit.*, PP. 428-29.
106. *Ibid.*, P. 510-11.
107. *Ibid.*, P. 53.
108. R.P.Tripathi, *Some Aspects of Muslim Administration*, Allahabad, 1936, P. 72.
110. Yahya B.A. B.A. Sirhindi, Tr., K.K.Basu, *Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi*, Baroda, 1932, P. 121.
111. *Ibid.*, P. 126.
112. K.A.Nizami, *Some Aspects of Religion and Politics in India during the Thirteenth century*, Aligarh, 1967, P. 176.
113. Iamani Mohan Banerjee, *History of Firoz Shah Tughlaq*, Aligarh, 1967, P. 169.
114. Riaz-ul-Islam, *Op. Cit.*, P. 174.
115. I.H.Qureshi, *The Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi*, Lahore, 1944, P. 36.
116. Agha Mehdi Hussain, Rise and fall of Mohammad-Bin Tughlaq, London, 1938, P. 7.
109. *Ibid.*, P. 72.
117. Prashad, *Op. Cit.*, P. 302.
118. Dr. S. Moin-ul-Haq, *Barani's History of the Tughlaqs*, Karachi, 1959, P. 302.
119. Zia-ud-Din Barani, *Fatawa-i-Jahandari*, Tr., Dr. Afsar Begum, Aligarh, N.D., P. 1.
120. *Ibid.*, P. 53.
121. Banerjee, *Op. Cit.*, P. 174.