

THE MUGHAL NOBILITY UNDER AURANGZEB

THE MUGHAL NOBILITY UNDER AURANGZEB

M. ATHAR ALI

Reader in History

Aligarh Muslim University

Published for

THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY,
ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY

ASIA PUBLISHING HOUSE

BOMBAY CALCUTTA NEW DELHI MADRAS
LUCKNOW BANGALORE LONDON NEW YORK

First published 1968

Reprinted. 1970

*All rights reserved No part of this publication
may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or
transmitted, in any form or by any means electronic,
mechanical, photo-copying, recording or otherwise,
without the prior permission of the publisher*

PRINTED IN INDIA

BY MOHAN MAKHIJANI AT REKHA PRINTERS, NEW DELHI, AND PUBLISHED
FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY,
ALIGARH, BY P B JAYASINGHE, ASIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, BOMBAY 1

To
The Memory of
My Father
SAIYID SALAMAT ALI

PREFACE

THIS book is based on a Ph D thesis submitted with the same title to the Aligarh Muslim University in 1961. It has been prepared under the Research Scheme of the Department of History, which made it possible for me to pursue my research for a number of years.

I am grateful to Mr. Badr-ud Din Tyabji, the then Vice Chancellor of the University, for having taken the trouble of reading this book in typescript and making suggestions in regard to its presentation.

I also take this opportunity to thank my teachers and colleagues to whom I am deeply indebted.

I must express my deep sense of gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Satish Chandra, who was always very generous to me, both with his time and attention. Professor Mohammad Habib has given me guidance on a large number of points, and only those who have benefited from his stimulating discourses can really appreciate the broad understanding of the basic problems that one can gain from him. I have also obtained constant inspiration from Professor S. A. Rashid's sympathetic interest in my work. Professor S. Nurul Hasan has always been very helpful to me, and I have the greatest pleasure in thanking him for all he has done to make the writing of this book possible. I have also been helped in various ways by my esteemed friend and colleague, Dr. Irfan Habib.

I am greatly obliged to Maharaj Kumar Raghubir Singh, M. P., for his kind permission to use his magnificent library of manuscripts at Sitamau. I am also grateful to the staff of the Maulana Azad Library and to Mrs. Saeeda Ansari of the Library of the Department of History, for their helpful cooperation.

I should like to thank my colleagues, Messrs. Iqtidar Alam Khan, Ahsan Jan Qaisar, Refaat Ali Khan, Ahsan Raza Khan and Satish Kumar, and Miss Aziza Hasan for their help in correcting the typescript and checking the proofs and in other matters.

Finally, I must acknowledge my deep gratitude to my wife, Feroza Khatoon, for her cooperation and indulgence in the face of the strain and stress which the writing of this book involved.

January 1966

M. ATHAR ALI

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
I. NUMERICAL STRENGTH AND COMPOSITION OF THE NOBILITY	7
Number of the Mansabdars, 7, Composition of the Nobility, 11, Racial and Religious Groups, 14, The Foreign Nobility, 16, The Turanis and Iranis, 18, The Afghans, 20, Indian Muslims, 21, Rajputs, 22, Deccanis, 26, Marathas, 29, Hindus, 30, Tables, 33	
II. ORGANISATION OF THE NOBILITY—MANSAB, PAY, CONDITIONS OF SERVICE	38
Evolution of the Mansab System, 38, Zat and Sawar Ranks, 40, Conditional Rank (Mashrut), 41, The Du aspa Sih aspa Rank, 42, Pay for the ranks, 43, Month Scales, 46, Deductions from Pay, 50, Military obligation of Mansabdars, 53, Recruitment and Promotion, 59, Escheat, 63, Appendix A, 69, Appendix B, 71	
III. THE JAGIRDARI SYSTEM AND THE NOBILITY	74
Assignments of Jagirs, 75, Transfer of Jagirs, 78, Watan Jagirs, 79, Fiscal Rights of the Jagirdars, 81, Administration of Jagirs, 82, Jagirdars and Zamindars, 84, Imperial Control over the Jagirdars, 87, Jagirdar and the Peasants, 89, Crisis in the Jagirdari System, 92	
IV. NOBLES AND POLITICS	95
Aurangzeb and the Nobility—First Phase (1658-66), 95, Aurangzeb and the Nobility—Second Phase (1666-79), 98, The Deccan Problem and the Nobility (1658-89), 102, The Deccan Problem and the Nobility (1689-1707), 106, Appendix, 112	
V. NOBLES AND ADMINISTRATION	136
Nobles at the Court, 136, Court Etiquette, 137, Titles and Distinctions, 139, The System of Presents, 143, Mansabdars and the Public Service, 144, Nobles' Conduct in Administration, 149	
VI. NOBLES AND ECONOMIC LIFE	154
VII. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NOBLES	161
The 'Sarkar' of the Nobles, 161, The Nobles' Contingents, 161, Public Welfare Activities and Charities, 165, Harem and Household, 167, Financial Crisis of the Nobility, 169	
CONCLUSION	171

CONTENTS

APPENDIX

LIST OF THE MANSABDARS OF AURANGZEB HOLDING THE RANKS OF 1,000 ZAT AND ABOVE 175

- A *Mansabdars* who held or reached the rank of 1,000 zat and above during the period, (1658-1678), 175
- B *Mansabdars* who held or reached the rank of 1,000 zat and above during the period, (1679-1707), 216

Bibliography 273

Index 279

Errata 295

ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations have been generally used in the tables and the Appendix only

AL	<i>Alamgir Nams</i> by Muhammad Kazim.
M. A.	<i>Mis'asir : Alamgiri</i>
A. M. T.	<i>Arkan : Mis'asir : Taurariya</i>
T. M.	<i>Tarikh : Muhammadi</i>
T. U.	<i>Tazkarat-ul Umara.</i>
Akh	<i>Akhbarat : Darbar : Mis'alla</i>
B. S.	<i>Basatin-us Salatin</i>
S. D. A.	<i>Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign</i>
Farhat.	<i>Farhat-al Nazim</i>
Adab	<i>Adab : Alamgiri.</i>
Ruq	<i>Ruqa'at : Alamgir</i>
Z. A.	<i>Zawabit : Alamgiri.</i>
Hatim Khan	<i>Alamgir Nams.</i>
Hamwar	<i>Tazkarat-us Salatin : Chaghia</i>
Izar Das.	<i>Fur'hat : Alamgiri.</i>
Mamuri	<i>"Tarikh-i Aurangzeb"</i>
M. U.	<i>Mis'asir-ul Umara.</i>

INTRODUCTION

It is an oft-repeated dictum that in Indian historical writing the ruled have been largely ignored. Yet it is equally true that the rulers too have not received adequate attention. There exist, of course, many impressive biographies of Indian monarchs and histories of royal dynasties. But kings, however despotic they might have been, and however grandiose their pretensions, after all represented only a part—even though an essential part—of the ruling class. The remaining members of the ruling class, who appear usually, but not invariably, as nobles or officers of the kings, also deserve close attention. Yet it need hardly be argued that the composition, traditions, predilections, etc., of this class, or of the various strata that might comprise it, are of at least as much importance as the characters and policies of individual monarchs.

This book, as its title shows, does not pretend to cover the medieval period, or the whole of the Mughal times, but concerns itself only with the nobility of the last Indian Empire under the last of its great Emperors. In so far as it is an excursion into a largely uncharted field, it is, perhaps, best that it should aim at surveying only a small part of the vast field. For various reasons the subject confined within these limitations may still be considered not unimportant. The Mughal Empire began to disintegrate under Aurangzeb's own eyes and the process of dissolution became only more marked and rapid under his successors. In other words at a time when the West was forging ahead in every field of life, Indian society was not only static, nor even stagnant, but, politically at least, degenerating and even receding from the levels it had previously reached. In what ways is this political decline, of such momentous consequence for the later course of Indian history, to be explained? Obviously such an explanation, to be plausible, cannot be provided on the basis of speculation or *a priori* assumptions or by simple appeal to the usual text-book formulae (e.g. personal degeneration of the kings, luxurious life at the court, inefficiency of administration), which are of doubtful value precisely because they can be applied with equal ease to every dynasty or empire. A detailed study of all the elements of the structure of the Mughal Empire can perhaps better supply the groundwork for such an explanation. Among these elements, the Mughal ruling class occupies a noteworthy place; and a detailed analysis of its nature and role would seem to be desirable. The principal object of this study of the Mughal nobility, attempted with particular reference to the reign of Aurangzeb (1658-1707), is, therefore, to describe the institutions and traditions that defined its organisation and policies, and the

stresses and the strains to which it was subjected or to which it itself gave rise

In order to prevent any misunderstanding it should be made clear that the use of the term 'nobility' in the title does not in any way anticipate the conclusions reached in this book about the actual nature and position of the Mughal ruling class. It is far from the intention of the author to assume that the Mughal ruling class was comparable in nature to either the nobles of the Roman Empire or the feudal nobility of Europe. The term 'nobility', despite these dangers of misinterpretation, remains convenient, because it generally denotes the class of persons who were officers of the king and at the same time formed the superior class in the political order and in this book has been used strictly in this sense. This word has also a further advantage in that it is the conventional English equivalent to the Arabic Persian term *Umara* (plural of *amir*) which in the Mughal times was applied to all officers holding the *mansabs* (ranks) of 1,000 and above, i.e. to all the higher strata of the official class. It should be added that this book does not pretend to comprehend within its scope all *mansabdars*, or holders of ranks who formed the bulk of the official class, but only the *mansabdars* of such ranks and status as could reasonably be counted in the ranks of the ruling class, on the basis of their power and income. For this reason, it has been considered useful for the purposes of this study to adopt the rank of 1,000 *zat* as setting the dividing line, at least in the time of Aurangzeb, between those who were mere officials, and those who, in addition, could also claim to have a voice in the government of the empire.

The size and composition of the Mughal nobility have been subjected to a certain amount of discussion, but it has unfortunately not been comprehensive nor in some cases, free from inaccuracies. In particular, the questions needing elucidation concern the number of nobles at various times, the rate at which the number increased, and the effects this increase had on the income of the nobility and its internal cohesion. As to internal cohesion, we have to study the groups and the races, which formed the Mughal nobility, considering specially the question of the position of *foreigners* (and descendants of foreigners) and the Indians, and, similarly, the position of the followers of the two main religious communities, the Muslims and Hindus. In answering these questions, specially the two last mentioned present day sentiment, no less than present day prejudice, would be a bad counsellor. An attempt is, therefore, made in this book to answer these questions only on the basis of statements of, and facts given by contemporaries, and on that of biographical information collected from all our various sources in respect of all the nobles holding the *mansabs* of 1,000 and above in the time of Aurangzeb. This information, when statistically presented, reveals many interesting facts which otherwise would not strike a student of the subject. It should, however, be borne in mind that statistical presenta-

tion has its own pitfalls. Not only should the information on which it is based be comprehensive, but various qualifications are always necessary whenever such information is reduced to a simplified form for purposes of comparison. Obviously, statistical presentation in such a subject as this can hardly ever be refined enough to be taken as offering the last word in historical evidence, yet its importance as a check on generalisations found in our sources or in modern writers, as well as its value for suggesting further avenues of enquiry, can hardly be denied.

The Mughal nobility, as is well known, was organised within the framework of the *mansabdari* system. A number of the essential features of the *mansab* system have been illumined by modern research. We know that each officer was assigned a pair of numbers, designated *zat* and *sawar*, which gave his place in the official hierarchy. It has been shown further (by Moreland and Abdul Aziz, in particular) that the *zat* rank indicated the personal status of the officer, and also, through sanctioned schedules, his personal pay, and the *sawar* rank determined the military contingent he was to maintain, and indicated the payment to be made to him for maintaining this contingent. But beyond this, much has remained obscure. An important object of this study has been to eliminate as far as possible these obscurities in order to gain a clear view of how the *mansabdari* system really functioned under Aurangzeb. It is feared that this will lead the reader into the realm of tedious detail and complexity. But this cannot be avoided since the points discussed relating to the income, and the obligations of the nobility are not of incidental, but central importance to our subject as a whole.

The Mughal nobles obtained their salary either in cash or through assignment of the revenues of various territories, known as *jagirs*. We are indebted to Moreland for a clear exposition of the basic features of the system of these assignments. But the problems which the *jagirdars* (holders of *jagirs*) faced in the work of revenue collection and government, specially in the 17th century, stand in need of detailed treatment. At the same time the ways in which the Emperor sought to restrain the authority of the *jagirdars*—and the extent to which he succeeded in it—have to be carefully studied. We have to see in particular whether the system under Aurangzeb was the same, in all essential features, as under his predecessors, or whether there were changes in it, or, again, whether it was showing any signs of stress and strain. Bernier's famous statement that the system of transfer of *jagirs* was leading to great oppression and ruining the peasantry, has been supported strenuously by some recent writers, and certainly needs to be examined in the light of all the evidence from Aurangzeb's reign.

The existence of the class of *zamindars*, whether chiefs or holders of superior rights over land or its produce, was an important factor in the political society of the time. The relations between this class and the Mughal nobility need to be investigated. The place occupied by ele-

ments of *zamindari* origin in the Mughal ruling class and the attitude of the latter towards the class of *zamindars* as a whole are interesting questions that need elucidation. For the time of Aurangzeb, when revolts against the Empire, led by *zamindars*, seem to have become widespread, answers to these questions assume great importance.

The reign of Aurangzeb extended for nearly fifty years. In the course of his reign, the Emperor formulated policies on various political problems which deeply affected the nobility. The Emperor's attitude towards various sections of the nobility was, of course, of signal importance. Interest, not unnaturally, has centred on Aurangzeb's policy towards the Rajputs which has been linked with his religious policy. An effort has been made in this book to trace the development of this policy, to distinguish its phases, and to put it into a proper perspective.

The Deccan loomed very large in Mughal politics under Aurangzeb, and the attitude of different nobles towards the policy pursued in the Deccan is of great interest. With the Deccan involvement of the last twenty five years of Aurangzeb, when the Emperor personally undertook to annex practically the whole of the peninsula, fresh difficulties as well as opportunities appeared for the nobility. A study of these could help us to understand how the process of disintegration within the nobility had begun even under Aurangzeb himself.

Finally, there is need for the study of the way of life of the nobles, and their role in administration and economic life. Admittedly here we run the risk of undue generalisation from individual cases. An attempt has been made to retain balance by examining contemporary statements critically while not rejecting the evidence for anything ascribed to the nobles simply because in our eyes today it seems extremely unethical or immoral. Answers to two questions, in particular, should be attempted. How should we evaluate the Mughal nobles as upholders of efficient government? And how far did the nobility, by its expenditure, investment or its conduct, contribute to, or retard, economic growth?

The source-material for our study is fortunately very extensive. It is true that except for the first ten years of Aurangzeb's reign, we lack the official Persian chronicles which provide us with such a wealth of information about the reigns of Akbar and Shahjahan. But Aurangzeb's reign is far richer in the primary sources—administrative manuals, official records, *Akhbarat* (court news letters), other documents, letters, etc. It is covered also by important unofficial histories and biographical dictionaries. Few of these Persian sources have been published, and most of the material is available only in manuscript. Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar in his monumental *History of Aurangzeb—Mainly based on Persian Sources* was able to show what a wealth of information could be extracted from these documents. Since his time many additional records have become accessible, and works of historical interest discovered. On

the basis of this evidence, it is now possible to have information on almost all aspects of the political history of the period.

The Persian evidence is supplemented by the accounts left by European travellers, the commercial records and private papers of the English and the other European merchants. Most of the important English accounts have been published; and accounts of many European travellers are available in English translations. A large number of English commercial and private documents too have been published; though in proportion to their bulk, such documents usually have little to offer that is of relevance to our subject. There is a recent tendency to belittle the importance of the European evidence. It is true, of course, that while using the accounts of foreign travellers we should distinguish between what they wrote on the basis of hearsay and on that of first-hand knowledge, between scandal and fact. But we should be grateful to these foreign writers for the descriptions they provide of things which Indian writers thought too well-known or too trivial or too discreditable to notice. Certainly, we should be nearer the truth only if we are able to combine, and check and collate, information derived from both the indigenous Persian sources and the European sources.

CHAPTER I

NUMERICAL STRENGTH AND COMPOSITION OF THE NOBILITY

NUMBER OF THE MANSABDARS

THE *mansabdars* formed the ruling group in the Mughal Empire. Almost the whole nobility, the bureaucracy as well as the military hierarchy, held *mansabs*. Consequently, the numerical strength of the *mansabdars* and their composition during the different periods materially influenced not only politics and administration, but also the economy of the empire.¹ It is, therefore, necessary to examine the size of this group and its composition in order to understand the position of the nobility under Aurangzeb. In this connection, emphasis has been laid on the *mansabdars* of 1,000 and above, since only these were entitled to be called *amirs* (nobles).

There are only two contemporary statements available giving details about the total number of *mansabdars*. The first statement is made by Abdul Hamid Lahori, who says that in the 20th year of Shahjahan's reign there were 8,000 *mansabdars* and 7,000 *ahadis* and mounted artillerymen (i.e. troopers directly in the pay of the Emperor).² During Aurangzeb's reign—probably some time before 1690—we get the figure of 14,449 for the *mansabdars*, *ahadis* (*du aspa sh aspa*), gunners and attendants.³ This total conforms to that of Lahori, but the figure for the *mansabdars* is not separately stated. This deficiency is partly made up, however, by classifying the Emperor's servants as *mansabdarani naqdi* (receiving cash salaries) who were 7,457 and *jagirdars* who were 6,992.⁴ Since it is almost certain that the *ahadis*, etc. were all paid in cash, while only a small portion of the *mansabdars* were on the cash list, it may be deduced from these figures that the number of *mansabdars* proper (excluding the *ahadis*, etc.) did not exceed 8,000. If this assumption is correct, it would mean that there was no increase in the total number of *mansabdars* between the 20th regnal year of Shahjahan and the year to which the figures of the *Zawabit* relate. But since the latter year is not clearly specified, we should not attach too much importance to this

¹ Badshah Nama II p 715

² *Zawabit* : Alamgiri f 15a

³ *Zawab* : Alamgiri f 15a. *Mura'at* : *Mahrusa* Alamgiri f 137b. S R Sharma is thus not correct in supposing that the figure of 14 449 in the *Zawabit* : Alamgiri is for *mansabdars* only (*Religious Pol'y of Mughal Emperors*, p 137)

comparison It is quite possible that its statistics were derived from an earlier period of Aurangzeb's reign

From the inconclusive nature of this comparison, we have to pass on to other data The most prominent among these are the lists of *mansabdars* of 200 *zat* and above in the *Ain* and 500 *zat* and above in the *Badshah Namas* of Lahori and Waris¹ The list of the *Ain* includes all *mansabdars* of Akbar's time, i.e. all those who had received a *mansab* of 200 or above up till the 40th regnal year, when the *Ain* was written Lahori gives us two lists, one for the first decade and the other for the second decade of Shahjahan's reign, Waris's list relates to the third decade In these three lists, the names of *mansabdars* are given according to ranks held by them in the years specified, but those who had died or were dismissed in the preceding decades are also listed, according to the ranks held by them last Finally, Muhammad Salih gives us a list of all the *mansabdars* of Shahjahan's reign, according to the highest rank reached by them Salih's list is apparently based on the lists of Lahori and Waris, but he also took into account the new appointments and promotions made in the last three (lunar) years of Shahjahan's reign²

Unfortunately, there are no official lists of this kind for Aurangzeb's reign This gap can only be filled by collecting information about individual *mansabdars* and their ranks from the surviving historical materials Two lists embodying the information collected by me and relating to the periods, 1658-78 and 1679-1707 are given in an appendix All nobles holding *mansabs* of 1,000 *zat* or above have been entered in each list according to the highest ranks reached by them within either period A number of names are, therefore, common to both lists I have attempted to make the lists as complete as possible by drawing not only upon histories and biographical dictionaries, but also upon the *Akhbarat*, collections of letters and other records For the highest class of nobles, who held the rank of 5,000 *zat* and above, the lists are likely to be complete For the lower two classes, i.e., *mansabdars* from 1,000 to 2,700, the list for 1658-78 is likely to be more complete than that for 1679-1707 This is chiefly owing to the fact that for the first ten years of the reign the official history of Muhammad Kazim, the *Alamgir Nama*, which gives details of almost all promotions to ranks of 1,000 *zat* and above, is available Thereafter, we have no comparable account and it is likely that the lower ranks have not been mentioned by our authorities Thus, though the list of 1679-1707 may require little addition as far as the number of *mansabdars* of 3,000 (*zat*) to 4,500 is concerned, the number of *mansabdars* of 1,000 (*zat*) to 2,700 is probably much below the actual number

The nature of these lists cannot be directly compared with the lists of Lahori and Waris, which relate to shorter periods of time They

¹ *Ain* Vol. I 160-65 *Badshah Nama* I pp. 297-328 Vol. II 717-52

² *Ain-i-Sikandari*, III, pp. 448-89

are more like the lists of the *Ain* and *Salih*. A comparative table of *mansabdars* from the *Ain* and *Salih* and the two lists prepared by me is given below.

	<i>Ain</i>	<i>Salih</i>	1658-78	1679-1707
<i>Mansabdars excluding sons and grandsons of the Emperor</i>	40 years of Akbar's reign	30 solar years of Shahjahan's reign	(21 years)	(29 years)
5 000 and above	29	49	51	79
3 000 to 4 500	30	88	90	133
1 000 to 2 700	74	300	345	363
TOTAL	133	437	486	575

It is obvious that there was a great increase in the number of *mansabdars* of all grades between the 40th year of Akbar and the 30th year of Shahjahan.¹ We are here, however, more concerned with the difference between *Salih's* list and the two lists of Aurangzeb's *mansabdars*.

It will be noticed that there were as many as 51 *mansabdars* of 5,000 *zat* and above during the first twenty (solar) years of Aurangzeb's reign, while in Shahjahan's entire reign of 30 years there were only 49 such *mansabdars*. The number of *mansabdars* of the two other classes, i.e. *mansabdars* of 3,000 to 4,500 and 1,000 to 2,700 is larger for the first twenty years of Aurangzeb's reign, though in neither case is the difference substantial.² This increase was probably due to the new appointments and promotions, which Aurangzeb made during and immediately after the War of Succession in order to consolidate his position. Shahjahan on coming to the throne was much better placed, and granted fewer increments in ranks, as may be seen from the following figures.

¹ The increase would be equally marked if one were to be more precise and compare the numbers of *mansabdars* of above 1 000 *zat* alive in the 40th year of Akbar (based on the *Ain's* list) and in the 10th year of Shahjahan (based on Lahori). In the former year there were 34 such *mansabdars*, in the latter 191—an increase of some 5.5 times.

² See the lists of Aurangzeb's *mansabdars* at the end of the book.

ADDITIONAL RANKS GRANTED

(Figures show total of net increase in the *zat* and *sawar* ranks)

	First two regnal years of Shahjahan	First two regnal years of Aurangzeb
<i>Zat</i>	43,500	89,000
<i>Sawar</i> (<i>du-aspa-suh-aspa</i> counted as double)	44,420	54,000 ¹

However, it seems that Aurangzeb tried to check the grant of promotions in the succeeding eight regnal years as is clearly indicated by the following table based on the *Alamgir Nama* :

NET TOTAL RANKS GRANTED

	Regnal Years								
	1-2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<i>Zat</i>	89,000	17,700	-10,900	5,000	-7,200	1,100	-10,500	-20,500	10,000
<i>Sawar</i>	54,000	16,450	-7,550	5,230	8,700	17,550	2,400	1,400	5,770

It was, perhaps, as a result of this restriction on the promotions granted each year that the period as a whole shows no great increase in the number of *mansabdars* over that of Shahjahan. On the other hand, the statistics concerning *mansabdars*, *ahadis* etc. given in the *Zawabit-i Alamgiri* probably relate to one of the closing years of the period 1658-78.

The next period (1679-1707) shows a considerable increase in the total number of *mansabdars*. This period exceeds the previous period by eight years, but the increase of *mansabdars* cannot be accounted for on that ground alone. While the *mansabdars* of 5,000 and above in all the 33 years of Shahjahan's reign numbered 49, as compared to 47 in the first twenty years of his reign,² the difference here is between 51 for the first 21 years of Aurangzeb's reign and 79 for the last twenty-nine years, showing an increase of 56 per cent. The number of *mansabdars* of 3,000 to 4,500 also increases from 90 to 133, an increase of 48 per cent. In the third category—holders of *mansabs* of 1,000 to 2,700—there is a

¹ The figures for Shahjahan's first two regnal years are based on the promotions and appointments recorded by Qazwini and Lahori, and for Aurangzeb's first two years on those recorded by Kazim in the *Alamgir Nama*.

² This has been arrived at by adding together Lahori's two lists, but eliminating the number of names common to both.

slight increase from 345 to 363, but this is probably owing to the fact that all the *mansabdars* of this grade have not been referred to by our authorities

It seems clear from what has been said above that the real increase in the number of *mansabdars*, especially of the higher grades, took place in the later years of Aurangzeb's reign after he had started operations for the annexation of the entire Deccan and an ever-extending war had to be waged against the Marathas. There was considerable recruitment during this period of Deccani and Maratha nobles, many of whom were given big promotions, sometimes as reward for good service but mostly as bribe for desertion. The number of *mansabdars* became so large that there were complaints that no *jagirs* were left for being granted to them.¹ The crisis became so acute that the Emperor and his ministers repeatedly contemplated the stoppage of all fresh recruitment,² but the force of circumstances prevented them from giving effect to this decision.

COMPOSITION OF THE NOBILITY

THE Mughal nobility was theoretically the creation of the Emperor. It was he alone who could confer, increase, diminish or resume, the *mansab* of any of his subjects. It would be wrong, however, to suppose that the Mughal nobility was open to all who could fulfil certain criteria of merit and competence to the satisfaction of the Emperor. The *mansabdars* were not only public servants, but also the richest class in the Empire and a closed aristocracy and entrance into this class was not easily available to ordinary subjects, whatever their merits.

Khanazads

The most important factor which was taken into account when nobles were appointed was heredity. The *Khanazads*, or sons and descendants of *mansabdars*,³ had the best claim of all. This may be seen from the fact that out of a total of 486 *mansabdars* holding ranks of 1,000 and above during the years, 1658-78, 213 were either sons or close blood relations (excluding those merely connected by marriages) of other *mansabdars*. During the period of 1679-1707, such *mansabdars* numbered 272 out of 575. Further details are given in the table below.

¹ Khafi Khan II pp. 396-97. Mamuri ff 156b-157a. *Dastur-al Amal-i Agahi*, f. 36. *Raqa'at-i Karam* f. 28b.

² Khafi Khan II pp. 411-12.

³ For the definition of *Khana'ad* see *Bahar-i Ajam* x.v. The term *Khanazads* though meaning 'the offspring of slaves or slave-officers' was applied to all *mansabdars* who were the relations or descendants of *mansabdars*.

'A' 1658-78

<i>Mansabdars</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Khanazads</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
5 000 <i>zat</i> and above	51	25	49
3 000 to 4,500	90	61	68
1 000 to 2 700	315	127	37
	486	213	44

'B' 1679-1707

5 000 <i>zat</i> and above	79	24	30
3 000 to 4 500	133	70	53
1 000 to 2,700	363 ¹	178	49
	575	272	47

It would seem from these figures that the *Khanazads* constituted a little less than half of the nobility during both periods. But the proportion of their number during the period, 1679-1707, is probably illusory, and it may be noted that in the highest class (5,000 and above), where our information about the total number of *mansabdars* is more complete, their proportion had fallen from 25 out of 51 to 24 out of 79. The proportion rises as we come to the lower ranks, but our lists for the lower ranks are not so complete. Also our authorities are more inclined to take notice of *mansabdars*, who were descended from prominent nobles, than of other *mansabdars* of the same rank, who did not belong to distinguished families. A contemporary writer, in fact, laments in a long passage that during this period the *Khanazads* were being pushed aside by a flood of new appointees, principally, the Deccanis.²

Zamindars

On the whole, it may be said that although a large portion of the nobility was recruited on the basis of hereditary claims, a slightly larger portion consisted of persons who did not belong to families of those already holding *mansabs*. Such persons came from a variety of classes. A number of them were persons who already had both distinction and power in the land. To this group belonged the *zamindars* or chiefs within the empire. The inclusion of *zamindars* among the officers of the state was no innovation of the Mughals,³ but it is true that Akbar gave it a very great importance by granting *mansabs* to a large number of *zamindars*.

¹ See Tables 3(a) and 3(b) at the end of the chapter.

² Mamuri, ff 156b-157a. Khafi Khan, II pp 396-7.

³ See references to *rai* under Balban in Barani *Tarikh*; Firuz Shah ed. Professor S.A. Rashid, Algarh Vol I pp 62 102 125 163.

and their relations. Their ancestral domains were left to them, being treated as their *watan-jagirs*, but as government officers ordinary *jagirs* were assigned to them in all parts of the Empire.¹ During the first part of Aurangzeb's reign (1658-78), there were no fewer than 68 officers who were also *zamindars* out of a total of 486 higher officers. Among the 575 *mansabdars* during the years 1679-1707, 81 were *zamindars* also. But out of these, 29 *zamindars* in the earlier period, and the same number in the later period, were new entrants whose predecessors had not held *mansabs*. The following table² provides further details :

'A' 1658-78				
	Total Mansabdars	Total <i>zamindars</i>	<i>whose fathers or blood relations were already mansabdars</i>	Other <i>zamindars</i>
5,000 <i>zat</i> and above	51	7	5	2
3,000 <i>zat</i> to 4,500	90	11	10	1
1,000 <i>zat</i> to 2,700	345	50	24	26
	486	68	39	29

'B' 1679-1707				
5,000 <i>zat</i> and above	79	15	6	9
3,000 <i>zat</i> to 4,500	133	20	13	7
1,000 <i>zat</i> to 2,700	363	46	33	13
	575	81	52	29

Nobles coming from other States

Then there were nobles and high officers of other states, who were given a place in the Mughal nobility on account of their experience, status and influence or of the contingents they commanded and the territories they controlled. A notable example of this was the conferment of a rank upon Husun Pasha, the Ottoman governor of Basra, immediately upon his arrival in India. For the Persian, Chaghtai and Uzbek nobility, India had traditionally been an El Dorado where fortunes could be rapidly made. In the Deccan, military necessity required that the largest number of nobles and officers of the independent states, both in times of peace and war, be won over to the Mughal side.

¹ See Chapters II and III

² Based on the Appendix at the end of the book.

They had to be granted *mansabs* high enough to induce them to betray their own states. Mir Jumla presents a classic example of this type; but almost all Deccani *mansabdars*, whether Bijapuris, Haiderabadis or Marathas, belonged to this category.¹

A very small portion of the Mughal nobility was recruited from those who had no claims to high birth but were pure administrators or accountants. Such were the members of the accountant castes, Khatris, Kayasths, etc. Usually they received low ranks when appointed officers or clerks in the financial departments.² But a few of them rose to higher ranks. Under Akbar there had been Raja Todar Mal. Raja Raghu-nath, the *diwan* in the early years of Aurangzeb, rose to the high rank of 3,000/700 after a purely financial career. In our lists of Aurangzeb's nobles, this class is included among 'other Hindus', i.e. Hindus other than Rajputs and Marathas. In the period 1658-78, there were 7 'other Hindus' enjoying ranks of 1,000 *zat* and above out of a total of 486 *mansabdars*. In the period 1679-1707, the number rose to 13 out of 575.

Finally, *mansabdar* ranks were also awarded to scholars, religious divines, men of letters, etc. Abul Fazl in the time of Akbar and Sa'adullah Khan and Danishmand Khan during the reign of Shahjahan owed their high ranks to their talent as men of letters. Fazl Khan, Aurangzeb's minister in the early years of his reign, who held the rank of 5,000/2,500, was also a scholar and a physician whose name, before he received his title from Shahjahan, was Hakim Alaul-Mulk Tuni. Among Aurangzeb's own recruits to the services from this class were Munshi Qabil Khan (1,000/70) and Inayatullah Khan Kashmiri (2,000/250). A few theologians and religious scholars were also awarded *mansabs*.³

RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS GROUPS

The Mughal nobility, after its first phase of development during the

¹See Tables 4(a) and 4(b) at the end of the chapter

Mirza Raja Jai Singh won over Mulla Ahmad Nautha, the leading noble of Bijapur and on the recommendation of the Raja, Mulla Ahmad was given the rank of 6,000/6 000 (*Alamgir Nama*, 919-920, *Futuh-i Alamgiri*, ff 103b, 116b, 117b, 165b, *Akhbarat*, 8th R Y). For the practice of meeting the commanders and military generals of the enemy to desert their master as followed in the Deccan, see Manucci, IV, pp 239-40. Even when the Deccan states were finally annexed, their nobles were given a place within the Mughal nobility. See *Zawabit-i Alamgiri*, ff 163a-163b, *Ma'asir-i Alamgiri*, 184, 254, Khafi Khan, II, 304, 373, 370, *Mamuri*, 187a, *Akhbarat*, 7th Ziqada, 44th R Y.

²Gopinath, when appointed *Pesh dast* (chief clerk) of the *diwan* of the Deccan in 1644, received the rank of 1,000/20, the same as enjoyed by his predecessor (*Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign*, 64). Similarly Bhimsen, the author of *Nuskhah-i-Dilkusha*, was a Kayasth Saksena by caste. His father had the *mansab* of 150/10 in the early years of Aurangzeb (*Dilkusha*, f 21a). Bhimsen himself became a *mansabdar* for sometime before joining service under Rao Dalpat Bundela.

³For example Shaikh Abdul Qawi reached 5,000/400, Mulla Iwaz Wajih, 1,000/200

reigns of Babur and Humayun and the early years of Akbar, came to consist of certain well recognised racial groups. There were the Turanis (Central Asians), Iranis (Persians), Afghans, Shaikhzadas (Indian Muslims, consisting of a number of sub groups), and the Rajputs, etc. Later on, in the 17th century, with the advance of Mughal power in the Deccan, there was an influx of the Deccanis, i.e. Bijapuris, Haiderabadis and Marathis. A very interesting description of the composite nature of the Mughal nobility is given by Chandrabhan Brahman, who wrote during the last years of Shahjahan's reign.

"From different races, Arabs, Persians, Turks, Tadjeks, Kurds, Lars, Tatars, Russians, Abyssinians, Circassians, etc. and from the country of Rum (Turkey), Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Arabia, Persia, Gilan, Mazandran, Khurasan, Sistan, Trans Oxiana, Khwarizm, the Qipchaq Steppes, Turkistan, Gharistan, Kurdistan, various classes and groups of persons from every race and people have sought asylum in the Imperial Court, and various groups of Indians, men possessed of knowledge and skill as well as men of the sword, viz. Bukhari and Bhakkari, Saiyids of correct lineage, Shaikhzadas of noble ancestry, tribes (*uhurat*) of the Afghans such as Lodis, Rohilas, Khwaishti, Yusufzai, etc. and clans of Rajputs, (styled) *rana*, *raja*, and *rajan*, such as Rathors, Sisodias, Kachhwahas, Haras, Gauris, Chauhans, Jhils, Chandravats, Jadauns, Tonwars, Baghelis, Bais, Badguyar, Panwars, Bhadurias, Solankis, Bundelas, Sekhawats and all other people of India, such as the races of Ghakkars, Langahs, Khokars, Baluch and other races, men of the pen and men of the sword, holding the positions of 7,000 to 1,000 and 1,000 to 100, and 100 to *ahadi*, and *zamindars* of the deserts and mountains, from the country of Karnatik, Bengal, Assam, Udaipur, Srinagar, Kamaun, Bandhu Tibet, and Kishtwar, etc. in the Empire, whole classes and groups of them, have obtained the privilege of kissing the threshold of the Imperial Court."

These various elements were incorporated into the Mughal service largely as a result of historical circumstances, but partly (specially the Rajputs) as a result of planned imperial Policy. Akbar's policy seems to have been to integrate all these elements into a single imperial service. He often assigned officers belonging to various groups to serve under one superior officer. At the same time, the distinct or separate character of each group was respected. The imperial government regulated the proportion of men belonging to his own race or clan which a *mansabdar* could recruit.

There was, therefore, diversity in unity, and the diversity was capable of producing tensions. Mirza Hakim had pinned his hopes on these tensions in 1581. He expected that the Iranis and Turanis in Akbar's forces would go over to his side, while the Rajputs and Afghans would

¹Guldasta Al garh. S r Sulaiman Collection 666/44 ff. 4b-5a

²Kulast us Syaq f. 54b

be slaughtered and the other Indians would be captured.¹ Akbar's policy of *Sulh-i Kul* was partly motivated by a desire to employ elements of diverse religious beliefs—Sunnis (Turans and most of the Shaikhzadas), Shias (including many Iranis) and Hindus (Rajputs)—and to prevent sectarian differences among them from interfering with their loyalty to the throne.² In the early years of Jahangir it was felt, at least by Mirza Aziz Koka, that the Emperor was hostile to the Chaghatais (Turans) and Rajputs, while he was showing undue favours to the Khurasanis (Iranis) and Shaikhzadas.³ But there seems to be no convincing evidence for this.⁴

It is clear, however, that there existed a certain amount of jealousy among the various sections of the nobility. Aurangzeb's nobility must have inherited both this tradition of internal rivalry and distrust as well as the dominant spirit of unity engendered by a common loyalty to the throne. In the following pages an attempt has been made to study how each of these elements fared under Aurangzeb. We will endeavour to find out how far the Emperor followed a consciously planned policy towards the various sections of the nobility and how the changes in the strength of each of them reacted upon the solidarity and cohesion of the nobility and the Empire as a whole.

THE FOREIGN NOBILITY

Commenting on the list of *mansabdars* in the *Ain*, Moreland says that just under 70 per cent of the nobles whose origin is known were foreigners belonging "to families which had either come to India with Humayun or had arrived at the Court after the accession of Akbar."⁵ This high proportion of *mansabdars* belonging to families from foreign lands continued under Akbar's successors. Thus, Bernier described the nobility during the early years of Aurangzeb's reign as "a medley of Uzbeks, Persians, Arabs and Turks, or descendants from these people". He adds elsewhere that the "*emars* mostly consist of adventurers from different nations who entice one another to the Court".⁶ We cannot really consider descendants of immigrants who had come from abroad a couple of generations back and had lost all contact with their own country as 'foreigners' in any real sense of the word.⁷ But even if we regard them

¹Akbar Nama, III, 366 The Mirza's advisers did not know, adds Abul Fazl, the extent of loyalty which the Turans and Iranis felt for Akbar, nor how brave the Rajputs and other Indians were.

²Cf. Dobson & Mazahib, ed. Nazir Ashraf, Calcutta, pp. 431-32.

³Arzdaht & Muzaffar, ff. 19a-19b, Cf. Hawkins, *Early Travels*, 106-7.

⁴See Rifaqat Ali Khan's paper, 'Jahangir and the Rajputs', *Proceedings of Indian History Congress*, Aligarh Session, 1960, pp. 223-25, for an examination of this evidence.

⁵India at the Death of Akbar, pp. 69-70.

⁶Bernier, 209, 212.

⁷For a discussion of this point, see Satish Chandra, *Parties and Politics at the Mughal Court*, pp. XXIX ff.

as 'foreigners', Bernier's statement would only be partly true for Aurangzeb's early years. This is brought out by the charts based on the lists of nobles of Aurangzeb's reign. It thus appears that in 1658-78 out of a total of 417 *mansabdars* of 1,000 *zat* and above, whose origin can be determined, 202 or slightly less than half, were foreigners; and of these 55 are known to have been born outside India. In 1679-1707, out of 482 *mansabdars* of 1,000 and above whose origin can be determined, 197 were foreigners, of whom 46 were born outside India.¹ It is clear from these figures that there had been a distinct decline in the number of nobles directly coming from foreign countries since the time of Akbar, and in the course of Aurangzeb's long reign, direct recruitment of foreigners declined even more sharply, as is apparent from the proportionately lower number of foreign-born nobles in the second period as compared to the first. The decline is still more remarkable if only the highest ranks are considered. In 1658-78, out of 51 *mansabdars* of 5,000 and above, no less than 32 were foreigners, of whom 15 were born outside India, while the origin of 2 cannot be determined. In 1679-1707 out of 66 *mansabdars* of 5,000 and above, whose origin can be determined, only 20 were foreigners, of whom just 6 were born outside India.²

It is possible to point out various reasons for this decline. The Uzbek and Safavid Kingdoms were no longer as powerful as they had been before and consequently the same number of nobles of administrative experience and status no longer came to India from those lands for recruitment to the Mughal nobility. Moreover, Aurangzeb's attention was concentrated for the most part of his reign on the Deccan and he never aspired to follow a forward or militaristic policy in the North-West like his father or great grand-father. He was, therefore, not likely to go out of his way to offer exceptional inducements to Turani and Irani nobles to desert their masters for Mughal service.

On the other hand, there is no evidence that Aurangzeb ever consciously set out to 'Indianise' the nobility. Such 'Indianisation' as occurred was purely the result of historical circumstances, and not of a deliberate policy. Indeed, there is some evidence to show that a distinction was maintained even in the time of Aurangzeb between the foreign and local elements in the nobility. It appears to have been assumed that the Turanis and Iranis should command a higher status than those belonging to clans that had their homes in India. Thus a great Rajput noble himself, Mirza Raja Jai Singh, is found expressing surprise that instead of his

¹ See Tables 1(a) and 1(b) at the end of the chapter. The number of nobles of 1,000 and above whose country of origin cannot be determined are 69 in the list of 1658-1678 and 93 in that of 1679-1707, i.e. respectively 14.4 per cent and 16 per cent of the total. They are all Muslims. Thus while calculating the relative strength of individual Muslim groups it may be permissible to deduct their number from the total in order to state the percentage. It should be counted in the total when the purpose is to find the relative strength of Muslims or Hindus as a whole, or of individual Hindu groups.

² See Tables 1(a) and 1(b) at the end of the chapter.

own nominees for the posts of fort-commandants in the Deccan, who from their names seem to have been Turanis and Iranis, Aurangzeb should have preferred to appoint to these posts men "belonging to the races of Indiran-born (Hindūstān-zād) Sayyids and Mughals and Shaikh-zādis (Indiran Muslims) and Rajputs".¹ This prejudice seems to have found reflection in the practice, reported by Bernier, of Mughal officers marrying women from Kashmir, so that their "children may be whiter than the Indirans and pass for genuine Mogols".² However, the very paucity of indications of such prejudice suggests that to postulate the existence of any deep rooted jealousy or struggle between the 'foreigners' and 'Indirans' merely on the grounds of their place of birth would be hazardous.

THE TURANIS AND IRANIS

The so called foreigners consisted largely of the Turanis and Iranis. Turani was a term applied to any person coming from Central Asia, where the Turkish languages were spoken. In spite of the fact that it is not possible to explain the tussle between the officers of Aurangzeb entirely in terms of a conflict between the Iranis and the Turanis, it cannot be denied that Irani and Turani group-consciousness did exist and was at times used for factional ends. It is, therefore, necessary to examine the proportion of the Iranis and Turanis in the higher official grades. Since the ruling family was of Turani origin, one might expect that the Turanis would be the dominant section of the foreign nobility but this was not so. Bernier noted that 'the Court itself does not now consist as originally, of real Mogols', and the lists of Aurangzeb's nobles bear him out completely. In 1658-78, there were 67 Turani *mansabdars* of 1 000 and above out of 486, while in 1679-1707, they numbered only 72 out of 575.³ That is to say, only 13.7 per cent of the nobles in the first period and 12.5 per cent in the second were Turanis. The decline in the Turanis position probably took place much before Aurangzeb's reign. We have already seen that Jahangir was charged with hostility towards the Turanis. It may be noted that the decline of the Uzbek Kingdom started much earlier than the decline of the Safavids. Moreover, the Turanis, especially the Badakhshis, were generally regarded as uncultured and boorish in India.⁴ An officer of Aurangzeb's court who went so far to say in the imperial presence that the word of a Turani could not be trusted only earned a mild reproof asking him to remember that his Emperor was also a Turani.⁵

¹Munshi Bhag Chand *Jam al Insha* Br. M. Or 1702 f 67a

²Bernier p. 404

³See Tables 2(a) and 2(b) at the end of the chapter

⁴*M rat-al I t lah* f. 78a

⁵Mamuri f. 179b. Khafi Khan II. 378-79

Iranis

The *Iranis*, also called *Khurasanis* and *Iraqis*, comprised the Persian speaking peoples from Herat up to Baghdad i.e. the inhabitants of the whole of the present-day Persia and the Persian-speaking parts of Afghanistan and Iraq. Aziz Koka's letter, referred to earlier, shows that there existed from earlier generations considerable jealousy between the *Turanis* and *Iranis*. [The fact that the *Turanis* were generally Sunnis and most *Iranis* were Shias¹ sometimes lent a religious colour to the controversy. The *Iranis* were supposed to be far more cultured, and won special favour under both Jahangir and Shahjahan. It has been suggested that in the War of Succession Aurangzeb rallied the Sunnis against the Shias,² but there is really no basis for this assertion. Out of 124 nobles of 1,000 and above, who are known to have supported Aurangzeb up to the battle of Samugarh, 27 were *Iranis*, 4 of them holding rank of 5,000 *zat* and above. As against this, 23 out of 87 of Dara Shukoh's supporters were *Iranis*.³ After all, Mir Jumla and Shaista Khan, the leading Irani nobles, were Aurangzeb's partisans. Similarly, there does not seem to be much weight in Bernier's statement that Prince Shuja was supported by the Persians.⁴ Only one of his ten known supporters, holding rank of 1,000 *zat* and above, was an Irani.⁵

Thus Aurangzeb's victory did not affect the position of the *Iranis* in any way. Bernier says that the 'greater part' of his foreign nobility consisted of Persians,⁶ and Tavernier says that the Persians occupied 'the highest posts' in the Mughal Empire.⁷ This statement can be proved by statistics. Out of 486 *mansabdars* in 1658-78, 136 were *Iranis*, quite dwarfing the *Turanis*, who numbered 67. In 1679-1707, their number still remained high—126 out of a total of 575. On the top rung of the ladder, 23 *Iranis* held the rank of 5,000 and above in 1658-78 and 14 in 1679-1707, while the number of *Turanis* was 9 and 6 respectively.

The *Iranis* maintained their position partly because of the influx of *Iranis* serving in the Deccan Kingdoms. Here the *Iranis* had long been dominant,⁸ and Mir Jumla provides an example of an Irani noble entering Mughal service through the Deccan. Aurangzeb is also said to have entertained great confidence in officers from Khawaf, a province of Persia, who became recipients of considerable favours during his reign.⁹

¹On most Irani nobles being Shia, see Badauni, II, pp 326-7.

²See I A Ghori in *Journal of Pakistan Historical Society*, Vol VIII, part II, pp 97-119.

³See Tables in Chapter IV

⁴Bernier, II, 26

⁵See Table in Chapter IV

⁶Bernier, 3

⁷Tavernier, II, 138

⁸Tavernier, II, 138

⁹Cf Khafi Khan II, p 72, who says in an interesting passage "Owing to Shaikh Mir's sacrificing his life in the service of the Emperor, the Emperor — a (great) patron of *Khanazads* — began to bestow great favour on all men of Khawaf. So much so that during Aurangzeb's reign, the people of Khawaf, which is the least regarded of all parts of Khurasan, came into prominence and obtained promotions, never seen in the histories of previous rulers. In fact, although the people of Khawaf are in appearance rough and rude as compared to the other people of Khurasan, most of them are efficient and upright in the discharge of their duties. In justifying loyalty to their salt they can be counted among the steadfast ones (in the Empire) "

Nor was the position of the Persians affected by the Sunni orthodoxy of the Emperor. He once refused to make an appointment to the office of *bakhshi* which was suggested to him on the ground that the existing incumbent was a Shia.¹

THE AFGHANS

The Afghans had a chequered history within the Mughal nobility. They cannot properly be regarded as foreign immigrants because their homelands lay within the Mughal Empire. During the time of the Delhi Sultans, the Afghans had been looked upon with contempt as robbers and plunderers.² However, by the time of Firoz Shāh, some of the Afghans had acquired prominence as nobles. With the establishment of the Lodi Kingdom, they came to constitute the governing class, and the influx of the Afghans from 'Roh' to Hindustan proper reached its height. When their Kingdom was overthrown by Babur, some of them made their peace with the conqueror. The short-lived Sur Empire, followed by the Mughal restoration, made the Afghan chiefs suspects in the eyes of the Mughals, and Akbar seems to have kept most of them at arm's length.³ Jahangir, however, began to encourage the Afghans, as is evidenced particularly by the position accorded by him to Khan-i Jahan Lodi.⁴ Under Shahjahan, after Khan-i Jahan Lodi's rebellion, the Afghans apparently suffered a set-back and, we are told, that Shahjahan placed no trust in the Afghans.⁵

Aurangzeb as a prince seems to have made an attempt to win over the Afghans. In a letter he expresses surprise that his proposal for promoting an Afghan officer was turned down by the Emperor simply because of his race.⁶ Still more revealing is the fact that out of the 124 nobles of 1,000 *zat* and above, who supported Aurangzeb up to the battle of Samugarh, 23 were Afghans, while there was only one Afghan among 87 nobles of this status on the side of Dara Shukoh.⁷

According to Abul Fazl Mamuri, Aurangzeb in the early years of his reign exercised great care to see that the Afghans did not get undue promotions.⁸ In our lists of *mansabdars* of 1,000 and above during 1658-78, we find 43 Afghan officers out of a total of 486. In the second period, 1679-1707, the Afghans numbered 34 out of a total of 575. But this decline is probably due to the incompleteness of our lists for the

¹ *Akām*, 39

² See Isami, *Futuh us Salatin*, ed. Mehdi Hasan, p. 244

³ *Dilkusha*, f. 84b

⁴ For further elucidation of this point, see Dr A. Rahim's article, 'Jahangir's Policy towards the Afghans', *Journal of Pakistan Historical Society*, 1959, Vol. VII, Part III, pp. 205-20

⁵ *Dilkusha*, ff. 84b, 173b, *Durr-al Ulum*, f. 15a. The *yagar* of an Afghan officer Bahadur Khan, who had rendered distinguished service in Balkh and Badakhshan, was resumed by Shahjahan on the charge of negligence of duty (*Amal-i Saluk*, III, p. 23)

⁶ *Adab-i Alamgiri*, f. 143

⁷ See Tables in Chapter IV

⁸ Mamuri, f. 156b

lower ranking *mansabdars*. Thus, while there were only three Afghans holding the rank of 5,000 and above in 1658-78, there were no less than ten in the same category in the period 1679-1707. Aurangzeb's later years, therefore, showed a considerable increase in the number of the Afghan nobility. But it appears that this was mainly owing to the recruitment of a large number of Afghans formerly serving in the Bijapur Kingdom.

Contemporary observers write of the Afghan nobility with an obvious feeling of aversion. The Afghans came from a tribal society and even when they were appointed Mughal officers, they still remained tribal leaders and employed men from their own tribes and clans. Manucci points out that they wore aristocratic dress only for the court. When they returned, they put away the dress for the simple costumes of their race.¹ Bhimsen has even graver objections to the Afghans. The Afghans were spread all over India and were everywhere a cause of turbulence and disorder. Their power increased after Aurangzeb's departure for the Deccan, and many of them, who were not admitted to the imperial service, raised private armies which put into the shade the contingents of many imperial officers.² The growth in the number of Afghan nobles weakened the internal cohesion of the nobility, and, in turn, reacted unfavourably on the fortunes of the Empire, particularly when the dominating personality of Aurangzeb was removed from the scene and still new weaknesses crept into the central government.

INDIAN MUSLIMS

The Indian Muslims, popularly known as *Shaikhzadas*, belonged largely to certain important clans, like the Saiyids of Barha and the Kambus. There were 65 Indian Muslims out of a total of 486 *mansabdars* of 1,000 and above in 1658-78, i.e. 13.4 per cent, in 1679-1707 they were 69 out of 575 or 12 per cent. In 1658-78, there were 4 Indian Muslims enjoying the rank of 5,000 and above, in 1679-1707, there were 10.³

It seems that behind this slight relative decline in the strength of the Indian Muslims lay the eclipse of certain old elements, offset by the entry of new sections. The Saiyids of Barha and the Kambus, who had held leading positions since the time of Akbar, were no longer equally prominent during the later years of Aurangzeb. The Saiyids of Barha, who traditionally formed the vanguard of the Mughal armies and were very proud of their martial qualities,⁴ were distrusted by Aurangzeb.⁵ This was probably because the Barha Saiyids had been loyal supporters of Dara Shukoh. Among the new groups that were brought in, the most

¹Manucci II p 453

²Dilkusha ff 173b-174a

³See Tables 2(a) and 2(b) at the end of the chapter

⁴Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri p 366

⁵Ahkam 32 B

prominent were the native Deccanis (i.e. excluding those Deccanis, who were Irani, Turani or Afghan, but including the Abyssinians of the Western Coast). "The Kashmiris were also promoted in larger numbers. We are told that in the early years of Aurangzeb's reign, the Kashmiris, specially the Chaks, seldom got any *mansab*."¹ But during the later years of the reign, their number increased. Inayatullah Kashmiri was one of Aurangzeb's favourite nobles.

RAJPUTS

Aurangzeb's policy towards the Rajputs has been considerably clouded by controversy. This is not surprising as it is—or has been supposed to be—closely connected with his religious policy, and the latter has aroused passionate debate for a long time. For the sake of clarity of discussion, however, it is desirable to examine the position of the Rajputs in the nobility without taking for granted its association with the religious policy of Aurangzeb.

Shahjahan was a devout Muslim king, who adopted a number of measures to show his orthodoxy. Yet his reign saw a very great increase in the number of Rajput *mansabdars*, as is shown by the lists given in Lahori and Waris.² Aurangzeb, too, was a devout Muslim; and he was censured at Shahjahan's court for harbouring hostility towards the Rajputs.³ But this was apparently a passing phase, and in the years immediately preceding the War of Succession, Aurangzeb seems to have made an earnest attempt to win over the leading Rajput chiefs to his side. His *nishans* issued to Rana Raj Singh of Mewar have survived.⁴ In these he promised the Rana to restore all the territories annexed from Mewar in 1654 as a punishment for the refortification of Chitor by the Rana. In one *nishan* he makes a promise in ringing tones that he would follow the religious policy of his ancestors declaring that "a King who practices intolerance towards the religion of another, is a rebel against God".⁵ Qanungo has shown at length how Mirza Raja Jai Singh had become a secret supporter of Aurangzeb, and played a key role in the overthrow of Dara Shukoh.⁶ It is true that among Aurangzeb's 124 supporters

¹Mamuri, f 156b To be a Kashmiri was one of the disqualifications cited by Aurangzeb in a letter to prince Muazzam (*Raqaum i Karaum*, f 15a b)

²This point was first made out by S R. Sharma, *Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors*, pp 98-101, where the actual numbers are given

³*Adab i Alamgiri*, ff 24a, 25a, *Ruq'at i Alamgiri*, pp 113, 115 It is interesting that this was in connection with a protest lodged by Aurangzeb at Shahjahan's rejection of his suggestion for granting promotion to Rao Karan

⁴*Vir Vinod*, II, pp 423-24, 426-27, *Adab i Alamgiri*, ff 325a, 326a

⁵*Ibid*, pp 419-20 note This *nishan* has been translated by me in my paper, 'The Religious Issue in the War of Succession, 1658-59', read before the Aligarh Session of the Indian History Congress, 1960 Reprinted in *Medieval India quarterly*, vol V, pp 80-87,

⁶*Dara Shukoh*, passim, but especially, pp 175-78

	Net Increase or Decrease in mansabs (excluding those of the Imperial Princes)			Share of Rajputs in the Total
	I II Yrs	III VI Yrs	VII X Yrs	I X Yrs
<i>Zat</i>				
Total	89 000	4 600	- 10 000	83 600
Rajputs	12 600	1 000	- 1 600	12 000
%	14 16	21 74	16 00 (of the reduction)	14 35
<i>Sawar</i>				
Total	54 000	5 430	27,320	86 750
Rajputs	11 900	1 350	- 2,500	10 750
%	22 04	24 86		12 40

nobles holding the rank of 1,000 *zat* and above, 82 (or 18.7 per cent) were Rajputs. While the nobles of 1,000 *zat* and above in all held a total of 10,07,000 *zat*, the Rajputs accounted for 178,500 or 17.7 per cent of this total. The figure of 14.35 per cent of net *zat* ranks granted during the whole of the first decade shows that on the whole the old proportion was not being maintained. It also seems that while during the first six years of the decade, the Rajputs were granted relatively higher ranks (specially as far as the *sawar* ranks are concerned), during the last four years, their position declined appreciably. The *sawar* ranks held by them were reduced in absolute terms while there was a considerable net increase in the *mansabs* granted to nobles in general.

There may, therefore, be much truth in Mamuri's statement that in the period before his departure for the Deccan, Aurangzeb had been exercising restraint in promoting the Rajputs.¹ The above table suggests that this restraint might well have become a deliberate imperial policy even before the end of the first decade of the reign.

This new imperial outlook was reflected in Aurangzeb's handling of the question of succession to the Marwar throne upon the death of Jaswant Singh in December, 1678. A detailed discussion of the whole issue of succession and the factors that led to the Rajput rebellion of 1680-81 is not relevant for our purpose here.² Aurangzeb evidently wished to assert the central authority, he converted even Jodhpur into *Khalisa* (or Crown Territory), immediately upon the death of Jaswant Singh, despite protests by Jaswant Singh's chief Queen and officers. However, there is no evidence that this was meant to be the prelude to a scheme

¹ Mamuri f 156 b

² For a discussion regarding the Rajput question and the attitude of the nobility towards it see Chapter IV.

for destroying all Rajput Kingdoms.¹ The fact that Jaswant Singh had left no son at his death gave Aurangzeb an excuse for bringing parts of Marwar under direct Mughal administration in order to provide *jagirs* for the Raja's officers. But with the posthumous birth of two sons to the queens of Jaswant Singh, a new situation arose; and Aurangzeb sought to salvage something of his old plan by nominating Inder Singh to the *gaddi*. It seems that Aurangzeb wished to remain, as far as was possible, within the bounds of custom and precedent. After all, the Mughal Emperors had not hesitated to grant *tikas* in violation of the Rajput customary law of succession.² At the same time Aurangzeb made peace on rather liberal terms with Mewar in 1681, despite two years of bitter fighting in which most of the state had been over-run.³ The 1680-81 rebellion had only involved the Rathors and Sisodias. The other clans not only remained aloof, but served under the Mughals. The *Waqā-i Ajmer* gives frequent reports of Rajput officers joining the Mughal army with their contingents. The rebellion, therefore, did not initiate any great decline in the fortunes of the Rajput nobility. Though in the period, 1679-1707, we find only 73 Rajput officers out of a total 575—a mere 12.6 per cent,⁴ compared to the proportionate number of the Rajputs in 1658-78, which was 14.6 per cent—this may be held to mark a decline. It should, however, be remembered that this was a decline generally suffered by the non-Deccani elements. If we take non-Deccani nobles alone, the number of Rajputs amounted to 16.6 per cent of the total during the period, 1658-78; while during the period, 1679-1707, the Rajputs numbered 17.6 per cent. This latter was the period of the Deccan wars in which Rajput contingents rendered gallant service. Indeed, prince Azam's wife could call upon the Haras to offer their lives in defence of her camp from the Marathas by exclaiming that "the honour of the Chaghtais is one with the honour of the Rajputs".⁵

These statistics do not lend support to the view that there was a special discrimination against the Rajputs after 1678. S.R. Sharma has tried to show that Aurangzeb as a rule granted smaller ranks to new Rajput chiefs than those of their predecessors, even though these ranks were held against hereditary lands or *watan-jagirs*.⁶ However, there is no evidence that Aurangzeb annexed any part of the Rajput states at the time of new successions. What Aurangzeb could have done was to

¹ Cf. Sarkar, *History of Aurangzeb*, Vol. III, p. 367.

² Eg. *Tuzuk-i Jahangir*, p. 106, *Adab-i Alamgiri*, f. 26a; *Raq'at-i Alamgiri*, p. 120.

³ By this peace (made with Rana Jai Singh), the entire territory of Mewar was restored to the Rana with the exception of those *parganas* which had been annexed to the Empire in 1654, but returned in 1659. The Rana was granted the same rank as his father, 5,000/3,000.

⁴ See Table 2 (b) at the end of the chapter.

⁵ Sarkar, *History of Aurangzeb*, Vol. IV, p. 302, (Sarkar quotes the *Al-Ussat* without giving the year and the date, but the present writer has not found this reference anywhere in the *Al-Ussat*).

⁶ *Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors*, p. 131.

have restricted such rank promotions as would have entitled the Rajput chiefs to claim imperial *jagirs* in addition to their *watan-jagirs*. A Rajput chief generally held imperial *jagirs* outside his *watan*, so that when he died, only part of his *jagir* and, therefore *mansab*, would go to his heir, and not the whole. As Rana Amar Singh wrote in a letter to Asafuddaula (A D 1708) "The previous Emperors, keeping in view (the paucity of) the resources of Rajputana, have been pleased to assign to the ancestors of the present chiefs, *parganas* and *in'am* lands besides their *watan-jagirs*, in return for which they have always rendered excellent service"¹ It will also be a mistake to suppose that the Rajputs were deliberately humiliated in Aurangzeb's later years. True, such tokens of honour as the putting of *tika* on the forehead of their Rajas by the Emperor himself or the chief *wazir* were withdrawn.² But the Rajputs were certainly given a higher status than the rest of their co-religionists, and all Rajputs who were in imperial service, were exempted from the *jizya*.³

On the other hand, it will also be a mistake to suppose that Aurangzeb followed a policy towards the Rajputs entirely in the same spirit as Akbar. We have already noted that Aurangzeb began to exercise a certain restraint in the appointments and promotions of the Rajputs before the end of the first decade of the reign. During the last thirty years of his reign, the Emperor's attitude is clarified by the treatment of some distinguished Rajput officers. Ram Singh Hara, Dalpat Rao Bundela and Jai Singh Sawai were three Rajput officers who served in the Deccan with their full contingents.⁴ Yet, Dalpat only held the rank of 3,000/3,000, Ram Singh Hara of 3,000/1,500 (200 x 2 3h) and Raja Jai Singh of 2,000/2,000. When Jai Singh was appointed by prince Bidar Bakht to serve as his deputy in Malwa in 1705, Aurangzeb forbade his sitting on a *masnad* and made it clear that a Rajput could not ordinarily be appointed a Governor or even a *faujdar*.⁵

DECCANIS

The word Deccani means a 'southerner', and the Mughals applied this name to all those nobles belonging to the Deccan kingdoms, who took service with them. An official document of Aurangzeb's 11th regnal year states that all nobles, whether of Indian or foreign origin, who had taken service with either Bijapur or Golkunda before joining Mughal service, were to be considered Deccanis.⁶ Though many of the Marathas, who were by birth Deccanis *par excellence*, were technically

¹ *Vinod* 111 777 78

² *Ma asir-i Alamgiri*, p 176

³ *Isar Das* f 74a b

⁴ *Diksha* f 140a 141a

⁵ *Inayatullah : Akbar : Alamgir* f 62b

⁶ *Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign* p 64

excluded by this order, they were generally counted among Deccanis by contemporary writers, and may be so designated.

In our general tables regarding the composition of Aurangzeb's nobility, no separate column has been provided for Deccanis — those among them who were Iranis being grouped under Iranis, Afghans under Afghans, Turanis under Turanis, and the rest either under other Muslims or Indian Muslims. Only the Marathas are listed separately. These tables, therefore, offer no index to the position of the Deccanis in the nobility. The figures for Deccanis i.e. all nobles covered by the official definition of Deccani, *plus* the Marathas, holding the *zat* ranks of 1,000 and above in the two periods of 1658-78 and 1679-1707 are set out in the following table:

1658-78				1679-1707		
	Percentage of the			Percentage of the		
	Total	Deccanis	Deccanis to the total	Total	Deccanis	Deccanis to the total
5,000 and above	51	10	19.6	79	48	60.8
3,000 to 4,500	90	13	14.4	133	34	25.5
1,000 to 2,700	345	35	10.1	363	78	21.5
Total	486	58	11.8	575	160	27.8

It appears clearly from this table that the Deccanis did not form a very large proportion of Aurangzeb's nobility in the first period. Not only were they few in numbers, but they were also regarded as a subordinate class of nobles. Their high *mansabs* did not reflect their real income or power. As Abul Fazl Mamuri tells us: "Although in order to win them over the Emperor (Aurangzeb) granted them high *mansabs*, yet they were put on a three or four months scale of pay and a fourth part of their total pay claim (*talab*) was deducted according to the regulations for pay in the Deccan. He (Aurangzeb) also exercised caution in granting them *jagirs*."¹ One reason for this, no doubt, was that, thanks to the desolation of the Deccan peasantry, revenue collection in the Mughal Deccan was only 1/3 or 1/4 of the *jama*² towards the end of Shahjahan's reign. There is no evidence to suggest that the situation had improved greatly in Aurangzeb's reign. For this reason the *jagirs* in the Deccan, which were most often awarded to Deccanis, were on the lowest 'month-scales'. The practice of deducting a fourth part of the Deccani's pay-claim had already become an established rule under Shahjahan,³ and

¹ Mamuri, f. 156b, *Dilkusha*, f. 31b.

² *Adab-i Alamgiri*, ff. 25b, 33a-33b, 35b, 36b, 43a.

³ *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign*, pp. 1-27, 13 and *passim*.

an official order of Aurangzeb's 11th regnal year also firmly reiterates it. All those who had been in the service of the Deccan states had to suffer this deduction. "Only if a person has come direct from Persia, and it is proved that he has not taken service with these (Kingdoms of Bijapur and Hyderabad), they are not to deduct a fourth (from his pay claim)"¹

The picture, however, changed in the second period when Aurangzeb went to the Deccan in 1681, and embarked on a policy which ultimately led to the annexation of the whole Deccan. During this period, there was a large scale recruitment of Deccani nobles into Mughal Service — Bijapuris, Haiderabadis and Marathas were either induced to surrender their fortresses and districts, or were admitted to service when Bijapur and Golkunda were finally conquered. Even the condition of providing sureties was waived for Deccani recruits.² As Aurangzeb was even then unable to secure a military decision against the Marathas, the policy of bribing the Deccanis had to be continued until it played havoc with the historic composition as well as status of the Mughal nobility.

If we keep in view the territories added to the Empire as a result of Aurangzeb's annexations in the Deccan, the influx of the Deccanis does not at first sight seem disproportionate. 'The *jamadani* (assessed revenue figures by which *jagirs* were assigned in lieu of pay) of the provinces of the Deccan about 1667 was 32.1 per cent of the total *jama* of the Empire,³ while the number of Deccani nobles of 1,000 *zat* and above during the period 1658-78, was no more than 11.8 per cent. After the annexation of Bijapur and Golkunda, the *jamadani* of the Deccan rose to 43.5 per cent of the total *jama* of the Empire in 1687-91,⁴ while the number of Deccanis amounted to 27.9 per cent of the nobles of 1,000 and above during the whole period, 1679-1707. Yet at the same time these figures show a certain imbalance. While the share of the Deccan in the *jamadani* of the Empire between 1667 and 1691 increased only by 35.5 per cent the proportion of the Deccani nobles between 1658-78 and 1679-1707 rose by 136.5 per cent. Though at first the Deccanis were assigned *jagirs* in the Deccan only, yet since the presence of non-Deccanis in large numbers in the Deccan was essential from a military point of view the Deccan could not provide for all of them and *jagirs* had eventually to be assigned to the Deccanis in other parts of the Empire as well.

Abul Fazl Mamuri in a passage which has escaped the notice of Khafi Khan gives expression to the feeling of resentment among the older

¹ *Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign* p. 64

² *Ibid* p. 182. The Deccanis exempted were those holding up to 1,000 *zat* ranks.

³ *Mut'al Alam* ff. 214b-215. *Jama* of the Empire 9,24,17,16,082 *dams*. Deccan provinces 2,96,70,00,000 *dams*.

⁴ *Zawab-i-Alamgiri*, ff. 3a-5b. *Jama* of the Empire 13,80,23,56,000 *dams*. Deccan provinces 6,00,22,22,140 *dams*.

nobility—the *Khanazads*—at the influx of the 'Upstart' Deccanis in the later years of Aurangzeb. "At last, things reached such a state that the whole country was assigned to the new recruits from the Deccan and their agents, through bribery, obtained the choicest (*jagirs*) yielding the highest revenue for the Deccanis, and it was plain for all to see that the ranks and numbers of the new and unknown *mansabdars* went on increasing while the *mansabs* of the old *mansabdars* went on declining"¹

All the Deccanis, however, did not fare equally well. Those who got *jagirs* in the Deccan were hardly in an enviable position. As early as 1677 the Deccanis had been exempted from paying the charges of *khurak* : *filan* : *halqa* (feeding the elephants of the imperial stables) because "of their distressed circumstances and the low income of their *jagirs*"². With the rise of Maratha power, the expanding circle of Maratha depredations and finally the famine of 1702-4, their condition worsened. Bhimsen, in the 1st year of Aurangzeb's reign, after describing the ravages that the Deccan was undergoing, remarks that many *mansabdars* of the country (i.e. the Deccan) not finding it possible to realise anything from their *jagirs* were actually deserting to the Marathas³.

MARATHAS

EVER since Malik Ambar utilised the Maratha chiefs and their followers (*bargis*) on a large-scale, the Mughals had begun to realise the value of the Marathas in the Deccan wars. Maratha turn coats played a leading part in the great defeat which Malik Ambar suffered in 1616 at the hands of Shah Nawaz Khan. A new phase in Maratha recruitment began in the early years of Shah Jahan's reign when the Emperor himself proceeded to the Deccan with the object of extinguishing the Ahmadnagar Kingdom. The rise of Maratha power, which was manifested in the establishment of an independent Maratha state in the Deccan by Shivaji, created a new situation. The growing importance of the Marathas in the affairs of the Deccan was reflected in a steady expansion of the Maratha element within the Mughal official class, which sought to meet the new challenge not only by military measures but also by a simultaneous attempt to absorb some sections of the Marathas in the Mughal nobility. The table on the next page shows the rapid growth in the numbers and position of the Marathas in the nobility.

Thus, Aurangzeb by force of circumstances had to open the gates wide to admit the Marathas in his service with succeeding years. He had failed to win over Shivaji with a grant of 5,000, and the Maratha leader had fled from his court. Now, in his last years, Shivaji's grandson, Shahu, enjoyed the rank of 7,000/7,000 and so was counted

¹ Mamur II 156b-157a.

² *Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign* 115

³ *Dairajika* I 140a

	Shahjahan	1658-78	1679-1707
5,000 and above	3	3	16
3,000 to 4,500	6	6	18
1,000 to 2,700	4	18	62
	13	27	96
Total number of Marathas as per cent of total <i>mansabdars</i>	2.9	5.5	16.7

among the highest nobles of the Empire—if only in a titular sense.

The attempt to win over Maratha chiefs by grant of *mansabs* ultimately proved a failure. As some Maratha chiefs were won over, others took their place in building new fortresses or ravaging Mughal districts. Perhaps the most important reason for this was that Maratha society was not organised on the lines of the Rajput clans, where the submission of the chief led to the submission of the entire clan. Among the Marathas so long as plunder and opposition offered any prospects, leaders of military bands or petty *zamindars* could always grow into rebel chieftains. The result was that the Maratha nobility under Aurangzeb was always unstable in its allegiance, with the chiefs coming over to the Mughals and then frequently deserting them. The Maratha nobility, therefore, never won any real position of influence within the Mughal governing class corresponding in any way to that of the Rajputs. Their presence was not indicative of a constructive expansion of the Mughal Empire, but was a symptom of its decline and decay.

HINDUS

The Rajputs and the Marathas together formed the overwhelming majority of the Hindu nobility of Aurangzeb. It has been suggested that not only the Rajputs, but the Hindu nobility as a whole, suffered a set-back under Aurangzeb. S.R. Sharma has drawn up a list of 160 Hindu *mansabdars* of 1,000 *zat* and above under Aurangzeb.¹ He believes on the basis of this list that the number of Hindu nobles remained the same as under Shahjahan, while the total number of *mansabdars* doubled.² Neither of the assumptions involved in this statement can be accepted. We have shown that the idea of a two-fold increase in the nobility under Aurangzeb is based on a misreading of the *Zawabit-i Alamgiri*, the total figures for *mansabdars*, *ahadis*, artillerymen, etc. being taken as applying to nobles alone.³ At the same time, Sharma's total of Hindu *mansabdars*

¹ *Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors*, 178-80.

² *Ibid.*, 131.

³ *Ibid.*, 131-132.

under Aurangzeb is based on incomplete data and cannot serve as a basis for a definite conclusion.¹ In the lists appended to this book, the names of all *mansabdars* of 1,000 and above, whether Hindu or Muslim, noticed in the sources have been given. Although these lists again might be incomplete, they may perhaps be considered reliable as to the proportion between Hindu and Muslim nobles, the margin of error being the same on both sides. In the table below, the figures of Hindu nobles have been set side by side with the number of *mansabdars*, serving in 1595, based on the *Ain*, and Salih's list of *mansabdars* of Shahjahan's reign.

	Akbar 1595		Shahjahan 1628-58		Aurangzeb			
	Total	Hindus	Total	Hindus	Total	Hindus	Total	Hindus
5,000 and above	7	1	49	12	51	10	79	26
3,000 to 4,500	10	1	88	22	90	18	133	36
1,000 to 2,700	17	6	300	64	345	77	363	120
500 to 900	64	14						
Total	98	22	437	98	486	105	575	182

For better appreciation of the position of the Hindu nobles, their number may also be stated as a percentage of the total:

	Akbar 1595		Shahjahan 1628-58		Aurangzeb	
					1658-78	1679-1707
5,000 and above	14.3		24.5		19.6	32.9
3,000 to 4,500	10.0		25.0		20.0	27.1
1,000 to 2,700	35.3		21.3		22.3	33.1*
500 to 900	21.8					
Total	22.5		22.4		21.6	31.6

¹ S. R. Sharma says in his text (p. 131) that he had found names of 143 Hindu *mansabdars* of 1,000 and above under Aurangzeb, but in his appendix he gives the names of 160. My own lists contain the names of 251 Hindu *mansabdars* of the same category. My lists have been compiled independently and do not give 14 out of the 160 names listed in Sharma's appendix. Of these Pratap shown by Sharma as holder of 5,000 *zat*, was really only an agent of Shambha, who held this rank. (*Diksha*, f. 35a-b; *Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign*, p. 66). I have grave doubts about some of the others out of these 14 as well, such as Santaji Jadaun (5,000 *zat*) and Raja Jai Singh of Toda (5,000 *zat*). (Raj Singh, *faujdar* of Toda in 1700, only held the rank of 400/300, *Akhbarat*, 18 Shaban, 43 R.Y.)

* See Tables 2(a) and 2(b) at the end of the chapter.

It will be noticed that in the first part of Aurangzeb's reign, the position of Hindu nobles declined slightly, but in the last twenty-nine years it improved appreciably with the result that during this time there were more Hindus in service proportionately than under Shahjahan or, indeed, at any former period.

These tables, would, therefore, provide a fine lawyer's answer to any charge that Aurangzeb discriminated against Hindu *mansabdars*. Yet the matter is not really so simple. The number of Hindus in the period is inflated because of the influx of the Marathas, who began to outnumber the Rajputs in the nobility. They were not recruited to the service on account of a policy of religious tolerance, but had practically forced their way in. Before Aurangzeb's fatal involvement in the Deccan had compelled him to begin admitting Marathas wholesale in order to secure their submission, he had in fact tried to reduce the number of Hindu nobles. This is clear from the figures for 1658-78. As we have seen, the number of the Rajputs began to decline towards the end of this period, and continued to go down in the next. However, not much can be built either way exclusively on these figures, and the fact remains that despite Aurangzeb's avowed policy of religious discrimination, the Hindus continued to form a large section of his nobility.

From the foregoing account it should be clear that a marked expansion of the nobility did not take place till Aurangzeb embarked on the policy of annexing the entire Deccan. As a result of fresh recruitment made during this period, the internal composition of the nobility changed in some material respects. The Deccanis, including the Marathas, came to form a high proportion of the nobility, particularly in the higher ranks. There was a corresponding decline in the position of some of the older elements, such as the Rajputs, Saiyids of Barha, and others. The Turanis and Iranis also lost a little of their previous eminence. The Afghans improved their positions owing to the influx of the Afghan officers who had been previously in the service of Bijapur.

Abul Fazl Mamuri summed up the changes by saying that the *Khana-zads* — i.e. nobles belonging to families previously connected with imperial service — were the chief losers. There may be some element of exaggeration in his statement, but our evidence largely bears him out. The new recruits were not admitted primarily on account of their ability and talent but because they already held power in the Deccan and could only be won over by being offered high ranks. Recruitment from the aristocratic families of Central Asia and Persia also continued but on a much smaller scale. There was very little opportunity for the non aristocratic educated classes. There may have been a few promotions of scholars like Bakhtawar Khan and Inayatullah Khan, but their number was limited. There was, however, room for adventurers, who first organised their troops and established themselves as chiefs or rulers in areas outside the control of the Empire and then sought to enter

imperial service. Many Maratha chiefs offer an excellent illustration of this curious procedure. But in their normal recruitment, the Mughals had no adequate machinery to admit anyone on the basis of talent: family and clan were too often the deciding factors.

TABLE 1 (a)

THE PROPORTION OF INDIANS, FOREIGNERS AND DESCENDANTS OF
FOREIGNERS AMONGST THE MANSABDARS OF AURANGZEB
1658—1678

Indians	Foreigners and Descendants of Foreigners				Group not known	Grand Total	Remarks
	Born in India	Born outside India	Birth Place not known	Total number of the foreigners and their descendants			
Mansabdar of 5,000 and above							
17	14	15	3	32	2	51	Out of 2 mansabdar whose group is not known, one was born in India and about the other it is not known whether he was born in India or not
Mansabdar of 3,000 to 4,500							
38	34	10	4	48	4	90	Out of 4 mansabdar whose group is not known, 2 were born in India and about the remaining 2, it is not known whether they were born in India or outside India.
Mansabdar of 1,000 to 2,700							
160	69	30	23	122	63	345	Out of 64 mansabdar whose group is not known, 4 were born in India and about the rest it is not known whether they were born in India or not
215	117	55	30	202	69	486	

TABLE 1 (b)

THE PROPORTION OF INDIANS, FOREIGNERS AND DESCENDANTS OF
FOREIGNERS AMONGST THE MANSABDARS OF AURANGZEB
1679-1707

Indians	Foreigners and Descendants of Foreigners				Group not known	Grand Total	Remarks
	Born in India	Born outside India	Birth place not known	Total of the foreigners and their descendants			
<i>Mansabdars of 5,000 and above</i>							
46	14	6		20	13	79	Out of the 13 <i>mansabdars</i> whose group is not known, 3 were born in India and about the remaining ten, it is not known whether they were born in India or outside India.
<i>Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4,500</i>							
58	46	15	1	62	13	133	Out of the 12 <i>mansabdars</i> whose group is not known, 4 were born in India and about the remaining 8, it is not known whether they were born in India or outside India.
<i>Mansabdars of 1,000 to 2,700</i>							
181	82	25	8	115	67	363	Out of 67 <i>mansabdars</i> whose group is not known, 10 were born in India and about the remaining 57 we cannot say whether they were born in India or outside India.
263	142	46	9	197	93	575	

TABLE 2 (a)

RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION OF AURANGZEB'S NOBILITY
1658 - 1678

<i>Iranis</i>	<i>Turans</i>	<i>Afghans</i>	<i>Indian Muslims</i>	<i>Other Muslims</i>	<i>Total Muslims</i>	<i>Rajputs</i>	<i>Marathas</i>	<i>Other Hindus</i>	<i>Total Hindus</i>	<i>Grand Total</i>
<i>Mansabdars of 5,000 and above</i>										
23	9	3	4	2	41	6	3	1	10	51
<i>Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4,500</i>										
32	16	9	10	5	72	11	6	1	18	90
<i>Mansabdars of 1,000 to 2,700</i>										
81	42	31	51	63	268	54	18	5	77	345
136	67	43	65	70	381	71	27	7	105	486

TABLE 2(b)

RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION OF AURANGZEB'S NOBILITY
1679 - 1707

<i>Iranis</i>	<i>Turans</i>	<i>Afghans</i>	<i>Indian Muslims</i>	<i>Other Muslims</i>	<i>Total Muslims</i>	<i>Rajputs</i>	<i>Marathas</i>	<i>Other Hindus</i>	<i>Total Hindus</i>	<i>Grand Total</i>
<i>Mansabdars of 5,000 and above</i>										
14	6	10	10	13	53	5	16	5	26	79
<i>Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4,500</i>										
40	22	4	18	13	97	15	18	3	36	133
<i>Mansabdars of 1,000 to 2,700</i>										
72	44	20	41	66	243	53	62	5	120	363
126	72	34	69	92	393	73	96	13	182	575

TABLE 3(a)

KHANAZADS AND ZAMINDARS
1658 - 1678

<i>Descendants of Mansabdars Khanazads</i>	<i>Not descended from Mansabdars</i>	<i>Zamindars</i>		<i>Total Zamindars</i>	<i>Grand Total</i>
		<i>Those whose blood relations were in service</i>	<i>Those who them- selves entered the service</i>		
<i>Mansabdars of 5,000 and above</i>					
20	24	5	2	7	51
<i>Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4,500</i>					
51	28	10	1	11	90
<i>Mansabdars of 1,000 to 2,700</i>					
103	192	24	26	50	345
174	244	39	29	68	486

TABLE 3(b)

KHANAZADS AND ZAMINDARS
1679 - 1707

<i>Descendants of Mansabdars (Khanazads)</i>	<i>Not descended from Mansabdars</i>	<i>Zamindars</i>		<i>Total Zamindars</i>	<i>Grand Total</i>
		<i>Those whose blood relations were in service</i>	<i>Those who them- selves entered the service</i>		
<i>Mansabdars of 5 000 and above</i>					
18	46	6	9	15	79
<i>Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4 500</i>					
57	56	13	7	20	133
<i>Mansabdars of 1,000 to 2 700</i>					
145	172	33	13	46	363
220	274	52	29	81	575

TABLE 4(a)

DECCANIS

1658 - 1678

	<i>Total No of mansabdars</i>	<i>Deccanis and South Indians</i>
<i>Mansabdars of 5,000 and above</i>	51	10
<i>Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4,500</i>	90	13
<i>Mansabdars of 1,000 to 2,700</i>	345	35
	486	58

TABLE 4(b)

DECCANIS

1679 - 1707

	<i>Total No of mansabdars</i>	<i>Deccanis and South Indians</i>
<i>Mansabdars of 5,000 and above</i>	79	48
<i>Mansabdars of 3 000 to 4,500</i>	133	34
<i>Mansabdars of 1,000 to 2,700</i>	363	78
	575	160

CHAPTER II

ORGANISATION OF THE NOBILITY — MANSAB, PAY, CONDITIONS OF SERVICE

EVOLUTION OF THE MANSAB SYSTEM

THE term *mansab* (office, position, rank) indicated under the Mughals the position of its holder (*mansabdar*) in the official hierarchy. A *mansab* by itself did not constitute any office, but apart from determining the status of its holder, it also fixed his pay while it laid upon him the obligation of maintaining a definite number of troopers with horses and equipment.

Long before the period of the Indian Mughals, the organisation of the cavalry in large Turkish armies was modelled on the decimal system. Under the Delhi Sultans, the ideal system laid down was that ten horsemen (*sawars*) should be put under one *sar-i khail*, ten *sar-i khails* under one *sipah-salar*, ten *sipah-salars* under one *amir*, ten *amirs* under one *malik*, 10 *maliks* under one *khan*, and at least ten *khans* under the King. Thus a *sar-i khail* would command ten men, a *sipah-salar* 100, an *amir*, 1,000, a *malik*, 10,000, a *khan*, 100,000¹. This, of course, is a suppositious calculation only, and there is also an error in Barani's account. An Arab account of the 14th century tells us that in the Indian army "the *khan* has under him 10,000 riders, the *malik* 1,000, the *amir* 100, the *sipah-salar* less than that," so that the size of contingents of the officers of the three highest ranks is reduced to one tenth². In the army of the Chengiz Mongols, from whom the Indian Mughals claimed descent, the smallest unit was that of ten horsemen, ten officers of such units being under 'a commander of 100', 'ten commanders of 100' being under 'a commander of 1,000' and ten 'commanders of 1,000' under one commander of 10,000³. A unit of 10,000 was generally called a *tuman*. The basic principle in this system seems to be that the lower officers are direct subordinates of the higher and their contingents form part of the latter's. Thus, if the *khan* in the Delhi Sultanate was supposed to have 10,000

¹ Barani *Tarikh-i Firuz Shahi* ed. Prof. S. A. Rashid I p. 167 (B. Ind. Ed. p. 145). Advice of Bughra Khan to Kai-Qubad. Bughra Khan wanted 10 *khans* in the empire but according to Barani's calculation this would mean an army of one million—a preposterous figure.

² Shahabuddin al-Umari *Masalik al-Absar fi Mamalik al-Amsar* tr. Spies, Rashid and Haq p. 28, also al-Qalqashandi *Subh al-Asha* extracts translated by Dr. Otto Spies as *An Arab Account of the 14th Century* p. 67.

³ H. H. Howorth, *History of the Mongols* Part I pp. 108-9.

horsemen, these were identical with the contingents of the 10 *maliks* serving under him, and so on.

It has been suggested that the origins of the *mansab* system lay in this 'decimal' system of organisation of armies.¹ There may be some truth in this, but it is important to remember that the *mansabdari* system as instituted by Akbar was different in certain vital respects from the earlier system; and it was both more complex and more manageable.

In the Mughal *mansab* system all *mansabdars* owed direct subordination to the King, whether they commanded 10 *sawars* or 5,000. The distinction between the *Umara* (the higher *mansabdars*) and the rest was purely conventional, and did not affect the system of military organisation. Thus a *mansabdar* of 5,000 did not make up his contingent by having under him 5 *mansabdars* of 1,000 *sawars*; his rank represented his own contingent exclusively. He might have his own subordinate officers to look after various units of his contingent; but such officers could not be *mansabdars*, unless they had their own contingents separate from that of their superior.²

Secondly, the Mughal *mansab* was dual, represented by two numbers, one designated *zat* ('personal') and the other *sawar* ('cavalry'). From the closing years of Akbar's reign, the number of the *zat* itself became a fictitious number, the chief use of which, besides indicating the salary according to the pay scale in force, was to place the holder in his appropriate position in the official hierarchy.³ The *sawar* rank, on the other hand, determined the number of horsemen and horses the *mansabdar* was required to maintain. It may, therefore, be styled the cavalry or military rank. We first meet it in the garb of a second rank in the later years of Akbar.

Now, the germs of the two ranks were present even in the earlier periods, whenever we see a clear deviation from the ideal. Thus Barani quotes Balban as declaring that if a *malik* does not have a full contingent of 10,000, he does not deserve this title.⁴ Yet the same historian tells us that *malik* Baq Baq, the Governor of Badaun, had 4,000 troopers (*chakar*); and he makes this statement in a context which suggests that Baq Baq had an exceptionally large contingent.⁵ Thus while nominally Baq Baq was a commander of 10,000, he maintained but 4,000 troopers. Moreland has also shown how in the time of the early Mughals, officers with high

¹ See for example, Abdul Aziz, *The Mansabdari System and the Mughal Army*, pp 16-25

² This might happen when a senior member of a family was given a high *mansab*, and his relations, who were grouped with him, lesser *mansabs*. The total of *mansabs* of the relatives frequently exceeded that of the senior member, so that it is obvious that they were essentially separate ranks, requiring the maintenance of separate contingents

³ Moreland, *JRAS*, 1936 p 647, Abdul Aziz, *The Mansabdari System and the Mughal Army*, p 93

⁴ Barani, *op cit*

⁵ Barani, *Tarikh-i Furuq Shahi*, ed Prof S A. Rashid, I, p. 48.

titles seldom maintained contingents corresponding to their titles, and he has suggested that Akbar's dual ranks were designed to meet this situation.¹ The nominal rank was confined to the *zat* rank, so as to determine the hierarchical position of the various nobles. But to see that there was a proper check on maintenance of contingents according to the salary or income granted to each noble, a *sawar* rank was instituted which was always either equal to or less than the *zat* rank.²

While the basic elements of Akbar's *mansabdari* system were retained in the 17th century, certain new features also appeared. Thus under Jahangir, we first hear of the *du-aspa sih-aspa* rank; under Shahjahan we have new scales of pay, 'month-ratios' and new regulations prescribing the sizes of contingents under various *sawar* ranks. On these and other features, such as conditional (*mashrut*) ranks, which might have existed under Akbar as well, our information becomes very extensive under Aurangzeb. In the following pages we shall first treat of the ranks, the method and scales of pay, and, then, the military obligations imposed upon the *mansabdars*.

ZAT AND SAWAR RANKS

In the time of Akbar, as we have already remarked, the *sawar* rank was normally either equal to or lower than the *zat* rank. This, broadly speaking, continued to be the position under his successors. Abdul Aziz has cited five instances where the *sawar* rank was higher than the *zat* rank, but he is of the opinion that these are errors of transcription.³ During the second half of Aurangzeb's reign, however, there were quite a large number of *mansabdars*, whose *sawar* rank was higher than their *zat* rank.⁴ In some instances, it is true, the *sawar* rank was conditional (*mashrut*); and in the Jaipur *Akhbarat* we find a larger number of instances

¹ "Rank (*mansab*) in the Mughal State Service"; *JRAS*, 1936, pp 641-65 For the introduction of the *mansab* under Akbar, see A. J. Qaisar, *Proc. Ind Hist. Cong.* Delhi session 1961, pp 155-56

² Abul Fazl says, "For this cause (to help him) did His Majesty establish the ranks (*mansab*) of *mansabdars* from the *dahbashi* (Commander of ten) to *dahkhazari* (Commander of ten thousand) limiting however all commands above five thousand to his august sons. The monthly grants to the *mansabdars* vary according to their contingents (*sawars*). An officer whose contingent (*sawar*) comes up to his *mansab* is put in the first class of his rank. If his contingent (*sawar*) is one half and upwards (of the *mansab*) he is put in the second class, the third class contains those contingents which are still less." *Ain-i-Akbari*, Vol I, pp 123-24 Tr Blochmann, ed. Phillot, p 248. *Akbar Nama* puts this classification under the year 1003 A H (A D 1595)

³ This principle for sub classification of each *zat* rank is also given in the *Khulasat-us-Siyag* f 48b, and *Mirat-al-Ittilah*, 15a-15b.

According to the author of *Mirat al-Ittilah*, a *mansabdar* who held a rank below 500 was not given the *sawar* rank. (f 15b) But there are innumerable instances of the *sawar* rank being granted to persons holding *zat* ranks below 500 throughout the 17th century.

⁴ Abdul Aziz, "The *Mansabdari* System and the Mughal Army", p 3.

⁵ See Appendix 'A' at the end of the chapter.

where the ordinary rank *plus* the conditional *sawar* rank was higher than the *zat* rank.¹ But there are also many instances where the *sawar* rank was not wholly or partly conditional, and yet was higher than the *zat* rank.² The fact that the *sawar* rank rose above the *zat* rank in a fairly large number of cases, particularly during the later years of Aurangzeb's reign, may have been partly due to the scarcity of able and experienced officers,³ which led the emperor to assign larger contingents to persons on whose efficiency he could rely; considerations of economy may also have induced the Emperor to raise the forces maintained by the nobles without increasing their *zat* rank in proportion. But whatever may have been the causes of allowing the *sawar* rank to exceed the *zat* rank, the practice was apparently limited. Also it did not usually apply to the higher ranks of the *mansabdars*. It was not a basic or deliberate reform, the device being employed only where expediency dictated it.

CONDITIONAL RANK ('MASHRUT')

[Conditional (*mashrut*) ranks were usually added to the previous *zat* and *sawar* ranks. According to the author of the *Mirat-al Istilah*, the unconditional *sawar mansab* was given along with the *zat* rank, and the 'conditional' *mansab* was given in view of the services required of a particular officer at a particular post. For example, if a *mansabdar* was appointed as *faujdar* of a particular area, and it was felt that for the satisfactory discharge of his duties an additional 100 *sawar* rank was required by him, then the *mansab* of the *faujdar* was conditionally increased so as to enable him to employ 100 *sawars*, and a *jagir* to provide the salary of this rank was also given to him. When he was transferred from the post, the conditional *mansab* was normally cancelled and the additional *jagir* resumed.⁴ Sometimes the whole or a part of a conditional *mansab*

¹ Rawat Mal Jhala, was appointed as *gal'adar* and *faujdar* of Beni Shah Dark alias Prakash Garh and was given the conditional promotion of 200 *sawars*, so ultimately his rank became 700/900 (*Akhbarat*, 4th Moharram, 45th R. Y.) Kartalab Khan, *duwan* of Bengal and *faujdar* of Makhnusabad, was also appointed *faujdar* of Bardwan and Medni Pur and was given the conditional promotion of 500 *sawars*, so ultimately he had the rank of 900/1,000 (26th Safar, 45th R.Y.) Shuja'at Khan, the *subedar* of Gujrat, was also appointed *faujdar* of Jodhpur and was given the conditional promotion of 4,000 *sawars*, so ultimately his rank became 5,000/8,000 (*Mirat-i Ahmadi*, Vol. I, p. 317).

² It may be argued that where the *sawar* rank was higher than the *zat* rank, it was either *mashrut*, or included *du-aspa sh-aspa* (2×3h) rank. Thus, 1,000/1,200 might mean 1,000/1,000 *mashrut*, or 1,000/1,200 including *du-aspa sh-aspa* (2×3h) rank. However, this argument cannot be accepted without definite proof. The *Akhbarat* generally mention the number of *du aspa sh aspa* separately in describing the rank of a *mansabdar*.

³ Thus in the *Raqaim-i Karam* Aurangzeb regrets that efficient persons were not available, f. 6a; *Dilkusha*, f. 139a; *Kalimat-i Ta'yab*, f. 21a, 83a, 97b, 135b, 135b, *Waqas-i Ajmer*, p. 645.

⁴ *Mirat-al Istilah*, f. 14b. Muzaffar, son of Sher Babi, was given a conditional rank of 400/400 for the duration of his appointment to the *fajdars* of Pargana Katra etc. (*Mirat-i Ahmadi*, Vol. I, pp. 289-90). Conditional *mansab* of Rad Andaz Khan was cancelled when he was

was made unconditional, but this was considered a promotion and usually given as a mark of favour.¹

THE DU-ASPA SIH-ASPA RANK

As has been mentioned above, the reign of Jahangir saw an important innovation in the *mansabdari* system, viz. the introduction of the *du-aspa sih-aspa* rank. In the 10th year of Jahangir's reign, when Mahabat Khan was appointed to serve in the Deccan, as a mark of special distinction 1,700 *sawars* out of his rank were made *du-aspa sih-aspa*.² This is the earliest instance mentioned of the *du-aspa sih-aspa* rank being granted to any noble. While there are only a few recorded cases of *du-aspa sih-aspa* rank being granted during the reign of Jahangir, they came to be granted quite frequently during Shahjahan's reign. This can be seen from the following table of *mansabdars* of the rank of 1,000 *zat* and above holding such ranks :

	Total	Holders of <i>du-aspa sih-aspa</i> ranks
10th year of the Reign ³	191	12
20th year of the Reign ⁴	219	23
30th year of the Reign ⁵	253	25

In Aurangzeb's reign, the number of the recipients of this rank increased further. During the first twenty years of his reign there were not

transferred from the *faujdar* of Lonar etc (*Akhbarat*, 23rd Safar, 36th R.Y. of Aurangzeb) Conditional *mansab* of Shaikh Anwar was cancelled when he was transferred from the *qal adari* and *faujdar* of Ram Nagar (2nd Shaban, 37 R.Y.) Conditional promotion of Shuja 'at Khan was cancelled, (*Mirat-i Ahmadi*, Vol I, p 317). Conditional promotion of Muhammad Beg was cancelled (*Akhbarat*, 8th Zilhij, 43 R.Y.) Conditional promotion of Aurang Khan was cancelled when he was transferred from the *faujdar* of Dhawar (18th Rajab, 46 R.Y.) Conditional *mansab* of Wali Dad Khan was cancelled when he was transferred from the *qal adari* of Dev Durk (13th Rabi, II, 39 R.Y.)

¹ The conditional *sawars* of Hummat Yar, the *faujdar* of Silhat were made unconditional (*Akhbarat*, 16th Zilhij, 38 R.Y.) 300 *sawars* out of the conditional *mansab* of Muhammad Salih were made unconditional, when he was appointed as *faujdar* of Fatehpur Sikri (28th Zilhij, 45 R.Y.) Rawat Mal Jhala was appointed *qal adar* and *faujdar* of Parnala and had the *mansab* of 700/700, out of which 300/200 were unconditional and the rest were conditional (4th Moharram, 45th R.Y.) 200 conditional *sawars* out of the rank of Khuda Band Khan were made unconditional (11th Ramzan, 45th R.Y.).

² *Tuzuk*, p 147 (But Mahabat Khan failed to discharge his duties properly. So the additional grant of *du-aspa sih-aspa* was withdrawn and the additional salary attached to it was cancelled, p 190) However, in the 19th R.Y. of Jahangir, Mahabat Khan was given the *mansab* of 7,000/7,000 (2 3h) (*Tuzuk*, Mirza Hadus' continuation, p. 391) Asaf Khan was given the rank of 7,000/7,000 (2-3h) towards the end of Jahangir's reign; *Badi'at Nama*, Vol. I, p 113

³ Lahori, *Badi'at Nama*, vol I, pp. 292-312

⁴ Lahori, *Badi'at Nama* Vol II, pp. 717-37.

⁵ Warsi, *Badi'at Nama*, Or 1675, ff 200a-214a

less than 68 *mansabdars* who held the *du aspa sih aspa* rank out of a total number of 486 *mansabdars* of 1,000 *zat* and above. In the remaining part of Aurangzeb's reign, 70 out of 575 *mansabdars* of 1,000 *zat* and above are recorded as holding this rank.¹

The *du aspa sih aspa* rank was theoretically regarded as a part of the *sawar* rank. The usual official formula for stating the rank, is, for example, "4,000 *zat* 4,000 *sawar* all (*hama*) *du aspa sih aspa*" which would mean $4,000/4,000 + 4,000$, or 4,000 *zat*, 4,000 *sawar*, of which 1,000 *du aspa sih aspa*, i.e. $4,000/4,000 + 1,000$. It could therefore, never exceed the *sawar* rank. If any portion of the *sawar* rank became *du aspa sih aspa*, the rest of the rank was termed *barawurd*. That is, if out of 4,000 *sawars*, 1,000 were *du aspa sih aspa*, the remaining 3,000 were *barawurd*.² [For the latter portion the noble was paid at the same rate as for the ordinary rank and his obligations were also on the same scale, while for the *du aspa sih aspa*, his pay and obligations both were doubled.] In other words, from the point of view of pay and military obligations, the rank of 4,000 *sawar*, of whom 1,000 were *du aspa sih aspa* really meant 5,000 *sawars* (i.e. 3,000 ordinary + 1,000 $2 = 3,000$ ordinary + 1,000 $\times 2$ ordinary = 5,000 ordinary). [From this it may be deduced that when the emperor wanted to favour a man or desired that he should maintain a larger contingent without raising his *zat* rank (which had usually to be higher than the *sawar*), he did so by granting a *du aspa sih aspa* rank.³

PAY FOR THE RANKS

The nobility of the Mughals depended practically for all its income on the pay it received from the State, whether in the form of cash or *jagirs*. The pay each noble received was determined by the *mansab* or rank he held. Sometimes, nobles were assigned additional pay as *nam*,⁴ but this payment could be regarded as being only supplementary to the amount paid against *mansabs*. A *mansab*, as we have already noticed, was always dual, *zat* and *sawar*. The *sawar* rank itself came to be supplemented in the case of some by an additional rank of the same genus, known as *du aspa sih aspa*. Each of these ranks separately entitled its holder to make a claim, known as *talab*, for definite amounts of pay, which was laid down by the established scales.⁵

¹ Based on information set out in the Appendix at the end of the book.

² For the use of the term *barawurd* see *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign* pp 138 141 159 160 208 Lahori, II, p 507 *Ilm-i Navisandgi*, f 146a. *Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign* pp 5 6 10 47 102 103 111 121 ff Cf Moreland *JRAS* 1936 pp 662-64.

³ Cf *Mirat-al Istilah* f 15b.

⁴ Cf. the case of Mirza Raja Jai Singh *Alamgir Nama* p 618.

⁵ The subject has been clearly discussed so far by Moreland *JRAS* 1963 pp 661 65. Moreland's study was based mainly on some Jaipur records. A number of documents printed in the *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign* specially pp 64 73 79-84 109 113 150-52 175-177.

Before examining the broad principles on which these pay scales were formulated, we should bear in mind the fact that the *zat* rank was basically personal while the *sawar* rank (and the supplementary *du-aspa sih-aspa* rank) fixed the contingents to be maintained by the nobles. It follows, therefore, that while the pay for the first rank was chiefly meant to provide the recipient the wherewithal to maintain himself and his family, and the cost of his personal establishment, payments on the second and third items were meant to meet the expenses of his contingents. Thus, in making out the pay certificates, the pay on the former account was termed *Khasah* (personal) and the latter *tabinan* (contingent or followers).¹ The sanctioned schedules of pay for the different ranks from the time of Akbar onwards are available, and these can also be supplemented by numerous references to the calculation of the pay of individual nobles.² In accordance with the purpose for which the salary was paid, the scales for each category of ranks display certain features which may be noted.

(i) The salary for the *zat* rank is stated separately for each rank, since the pay fixed for one number of *zat* rank usually bore no arithmetical proportion to another *zat* rank. The salary did not rise proportionately as one proceeded to higher ranks. Secondly, below the rank of 5,000 the pay for *zat* rank was fixed differently for three categories: first, when the *sawar* rank was equal to, or not less than half the *zat* rank, second, when the *sawar* rank was half the *zat* rank, and third, when it was less than half. The pay for the first grade was higher than that for the second, and higher for the second than for the third.

(ii) The salary for the *sawar* rank is not given separately for each rank, but the rate is invariably stated per unit of the *sawar* rank. To calculate the pay due on any *sawar* rank, one has to multiply this amount by the number of the rank. This method of calculation becomes understandable when we remember that what we are considering here are the 'contract rates' for maintaining the required contingents. The amount paid on an average to ten horsemen would be ten times that paid to one, and, therefore, the pay for higher ranks had to increase in exact arithmetical proportion.

(iii) The *du aspa sih aspa* rank was regarded as part of the *sawar* rank³ with this peculiarity that the obligation for the number covered by this fully bear out the description given by Moreland of the method of calculating the pay due and the significance of the term *talab*.

¹ See *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign* pp. 109-12, 176.

² *Ann. I* pp. 124-31. The *Faḥṣāḥ-i Kardān* ff. 43-49 reproduces the scales issued in the 9th year of Shahjahan's reign by Afzal Khan; the *Selected Documents* pp. 79-84 contain a schedule issued in the 14th year by Islam Khan; and *Dastur-al Amal-i Alamgiri*, ff. 121-23 a schedule issued by Sadullah Khan in the same reign. To Aurangzeb's reign belong pay schedules contained in the *Zawābit-i Alamgiri* ff. 42b-45b. *Ḥalāt-i Mamlūk-i Mahrusa-i Alamgiri* ff. 149b-51b. The scales are set out in tabular form in appendix 'B' at the end of this chapter.

³ We have 5 000 *zat* 4 000 *sawar* all of which (*ḥama*) *du-aspa sih-aspa*

rank was double the obligation for the ordinary rank.¹ The pay for it had, therefore, to be double that of the ordinary rank. For example, if the rank of a *mansabdar* was 3,000 *sawar* of which 1,000 were *du-aspa sih-aspa*, and 8,000 *dams* was the rate per unit of *sawar* rank, the pay would be calculated as follows:

3,000 *sawar* rank of which 1,000 are *du-aspa sih-aspa*. Therefore, there are 2,000 *barawurdi* (ordinary) *sawars* whose pay would be $2,000 \times 8,000 = 16,000,000$ *dams*. And 1,000 *du-aspa sih-aspa* whose pay would be $1,000 \times 8,000 \times 2 = 16,000,000$ *dams*. Total 32,000,000 *dams*.²

The salary for the *sawar* rank would thus always be substantially higher than the pay for the *zat* rank of the same number, for the simple reason that while the former was meant to provide funds for the maintenance of the troops, the latter was the personal salary of the noble.

While in the *Ain* the salaries are given in terms of rupees, the later scales state them in terms of *dams*.³ The *jama* or the figure at which each *pargana* was assessed for purposes of assignment (*jagir*) in lieu of pay, was worked out in terms of *dams* from the time of Akbar onwards and it must have appeared best to state the pay schedules in the same unit of money (the *dam*) as the *jagir* assessments.

Moreland has shown how the pay for both the *zat* and *sawar* ranks was gradually reduced between the time of Akbar and Shahjahan.⁴ There is considerable evidence in various documents and manuals of the period, which were not available to Moreland but which corroborate his conclusions.⁵ It is, therefore, not necessary for us to go into this matter in detail. The scales fixed by Shahjahan are available to us in no less than three

¹ Cf. Lahori, *Badshah Nama*, II, p. 507.

² The statement that the *du-aspa sih-aspa* rank was paid at double the rate of *barawurdi* or at 16,000 *dams* per unit of the rank, is made in *Dastur-ul Amal-illm* : *Lacnungi*, Add 6599 f 146a. Moreland, (*JRAS*, 1936, p. 662) refers to a *farman* in the Jaipur Records where a calculation is made on this basis. One can similarly deduce this from cases wherever the total salary of *mansabdars* holding *du-aspa sih-aspa* rank is mentioned, e.g. Lahori, *Badshah Nama*, II, 258, 321, 715, Salih, III, p. 246. It may be noticed that the *du-aspa sih-aspa* rank was supposed to carry pay at double the ordinary rate simply because the number of the rank was deducted from the *sawar* rank. Otherwise the result would be the same if one were to regard it as an additional rank paid at the same rate. That is, in our hypothetical case, if we were to add the *du-aspa sih-aspa* rank to the *sawar* rank and multiply the number so obtained, viz. 4,000 by the flat rate of 8,000 *dams*, the total would be the same—32,000,000 *dams*. Thus in Salih, III, p. 112, the conversion of 1,000 *sawar* into *du-aspa sih-aspa* in the case of Jai Singh is shown to result in an addition of 8,000,000 *dams* ($1,000 \times 8,000$) to his total pay.

³ Cf. Manucci, II, pp. 374-5. "When the King fixes or gives orders about the allowance of a *mansabdar* or an *amara*, he does not talk of rupee but of *dams*, which is a money of account of which they make forty go to the rupee." In a country with a bimetallic currency, the value of the coins of the two metals would be constantly changing, so for official purposes the currency was made monometallic based on the silver rupee. Whatever its value in copper currency at any time, the silver rupee was considered to be equal to forty *dams*. This *dam* (*dam-i sultrahi*) was, of course, a non-existent copper coin. The real copper coins circulated for what they were worth.

⁴ *JRAS*, 1936, pp. 641-65.

authorities,¹ while schedules giving similar scales belonging to the time of Aurangzeb are still more numerous.² It appears from a study of the *Dastur-al Amals* of Aurangzeb's reign that the scales fixed by Shahjahan were continued by Aurangzeb without any alterations whatsoever. The detailed figures of pay for the *zat* ranks are the same, while for the *sawar* ranks payment continued to be made at the rate of 8,000 *dams* per unit. A comparative table showing the figures for various *zat* ranks in schedules belonging to the two reigns is given in an appendix at the end of the chapter.

MONTH SCALES

A feature which appeared first in the reign of Shahjahan, but soon became all pervasive, was the institution of month-scales or ratios. This seems to have arisen out of the difference between the official assessment of *jagir* (*jama*) and the actual revenue collection (*hasil*).³

Thus when a man obtained a *jagir* whose *jama* equalled his annual salary-claim (*talab*) on paper, he might in actual fact find it yielding him only one half or one fourth of his claim. In such cases the *jagir* might be known respectively as *shashmaha* (six monthly) or *sih maha* (three monthly).⁴ Where the *jama* greatly exceeded the actual realisation, the *jagir* would be very low in the month-scale. In the later years of Shahjahan the actual *hasil* of the Mughal Deccan amounted to about one quarter of the *jama* (i.e. equal to three months only).⁵ The *jagirs* of most *mansabدارs* in the Deccan were accordingly not more than four-monthly and often even less.⁶ Conditions seem to have been better in Northern India. In the later years of Shahjahan and in the reign of Aurangzeb, we hear of complaints that a transfer from Northern India to the Deccan entailed a *jagir* on a lower month scale.⁷

The month system was applied also to cash salaries. Naturally a person having a five month *jagir* could not be paid a full '12-monthly' salary whenever he was made a *naqdi*. Shahjahan, in a *farman* issued in the 27th R.Y., declares that cash salaries (*tankhwah* i. *naqdi*) were never to be fixed above 'eight-monthly' or below '4-monthly' rates. An exception was made only in the case of the two highest nobles of the

¹ & ² See appendix 'B'.

³ See the chapter on '*jagirdars*'.

⁴ See Irfan Habib *The Agrarian System of Mughal India* 264-5 and n. When Lahori II 507, lists the military obligations of nobles according to month ratios he speaks of their *jagirs* being 12 monthly or 11 monthly and so on.

⁵ *Adab-i Alamgiri* ff 25b 18b-19a 24b *Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign* p. 115.

⁶ *Adab-i Alamgiri* f 25b *Ruq'at-i Alamgiri* 116-17. Elsewhere it is said that the *jagirs* of most of the *mansabدارs* in the Deccan were either 4 monthly or less. (*Adab* f 33a b), *Ruq'at-i Alamgiri* 129.

⁷ *Adab-i Alamgiri* ff 35b, 36b 40a-40b, 43a *Ruq'at-i Alamgiri* 80 156-37, *Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign* p. 81.

empire, besides princes of royal blood, who received their pay on a '10-monthly' scale.¹

In the case of the *hasil* realised from his *jagir* by an assignee, the proportion it bore to the *jama* would, of course, only roughly correspond with the exact proportion of the month-scale. A *jagirdar* would seldom recover just exactly 5/12 or 7/12 of his paper salary. In cash payments, however, the month-proportion would be exactly followed. Certain manuals contain a table showing the amount to be paid to a *mansabdar* receiving cash salary under each month-ratio in rupees and annas (the actual currency), if his annual paper salary was one lac *dams*.²

12 months	11-months	10-months	9 months
Rs 2,500	Rs 2291/10½	Rs 2,083/5¼	Rs 1875
8-months	7-months	6-months	5-months
Rs 1,666/10½	Rs 1,458/5¼	Rs 1,250	Rs 1,041/10½
4-months	3 months	2 months	1 month
Rs 833/5¼	Rs 625	Rs. 416/10½	Rs 208/5¼

In the *Zawabit-i Alamgiri* similar tables are given also for cases where the salary was 100 *dams*, 1,000 *dams* and 10,000 *dams*. In all these tables the exact arithmetical proportions have been followed. The *Khulasat-us Siyag* gives the annual pay for each month-ratio sanctioned for various *zat* ranks.

It is explicitly stated in one manual that the tables given above apply only to pay due on *zat* ranks of the *nagdis*. For their *sawar* rank (*tabinan*) payment was made for various month-rates according to an altogether different scale. This scale is given under the heading '*tabinan*' and reads as follows :³

12-months	11 months	10-months	9-months
Per head	Per head	Per head	Per head
(<i>A nafar</i>)	per month	per month	per month
per month	Rs 37/8	Rs 35/	Rs 32/8
Rs 40/-			

¹ *Misat-i Ahmadi* I, 228 In his 21st R Y Aurangzeb ordered that the *nagdis* should no longer be paid on a '8-monthly or 7 monthly' basis only the '6-months' scale was sanctioned. (*Misat-i Alamgiri*, p 160)

² *Zawabit-i Alamgiri*, ff 41b-45b, *Halat-i Munsalik-i Mahrusa-i Alamgiri*, ff 149a 151b, *Farhang-i Kardani*, ff 43 49, *Bodl* O 390 f 40a (reference given by Dr Irfan Habib) Cf. also *Khulasat us Siyag*, ff 49b-50a. There are some discrepancies in the figures in these manuals, but they appear to have arisen entirely out of errors of transcription.

³ *Bodl* O 390 f 42a-43a. The table in *Farhang-i Kardani*, f 24a b, reproduces a table identical with this down to six months. Then it reads as follows 5-months Rs. 20/13, 4 months Rs 16/10, 3 months Rs. 12/7-1/2 It does not go any further. *Zawabit-i Alamgiri*, ff 45b-46b, *Munsalik-i Mahrusa-i Alamgiri*, ff 151b-152a.

8 months	7 months	6-months	5-months
Per head per month Rs 30/	Per head per month Rs 27/8	Per head per month Rs 25/	Per head per month Rs 22/8
4 months	3 months	2 months	1 month
Per head per month Rs 20/	Per head per month Rs 17/8	Per head per month Rs 15/	Per head per month Rs 12/8

The significance of this table can be understood only when we refer to the *farman* issued by Shahjahan in his 27th year. This order declares. "Whereas it has been represented to the Court that the nobles (*umara*) and *mansabdars*, who receive cash instead of *jagirs* are paid for each horse branded (*asp daghi*) after deducting the difference for the seven *rasad* horses of *jagirdars*, rupees thirty in case of '8-months', '7-months' and '6-months', and in five-months and four-months rupees twenty-six, it has been decreed that it is not reasonable to pay Rs 30/- for '8-months', or fall below '4-months', we have determined that from the beginning of the solar month of Mihr to the end of Isfandarmuz of this year, the branding according to the established Rule of One-fifth (i.e. whereby cavalry to the fifth of the number of the *sawar* rank had to be maintained) should be followed, paying per horse, Rs 30/- for '8-months', Rs 27/8 for '7-months', Rs 25/- for '6 months', Rs 22/8 for '5-months' and Rs 20/- for '4-months'.¹ This may be read along with a letter of Aurangzeb written in the 29th year of Shahjahan which quotes an imperial order to the effect that the pay for '3 months' and '2-months' for which Rs.17/8 and Rs 15/- have respectively been sanctioned (elsewhere) has been fixed (in the case of the Deccan) from the beginning of the month of Mihr, Kharif Yunt II, at Rs 20/- per head per month, i.e. at the same rate as for '4-months'.²

From this evidence, the following points are established. First, those receiving cash salaries were not paid in the year for their *sawar* rank a sum equal to the number of the *sawar* rank multiplied by 8,000 *dams* as was done in case of those who were assigned *jagirs*. On the other hand, the method was, first, to determine the contingent which the *mansabdar* was required to maintain according to his *sawar* rank. In case of *naqdis* this was fixed under 'the Rule of One fifth'. Then the number of *sawars* so fixed was multiplied by the rate of rupees forty per month being paid under the '12-monthly' scale. For those placed in the lower month-scales, the rate per *sawar* was reduced, but not in

¹ *Mirāt-i Ahmadi* I, pp 227-28

² *Adab-i Alamgiri* II 33a 33b. *Ruq'at-i Alamgiri* p 129

the same proportion as that of the respective number of the months to twelve. It is these rates which have been reproduced in the table above and form the subject of Shahjahan's *farman*.

The details of men and horses required of *mansabdars* under the "Rule of the One-fifth" are available to us in the *Badshah Nama* and *Khulasat-us Siyaq*.¹ By working from these and using the table above, we can arrive at the pay due to the *naqdi* of any *sawar* rank on any month-scale. The second column in the table below shows the pay of *naqdi* holders of 100 *sawar* arrived at by this means. In the third column is given the pay calculated from rates established previous to Shahjahan's 27th year (7-4 month) and those continued in the Deccan subsequently (3-2 months). The fourth shows the pay calculated on the basis of the rate of 8,000 *dams* per unit of *sawar* rank, the figures for each month representing exact arithmetical proportions.

I	II	III	IV
12-months	Rs. 21,120		Rs. 20,000 (=8,00,000 <i>dams</i>)
11	18,000		18,333
10	15,120		16,666
9	12,480		15,000
8	10,440	Rs. 10,440	13,333
7	8,250	9,000	11,666
6	6,600	7,920	10,000
5	5,400	6,240	8,333
4	3,840	4,992	6,666
3	2,520	2,880	5,000
2	1,440	1,920	3,333
1	600	—	1,666

A curious feature revealed by this table is that the pay was higher per horse for the *naqdis* placed in higher month-scales than for those in the lower. The situation for the lower categories was better before Shahjahan's order of the 27th year as indicated by figures in column III. One can also understand why Aurangzeb as Viceroy of the Deccan should have so strongly urged the modification of this order, and be so grateful when Shahjahan made an exemption in the case of the Deccan for those placed in the 2 and 3 months-scales.² Aurangzeb as Emperor appears, however, to have forgotten his own pleas as Viceroy, and as the table we have reproduced proves, continued the new scale established by Shahjahan. The pay schedule from 12 to 7 months, however, came to be merely of academic interest, since Aurangzeb decided, in his 21st year, to lower Shahjahan's maximum allowance of 8-months to 6-months for all *naqdis*.³

¹ See the section on Military Obligation of *mansabdars*, infra p. 47.

² *Adab-i Alamgiri*, 33a-33i; *Ras'ala-i Alamgiri*, p. 129

³ *Adab-i Alamgiri*, p. 160

DEDUCTIONS FROM PAY

As against the sanctioned claim (*muqarrara talab*) there used to be a number of deductions.¹ The largest was made in the case of 'Dakhinis', i.e. Bijapuri, Haiderabadi and Maratha officers, who took service with the Mughals. Their total salary due on both their ranks was first calculated and then a fourth part of it was deducted, *jagirs* or cash-pay being assigned for the remainder only. This deduction was known as '*waza-i dam-i chauthai*' or '*Deduction of one-fourth in Dams*'. This deduction was already established in the time of Shahjahan and was continued by Aurangzeb.¹

The *chauthai* was a deduction applying only to a particular section of the nobility. There was, however, a charge not perhaps of the same magnitude, but still quite substantial, which applied to all nobles unless specifically exempted. This comprised a number of items, grouped together collectively under *khurak-i dawwab* ('fodder for beasts'). Originally it seems to have been merely an obligation to maintain and feed certain number of elephants, horses, camels and carts belonging to the Emperor. The number was regulated according to the *zat* rank of the officer. In the *Ain*, a full scale of the numbers to be maintained is set out under each rank.² Though the term *khurak-i dawwab* is not to be found in Abul Fazl, it is obvious that he refers to the same obligations. In a manual of Aurangzeb's reign we find a reference to this term as meaning fodder for animals, which are put in the charge of the nobles.³ The number of animals (horses and elephants) fed by officers of each rank is actually specified.⁴

From entrusting animals to the nobles the next step was to keep the animals in the imperial stables and to demand that the nobles pay for feeding them there.⁵ Thus in the tables referred to above, besides the number of animals, the standard cost for feeding each is also specified. By the time of Shahjahan it had apparently become the practice to deduct the cost of the *khurak* or *rasad-i khurak* from the *talab* or salary demand of the noble.⁶ In Aurangzeb's reign, however, we find that the practice was

¹ For this deduction, see *Zawabit-i Alamgiri*, f. 43b, in *Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign*, pp. 63-64, an imperial decision of the 11th year is set out to the effect that the *chauthai* was to be deducted from the pay of all those who had served under Bijapur and Haiderabad (Golkunda) governments, even if they had originally come from Persia. See also Abul Fazl Mamuri, f. 156b where he speaks of the deduction of a fourth part from the pay of the Deccanis, i.e. all those people who were the servants of Shambha and the Bijapuri and Haiderabadis, who joined imperial service. For the deduction of *chauthai* in the reign of Shahjahan, see *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign*, pp. 2, 18, *Adab-i Alamgiri*, f. 25b.

² *Ain*, I, pp. 124-131, Cf. Abdul Aziz, *The Mansabdari System and the Mughal Army*, pp. 50-57.

³ Bodl. Fraser 86, f. 75b.

⁴ *Ilm-i Naurundgi*, f. 146a-147a.

⁵ Cf. Manucci, II, 372-73.

⁶ *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign*, p. 1, *Ilm-i Naurundgi*, f. 147a.

of assigning the *jagirs* for the full salary and then demanding the *khurak* in kind or cash; *sazawals* or imperial messengers used to be sent to exact it from the *jagirdars*.¹ This seems to have been greatly resented by the nobles. In the 46th R.Y. of Aurangzeb's reign, the Emperor consented to abolish the system in respect of the *khurak* for elephants. Now this charge was to be again converted into *dams*, and *jagirs* with equivalent *jama* were to be taken away from the *jagirdars*, freeing them from the obligation of obtaining supplies or paying in cash for the animals.² In the next reign the measure was extended to cover the whole of the *khurak-i dawwab* to the great relief of all the *mansabdars*.³

The *khurak-i dawwab* was not imposed under the rules on any officer drawing 14 lacs of *dams* or less, nor on those who had no *sawar* ranks or held ranks below 400 *zat* or 200 *sawar*.⁴ Apart from this, individual officers could sometimes be exempted by the emperor from this obligation.⁵

There was another deduction technically known as *irmas*. This, according to Badauni, was another name for *talab-i iynas* (or demand for supplies).⁶ [Ilahadad Faizi in his dictionary states that *iynas* was a term used in Akbar's Government for all that was given to the troops apart from cash and their salary, and he follows Badauni in identifying it with *irmas*.⁷ Apparently this payment-in-kind was valued and deducted from the salary.⁸ From what Abul Fazl says in the *Am*, it would appear that this was a deduction against which the emperor presented horses to the nobles.⁹ In a salary statement of Shahjahan's reign, this deduction is coupled with *rasad-i khurak* and *chauthat*, the two other important deductions.¹⁰

[From the salaries paid in cash to *naqdis*, there were a number of deductions such as the *du-damt* (i.e. 2 *dams* in the rupee) amounting to 5 per cent.¹¹

In addition to these deductions, there were fines or *jurmana*. These were imposed for various reasons, but mostly for deficiencies in the contin-

¹ Letters of Ali Quli Khan, *Matn-al Insha*, Bodl MS ff 71a-72a, 74a-74b. When in the 37th year, a noble prayed for exemption from the charge, Aurangzeb ordered apparently as a concession that 'the *dam* (of the *khurak*) be deducted from his *jagir*' (*Akhbarat*, 3rd Rabi I, 37th R Y).

² *Akhbarat*, 3 Rabi I, 46 R Y.

³ Khafi Khan, II, 602-03.

⁴ *Ilm-i Nizamiyyat*, ff. 146a-147a, Fraser 86, ff 75b-76a.

⁵ *Ma'auz-i Alamgiri*, p. 86, *Akhbarat*, 15th Safar, 36 R Y., 28 Ziqada, 28 Rabi I, R.Y. 39;

13 Rabi II, 39 R.Y., 2nd Safar 43 R Y., 27 Rabi II, 46 R Y.

⁶ *Badauni*, II p. 202.

⁷ *Madariyat Afzili*, ed. Dr Muhammad Baqar, Lahore, A. H. 1334, p. 55 (where *irmas* has, however, been misread as *Asnas*).

⁸ Cf. Bernier, pp. 215-6, who refers to *yarns* as "Agenas".

⁹ *Am*, Vol I, pp. 132.

¹⁰ *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign*, 1-2.

¹¹ *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign*, 26, 27, 64, 70, *Zarab-i Alamgiri*, p. 37b, *Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign*, pp. 241-42.

gents required from the nobles! If more than a fourth of the caval-rymen were entered as '*fauti*' (dead) or '*firari*' (fled), that is, if more than 1/4 of the persons were new recruits since the last muster, the noble had to pay a fine of 4 *muhars* for each *sawar* so presented. For any deficiency in horses, a fine of 2 *muhars* per horse was charged.¹

The emperor sometimes used to order advances to be made to *mansabdars*, especially while on expeditions. This was known as *masaidat*. In the Balkh and Badakhshan campaigns, for example, sums of money amounting to as much as 1/4th of their pay was advanced to the *naqds*.² Besides cash advances, horses and equipment were also lent as part of *masaidat*.³ All this was converted into a cash claim against the officer concerned and was known as *mutaliba* (treasury claim). So an English factor writing in A D 1656 defined *mutaliba* as "moneys lent out of the king's cussena (*khazana*) to umharaes (*Umara*) when they are employed in any war to be repaid out of their jaggeeries (*jagirs*)".⁴

But the *mutaliba* probably also included items other than *masaidat*, such as *jurmana* or fines. In any case, officers often owed large amounts to the Treasury. When Ali Mardan Khan died, the *mutaliba* against him amounted to no less than 50 lakhs of rupees.⁵ The official chronicler of Aurangzeb praises him for having remitted the *mutaliba* contracted by the forefathers and ancestors of his officers. As for *mutaliba* due from the father, it was to be remitted if the son was a *mansabdar* of 4,000 or less. From others the *mutaliba* was claimed if they had inherited a large amount from their father, it was to be partly remitted if they had inherited a small amount and completely remitted in case they had inherited nothing.⁶ Although the *mutaliba* was thus apparently allowed to accumulate, it was normally exacted by the resumption of a *jagir* of equivalent revenue.⁷ Sa'adullah Khan, the famous minister of Shahjahan, was suspected of having favoured the nobles by allowing the *mutaliba* against them to accumulate without calling them to account.⁸

During the earlier period whenever the *muhasiba* (settlement of accounts) took place, the *mutaliba* usually exceeded the *talab* or unsatisfied claims of the officers. But in the later years of Aurangzeb's reign conditions changed, officers did not get *jagirs* for long periods and so their claims went on accumulating. Now that the balance was often in the favour of the nobles, the policy of the administration changed and the officers usually found it very difficult to obtain a settlement or *muhasiba*.

¹ Fraser 86 f 13a 13b *Zawab-i-Alamgiri* 40a.

² Lahori *Badshah Nama* II 507

³ *Akhbarat* 6th Ramzan 49 R Y 18th Ziqa'da 38th R Y

⁴ *English Factor's* 1655-60 p 67

⁵ *Amal-i-Salih* III 248

⁶ *Alamgir Nama* p 1083

⁷ Cf *Dilkusha* f 139a where the complaint is made that *jagirs* are resumed on account of *mutaliba masaidat* and *jurmana* etc.

⁸ *English Factor's* 1655-60 pp 66-67

from the finance department "And if through great endeavour, winning a patron and employing an ardent and capable agent (*vakil*) and after running about for seven or eight months and spending a large amount" Mamuri tells us "an officer succeeded in proving his claim (*talab*), he would only be able to get a fourth of the money from the treasury after the greatest effort. In the end, gradually, all order disappeared"¹

To sum up, Moreland has conclusively proved that the salaries payable to *sawars* were gradually reduced from the time of Akbar to the time of Shahjahan and Aurangzeb. This reduction did not, however, have much direct bearing on the income of the nobles themselves owing to the reduction in their military obligations. The introduction of the month scales in the time of Shahjahan, on the other hand, had a direct bearing on the pay scales of the nobles, since it not only involved a reduction in the salary payable for the employment of *sawars*, but also the personal salary payable to the nobles under the head of *zat*. The contention that the month-scale was applied only to the *sawar*² rank is shown to be untenable by the evidence cited above. Since it had become usual in the time of Aurangzeb to assign *jagirs* on a scale not higher than a six month scale, the reduction in salaries was fairly considerable. This was counterbalanced to some extent by a drastic scaling down of the obligations of the nobles for the maintenance of *sawars* and horses, as will be explained later. In addition, considerable deductions were made under a number of heads from the time of Shahjahan onwards. It would, therefore, appear that the net income of the nobles in the time of Shahjahan and Aurangzeb definitely declined, though it is difficult to form a precise idea of the extent of the decline.

MILITARY OBLIGATION OF MANSABDARS

As we have noticed, the system of double ranks (*zat* and *sawar*) made its appearance during the second half of Akbar's reign. The motive probably was to compel every *mansabdar* to actually maintain the number of horses and cavalymen expected of him for the imperial service. But dishonesty among the nobles was found to be so widespread that a mere paper edict could not remove it. Therefore to check all evasions of military obligations, Akbar introduced *dagh* (branding) for the horses and *chehra* (descriptive rolls) for the men.³

¹ Mamuri f 182b Khafi Khan II 396-7 *Dastur al Amal Agha* f 53 *Raqam-i-Aarum*

f 8b See also *Wagah-i-Aisamat Khan Ali* p 16

² Abdul Aziz *The Mansabdar System and the Mughal Army* p 69

³ *Asiatic* Vol I p 135 (Tr) pp 266-67 "The servants (*mansabdars*) of His Majesty have the horses every year newly marked and thus maintain the efficiency of the army as by the endeavours unprincipled people learn to choose the path of honesty. If a *mansabdar* delays bringing his men to the muster one tenth of his *jagir* (*iqta*) is withheld. Formally when the mark was repeated, they put the number on the muster of the horse marking for example a

It seems from the account given by Abul Fazl that during the reign of Akbar a *mansabdar* was expected to bring for muster the number of men indicated by his *sawar* rank and was penalised in case of any default. An interesting point to consider is whether the number which the *mansabdars* were required to bring as equal to their *sawar* ranks, was that of horsemen or horses. We know that according to the rule prescribed by Akbar, each contingent had to have horses double the number of horsemen. Thus, a man holding 100 *sawar* rank was required to maintain either 100 men and 200 horses or 50 men and 100 horses.¹ Since in Shahjahan's time under the "Rule of One-third", he would have had to bring 33 men and sixty-six horses, and the gap between 100 and 33 is substantial, it seems probable that in Akbar's time no more than 50 men and 100 horses were required for 100 *sawar* rank. But this is largely a matter of conjecture.²

It appears that in the time of Jahangir the check over the contingents maintained by the *mansabdars* slackened. But for this again there is no positive proof.³ When Shahjahan came to the throne, he apparently reorganised the whole *mansabdari* system on a new basis. Akbar's rules and regulations were enforced with some modifications, while he also gave formal status to the actual position with regard to the contingents maintained by the nobles. The main features of the *mansabdari* system, especially with reference to *dagh*, are clear from a passage in the *Badshah Nama* of Lahori. The author says that it was the law of the empire that those *mansabdars*, who had *jagirs* in any of the provinces of Hindustan and were posted in the same province in which their *jagirs* lay, were to bring to the muster horsemen equal in number of one-third of their *sawar* rank. But if posted outside the province of their *jagirs*, they were only obliged to one-fourth, and if in Balkh and Badakhshan, one-fifth.⁴

horse with a '2' when it was mustered the second time and so on, but now as each class of soldiers had a particular mark, the mark is only repeated at the subsequent musters. In case of *ahadis*, the former custom was retained, some *butchis*, and near servants of His Majesty who have no leisure to look after *jagirs*, receive their monthly salaries in cash and muster their horses every eighteen months. Grandees, whose *jagirs* are very remote, do not bring their horses to the muster before twelve years have elapsed, but when six years have elapsed since the last muster, one-tenth of their income is retrenched. And if a *mansabdar* has been promoted to a higher *manab* and three years have elapsed since he last presented his horses at a muster, he receives a (only) after the first muster. His old and new men then get their assignments. If at the renewal of the mark at subsequent musters, any soldier brings a superior horse in exchange of his old one, he is taken before his Majesty, who inspects and accepts it."

¹ *Ain-i Akbari*, Vol I, pp 123-24

² Evidence of a sort in favour of our suggestion comes from a letter of Abul Fazl, preserved in a collection of a doubtful genuineness. This letter, shows that a *mansabdar* of 100 *sawar* had to bring at the maximum 50 horsemen (*Ruqat-i Abul Fazl*, p 45, Newal Kishore Ed.)

³ For a discussion, see Moreland, *JRAS*, 1936, pp 641-65.

⁴ Lahori, *Badshah Nama*, II, pp 505-7.

The last rule was applied later on to all those posted in the Kabul province.¹ It seems that the *naqdis* or *mansabdars* paid in cash were required to muster their contingents according to the rule of One-fifth. This is clearly stated in a *farman* (or rather, *dastur-al amal*) issued in the 27th year of Shahjahan.² We also get a confirmation of these new rules from the *Khulasat-us Siyaq* which was written in the later years of Aurangzeb.³

With regard to the holders of the *du-aspa sih-aspa* ranks, Lahori makes it clear that the obligations required under the *du-aspa sih-aspa* rank were exactly double that under ordinary (*barawurdi*) *sawar* rank. Thus whereas under the 1/5th Rule, a 5,000 *sawar* rank on a 12 month-scale would require 1,000 men and 2,200 horses, a *sawar* rank of 5,000 all *du-aspa sih-aspa* would require 2,000 men and 4,400 horses.⁴

Lahori specifies the actual numbers of men and horses—that is, the number of *sih-aspas*, *du-aspas* and *yak-aspas* or three-horse, two-horse and one-horse troopers—which had to be mustered under the Rule of One-fifth on each month-scale. His statements are reproduced below in a tabular form for the sake of convenience.

Months	Sih-aspa (men with 3 horses each)	Du-aspa (men with 2 horses each)	Yak-aspa (men with one horse each)	Total	
				Men	Horses
12	300	600	100	1,000	2,200
11	250	500	250	1,000	2,000
10	—	800	200	1,000	1,800
9	—	600	400	1,000	1,600
8	—	450	550	1,000	1,450
7	—	250	750	1,000	1,250
6	—	100	900	1,000	1,100
5	—	—	1,000	1,000	1,000 ⁵

In the table the number of horses is comparatively less in each lower step in the month-scale. The proportion of horses given against each month-ratio should not be assumed to be on the same scale as prescribed for the One-third and One-fourth Rules, so that Abdul Aziz is clearly in error when he compiles a table showing men and horses required under the latter rules, by merely adapting the figures given by Lahori

¹ *Mirat-i Ahmadi*, I, 228 (Shahjahan's *farman*, 27th R Y) But see *Waga-i Ajmer*, where a Rajput officer serving in Kabul was required to muster men under the rule of 1/4th. In the 25th R.Y. of Shahjahan, Jai Singh was summoned to court to be sent with prince Aurangzeb on the Qandahar expedition. Jai Singh was asked to bring his contingent according to the 1/4th rule, and if that was not feasible, then according to 1/5th rule (*Jasper Documents* No 79, p 145)

² *Mirat-i Ahmadi*, Vol. I, p. 228.

³ Lahori, *Badshah Nama*, II, pp 506-7.

⁴ *Khulasat-us Siyaq*, f 54 a.

⁵ *Ibid.*

for the One-fifth Rule.¹ In fact we have the information about the requirements under the 'One-third Rule' in the *Khulasat-us Siyaq*. The *Khulasat-us Siyaq* also proves that the rates of remounts given in *Badshah Nama* were not only enforced for the North-Western Campaigns of Shah-jahan, but came to be fixed permanently for all cases where the *mansabdars* served under the 'One-fifth Rule'. This means that the system established by Shahjahan continued under Aurangzeb. The tables from the *Khulasat-us Siyaq* are reproduced below; these tables assume that the obligations are for a holder of 100 *sawar* rank. To compare these figures with those in the table of *Badshah Nama*, we have to multiply each of the figures here by 50.

A "RULE OF ONE-FIFTH FOR NAQDIS FOR 100 SAWAR RANK"

Months	<i>Sih-aspa</i>	<i>Du-aspa</i>	<i>Yak aspa</i>	Men	Horses
12	6	12	2	20	44
11	5	10	5	20	40
10	-	15	5	20	35
9	-	12	8	20	32
8	-	11	9	20	31
7	-	5	15	20	25
6	-	2	18	20	22
5	-	-	20	20	20
4	-	-	16	16	16
3	-	-	12	12	12
2	-	-	8	8	8
1	-	-	4	4	4

B "MANSABDARS WHO ARE POSTED (IN A PROVINCE) AND HAVE JAGIRS IN THE SAME PROVINCE, MUSTER UNDER THE ONE-THIRD RULE".

Months	<i>Du-aspa</i>	<i>Yak-aspa</i>	Men	Horses
12	22	12	34	56
11	17	17	34	51
10	12	22	34	46
9	8	26	34	42
8	3	31	34	37
7	1	33	34	35
6	-	34	34	34
5	-	24	24	24
4	-	18	18	18
3	-	14	14	14
2	-	11	11	11
1	-	9	9	9*

¹ Of Norman A. Siddiqi in *Proc. Ind Hist Cong.*, Delhi Session, 1961, pp. 157-162

² *Khulasat-us Siyaq*, ff 54a-54b Cf *Waqat-i Ajmer*, p. 339 (1/3rd Rule applied for serving in the same province) One-fourth and One-fifth Rule applied for branding, (*Musiri Ahmadī*, Vol

It is interesting to note that except in a few details the table for the One-fifth Rule in the *Khulasat-us Siyaq* is on the same scale as in Lahori. Only it goes down to one month whereas the latter closes with the fifth-month scale.¹ However, it should not be concluded from this that *jagirs* on a one-month scale or two-month scale were granted in the time of Aurangzeb. No instance has yet come to light where a *jagir* below a 3-month scale was granted.

Many of the detailed regulations prescribed for branding and checking the contingents of the *mansabdars* have come down to us, notably in the *Zawabit-i Alamgiri* and *Khulasat-us Siyaq*.² The *naqdi mansabdars* (drawing their salary in cash) were required to obtain a renewal certificate (*tashiha*) twice a year from the branding officials. If a *mansabdar* failed to obtain the renewal certificate within six months, an extension of two months was to be given to him. If he failed even then to obtain the renewal certificate, all his salary exceeding eight months was to be withheld.³

As for *mansabdars* who were partly paid in cash and partly in *jagir*, if more than half of their salary was paid in *jagir*, they were expected to obtain the branding certificate according to the rules for *jagirdars* — that is, they were to present their horses for branding annually and in case of delay a six months' extension was given to them. In case of further delay their salary was withheld or adjusted according to the rules for *jagirdars*. If the *mansabdar* was paid more than half of his salary in cash, the rules prescribed for *naqdis* were applied to him. If half of the salary of the *mansabdar* was paid in cash and half in *jagir*, he was allowed an extension in case of delay according to the *naqdi* rules.⁴

It appears however from the *Waq-i Ajmer* that an order was issued in Aurangzeb's 23rd year requiring all *naqdis* to present their contingents for branding every three months and all *jagirdars* every six months.⁵

A *farman* of Shahjahan preserved in the *Mirat-i Ahmadi* (A.D. 1652) lays down the rules whereby fractions of horses required under branding were to be completed or ignored. Thus in case of a *sawar* rank of five, one horseman was to be regarded sufficient for branding purposes under the One-fourth Rule (the extra fraction of 1/4th 'horseman' being disregarded). In case of a *sawar* rank of ten, the required contingent

I, pp. 227-29); One-fourth Rule applied for checking the contingent of Aqil Khan, (*Akhhbarat*, 15th Shaban, 10th R.Y.) *Mahamat-ul Afaq*, pp. 196-97.

¹ The variations of scale in men and horses are as follows per hundred *sawar* rank :

Months	Lahori		Khulasat-us Siyaq	
	Men	Horses	Men	Horses
10	20	36	20	35
8	20	29	20	31

In both cases the figures given in *Khulasat-us Siyaq* seem merely to have arisen out of errors of transcription.

² For the duties of *darogha-i tashih*, see *Hidayat-al Qawaid*, ff. 36a-37a.

³ *Zawabit-i Alamgiri*, ff. 38a-40b.

⁴ *Zawabit-i Alamgiri*, ff. 38a-40b.

⁵ *Waq-i Ajmer*, p. 639.

under the One-fourth Rule was $2\frac{1}{4}$ horsemen, the officer had the option of bringing either three or two horses. If he brought three *sawars* to the brand, the supply of provision to the extent of half-a-*sawar* was to be added to his salary, and if he brought two *sawars* the supply of provision to the extent of one-half of a *sawar* was to be deducted. In case of a rank of 15 *sawars* he was required to bring only four horses for branding. The *zamindars* were to bring *sawars* to the number of half of their *sawar* rank for branding. The quality of the horses to be brought to the muster was also carefully regulated. According to the *farman* cited above, *tazi* horses were not to be branded in any province except in the Deccan, Ahmadabad, Bengal and Orissa.¹

However, according to the *Khulasat-us Siyag*, *mansabdars* drawing their salaries in cash were to bring only Turki horses for branding, and *jagirdars* had to make up $\frac{2}{3}$ rd of the required number with Turki and Yabu horses and $\frac{1}{3}$ with Tazi.²

Branding was also enforced to check the animal corps required under the *zat* rank.³ Branding was not enforced in the case of *mansabdars* of 5,000 *zat* or above, but all *mansabdars* below this rank had to submit to it.⁴ In the 25th R. Y., we find Aurangzeb issuing an order that all the *mansabdars* serving in the Deccan up to the *zat* rank of 5,000 should bring their horses (required against the *zat* rank) for branding.⁵

A serious view was always taken of cases where the *mansabdars* failed to maintain the required contingent. Thus, on one occasion, it was reported to Aurangzeb that a hundred gunners were appointed under Sa'adat Khan but at the time of checking only sixty-five were present and thirty-five came afterwards. The Emperor ordered that attendance certificate be refused.⁶ The *mansabdar* whose contingents fell below the required number was punished by demotion or fines, and his *jagir* was often reduced.⁷

On the other hand, in special circumstances, the Emperor might reduce the quota of *sawars* which a *mansabdar* was required to maintain. Thus in the 38th R.Y., Aurangzeb reduced the contingent

¹ *Mirat-i Ahmadi*, Vol I, pp. 228-29, Cf *ibid*, p 173.

² *Khulasat us Siyag* f 54b

³ *Am*, Vol I, p 135

⁴ *Khulasat us Siyag*, f 54b

⁵ *Akhbarat*, 21st Shawwal, 25th R Y

⁶ *Waq : Ajmer*, p 537 On another occasion the Court was informed that the sons of Raja Rai Singh did not maintain more than one hundred *sawars* and at the time of branding borrowed the *sawars* of Harnath Kachwaha. It was also recommended by the officer concerned that the Raja be directed to explain why he was not maintaining the requisite contingent (*Ibid*, p 542)

⁷ *Mirat : Ahmadi*, Vol I, pp 265-66, *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign*, pp 165-72. It is further stated that out of the total grant of the sum of 320,000 *dans*, sixty eight thousand, eight hundred *dans* should be withheld, until the grant holder's horses had gone through the processes of branding

The salary was paid on producing the *Sanad* of brand, etc. *Waq : Ajmer*, p 529

of Hamid Khan from 1/4th to 1/5th.¹ In 1685 when Firoz Jang Bahadur was ordered to set out with provisions and a large force to reinforce Prince Azam at Bijapur, the Emperor exempted the *mansabdars* of 100 to 400 stationed at the court from the brand under the 1/3rd Rules, to enable royal officials to purchase their horses for replenishing the Cavalry of the Prince.² Sometimes the emperor exempted a *mansabdar* who was given a conditional promotion, from *dagh* (branding) to the extent of his conditional promotion only.³ In some cases, the Emperor exempted the *mansabdar* from *dagh* for a limited period. Thus, in the 38th R.Y., Aurangzeb exempted Baqi Khan *Kotwal* and *Faujdar* of Shahjahanabad from *dagh*.⁴ In the 8th R.Y. of Aurangzeb, when Mur Aziz wanted to go to Hajj, he was exempted from *dagh* till his return.⁵

RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION

In theory all *mansabdars* were appointed directly by the emperor, and, as far as possible, candidates for enrolment as *mansabdars* were required to appear personally before him. The imperial eye was considered to be sharp and penetrating enough to discern the merits and demerits of every man. Abul Fazl says, "His Majesty sees through some men at the first glance, and confers upon them high rank".⁶ The *Bakhshi* was responsible for presenting all candidates Iranis, Turanis, Rumis, Ferangis, Hindis and Kashmiris—who came for service before the emperor.⁷

However, another method of recruitment was that the leading nobles of the empire, particularly governors of provinces and leaders of military expeditions, recommended persons for appointment to the emperor. Their recommendations were generally accepted and *mansabs* were given to the persons they recommended.⁸ Sometimes, the emperor ordered

¹ *Alfbarat*, 25th Ziqaada, 38th R.Y.

² *Ma'am-i Alangur*, p. 264-65, *Dilkusha*, 90b

³ *Alfbarat*, 23rd Safar, 36th R.Y., 2nd Safar 43rd R.Y. 29th Moharram 38th R.Y., 300 *mansabs* out of the conditional *mansab* of Khuda Band Khan were exempted from branding (11th Ramzan, 45th R.Y.)

⁴ *Alfbarat*, 28th Rabi I, 38th R.Y.

⁵ *Alfbarat*, 7th Jamada II, 8th R.Y.

⁶ *Am*, Vol. I, p. 248 (Tr.), p. 124 (Text) Chandra Bhan Brahman's *Gulistan*, f. 8a. Pratab Singh and others, five persons, the sons of Sunder Das Sisodia, were presented to emperor Aurangzeb for the award of *mansabs* and they were awarded suitable *mansabs*. (*Alfbarat*, 8th Zilhi, 20th R.Y.) Man Singh and others, the sons of Raja Rai Singh were presented to emperor Aurangzeb for the award of the *mansabs*. All of them were granted suitable *mansabs*. (3rd Shaban, 24th R.Y.) Islam Khan, *hakum* of Basra, visited Aurangzeb in the 11th R.Y. and was awarded a *mansab* of 5,000/5,000, Cf. Khafi Khan, Vol. II, p. 234. *Mamun*, I. 144a.

⁷ *Am*, Vol. I, p. 108, For the duties and functions of the *bakhshi* see *Hidayat-al-Qawaf*, I. 11b-12a.

⁸ For example Mulla Ahmad Naitha was given the rank of 6,000/6,000 on the recommendation of Jai Singh (*Alangur Nama*, pp. 919-20), Murtaza Khan, son of Kakur Khan, was given the *mansab* of 400/100 on the recommendation of Zulfiqar Khan Bahadur (*Alfbarat*, 9th

persons recommended by nobles for the award of a petty *mansab* to be presented at a review and after that the *mansab* was awarded.¹ Princes of the royal family also recommended persons to the Emperor for appointment and their recommendations were accepted in most cases.²

Once a recommendation was submitted to the Emperor and approved by him, an elaborate procedure was followed for preparing the appointment order. The royal approval was sent to the *diwan*, the *bakhshi* and the *shah-i-taujih* (military accountant) for inspection. It was presented to the Emperor once more after it had passed through these imperial officers, and after the Emperor had approved a second time, the formal appointment order (*farman*) was drawn up, requiring the seals of various officers, specially the *diwan* and *bakhshi*, before it was issued under the seal of the *wazir*.³

Every candidate for a *mansab* had to provide a surety (*zamin*) and this rule was very rigorously enforced.⁴ Manucci says, "All soldiers, high and low, generals and captains, are forced to give surety and without it they cannot obtain employment. The practice is so common and so general that even the princes find it necessary to conform to the custom".⁵ It appears that professional bankers or money-lenders of standing were accepted as sureties by the administration.⁶ Persons standing as surety were held responsible for the behaviour of the *mansabdar* and undertook to meet any claims of the government against the *mansabdar* concerned, if the latter failed to meet them.⁷ Sureties were, therefore, difficult to obtain and were apparently bought.⁸ Thus it was regarded as a great

Ziqada, 39th R Y), Sardar Singh Hara was given the *mansab* of 500/200 on the recommendation of Ruhullah Khan (2nd Shawwal, 25th R Y), Dankat Rao, the *Zamindar* of Alwar Kunda was given the *mansab* of 500/200 on the recommendation of Rustam Dil Khan (1st Moharram, 45th R Y), Raj Singh was appointed *jangdar* of Toda on the recommendation of Sayed Abdullah Khan, the *nazim* of Ajmer, and was given the *mansab* of 400/300 (18th Shaban, 43rd R Y); Sayid Shah was given the rank of 5,000/2,000 on the recommendation of prince Bidar Bakht (24th Shawwal, 45th R Y). Donbri Rao was given the rank of 1,500/1,000 on the recommendation of Tarbiyat Khan (*Maf'asir-i Arkan-i Taimuriya*, f. 131a)

¹ Bahramand Khan recommended some of his servants to emperor Aurangzeb for the award of *mansabs*. The Emperor ordered the candidates to be presented for review (*Akhbarat*, 21st Rabi I, 44th R Y)

² Jagat Singh and others were recruited in the imperial service on the recommendation of Prince Shah Alam (*Akhbarat*, 8th Shaban, 24th R Y.), Prince Azam recommended some persons for the grant of suitable *mansabs* and his recommendation was accepted (*Akhbarat*, 13 Ramzan, 13th R Y). Aurangzeb recommended to Shahjahan a number of persons for the grant of *mansabs* (*Adab-i Alamguri*, ff. 108a-109a)

³ The details of procedure are described in Ibn Hasan, *The Central Structure of the Mughal Empire*, p. 93 ff see also *Ain*, I, p. 136 and *Zawabit-i Alamguri*, ff. 17, 30b

⁴ Manucci, Vol. II, p. 377

⁵ Lendesiana, No. 353, Folios unmarked, "The surety of Bheku Sabu for one lakh of Rupees in favour of Savai Singh Khattri who was given the charge of *pargana* of Bidhnur was accepted through a *hasbil hukm* from the Mughal Court" A.D. (1689-90).

⁶ See the undertaking of a *zamin* in *Farhang-i Kirdani*, f. 20a *Zawabit-i Alamguri*, ff. 19b, 25a, 32b

concession to the Deccanis when Aurangzeb exempted them from this obligation.¹

The procedure for the grant of promotions to *mansabdars* was similar to the procedure for the grant of the initial *mansab*. The recommendation (or *tajwiz*) for promotion was usually made by princes, commanders or governors, under whom the *mansabdar* happened to be serving.² It was the general custom for the Emperor to award promotion in *mansabs* on the occasion of the festivities,³ at the beginning of the regnal year, and on his birthday celebrations.⁴ But promotions were also granted on other occasions, such as the beginning or the end of a military expedition.⁵

Promotions were awarded for various reasons. Gallantry in military service and merit occupied a high place;⁶ at the other end of the scale were promotions granted on receipt of a handsome present or *peshkash* from a noble.⁷ Promotion was also generally, though not invariably, given when an officer was found to be really deserving a higher post. In any case, we often find the ranks of the *mansabdars* being increased simultaneously with their appointments to higher posts. A list of such promotions, where the increase granted was in the basic personal rank (and not *mashrut*, i.e. to be relinquished when the *mansabdar* was transferred from that post) is given below. However, there are cases of appointments to higher posts without a corresponding increase in the *mansab*. An increase in the *mansab* was usually proportionate to the *mansab* already held, the grant of an increase larger than the original rank being quite exceptional. Normally, a promotion by an additional *mansab* of more than 50 per cent of the original was not granted, as a

¹ 'Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign', p. 182

² *Akhbarat*, 29th Rabi II, 8th R Y (Qutbuddin Khan, Raghubath Singh and Inayat Khan were promoted to higher ranks)

³ *Ma'asir-i 'Alamgiri*, *passim*

⁴ *Alamgiri Nama*

⁵ In 1665 Prince Muhammad Muazzam, along with Maharaja Jaswant Singh, was deputed to safeguard the Mughal frontier against the Shah of Persia. The nobles who were appointed with the Prince were promoted and awarded *khilats* and titles etc. *Alamgiri Nama*, pp. 976-77. In 1661 when some *zamindars* of Jammun rebelled, all officers who were sent to punish them were promoted, pp. 757-58. After the conquest of Bijapur, all the *mansabdars* from the rank of 20 up to 7,000, who had been conducting military operations against Bijapur, were promoted, (*Futuhat-i 'Alamgiri*, f. 105b). The names of all the nobles, who were promoted after the conquest of Bijapur, are given, and their original *mansabs* and promotions are separately indicated, *Zawabit-i 'Alamgiri*, ff. 159b-63a. When Hyderabad was conquered, all *mansabdars* who were participating in the siege were promoted, ff. 163b-65a. In 1666 when the Afghan leaders submitted, Aurangzeb promoted all nobles who were conducting the war against the Afghans (*Alamgiri Nama*, pp. 1056-57). After the conquest of Purandhar, when Shivaji surrendered, all nobles serving with Raja Jai Singh in this expedition were promoted (*Alamgiri Nama*, 907-908). After the conquest of Khulna, at the recommendation of Fateh Ullah Khan, Aurangzeb promoted all *mansabdars* of the brot' erhood of the Khan (Khafi Khan, Vol. II, p. 494).

⁶ *Dilkusha*, f. 97a b, 115a and *passim*; *Adab-i Alamgiri*, ff. 21b-22b, 25a.

⁷ See Chapter V, Section 'The Conduct of Nobles in Administration'.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Post</i>	<i>Previous Rank</i> (<i>fknown</i>)	<i>Promotion</i>	<i>Source</i>
1 Shah Nawaz Khan	<i>subedar</i> of Gujrat	5 000/5 000	1 000/1 000	2 3h <i>Alamg r Nama</i> p 210
2 Fida Khan	<i>faujdar</i> of Oudh and Gorakhpur	4 000/2 000	1,500 <i>sauwars</i>	<i>Adab-i Alamguri</i> f 260a
3 Amir Khan	<i>subedar</i> of Kabul	4 000/4 000	1 000/1 000 (2 3h)	<i>Alamguri Nama</i> p 661
4 Shahamat Khan	<i>faujdar</i> of Gi aznin	3 000/1 000	1 000 <i>sauwars</i>	<i>Adab-i Alamguri</i> f 286b
5 Arab Khan	<i>faujdar</i> of Bah ra ch	3 000/700	800 <i>sauwars</i>	<i>Adab-i Alamguri</i> f 279b
6 Muhammad Beg	<i>faujdar</i> of M yan Doab	1 000/600	500/100	<i>Adab-i Alamguri</i> f 241
7 Kamgar Khan	<i>faujdar</i> of S kandar pur	1 000/400	500/300	<i>Adab-i Alamguri</i> f 280a
8 Mahmud	<i>faujdar</i> of one of the <i>mahals</i>	1 000/200	800 <i>sauwars</i>	<i>M rat-al Alam</i> ff 160a 160b
9 Tarb yat Khan	<i>faujdar</i> of Orissa promoted to the rank of 4 000/ 3 000 (500 x 3-2h)			<i>M at-al Alam</i> f 208a
10 Ikram Khan	<i>faujdar</i> in the v cin ty of Ak barabad		1 000 <i>sauwars</i>	<i>Adab-i Alamguri</i> f 280b
11 Zabardast Khan	<i>faujdar</i> of Hosh angabad promoted to the rank of 1 000/1 000 (2 3h)			<i>Murat-al Alam</i> f 160a 160b.

glance at the promotions set out in our authorities will make clear. Thus the author of *Ma'asir al Umara* expresses surprise at the sudden promotion by Aurangzeb of Khan-i Jahan Bahadur Zafar Jang from 700 *zat* to 5 000¹. All *mansabs* above 7,000/7,000 (2-3h) were reserved for princes of the Imperial family².

¹ *Ma'asir al Umara* I 813

² When Jas Singh had reached this rank he could be rewarded further only by way of *nam* but not by further increase in rank (*Alamguri Nama* p 618). *Alamguri Nama* of Hatim Khan ff 109a-124a. *M at al Alam* f 160a. *M rat-i Jahan Numa* f 268a. The only noble who ever passed this barrier was Asaf Khan who was awarded the rank 9 000/9 000 (2 3h) by Shahjahan. But Shahjahan decided that this was an exceptional case and no other noble was to be promoted beyond 7 000/7 000 (*Lahori, Badshah Nama* II p 25).

ESCHEAT

[No discussion of the pay and conditions of service of the nobles can be complete without considering how far they enjoyed security of the wealth accumulated by them during their tenure of service and could pass it on to their heirs. Cases of punishment for specific crimes or faults apart, the Mughal nobles generally seem to have enjoyed such security during their life-time. But it is a matter of controversy whether the wealth of a noble could safely pass on to his legal heirs. There is some evidence that the king claimed a right to the property of all his deceased officers.

The claim of the king over the possessions and riches accumulated by his officers dates from an early period in the history of monarchy among the Musalmans. The introduction of slavery provided the Abbasid Caliphs a legal pretext (i.e. in terms of the *shariat*) for claiming the property of their officers. The property acquired by a slave, under Muslim law, always belonged to his master in the life-time as well as after the death of the slave, while the property of a free man went to his sons or blood relations.¹ The Sultans of Delhi too used to have large a number of slave officers. Even a Sultan so anxious to maintain conformity with Muslim law as Firuz Tughlaq justified the confiscation of the property of an officer of his on the ground that he had been his manumitted slave.²

[The Indian Mughals seem to have followed the Delhi Sultans in not having any real slave-officers of status and yet in making claims upon their 'free' officers that could only be made under Muslim law upon slaves. This royal claim to succession is not elaborated in the *Ain-i Akbari*, but is noticed by a series of European travellers from the time of Akbar onwards.³ Among the earliest is, perhaps, that found in Purchas, where we are told that "the custom of this Mughal Emperor is to take possession of his nobles treasure when they die, and to bestow on their children what he pleaseth, but commonly he dealeth well with them and

¹ See Levy, *Social Structure of Islam*, Cambridge, 1957, p. 78. The appointment of slaves (generally of Turkish birth) gave the Abbasids and other rulers, who preferred to base their government on slave-officers, a *shariat* or legal right which they would not have had over a bureaucracy recruited from free-born citizens. The *shariat* places the slave, whatever his status, under three restrictions: he cannot marry without the permission of his master; when he dies he is inherited by his master, who is his sole heir; lastly, all his children, in their turn, are the slaves of his master. This extra-ordinary authority which the *shariat* gives to the master over his slaves is probably the cause of those slave bureaucracies, which we find recurring in Islamic history.

² Afif, *Tarikh-i Firuz Shahi*, p. 445. The officer was Bashir Imad-ul Mulk, who left behind 12 crores of *tankas*, of this amount, 9 crores were escheated to the crown and the remaining 3 crores were distributed among Imadul Mulk's sons, sons-in-law, wives, adopted sons and slaves. But legally the Sultan had no power to inherit a manumitted slave, and Firuz's action must be regarded as an "act of state".

³ Bernier, 211-42, Manucci II, p. 417, Careri, p. 241, Pelsaert, Tr. Moreland *Jahangir's India*, pp. 54-56.

unto the eldest son he hath a very great respect, who in time receiveth the full title of his father".¹

Now, what is clearly stated here and in other European accounts is that the Emperor first actually took possession of the entire wealth of the noble, and then disposed of it as he chose, taking some part of it for himself and leaving the rest to the heirs of the nobles in portions determined by himself. That this was not a figment of the imagination of the foreigners shown by the actual instances from the period of Akbar and Shahjahan.

When Munim Khan died in 1575, all his wealth and property was escheated to the crown, the term used for it being *zabt*. It is true that he had died without heirs (he had one son living whom he had disowned) and so the state could be his only heir.² However, when Abul Fazl, who had many sons, was murdered, his entire moveable property was presented before Akbar and it is recorded that as a mark of favour to his family the Emperor refused to confiscate it.³ The action taken by Shahjahan with regard to Ali Mardan Khan's property upon his death in 1657, offers, perhaps, the best illustration of the actual position before the accession of Aurangzeb.

The whole property of the deceased, amounting in cash and goods, to one crore of rupees, was seized (*baqaid-i zabt dar amad*). From bountiful generosity, the Emperor bestowed thirty lacs on Ibrahim Khan, and twenty lacs on the remaining three sons and ten daughters, while fifty lacs were appropriated to the imperial treasury against the *mutaliba*.⁴

What is of particular interest, here, is that the imperial right did not remain confined to realising the *mutaliba*, i.e. the amount borrowed by the deceased noble from the imperial treasury, but extended to the disposal of his entire inheritance in complete disregard of the Muslim law of inheritance. The law gave equal shares to all brothers and the sisters are given half the brother's share; yet in this case one son (not the eldest) got 30 lacs, while three sons and ten daughters had to rest content with twenty lacs.⁵ In the case of a Hindu noble, Raja Bithaldas, Shahjahan asserted his right to deal with the inheritance with a similar disregard of Hindu law. Out of ten lacs left by the Raja, 6 lacs were bestowed on the eldest son, while the other three sons got 3 lacs, 60 thousand and 40 thousand respectively.⁶

¹ Purchas, III, p. 34

² Bayazid, 349; Badauni, II, 217-18

³ *Waqiat-i Asad Beg*, Br. M. Or. 1996, f. 6

⁴ *Amal-i Salih*, III, 246-8, *Tuhfa-i Shahjahan*, f. 27b

⁵ When Islam Khan died, it was expressly laid down that only the *mutaliba* and the presents he had received from the *zamindars* of the Deccan were to be appropriated to the imperial treasury. The remainder of his property was bestowed upon his heirs, who were ordered to distribute it among themselves according to the *shariat* (Waris, 16-17). An exception, perhaps, that proves the rule

⁶ Waris, f. 154

In effect, therefore, the Emperor did not confiscate the entire property of a noble; he only took his *mutaliba* and if he chose, something more. But theoretically, he was the sole heir and when he passed on the inheritance to the members of the deceased noble's family, he could follow his own will in its distribution. The *Qazis* were not entitled to interfere.

To Aurangzeb is attributed a radical revision of this system by two contemporary historians. They denounce the old iniquitous practice of sequestering the property of nobles, who had no dues to pay to the imperial treasury and declare that Aurangzeb waived all claims to the property of his nobles beyond claiming the *mutaliba*.¹

Fortunately, the text of the order which Aurangzeb issued on the subject has survived in the great collection of documents preserved in the *Mirat-i Ahmadi*.

In this *farman* issued in 1666 Aurangzeb instructed all the provincial *diwans* that when a servant of the state died leaving no legal heir behind him and without any state dues against him, his property should be deposited in the *bait-ul mal*. If he owed something to the state, the state dues should be realised and then the rest of the property deposited in the *bait-ul mal*. If he had heirs and also owed something to the state, they should attach his property within three days of his death. If the property exceeded the amount of his debt to the state, they were to take the amount of the debt only and deliver the rest to his heirs, after the latter had legally established their right. If the state-claims exceeded the property of the deceased, the whole of the property was to be confiscated. If the deceased noble owed nothing to the state, his whole property was to be handed over to his legal heirs and the state officials were asked not to interfere with it.² This order was reinforced by another in 1691, which called upon the officers not to attach the property of nobles whose heirs were in government service, because the latter could be asked to pay the *mutaliba* contracted by the deceased.³

A number of instances can be cited to show that Aurangzeb's orders were followed and the claim over the property of the *mansabdars* was limited to the *mutaliba*.

In 8th regnal year, on Rahmat Khan's death, it was ordered that the state dues alone were to be recovered from his property and the rest handed over to his heirs.⁴ In 1099 A.H. (A. D. 1687) Shaikh Mohiuddin, the *sadar* and the *amin* of *jizya* of the province of Gujarat, died.

¹ *Ma'asir-i Alamgiri*, p. 531; *Murat-al Alam*, f. 211b.

² *Murat-i Ahmadi*, Vol. I, pp. 135, 267 and 319.

³ *Murat-i Ahmadi*, Vol. I, pp. 326.

⁴ *AlAharat*, 9th Jamada II, 8th R.Y. : Order issued on the petition of Abdur Rahim Khan son-in-law of Rahmat Khan. In 1662 Ali Yar Beg died; only the *mutaliba* (state-dues) were recovered from the deceased noble's property and the rest was handed over to his heirs (*Selected Wags-i of the Deccan*, No. 14, p. 50).

His son, Shaikh Ikramuddin, stood surety for the payment of the state-dues, and so the property of the deceased was not confiscated.¹ In the 44th R.Y. of Aurangzeb (A.D. 1700) when Sher Afgan Khan died, his property was passed on to his legal heirs.² In 1113 A.H. (A.D. 1701) when Shuja'at Khan, the *subedar* of Gujarat died, the Emperor permitted his heirs to succeed to his property, which was not confiscated. Only the elephants and horses, etc., belonging to the Khan were taken and sent to the court.³ In A.D. 1702, Fazil Khan, the *Najib Mir Saman* submitted before the Emperor that a deceased officer, Lutfullah Khan, owed one lakh and seventy thousand rupees to the state, and his heirs had been permitted to succeed to his legacy. The Emperor ordered the horses and elephants of the Khan to be confiscated, but the rest of his property was left to his heirs.⁴

It is, however, not possible to take these examples as a sufficient proof that Aurangzeb basically modified the older practice of escheat. Bernier's statements on this point may be disregarded because they refer to the period before the date of Aurangzeb's first order (A.D. 1666) and, therefore, relate to the system in force before his reform. Yet Manucci, who wrote at the close of Aurangzeb's reign, says flatly :

"He (Aurangzeb) seizes everything left by his generals, officers and other officials at their death, in spite of his having declared that he makes no claims on the goods of defunct persons. Nevertheless, under the pretext that they are his officers and in debt to the crown, he lays hold of everything. If they have widows, he gives them a trifle every year and some land to furnish a subsistence."⁵

The underlined words show that Manucci was aware of Aurangzeb's order of 1666 and 1691 and, perhaps, of the acclamation of the author of these orders by his courtiers. He says that these orders were in fact often violated and that the Emperor continued to enforce his claims on the property of his officers, which he had publicly renounced.

That Manucci is not entirely wrong is supported by a number of actual cases, where the right of escheat was in fact claimed.

In A.D. 1694 Mukhtar Khan, the *nazim* of the Gujarat *suba* died, and Muhammad Tahir, the *diwan* of the province of Gujarat along with other

¹ *Mirat-i Ahmadi*, Vol. I, p. 319 The property of late Rashid Khan was given to his son, Muhammad Husain, and he was asked to pay the state-dues which his father owed (*Akhbarat*, 10th Rabi I, 45th R.Y.) In 1676 Islam Khan Rumi died fighting against the Bijapuris. His possessions amounting to three lakhs of rupees and twenty thousand *ashrafis*, which had been confiscated in Ujjain and Sholapur, were restored to his sons and they were directed to pay the state-dues which their father owed, (*Mifta'ul-Umara*, Vol. I, pp. 246-47)

² *Akhbarat*, 5th Zilhi, 44th R.Y.

³ *Mirat-i Ahmadi*, Vol. I, p. 345 The property of late Ikhtlas Khan was handed over to his sons, only the horses and elephants etc. were confiscated for the State, (*Akhbarat*, 19th Rajab, 43rd R.Y.)

⁴ *Akhbarat*, 7th Shaaban, 46th R.Y.

⁵ Manucci II, p. 417, Cf H.H. Das, *Norris Embassy to Aurangzeb*, 146

officials confiscated all the property left by him.¹ In A.D. 1682 Muhammad Amin Khan died, and Muhammad Latif, the *diwan* and the officers of the province of Gujarat, confiscated the whole of his moveable and immoveable property, including his animals.² After the death of Amir Khan, the *subedar* of Kabul, Aurangzeb directed Asad Khan to write to the *diwan* of Lahore, to attach his property with great care and diligence so that nothing may escape their hands. He was also asked to get information from other sources and to take possession of everything found at any place belonging to Amir Khan.³ In A.D. 1678 Jaswant Singh died and Aurangzeb ordered his entire treasure and wealth to be confiscated.⁴ However, in the case of Jaswant Singh it is known that he had large state-dues against him.⁵ We can thus enumerate the cases where property of dead nobles was seized on behalf of the Crown and make a long list, but it is not quite clear in all these cases whether the seizure was only to recover the *mutaliba* or to enforce the right of escheat.⁶

On the basis of this evidence, we may refuse to join the panegyrists of Aurangzeb in regarding him as a reformer, who liberated the nobility from the yoke of the escheat system. We have seen that the 'yoke' was really a light one even before Aurangzeb. It amounted in practice to only : (a) that the state-dues should be the first claim on the estate of a deceased officer and (b) that in disposing of the rest of his property the king, and not the *shariat*, should have the decisive voice. The orders of 1666 and 1691 confirmed the first of these two rights, but theoretically abandoned the second. Yet in practice, as we have seen, Aurangzeb enforced this right whenever he chose. The two orders he issued were self-denying ordinances, which he might, or might not, enforce in particular cases.

¹ *Murat-i Ahmadi*, Vol I, pp 310-11

² *Murat-i Ahmadi*, Vol I, p 302 For full details of the property of Mohammed Amin Khan deceased which was confiscated for the state, see *Mas'ar-i Alamgiri*, p 226

³ *Raqam-i Karam*, f 14a. About two lakhs of rupees, some *ashrafis* and jewels belonging to the late Amir Khan, were concealed by his sons but later on the property was discovered and escheated *Akhbarat*, 25th Rabi I, 44th R.Y., *Kalamat-i Tayyabat*, f 24b, H.H. Das, *Norris Embassy to Aurangzeb*, p. 285

⁴ *Waqat-i Ajmer*, pp 77, 81, 83 and 84, *Mas'ar-i Alamgiri*, p 173

⁵ *Murat-i Ahmadi*, Vol I, p 277 Dilir Khan had state-dues against him, so at his death Aurangzeb ordered that his property should be escheated. (*Dilkusha*, f 83b)

⁶ Abdul Nabi, the *faydar* of Mathura, was killed during a fight by a musket ball, and his entire property was confiscated for the state (*Kamwar, Ta'ara : Salatin-i Chaghta*, f 280b, *Mas'ar-i Alamgiri*, p 83) The property of Bakhshi al Mulk Mukhlis Khan was confiscated after his death. (*Akhbarat*, 4th Shaban, 44th R.Y. of Aurangzeb) The property of Arshad Khan was confiscated for the state after his death (*Akhbarat*, 10th Rabi I, 45th R.Y.) Muhammad Jafar was deputed to attach the property of Qasim Khan deceased (19th Jamada II, 39th R.Y.) The entire property of Shaista Khan deceased was escheated to the crown (*Mas'ar ul Umara*, Vol II, p 705) In the 38th R.Y. of Aurangzeb, Khan-i Jahan Bahadur Zafar Jang Kokaltash died, the entire property of the deceased Khan was escheated for the state (*Dilkusha*, f 118b)

On a more general view, taking the Mughal 'system of escheat' as a whole, it is difficult to agree with some European travellers and modern writers¹ in considering it the source of all evils. Bernier, for example, denounced it as 'a barbarous' custom. He declared that it made it impossible for families to retain their status and wealth : "The king being the heir of all their possessions, no family can long maintain its distinction, but after the Umrah's death, is soon extinguished, and the sons or at least the grandsons, reduced generally to beggary..."² Moreland suggests that the escheat system created great insecurity for the nobles and was the reason why the nobles spent huge amounts on luxuries and did not save and invest.³

These statements assume that the Emperor in practice exercised his rights over his nobles' property and confiscated it entirely or the larger part of it. This is far from the truth. All the nobles were not spend-thrifts; many of them saved and accumulated large amounts. Pelsaert, indeed, was surprised that despite the escheat system the nobles continued to amass wealth, and was led to believe that wealth was loved for its sake alone.⁴ In fact every noble felt confident that his wealth, after meeting the *mutaliba*, would remain with his heirs, although one son (generally the eldest but possibly another son who was his or the king's favourite) would get more than the others. This was why they amassed wealth and accumulated riches. The escheat system had, therefore, a more theoretical and legal than economic significance.

¹ Sarkar, *Mughal Administration*, 3rd ed 1935, pp 175-76

² Bernier, 211 12, See also Careri, p 241

³ *India At the Death of Akbar*, pp 262-63

⁴ Pelsaert Tr Moreland, *Jahangir's India*, pp 54-56.

APPENDIX A

MANSABDARS WHOSE SAWAR RANK EXCEEDED THE 247 RANK

<i>Name</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Source</i>
1. Faujdar of Gorakhpur (Name not given)	3,000/4,000	<i>Alkharat</i> , 28th Moharram, 43 R.Y.
2. Kishore Singh Hara	2,500/3,000	" 28th Jamada, 33 R.Y.
3. Khwaja Muhammad Arif Mujahid Khan	2,500/2,800	" 16th Rabi II, 39 R.Y. <i>Kamwar</i> , f. 273a.
4. Rao Dalpat	2,500/2,700	<i>Dillwala</i> , f. 136a.
5. Hadi Khan	2,000/2,400	<i>Alkharat</i> , 13th Ramzan, 13 R.Y.
6. Ram Chand	2,000/3,000	<i>Mas'arrat-Alamgar</i> , 423
7. Qabad Khan	2,000/2,500	<i>Alamgar Nama</i> , p. 120
8. Sardar Khan	2,000/2,500	" " p. 629
9. Sher Afgan	1,500/1,700	<i>Mas'arrat-Alamgar</i> , p. 381
10. Alah Dad Khan	1,500/2,000	<i>Alkharat</i> , 13th Jamada II, 46 R.Y.
11. Dhir S o Bahadur Rehela	1,000/1,200 (500x2.5h)	<i>Alamgar Nama</i> , p. 661
12. Mohtasham Khan	1,000/1,200 (1,000x2.5h)	<i>Alkharat</i> , 13th Jamada II, 46 R.Y. " 16th Rajab, 24 R.Y.
13. Kakur Khan	1,000/1,200	" 8th Zaqada, 39 R.Y.
14. Sayyid Hasan Ali Khan	1,000/1,200	" 28th Zaqada, 43 R.Y.
15. Iftikhar Khan	1,000/1,500	" 25th Rajab, 43 R.Y.
16. K. Fajal Singh	1,000/2,000	" 9th Ramzan, 44 R.Y.
17. Marmur Khan	1,000/1,200	" 4th Zaqada, 46 R.Y.
18. Rahman Daul Khan	1,000/1,500	" 15th Jamada II, 46 R.Y.
19. Samandar Khan	1,000/1,200	" 1st Moharram, 45 R.Y.
20. Abdul Samad Khan	1,000/1,100 (500x2.5h)	" 7th Zaqada, 31 R.Y.
21. Muhammad Murad Khan	900/1,000	" 10th Rabi I, 43 R.Y.
22. Faizam	1,000/1,000	<i>Alamgar Nama</i> , p. 1033
23. Kartalab Khan	900/1,000	<i>Alkharat</i> , 24th Safar, 43 R.Y.
24. Nazaf Quli	800/1,000	" 5th Moharram, 45 R.Y.
25. Fawzi Jalauri	700/1,400	" 15th Sha'ban, 34 R.Y.
26. Aurang Khan	700/900 (400x2.5h)	" 27th Ramzan, 46 R.Y.
27. Hala Khan	700/900	" 27th Safar, 47 R.Y.
28. Khwaja Khwaja Ali Khan	700/1,000	" 14th Rabi II, 44 R.Y.
29. Agha Quli Khan	700/900	" 25th Zaqada, 45 R.Y.
30. Fawzi Hal Jiala	700/900	<i>Alkharat</i> , 4th 31st Ramzan, 45 R.Y.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Source</i>
31 Mir Mubarakullah	700/1,000	<i>Ma'asir-ul-Umara</i> , I, 204 5.
32 Muhammad Hamyab	600/620	<i>Akhbarat</i> , 8th Zilhij, 43 R Y
33 Shukrullah Khan	500/1,700	" 13th Ramzan, 47 R.Y.
34 Abul		<i>Ma'asir : Alamgiri</i> , pp 303-4
35 Himmat Yar	500/600	<i>Akhbarat</i> , 11th Zilhij 38 R Y
36 Khan Chand Bundela	500/900	" 16th Zilhij, 38 R Y.
37 Muhammad Salih	500/650	" 1st Rabi II, 38 R Y
38 Khidmat Talab Khan	500/700	" 28th Zilhij, 45 R.Y.
Shah Beg		
39 Asfandiyar	500/640	" 2nd Moharram, 45 R.Y.
40 Mir Muhammad Latif	500/700	" 27th Safar, 45 R Y
41 Wali Dad	500/600	" 9th Ramzan, 44 R Y
42 Sayid Mudassir	500/650	" 19th Moharram, 45 R.Y
43 Niyaz Khan	500/600	" 11th Shaban, 43 R Y
44 Fauzdar Khan	500 800	<i>Ma'asir : Alamgiri</i> , p 474
45 Tilok Singh	500/700	<i>Akhbarat</i> , 2nd Shaban, 37 R Y
46 Muhammad Rafi	400/450	" 13th Rabi II, 38 R Y
47 Dilawar Khan	400/650	" 4th Jamada I, 38 R Y
S/o Alah Dad Khan		
48 Shakir Kharr	400/500	" 19th Ziqada, 38 R.Y
49 Qasim Khan	400/1 000 (200x2 3h)	" 13th Ramzan, 47 R Y
50 Muhammad Qasim	400/700 (250x2 3h)	" 6th Rajab, 46 R. Y
S/o Sher Khan		
51 Muhammad Sharif	400/450	" 13th Rajab, 43 R Y
52 Keshaw Das	400/560	" 16th Moharram, 38 R Y
53 Mir Muhammad Sanju	300/500	" 5th Ziqada, 38 R Y
54 Dilawar Khan	300/700	" 29th Rabi II, 38 R Y
55 Saf Shikan Khan	300/700	" 1st Ramzan, 46 R Y
56 Ram Chand	300/500 (400x2 3h)	" 29th Safar, 46 R Y
S/o Dalpat Bundela		
57 Azam S/o Hummat	300/500	" 3rd Moharram, 45 R Y
58 Muhammad Sardar	300/420	" 28th Safar, 43 R Y
S/o Dindar		
59 Bhim Singh	100/400 (200x2 3h)	" 19th Zilhij 43 R Y
60 Gharib Das	300/400	" 5th Rajab 39 R Y
61 Muhammad Murad	300/500	" 21st Jamada II 39 R Y
62 Nur Khan	300/450	" 3rd Jamada II, 38 R Y
		" 1st Moharram 38 R Y

TABLE SHOWING THE PAY FOR ZAT RANK
(7,000 Zai)

Source	Page or Folio Reference	Class I
<i>Am i Akbari Vol I</i>	p 124	Rs 45,000 (Per month) 21,600,000 dams (annual)
<i>Farhang-i Kardani</i>	ff 43-49	14,000,000 dams (annual)
<i>Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign</i>	p 80	14,000,000 dams (annual)
<i>Dastur ul 'Amal i Alamgiri</i>	f 125a	14,000,000 dams (annual)
<i>Zauqibit i Alamgiri</i>	ff 42b-45b	14,000,000 dams (annual)
<i>Mumalik i-Mahruza i Alamgiri</i>	f 149b	14,000,000 dams (annual)
<i>Khulasat us Syaq</i>	ff 48b-49a	14 000,000 dams (annual)
<i>Ma'murat ul Afq</i>	pp 195-96	14,000,000 dams (annual)

TABLE SHOWING THE PAY FOR ZAT RANK
(5,000 Zai)

Source	Page or Folio Reference	Class I	Class II	Class III
<i>Am-i Akbari Vol I</i>	p 124	Rs 30,000 (Per month) 14,400,000 dams (annual)	Rs 29,000 (Per month) 13 920,000 dams (annual)	Rs 28 000 (Per month) 13,440,000 dams (annual)
<i>Farhang-i Kardani</i>	ff 43-49	10,000 000 dams (annual)	9,700,000 dams (annual)	9 400,000 dams (annual)
<i>Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign</i>	p 80	10,000 000 dams (annual)	9,700,000 dams (annual)	9,400 000 dams (annual)
<i>Dastur ul 'Amal i Alamgiri</i>	f 125a	10,000 000 dams (annual)	9,800,000 ¹ dams (annual)	9,600,000 ¹ dams (annual)
<i>Zauqibit i Alamgiri</i>	ff 42b-45b	(9,400,000) ¹ dams (annual)	9,700,000 dams (annual)	9,400,000 dams (annual)
<i>Halet u-Mumalik i-Mahruza i Alamgiri</i>	f 149b	10,000,000 dams (annual)	9,700,000 dams (annual)	9,400,000 dams (annual)
<i>Khulasat us Syaq</i>	ff 48b-49a	10,000,000 dams (annual)	9,700,000 dams (annual)	9,400,000 dams (annual)
<i>Ma'murat ul Afq</i>	pp 195-96	10,000 000 dams (annual)	9,700,000 dams (annual)	9,400,000 dams (annual)

¹ According to the previous scales in force² The figure within brackets seems to be a mistake of transcription

TABLE SHOWING THE PAY FOR *ẒAT* RANK
(4,000 *Ẓat*)

Source	Page or Folio Reference	Class I	Class II	Class III
<i>Am i Akbari Vol. I</i>	p 125	Rs 22,000 (Per month) 10,560,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	Rs 21,800 (Per month) 10,464,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	Rs 21,600 (Per month) 10,368,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)
<i>Faḥṣang i Kardani</i>	ff 43-49	8,000,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	7,700,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	7,400,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)
<i>Selected Documents of Shāhjahān's Reign</i>	p 80	8,000,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	7,700,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	7,400,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)
<i>Dastur ul Amal i Alamgiri</i>	ff 125a 125b	8,000,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	7,800,000 ¹	7,600,000 ¹
<i>Ẓawābiḥ i Alamgiri</i>	ff 42b 45b	8,000,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	7,700,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	7,400,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)
<i>Mumalik Mahrusa i Alamgiri</i>	f 150a	8,000,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	7,700,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	7,400,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)
<i>Khulasat us Siyāq</i>	ff 48b 49a	8,000,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	7,700,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	7,400,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)
<i>Maduniat ul Afṣāq</i>	pp 195-196	8,000,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	7,700,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	7,400,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)

¹ "According to the previous scales in force"TABLE SHOWING THE PAY FOR *ẒAT* RANK
(3,000 *Ẓat*)

Source	Page or Folio Reference	Class I	Class II	Class III
<i>Am i Akbari Vol. I</i>	p 125	Rs 17,000 (Per month) 8,160,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	Rs 16,800 (Per month) 8,064,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	Rs 16,700 (Per month) 8,016,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)
<i>Faḥṣang i Kardani</i>	ff 43-49	6,000,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	5,700,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	5,400,000 <i>dams</i> (annual) ¹
<i>Selected Documents of Shāhjahān's Reign</i>	p 81	6,000,000 ¹ <i>dams</i> (annual)	5,700,000 <i>dams</i> (annual) ¹	5,600,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)
<i>Dastur ul Amal i Alamgiri</i>	ff 125a b	6,000,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	5,800,000 (According to the former Dastur ul-Amal).	5,400,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)
<i>Ẓawābiḥ i Alamgiri</i>	ff 42b-45b	6,000,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	5,700,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	5,400,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)
<i>Mumalik Mahrusa i Alamgiri</i>	f 150a	6,000,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	5,700,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	5,400,000 <i>dams</i> (annual) ¹
<i>Khulasat us Siyāq</i>	ff. 48b-49a	6,000,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	5,700,000 <i>dams</i> (annual)	5,400,000 <i>dams</i> (annual) ¹

¹ "According to the previous scales in force"

TABLE SHOWING THE PAY FOR ZAT RANK
(2,000 Zāt)

Source	Page or Folio Reference	Class I		Class II		Class III	
		Rs	(Per month)	Rs	(Per month)	Rs	(Per month)
Am i Akbari Vol I	p 127	Rs 12,000	(Per month)	Rs 11,900	(Per month)	Rs 11,000	(Per month)
		5,760,000 dams	(annual)	5,712,000 dams	(annual)	5,664,000 dams	(annual)
		4,000,000 dams	(annual)	3,700,000 dams	(annual)	3,400,000 dams	(annual)
Farhang i Kardans	ff 43-49	4,000,000 dams	(annual)	3,700,000 dams	(annual)	3,400,000 dams	(annual)
Selected Documents of Shāhyāhān's Reign	p 81	4,000,000 dams	(annual)	3,800,000 ¹	(According to the former Dastur ul-Amal)	3,600,000 ¹	(According to the former Dastur ul-Amal)
						3,400,000 dams	(annual)
Dastur ul Amal i Alamgiri	ff 125a 125b	4,000,000 dams	(annual)	3,700,000 dams	(annual)	3,400,000 dams	(annual)
Zawab-i Alamgiri	ff 42b-45b	4,000,000 dams	(annual)	3,700,000 dams	(annual)	3,400,000 dams	(annual)
Mumalik Mahruza i Alamgiri	f 150a	4,000,000 dams	(annual)	3,700,000 dams	(annual)	3,400,000 dams	(annual)
Khulasat us siyāq	ff 48b-49a	4,000,000 dams	(annual)	3,700,000 dams	(annual)	3,400,000 dams	(annual)
Malumat ul Afaq	pp 195 96	4,000 000 dams	(annual)	5,700,000 ² dams	(annual)	5,400,000 ² dams	(annual)

¹ "According to the previous scales in force"² The figures seem to be an error of transcriptionTABLE SHOWING THE PAY FOR ZAT RANK
(1,000 Zāt)

Source	Page or Folio Reference	Class I		Class II		Class III	
		Rs	(Per month)	Rs	(Per month)	Rs	(Per month)
Am i Akbari Vol I	p 128	Rs 9,200	(Per month)	Rs 8,100	(Per month)	Rs 8,000	(Per month)
Farhang i Kardans	ff 43-49	3,936 000 dams	(annual)	3,888,000 dams	(annual)	3,840,000 dams	(annual)
Selected Documents of Shāhyāhān's Reign	pp 81 82	2,000,000 dams	(annual)	1,900,000 dams	(annual)	1,700,000 dams	(annual)
	ff 125a-126a	2,000,000 dams	(annual)	1,900,000 dams	(annual)	1,700,000 dams	(annual)
Dastur ul Amal i Alamgiri	ff 42b 45b	2,000,000 dams	(annual)	1,900,000 dams	(annual)	1,700,000 dams	(annual)
Zawab-i Alamgiri	f 150a	2,000,000 dams	(annual)	1,900,000 dams	(annual)	1,700,000 dams	(annual)
Mumalik Mahruza i Alamgiri	ff 48b 49a	2,000,000 dams	(annual)	1,900,000 dams	(annual)	1,700,000 dams	(annual)
Khulasat us Siyāq	pp 195 96	2,000,000 dams	(annual)	1,900,000 dams	(annual)	1,700,000 dams	(annual)
Malumat ul Afaq		2,000,000 dams	(annual)	1,900,000 dams	(annual)	1,700,000 dams	(annual)

THE JAGIRDARI SYSTEM AND THE NOBILITY

THE *mansabdars* of the Mughal Empire received their pay either in cash (*naqd*) or in the form of assignments of areas of land from which they were entitled to collect the land revenue and all other taxes imposed or sanctioned by the Emperor. These assignments were known as *jagirs* and *tuyuls*, though sometimes the term *iqta*, used in the time of Delhi Sultans, was also employed. The officers, when paid in cash were known as *naqdi*, and, when holding assignments, as *jagirdars* and *tuyuldars*. The author of *Mirat-al Istilah* suggests that the term *tuyul* was originally used for the assignment held by princes of royal blood but, at least in the time of Aurangzeb, the term was indifferently used for all assignments.¹ Land which was reserved for the income of the crown was called *khalisa* or *khalisa-i sharifa*,² and such areas, which were to be assigned, but were for the time being managed by imperial officers, were known as *paibaqi*.³

By far the larger part of the Empire was assigned in *jagirs*. In the 10th year of Aurangzeb, for example, out of a total estimated revenue (*jamadami*) of 924 crores of *dams* for the whole Empire, 725 crores were assigned to *jagirdars* or placed in *paibaqi*.⁴ Nothing like the *karori* experiment of Akbar, when practically the whole Empire had been placed in the *khalisa*, was repeated in the 17th century. Indeed in the last years of Jahangir's reign, the *khalisa* shrank to 28 crores of *dams*⁵ or less than 1/20th of the total *jama*. But since then, especially in the reign of Shahjahan, an expansion of the *khalisa* had taken place. Its *jama* stood at 120 crores out of a total *jama* of 880 crores i.e. it was over 1/7th of the whole empire in Shahjahan's 20th year.⁶ In Aurangzeb's 10th year, it amounted to almost one-fifth of the total *jama*.⁷ No later information about the precise extent of the *khalisa* is available.

These data show that the *khalisa* covered a very large portion of the Empire, but the Emperor was also in command of a considerable income collected directly by his treasury. Out of this he paid his own troops, artillery men, attendants, etc., and the *naqdi mansabdars*. Still the fact

¹ The *jagirs* of the princes are usually indicated by such phrases as *jagir-i* or *Tamul-i* *Shahis* *Sarfaraz Dastar Nader*.

² *Mirat-al Istilah* f. 15a.

³ *Khamsat-i Siaz* f. 26b. *Ilqan-i Akbar* pp. 74, 375-6. *Mamuri*, ff. 156b-157a.

⁴ *Mir'at Alam* f. 214b. The same figures appear in *Mir'at-al Afagh* p. 194.

⁵ *Qasrawi*, p. 423. For the *jama* of the Empire see *Ilqan-i Akbar* ff. 115a-b.

⁶ *Labret, Badshah Nama* II pp. 710-13.

⁷ *Mir'at-al Alam*, Op cit.

remains that no less than $4/5$ th of the revenue of the Empire had been alienated to the *jagirdars*.¹

The importance of this fact for the administrative system of the Mughal Empire does not seem to have been grasped fully. Writers of text-books, and even of standard works,² in their discussions of revenue and other branches of the administration assume that the machinery of the *khalisa* was identical with the administrative apparatus as a whole. They, therefore, fail to analyse the way in which the *jagirdari* system was integrated with the administration and how the prevalence of this institution created problems for which various devices had to be adopted from time to time. In the present chapter, an attempt will be made to correct this distortion by analysing the *jagirdari* system, the nature of the problems posed by it during the second half of the seventeenth century, and their impact on the Mughal administrative structure.

ASSIGNMENT OF JAGIRS

Generally speaking, *jagirs* were assigned in lieu of the salary due to a *mansabdar*, for his *zat* and *sawar* ranks. Such *jagirs* were known as *jagir-i tankhwah* or *tankhwah-i jagir*.³

When a *jagir* was allotted to a person conditional upon his appointment to a particular post, the *jagir* was known as *mashrut* or conditional.⁴ Thus, in 1672 when Muhammad Amin Khan was appointed *subedar* of Gujarat, the *jagir* of *sarkar* Patan and Beram Gam, which was attached to the post, was granted to him as *mashrut*.⁵ *Jagirs*, which involved no obligation of service, being independent of rank, were known as *inam*.⁶ It was for the Emperor to decide whether any *mansabdar* would receive his pay in cash or in *jagir*.⁷

Since a *jagir* was given in lieu of cash salary, it was essential that it should yield at least as much as the salary to which the holder was entitled. If it yielded less, he would be a loser, and would not be able to fulfil his obligations. Moreland has quoted a set of figures representing what was regarded as the average or normal revenue yield of each *mahal*⁸ or revenue unit, on the basis of which all *jagir* assignments were

¹ In P. Saran's *Provincial Government of the Mughals*, even the *jagirdar's* agents for collecting revenue in the *jagirs* are not mentioned. ² *Dilkusha*, f. 139a, Allahabad Documents, 789.

³ *Mirāt-i Ahmadi*, Vol. I, p. 303.

⁴ *Mirāt-i Ahmadi*, Vol. I, p. 289.

⁵ *Lahori*, Vol. II, p. 397. Surat was assigned to Jahan Ara Begam as *inam*. Raja Jai Singh was honoured by *inam* assignments, by that time Mirza Raja Jai Singh had been granted the maximum rank permitted to any noble and there was no way of honouring him further except by granting *inam* assignments, *Alamgir Nama*, p. 618.

⁶ *Akbarat*, 45th R.Y. p. 46. In 1701 Aurangzeb issued an order that if the soldiers of the *risalas* of Ruhullah Khan, Muhammad Amin Khan and Siyadat Khan, etc. were not prepared to accept *jagirs* in lieu of their salary, they were to be dismissed.

⁷ A *mahal* often corresponded to a *pargana* which was the smallest administrative unit. But it could be a smaller unit, or would cut across the administrative units.

made. In Akbar's time such figures were comprehended under the term *jama*, which has been rendered a little inaccurately as 'valuation'.¹ In the 17th century, the term *jamadami* came into use for the same category of figures. This was so probably because the figures were stated in *dams*, which was calculated at a fixed ratio of 40 *dams* to the rupee. The salaries too were expressed in terms of this unit, although the money in use was the rupee and the original copper *dam* had appreciated much above its former value of 1/40 of a rupee.² The value of this new term *jamadami* is that we are now able to distinguish the assessment figures on the basis of which *jagirs* were assigned, from the ordinary *jama* or seasonal assessment of revenue upon the individual peasant of the village.

Whenever a person was assigned a *jagir*, the *pargana* or villages assigned to him were such as bore a *jamadami* in the imperial register exactly equal to his pay. This is shown best by the actual assignment orders which have survived. These state first the rank of the assignee. Then follows the statement of pay which he should get against his rank according to the sanctioned schedules. This is termed *mugarrara talab* or sanctioned claim. To meet this claim, *parganas* with their *jamadami* figures are then specified, the total of the *jamadami* figures being equal to the amount of the pay-claim.³ In case the sanctioned amount of the pay-claim could only be met by assigning not the total *jama* of a *pargana* but a fraction of it, this fraction was stated. In that case, the *diwani* or Imperial Finance office had to order a division (*qismat*) of the villages of the *pargana* among the assignees, who had obtained claims on its *jama*.⁴ However, the assignment of a whole *pargana* (*darobast*) in one *jagir* was always preferred by the administration to dividing it among two or more *jagirdars*.⁵

How the *jamadami* figures were actually worked out in the 17th century is an obscure subject. Whether the system of deriving it from the average of the revenue collection (*hal-i hasil*) of the past ten years (*dah-sala*), as under Akbar,⁶ continued under his successors is never directly discussed by any contemporary authority. However, we certainly find that the central government was interested in collecting information about the "papers of *hal-i hasil* of *parganas* and the comparative revenue state-

¹ Cf. Moreland, *Agrarian System of Moslem India*, pp. 56, 209, 212, 240.

² Cf. Manucci, II, pp. 374-75. For the appreciation of the *dam* see Moreland, *Akbar to Aurangzeb*, pp. 183-85, and Irfan Habib 'Currency System of the Mughal Empire', *Medieval India Quarterly*, Vol. IV. The *dam* in which the salaries were stated thus became a money of account, having no relation to the actual copper coin of that name.

³ See the assignment orders published in *Selected Documents of Shah Jahan's Reign*, the sanctioned pay-schedule is given on pp. 79-84 of the volume. See also *Vir Vinod*, II, pp. 428-31 and Moreland's description of assignment orders in *JRAS*, 1936, pp. 641-62.

⁴ See *Wag-i Ajmer*, 470, 637, also Allahabad, No. 880.

⁵ *Raq 'at-i Alamgar*, pp. 26-27; Fraser, 86, ff. 6a-7a.

⁶ Moreland, *Agrarian System of Moslem India*, pp. 96-98.

ment of ten years (*muwazana-i dah sala*) of the provinces".¹

Nevertheless, the problem which had existed in the early years of Akbar's reign, namely that the *jama* was 'a long way' from *hasil*,² continued and, if anything, became more acute during the 17th century. During his second Viceroyalty of the Deccan, Aurangzeb represented to Shah-jahan that 'the *jamadami* of these provinces (of the Deccan) after the reduction (sanctioned) is 1,449,000,000 *dams*. The actual revenue (*mahsul*) thereof, including the deduction of 1,200,000 rupees which the *diwans* had not written off but put as due to natural calamity (*afat*), comes to 10,000,000 rupees; (i.e. 400,000,000 *dams*) which does not come on average to three-monthly (or one-fourth) of the *jamadami*'.³ This statement cannot be taken to mean that the same state of affairs existed in the other parts of the Empire. Still, the *hasil* seldom amounted anywhere to the full amount of the *jama*. In a document setting out the lease of two *jagirs* in Awadh, we come across the statement that one was an 'eight-monthly' and the other 'of seven months and seven days', because in the former case, the *jama* was 440,000 *dams* and the yield of the lease Rs. 7,333 and annas four, and in the latter the respective figures were 210,000 *dams* and Rs. 3,162.⁴ The nature and effect of this difference systematised under the 'rule of months', in so far as it affected the pay and obligations of the *mansabdars* have already been discussed.

An adjustment was sometimes made, if the collection happened to be far below expectations. This reduction was known as *takhfif-i dami*. In such cases, the *jagirdar* was entitled to the amount of the reduction, so as to keep the *jamadami* equal to his pay. This was adjusted either by a cash payment from the treasury or the assignment of additional *jagir* of an equivalent amount.⁵ At the same time if the actual collection by the *jagirdar* exceeded the *jamadami* or the 'month ratio' sanctioned for the *jagirdars*, the difference could be recovered from the assignee.⁶ Sometimes an honest *jagirdar* himself would report that he had collected revenue in excess of the amount fixed by the 'month ratio'. In such cases, the *sawar* rank of the *jagirdar* might be increased and the surplus revenue adjusted.⁷ A periodical correction of the revenue papers concerning

¹ *Misir-i Ahmadi*, I, 326-7. The statement refers to Gujarat, A.D. 1692. See also *Siyaq Nama* pp. 100-101, where it is stated that *muwazana-i dah sala* and other *hasil* papers were to be regularly deposited in the office of the central *diwan*. This manual was written in the time of Aurangzeb, *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign*, pp. 89-90, 194-5, *Ruq'at-i Alamgir*, pp. 88, 107, 164.

² *Ain*, II, p. 2, *Akbar Nama*, II, 270, III, p. 117.

³ *Adab-i Alamgiri*, 27a-27b, *Ruq'at-i Alamgir*, 121-123.

⁴ Allahabad Documents, 885, 884.

⁵ *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign*, p. 177, *Adab-i Alamgiri*, ff. 18b-19a, 24b, 25b, 29b-30a, 39a, 40a-40b, 43a, *Ruq'at*, pp. 88, 95-96, 98.

⁶ *Adab-i Alamgiri*, ff. 40a-40b, *Ruq'at-i Alamgir*, pp. 130-31, *Ma'asir-i Alamgiri*, p. 170; *Fathiyat-i Ibriya*, ff. 117a-b.

⁷ Thus, according to the *Akhbarat* (12th R.Y. of Aurangzeb, p. 223), Asad Khan reported to the Emperor that Mukarram Khan had informed him that the actual yield of his *jagir* in the Deccan exceeded the 'month ratio' sanctioned for him. It was ordered that an increase of 100

assignments was also made, the paper value of the *jagir* was often compared with the actual collection, and according to it changes were made in respect of the 'month ratio' in which the *jagir* was classed¹

TRANSFER OF JAGIRS

The *jagirs* were by their very nature transferable. That no person should have the same *jagir* for a long period was an established principle of the Mughal Empire. Abul Fazl linked it to the way a gardener transplants plants.² That all *jagirs*, except for *watan jagirs*, were subject to *taghayyur* or transfer after every three or four years was noticed by European travellers of the 17th century from Hawkins to Bernier.³ The real basis for our statement is, however, the actual evidence of such transfer in chronicles, letters, documents—a whole mass of material that is too voluminous to be cited. It is enough to say that any collection of administrative letters like the *Adab-i-Alamgiri* or *Nigar Nama-i-Munshi* will provide cases of numerous transfers. No period seems to have been fixed for such assignments. As Bhim Sen says, "the agents of the *jagirdars*' never had "any hope of the confirmation (*bahali*) of the *jagirs* for the following year"⁴

From the view point of the *jagirdars*, the transfer system had certain complications. For purposes of transfer it was assumed that *Kharif* and *Rabi* crops were of equal value everywhere, except in Bengal and Orissa.⁵ But since in fact the *Rabi* and *Kharif* harvests were hardly of equal value anywhere, the *jagirdar* had to suffer heavily as a result of transfers made in mid year. Sometimes the assignee was required to collect the previous arrears (*baqaya*) and send them to the treasury.⁶

A *jagir* was not only transferred because of a principle. It was often transferred because a *mansabdar*, when sent to serve in a province, had to be assigned a *jagir* there, and similarly, those recalled from there would require *jagirs* elsewhere. When Aurangzeb was Viceroy of the Deccan under Shahjahan, he protested on numerous occasions, though usually unsuccessfully, against the transfer from northern India of the *jagirs* of those who were posted (*tainat*) with him.⁷ In 1694 as Emperor he ordered that only those persons who served in the Deccan were to be assigned *jagirs* there.⁸ The *Mirat-i-Ahmadi* contains instances of persons

sent to be made in the rank of M. karram Khan to offset the excess of his income. Also see *Akbar Nama* III 459

¹ *Akhbarat* 40th x v P 9 *Ruq at-i-Alamgir* p 10 ² *Akbar Nama* II 332 3

³ *Early Travels* 114 De Laet tr Hoyland 94 95 Bernier p 227

⁴ *Dilkusha* f 139a.

⁵ *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign*, pp 76-77 Fraser 86 f 60b

⁶ *As at-i-Ahmad* Vol. I p 30, *Fathya-i-Ib ya* f 130b

⁷ *Adab-i-Alamgir* II 18b-19a, 25b 40a-40b 43a

⁸ *Akhbarat* 38th s. v., p 46

appointed *faujdar*s and *jagirdar*s of the same place in Gujarat.¹ [Another consideration which had to be kept in view when transferring and assigning *jagirs* was that the *jagirdar*s should be competent to manage such areas as were assigned to them! Thus, an administrative manual written in the time of Farrukh Siyar recommends that the *jagirs* should be assigned on the following principle : The Governor was to have one-fourth of his *jagirs* in seditious (*zor-talab*) areas and the rest in areas classed as medium (*ausat*); the *diwans*, *bakhshis* and other high *mansabdars* should have half of their *jagirs* in 'medium areas' and the other half in revenue-paying (*rai-yati*) areas; the *jagirs* of small *mansabdars* were to be placed entirely in *rai-yati* areas.²

The system of *jagir* transfers was necessary for the unity and cohesion of the Empire. Only by these transfers could the nobles or military commandants be prevented from developing local relations and growing into local potentates. Under this system they could never call any part of the country their own and remained entirely dependent on the will of the Emperor.]

WATAN-JAGIRS

The *watan-jagirs* were the only exception to the general system of *jagir* transfers. The *watan-jagirs* originated from the admission of *zamindars* or territorial chiefs into the Mughal service. The chiefs obtained *mansabs* or ranks, the pay for which was equal to the *jama* of their dominions, but since their dominions had been autonomous, this calculation was arbitrary.³ Their old dominions were known as their *watans* and they remained with their family. As Raja Indar Singh stated in a representation to Aurangzeb, the established practice was that 'after the death of the holders of *watans*, *mansabs* are given (to their heirs) according to the assessed revenue (*damha*) of their *watans*'.⁴

[Theoretically, the king was entitled to determine the succession to a *watan-jagir*. But, as a rule, the Emperor neither took away, nor resumed any part of the *watan-jagir* from a ruling dynasty.⁵ Thus, Aurangzeb's annexation of Jodhpur to the *Khalisa* in 1679 caused the greatest resent-

¹ *Mirat-i-Ahmadi*, I, 341, 343

² *Hidayat-al-Qawad*, Aligarh MS f 8a

³ Cf. The arrangement made with Pratab, the *zamindar* of Palamau (Lahori, *Badshah Nama*, II, pp. 360-61)

⁴ *Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign*, p. 121 The *jamadami* of Raja Indar Singh's *watan-jagir* exceeded the pay due on his rank. He, therefore, prayed that either his rank be increased to make its pay equal to the *jamadami*, or that the *jamadami* be reduced to equal the pay for his existing rank. In either case, no one else would be assigned a share in his *watan-jagir*. His *mansab* was increased. *Ruq'at-i-Alamgiri*, p. 167, Lahori, *Badshah Nama*, I, p. 161

⁵ Except as a temporary measure, Cf. Satish Chandra, *Parties and Politics at the Mughal Court*, 1707-40, p. 31-32.

ment among the Rathors, who thought it was a violation of an established custom.¹ In some other cases in the same reign, neither lack of a direct descendant, nor rebellion, was considered a sufficient reason for resuming a *watan-jagir*. In 1659 Jaswant Singh of Marwar was pardoned despite his various acts of hostility towards Aurangzeb and his *watan* was left untouched.² Jagat Singh, son of Mukand Singh Hara, who had a *mansab* of 2,000/1,000, died (A.D. 1681) and left no male issue. His *watan* was conferred on Kishore, son of Ratan Singh, a near relation of the deceased.³ In the 43rd R.Y. of Aurangzeb, Raja Karan of Bikaner rebelled against the Emperor, and when submitted through the mediation of Amir Khan, he was pardoned and granted a *mansab* and his *watan-jagir* was not touched.⁴

If the holders of *watan-jagirs* obtained any increase in their ranks—or if from the very beginning they had held a rank the pay for which was not fully met from the *jamadami* of their *watan-jagirs*—they were given ordinary *tankhwa jagirs* in addition to their *watan-jagirs*.⁵ Thus, Maharaja Jaswant Singh, though holding the whole of Marwar as his *watan-jagir*, held *jagirs* in Hisar (Delhi province) which, on his appointment as governor of Gujarat for the second time, were transferred to Gujarat.⁶

It was not necessary that a *watan-jagir* should always be held against a rank. In one case, at least, we know it to have been given against *inam* or pay granted without any obligation.⁷

As we have implied above, the *watan-jagir* originated in settlements made with *zamindars* who were already in possession of their *watans* (homelands) before the expansion of the Mughal Empire. Non-*zamindars* did not normally hold any place as *watan-jagirs*.⁸ As a concession to these *mansabdars*, Jahangir decided to institute *allun tamgha* (or *al-tamgha*) *jagirs* to be held permanently.⁹ But these *jagirs* were confined to the place of birth, or perhaps, the family seat, of the noble concerned and could not compare with the great ancestral dominions of the Rajput chiefs. Very few references to *al-tamgha jagirs* survive from Aurangzeb's reign. But that these were still granted is shown by the request of a high officer that he be assisted in bringing his family from Persia through the assignment of a *jagir* of "ten lacs of *dams* in the province of Lahore in *al-tamgha*".¹⁰

¹ *Waqas-i Ajmer*, pp 82, 83, 245-6, and passim

² *Mamuri*, f 107b.

³ *Dilkusha*, f. 83a.

⁴ *Mamuri*, f. 116b.

⁵ See, for example, Jahangir's *farman* granting *mansab* and *jagir* to Rao Karan of Mewar in *Vir-i-nod*, II, p 239.

⁶ *Misir-i Ahmadi*, I, p 277

⁷ *Alkharat*, 25th R.Y., p 270 To Bhan Prohit, 30 lacs of *dams* in *Pargana Khor Jogi Garhi* by way of *watan* in *inam* in addition to a rank.

⁸ *Tuzuk*, p 10

⁹ *Matin-al Insha*, Letters of Ali Quli Khan, *faujdar* of Kuch Bihar (c. 1700), Bodl. Ms., ff 99b-100a.

FISCAL RIGHTS OF THE JAGIRDARS

The assignment orders described in almost set terms the rights which the Emperor granted to the *jagirdars*. The local officials and "the headmen and peasants and cultivators" are informed that "they must answer to the agents (*gumashtas*) of the person named (i.e. the *jagirdar*) for the authorized revenue (*mal : wajibi*) and all claims of the state (*huquq : diwani*), properly and honestly"¹ [No other right except that of collecting the land revenue and authorized taxes was delegated to the *jagirdar* as *jagirdar*. And this right too he was expected to exercise in conformity with imperial regulations. Moreland has pointed out that Abul Fazl's language leaves no doubt that the *jagirs* were bound by the orders setting forth the procedure according to which the land revenue was to be assessed and collected². Similar language is used in Aurangzeb's comprehensive *farman* on revenue administration to Rasikdas Karori issued in his 8th R.Y. "All revenue-collectors (*amils*) of the *mahals* (*parganas*) of the *jagirdars* are required to follow the regulations contained in it"³. The order that not more than one half of the produce was to be taken as land revenue, which was given in Aurangzeb's *farmans* to Rasikdas and Muhammad Hashim, was also to be enforced in the *jagirs*. A curious case, where the *jagirdars* sought to evade this, but were found out, is brought up in an order quoted in the *Mirat-i Ahmadi*. "Because of the high price of grain, the (*jama*) revenue assessed (on the peasants) reached the maximum amount. Then grain became cheap. The *jagirdars* and revenue officials (*mutasaddis*) keeping in view the former *jama*, made the current assessment (*jama bandi*) under threats. If they had decided to take half the share of the harvest, they estimated the harvest at 250 maunds, while the actual harvest was only 100 maunds. (By demanding the revenue as half of 250 maunds i.e. 125 maunds), they made his (the peasant's) life a torture for a year and took all his earnings and compelled him to till the soil by blows. (It is ordered, therefore, that) they should only take half the actual harvest and are not to demand anything in excess of this"⁴.

Simple statements requiring the *jagirdars* to take not more than half of the produce also occur elsewhere in the revenue records and other literature of the reign⁵.

The *jagirdars* could also collect, in theory, only such cesses and taxes, besides the land revenue, as were permitted by the government. In the 2nd year of his reign, Aurangzeb abolished the road cess (*rahdari*),

¹ *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign* pp. 5ff.

² *Agrarian System of Muslim India* pp. 91-9.

³ Text published by Sarkar in *JASB* N. S. II (1906) pp. 223-55.

⁴ *Mirat-i Ahmad* I p. 263. The order was issued in the 8th R.Y. of Aurangzeb.

⁵ *A'gharnama-i Afanishi* pp. 80-92, 93, 141-5. *Raqaim-i Karaim* ff. 24a, b. *Durr-al Ullam* f. 140b.

the toll levied on grain and vegetables,¹ and the cesses on eatables and drinks. Previously these cesses were collected by the *jagirdars* and the revenue so derived went to the coffers of the *jagirdars* and the *jama* of the *jagirs* included the income from this source. By the abolition of these cesses the imperial exchequer suffered an annual loss of Rs 25 lakhs in the *khalisa* lands.² It seems that in spite of the repeated orders of the Emperor many officers continued to realise at least some of these cesses, if not all. Khafi Khan tells us that this was partly due to the Emperor's reluctance to punish those who were guilty of violating his prohibitions, and partly to the fact that the *diwans* continued to include the income from the forbidden dues in the *jamadani* of the *jagirs*, and so left the *jagirdars* no option but to collect them in order to get the full amount of their pay.³ The leniency of the Emperor is certainly seen from the following incident recorded in the *Mirat*. In A.D. 1668 it was reported to the Emperor that Kamal Jalauri, *faujdar* of Palanpur, used to realise *gau charai* and *khurak-i ashan*. It was ordered that, after an enquiry, he should be asked not to collect them.⁴ The fact that upon the complaint of the *mutasaddis* against Kamal Jalauri, the Emperor merely ordered him to desist from the practice and no punishment was meted out shows that such disobedience of orders was only too common. In A.D. 1659 Aurangzeb had appointed Mulla Iwaz Wajih, the *muhtasib*, to see to it that the cesses which had been abolished were not realised and certain *mansabdars* and *ahadis* were also directed to assist Mulla Iwaz in case of need. Orders for the abolition of cesses etc. were also sent to all provinces of the Empire.⁵ But apparently the *muhtasib* achieved only a limited success in his object.

ADMINISTRATION OF JAGIRS

The *jagirdars* had to employ their own agents to collect the revenue and taxes within their *jagirs*. The arrangements made by the big *jagirdars* were naturally on a more systematic basis than those of the smaller *assignees*. Thus the administrative structure of the *jagirs* of the princes was usually modelled on that of the *khalisa*. The *amils* in the *parganas* of the *jagirs* of the princes were called *karoris* (revenue collectors), a name otherwise reserved for the revenue collectors in the *khalisa*.⁶ They also had an *amin* (revenue assessor), a *fotadar* (treasurer), and a *karkun* (accountant) as independent colleagues.⁷ However, some of these

¹ *Alamgir Nama* I pp 437-38. A number of orders of Aurangzeb spread all over his reign detailing forbidden imposts are set out in *Al-i-Istislah* Vol I pp 259-264-286-288.

² *Al-i-Istislah* I p 249.

³ Khafi Khan II pp 88-89. *Al-i-Istislah* I pp 263-64. *Durr-ul-Ulum* ff 255b-56a.

⁴ *Al-i-Istislah* I p 275.

⁵ *Alamgir Nama* p 39.

⁶ *Selected Documents of Shahjahan's Reign* p 121. *Al-i-Istislah* p 8 and passim.

⁷ *Al-i-Istislah* pp 136-37. *Durr-ul-Ulum* ff 138b-139a.

stopped at nothing in order to fulfil their pledges to the *jagirdar* and to make a profit for themselves. Sadiq Khan, the historian of Shahjahan, declares that this practice had become very common during Shahjahan's reign and that it was one of the causes of the ruin of the peasantry.¹ Morally *yaras* were strongly disapproved of at the Court, and this is proved by the fact that in the case of revenue-farming in Kashmir as mentioned above Aurangzeb took the extreme step of bringing all *jagirs* into the *khalisa* in order to suppress this practice there.² But there is no reason to believe that *yaras* were legally forbidden, for in that case the regular *yara*-documents preserved at Allahabad would not have been drawn up and written.

JAGIRDARS AND ZAMINDARS

The author of *Mirat-al Istilah*, an 18th century manual, defines the term *zamindar* as "literally meaning master of the land (*sahib-i zamun*) but now (actually) the *malik* (proprietor) of the land of a village or township, who (also) carries on cultivation".³ A *zamindar*, therefore, was not a person who merely owned the land he cultivated. Many petty *zamindars* corresponded in economic status to better-off peasants, who leased the land they cultivated. On the other extreme stood the various tributary chiefs and autonomous Rajas, who were also called *zamindars* by the Mughal Chancery.

It is a remarkable fact that general revenue regulations issued in the time of Akbar and Aurangzeb exclude the *zamindars* from the framework of the standard revenue machinery prescribed under them. Aurangzeb's *farman* to Rasikdas, for example, insists on the *assessment* being made directly on the peasants by the officials of the *khalisa* as well as of the *jagirdars*. It mentions the *zamindars* only once and that in connection with illegal exactions.⁴ On the other hand, there is considerable evidence that the *zamindars* paid the revenue on behalf of whole villages. The *Waga-i Ajmer* (1679-80)⁵, and the letters of Ra'ad Andaz Khan (c. 1700), relating to Baiswara and Awadh,⁶ provide us with numerous examples of *zamindars* paying, or being compelled to pay, the land-revenue (*mal*) in areas which, according to the *Ain*'s tables of rates, were under *zabt* or the standard administration.

A possible explanation seems to be that every locality had some land

¹ Sadiq Khan, *Shahjahan Nama*, Or 174, ff 10a b

² *Akhbarat*, op. cit.

³ *Mirat-al Istilah*, f 122 b, Moreland, however identified *zamindar* with the chief. For a criticism of his theory on the basis of the evidence of the *Ain-i Akbari*, see Irfan Habib in *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, Trivandrum Session, (1958) pp 320-322

⁴ *JASB*, No 11, 1906 ed. Sarkar, pp 223-55

⁵ *Waga-i Ajmer*, pp 55, 398

⁶ *Ishta-i Roshan Kalam*, ff 2a, 3a, ff

under *zamindars*, while the rest was held by peasants (*rayati*) and had no *zamindars* as intermediaries. It is interesting to see that this broad classification occurs in the *Siyag Nama*, a manual compiled in the reign of Aurangzeb where the land is divided into two classes *rayati* (peasant-held) and *ta'alluqa*. The term *ta'alluqa* was now slowly becoming a synonym for *zamindari*.¹

If the above hypothesis be accepted, then a *jagirdar* had normally to deal with both peasants and *zamindars* in his *jagir*. It is possible that the tendency was to summarily assess the land in the possession of a *zamindar* and to collect the revenue from him without any reference to the peasants. This is suggested by two pairs of documents from Awadh appertaining to Aurangzeb's reign, in both of which the assessee is the *zamindar* (*malik*) or *ta'alluqdar* of the villages for which he paid the revenue. The assessors are in both cases agents of a *jagirdar*. But while in the first pair of documents the land revenue is shown as varying from year to year, in the other it is fixed at the same amount (*bi l muqta*) for every year.² In the second, then, the *jagirdar's* demand was independent of what the peasants actually harvested.

Summary assessment of land revenue and collection through *zamindars* must generally have considerably simplified the task of the *jagirdars* and their agents. And it might be expected that they would welcome the institution of *zamindars*. Yet, it was precisely from the *zamindars* that they met with the greatest opposition and hostility. A heavy assessment would deprive the *zamindars* of their income and in that case they might use their armed retainers, backed in some cases by the peasants, to defy the *jagirdar*. The *Hidayat al Qawaid* classified the *zamindars* into those who were submissive and revenue paying (*rayati*) and those who were rebellious (*zor talab*). It adds that a *jagirdar* holding a small *mansab* would usually have the greatest difficulty in subduing the rebellious *zamindars*.³ In a semi humorous petition to God, ascribed to *Izad Bahsh Rasa*, the first task of a *jagirdar* reaching his assignment is represented to be the suppression of defiant *zamindars*.⁴

By such acts of defiance a *zamindar* might forfeit his *zamindari* rights. But the letters of Rad Andaz Khan make it clear that a *zamindar* could not be dispossessed or appointed by anyone except the Emperor. An official or *jagirdar* could only send his *tajriz* or recommendation to the Court.⁵ Sometimes a member of the same old family might be appointed to replace a recalcitrant *zamindar*. In Aurangzeb's time, there are also

¹ *Siyag Nama* pp. 35-36. For the synonymy of *zamindar* and *ta'a' uqdar* see the sale-deeds of Calcutta 1703 cited in Moreland *Agrarian System* pp. 191-92. Also see Irfan Habib *The Agrarian System of Mughal India* pp. 159-171 for the terms *ta'alluqa* and *ta'alluqdar*.

² Allahabad Documents 897, 1206, 1220, 1223.

³ *Hidayat-al Qawaid* ff. 65a-b.

⁴ *Bayaz-i Izad Bahsh Rasa*, I O 4014 f. 2a-2b. I owe this reference to Dr Irfan Habib.

⁵ *Jash-i Roshan Kalam* ff. 3b-4a, 7a.

cases where outsiders were appointed, who were often Muslims¹ The chief condition prescribed was that the nominee should have an *ulus* or body of armed retainers² In exceptional cases, a *jagirdar* himself might be appointed *zamindar* of an area under his charge An example of this occurs in a *sanad* of *zamindari* from the court to a *jagirdar* near Mathura The *sanad* reads "Whereas it has been submitted to His Majesty that Nawab Bahadur Hasan Ali Khan, *faujdar* of the *chakla* of Islamabad (Mathura) has recommended the grant of the *zamindari* of 25 villages (specified hereunder) in the *pargana* of Sahar in the province of Akbarabad, which was inhabited by rebels and lay in the *jagir* of Nawab Qasim, son of Daulat, to the said Qasim, and he has petitioned that a *farman* be issued from the Court to order the grant of the *zamindari* of the said villages to the said Qasim, therefore, the imperial order has been issued that we have granted the *zamindari* of the said villages to Qasim, so that he might expel the ill mannered rebels and settle revenue paying peasants there So long as these villages are held in his *jagir*, he can keep the land revenue and other taxes (*mal : wajib wa huquq : duwani*) And when the said villages are assigned in *jagir* to someone else, he will be answerable for the revenue collections (*hasil*) to the *amil* (revenue collector) of that place"³

The order shows that though a *jagirdar* might be made the *zamindar* of an area, this did not make that locality his *watan jagir* The *jagir* remained transferable, while the *zamindari* was a permanent hereditary possession

—It has been suggested that Aurangzeb's reign saw a great increase in the pressure of the administration and of the *jagirdars* upon the *zamindars* as a class⁴ Manucci declared that "usually the viceroys and governors (of the Mughal Empire) are in a constant state of quarrel with the Hindu princes and *zamindars*—with some because they wish to seize their lands, with others to force them to pay more revenue than is customary"⁵ The conflict of the state and the *zamindars* over the payment of land revenue was a constant feature of medieval society That such conflicts were a new phenomenon in the reign of Aurangzeb may be doubted Detailed evidence on this point from the earlier reigns is not forthcoming, but that may be because we generally lack for the early period the type of material, e.g. the *Akhbarat* and the numerous collections of letters and documents etc. that have survived from Aurangzeb's reign But even if the pressure upon *zamindars* as a system had been fully inherited, its continuance under Aurangzeb's reign must have some fresh causes as well

¹ *Ishta-i Rashid Kalam* contains a number of cases of appointment of Muslims (ff 3b-4a 7a) see the numerous instances of appointments of *zamindars* in the *Akhbarat*

² *Ishta-i Rashid Kalam* f 34b

³ *Nigarnama-i Afshari* p 152

⁴ Irfan Habib, *The Agrarian System of Mughal India*, pp 334-38

⁵ Manucci, II pp 431-432

As we will see, there was a scarcity of *jagirs*, and even when *jagirs* were actually obtained the revenue collected was less than the *jama* hence, the 'month-scales' Under such conditions it should not be surprising that the *jagirdars* began to squeeze the *zamindars* harder during the latter part of Aurangzeb's reign Under this squeeze, as Manucci tells us, there was usually "some rebellion of the *rajahs* and *zamindars* going on in the Mogul Kingdom"¹ But further investigation is necessary before we can reach any positive conclusion on this point

IMPERIAL CONTROL OVER THE JAGIRDARS

[We have said earlier that the *jagirdari* system was an essential aspect of Mughal administration It does not mean, however, that the *jagirdar* possessed within his *jagir* an absolute power over its inhabitants On the contrary, his authority was checked by an almost parallel system of administration under the direct control of the king and his ministers

In the field of revenue collection, the king's interests were represented in every *pargana* by two officials known as the *qanungo* and the *chaudhari* (*deshmukh* in the Deccan) The former was usually an accountant, the latter a *zamindar*² Their offices were generally hereditary, but they invariably held their appointment on the basis of a sanad or imperial order. They could also be removed from their posts by the Emperor But their appointment was, as a rule, for life and so while *jagirdars* came and went, they stayed on Every *jagirdar*, or rather the agent of every *jagirdar*, had to rely very heavily on the assistance of these two officials in assessing and collecting the revenue It was the duty of these officials to assist them, but they also had to check the accounts of collections and to see that no irregular exactions were taken from the peasantry³

The faujdars or military commandants appointed by the Emperor had the task of maintaining law and order And in discharging this duty, they could also operate in the *jagirs* Some *jagirdars* did, however, obtain the office of *faujdar* for themselves in their *jagirs* This practice might have been found in the earlier reigns also In Aurangzeb's reign there are certainly numerous instances of the grants of *faujdari* rights to *jagirdars* by the Emperor⁴

[The *jagirdar* had no judicial powers, every *pargana* had a *qazi* appointed

¹ Manucci II p 462

² This point was made first by Charles Elliot after a detailed study of old Mughal records of Unao district (quoted by Moreland in JRAS 1938 pp 516 ff)

³ On the *Qanungo* and his duties see *Nisarnama* : Munshi pp 91, 140 *H dayat al Qawaid* Aligarh Ms f 64a b and documents of Farrukh S yar's reign translated in *Proceedings of Indian Historical Records Commission* XXXI part II 1945 pp 142-47 For *chaudharis* or *deshmukhs* see documents translated by Moreland in JRAS 1938 pp 516 ff *Mrat* : Ahmad I p 216, and *Nisarnama* : Munshi p 80 *Mazhar* : *Shahjahan* p 189

⁴ *Akhbarat* 38th N.Y p 480 and passim *Insha* : *Roshan Kalam* ff. 6b 11b 24b

under an imperial *farman*, who heard and settled criminal as well as revenue cases. He was completely independent of the *jagirdar*, and drew his income from the *madad-i ma'ash* granted by the emperor.¹

Finally, there were the news reporters, known as *waga-i navis* and *sewan-i navis*. They were expected to report on every matter of importance which occurred in their jurisdiction and to send criticisms and complaints without any respect for persons. The conduct of *jagirdars* or their agents was also one of the subjects on which they sent their reports.²

The peasants or inhabitants of a *jagir* could also make complaints direct to the Court,³ and thus the king reserved the right to intervene and rectify any oppressive act that a *jagirdar* may be guilty of.

The Emperor often ordered enquiries into the administration of various *jagirdars*. Aurangzeb was reprimanded by Shahjahan for not administering his *jagir* on the lines indicated by the Emperor, and had to explain his conduct.⁴ It was, perhaps, natural that the *jagirdars* should sometimes obstruct attempts to collect information about their collections and administrative practices.⁵ In 1692 it was reported that the *jagirdars* in Gujarat were preventing *desais* and *mugaddams* from providing information about *hasil* or revenue collections to the officers sent from the Court to collect such information. The Governor of Gujarat thereupon sent *sazavals* or special officials to compel the *jagirdars* to obey orders and allow the imperial officers to collect information freely.⁶

On occasions the Emperor could also order the *jagirdars* to reform their administration. Aurangzeb directed Nasiri Khan to put the administration of his *jagir* on a sound basis and uproot all the seditious elements from there.⁷ On Prince Azam's appointment of Muhammad Baqar as port comptroller, Aurangzeb reprimanded the Prince declaring that a thief should not be appointed 'guardian of the people'.⁸ Aurangzeb criticised Prince Muazzam for leaving the administration of his *jagir* in the hands of the Iranians.⁹

At the same time, the imperial administration also undertook some obligations towards the *jagirdars*, particularly of protecting them in the management of their *jagirs* and securing them in the enjoyment of their revenues. The *wakil* of Muhammad Jan Beg, the *qaladar* of Siri Mast Garh, complained to the emperor that Sher Khan, the *faujdar* of Kadak, had realised the revenue of two years from the *jagir* of his client (Muhammad Jan Beg). The emperor ordered the amount to be refunded.¹⁰

¹ *Siyak Nama* p. 36 Allahabad Documents 782-1203

² *A'gharnama-i Afunsh* pp. 87-88. See also *The English Factoris 1678-84* Vol. III (New Ser.) p. 310

³ *Ruq'at-i Alamgir* ed. Nadvi, p. 119. *Waga-i Ajmer* pp. 2-7, 19. *Ruq'at-i Alamgir* Kanpur, ed. pp. 40-41. *Mazhar-i Shahjahan* p. 174

⁴ *Adab-i Alamgiri*, ff. 18a, 19b-20a, 40a-40b

⁵ *Mir'at-i Ahmad* I pp. 326-27

⁶ *Raq'a-i Kara m* f. 1b.

⁷ *Raq'a-i Kara m* f. 8b

⁸ *Adab-i Alamgiri* f. 168b

⁹ *Alkhabarat* 36th N.Y. p. 8

The deputy of Alif Khan, the *fauzdar* and *qaladar* of Gulbarga, arrested the *amil* of the *jagir* of Sidi Miftah. When this incident was reported to the emperor, he ordered that *guzrbardars* (mace-bearers) be appointed to get the *amil* released and the amount refunded.¹ Saf Shikan Khan, the *jagirdar* of *pargana* Kahni, complained that Bahadur Khan, the *fauzdar* of the aforesaid *pargana*, had oppressed the ryots of the locality and that the ryots had fled. Saf Shikan Khan also requested that he be appointed the *fauzdar* of the aforesaid *pargana*. The emperor ordered Inayat Khan, the *harris* (commandant) of Aurangabad, that he should see to it that the peasants were not oppressed by anyone.² It was reported to the emperor by Muhammad Munim that Muhammad Husain Kambo had realised the revenue from the *jagir* of the complainant (Muhammad Munim). The Emperor ordered Aqil Khan to send the culprit to the Court.³ The *wakil* of Jamshed Khan complained that Izzat Beg, son of Jahangir Quli Khan, had plundered the *jagir* of his client and had appropriated the goods. The complainant also prayed that *guzrbardars* be appointed. The Emperor ordered Bahramand Khan to direct Jahangir Quli Khan to ask his son to refund the whole amount and warned him that in future such incidents must not be repeated.⁴

The evidence that we have presented above shows that so far as the reign of Aurangzeb is concerned, the *jagirdars* had not yet begun to display any open tendency towards autonomy or independence. On the contrary, in many essential respects, they were not only checked and controlled by the imperial government, but were also quite dependent on it for carrying on the management of their *jagirs*.

JAGIRDARS AND THE PEASANTS

The French traveller, Bernier, has presented us with a closely argued analysis of the causes of the failure of the Mughal Empire, which he prophesied in the early years of Aurangzeb's reign, when outwardly the empire had reached the height of its power. The basic argument of Bernier was that the system of the transfer of *jagirs* led inevitably to oppression and the devastation of the country. "The Timariots (Bernier's term for *jagirdars*), Governors and Revenue contractors," he says, "on their part, reason in this manner. Why should the neglected state of this land create uneasiness in our minds? And why should we expend our money and time to render it fruitful? We may be deprived of it in a single moment, and our exertions would benefit neither ourselves nor our children. Let us draw from the soil all the money we can, though the peasant should starve or abscond and we should leave it, when commanded to quit, a dreary wilderness."⁵

¹ Akbharat 38th R. v p 520

² Akbharat 38th R. v p 480

³ Akbharat, 36th R. v p 18

⁴ Akbharat 38th R. v pp 480-82

⁵ Bernier p. 227. He was, rather unjustifiably trying to equate the *jagirdars* with the French

It would appear that Bernier was excessively influenced by the idea of the sanctity of private property—the transfer of *jagirs* seemed to him a violation of this right and thus provoked his strongest condemnation. However, this is not a sufficient reason for dismissing his statements. Indeed he is supported by an Indian observer, writing in or about 1700, who had no similar preconceptions. "The agents of the *jagirdar*", says Bhim Sen, "having apprehensions concerning the niggardly behaviour of the clerks of the Court, who on every excuse effect a transfer, do not have any hope of the confirmation of the *jagir* for the following year and, therefore, give up the habit of protecting the peasants with firmness. The *jagirdar*, who sends a revenue collector, first owing to his own difficult circumstances, takes something from him in advance (*qabz*) and the latter, on reaching the *jagir*, keeps thinking that, perhaps, another collector is coming behind him, who has paid a larger *qabz*, and so proceeding tyrannically, is unrelenting in his exactions (*tahsil*). Some peasants are not remiss in paying the authorised revenues, but are made desperate by the evil of this excruciating spoliation."¹

While there is substance in these remarks of Bernier and Bhim Sen, it should also be borne in mind that a *jagirdar*, who had no permanent interest in his *jagir*, had, as an individual, a great temptation to kill the goose that laid golden eggs for the whole of his class. There is, therefore, no doubt that among the *jagirdars* there existed a natural tendency towards the oppression of the peasantry created by the very basis on which the system was founded—namely, *jagir* transfers.

Before we accept this generalisation, it is pertinent to raise two questions. First, whether the *jagirdars* were able to put their wishes into effect without any check from the Emperor and the administration? Secondly, whether the Emperor himself, even if he had the inclination, was in practice able to devise suitable measures to check oppression by the *jagirdars*?

The last section has been wholly devoted to answering the first question. We have, perhaps, evidence enough to show that the imperial control was not nominal, but real during the larger period of Aurangzeb's reign. We may, therefore, pass on to the second question.

Now, just as it is logical to expect that an individual *jagirdar* would be irresistably driven to denude the land of everything worth taking, the Emperor would be inclined to take more farsighted view. He was concerned not only with immediate and personal acquisitions of his officers but also with the long term prosperity of the Empire. If the

aristocracy of his day forgetful of the fact that while the French aristocracy enjoyed its feudal privileges the government of France was coming into the hands of middle class men.

For the oppression of the peasantry in Bengal see *Fathya Ibriya*, ff 117b-119a 125a 126a 127a b 131a b see also *The Travels of Peter Mundy 1608-1667* Vol II p 73

¹ *D Ikusha* ff 138b-139a

peasants were starved to death in large numbers, and if cultivation fell off, the revenue resources of the Empire would decline and its foundations would be shaken. That Aurangzeb, for one, realised this, is clear from two *farmans* he issued in his 8th and 13th regnal years. In the first, issued to Rasikdas *karori*, it is specially laid down that its provisions were to be applied in the *jagirs* and the *khalisa* alike. Its main object was to reform and regulate the assessment and collection of land-revenue from the peasants, and to prevent the oppression of the peasants or imposition of excessive burdens upon them. The second *farman*, issued to Muhammad Hashim, takes great care to protect the rights of the peasants to their land; even if the peasants abandoned the land, their right to it was to be respected.¹ We have already quoted the order issued by Aurangzeb, specifically condemning the action of the *jagirdars* in Gujarat, who attempted to extort from the peasants through fraudulent means a far larger amount than they were entitled to.² It is extremely difficult to judge how far the *jagirdars* were able to evade the imperial regulations, and oppress the population placed in their charge. Moreland's view that the revenue demand increased very sharply in the 17th century and that the increase in the *jamadami* figures is due to increased oppression has been questioned on the ground that Moreland erroneously assumes that prices remained constant during this period; indeed, prices appear to have doubled. In other words, the *jamadami* really shows only a nominal, not a real, increase,³ apart from the fact that the *jamadami* might vary considerably from the *hasil*, the actual revenue paid. On the other hand, the fact that *jamadami* figures did not increase in real terms does not necessarily prove that there was no growth in oppression. The total revenue might have remained constant simply because the fall in revenue through decline in cultivation was made up by a heavier revenue demand on the cultivated land.

It is beyond the scope of the present work to attempt a detailed investigation of these questions. From the general remarks quoted above, it would appear that the condition of the peasantry had deteriorated towards the end of Aurangzeb's reign, particularly in such areas as the Deccan. In his last years Aurangzeb was involved in a war in the Deccan which demanded all his resources, energy and attention. The old control over the *jagirdars* must have considerably slackened. It is in this context that we must examine the statements of Manucci and others to the effect that Aurangzeb gave up any serious attempt to check

¹ The texts of these two *farmans* have been published by Sarkar in *JASB*, N S II, 1906, pp 223-255. I have collated the text of the *farman* to Muhammad Hashim with the text in *Durr-ul Uloom*, ff 139b-149b, and *Misrat-i Ahmadi*, I, pp 268-72.

² *Misrat-i Ahmadi*, Vol I, p 263, order issued in the 8th a y

³ Cf. Irfan Habib, *The Agrarian System of Mughal India*, pp 326-28.

his officers, and that on the complaints of most heinous acts of oppression, he only issued the mildest of reprimands.¹

But whether this oppression of the peasantry was basically a result of the wars of Aurangzeb, which led to the slackening of imperial control, or whether it was itself the cause of the rebellions, since it drove into the arms of the rebels, the starving peasants who had no other hope left, must be left an open question. The latter alternative has been recently advanced as a theory for explaining the fall of the Mughal Empire.² While many cogent arguments have been advanced in support of this view, it should not be allowed to become a premature dogma. Our evidence at present is too limited to allow us to come to any conclusion with assurance. And until the available evidence regarding conditions prevailing in various regions has been carefully analysed, all suggestions on the subject must be treated as strictly tentative.

CRISIS IN THE JAGIRDARI SYSTEM

The *Jagirdari* system in its standard Mughal form had worked with tolerable efficiency down to the middle of Aurangzeb's reign. But during the last twenty-six years of Aurangzeb's reign, owing to the increasing strain of the Deccan wars on the financial resources of the Empire and the dislocation of the administration owing to the absence of the emperor and the Court from Northern India, the complicated machinery under which *jagirs* were assigned began to lose its efficiency. Aurangzeb's last years, it is true, only saw the first stage of the disorganisation; but it was the beginning of the end.

In this first stage, the crisis which shook the *jagir* system appeared in the garb of what a contemporary writer called, *be-jagiri*. "A world became *jagirless*", says Mamuri, "and there was no *paibaqi* left. The Emperor repeatedly wrote on the register of salary-claimants: 'There is only one pomegranate to serve a hundred sick men.' At the time of despatching armies and assignments of (military) duties to high officers deserving favour, it became necessary that in view of the scarcity of *paibaqi*, the *jagirs* of some of the nobles be resumed and given to others, on the basis of the registers. The Emperor called for the revenue-register of the *parganas* and cancelled the assignments of a very large number of men; and this became a further cause for the ruin and lamentation of the helpless and penniless ones."³ This was the direct result, according to the author, of the influx of the large number of Deccani nobles, whom Aurangzeb granted *mansabs* on an increasingly generous scale, in order to entice them from the side of his enemies or to prevent them from becoming rebels.⁴

¹ Manucci, II, p. 382; *Dilkusha*, f. 159a; Khafi Khan, II, p. 550.

² By Irfan Habib, *The Agrarian System of Mughal India*, pp. 317-51.

³ Mamuri, f. 157a.

⁴ Mamuri, ff. 156b-157a; Khafi Khan, II, p. 396.

The statement that there was no *paibaqi* left—i.e. there were no areas left for assignment in *jagirs*—is one which often occurs in our authorities with reference to Aurangzeb's last years; it is frequently put into the mouth of the Emperor himself or of one of his officers. Aurangzeb wrote to Azam, stating frankly that "there is shortage of *paibaqi* and surfeit of claimants for pay".¹ He is reputed to have said repeatedly that the available area of *paibaqi* was like one pomegranate required to serve a hundred sick men.² In 1691 he accordingly forbade the *bakhshis* from recommending new men for *mansabs*.³ Inayatullah Khan is said to have remonstrated once with the Emperor, submitting that "the list of officers who are daily paraded before your Majesty is unlimited, while the land for granting *jagirs* is limited. How can an unlimited quantity be equal to a limited quantity?"⁴

The scarcity of *paibaqi* land made the routine working of the *jagirdari* system impossible. People appointed to *mansabs* found it very difficult to get *jagirs*. Many officers failed to get their *jagir* for four or five years.⁵ And a wit said at the Court that a boy *mansabdar*, newly appointed, would have grown a white beard before he could obtain his *jagir*.⁶ Even when a *jagir* was once obtained, there was no certainty that it would not be transferred to some one else without the incumbent getting any other. Thus, several people remained without *jagirs*, though they had been long in service.⁷

Inevitably, influence and money began to count most in all *jagir* allotments. To get a *jagir* one apparently needed a patron (*murabbi*), very hard working and earnest agent (*wakil-i dilsoz*), and the wherewithal for getting things done by payment of enormous bribes (*sakht-i rishwat*).⁸ The small *mansabdars* could not manage all this and were, therefore, in desperate circumstances. This is admitted by Aurangzeb himself.⁹

The situation also provided a breeding ground for factionalism in its most intense form. Mamuri launches a tirade against the Deccani nobles who deprived the old nobility (*khanazads*) of their *jagirs*.¹⁰ This problem became so serious that, according to Bhim Sen, Aurangzeb's

¹ *Dastur-al Amal-i Agahi*, f. 36, *Ra'aim-i Karam*, f. 28b

² *Tak anar sad himar* (Mamuri, f. 157b), Khafi Khan, II, pp. 602-03

³ Khafi Khan, II, pp. 411-12

⁴ Quoted in Sarkar, *Anecdotes of Aurangzeb*, p. 110. The Emperor retorted: "To believe in the scantiness and limit of God's court (of which he, Aurangzeb, was the *meze* representative) is the essence of infidelity and sin." This reply, while it shows the optimum of Aurangzeb, provided no solution to the concrete problem facing his *bakhshis*.

⁵ Mamuri, ff. 179b, 182b, Khafi Khan, II, p. 396.

⁶ Khafi Khan, II, p. 379, Mamuri, f. 179b.

⁷ Mamuri, f. 157a, Khafi Khan, II, p. 396.

⁸ Mamuri, ff. 156b-157a, 182b, Khafi Khan, II, pp. 396-97.

⁹ *Dastur-al Amal-i Agahi*, ff. 64, 65

¹⁰ Mamuri, ff. 156b-157a.

successor, Bahadur Shah, was persuaded to attack the Rajput states in order to distribute their lands in *jagir* to his officers.¹

A struggle for *jagir* inevitably developed among the *mansabdars* of the Mughal Empire. But it must be borne in mind that this struggle had not yet become an armed struggle, it was fought out in the form of factional rivalries, bribing of the officials, etc., at the Court. There are hardly any instances where transfer orders were forcibly resisted by the *jagirdars*. Yet the conditions prevailing in the last years of Aurangzeb were bound to result in a situation where transfer orders would no longer be honoured. The *jagirdar* himself might have no rebellious intentions, but he knew that if he relinquished his *jagir*, another *jagir* would not be assigned to him. When precisely this stage arrived is uncertain. But Anand Ram Mukhlis suggests that during the reign of Farrukh Siyar (1713-19) *jagir* assignments by the Court became mere paper orders, so that a large number of persons who were granted *mansabs*, never got *jagirs*.² Once this happened, all was over not only with the *jagirdari* system, but with the Mughal Empire.

¹ *Dilkusha*, f 169b For a different view see Satish Chandra's *Parties and Politics at the Mughal Court*, pp 29-34

² *Mirat-al Istilah*, f 64b

THE MUGHAL NOBILITY UNDER AURANGZEB

Mansabdars	Dara Shukoh					Aurangzeb					Shah Shuja					Aurang Bakhsh				
	Mansabdars of 5,000 and above	Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4,500	Mansabdars of 1,000 to 2,500	Total	Mansabdars of 5,000 and above	Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4,500	Mansabdars of 1,000 to 2,500	Total	Mansabdars of 5,000 and above	Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4,500	Mansabdars of 1,000 to 2,500	Total	Mansabdars of 5,000 and above	Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4,500	Mansabdars of 1,000 to 2,500	Total	Mansabdars of 5,000 and above	Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4,500	Mansabdars of 1,000 to 2,500	Total
Muslims																				
Iranis	3	4	16	23	4	7	16	27	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
Turans	1	2	13	16	1	3	16	20	1	1	1	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Afghans	—	—	1	1	—	4	19	23	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other Muslims	—	4	19	23	1	4	28	33	—	1	4	5	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	7
Total	4	10	49	63	6	18	79	103	1	3	6	10	—	1	2	6	9	—	—	9
Hindus																				
Rajputs	2	6	14	22	2	2	5	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Marathas	1	1	—	2	—	2	8	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other Hindus	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	3	7	14	24	2	4	15	21	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Grand Total	7	17	63	87	8	22	94	124	1	3	6	10	—	1	2	8	11	—	—	11

It will be seen that out of 124 *mansabdars* of 1,000 *zat* and above who supported Aurangzeb, 20 were Turanis, 27 Iranis, 23 Afghans, 33 other Muslims, 9 Rajputs, 10 Marathas and 2 other Hindus. Out of 87 supporters of Dara Shukoh, holding *mansabs* of 1,000 *zat* and above, 16 were Turanis, 23 Iranis, one Afghan, 23 other Muslims, 22 Rajputs and 2 Marathas. Shah Shuja was supported by ten *mansabdars* of 1,000 and above — 3 Turanis, 1 Irani, 1 Afghan and 5 other Muslims. Eleven *mansabdars* of 1,000 and above are known to have supported Murad Baksh — 1 Irani, 1 Afghan, 7 other Muslims and 2 Rajputs.¹

Thus, the support Aurangzeb received from the nobility was quite broad based. In Chapter I we have shown that there was no question of Aurangzeb raising an outcry against the Hindu nobles at this stage. On the contrary, he made great efforts to win over the Rajput Rajas — Rana Raj Singh, Mirza Raja Jai Singh, and even Jaswant Singh — and succeeded to a very great extent. Similarly, there is not the slightest proof that he attempted to rally the Sunni nobles against the Shias.

Aurangzeb's policy after his accession was the same as during his struggle for the throne. He had come to the throne after killing his eldest brother and then his youngest. He had also imprisoned his own father. More than any other Mughal king, he had to justify his seizure of the throne. A legal opinion by which he used to support his action in deposing his father was that he was more competent than his father.² This had now to be proved in practice by the achievement of conspicuous success and nothing would be more conspicuous than military conquests. So a vigorous military policy was undertaken. In 1660 Shaista Khan opened a great campaign in Maharashtra. In 1661 Palamau in Bihar was annexed and Mir Jumla occupied Kuch Bihar. In 1662-63 came Mir Jumla's famous invasion of Assam. In 1663 the state of Navanagar in Gujarat was annexed. In 1665 Mirza Raja Jai Singh concluded a successful campaign against Shivaji by the treaty of Purandhar. In 1665-66, the Mughals launched a big attack on Bijapur. In 1666 Shaista Khan occupied Chatgaon (Chittagong). Few decades in the 17th century had seen such hectic military activity.

Such an aggressive policy required the fullest co-operation of the nobility. All dissensions had to be avoided. Moreover, Shahjahan was alive till 1666, and it could not be overlooked that any serious change in imperial policy, adversely affecting the interests of a large section of the nobility, might lead to an attempt at Shahjahan's restoration.

¹ These figures are based on the Appendix at the end of the chapter. Also cf. my paper "The Religious Issue in the War of Succession 1658-59", read before Indian History Congress Aligarh Session 1960 *Medieval India Quarterly* Vol V pp 80-87.

² See Aurangzeb's letters to Shahjahan *Adab-i-Alamgiri* ff 289a 93b. *Ruq'at-i-Alamgiri* 211 12 216-18 223-26 also Qazi Wahab's opinion *Mirat-i-Ahmad* I p 248.

AURANGZEB AND THE NOBILITY—SECOND PHASE (1666-1679)

It appears that it was about 1666 that Aurangzeb began to adopt a policy which if not directly opposed to, was at least different in spirit from that of his predecessors. We have seen in Chapter I, that the Emperor began to curtail the recruitment and promotion of Rajputs during this period. Before investigating how this change came about, it is necessary to examine briefly the political situation after 1666.

First, in 1666 after Shahjahan's death, there was no one to substitute Aurangzeb and his fears of any future opposition within the nobility probably vanished.

Second, it was clear that the reckless policy of expansion begun in 1659 had proved a complete failure. Mir Jumla's invasion of Arakan ended in a hopeless retreat, while the annexation of Kuch Bihar had to be abandoned. Shantia Khan's campaign in Maharashtra ended with the plunder of his own camp and Shivaji's sack of Surat in 1664. If Jai Singh was successful against Shivaji, the fruits of his military victory were snatched away to a great extent by Shivaji's flight from Agra in 1666. Lastly, Jai Singh's invasion of Bijapur ended in a miserable failure and he died broken hearted in 1667.

With these successive failures, the emperor's attempt at expansion was brought to a halt at least for the time being and a period of rebellion began. The Jat rebellion under Gokula broke out in the Braj country in the mid-sixties. The Satnamis rebelled in 1672 and their early successes were surprising. In 1667 the Yusufzais revolted near Peshawar, in 1672 the Afridis also rebelled and Aurangzeb had to go to Hissar. Abdal in 1674. In 1670, Shivaji again opened war against the Mughals and sacked Surat for the second time.

A ruler, who had sought to justify the imprisonment of his father and the executions of his brothers by successes in military sphere, found himself a failure despite all his personal exertions. A new *post facto* justification had to be found for his coup of 1658-59. Consistent with the orthodox temperament, which he had been developing, this justification was provided by an emphasis on the Islamic character of the Empire, and a new religious policy was inaugurated to create a religious halo around the imperial crown. The discriminatory policy against the Hindus¹ was coupled with an attempt to associate the Muslim orthodox

¹ In 1665 the duty on goods carried by Hindu merchants was increased to 5 per cent *ad valorem* as against 2½ per cent imposed on Muslims. In 1667 the duty on Muslims was entirely withdrawn though it was reimposed in 1682. The duty on goods carried by English merchants was reduced from 3 per cent to 2 per cent. (Bodl. MS. Fraser 228 ff. 18a, 19b). In 1669 came the order for temple destruction (*Muzammas Alamgiri* p. 81). That this order was widely enforced is shown by a number of documents (*Waqai-i-Ajmer* including *Waqai of Ranthambor Akbarat* etc.). At the same time it is obvious that exceptions were made and grants to Hindu and Jain temples and devnes given by Aurangzeb survive, Jnan Chandra of Bombay in *Pakistan*

oxy as closely as possible with the Empire. In the seventies the Emperor's attempt to appeal to Muslim religious divines for support in respect of every political action went so far as to provoke a protest from some of the nobles.

In a letter written to the Emperor in late '70s Mahabat Khan expressed his surprise at the Emperor's policy that had made "fowlers into captives and sparrows into huntsmen. The experienced and able officers of the state are deprived of all trust and confidence while full reliance is placed on hypocritical mystics (*Mashai Khan - riyā Kosh*) and empty-headed scholars (*ulamayan-i tahi hosh*). Since these men are selling their knowledge and manners for the company of kings, to rely upon them was neither in accordance with the divinely prescribed path, nor suited to the ways of the world. Thus these men are robbers in every way. The country is being laid waste; the army disheartened; the peasantry ravaged; the lowly crying of distress; the higher ones seeking to raise disturbances. (As the saying is,) the finances are given over to the *Qāzi* and the *Qāzi* is satisfied only with bribes."¹ Some times after this letter was written, Aurangzeb went even further and imposed the *jizya* in 1679. This aroused considerable anxiety in the ranks of the nobility, and we are told that "all the high-placed and important men at the court opposed themselves to this measure. They besought the king most humbly to refrain..."²

But it was perhaps not only a desire to resurrect his prestige on a new basis that led Aurangzeb to a new religious and Rajput Policy. So long as the Empire was expanding, the nobility as a whole could satisfy its ambitions by looking forward. Once, however, it became clear, as it did by 1667, that any rapid expansion was not to be expected, while disorder broke out within the empire itself, the urge for promotions among the *mansabdars* could not be easily satisfied. In such a situation it must have been highly tempting for the Emperor to enlarge the avenues of income for the majority of the nobility by progressively shutting out a minority. The Rajputs were, owing to their different religion, a section that could be most easily isolated. Their eclipse would also accord with the Emperor's new posture of militant orthodoxy. The Rajputs,

Historical Society, Oct. 1957, pp. 247-54, July 1958, pp. 208-13, Oct. 1958, pp. 269-72, January 1958, pp. 55-56, January 1959, pp. 36-39, & April, 1959, pp. 99-100. See also grants to Hindus, particularly Brahmans, calendard by K.K. Datta, *Some Firmans, Sanads and Patras* (1578-1802), Patna, 1962, Part II, Nos 36, 45, 51, 58, 60, 64, 113, 117, 130, 154, 219, 220, 221, 262, 263, 278, 279, 280, 300, 308, 325, 326, 330, 364, 374, etc. Note may also be made of the temple of Gopinath with its fine tank built by Naunidha Rai in 1699 at Gopamau in Hardoi District, (A Fuhrer, *Archaeological Survey of India*, p. 279.). In 1679 the *jizya* or poll-tax was imposed on non-Muslims.

¹R.A.S. Pers. Cat. 173, ff. 8a-11a. The letter was written after Asad Khan's appointment as *wazir* in 1676, since it contains a crucial reference to his elevation to this high office.

²Manucci, III, 288.

as we have seen, continued to be confirmed in their ancestral domains or *watan jagirs*, but if the total *mansabs* awarded to them were reduced with the passage of years, their share of imperial *jagirs* outside their homelands, would fall correspondingly. These *jagirs* were the loaves and fishes which Aurangzeb offered to his 'Muslim' nobility in order to rally it more firmly behind his throne. The causes that led to the Rajput rebellion of 1679-80 have been obscured by discrepancies in contemporary accounts and modern controversies. Fortunately, we have now in the *Waga : Ajmer* a series of reports by the news writer of Ajmer covering precisely this period. This sheds valuable light on the events of this conflict and the issues involved in it. On the whole it shows that while there were intrinsic difficulties involved in Jaswant Singh's having died without any male issue, Aurangzeb's policy was not calculated to reconcile the Rajputs, and he obviously made an attempt to use the dispute between Jaswant Singh's officers and Raja Indar Singh, the approved claimant to the throne, to subvert the kingdom of Marwar.¹

When Raja Jaswant Singh died, he left no son. Pending the decision about the successor, Aurangzeb declared that the whole of Marwar, including the capital, Jodhpur, and with the exception of two *parganas* only, was to be brought into the *khalisa*, and royal officers were despatched to take charge of the territory. This aroused the indignation of the Rathor clansmen, who declared that if Jodhpur, the seat of their clan and the place where the mourning for the dead king was taking place, was taken into the *khalisa*, the prestige of the Rathors would be affected. "During the rule of the Imperial Dynasty, no *bumi* or *zamindar* has been turned out of his native place (*watan*) even for specific faults. The Rathors, who have always been loyal and faithful, ask simply that they be not subjected to exile." They were prepared to give over the whole of Marwar, but not the ill-fortified town of Jodhpur.² Aurangzeb refused to withdraw his earlier order, but issued another order that all officers of Jaswant Singh would be left with the *pattas* or assignments corresponding to the *jagirs* granted to them by the late Raja, and they would receive corresponding *mansabs* against these *jagirs*.³ This was an obvious bribe, and might well have meant the end of the Jodhpur state. At any rate, it would have considerably augmented the control of the Emperor over the internal affairs of Marwar. Jaswant Singh's officers, to their credit, refused to be a party to this deal.⁴

In the meantime it became known that two of the Raja's queens were pregnant and ultimately two sons were born, one of whom was Ajit Singh.

¹ For a detailed discussion see my article 'The Causes of the Rathor Rebellion of 1679-80' Proceedings of Indian History Congress, Delhi Sess on 1961 pp 135-41.

² *Waga : Ajmer* pp 80-83.

³ *Ib id* p 114.

⁴ Despite the Governor's persuasions they declared that though they knew they could not resist the imperial army they had decided to die rather than be bought over (*Waga : Ajmer* 116).

This made a change in imperial decision necessary, because it could no longer be assumed that Raja Jaswant Singh had left no successor. The Rathors went to extremes in their attempt to get one of the children recognised as their Raja. Jaswant's chief queen, Rani Hadi, even said that the Rajputs would be prepared to destroy all the temples of Jodhpur and erect mosques instead, if only Jodhpur was conferred upon the Raja's son.¹ They were prepared to give a bigger offering (*peshkash*) than Indar Singh, the rival claimant of the collateral line.² They even appealed to the *shariat* in support of their plea.³ Yet Aurangzeb overruled the claims of Jaswant Singh's children in favour of Indar Singh, who was intensely unpopular in Marwar.⁴

The rebellion of the Rathors and Sisodias was not really a "Rajput Rebellion", if by that is implied that the majority of the Rajputs were involved in it. The Kachwahas, the Haras, the Bhatias, the Rathors of Bikaner, all remained loyal to the Mughals. The *Waqā-i Ajmer* contains report after report of Rajput contingents joining the Mughal army to fight the Rathors.

Yet while most of the Rajputs had not been sufficiently alienated by Aurangzeb's policy so as to rebel against him, the Rajput rebels too were not completely friendless within the rest of the Mughal nobility. The very fact that Prince Akbar should have staked his fortune and placed himself at the head of the rebels shows that he expected some support from the Muslim nobility. Tahawur Khan, his main supporter, enjoyed no mean status. Bahadur Khan Kokaltash, the leading noble of Aurangzeb at the time, had in fact advised Aurangzeb to recognise Ajit Singh.⁵ When Prince Akbar fled to the Deccan, Bahadur Khan Kokaltash, then Viceroy of the Deccan, was widely suspected of having closed his eyes and allowed the Prince to proceed unchallenged to the court of Shambhaji.⁶

On the whole, however, the indifference of the rest of the Rajputs to the fate of the Rathors and the complete fiasco of Akbar's rebellion showed that Aurangzeb had greatly consolidated his position, and however harmful his religious and Rajput policies might have been for the Empire in the long run, for the moment they seemed to have been crowned with success. The Rajputs were cowed, the proud Sisodias compelled to seek terms, and the Muslim nobility apparently rallied unanimously behind the Emperor.

¹ *Waqā-i Ajmer*, pp. 167, 244-46

² *Ibid.*, p. 244

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 245-46

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 241, 270, 277-78

⁵ *Futūḥat-i Alamgiri*, f. 75a b, *Mas'at-i Alamgiri*, p. 168. Bahadur Khan Kokaltash did not try to keep control over the territory of the Rana, when given command of an army sent into Mewar (Mamuri, f. 51a).

⁶ Khafi Khan, II, pp. 276-77, *Dilkusha*, f. 78b.

THE DECCAN PROBLEM AND THE NOBILITY (1658-89)

Since 1590 the Mughal Empire had been almost continuously involved in operations against the Deccan states. Except for an interruption of twenty years after the settlement of 1636, all peace treaties had been in the nature of cease-fire arrangements, which both sides were prepared to break whenever an opportunity presented itself. In all this the Deccan presented a sharp contrast to Northern India, where Mughal conquests had been as quickly consolidated as they were made. There were, of course, geographical reasons—as the hills there made transport difficult and enabled great fortresses to be built—which may be held partly responsible for the slowness of the Mughal progress in the Deccan.

But there were also additional reasons and one of them was the peculiar attitude which the Mughal nobles had towards the questions of the annexation of the Deccan. Explaining why the Mughals had failed to annex Bijapur, Bernier declares that this was because the generals sent against it 'conduct every operation with languor, and avail themselves of any pretext for the prolongation of war which is alike the source of their emolument and dignity. It is become a proverbial saying that the Deccan is the bread and support of the soldiers of Hindustan'.¹ Fryer repeats the same statement calling 'Deccan, the Bread of the military men'.²

Support is lent to these general statements by individual incidents. During the reign of Jahangir, Abdul Rahim Khan-i-Khanan is said to have been taxed by Raja Man Singh Kachwaha for his dilatory way in conducting operations. The Khan-i-Khanan retorted that the result of Man Singh's own success in Bengal was that he had been deprived of his command there, if he (Khan-i-Khanan) also succeeded in the Deccan, he too would have to go.³ Similarly, in the times of Aurangzeb, when Namdar Khan urged Shaista Khan to make a direct attack on Shivaji, the shrewd noble replied that if the Deccan campaign was so quickly concluded an attack on Qandhar would be ordered and if that too succeeded, the contingents would be disbanded.⁴

It was not however, the deliberate design of the Mughal officers that prolonged the war in the Deccan. The problem of supporting the war through the resources of occupied Deccan only was always there. Owing to the ravages of war the Deccan had suffered heavily and its resources were diminishing as is emphasized again and again in the letters written by Aurangzeb himself when he was the Viceroy of the Deccan for the second time. Mughal nobles who were posted in the

¹ Bernier pp 196-97

² Fryer II p 51 See also Manucci III p 271

³ *Dilkusha* f 123a

⁴ *Ibid* f 123a *English Fa to es* 1665 1667 p 152

Deccan, therefore, found it very difficult to maintain their requisite contingents and were, therefore, not militarily superior to their Deccan opponents¹

In such circumstances, it was inevitable that cases of collusion between Mughal commanders and the Deccanis should be frequently reported. Under Jahangir, the Khan-i-Khanan, and later on Khan-i-Jahan Lodi, had been suspected of accepting bribes from Ahmadnagar for the favour of ceding some territory. During the earlier part of Aurangzeb's reign a large number of officers from Prince Shah Alam downwards were believed to have been opposed to a forward policy in the Deccan. In 1663 Aurangzeb charged Shah Alam with culpable negligence in crushing the Marathas, and he was replaced by Jai Singh as Viceroy of the Deccan. In 1667 on the recommendation of Prince Shah Alam and Jaswant Singh, Shivaji was pardoned and his son Shambhaji was given the rank of 5,000/5,000, Shivaji was also permitted to conquer as much of Bijapur territory as his resources permitted, or else, he was to confine himself to his own territory and act according to the advice of the *subedar* of the Deccan². There were differences between Dilir Khan, on the one hand, and Prince Shah Alam and Jaswant Singh on the other, when Shah Alam was *subedar* of the Deccan in 1668 because the prince and the Raja were slack in punishing the Marathas³. In A.H. 1095 (1682-83) it was alleged that Shah Alam, Saiyid Abdullah Khan, Maumin Khan Najm Sani, and Sadiq Khan were in secret alliance with the king of Bijapur. Aurangzeb severely reprimanded the Prince, arrested Saiyid Abdullah and dismissed the others⁴. Later on Aurangzeb again had to reprimand Shah Alam, along with Bahadur Khan Kokaltash, for adopting a mild attitude towards Abul Hasan, the ruler of Golkunda. Shah Alam informed Ibrahim Khan, the commander of the army of Golkunda, that owing to the mild attitude adopted by Shah Alam towards Abul Hasan he had been sharply censured by the Emperor⁵. In 1685 Shah Alam was arrested on the charge of being in secret alliance with Qutb Shah and of being friendly with Shambhaji⁶.

Badhur Khan (or Khan-i-Jahan Bahadur Zafar Jang Kokaltash), who had for a time been the premier noble of Aurangzeb, was repeatedly suspected of being friendly with the Deccan powers. He was appointed Viceroy of the Deccan in 1672. Dilir Khan, a Mughal noble and Abdul

¹ *Adab-i Alamgiri* ff 25b-27a b

² *Dikusha* f 35a-35b

³ *Dikusha* ff 34b-35a. Shah Alam was opposed to the forward policy of Dilir Khan in the Deccan directed against Bijapur (*Futuh-i Alamgiri* f 59a)

⁴ *Mamuri* 168b-169a. Khafi Khan II pp 320-21. *Futuh-i Alamgiri* f 100b. *Maasir-i Alamgiri* pp 293-94

⁵ *Mamuri* f 165a b. Khafi Khan II pp 330-301

⁶ *Mamuri* f 171a b. Khafi Khan II pp 330-34. *Dikusha* 93b-94a. *Futuh-i Alamgiri* ff 113a-115b. *Maasir-i Alamgiri* pp 294-95. *Manucci* II pp 302-4

Karim, the leader of the Afghan nobles at the Bijapur Court, accused him of sympathy with Shivaji.¹ In 1681 when Shambhaji sacked the towns in the suburbs of Burhanpur, it was widely believed that Bahadur Khan had accepted a bribe from Shambhaji and marched in the opposite direction while the Maratha ruler escaped with his booty.² Aurangzeb himself suspected Bahadur Khan of being in the pay of Adil Shah.³ There was negligence on Bahadur Khan's part in occupying certain forts and districts of Haiderabad and Aurangzeb had to send *sazawals* and mace-bearers to expedite the work.⁴ Subsequently, it was widely believed that Bahadur Khan was wholly opposed to Aurangzeb's forward policy in the Deccan and might well have made a secret alliance with the Marathas.⁵ In 1688 when the Jats rebelled near Akbarabad, Bahadur Khan was transferred from the Deccan, ostensibly in order to crush the Jat uprising, but really to rid the Deccan of his presence.⁶

Jaswant Singh, though posted twice to the Deccan, was believed to be at heart an opponent of the expansionist policy. He was suspected of having had a hand in Shivaji's night attack on Shaista Khan's camp in 1663.⁷ And we have seen that Dilir Khan alleged during Jaswant Singh's second posting to the Deccan, that he was always slow in pursuing the Marathas.

Mahabat Khan too seems to have enjoyed the same reputation. His cynicism about the imperial efforts in the Deccan is revealed by an anecdote recorded by Khafi Khan. The Emperor once said to Jafar Khan and Mahabat Khan that it was necessary to crush Shivaji. Mahabat Khan retorted that there was no need for an army being sent against Shivaji, as a judgment (*fatwa*) of the Qazi would suffice.⁸ In 1671 it was reported to the Emperor that Mahabat Khan had a secret alliance with Shivaji and was not exerting himself against the Marathas. He was, therefore, replaced by Bahadur Khan Kokaltash.⁹

Different sections of the nobles had contacts with, or sympathy for,

¹ *Dilkusha*, 69b Shivaji proposed to Bahadur Khan Kokaltash that peace should be concluded between the Marathas and the Mughals. Bahadur Khan sent Ganga Ram Gujrati, his servant, to Shivaji in response to his proposal. But Shivaji sarcastically asked Ganga Ram as to what pressure the Mughals had exercised over him to make him conclude peace with them (*Dilkusha*, f 63a b), *The English factories, 1670-77* Vol 1 (New Series), p 124

² Mamuri, f 153b Khafi Khan, II, pp 274-75

³ *Ruq'at-i Alamgr*, p 127

⁴ Mamuri, f 163a.

⁵ Mamuri, ff 167b-168a, *Dilkusha*, ff 118b-19a, Khafi Khan, II, pp 313-14, Bahadur Khan Kokaltash pleaded the case of the Marathas before Aurangzeb (*Dilkusha*, ff 99b-100a).

⁶ Mamuri, f 173b, Khafi Khan, II, p 316

⁷ *Dilkusha*, f 24a b, Mamuri, f 131a, Khafi Khan, II, p 175 Aurangzeb was dissatisfied with Jaswant Singh's conduct in the Deccan and so had him recalled and replaced by Jai Singh. Jaswant Singh was also reputed to have accepted 9,000 *pagodas* from Bysapur and to have entered into a secret understanding with that state (*Murat-al Alam* ff 190b-91a)

⁸ Khafi Khan, II, pp 216-17

⁹ *Dilkusha*, f 51b

particular Deccan states. Naturally some of the Rajput *mansabdars* sympathised with the Marathas.¹

Daud Khan Qureshi was openly opposed to Jai Singh's campaign against Adil Shah and sought to discourage the Muslim soldiery by saying that it was against the dictates of the Quran.² The Afghan *mansabdars* in the Deccan seem to have developed a soft corner for Bijapur owing to the presence of a number of their compatriots at the Bijapur court. In 1677 when Bahadur Khan Kokaltash made active preparations for invading Bijapur, the Afghan officers of the imperial army advised Abdul Karim, the leader of the Afghan nobles at Bijapur, to offer peace terms to Bahadur Khan, because if the entire Mughal army under Bahadur Khan were to invade Bijapur, it would be very difficult for the Bijapuris to withstand its onslaught. Aurangzeb was influenced by this and other incidents, and not being satisfied with the conduct of the Afghans in the Deccan, appointed Asad Khan Viceroy of the Deccan in 1678.³

In the case of Golkunda the Persian nobles were suspected of sympathising with Qutb Shah on account of their Shi'ite beliefs. It was alleged that the Iranian nobles at the Mughal court were not pressing the siege of Golkunda vigorously.⁴ But opposition to the destruction of Golkunda was not confined to the Iranians alone. Aurangzeb asked his chief Qazi, Shaikhul Islam, for his opinion about the war against Golkunda and Bijapur. The Qazi refused to attribute to it the character of a *jihad*, he was consequently asked to go to Haj.⁵ Qazi Abdullah, who was appointed in place of Shaikhul Islam, remarked one day that it would be better to conclude a treaty with Golkunda as it would avoid the unnecessary bloodshed of Muslims, Aurangzeb got annoyed and Qazi Abdullah was ordered not to come to the Court and to confine himself to his judicial duties.⁶

But not all the nobles shared this hesitation in extending the Empire in the Deccan. One of the leading protagonists of a forward policy in the Deccan was Mirza Raja Jai Singh who was sent to retrieve the situation in the Deccan after the discomfiture of Shaista Khan. Jai Singh first concentrated his fire against Shivaji, driving him to seek terms at Purandhar. His plan then was to take the Marathas into a subordinate partnership and make an attempt with their aid upon the kingdom

¹ Khafi Khan II p. 229.

² *Hafiz Anyuman* f. 190b (cited by Sarkar IV p. 149).

³ *Diksha* ff. 67b-68a. Diler Khan wanted peace with Bijapur because the Afghans were the ruling party in Bijapur (*Diksha* f. 68b).

⁴ Mamuri f. 175b. Bernier p. 211. Nemat Khan Ali through his satirical account of the siege of Golkunda leaves us no doubt where his sympathies lay.

⁵ Mamuri f. 162a.

⁶ Ibid. f. 173a. Peace terms offered by 'Abul Hasan were rejected by Aurangzeb (Mamuri f. 174. *Mafat-i-Alamgiri* pp. 787-83).

of Bijapur. It appears that Aurangzeb was not prepared to commit such large forces to the Deccan as Jai Singh demanded, nor did he approve of the recruitment and promotions of the Deccanis which Jai Singh recommended for sowing dissensions among the Adil Shahis.¹

There were naturally objections to Jai Singh's plan from many, who did not believe in an aggressive policy. It is true that the Mughals had started giving *mansabs* to the Marathas since the time of Jahangir. But to ask for co-operation from Shivaji, who maintained for all practical purposes a separate centre for his political power, was another matter. Jai Singh's predecessor in the Deccan, Shaista Khan, had been so hostile to the Marathas that he never employed them either as cavalymen or foot troopers.² The test came when Shivaji appeared at Agra for the grant of a suitable *mansab*. A number of nobles led by Jaswant Singh (who dismissed Shivaji as a 'petty bumia'), Jafar Khan and R'ad Andaz Khan were opposed to any concessions to Shivaji, while Jai Singh's policy was backed up by Amin Khan, Saiyid Murtaza Khan and Aqil Khan.³ The Emperor seems to have remained undecided, with the unfortunate result that Shivaji was neither crushed nor conciliated.

Ultimately, neither the policy of Jai Singh nor that of his critics prevailed. Whether by design or by force of circumstances, Aurangzeb waged a simultaneous struggle against all the three Deccan Powers—the Marathas, Bijapur and Golkunda. This was a forward policy with almost no qualifications. But it required a tremendous military effort, which exhausted the Mughal Empire, and once it had been undertaken, neither the Deccan nor the Mughal Empire could have been the same again.

THE DECCAN PROBLEM AND THE NOBILITY (1689-1707)

From 1682 to his death in 1707, for over 25 years Aurangzeb remained in the Deccan. During the first phase of this period he seemed to have succeeded in smashing all the three centres of political power in the Deccan. Bijapur fell in 1686, Golkunda in 1687 and in 1689, Shambhaji, the Maratha ruler, was captured and executed. It soon became clear, however, that the Marathas would continue the struggle despite their lack of an effective centre. While Mughal armies marched into the Carnatik in pursuit of Rajaram, the Maratha chiefs organised raids all over the Deccan from their innumerable hill fortresses. Aurangzeb

¹ For a definite account of Jai Singh's plan see Sarkar IV, 120-21, which is based largely on *Haft Anyuman*. See also *Atang Nama* p. 913, *Dikhuha* f. 28b, Khafi Khan II, p. 184. For Aurangzeb's disapproval of the recruitment of the Deccanis see *Dikhuha* f. 31b. On 29 h. Z. qada 8th R.Y. Aurangzeb told Jai Singh that the Deccanis could not be trusted for their word and deed (*Jai Singh Documents* No. 98, p. 184). *Atang Nama*: Munshi p. 121.

² Mamur f. 130a.

³ Sarkar *House of Shahjahan* pp. 158-60.

needed reminders to act according to his orders is preserved in the *Akhbarat*¹ Bhimsen says that Mughal officers often found private deals with the Marathas more profitable than resisting them² Manucci also makes the same statement and cites the example of Daud Khan Panni, who had a secret agreement with the Marathas³ The Deccani nobles, indeed, were most unstable in their loyalties In 1689 the Haiderabadis nobles, who had recently been taken into Mughal service, caused great damage to the imperial cause by breaking into an open rebellion⁴ In 1691 when Zulfiqar Khan was besieging Jinji, the Deccani nobles accompanying him deserted to Rajaram⁵ Writing under A.D. 1700 Bhimsen says that large numbers of the *mansabdars* of the country (Deccan) were deserting to the Marathas⁶

In such a situation suspicions and intrigues at the Court and mutual jealousies among the nobles naturally found free play Aurangzeb himself told Muhammad Murad Khan that he was aware of the exceptional courage in battle shown by him, but some of the nobles did not wish it to be brought to the notice of the Emperor⁷ Tarbiyat Khan was jealous of Muhammad Murad Khan, while a number of leading nobles were jealous of Fathullah Khan⁸ Aurangzeb could not give due promotion to Muqarrab Khan, the captor of Shambhaji, owing to the jealousy of other nobles⁹ There was keen rivalry between Saiyid Lashkar Khan, son of Saiyid Khan, Jahan Barha, on the one hand and Zulfiqar Khan Nusrat Jang on the other¹⁰

In 1686 when Aurangzeb was besieging Golkunda, some nobles out of jealousy alleged that Saf Shikan Khan son of Qiawamuddin Khan was not pressing the siege vigorously, Aurangzeb thereupon dismissed him and confiscated his property But when it was established that the allegations were false, Aurangzeb restored Saf Shikan Khan to his former post and *mansab*¹¹ In 1699 when Iradat Khan was transferred to the contingent of Tarbiyat Khan he petitioned to the Emperor that he was prepared to undertake any assignment given by the Emperor but was not prepared to work with Tarbiyat Khan¹²

¹ *Akhbarat* 28 Shaban 43 R.Y. For the indolence dilatory tactics and cowardice of the Mughal nobles in the Deccan see Wagon *Niamat Khan Ali* p. 142

² *Diksha* f. 140a b

³ Manucci IV pp. 98-228-9

⁴ Sarkar V p. 68

⁵ *Diksha* f. 99b

⁶ *Ibid.* f. 140a An interesting study of one of such deserters Rahim Dad Khan has been made by Prof. S. R. Phadke Proceedings of Indian History Congress Allahgarh Session 1960 pp. 259-60

⁷ Mamuri f. 145a b There was rivalry between Muhammad Murad and Shujaat Khan (*Ibid.*, ff. 197b-198b)

⁸ Khafi Khan II pp. 488-89

⁹ *Ibid.* pp. 391-92 Mamuri f. 181a

¹⁰ *Mamuri* f. 181a

¹¹ Khafi Khan II p. 359 Mamuri f. 175b

¹² *Akhbarat* 14 Shawwal 43rd R.Y.

Such instances of rivalry and jealousy among the nobles during the Deccan Wars could be multiplied,¹ but those given above should suffice to reveal their nature.

In this atmosphere the formation of cliques and factions pulling in different directions was inevitable. Since there was a growing doubt about the success of the Mughal cause as a whole, the nobles naturally started looking to their own personal interests. "Nothing", observed Manucci in 1700, "can be more surprising than the way things go in the Mughal Empire. The king, the princes, the governors and the generals have each their own lines of policy, calculated for securing success to their designs."²

Two important groups among the greatest nobles arose, which typified the new factionalism. They may be loosely designated as Irani and Turani. Between the nobles of these two races there had been an ancient rivalry, as we have seen in Chapter I. In Aurangz-b's last years the leading Irani nobles were Asad Khan and his son, Zulfiqar Khan, and the leading Turani nobles, Ghaziuddin Khan Feroz Jang and his son, Chin Qilich Khan.

The character of the two groups, and the careers of the leading figures of each, have been carefully analysed by Dr. Satish Chandra in his *Parties and Politics at the Mughal Court, 1707-40*. As pointed out by him, the first group was "essentially a family-cum personal group and was held together by family loyalties, and the personal relations of its adherents with Zulfiqar Khan."³ Besides Asad Khan and Zulfiqar Khan, Daud Khan Panni, Dalpat Rao Bundela and Ram Singh Hara could be considered members of this group. Their combined *mansabs* at Aurangzeb's death amounted to 25,000 *zat* and 23,500 *sawars*.

Asad Khan	7,000/7,000
Zulfiqar Khan	6,000/6,000
Daud Khan Panni	6,000/6,000
Dalpat Bundela	3,000/3,000
Ram Singh Hara	3,000/1,500

25,000/23,500

Ghaziuddin Khan Feroz Jang's group was a "racial-cum family group" in as much as all its important adherents were Turanis.⁴ The combined *mansabs* came to 20,000 *zat*/15,600 *sawars*.

¹ Rivalry between Saf Shikan Khan and Feroz Jang (*Muslims in India*, p. 290). Jealousy between Ali Mardan Khan and Zulfiqar Khan (Manucci, III p. 273). Khudaband Khan refused to cooperate with Zulfiqar in 1702 in crushing the Marathas because he was jealous of Zulfiqar (*Diwan-i-Hisari*, I, 137a). For the jealousy between the *Kharas* on the one hand, and the Deccani nobles who were new entrants in the Mughal service on the other see Manucci I, 181a. Khafi Khan, II pp. 591-92.

² Manucci II p. 270.

³ *Parties and Politics*, p. 6.

⁴ *Parties and Politics*, p. 9.

Ghaziuddin Khan Firoz Jang	7,000/7,000
Chin Qilich Khan	5,000/5,000
Muhammad Amin Khan	4,000/1,500
Hamid Khan	2,500/1,500
Rahimuddin Khan	1,500/600

20,000/15,600

An important element common to both groups in the time of Aurangzeb was their deep involvement in the Deccan. Both Zulfiqar Khan and Ghaziuddin Khan had a long record of military service in the Deccan and were certainly his leading generals. Their interest in the Deccan was revealed by their extreme reluctance to accompany Prince Azam to the North after Aurangzeb's death.¹

But it appears that within the Deccan the two groups were protagonists of different policies. Asad Khan and Zulfiqar Khan believed—or gradually came to believe—in the necessity of placating the Marathas and saving Mughal authority in the Deccan through a settlement with them. In 1698 Zulfiqar Khan captured Junji, but Rajaram escaped—or was allowed to escape.² Only a year earlier Zulfiqar had forwarded a proposal from Rajaram for a settlement to Aurangzeb, but Aurangzeb was not prepared to entertain it.³ In 1705 when Aurangzeb was hard pressed at Wakinkera, Zulfiqar was summoned along with his officers. The arrival of Zulfiqar Khan changed the situation and the fort fell after a short time. Aurangzeb, however, suspected that it was due to Zulfiqar Khan and Rao Dalpat's intrigues that the Maratha forces escaped unhurt.⁴ Later on when Aurangzeb wanted to sow dissension among the Marathas, he handed over Shahu to Zulfiqar Khan to enable him to negotiate with the Maratha *sardars*.⁵ Shahu was also given the rank of 7,000/7,000 and the title of Raja.⁶ Zulfiqar Khan wrote conciliatory letters to the Maratha *sardars* and asked them to join Shahu, but there was no positive response on their part.⁷ Zulfiqar Khan's attempt at placating the Marathas was also noted by a French observer, Francois Martin, who thought that he was seeking to strengthen himself by this alliance.⁸

Daud Khan Panni, a bosom friend of Zulfiqar Khan, had a secret agreement with the Marathas and did not try to crush them when he was governor of Carnatik in 1705.⁹

¹ *Dilkusha* ff 162a-172b. *Azam al Ha b* pp 188-92. Khafi Khan II, p 572.

² This aroused Aurangzeb's displeasure (*Mafarri Alamgar* pp 391-2).

³ *Dilkusha* f 122a b. ⁴ *Ibid*, f 153a.

⁵ *Dilkusha* ff 154-55b. *Mafarri Alamgar* p 511. Manucci III pp 498-99.

⁶ *Ragunni* : Karam f 23b. *Dilkusha* f 98a. ⁷ *Dilkusha* ff 154b-55b.

⁸ Quoted by Sarkar *History of Aurangzeb* V p 101.

⁹ Manucci, IV, pp 98, 228-29, *Murat Ahmad*, I p 403.

Rank		Racial Group		Sources
	5,000/2,500	Rajput		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 65, Haum Khan, 21a, <i>Amal-i-Salih</i> , III, 451, M U, II, 297-301, Aqil Khan, 39
Raja Rai Singh Sisodia				
	5,000/5,000	Maratha		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 66, 71, 96, Mamuri, 97b, Haum Khan, 21a, 29b, <i>Amal-i-Salih</i> , III, 451, Aqil Khan, 39
7 Maluji				
			Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4,500	
	4,000/4 000	Rajput		<i>Dilkusha</i> , 16a, <i>Tulifa-i-Shah Jahani</i> , 29b, <i>Aurang Nama</i> , 20, <i>Amal-i-Salih</i> , III, 452, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 95, M U, II, 260-63, Isar Das, 26a Aqil Khan, 60
8. Rao Satar Sal Hara				
	4,000/3,000	Irani		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 95, Manucci, I, 271, Haum Khan, 29a, M U, I, 295-301
9 Ibrahim Khan				
	4,000/3 000	Other Muslim		<i>Dilkusha</i> , 19a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 85, 95, 143, 182, 188, 230, Mamuri, 102a, Isar Das, 23a, M U, II, 32-37, Aqil Khan, 60
10 Daud Khan Qureshi				
	4,000/3,000	Other Muslim		<i>Amal-i-Salih</i> , III, 277, Isar Das, 9b, Mamuri, 102b, M U, I, 444-47, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 125, 170
11 Baqi Beg Bahadur Khan				
	4,000/3,000	Rajput		<i>Amal-i-Salih</i> , III, 300, 453, Haum Khan, 29a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 95, 102, M U, II, 268-70, Aqil Khan, 60
12 Raja Roop Singh Rathor				
	3,000/3,000(2 3b)	Turani		<i>Amal-i-Salih</i> , III, 453, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 65, <i>Aurang Nama</i> , 8, 13, M U, I, 200-203, Haum Khan, 10a, 17a, 21a
13 Khawaja Abdul Baqa, Iftikhar Khan				
	3,000/3,000	Other Muslim		Isar Das 36a, <i>Amal-i-Salih</i> , III, 454
14 Syed Ibrahim Murtaza Khan				

SUPPORTERS OF DARA SHUKOH IN THE WAR OF SUCCESSION 1658-59

Manabidars of 5 000 and above

S. No.	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Source
1	Maharaja Jawant Singh	6 000/5,000 (5 000 X 2 3h)	Rajput	<i>Tuhsa i-Shah Jahan</i> , 29b, <i>Dikkuia</i> , 14a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 32, 41, 49, 56-59, <i>Aurang Nama</i> , 13, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 284, 449, <i>Hatim Khan</i> , 10a, M U, III, 599-604
2	Rustam Khan Feroz Jang Deccani	6,000/5,000 (5,000 X 2-3h)	Circassian (Turani)	M U, II, 270-76, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 298, 449, <i>Mamuri</i> , 98b, <i>Isar Das</i> , 26a, <i>Aurang Nama</i> , 20, 25, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 96, 99, <i>Dikkuia</i> , 16a, <i>Tuhsa i-Shah Jahan</i> , 29b, <i>Aqil Khan</i> , 62
3	Shah Nawaz Khan Safvi	6 000/6 000 (5,000 X 2 3h)	Irani	<i>Hatim Khan</i> , 69a, 72a, M U, II, 670-76, <i>Mamuri</i> , 107a, 108a, <i>Isar Das</i> , 43a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 296, 313, 322, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 331, <i>Aqil Khan</i> , 110, III, 118
4	Qaum Khan	5 000/5 000(2 3h)	Irani	<i>Isar Das</i> , 20b, 23a, <i>Hatim Khan</i> , 10a, 17a, 18a b 21a, 29a, <i>Aurang Nama</i> , 7, <i>Tuhsa i-Shah Jahan</i> , 29b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 33, 41, 65, 72, 96, <i>Mamuri</i> , 97a b, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 285-87, 450, M U, III, 95-97, <i>Aqil Khan</i> , 39, 42.
5	Khadilullah Khan (Controversial figure)	5 000/5,000	Irani	<i>Aurang Nama</i> , 20, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 451, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 85, 99, <i>Hatim Khan</i> , 26a, 29a, M U, I, 775-82, <i>Aqil Khan</i> , 59

In contrast with the attempt at a negotiated settlement with the Marathas repeatedly made by Zulfiqar Khan, Ghaziuddin Khan Firoz Jang adopted a firm and uncompromising attitude towards them. Yet he was reputed to be harbouring ambitions, which were not entirely in conformity with the spirit of loyalty. Isar Das relates an incident which shows that Ghaziuddin Khan was thinking of becoming independent after Aurangzeb, and he might have hoped to carve out a kingdom in the Deccan for himself on the basis of his military successes. It was believed that Aurangzeb had begun to suspect him, and Isar Das goes so far as to allege that Ghaziuddin Khan's blindness had been brought about by a physician sent by Aurangzeb.¹

The jealousies, rivalries and factionalism within the nobility, which these two groups reveal, give an indication of the serious political crisis that the Mughal Empire would have to face in the future. Aurangzeb's policy might have succeeded—though even this is doubtful—if the majority of his officers had brought loyalty and a singleness of aim and purpose to their task. But their factionalism, while it deprived Aurangzeb precisely of this support, also reflected in a great measure a grievous lack of confidence in the Emperor and the Imperial policy on the part of the great nobles. It is significant that the group led by Ghaziuddin Khan, while it ostensibly supported the Deccan policy of Aurangzeb, also, visualised its eventual failure, and thus led to the creation of an independent principality in the Deccan under his son.

SUPPORTERS OF DARA SHUKOH IN THE WAR OF SUCCESSION
1658-59

Members of 5,000 and above.

S. No.	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Source
1	Maharaja Jaswant Singh	6,000/6,000 (5,000 × 2-3h)	Rajput	Talyan-i-Salt Jahan, 25b, Dillala, 14a; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 32, 41, 49, 56, 59, <i>Aurang Nama</i> , 13; <i>Amal-i-Salt</i> , III, 224, 449, Hatim Khan, 10a, M. U., III, 599-604
2	Rustam Khan Feroz Jang Deccani	6,000/6,000 (5,000 × 2-3h)	Circassian (Turani)	M. U., II, 270-76, <i>Amal-i-Salt</i> , III, 208, 449, Mamuri, 98b; Iyar Das, 26a, <i>Aurang Nama</i> , 20, 25, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 96, 99, Dillala, 16a; Talyan-i-Salt Jahan, 20b, Aqil Khan, 62.
3	Shah Nawaz Khan Safvi	6,000/6,000 (5,000 × 2-3h)	Irani	<i>Hatim Khan</i> , 60a, 72a, M. U., II, 670-76, Mamuri, 107a, 108a; Iyar Das, 43a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 206, 313, 372, <i>Amal-i-Salt</i> , III, 331; Aqil Khan, 110, 111, 118.
4	Qasim Khan	5,000/5,000 (2 3h)	Irani	Iyar Das, 20b, 23a, Hatim Khan, 10a, 17a, 18a b 21a, 29a; <i>Aurang Nama</i> , 7, Talyan-i-Salt Jahan, 20b; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 33, 41, 65, 72, 96, Mamuri, 97a-b; <i>Amal-i-Salt</i> , III, 285-87, 450, M. U., III, 95-97; Aqil Khan, 39, 42.
5	Khalilullah Khan (Controversial figure)	5,000/5,000	Irani	<i>Aurang Nama</i> , 20, <i>Amal-i-Salt</i> , III, 451; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 85, 99, Hatim Khan, 26a, 29a; M. U., I, 775-82; Aqil Khan, 59

Manabdar of 1,000 to 2,500

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group		Sources
25	Syed Sher Khan Barha	2,500/1,200	Other Muslim		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 65, 95, Hatim Khan, 21a, 29a, MU, II, 667 68
26	Girdhar Das Gaur	2,000/2,000	Rajput		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 95, Hatim Khan, 29a, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 458
27.	Muhammad Salih Tarikhan	2,000/2,000	Turani		Isar Das, 26a, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 458
28	Raja Sujan Singh Bundela	2,000/2 000 (500 X 2 3h)	Rajput		Mamuri, 97b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 65, 70, <i>Aurang Nama</i> , 8, Hatim Khan, 21a, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 457
29	Iradat Khan	2,000/2,000	Irani		Isar Das, 36a, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 458, MU, I, 203 206.
30.	Syed Salabat Khan Barha	2,000/1,500	Other Muslim		Hatim Khan, 47a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 170 198, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 459
31	Qabad Khan	2 500/1,500	Turani		<i>Aurang Nama</i> , 20, Hatim Khan, 26a, 29a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 85, 95, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 456, Aql Khan, 60
32	Abdullah Khan Saecd Khan	2,000/1,500	Turani		Isar Das, 36a, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 458, MU, II, 807
33	Shro Ram Gaur	2 000/1,500	Rajput		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 57, 95, 102, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 300, 458, Mamuri, 99a, Hatim Khan, 29a
34	Ratan Rathor	2,000/2,000	Rajput		Mamuri, 97a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 65, 70, Hatim Khan, 21a, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 458

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Ethnic Group	Sources
47	Mir Rustam Khawafi	1,500/500	Iran	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 232, 274, 399
48	Rahmat Khan	1,500/400	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 297, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 463
49	Syed Masud Barla	1,500/300	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 207, 268
50	Syed Feroz Rustam Khan	1,500/200	Other Muslim	Isar Das, 9b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 161, 213
51	Syed Salar Barha	1,000/1,000	Other Muslim	Hatim Khan, 21a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 65, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 464
52	Ghazanfar Khan	1 000/900	Iran	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 95, Hatim Khan, 29a, M U, II, 866-67, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> III, 465
53	Imam Quli	1,000/800	Iran	<i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 465, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 85
54	Muhammad Salih Wazir Khan	1,000/800	Iran	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 104, Hatim Khan, 31b, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 465
55	Maha Singh Bhadoniyā	1,000/800	Rajput	Hatim Khan, 29b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 96, 240, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 465
56	Shahk Muazzam	1,000/800	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 96, 106, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 465
57	Asfandiyar Beg	1,000/1 000	Iran	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 106, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 464
58	Kerat Singh	1 000/900	Rajput	Hatim Khan, 29b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 96, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 465
59	Maghol Khan Khawafi	1 000/700	Iran	<i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 465, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 314

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Patel Group	See p.
35	Ayaz Gaur	2,000/1,500	Rajput	Mamuri, 99b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63, 70, <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 297, 300, 478, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 14, <i>Haum Khan</i> , 21a.
36	Amar Singh Chandrawat	2,000/1,000	Rajput	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63, 71, <i>Haum Khan</i> , 21a; <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 460.
37	Fazrullah Khan	2 000/1,000	Irani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 56, <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 479, M. U., III, 28-30.
38	Mukhlis Khan	2,000/200	Turani	<i>Haum Khan</i> , 21a; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63, <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 460.
39	Khushhal Beg Kaabghari	2,000/200	Turani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63, 56, <i>Haum Khan</i> , 21a, <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 460.
40	Sujan Singh Snodia	2,000/200	Rajput	Mamuri, 97b, <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 460.
41	Abdullah Beg Aukar Khan Najm Sanj	Above 1,000	Irani	Mamuri, 102a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 93, 313, 463, <i>Haum Khan</i> , 26a, 27a, 62b, M. U., II, 200.
42	Khanjar Khan	1,500/1,500	Turani	<i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 321, 461, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 173, 198, 299.
43	Feroz Khan Mewati	1,500/1,000	Other Muslim	Mamuri, 102a; <i>Haum Khan</i> , 27a, 62b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 56, 203, 313, 440.
44	Husain Beg Khan Zig	1,500/1,000	Irani	<i>Haum Khan</i> , 27a; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 93, M. U., I, 591, 291.
45	Muhammed Beg	1,000/600	Turani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63; <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 460.
46	Mir Miran	1,500/500	Irani	<i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 463, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 93; <i>Haum Khan</i> , 27a.

S No.	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Sources
47	Mir Rustam Khawafi	1,500/500	Irani	<i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 232, 274, 399
48	Rahmat Khan	1,500/400	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 297, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 463
49	Syed Masud Barla	1,500/300	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 207, 268
50	Syed Feroz Rustam Khan	1,500/200	Other Muslim	Isar Das, 9b <i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 161, 213
51	Syed Salar Barha	1 000/1,000	Other Muslim	Hatim Khan, 21a, <i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 65, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 464
52	Gharanfar Khan	1 000/900	Irani	<i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 95, Hatim Khan, 29a, M U, II, 866-67, <i>Amal i Salih</i> III, 465
53	Imam Quli	1,000/800	Irani	<i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 465, <i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 85
54	Muhammad Salih Wazir Khan	1,000/800	Irani	<i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 104, Hatim Khan, 31b, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 465
55	Maha Singh Bhadoriya	1,000/800	Rajput	Hatim Khan, 29b, <i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 96, 240, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 465
56	Shaukh Muazzam	1,000/800	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 96, 106, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 465
57	Aufandiyar Beg	1,000/1,000	Irani	<i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 106, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 464
58	Kerat Singh	1,000/900	Rajput	Hatim Khan, 29b, <i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 96, <i>Amal i Salih</i> , III, 465
59	Mughol Khan Khawafi	1 000/700	Irani	<i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 465, <i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 314

S. No.	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Sources
60	Sultan Husain	1,000/500	Irani	Hatim Khan, 21a, 29a, <i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 65, 95, M U, I, 252
61	Fakhr Khan Najm Sanı	2,500/1 000	Irani	Hatim Khan, 29b, M U, III, 26 28, <i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 96, Aql Khan, 60, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 457
62	Yadgar Beg	1,000/500	Turani	<i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 65, <i>Amal t Salih</i> , III, 467
63	Muhamad Muqim Mughal Khan S/o Shah Beg Khan	1,000/700	Turani	Hatim Khan, 21a, <i>Amal t Salih</i> , III, 465, <i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 65
64	Mahresh Das	1,000/500	Rajput	<i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 65, Isar Das, 20b, Hatim Khan, 21a, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 467
65.	Gurdhan Das Rathor	1,000/500	Rajput	Hatim Khan, 21a, <i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 65, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 467
66.	Kuhan Singh Taunur	1,000/500	Rajput	Hatim Khan, 29a, <i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 95, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 467
67	Khawja Rahmat ullah Sarbuland Khan	1,000/500	Turani	Hatim Khan, 29a, <i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 96, 113, M U, II, 477, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III 467
68.	Syed Bahadur Bakkari	1,000/500	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 96, Hatim Khan, 29b, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 467
69	Syed Ahmad	1,000/500	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 176, <i>Amal t-Salih</i> , III, 467
70	Abdul Nabi Khan	1,000/500	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgur Nama</i> , 96, Hatim Khan, 29b, <i>Amal t Salih</i> , III, 467

<i>S. No</i>	<i>Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Racial Group</i>	<i>Sources</i>
71	Syed Najabat Barha	1,000/500	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 96, <i>Hatim Khan</i> , 29b, <i>Amal-i-Salih</i> III, 467
72	Syed Ghaurat Khan Barha or Izzat Khan	1,000/500	Other Muslim	<i>Mamuri</i> , 103b, <i>Amal-i-Salih</i> , III, 467, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 178, 180
73	Bheem S/o Bethal Das Gaur	1,000/400	Rajput	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 65, 95, <i>Mamuri</i> , 99b, <i>Amal-i-Salih</i> , III, 468
74	Purtha Raj Thanz	1,000/400	Rajput	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 95, 237, <i>Hatim Khan</i> , 29a
75	Syed Munawwar Barha	1,000/400	Other Muslim	<i>Hatim Khan</i> , 29b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 96, <i>Amal-i-Salih</i> , III, 468
76	Syed Maqbool Alam Barha	1,000/400	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 96, <i>Hatim Khan</i> , 29b, <i>Amal-i-Salih</i> , III, 468
77	Syed Ibrahim Dara Shukohi later Mustafa Khan	1 000/400	Other Muslim	<i>Mamuri</i> , 108a, <i>Hatim Khan</i> , 68b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 313, 347
78	Abbas Afghan	1,000/400	Afghan	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 213, 215
79	Syed Nurul Ayeen Barha	1,000/300	Other Muslim	<i>Amal-i-Salih</i> , III, 469, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 96, <i>Hatim Khan</i> , 29b
80	Khawaja Muhammad Sadiq Badakhshi	1 000/300	Turani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 188, 206
81	Ismail Beg	1,000/300	Irani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 95, 106, <i>Hatim Khan</i> , 29a, <i>Amal-i-Salih</i> , III, 469

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Sources
82.	Ishaq Beg	1,000/300	Irani	Hatim Khan, 29a, <i>Amal-i-Saltih</i> , III, 469; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 95, 106.
83	Muhammad Sharif Quli Khan S/o Islam Khan Mashhadi	1,000/200	Irani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> 314, 324; <i>Amal-i-Saltih</i> , III, 469; Hatim Khan, 69a, M U, I, 166; Aqil Khan, 118.
84	Muhammad Husain Sildoz	1,000/200	Turani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 200, 210, 213.
85	Shaikh Nizam	1,000/50	Other Muslim	M. U, I, 222; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 274, 399.
86	Syed Nashar Khan Barha	Amir	Other Muslim	Mamuri, 99a; Hatim Khan, 32a; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 104.
87.	Syed Ahmad Buthari	Amir	Turani	Mamuri, 110a-b

SUPPORTERS OF AURANGZEB IN THE WAR OF SUCCESSION 1638-59

Manabdaris of 5,000 and above

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Sources
1	Mirza Shuja Najabat Khan Khan i Khanan	7,000/7,000	Turani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 42, 54, 61, 88, 117, <i>Dilkusha</i> , 13b, M U, III, 821-28, Hatim Khan, 12b, 16a
2	Mir Mohammad Saeed Mir Jumla Muazzam Khan	6 000/6 000(2-3h)	Irani	<i>Dilkusha</i> , 18a, <i>Tuhfa i Shah Jahani</i> , 30b, <i>Aurang Nama</i> , 37, Mamuri, 103b, M U, III, 530-55, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 84, 190, 267, Hatim Khan, 25b, Manucci, I, 262
3	Rana Raj Singh	5,000/5,000	Rajput	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 129, 194, <i>Vir Vinod</i> , II, 419-20, 421-27, M U, II, 206-208, <i>Amal i Salih</i> , III, 451
4	Abu Talib Shasta Khan	6,000/6,000(2-3h)	Irani	<i>Dilkusha</i> , 12a, 19a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 111, 114, 130, 321, M U, II, 690-707, Hatim Khan, 26b, Manucci, I, 255
5	Shahk Mir Khawafi	5,000/5 000	Irani	Isar Das, 20b, Mamuri, 97a, 98b, <i>Aurang Nama</i> , 41, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 332, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 68, 92, 98, 156-57, <i>Tuhfa i-Shahjahani</i> , 30a, Hatim Khan, 28b, M U, II, 603-70
6	Muhammed Tahir Maishhadi Wazir Khan	5,000/5,000	Irani	<i>Dilkusha</i> , 14b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 50, Mamuri, 96b, Hatim Khan, 15a, M U, III, 936-40
7	Sarfraz Khan Deccani	5,000/4,000	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 47, M U, II, 469-73
8	Champat Bundela	5,000/	Rajput	<i>Dilkusha</i> , 15b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 78, 92, 163, 207, 217, Hatim Khan, 24b, 28a, Manucci, I, 269-70

Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4,500

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Source
9	Kartalab Khan (Yaswant Rao)	4,000/4,000 (1,000 x 2 3b)	Other Muslim	Hatim Khan, 20a, 24a, 28a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 55, 63, 76, 92, M U, III, 153
10	Ghazi Bijapur Randola Khan	4,000/4,000	Afghan	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 76, 93, Hatim Khan, 13a, 24a, 28b, M U, II, 309
11	Jadu Rao	4,000/2,500	Maratha	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 47, 55, Hatim Khan, 14a, 20a
12	Muhammad Beg Zulfikar Khan	4,000/2,000	Irani	Mamuri, 97a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 51, 62, 76, 92, 157, M U, II, 89-93, Hatim Khan, 21b, Aqil Khan, 39, 59
13	Mir Ziauddin Hoxan Hummat Khan Islam Khan	4,000/2,000	Turani	Mamuri, 97b, <i>Tasfiya</i> : <i>Shah Jahani</i> , 30b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 43, 76, 92, 157, M U, I, 217-20, Hatim Khan, 12b, 24a, 28a; Aqil Khan, 39
14	Muliatat Khan Azam Khan	4,000/2,500	Irani	<i>Dilkusha</i> , 14b, <i>Aurang Nama</i> , 26, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 51, 75, 92, Mamuri, 98b, M U, III, 500-503, Hatim Khan, 28a.
15	Mirza Muhammad Maabadi Asalat Khan	4,000/2,000	Irani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 51, 53, 63, Mamuri, 96b; M. U. I, 222-25, Hatim Khan, 15b, 20b 28b.
16	Mirza Sultan Safvi	4,000/2,000	Irani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 46, 218, M U, III, 581-83
17	Damaji Deccani	4,000/1,300	Maratha	Hatim Khan, 14a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 47, 63
18	Khawaja Abid Khan	4,000/700	Turani	M U, III, 120-23, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 44, 51, 55, 76, Hatim Khan, 13a, 24a.

THE NOBLES AND POLITICS

Sources

Racial Group

Rank

Name and Title

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Sources
19	Syed Mahmud Nasiri Khan	3 000/2,500	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 79,93,126, M U, I, 782-84, <i>Amal i-Salikh</i> , III, 454, Mamuri, 98a, Hatum Khan, 25a
20	Fateh Rohela Fateh Jang Khan	3,000/2,500	Afghan	Hatun Khan, 14a, 24a, 28b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 47,51,76,93, 290, M U, III, 22-26
21	Raja Inder Man Dhandera	3,000/2,000	Rajput	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 43,62,76,92,247; Hatun Khan, 20a, 28a, M U, II, 265-66
22	Mir Malik Husain Bahadur Khan	3,000/1,500	Irani	<i>Dikhuha</i> , 14b, 19a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 44,51,54,62,92, M U I, 791-813, Hatun Khan, 13a, 16a, 28b, Aql Khan, 39, 59
23	Murshid Quli Khan	3 000/1,500	Irani	<i>Aurang Nama</i> , 15, Mamuri, 97b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 44,54, 62,67, M U, III, 493-500, Hatun Khan, 13a, 16a, 18b, Aql Khan, 39,41
24	Hasan Khan Deccani	3,000/2,500	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 45, T U "H", Hatun Khan, 13b
25	Muzaffar Lodi (Lodi Khan)	3,000/2,000	Afghan	Hatun Khan, 15a, 19b, 28a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 51,76,291.
26	Shamsuddin Kheshgi	3,000/2,000	Afghan	M U, II, 676-77, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 45, Hatun Khan, 13b
27	Mufakhor Khan Sipahdar Khan Khan i Azam	3 000/2,000	Irani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 47,51,62,75,92, Hatun Khan, 14a, 20a, 24a
28.	Abdur Rehman Dnyapuri Sharza Khan	3,000/1,500	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 76,92,208-209, T U "Sh", Hatun Khan, 24a
29	Abdullah Beg Muthilis Khan Yakataz Khan	3,000/1,500	Turani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63,78,93, M U, III, 968-70, Hatun Khan, 20b, 24b, 28b

THE MUGHAL NOBILITY UNDER AURANGZEB

S No.	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Sources
30	Raja Rajroop Kohistani	3,000/3,000	Rajput	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 181, 187, 190, 320
31	Hadi Dad Khan	2,500/2,500	Manasbalars of, 1,000 to 2,500 Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 62, 108, Hatim Khan, 20a, 28b; <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 456.
32	Bhel Afghan Purdil Khan	2,500/2,000	Afghan	Hatim Khan, 15a, 19b, 28a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 52, 33f
33	Muhammad Ibrahim Shujaa' Khan	2,000/1,000	Turani	Hatim Khan, 13b, 16a, 19b, 24a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 45, 51, 54, 61, 92.
34	Dadaji	2,500/1,000	Maratha	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 48, Hatim Khan, 14b.
35	Manaji Bhonsle	2,500/1,500	Maratha	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 128, Hatim Khan, 16a S D A. 7
36	Rustam Rao	2,500/1,200	Maratha	Hatim Khan, 14a, 20a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 47, 55
37	Babaji Bhonsle (Habaji)	2,500/1,500	Maratha	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 54, 63, <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 460
38	Sadat Khan	2,000/1,500	Irani	Hatim Khan, 28b; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 62, <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 458
39	Byas Rao	2,000/1,200	Maratha	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 48, Hatim Khan, 14b.
40	Syed Hasan, later on Ikram Khan	2,000/1,000	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 92, 346-47, N U I, 215-16, <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 459
41	Betuji Deccani	2,000/1,000	Maratha	Hatim Khan, 14a, 20a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 47, 63.
42	Abdullah Khan Sarai	2,000/1,000	Turani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 47, 63

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Sources	
43	Syed Sherzaman Barha Muzaffar Khan	2,000/600	Other Muslim		M U, II, 465, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 47, 54 61, 92, <i>Haum Khan</i> , 14a, 19b, 28a.
44	Wali Mihalidar	2 000/1,000	Other Muslim		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 45, <i>Haum Khan</i> , 13b, 15b, <i>Amal-i-Saluk</i> , III, 463
45	Mir Shamsuddin Mukhtar Khan S/o Mukhtar Khan	2 000/1,000	Irani		<i>Namuri</i> , 96b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 47, 51, 62, 92, <i>Haum Khan</i> , 14a, 20a, 28a, M U, III, 620-23
46	Bakhtiyar Khan Khawas Khan	2,000/1 500	Afghan		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 52, 53, 92, 132, <i>Haum Khan</i> , 15a b, 28a
47	Muhammad Tahir Saf Shikan Khan	2 000/1,000	Irani		<i>Namuri</i> , 97a, <i>Dilhusha</i> , 14b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 53, 68, <i>Haum Khan</i> , 15b, 20a, M U, II, 738-40
48	Muhammad Aqil Birlas Tabawur Khan	2 000/400	Turani		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 53, 55, <i>Haum Khan</i> , 16a, 20b, 28a.
49	Mir Murad Marandani Gharat Khan	2 000/400	Irani		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 54 55, 92, <i>Haum Khan</i> , 16a, 20b
50	Kamal Lodi Harbuz Khan	2 000/500	Afghan		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 55 63 76, 77, <i>Haum Khan</i> , 19b, 24a, 28b
51	Syed Shah Muhammad Murtaza Khan of Dukhara	2,000/500	Turani		<i>Haum Khan</i> , 15a, 20a, 24a, 28b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 51, 68, 77, 101
52	Mir Masum Khan	1,500/1,000	Irani		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 51, 210, M U II, 676, <i>Haum Khan</i> , 15a.
53	Khushhal Beg Qazqhal Quliy Khan High Rank		Turani		<i>Haum Khan</i> , 15b, 20b, 28b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 53 63 471 914
54	Ahmad Beg Khethtg Ihtlas Khan	2 000/500	Afghan		<i>Haum Khan</i> , 19b 24a, 28b <i>Alamgir Nama</i> 77

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Notes
55	Beg Muhammad Kheshti Dindar Khan	2 000/500	Afghan	Hatim Khan 21a, 1-2gr Nama 63, 77, 93 143
56	Isma'il Kheshti Jan Baz Khan	2 000/600	Afghan	4-2gr Nama 62 76 Hatim Khan 20a, 21a MU, III 777-8.
57	Mir Isa Himmat Khan	2 000/200	Turani	MU III 916-19 Hatim Khan 20b 24a 28a, 4-2gr Nama 77, 92
58	Iltumullah	1,500/1,500 (00 x 2 3h)	Other Muslim	4-2gr Nama 111, 470 Hatim Khan, 19b, 21a, 4-2gr Nama, 62 MU, II 903 30.
59	Syrd Yusuf	1 000/500	Other Muslim	4-2gr Nama, 62, 4-2gr Nama III, 467.
60	Rad Andaz Beg	1 000/400	Irani	MU II 674-81, 4-2gr Nama, 63 237, Hatim Khan, 20b
61	Alahyar Beg Bukhari	1 000/1 000	Turani	4-2gr Nama 63 94 831 Hatim Khan 20b, MU I 216
62	Sikandar Rohela	1 000/500	Afghan	4-2gr Nama 63 291, Hatim Khan 20a, 4-2gr Nama, III, 468
63	Tarmakji Bhonsle	1,500/1,000	Maratha	Hatim Khan, 14a, 4-2gr Nama 48
64	Man Singh of Gular	1,500/1 000	Rajput	4-2gr Nama, 199-200, Badshah Nama, II, 738
65	Dakuji	1,500/1 000	Maratha	4-2gr Nama 48, Hatim Khan, 14b.
66	Amar Singh zamundar of Narwar	1 500/1,000	Rajput	4-2gr Nama, 77 215 Hatim Khan 24b, 4-2gr Nama, III, 462
67	Muhammad Shah Mughal Qaladar Khan	1,500/1 000	Turani	4-2gr Nama, 48, Hatim Khan, 14a

S. No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Sources	
68	Muhammad Sharif Polakji	1,500/1,000	Other Muslim	41amgir Nama, 51, Haum Khan, 16a, 20b	
69	Syed Mansur Khan	1,000/400	Other Muslim	Haum Khan, 28b, 41amgir Nama, 63, Amal i Salih 111, 468, M U, II, 449 52	
70	Daulatmand Khan Deccani	1,500/1 000	Afghan	Haum Khan, 20a, 28b, 41amgir Nama, 63, 93, Amal i Salih, 111, 462	
71	Hayat Afghan Zabardast Khan	1,000/800	Afghan	41amgir Nama, 54, 92, Haum Khan, 20a, 28a	
72	Karan Kachhi zamundar of Malwa	1,500/500	Hindu	41amgir Nama, 52, 92, Haum Khan, 15a, 20a, 28b	
73	Mir Ahmad	1,500/800	Irani	Haum Khan, 13b, 41amgir Nama, 45, 53, M U, III, 516 18	
74	Muhammad Munim Khan	1,500/600	Turani	41amgir Nama, 45, 51, 55, M U, III, 589, Haum Khan, 13b, 20a, 28b	
75	Mir Salih	1,500/500	Other Muslim	Haum Khan, 13b, 41amgir Nama, 45	
76	Ahmad Beg Zulqadar Khan	1,000/500	Turani	41amgir Nama, 63, 77, 448, Haum Khan, 20b, 28b	
77	Ismail Khan Niyazi	1,500/300	Afghan	41amgir Nama, 45, 62, 92, Haum Khan, 24a	
78	Qazi Nizam Kararodi	1,500/200	Other Muslim	41amgir Nama, 49, 53, M U, III, 566 68, Mamuri, 98b, Haum Khan, 14a, 16a	
79	Mir Afghan	1,500/500	Afghan	41amgir Nama, 53, 30a, Haum Khan, 15b	
80	Mir Abul Fazl Mamuri Mamur Khan	1,500/500	Irani	Haum Khan, 15b, 19b, 41amgir Nama, 53, 62, 77	

S.No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Sources
81	Shaikh Abdul Amz	1,000/500	Other Muslim	Mamuri, 97b; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 62, 74, 77, MU, II, 686; Haum Khan, 20b, S.D.A. 74
82	Saifuddin Mahmud Faqirullah Saif Khan	1,500/700	Turani	Mamuri, 98b; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 78, 92, MU, II, 479-85; Haum Khan, 24b.
83	Mir Hoshdar (Hoshdar Khan)	1,500/700	Irani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 51, 62, 92, MU, III, 943-46; Haum Khan, 14a, 20a, 28a.
84	Ira Beg Sarawar Khan	1,500/200	Other Muslim	Mamuri, 96b; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 46, 53, 63, 108, Haum Khan, 20b, 28b.
85	Hameeduddin Khan Khanazad Khan	1,500/200	Irani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 55, 77, 94, 270, 594
86	Shaikh Abdul Qawi	1,500/100	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 54, 94, 231; MU, I, 225-29
87	Mir Bahadur Dal Jan Spar Khan	1,000/400	Irani	Haum Khan, 20a; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 62, 127; <i>Amal-i-Saltah</i> , III, 468; MU, I, 535; S.D.A. 29.
88	Qazalbash Khan	1,500/700	Irani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63, 291; Haum Khan, 20b
89	Mir Askari Aqi Khan	1,500/500	Irani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 44, 193-94; MU, II, 821.
90	Khawaja Obedullah	1,500/400	Other Muslim	Haum Khan, 20b, 28b, 65b; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63, 301.
91	Masud Yadgar Ahmad Beg Khan	1,500/600	Turani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 78, 158, 193, 196; <i>Arkan-i-Ma'arif-i-Taimuriya</i> , 126b
92	Syed Abdur Rahman Dilawar Khan	1,000/1,000	Other Muslim	Mamuri, 96b; Haum Khan, 14a, 16a, 28b; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 48, 55, 62, 93

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group		Sources
93	Saun Singh	1,000/500	Rajput		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 55, 77, Hatim Khan, 24b
94	Raja Sarang Dhar of Jammun	1,000/500	Hindu		Hatim Khan, 20a, 28a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 62, 92, 196, 219, 286
95	Khawaja Kalan Kifayat Khan	1,000/200	Other Muslim		Mamuri, 97b, Hatim Khan, 24b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 77.
96	Syed Nauruddin Khan Deccani	1,000/800	Other Muslim		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 45, 61, 92, Hatim Khan, 13b, 19b, 28a
97	Saifullah Arab	1,000 800	Other Muslim		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 45, Hatim Khan, 13b
98	Bhagwant Singh Hara	2,500/800	Rajput		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63, 92, 192, Hatim Khan, 20b, 20a
99	Khudawand Habsbi	1,000/400	Other Muslim		Hatim Khan, 13b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 45
100	Ghulam Muhammad Afghan	1,000/400	Afghan		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 53, 305, Hatim Khan, 13b
101	Muhammad Ismail S/o Najabat Khan	1 000/500	Turani		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 48, Hatim Khan, 14a, 20a
102	Abdul Bari Ansari	1,000/500	Other Muslim		Hatim Khan, 19b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 62, 92, 291.
103	Zamul Abidin Bukhari	1,000/300	Turani		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 45, Hatim Khan, 13b
104.	Niamatullah	1,000/200	Irani		Hatim Khan, 15a, 20a, 28b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 52, 62, 92, M U I, 584-87
105	Husain Beg Khan	1,000/400	Other Muslim		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 55, 218, Hatim Khan, 16a
106	Jamal Khan s/o Dilir Khan	1,000/400	Afghan		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 147.

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Source
107	Muhammad Sadiq	1,000/300	Turani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 55, 92, 206.
108	Ghaurat Beg Shuja Khan	1,000/300	Other Muslim	Hatum Khan, 28a; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 55, 206, 232
109	Jamal Nauhan Bujapuri	1,500/800	Afghan	Hatum Khan, 19b, 28a; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 61, 92; <i>Amal-i-Salt</i> , III, 462
110	Hameed Kakar Kakar Khan	1,000/700	Afghan	Hatum Khan, 20a, 24a; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 62, 77, 218.
111.	Masud Mangh Mangh Khan	1,000/600	Afghan	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63, 77, 207, Hatim Khan, 20a, 24a, 28b.
112.	Badi Bakhtiyar	1,000/300	Afghan	Hatum Khan, 20a; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63, 93, 207.
113	Saif Bujapuri	1,000/600	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63, 163; Hatim Khan, 20a
114	Ibrahim Qarbegi	1,000/400	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63, 94, 163; Hatim Khan, 20b.
115	Daulat Afghan	1,000/500	Afghan	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 78.
116.	Muhammad Muqum	1,000/500	Turani	Hatum Khan, 24b; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 78.
117.	Bahram	1,000/600	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 93, 486; Hatim Khan, 28b.
118.	Inayat Khan	1,000/500	Afghan	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 92, Hatim Khan, 28a.
119.	Abu Muslim	1,000/300	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 92, 206; Hatim Khan, 28b.
120	Subh Karan Bundela	1,000/500	Rajput	Dikkaula, 14b, 18b; <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 63, 93, 190, 249; Hatim Khan, 16b, 20b, 28b.

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group		Sources
121	Itbar Khan Khawajasara	1 000/200	Other Muslim		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 193
122	Hakim Muhammad Amin Shirazi	1,000/	Irani		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 45, Hatim Khan, 13b
123	Mir Muhammad Mahdi Urdistani	1 000/	Irani		<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 45, <i>Ma'asir i Alamgiri</i> , 70, Hatim Khan, 13b M U, I 599 600
124	Iradat Barha	Amir	Other Muslim		Mamun, 98b

SUPPORTERS OF SHAH SHUJA IN THE WAR OF SUCCESSION
1658-59

Manasbdrs of 5 000 and above

<i>S No</i>	<i>Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Racial Group</i>	<i>Sources</i>
1	Abdur Rahman S/o Nazar Muhammad Khan	5 000/2 500	Turani	Mamuri, 104b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 250, 257, 267, 341, Hatim Khan, 58a, M U, II, 809-812
			<i>Manasbdrs of 5 000 to 4,500</i>	
2	Murad Kam Mukarram Khan Safvi	3 000/3 000	Irani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 239, 251, 267, Mamuri, 104b, 106a, Hatim Khan, 54b, M U, III, 583-86, <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 454 Aqil Khan, 104
3	Mir Abul Ma'ali	3 000/2 000	Turani	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 240-41, 251, Hatim Khan, 58b, M U, III, 557-60
4	Syed Qasim Barha	3 000/1 000	Other Muslim	Mamuri, 104a, Hatim Khan, 54b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 250, 257, 303, M U II, 681-82, Aqil Khan, 104, 124
			<i>Manasbdrs of 1,000 to 2,500</i>	
5	Syed Alam Barha	2 000/1 000	Other Muslim	<i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 325, Isar Das, 9b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 239, 252, 258, Mamuri, 105b, <i>Badshah Nama</i> , II, 727, M U, II, 454-56, Aqil Khan, 103, 129
6	Nurul Hasan Barha	1 000/400	Other Muslim	Mamuri, 114b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 499, 504 <i>Badshah Nama</i> II, 736, <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 468, Aqil Khan, 124

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Sources	
7	Abu Muhammad	1 000/800	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 349, <i>Amal i-Salih</i> , III, 465	
8	Hasan Khetigt	High Rank	Afghan	Hauim Khan, 54b, 50b, Mamuri, 106a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 230, 251, 257, Aql Khan 103, 106	
9	Ibn Ifusa n (Darogha i top Khana)	Amir	Other Muslim	Mamuri, 114b, 117a, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 544, 554	
10	Syed Q.ah Uzbeke	Amir	Turani	Hauim Khan, 50b, Mamuri, 116a, 117b, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 251, 527, 514, 561	

N B Iahwardi Khan has not been included among the supporters of Shah Shuja because he created disunion in Shah Shuja's camp and tried to paralyse his military effort He betrayed him at the battle of Khajwah and was put to death by the prince at Akbarnagar (*Riyaz us-Salatin*, 217 M U, I, 207, Aql Khan 85, Manucci, I, 330 31)

SUPPORTERS OF MURAD BAKSH IN THE WAR OF SUCCESSION 1658-59

Manabdhars of 5,000 and above

S No	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Source
1	Shahbaz	5 000/	Other Muslim	Mamuri 96a 101b Isar Das 10b, 11a 32b, Hatum Khan, 9a, Manucci, I, 301, MU I, 298, Aqil Khan, 93
Manabdhars of 3 000 to 4,500				
2	Ibrahim Khan ¹	4 000/3 000	Iran	Mamuri, 101b, 102a Hatum Khan, 41b, Manucci, I, 301 302, MU I, 295 301, <i>Ulangir Nama</i> 139, 158, Aqil Khan, 87
3	Qutbuddin Khan Khetghi	3 000/3 000(2 3b)	Afghan	<i>Ulangir Nama</i> 139 140, <i>Dilkusha</i> 17a b Isar Das, 10a, 32b 34a <i>Mutal-i-Samada</i> I, 240, MU, III, 103
Manabdhars of 1,000 to 2,500				
4	Debi Singh Bundela	2 000/2 000	Rajput	<i>Ulangir Nama</i> , 71, 74, 139, 206, 207 Isar Das, 21a, Mamuri, 97b, Hatum Khan, 23a, MU, II, 295 97
5	Syed Hasan Barha	2 000/2 000	Other Muslim	<i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III 461, Isar Das, 17a, <i>Ulangir Nama</i> , 139 140
6	Rana Gherib Das Susodia	1 500/700	Rajput	Isar Das 17a 24a <i>Ulangir Nama</i> , 107, <i>Amal-i-Salikh</i> , III, 463, Hatum Khan, 33a

¹ In the battle of Samugarh Ibrahim Khan fought on the side of Dara Shukoh, but after the battle joined Murad Baksh. When Murad Baksh was arrested Ibrahim Khan refused to serve Aurangzeb and retired from service.

Sources

S. No.	Name and Title	Rank	Racial Group	Sources
7	Sultan Yar	1 500/1,500	Other Muslim	Hatim Khan, 33a, Isar Das, 17a 24a, <i>Itanagir Nama</i> , 107, <i>Mirat i Ibradi</i> , I, 235, <i>Amal i Salih</i> , III, 161 <i>Alamgir Nama</i> 139, 140 <i>Amal i Salih</i> , III, 463, <i>Mirat i Ibradi</i> , I, 233
8	Dildoz (Dildost)	1 500/1,000	Other Muslim	<i>Mirat i Ahmed</i> , 237, 240, <i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 139 10, Hatim Khan, 41b, <i>Amal i Salih</i> , III, 463
9	Rahmat Khan ¹	1 500 400	Other Muslim	Isar Das, 17a, <i>Itanagir Nama</i> , 107, Hatim Khan, 33a, <i>Badshah Nama</i> , II, 733
10	Syed Shaikh Barha	1,000/500	Other Muslim	<i>Alamgir Nama</i> , 139, 140, Isar Das, 17a, Hatim Khan, 41a, <i>Amal i Salih</i> , III, 463, <i>Mirat i Ahmed</i> , I 235
11	Syed Mansur Barha	1 000/400	Other Muslim	

¹ In the battles of Dharmat and Samugarh, Rahmat Khan fought on the side of Murad Baksh. When Murad Baksh was arrested, Rahmat Khan along with Shah Nawaz Khan Safvi joined Dara Shukh before the battle of Deorai.

CHAPTER V

NOBLES AND ADMINISTRATION

NOBLES AT THE COURT

In a system of despotic monarchy, such as that of the Mughals, the fortunes of all officers depended directly or indirectly upon the approbation of the Emperor. The Court, therefore, was the centre towards which the eyes of the nobles were constantly turned. At the same time the Emperor had to govern the empire through the agency of the *mansabdars*, and had all the time to see that they not only carried out his orders, but also that the power which he vested in them was not abused. A study of the relations between the Mughal Court and the nobility, therefore, is not without interest, and may help us in understanding the ties which bound the nobility to the throne.

From the point of view of the Court, the Mughal nobility at any particular time could be divided into two groups: the *tainat-i rakab*, or those who were stationed at the Court; and the *tainat-i subajat*, or those who were posted in the provinces. This division was based purely on the postings of individual officers, who were frequently transferred from one group to the other.

It was an established practice under the Mughals that when a high noble was transferred from one place to another, he presented himself at the Court before proceeding to his new appointment. But in case the transfer was due to some fault committed by the noble, he was not permitted to come to the Court.¹ An officer, who left his post to come to the Court without imperial permission, was liable to be dismissed.²

In placing nobles among the *tainat-i rakab* and *tainat-i subajat*, a number of factors had naturally to be kept in view.³ Nobles who possessed organising capacity and administrative abilities were posted in different parts of the Empire, and were not recalled to the Court unless their presence was absolutely necessary. The nobles present at Court were considered

¹ In 1663, when Shaista Khan was transferred from the Deccan to Bengal on account of his negligence which resulted in Shivaji's night attack on his camp, he was not permitted to come to the Court (*Dilkusha*, f 24a 24b Mamuri, 131a, Khafi Khan, II, p 175). In 1672, when Muhammad Amin Khan suffered heavy losses at the hands of the Afghans, he was transferred to Gujarat and was directed to proceed directly to that Province without presenting himself at Court (*Ma'asir-i Alamgiri*, p 121).

² *Akhbarat*, 30 R. Y f 275

³ "The army stationed in the provinces differs in nothing from that about the King's person" (Bernier p 218)

Except with the permission of the Emperor, no one could come armed to the *darbar* or to the Emperor's private audience.¹ It was forbidden to come in a *palki* within the *gulal-bar* or the enclosure of the Emperor's residence.² In 1693 Aurangzeb ordered that the colour of the garments of the *umara*, when they came to the *darbar* should not be red and should not be dyed in colours that were illegal according to the *shariat*.³ The nobles were also prohibited from wearing *nima astin* (half-sleeves) and wrapping a shawl round their shoulders in the presence of the Emperor.⁴ The offering of betel-leaves (*pan*) by the nobles to each other in the *darbar* was considered as a breach of etiquette and prohibited.⁵

The most important duty which the *mansabdars* had to perform when at Court was mounting guard (*chauki*) at the Palace.⁶ It would appear that the practice established by Akbar continued in the same form down to the time of Aurangzeb. This is clear, for example, from the description offered by Tavernier. "The first court is, as I have elsewhere said, surrounded by porticoes with small rooms connected with them, and here it is that the Omarahs stay while they are on guard. For it should be remarked that one of the Omarahs mounts guard every week. He disposes, both in the Court as also about the Emperor's palace or tent when he is in the field, the cavalry under his command, and many elephants. The best of these Omarahs command 2,000 horses, but, when a prince of the blood royal is on guard, he commands up to 6,000."⁷ At another place Tavernier says, "The principal nobles mount guard every Monday, each in his turn, and they are not relieved before the end of a week. Some of these nobles command 5,000 or 6,000 horses and encamp under their tents around the town".⁸ The *Zawabit-i Alamgiri* gives detailed rules and regulations in respect of absence from *chauki* in case of illness, marriage and death of near relatives.⁹

When the Emperor went in procession and rode on an elephant, the nobles followed him mounted on horses and when the Emperor was on horse-back, the nobles followed him on foot.¹⁰

Many ceremonies of the Court were considered an exclusive privilege of the Emperor. Jahangir had once issued an order listing the ceremonies which were reserved exclusively for the imperial Court and the

¹ The Emperor permitted Kalal Khan, the *darogha* of the Kahars, to come armed to the *darbar* (Akbarat, 45th R Y f 120b)

² Zulfiqar Khan was permitted to come to *Rahla* in a *palki* in the same fashion as the late Bahramand Khan (Akbarat, 47th R Y f 15b), *Farhat-al Nazrin*, f 178b

³ Mamuri, f 140a

⁴ *Mirat-al Istilah*, f 16b

⁵ Manucci, Vol I, p 202.

⁶ For the detailed account of night guard, (Ain, I, tr pp 267-68).

⁷ Tavernier, I, pp 302-3

⁸ Tavernier, I, p 126 It is the practice of the Hindu princes and commanders to encamp with their tents for 24 hours every week below the royal fortress (Manucci, I, p 207) He is also probably referring to the *chauki*

⁹ *Zawabit-i Alamgiri*, f 38a; see also *Indian Travels of Careri*, p 248

¹⁰ Tavernier, I, pp 308 & 310, *The Travels of Peter Mundy*, 1608-1667, Vol II, p. 199.

Emperor¹ One of these was the holding of elephant fights. This ban continued under Aurangzeb, for Aurangzeb reduced the rank of the *zamindar* of Ratlam by 500 *zai* and ordered his *guzastha* (revenue collector) to be brought to the Court for receiving suitable punishment, because the latter used to organise elephant fights.²

The real object of these detailed rules of Court etiquette was to impress upon the nobles the magnitude of the imperial prestige and authority. To a cynical observer of the 20th century all this paraphernalia may seem ridiculous and absurd but in the medieval ages it was considered an essential instrument of government. It was the policy of the medieval emperors to maintain their pomp and splendour as zealously as possible, so that nobles be made to realise that, however great and powerful they may be, they were nothing when compared with the Emperor, and that their authority, power and greatness depended entirely on his sweet will. At the same time the Emperor also wanted to impress the mass of the people in order that they may realise that even the greatest nobles and *emirs* were merely his servants and that the loyalty of his subjects was commanded by him alone.

TITLES AND DISTINCTIONS

Honorary distinctions have existed in all countries, and they have often served as an incentive to the subjects to put forth their best efforts. The policy of the Mughal Emperors was not an exception to this universal rule, and they certainly did succeed in converting things mostly worthless in themselves into highly coveted and dearly prized objects. Among the marks of honour bestowed by them the most important were titles, robes of honour, standards and kettle-drums, etc. and presents such as jewelled dagger, beret leaves, etc.

With regard to the titles we may note a remark of Manucci: "The King confers these names (by which the nobles were known) either as a mark of distinction and of the esteem he holds them in by reasons of their services, or else from friendship and liking. These lords can acquire more wealth as well as more titles. Manucci adds that the Court had become generous in the award of these honorary distinctions under Aurangzeb. 'At present there is a very great number of them, but in Shah Jahan's days, it was not so, and it was very hard to acquire these titles, for it was at once necessary to give a heavy payment and produce enough to maintain a great display. But now a-days Aurangzeb pays less heed to the matter and gives the title but with less pay.'³

A title once conferred served officially as the name of the noble concerned. A number of titles were reserved for Muslim nobles and others

¹ Tuzuk, p. 100.

² Iqbal Dag, ff. 144b-45a.

³ Manucci II p. 369.

for Hindus, while some titles were reserved for persons of different professions.¹

Great care was exercised lest a person, who had not reached the requisite status, be given the title 'Khan'.² It should be noted that element of heredity in titles is found at least in the time of Aurangzeb; if one of the sons of a deceased noble attained to eminence, he was generally awarded his father's title.³ Again, no two nobles could have the same title at the same time,⁴ although many titles were given to others after the death of their holders, or after the title-holders had relinquished their old titles for new. Thus the titles of Mahabat Khan, Murshid Quli Khan, Amir Khan were held by successive nobles after the death of their previous holders; while the title of Khan-i Jahan was granted to Bahadur Khan after it had been relinquished by Shaista Khan, the *Amirul Umara*. Great value was attached to those titles, which had been previously borne by important nobles, so that the nobles were often prepared to buy them by offering gifts and bribes.⁵

Along with titles which served for the names of the nobles, elaborate sets of epithets, appellations and forms of address were prescribed for every important noble and had to be used in all official correspondence.⁶ Generally titles were awarded at the time of the accession of the Emperor, on the Persian New Years Day (*Nauroz*), on the birth anniversary of the Emperor and on the day of a victory gained by royal arms.⁷

Robes of honour (*khil'ats*) were presented to the nobles as a mark of Imperial favour. These *khil'ats* consisting of three to seven pieces were of different varieties, those granted as a special honour were called *Malbus-i Khas* (or the personal robes of the Emperor).⁸ The *khil'ats* were generally awarded on the same occasion as those on which titles

¹ *Zawabut i Alamgiri*, f 15a 15b, Manucci, II, 366-69

² *Akhbarat*, 5th Ramzan, 47th R Y

³ Mir Khan was awarded his father's title of Amir Khan (*Ma'asir-i Alamgiri*, p 489), Muhammad Ismail Inqad Khan was granted his ancestral title of Zulfiqar Khan in 1689 (*Ibid*, pp 331-32), Mirza Lahrasp was granted his ancestral title of Mahabat Khan (*Ma'asir ul Umara*, III, p 590), Sayid Mahmud was awarded his hereditary title of Khan-i Dauran (*Ma'asir ul Umara*, I, p 784)

⁴ Khafi Khan, II, pp 627-28, deprecates a violation of this rule under Bahadur Shah, who gave the same title to different persons

⁵ Mir Khan was given his hereditary title of Amir Khan, Aurangzeb reminded him that when his father Mir Khan became Amir Khan, he presented one *lakh* of rupees to emperor Shahjahan for the addition of the letter 'A' (*Alif*) to his title (*Ma'asir-i Alamgiri*, p 489), *Farhat-al Nazrin*, f 179a.

⁶ *Alqab Nama*, ff 10-77, *Zawabut i Alamgiri*, ff 107b-09b, Fraser, 86, ff 31b-36a

⁷ This is clear from the lists of titles conferred on such occasions which appear in Court histories, like the *Alamgir Nama* or *Lahori-i Badshah Nama*

⁸ For the detailed description of the *khil'at*, see Tavernier, I, p 163, cf Manucci, II, p 464, Irvine, *The Army of the Indian Mughals*, p 29 When *khil'at-i khas* was awarded to anyone the recipient had to salute (*taslim*) four times before and four times after putting on the *khil'at*. In case of the ordinary *khil'at* four salutations were considered sufficient (*Guldasta*, f 6b)

were conferred as also for the different seasons. Hindu nobles were sometimes given *khil'ats* on the occasion of *Dashera*.¹

(Abul Fazl describes the standards which were conferred by the Emperor upon nobles: the *Alam*, the *Chatrtoq*, the *Tumantoq* and the *Jhanda*.² A new standard was introduced in the time of Shahjahan, namely the *mahi-maratib*. Lahori tells us that it was first conferred by Shahjahan upon Nasiri Khan in the 4th R.Y. "The *mahi-maratib*", he says, "used to be conferred in old times by the Sultans of Delhi. The practice was borrowed from them by the rulers of the Deccan and is now common in the Deccan. The rulers there give it to the person whom they regard worthy of the highest honour."³ The *mahi-maratib* seems to have become the highest honour of the Mughal Empire also, and was not to be awarded to any noble below the rank of 7,000. In case of Zulfiqar Khan Nusrat Jang alone this rule was relaxed at the request of his father, the *Wazirul Mumalik* Asad Khan, for at the time the *mahi-maratib* was conferred upon him, he had the rank of 6,000/6,000.⁴

The 'alam or standard could be awarded to a noble who had the rank of 1,000 and upwards.⁵ The 'alam was conferred by being placed on the shoulder of the recipient and he had to perform the *kurnish* (or kneeling salutation).⁶

The right to play the *naubat* could be granted to a noble as a special favour. But the recipient had to be a man of the rank of 2,000 or above.⁷ It was presumed that the recipient would never play the *naqqarah* (kettle-drum) when the Emperor was present, or within a certain distance from the Emperor's residence.⁸ The procedure of the award of the *naqqarah* was identical with that of 'alam, i.e. the *naqqarah* was placed on the shoulder of the recipient and he had to perform the *kurnish*.⁹

(Apart from cash-grants, there were varieties of other gifts given to the

¹ *Alamgir Nama*, passim.

² For full details, see *Am*, Vol. I, pp. 29-30.

³ Lahori, I, pp. 398-99. For the detailed description of *mahi maratib*, see Thorn, *Memoir of the war in India*, pp. 351-56, *Afraz-ul Istilah*, f. 16a, Irvine, *The Army of the Indian Mughals*, p. 33. *Mahi maratib* is of Persian origin and is reputed to have been established by Khusrro Parwez, the King of Persia in A.D. 591. The *mughals* borrowed it from Persia (Sleeman, Vol. I, p. 176, as cited by Shiamal Das in *Vir Vinod*, II, p. 190).

⁴ *Ragayim-i Karaim*, f. 12a, According to the *Afraz-ul Istilah* (f. 16a), *mahi maratib* could be awarded to a noble holding the rank of 6,000/6,000.

⁵ *Afraz-ul Istilah*, f. 16a. This is corroborated by contemporary sources. In 1694 Aurangzeb asked Shah Beg Khan to furnish information concerning those *mansabdars* between the ranks of 1,000 and 7,000 who had got the 'alam and *naqqarah* and who had not (*Alhbarat*, 38th R.Y. f. 226).

⁶ *Afraz-ul Istilah*, f. 16a, *Guldasta*, f. 6b.

⁷ *Afraz-ul Istilah*, f. 16a.

⁸ In 1719, Husain Ali Khan entered Delhi beating his drums and declared that he no longer counted himself as the servant of the Emperor (Khafi Khan, II, p. 804).

⁹ *Afraz-ul Istilah*, f. 16a.

nobles by the Emperor, such as jewelled ornaments, daggers and swords with jewelled hilts, horses and elephants with gold and silver trappings, and *palkis* with gold fringes, etc.¹ Sometimes *padm-i murassa* (a jewel-studded lotus ornament) was also awarded but this was very rare.² *Sarpech-i Yamani* (an ornament in front of the turban) was not normally granted to any noble who held a rank below 3,000.³ Aurangzeb ordered that no *amir* to whom a *sarpech* of jewellery was awarded should wear it except on Sundays. The nobles were not entitled to get the *sarpech* prepared for themselves and were not to wear an unauthorised *sarpech* on their turbans.⁴ The award of the ring of sapphire on the bezel of which the title of the recipient was engraved was also considered a rare honour.⁵

There were other ways still in which the Emperor could show his regards for particular nobles. One was through letters of formal goodwill and congratulations which the king wrote to the highest nobles.⁶ Again, when the relation of such a noble died, the Emperor would send some one to express his condolences to the bereaved on his behalf.⁷

The highest among the nobility were connected with the imperial family through marriages. Usually, the Emperor and his sons married into families whose members not only held very high ranks but had the prestige of a long aristocratic lineage. Thus, the great Rajput houses and families like those of Itimaduddaula provided brides to the imperial family for generations. The demand of a bride by the Emperor for himself, or for one of his sons, was another mark of distinction, reserved usually only for the greatest families. The Emperor himself, however,

¹ Chandra Bhan Brahman's *Guldasta* contains an interesting passage on the ceremonials associated with the bestowal of such gifts. According to the rules of the Empire, a person who was awarded *mansab* or a promotion or was granted a *jagir* had to salute (*taslim*) four times. The jewels and jewelled ornaments were placed on the head of the recipient, bracelet (*paunchi*), bow-string (*r'ud*), and *mala* etc., were placed on the hand, collar, ear and neck and he had to salute four times.

Regarding the weapons the rule was that the sword was suspended from the neck of the recipient, the dagger and *jandhar* was placed on the head, and the quiver on the shoulder, and after performing four salutations (*taslim*) the recipient was allowed to gird them. The bows and the musket were placed on the shoulder, and the recipient, having offered four salutations, held them in his hand. The shield was placed on the neck and the armour on the shoulder of the recipient, who then put them on. Similarly, on the occasion of the bestowal of horses and elephants, the horse-bridle and the elephant-drivers baton were placed on the shoulder, for which salutations (*taslimat*) were offered by the recipients (*Guldasta*, f 6b-7a).

² When Jai Singh was deputed to punish Shivaji, he was awarded *Padm-i Murassa* with *khi'as* etc. (Mamuri, f 131b).

³ *Raqam-i Karam*, ff 14a-14b, for an exception to this rule, expressly made in favour of Amun Khan's son.

⁴ *Raqam-i Karam*, f 20b.

⁵ *Dastur-al amal Agahi*, f 61, *Raqam-i Karam*, f 13b.

⁶ *Adab-i Alamgiri*, ff 106a, 144b, 150b, *Raqam-i Karam*, ff 5b-6a, 17a-17b.

⁷ *Ma'asu-i Alamgiri*, pp 103, 223.

out of political considerations, never gave his sisters or daughters in marriage to any one outside the imperial family. They either remained unmarried or husbands were found for them within the imperial family.¹ With the other princesses, such strict regard for imperial dignity was not observed, and such marriages were also not considered significant from the political point of view. Thus, for example, in 1672, Murad's daughter, A'isha Banu was married to Muhammad Salih, a noble belonging to a Persian family.²

THE SYSTEM OF PRESENTS

[The system of nobles offering presents to the Emperor had become a part of the Court etiquette.] In fact, it was a general custom all over Asia that "the great are never approached with empty hands".³ [The offering of these presents to the Emperor was really a public act, and it was expected that the worth and glitter of the offering would enhance the splendour of the imperial Court.]

Gifts of substance presented by officers went by the name of *peshkash*. There were certain occasions when the *peshkash* was expected from the nobles present at the Court.⁴ Such were the anniversaries of the Emperor's accession, the birth-anniversary of the Emperor, the Nauroz (Persian New Year's Day), the birth of a prince or princess, the celebration of a victory and the Emperor's recovery from an illness. The nobles also offered *peshkash* whenever they wanted some particular favour from the Emperor.⁵ The *zamindars* offered *peshkash* at the time of their accession to their *gaddi* (throne) while the tributary princes offered an annual *peshkash*.⁶ The *peshkash* offered by the *zamindars* and tributary princes was different in nature from the *peshkash* of the ordinary nobles, it was a token of the recognition of the Emperor's supremacy, and also an assertion of the imperial rights in the appointment of a person to the *gaddi*.

Peshkash was often presented not in cash but in jewels, precious articles, etc. Jafar Khan was prepared to pay a very high price for a diamond

¹ This was true at least for the reigns of Shahjahan and Aurangzeb

² *Ma'am-i Alamgiri*, p. 120 For the treatment of their husbands by these princesses, see Tavernier, I, p. 313

³ Bernier, p. 200

⁴ The occasions set out in the following sentence can be picked out from the official chronicle, (*Alamgir Nama*), where the account of each is marked by references to articles or amounts offered as *peshkash* by important nobles.

⁵ During his second Viceroyalty of the Deccan, Aurangzeb wrote to Mir Jumla that he should send the agent of Shri Ranga Rayal, the *zamindar* of Carnatik to the Court along with *peshkash* (*Adab-i Alamgiri*, f. 77b) Aurangzeb informed Mir Sultan that goods sent by him as *peshkash* were accepted (*Adab-i Alamgiri*, f. 155b) Rana Raj Singh sent two jewelled swords and one jewelled spear to the Emperor as *peshkash* and it was accepted (*Alamgir Nama*, p. 341)

⁶ Tavernier, I, pp. 308-310, *Alamgir Nama*, p. 837, Manucci, II, pp. 348-49, III, p. 411

to Tavernier in order to be able to present it to the Emperor.¹ [Jewels etc. offered by the nobles to the Emperor as *peshkash* were valued and set off against cash. The nobles were expected to offer *peshkash* according to their status].²

Besides *peshkash*, there was *nazr*. In 1700 Aurangzeb ordered all *peshkash* offered in cash to be called *nazr*.³ Next year he ordered that instead of *nazr* the term *niaz* should be used for gifts offered by princes and instead of *peshkash* the term *nisar* for the gifts of nobles.⁴ But, perhaps, in earlier time *nazr* was different from *peshkash* only in being less substantial and was offered in thanks-giving on felicitous occasions of lesser importance. Thus, nobles offered presents to the Emperor on occasions of felicity in their families, such as the birth of a son.⁵ A *nazr* could be offered by a noble after recovery from an illness.⁶ It could also be offered when a noble came to the Court from his post⁷ or *jagir*.⁸ In one case, it was offered by a noble on his reinstatement. The amounts given were usually small, amounting to a few *muhrs* (minimum one *muhr*) and some rupees (minimum five), even when offered by the highest nobles.

While it is true that the *nazr* was usually only a nominal amount, the *peshkash* must have imposed a real burden on the nobles.⁷ How far Bernier is right in stating that the nobles were ruined partly because of the presents they had to offer to the Emperor it is difficult to say.⁸ [But apart from the financial aspect, the system is open to criticism from an ethical point of view as well. Often the *peshkash* would only be a veiled form of bribe offered to the Emperor in expectation of certain favours. If the sovereign himself presented such a spectacle, the nobles and other officials would not hesitate to follow his example more vigorously and without any check, as we shall see in the subsequent section.]

MANSABDARS AND THE PUBLIC SERVICE

The Mughal conception of public service was obviously determined by the nature and sphere of state activity. Unlike modern states, 'national reconstruction' was no part of the real purpose of the state; its moral basis, as stated by Abul Fazl, the chief spokesman of Mughal monarchy, lay in the establishment of justice and of law and order, and in the prevention of crimes and of violent conflicts between various sections of the people.¹⁰ The welfare of the people, in general terms, was regarded as

¹ Tavernier, I, pp. 112, 301; Bernier, p. 271.

² *Alamgir Nama*, passim. The value of the jewels presented to the Emperor is always quoted.

³ *AlIsharat*, 9 Jamada II, 44, R.Y.

⁴ *Ma'asir-i Alamgiri*, p. 440.

⁵ *AlIsharat*, 28 Rabi II, and 1st Jamada II, 8th R.Y.; 25 Rabi I, 38 R.Y.

⁶ *AlIsharat*, 28 Rabi II, 1st Jamada I, 1st Jamada II, 8th R.Y.; 3 Zilhij and 4 Ziqada, 9th R.Y.

⁷ *AlIsharat*, 20 Rajab, 12 R.Y.; 20 Rajab, 45 R.Y.

⁸ *AlIsharat*, 28 Rabi II, 8th R.Y.

⁹ Bernier, p. 213.

¹⁰ *Ain*, Vol. I, 201-3.

a laudable ideal, but was practically visualised as the establishment of charitable institutions, famine relief, *taqavi* loans to the peasants, land and cash grants to scholars and men of religion, etc. The main interest of the state lay in the organisation of the army, the collection of revenue and the functioning of the judiciary. The judiciary was a separate institution in itself, but all the remaining functions of the government were assigned to the *mansabdars*.

The *mansabdari* organisation included all government services, without any official subdivisions into military, financial and executive branches. Military obligations were invariably imposed on each *mansabdar* in accordance with his *sawar* rank. But since separate departments had to be established in the administrative machinery with posts such as *faujdar* (military and civil affairs), *diwan* (finance), *kotwal* (police) and so on, the office held by a *mansabdar* imposed duties of different types upon him. So, while nominally there was no difference between the civil and military duties of a *mansabdar*, yet in fact civil (revenue) and military duties were often assigned to different persons according to their experience or training.¹ Thus, for example, nobles like Jai Singh,² Daud Khan Qureshi,³ Dilir Khan,⁴ Bahadur Khan Zafar Jang Kokaltash,⁵ Amir Khan,⁶ Dalpat Bundela,⁷ were always assigned military duties and no financial and revenue duty was ever required of them. Such instances may, of course, be multiplied. Likewise, some nobles were always assigned financial and executive duties, such as Raja Raghunath,⁸ Inayatullah Khan,⁹ Fazil Khan,¹⁰ Bahramand Khan,¹¹ etc.

However, there are also instances of the same *mansabdars* serving in various departments at different times.¹² Thus Amanat Khan, who held the office of the *diwan* of Bijapur, *daftardari-tan*, *bayutat-i rikab* and, finally of the *mutasaddi* of the Port of Surat, was also twice appointed *haris* (or Commandant) of Aurangabad.¹³ Ashraf Khan who at various times had held the office of Superintendent of Branding, Royal Librarian and *bakhshi* of Sulaiman Shukoh, and served as *diwan* of Dara Shukoh and Jahan Ara, was also appointed Governor of Kashmir.¹⁴ Ruhullah

¹ *Alamgir Nama*, pp. 30, 184, 306, 315, 324, 414 & 866, Mamuri, f. 131b.

² *Ma'asir-ul Umara*, II, pp. 32-37.

³ *Alamgir Nama*, pp. 160 & 315, Mamuri, 131b, Khafi Khan, II, p. 178, *Dilkusha*, f. 28a-28b, *Ma'asir-ul Umara*, II, pp. 42 & 56.

⁴ *Dilkusha*, f. 51b, *Ma'asir-ul Alamgiri*, pp. 123-24, Mamuri, f. 173b, Khafi Khan, II, p. 316.

⁵ *Alamgir Nama*, pp. 1045 & 1057, *Ma'asir-ul Alamgiri*, p. 61, *Ma'asir-ul Umara*, I, pp. 277-87.

⁶ *Dilkusha*, ff. 105b, 114b-15a & 153a, *Ma'asir-ul Alamgiri*, pp. 284 & 356, *Ma'asir-ul Umara*, II, pp. 317-23.

⁷ *Alamgir Nama*, pp. 749, 763, 829, *Ma'asir-ul Umara*, II, p. 282.

⁸ *Ma'asir-ul Alamgiri*, pp. 314, 345 & 393.

⁹ *Ma'asir-ul Alamgiri*, pp. 393-94, Khafi Khan, II, p. 175.

¹⁰ *Ma'asir-ul Umara*, I, pp. 484-85.

¹¹ *Ma'asir-ul Umara*, I, pp. 287-90, *Ma'asir-ul Alamgiri*, p. 347.

¹² *Ma'asir-ul Umara*, I, pp. 272-74.

Khan not only held successively the offices of *mir bakhshi* of *ahadis*, *akhta begi*, *khan-saman*, *akhtabegi* (again), and second *bakhshi*, first *bakhshi*, but also served as *faujdar* of Dhamau and Saharanpur and *subedar* of Orissa.¹ Muhammad Amin Khan was the *sadr-i kul* of Aurangzeb and thus in charge of judicial administration; but he was also assigned a number of military duties throughout his career.²

As noted above, the judiciary was generally treated as a separate institution as it required a specialized academic training, and the *qazis* and *sadrs* could expect careers in one branch only! Saiyid Jalal Khan Bukhari,³ Abdul Wahab,⁴ and Shaikh-al Islam,⁵ for example, made their careers in the judiciary only, and no other duties were ever assigned to them. Amin Khan seems to have been the only exception. The officers of the judiciary were seldom assigned any executive or financial duties probably in order to avoid the possibility of their having any administrative interests. Unlike the modern judiciary, the judiciary of the Mughals was not an independent institution; but still it was to some extent a check on the tyranny of the executive. The nobles and the administrators also considered the judiciary an entirely separate institution, which had nothing to do with the administration of the country. Interference by the judiciary in the administration was often resented by the nobles.⁶ Mahabat Khan in a letter to Aurangzeb protested sharply against the increase in the power of the *qazis* (judges) of the Empire.⁷

Theoretically, once a person accepted a *mansab*, he placed his entire services at the disposal of the Emperor, and his duties by no means ended after he had supplied the contingent or fulfilled the other obligations required from him by the rank he held. He could be assigned any duty or work in any department without receiving a specific salary for the office. His *zat* pay covered everything. Naturally if he failed to perform his duty to the Emperor's satisfaction, he would be punished not by the cancellation of any allowance but by a reduction in his *mansab*.⁸

Certain canons seem to have been gradually developed to establish a correspondence between a post and the rank held by the *mansabdar* assigned to that post. On the executive side, there were three important posts in the provinces, namely, the *nazim* or *subedar* (or Governor), the *faujdar* and the *thanedar*. Nobles holding the ranks from 2,500 to 7,000

¹ *Alamgir Nama*, pp 830, 1061, *Ma'asir-i Alamgiri*, pp 127, 144, 150, 156, 195 & 281

² *Ma'asir-al Umara*, I, pp 346-50

³ *Murat-i Ahmadi*, I, p 218, *Lahori*, II, p 365, *Ma'asir-al Umara*, III, pp 447-51

⁴ Khafi Khan, II, p 216, *Ma'asir al Umara*, I, pp 235-41

⁵ Mamuri, 162a, *Ma'asir al Umara*, I, pp 237-39

⁶ *Byaz-i Izad Bakhsh Rasa*, ff 8a-11a, Khafi Khan, II, pp 215-17

⁷ "The Empire depends now on the *qazis*, and a *qazi* is only satisfied with bribes"

⁸ When, for example, it was reported that Neknam Khan, the *bakhshi* of the army, and Ikhlas Khan, the *waqia nigar*, had not joined prince Bedar Bakht, the Emperor reduced the *mansab* of both of them (*Akhbarat*, 16th Shaban, 43rd R. Y)

were generally appointed governors. Actually the provincial charges varied considerably in importance. On the one hand, there were the *subedaris* of Kabul¹ Gujarat² and Bengal³, etc. to which only *mansabdars* of very high ranks were appointed. On the other hand, there were *subas* like Kashmir⁴ and Ajmer,⁵ etc. to which *mansabdars* of second rank were appointed.

As far as the appointment to the post of *faujdar* was concerned, generally *mansabdars* from the rank of 500 up to the rank of 5,000 were appointed. Actually, the charges of the *faujdar* varied considerably in importance. The governor of Ajmer province was known as *faujdar-i Ajmer*, the whole province being regarded under his *faujdar* jurisdiction.⁶ In Gujarat there was the *faujdar* of Sorath, to which only nobles of very high ranks were appointed.⁷ Various other examples could also be given such as Baiswara (whose *faujdar* was independent of the governors of Oudh as well as Allahabad),⁸ Jaunpur and Carnatik⁹ and Raheri,¹⁰ etc. to which *mansabdars* of first rank were appointed. On the other hand, there were very small *faujdaris* e.g. the environs of the city of Ahmadabad,¹¹ Rai Sen,¹² and Khaun,¹³ etc. to which *mansabdars* of low ranks were generally appointed. Some *faujdaris* were assigned to local *jagirdars*,¹⁴ while a few, perhaps,

¹ Mahabat Khan 6,000/5,000 (3,500 × 2-3h) held the charge of the *Subedari* of Kabul (*Alamgir Nama*, 229). After the transfer of Mahabat Khan, Amir Khan 5,000/5,000 (1,000 × 2-3h) was appointed to that post (*Ibid.*, p. 661).

² Shah Nawaz Khan Safvi 6,000/6,000 (5,000 × 2-3h) was appointed as *Subedar* of Gujarat (*Alamgir Nama*, p. 210), afterwards Raja Jaswant Singh 7,000/7,000 (5,000 × 2-3h) held the charge of the *subedari* of Gujarat (*Ibid.*, p. 346).

³ Muazzam Khan Mir Jumla 7,000/7,000 (2-3h) held the charge of the *Subedari* of Bengal (*Alamgir Nama*, p. 676), his successor was Shaista Khan Amir-ul Umara, 7,000/7,000 (2-3h) (*Ibid.*, p. 848).

⁴ Lashkar Khan 2,500/2,000 held the charge of the *suba* of Kashmir (*Alamgir Nama*, 195), Ifukhar Khan 2,000/1,000 was appointed *subedar* of Kashmir in 1672 (*Ma'asir-ul Umara* I, p. 254).

⁵ Tarbiyat Khan 4,000/4,000 was appointed as *hakim* of Ajmer in 1659 (*Alamgir Nama*, 119, 304), Ifukhar Khan 3,000/1,200 was appointed *hakim* of Ajmer in 1679 (*Waqi Ajmer*).

⁶ *Waqi Ajmer*.

⁷ *Raqam-i Karaim*, ff 3b, 9b, *Dastur-al Amal-i Agahi*, f 38.

⁸ *Insha-i Roshan Kalam*.

⁹ Zulfikar Khan, 5,000/5,000, held the charge of the *faujdar* of Carnatik Haiderabad (*Ma'asir-ul Umara*, II, p. 65), Qasim Khan 3,500/3,500 (2,000 × 2-3h) held the charge of the *faujdar* of Carnatik Bijapuri (*Akhbarat*, 15th Safar, 35th R. Y.).

¹⁰ Abdur Razzaq Lari, 5,000/5,000, appointed *faujdar* of Raheri (Khaifi Khan, II, p. 405), Fedai Khan, 4,000/4,000, appointed *faujdar* of Gorakhpur (*Adab-i Alamgiri*, 260a), Tarbiyat Khan, 4,000/3,000, appointed *faujdar* of Orissa (*Mirat-al Alam*, f 208a).

¹¹ *Akhbarat*, Azam's Camp, 24 Rajab, 47th R. Y.

¹² Mir Faizullah, 500/200, was appointed *qaidar* and *faujdar* of Rausen (*Akhbarat*, 38th R. Y. f 378).

¹³ Aqa Bahram, 500/400, appointed *faujdar* of Khaun (*Akhbarat*, 9th Rajab, 24th R. Y.), Nurat Khan, 700/500 (2-3h), held charge of the *faujdar* of Jamun, but was suspended later on (*Akhbarat*, 11th Rabi I, 37th R. Y.).

¹⁴ See Chapter III.

in each *subah* were generally at the disposal of the *subedar*, who might govern them through a deputy or appoint a man of his own choice to its substantive charge.¹

Next to the *faujdar* was the post of the *thanedar*. The precise nature and duties of the *thanedars*, and the extent of the control exercised over them by local *faujders* is not quite clear. Some of the *thanedaris* were of such importance that nobles of very high rank were appointed to them. Such, for example, were the *thanedaris* of Kolah Pur,² Bahrura,³ and Lohgarh.⁴ It is difficult to imagine that control over these *thanedars* was ever exercised by local *faujders*. On the other hand, there were small *thanedaris* e.g. Saraha,⁵ Khanda,⁶ etc. to which only petty *mansabdars* were appointed. In 1671 Jaswant Singh 7,000/7,000 (5,000 $\times$ 2—3h) was appointed as *thanedar* of Jamrud,⁷ but this appointment was of a political nature and not of a routine character. In general it appears that nobles from the rank of 200 upwards were appointed *thanedars*.

On the financial and purely administrative side, the post of the *diwan*, the *mir bakhshi*, the second *bakhshi* and the third *bakhshi* were important. The post of the central *diwan* was considered to carry the highest authority, and nobles of the first rank like Muazzam Khan, Wazir Khan and Jafar Khan, etc. were appointed to it.⁸ The post of *mir bakhshi* was also almost as important, and it was assigned to the nobles of the first grade like Bahramand Khan,⁹ and Zulfiqar Khan.¹⁰ To the post of second and third *bakhshi*, nobles of the second grade were appointed.¹¹

A *mansabdar* might not only be given offices in different departments but also be sent to any province on any assignment that the Emperor decided. Throughout the reign of Aurangzeb, as in earlier reigns, there are innumerable cases of nobles being transferred from one province to another, from one end of the Empire to another. The biography of

¹ *Akhbarat*, 36th R.Y. f 73, 37th R.Y. ff 201-02.

² Khan i Alam Ikhtas Khan, 6,000/5,000 was appointed *thanedar* of Kolahpur and, after his transfer, his younger brother, Ikhtas Khan, 4,000/2,600, was appointed to the same *thanedari*, (*Akhbarat*, 4 Rabi I, 42th R.Y.)

³ Randula Khan, 4,000/4,000, held charge of the *thanedari* of Bahrura and, after his transfer Nagu Ji Mane, 5,000/4,000, was appointed to the same *thanedari* (*Akhbarat*, 8th Moharram, 44th R.Y.)

⁴ Muhammad Sadiq Khan, 3,000/1,200, appointed *thanedar* of Lohgarh (*Ma'asir-al Umara*, III, p 247)

⁵ Mohan Singh, 200/50, appointed *thanedar* of Saraha (*Akhbarat*, 24th R.Y. f 52)

⁶ *Ahmadad*, 700/500, held the charge of the *thanedari* of Khanda (*Akhbarat*, 28 Rajab, 24th R.Y.)

⁷ *Ma'asir i Alamgiri*, p 109

⁸ *Zawabit-i Alamgiri*, ff 82a-82b

⁹ Khafi Khan, II, p 407

¹⁰ *Ma'asir i Alamgiri*, p 461.

¹¹ In the beginning of Aurangzeb's reign Asad Khan, 4,000/2,000, was 2nd *bakhshi* (*Ma'asir-al Umara*, I, p 311) In 1694 Mukhlis Khan, 2,500/700, was appointed second *bakhshi* (*Ma'asir i Alamgiri*, p 349) In 1704 Mirza Safi Khan was appointed third *bakhshi* and at that time he had the rank of 3,000/1,000 (*Ma'asir-i Alamgiri*, 482)

almost any noble would bring out the fact that he had been posted at various times to different provinces in the Empire¹

[From the foregoing facts, some general conclusions may be arrived at about the relationship between the *mansabdari* organisation and the administrative system of the Empire. The *mansabdari* organisation included the military, civil and financial services, i.e. all public services, except the judiciary. A *mansabdar* had a minimum military obligation indicated by his rank, but in addition he could be assigned to do any work in any department. While the *mansab* held by a noble and the post assigned to him were not directly related, a broad correspondence between the two did exist. The *mansabdars* formed in every sense the governing class of the Empire, and were therefore different from the French aristocracy of the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which had been divorced from administrative machinery. The detailed business of the government could not but be carried on with the help of the subordinate employees, who sometimes wielded considerable influence. Broadly, however, the Mughal nobility retained its hold over the administration and preserved its internal cohesion by the system of constant transfers of individual nobles from one province to another, which made the nobility truly imperial (or all-India) in character and tended to moderate the effects of parochial elements and traditions.]

NOBLES' CONDUCT IN ADMINISTRATION

[Since the Mughal nobility combined the status of an aristocracy and the functions of a bureaucracy in one governing group, it is worth asking how they conducted themselves in the latter role. To some extent their conduct was subject to the control of the Emperor who could promote, demote, depose or otherwise reward and punish his officers. But in its turn the imperial policy in exercising such control was largely governed by the object which the Mughal state set before itself. We have said earlier that a rigorous urge for reconstruction in the modern sense could not be expected, at best the administration concerned itself with maintaining law and order and providing for relief of exceptional distress. Emphasis was placed on the mystic or the religious element, in deference to the principle of *sulh-i-kul* under Akbar or to the *shariat* under Aurangzeb, and the imperial government stood forth—on paper, at least, if not in actual fact—as the upholder of piety and morality. These considerations apart, the attention of the state was concentrated almost exclusively upon increasing the income, augmenting the military resources and maintaining the administration in a high state of efficiency.] An analysis of the reasons for which various officials were

¹ The only class of nobles for which this will not be wholly true was perhaps the Deccanis

demoted by Aurangzeb would show to what misdemeanours the Emperor, limited as the objects of the government were, took particular exceptions. Thus, disobedience of the orders of the Emperor, not discharging duties to the emperor's satisfaction and not maintaining the required contingents were offences for which punishment were most often meted out. Another set of actions, for which an official might suffer, were infringing upon royal prerogative, having some connection with the enemy, sympathising with the rebels or showing cowardice in action. Immoral activities (drinking, etc.) could also bring about reduction in ranks. Finally, tyranny and maladministration, murder and robbery were similarly punished.¹ However, in his dealings with the nobles in the last mentioned sphere, Aurangzeb showed surprising leniency. Khafi Khan says that although he abolished many illegal taxes on the peasants and merchants, he never punished those who continued to levy them; and, indeed, his own Finance Ministry acted in collusion with the nobles by including the yield of such taxes in the *jama* of the *jagirs*.² In an order issued in his 8th R.Y., Aurangzeb himself says that many *jagirdars* in Gujarat were demanding land revenue more than the actual yield harvested by the peasants and oppressing them when they failed to meet this demand. But except for reiterating a ban on such malpractices, he prescribed no punishment for those who had been so flagrantly guilty of violating imperial regulations.³ Even when he punished, Aurangzeb's hand fell very lightly. Even for enormous crimes, nobles escaped with a mere reduction in rank. Aurangzeb himself acquired a reputation for being exceptionally mild towards his officers. He was prepared to forgive or overlook any disobedience to his orders where his own military interests were not directly involved.⁴

When the imperial control was lax, the only controlling force was the noble's conscience. And this could apparently be persuaded to overlook many things. The prevailing practice of bribery provided the best illustration of this. There were a few officers who disdained to take

¹ See *Akhbarat*, 19th Rabi II, 12 R.Y., 3rd Shaban, 24 R.Y., 14th Shaban, 43 R.Y., 5th Shaban, 43 R.Y., 8th Jamada I, 44 R.Y., 9th Zulhij, 45 R.Y., 20th Ramzan, 40 R.Y., 24th Shaban, 37 R.Y., 10th Ziqada, 38 R.Y., 25 R.Y., f 388, 6th Ziqada, 13 R.Y., 27th Moharram, 44 R.Y., 2nd Rabi I, 43 R.Y., 10th Shaban, 43 R.Y., 19th Jamada, 45 R.Y., 5th Rabi I, 43 R.Y., 11th Moharram, 46 R.Y., 1st Ziqada, 43 R.Y.; 11th Rabi I, 43 R.Y., 24 Rabi I, 43 R.Y., 15th Jamada II, 44 R.Y., 24th Ramzan, 44 R.Y., 2nd Jamada, 9 R.Y., 23rd Ziqada, 43 R.Y., 7th Zulhij, 43 R.Y., Khafi Khan, II, pp 275, 478-83, Mamuri, ff 155a, 178b, *Ma'asir-i Alamgiri*, pp 88-89.

² Khafi Khan, II, pp 88-89.

³ *Mirat-i Ahmadi*, I, p 263, *Mazhar-i Shahjahan*, pp 177, 180.

⁴ Manucci, III, p 260, IV, p 98 & 100, Bhim Sen also, says that Aurangzeb in his last years devoted little thought to the conditions of his Empire, concentrating his entire attention on seizing forts (*Qala giri*) (*Dilkusha*, f 146a) *Mazhar-i Shahjahan*, pp 173-74.

bribes or presents,¹ but the fact that writers of the period should note the presence of this habit in certain individuals as an exception worthy of record, shows that in general the nobles saw nothing wrong in this practice. Indeed, as we have said earlier, the Emperor's own practice of expecting and taking presents served them as an unimpeachable model.

The nobles expected presents in return for doing everything, even for acts done under imperial orders or in accordance with the specified duties of their posts. Thus, according to Manucci, the governors and *fauj-dars* turned out from villages, houses and lands, people to whom these had been given by imperial *farmans*, unless they paid them presents.² The texts of *madad-i-ma'ash farmans* which contain injunctions to officials not to take presents and perquisites from the grantees on various pretexts, suggest that Manucci was not by any means exaggerating.³ At a higher level, the same story could be heard. William Norris, ambassador of the new English East India Company, was told that Aurangzeb had decided to permit his Company to operate in his dominions, but to obtain the necessary document, he had to present Rs 200,000 to His Majesty and Rs 100,000 to his officials.⁴

When this was the case where duty was concerned, the price was still higher where it was within the discretion of the noble to take what action he chose. When the English wanted some concessions from the Mughals on the western coast, they sent presents to Bahadur Khan Kokaltash, governor of the Deccan, but were defrauded by the intermediaries. This was unfortunate because, "nothing was to wrought (on Bahadur Khan) without liberal *Pishkashes* (*peshkashes*), he bearing it as high as the King himself."⁵ If the aid of a noble was sought for intercession with the Emperor or for the recommendation of a suit, a price had to be paid. Daud Khan took some very fine presents from the queen of Trichinapalli before undertaking to recommend her appeal for protection to the Emperor,⁶ he also took Rs 25,000 from the English to recommend a petition of theirs to Aurangzeb.⁷ Nobles at the court, who had access to the Emperor, sold their good offices to the highest bidder. Qabil Khan, Aurangzeb's *mir munshi*, or Chief Secretary, amassed a fortune of 12 lacs of rupees in cash and

¹ *English Factories* 1661-64, pp. 203-05. Mamur-i f. 175b-79a. Khafi Khan II pp. 261 & 375-81.

² Manucci III p. 232. *Dilkusha* f. 84a.

³ Large numbers of such *farmans* have survived. The U.P. Record office at Allahabad has a specially rich collection of these. Their text was standardised from the last years of Akbar onwards.

⁴ Manucci III pp. 300-01. Cf. H. H. Das, *The Norris Embassy to Aurangzeb* pp. 221, 277.

⁵ Fryer pp. 329-30. See also *The English Factories 1670-77* Vol I (New Series) p. 190.

⁶ Manucci III p. 411.

⁷ *Ibid.*, III pp. 412-13.

valuables during his two and a half years service with the Emperor¹ Norris had to offer big presents to the *diwan*, Asad Khan, to win his support for his suit before the Emperor² Subordinate officers similarly sold their good offices for interceding with their superiors Chatar Bhuj, the *peshkar* (personal assistant) of Rashid Khan, the *diwan* & *khalsa*, used to receive Rs 1,000 every year from Muhammad Muqum, *amin* and *faujdar* of a *pargana* which has been left unnamed To Bali Ram, Chatar Bhuj's successor, the same official sent a *rath* or chariot worth Rs 250³

From this the next step was to demand presents from those whom a noble could not help but harm Thus Bhim Sen had to pay money to numerous persons at the Court simply in order to retain his *mansab*⁴ He probably had not committed any fault to deserve losing his rank But others who might have deserved punishment escaped by offering presents to those whose duty it was to detect and expose them Manucci declares that Aurangzeb's younger nobles 'in their eagerness to become rich, plunder and act wrongfully They bribe the *waqia navis* (official reporter) and the *khufiya navis* (secret reporter) so that the king may never hear'⁵ From this type of blackmail we may pass on to direct extortion Shaista Khan, Governor of Bengal, presuming upon his high status, was perhaps, boldest in this respect Bowrey reports of his compelling Chum Khan, a merchant, to pay him Rs 50,000⁶

From methods such as these, nobles of moderate ranks were able to amass enormous fortunes Abdun Nabi, (2,000/1,500), *faujdar* of Mathura, left 13 lacs of rupees, 9,300 *muhrs*, and valuables worth 4½ lacs⁷ Azam Khan Koka, (4,000/4,000), governor of Bengal, left 22 lacs of rupees and 1,12,000 *muhrs*⁸

Bribery was thus, for all practical purposes, the chief method by which a subject could secure the aid and assistance of the administration, either for his own protection or for the destruction of others, both in accordance with, and in direct opposition to, all the regulations of the state and imperial orders There seems to have been no serious attempt to check this practice in the time of Aurangzeb Only when, as in the case of Munshi Qabil Khan, the bribes taken exceeded all bounds, and perhaps annoyed men of higher ranks, did the Emperor take action This action too was seldom severe, Qabil Khan was dismissed from his office at the Court and his house was confiscated⁹ A more severe attitude was

¹ *Ma asir Alamgiri*, p 191

² Manucci III p 300

³ *Akhbarat* IIth Rajab 39 R Y

⁴ *D Iksha f* 84a

⁵ Manucci II pp 451-52 also III p 291

See also *The English Factor at 1670-77*

Vol I (New Series) p 267

⁶ Bowrey *The Countries Round the Bay of Bengal* pp 153-56 See also *The English Factor at 1661-64* p 140 1668-69 p. 315

⁷ *Ma asir Alamgiri*, 83

⁸ *Ma asir Alamgiri* p 169

⁹ *Ma asir Alamgiri* pp 190-91

naturally shown towards cases of embezzlement—for the imperial treasury was here directly concerned—but it was considered enough if the embezzled money was returned.¹

[The picture that we get of the Mughal governing class, based on accounts of bribery and corruption, is not a flattering one. It is possible that individual Mughal nobles realised that corrupt practices could not be taken too far without destroying all semblance of government, let alone good government. But even if the picture we have drawn is one-sided or exaggerated—possible faults because of the nature and limitations of our evidence—much would remain, after all qualifications have been made, to suggest that the Mughal nobility formed an extremely short-sighted ruling class. Whatever the reasons for this attitude, their immediate personal gains blinded them to all future dangers to the administration. No central policy could be enforced loyally and steadily by such a class. If the civil administration was the first to suffer from its extortions, the military and diplomatic fortunes of the Mughal Empire were bound to suffer in the end. And by the closing years of Aurangzeb's reign that ultimate stage had already arrived.]

¹ In 1702, Chatar Bhuj, *farrier* of the *durwan-i Akhara*, was imprisoned for misappropriating one lac of rupees. He was ordered to be released on payment of Rs. 25,000 and the promise to pay the rest in instalments (*Alifbarat*, 13th Shaban, 45 R.Y.) But Lutfullah Khan, who sold grain-stores, etc. of the fort of Meerā, and misappropriated the proceeds, suffered only a reduction of 300 *manas* in his *mansab* (*Alifbarat*, 22nd Shawwal, 38 R.Y.) See also *The English Factories*, 1670-77, Vol. I, (New Series) p. 267.

CHAPTER VI

NOBLES AND ECONOMIC LIFE

ROLE OF NOBLES IN COMMERCE

THE Mughal nobility, unlike contemporary European nobility, was not tied to the land; their *jagirs* (or revenue assignments) were transferred from one place to another as a matter of routine, and many of them were *naqdis*, i.e. they received their pay in cash directly from the treasury. But if the Mughal nobles were not hereditary landlords, it does not follow that they were a commercialised ruling class. Salary, not commercial profit, was their main object in life. Nor did they, or any substantial number of them, rise from a mercantile 'middle class', as was the case with a big section of contemporary English 'oligarchy'. The biographical material available for the Mughal nobility is extensive, but examples of men of mercantile origin are hard to find. Mir Jumla, certainly presents a striking instance of a merchant turning into a statesman. Manucci suggests, in a passage on the Pathans, that they combined the profession of warriors and merchants and treated their admission into the ranks of courtiers (on the basis of equipage and following) as a kind of business investment.¹ Another noble who was originally a merchant was one Nurullah Khan who came into prominence towards the middle of Aurangzeb's reign.² But this is about all; and we know of no other nobles under Aurangzeb who might have begun their careers as merchants.

But by their very position as members of the ruling class, the nobles could not isolate themselves from the commercial world. Whether holding *jagirs* or receiving pay from treasury, the income of the *jagirdars* was derived mainly in cash. As we have seen in Chapter III the cash nexus was well established, so that the revenue in *jagirs* was also largely collected in cash. It should, therefore, occasion no surprise when we find nobles of the period accumulating enormous treasures in specie, cash and jewels. It would be natural for nobles, who had a large amount of cash in hand, to desire to increase it still further by investing it in trade, either by engaging in trade directly or by making capital advances to merchants. A big source for capital needed for sea-borne trade came from the Mughal aristocrats. We are informed by Tavernier that, "on arrival for embarkation at Surat, you find plenty of money. For it is the principal trade

¹ Manucci, Vol II, p 453

² *Riyaz us Salatin*, p 224 He is said to have held the rank of 3,000 *zat*

of the nobles of India to place their money on vessels on speculation for Harmuz, Bassora and Mocha, and even for Bantam, Achin and Philippenes."¹

Mir Jumla's activities in the commercial sphere offer the most noteworthy example of such business investments. He had frequent business deals with the English,² and sometimes he advanced money to the English factors also.³ Not only did Mir Jumla advance his money to others; he was in a real sense a 'merchant prince'. His ships carried on trade between Arrakan, Southern India⁴ and Persia. His interest in sea-borne trade with Persia is well brought out in the following passage from the *English Factories in India*:

"You (Chamber and his colleagues) will perceive by the copy of our generall consultation that we have condescended and agreed, for the preservation of the Nabob's amity, that now the junk cannot be restored, he may take his choice either of the *Anne*, with all her ammunition and stores or of your new built shipp. But this year you must not seem (to know) that we do any way condescend to, so that it may come to his knowledge, for you know the Nabob is five times more indebted to us, by his accompt; besides he doth yearely make use (of us) as this last yeare with twenty five tonnes of gumlacke whereof he pays noe freight nor custome in Persia."⁵

The attention of the nobles was, however, not only confined to foreign trade, but extended as well, and perhaps, to a greater extent, to internal trade. Here their lack of professional knowledge was more than amply compensated by the abuse of their influence and authority. Aurangzeb's farman to officials in Gujarat contain references to such commercial transactions, which yielded handsome profits, entered into by the nobles.⁶

If Mir Jumla offers the best instance of a Mughal noble taking part in sea-borne trade, Shaista Khan is the best example of a noble dabbling

¹ Tavernier, Vol. I, p. 31

² "The Nabob's money wee positively enorder, without, disputing or pretences, to be paid by Mr Trevisa back, and that accompt cleared, and that for the future none undertake such an unthankful and trespassing part of service. His ship wee shall endeavour to recover, and hope in March next to give you certain advice of our proceedings therein" (*The English Factories in India*, 1661-64, p. 68)

³ "In the meanwhile Charnock and Sheldon were peremptorily ordered to give respect and accompt of their actions unto Mr Trevisa. The latter was urged to repay the money lent to him by Mir Jumla and was again reminded of the necessity of a large supply of saltpetre" (*The English Factories in India*, 1661-64, p. 153), 1665-67, pp. 135 and 145

⁴ *Waqas-i-Deccan*, ed. by Dr Yusuf Husain, No. 2 (Ist Moharrum, 1702 A.H.)

⁵ *English Factories*, 1661-64, pp. 148-49, for the commercial activities of Mir Jumla, see also J. N. Sarkar, *The Life of Mir Jumla*, pp. 216-18.

⁶ *Mirāt-i-Ahmadi*, Vol. I, pp. 286-88 Gujarat, Centre of Commercial activities, *Rajm-Karim*, t. 20b.

in internal trade. His unlimited appetite for money found an outlet in his monopolisation of the internal trade of Bengal.

"Shaista Khan used to import by ship salt, *supari* or betelnuts and other articles, and sold them in Bengal on profitable terms. In addition, he accumulated seventeen crores of rupees by procuring two or three tolas of gold for one gold mohur. He also sold salt and *supari* to the merchants and traders in the city of Dacca. The latter were thus debarred from making purchases and sales on their own account."¹ We learn from the same source that Shaista Khan had established vast "emporiums of salt worth 152,000 rupees at several places".²

The English records are full of similar information about the same noble. "The Nabob's (Shaista Khan's) officers oppress the people, monopolize most commodities, even as low as grass for Beasts, caves, firewood, thatch, etc., nor do they want ways to oppress those people of all sorts who trade, whether natives or strangers."³ Charnock, writing from Patna (July 3, 1664) stated that "Shaista Khan's intentions were : To get the whole trade of peeter (saltpetre) into his own hands, and so to sell it againe to us and the Dutch at his own rates, he well knowing the ships can not goe from the Bay empty. But he is not likely to get above maunds 4 or 5,000 this year. His darogha hath so abused the merchants that they are almost all runne away. He pretends that all the peeter he buyes is for the king. It was never known he had occasion of more than maunds 1,000 or 1,500 yearly for all his warrs."⁴

Shaista Khan's inordinate interest in making commercial profit by hook or by crook was by no means an exception. About A.D. 1703, it was reported to the emperor that Prince Azimushshan was forcing the purchase of goods for his private trade and called it *Sauda-i Khas*. Aurangzeb censured the prince sternly and sarcastically called the practice *sauda-i kham* (raw deal) and called the prince a fool and a tyrant for practising such plunder of the people.⁵

The Mughal nobles were naturally interested in the trade in luxury goods, especially jewels. Shaista Khan's purchases from Tavernier are an example of this. The French merchant even went to Europe in 1654 to buy jewels on behalf of this potentate.⁶

¹ S K Bhuyan, *Annals of the Delhi Badshahat*, Gauhati, 1947, pp 167-68

² *Ibid* pp 169 & 172 Mirza Raja Jai Singh started manufacturing salt in his *jagir* and as a result of this the imperial salt factory in the Pargana of Sanbhar began to incur the loss of one lakh of rupees annually. Shahjahan directed Jai Singh to stop the manufacture of salt at once, otherwise his *jagir* would be transferred (Jaipur Documents, No 68, 5th Shawwal, 1053 A.H.)

³ *Diaries of Streyghsan Master*, I, p 80 For the tendency of the officials in Bengal for monopolising the commodities, see *Fathiyat-i 'Ibriya*, f 127a

⁴ *English Factories*, 1661-64, pp 395-96

⁵ *Riyazus Salatin*, pp. 243-44.

⁶ Tavernier Vol. I, pp 320-22 Tavernier says that in matters of trade the Indians were very precise and paid their debts without delay (Vol I, p 326) Shaista Khan purchased

Sometimes the emperor himself purchased jewels through the agency of the nobles. Shaista Khan sent one hundred and nine pearls to Aurangzeb but the price recommended by the Khan was exorbitant according to the estimate of the royal experts, so the emperor did not purchase them and they were returned.¹ On an earlier occasion Shaista Khan had sent a jewel and some pearls to Aurangzeb when he was a prince, and the latter had enquired from him about the prices so that the payment be made to him.²

The desire for luxuries and for obtaining articles made according to their own tastes and specifications led the nobility in general to have their own *karkhanas*,³ or workshops, for manufacturing robes, utensils, arms, furniture, etc. which sometimes employed quite a large number of artisans.⁴ The character of these *karkhanas* and the attitude of the nobles towards the artisans employed in them is brought out by Bernier in a well-known passage. He says: "Workshops, occupied by skilful artisans, would be vainly sought for in Delhi, which has very little to boast of in that respect. This is not owing to any inability in the people to cultivate the arts, for there are ingenious men in every part of the Indies. Numerous are the instances of handsome pieces of workmanship made by persons destitute of tools, and who can scarcely be said to have received instructions from a master. The rich will have every article at cheap rate. When an Omrah or Mansabdar requires the services of an artisan, he sends to the bazar for him, employing force, if necessary, to make the poor man work; and after the task is finished the unfeeling lord pays, not according to the value of labour but agreeably to his own standard of fair remuneration; the artisans having reason to congratulate himself if the Korah (whip) has not been given in part payment. . . . The artists, therefore, who arrive at any eminence in their art are those only who are in the service of the king or some powerful Omrah, and who work exclusively for their patron."⁵

Detailed information about the *karkhanas* maintained by the nobles is not available. But by the side of Bakhtawar Khan's proud claim of having established a number of *karkhanas* in various towns⁶ may be set the

from Tavernier articles worth Rs. 96,000 in 1632, in 1660 he for the second time purchased some articles from Tavernier, in 1666 he again purchased some articles of luxury (Vol. I, pp 15-16). Shaista Khan asked Tavernier to supply beautiful jewels and assured him that he would pay for them as liberally as the emperor (Vol. I, p. 245)

¹ *Adab-i Alamgiri*, f. 113a.

² *Adab-i Alamgiri*, f. 113a b.

³ Usually the scholars of today associate the term *karkhana* with the workshops maintained exclusively by the emperor, princes and the nobles. But it must be added that the *karkhanas* were also maintained by foreign trading companies in the 17th century (*The English Factories*, 1618-21, p. 198). We may assume that the individual traders also maintained *karkhanas*.

⁴ For a reference to Bakhtawar Khan's *karkhanas* established with his houses and palaces in Delhi, Agra, Lahore and Burhanpur, see *Mushtak al Alam*, f. 253b.

⁵ Bernier, pp. 254-56.

⁶ *Mushtak al Alam*, f. 253.

historians praise for Shuja'at Khan's *karkhanas*. The cups, plates, vessels, etc. manufactured in this noble's *karkhanas* were much admired by Aurangzeb, and Shuja'at Khan sent these articles as presents to the Emperor and other nobles.¹

[Apart from the nobles, the emperor and the princes and princesses also maintained *karkhanas* for providing their own needs.] For instance, we read in a letter from Aurangzeb to Shahjahan that owing to the scarcity of skilled hands, the output of the imperial *karkhanas* and of the *karkhanas* of Princess Jahan Ara had been meagre. The work of the artisans employed in Aurangzeb's own *karkhana* was not admired by the Emperor.² In another letter addressed to Jahan Ara Begam, Aurangzeb assures her that the management of the *karkhana* would not be changed and the articles required by her would continue to be manufactured.³

While there is a record of the nobles investing capital in commercial enterprise, it can not be said that their interest was always confined to making commercial profit by honest means. On the other hand, they often put obstructions to the free flow of trade so that they may enhance their income, not from the use of their wealth but the misuse of their power. Bribes were always necessary before they would grant the required privileges to traders and merchants.

In A.D. 1667, when the French traders wanted to obtain a *farman* from the Emperor for trade, they had to pay Rs 30,000 to the Emperor in foreign rarities while they also undertook to give Jafar Khan Rs 10,000 and a similar amount to other nobles. When all these payments were made, the *Parwana* for trade was issued to the French traders and they were permitted to hire a house in Surat and to pay 2 per cent duty *ad valorem* on their goods.⁴

In 1659 Mir Jumla stopped the trade of the English at Kasimbazar until some presents were offered to him, and then the requisite permission was given.⁵ In 1660 Mir Jumla demanded 20,000 pagodas from the English factors, and also asked them to remit 32,000 pagodas which he owed to the Company.⁶ When he was *subedar* of Bengal, Mir Jumla had exempted the English traders from custom duties and in return the English traders had to pay Rs 3,000 annually.⁷ In trade and commerce corruption prevailed everywhere and no assistance was rendered by the authorities unless they were paid for it.

Tavernier says "So true it is that those who desire to do business at the Court of the princes, in Turkey as well as in Persia and India, should not attempt to commence anything unless they had considerable presents ready prepared and almost always an open purse for diverse officers of

¹ *Alamgir-nama* pp. 403-06.

² *Alamgir-nama* I 196a.

³ *The English Factories in India 1665-67* p. 281.

⁴ *Id.* pp. 291-2.

⁵ *Id.* pp. 293-94.

⁶ *Alamgir-nama* I 25a.

economic affairs was taken for granted in medieval times, as also the seeking of special favours, including the creation of monopolies by suitable bribes, presents, etc.]

In spite of the uncertainty of income from the *jagirs*, a considerable number of nobles in Aurangzeb's time had huge resources, obtained mainly from the land revenue, at their command, which they could either have invested as capital or spent on goods required for consumption by themselves, their house-holds and retainers. [The high level of personal consumption was, on the whole, more a hindrance than a help to the development of trade and industry, since it resulted in an undue emphasis on the production and procurement of luxury goods. In such a situation there was little incentive for the growth of new methods and techniques of production. The ideas of the nobles concerning industry never went beyond *karkhanas* or establishments employing artisans at low rates for satisfying their needs for luxuries.

The view may accordingly be hazarded that by and large their 'investments' were not of a nature likely to lead to an improvement in the techniques of mass production, however large the patronage extended by them to skilled artisans.]

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NOBLES

THE 'SARKAR' OF THE NOBLES

WE have discussed in an earlier chapter the manner in which the *mansabdars* drew their pay. They constituted the governing class of the Empire, but were at the same time almost entirely dependent upon the state for their income. It was the Emperor who assigned them *jagirs* to provide them with their sanctioned income or pay, or, in case they were *naqdis*, paid them in cash. [On their part, they were obliged to maintain military contingents and to incur other expenses in the service of the state. Any audit of the disbursement made by them from their own resources was, however, quite alien to the Mughal administration. The personal expenses of the nobles were not checked or inspected, but only the men, material and services provided by them.¹ Each noble, therefore, had a semi-autonomous '*sarkar*' (administration) of his own, which comprised his military contingent, officials, household staff, harem, servants and hangers-on.² All such administrations were independent units, because the nobles could spend out of their own income whatever they pleased, as long as the military and other obligations to the state were fulfilled. The central position in a noble's *sarkar* was naturally occupied by the financial department responsible for collecting the revenues from his *jagir* through his agents. This income was often augmented by presents and bribes or profits from commercial enterprises. Every noble had a *duwan*, who was in charge of the financial administration of the noble's establishment, and had a large staff under him.³ Pelsaert remarks, "As a rule all the possessions of the lords and their transactions are not secret, but perfectly well known, for each has his *duwan*, through whose hands everything passes, he has many subordinates, and for the work that could be done by one man, they have ten here, and each of them has some definite charge, for which he must account."⁴ It is not clear if the official whom Manucci describes as 'treasurer' was the same as the *duwan*. We are told by him of how "a man, who supplied his (the noble, Jafar Khan's) household with herbs and vegetables during his journey to Kashmir brought his account at the end of the year to the treasurer

¹ See Chapter II.

² For the word '*sarkar*' used in this sense see *Mushtak al-Ishrak* I. 92b also *Masawir-i-Ruhani* III p. 857 *Nigar-Arzu-i-Mahshar* passim (used for Muazzam's *sarkar*) *The English Factories* 1618-1621 p. 200.

³ Pelsaert, p. 55.

of this general's household, wishing to be paid for the supplies he has sent in. Having examined the accounts, his official found the amount so enormous that he decided to strike the sum of eighty thousand rupees."¹

We owe to the author of a versified panegyric of a saint of the Punjab, a very interesting description of the various officials in a noble's *sarkar*. The author, while describing incidents in which he and his brother, both serving nobles, were concerned in 1639, gives designations of a number of officials of the nobles with some hint of their duties. There appears to have been, to begin with, a *Khazina-dar*, treasurer, who kept cash. The *mushrif-i-Khazana* kept the accounts and kept copies of the *sanads*, i.e. *barats* (orders of Payment) and *qabz* (receipts). The author who held this office in one noble's *sarkar*, says he was given *daftar-i-taujih* (or accounts) in another. The *mushrif-i-sarkar* undertook actual purchases, but apparently needed authority from other officials of the nobles for concluding particular transactions. For example, a *mushrif* who purchased grain without the knowledge of the *Khan-i-saman* and *Khawan-salar* came in for criticism. These two latter officials respectively managed the household and stores, and supervised the actual work of the kitchen. There was yet another official, the *bakhshi-i-sarkar*, who apparently supervised the maintenance of the noble's contingent. There seems to have been well-established conventions which governed the functioning of the noble's *sarkar*. Each official, for any expenditure within his jurisdiction, drew a *barat* on the treasurer. Thus the author's brother, as *Khan-i-saman*, was pressed by a trooper of the noble, to write a *barat* for some amount due to him: but he asked him to approach the *bakhshi-i-sarkar* for the *barat*.²

The noble's officials not only had to keep large accounts on behalf of their master, but also arranged for the transfer of money from one place to another, especially from the *jagirs* to the headquarters. This was usually done through *hundis*, or indigenous bills of exchange,³ and it is quite possible that the nobles were as great users of this instrument as the merchants.

THE NOBLES' CONTINGENTS

The military contingent of a noble naturally formed a very important, if not the most important, part of his establishment. According to the imperial regulations every *mansabdar* had to maintain a number of *tabinan* or *sawars* mounted on horses of standard breeds, the *sawar* number

¹ Manucci, III, p. 416. Jafar Khan, however, ordered the whole amount to be paid.

² Surat Singh, *Tazkira-i-Pir Hasnu Taht*, written A.H. 1057, MS. (probably autograph) in Library of the Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University.

³ See *Akhbarat*, 28th Ramzan, 47 R.Y., for Rs. 12,000 sent from Tarbiyat Khan's *jagir* to Burhanpur by *hundi*. See also *Nigar Nama-i-Mumshi*, pp. 29, 30, 33.

being determined by the *mansab* held by the nobles. The *tabinan* were expected to be held in constant readiness, they thus formed a part of the standing army of the Empire.¹ Troops which were hired by the nobles for a temporary period were known as *sih-bandis* and were usually employed for such tasks as the collection of land revenue or police-duties.² They were not considered eligible for musters and were generally regarded with some contempt when compared to the *tabinan*.³

It was generally believed that the *mansabdars* did not keep the full contingents required by their ranks.⁴ Thus Manucci tells us that "these gentlemen (*mansabdars*) have generally each in his stable fifty, a hundred and up to two hundred horses for show or service. On the day of the review they equip their servitors and mount them on these horses, and pass them off as soldiers, putting to the account of profits the pay these men draw. In every quarter of the empire there are officials who keep an eye on everything, or, at least, ought to do so, for being at a distance from the Court, they do not acquit themselves of their duty as loyal subjects ought. But they are negligent by reason of the presents given them to that intent by the persons interested. Owing to these considerations they practise concealment, and never dream of enforcing the performance of duties."⁵

Manucci is supported in this general statement by Bhūm Sen, who declares that during the last days of Aurangzeb, none of the imperial officers, excepting three Rajput chiefs, maintained their requisite contingents of troops.⁶ Specific complaints about officials, high and low, not maintaining their contingents abound in the official records of the reign.⁷

The *tabinan* of the *mansabdars* were usually recruited from the recognised 'martial clans', and each *mansabdar* would usually recruit them either from his own clan or a recognised martial clan. The imperial government itself framed regulations about the clan composition of the troops to be presented for muster by the nobles. These, as set forth in the *Khulasat-us-Siyāq*, may be summarized as follows:

I Mughal nobles of Trans Oxiana, who had come to the Court after the 24th R.Y. (of Aurangzeb), were to present only Mughals at the muster.

II Mughals who had come earlier, were to have Mughals as one-third of their troops and other races as two-thirds, but the Afghans were not to exceed one-sixth.

¹ See Chapter II.

² Cf. Babur Nama, II Tr. Beveridge p. 470 (*sih bandis* misread as *bid hindis*), *Aḡgar Nama*, *Munshi*, p. 93.

³ Cf. Asad Beg Qazwini's *Memoirs*, I 4a. *Itāqat-i-Ajmer* p. 91.

⁴ Manucci, II p. 378 also III p. 409.

⁵ *D. Ikṣha* ff. 140a, 141a. The three Rajput chiefs were Rao Dalpat Bundela, Ram Singh Hara and Jai Singh Sawai.

⁶ See, *Itāqat-i-Ajmer*, pp. 350-56. *Akhbarat* 5 Jamada I 45 R.Y.

III. Saiyids and Shaikhzadas (Indian Muslims) were to recruit from their own races, but the Rajputs and Afghans not to exceed one-sixth.

IV. Afghan nobles were to have two-thirds of Afghans and one-third of other races.

V. Rajputs : The same regulations as for Saiyids and Shaikhzadas (i.e. they were to recruit from their own race).¹ Manucci also refers to this regulation and attributes its establishment to Akbar.² Tahauwur Khan, governor of Ajmer in 1680-81, took especial pride in the fact that he only employed Turanis (Trans-Oxonians).³

[The salary paid to various troopers was a matter of contract between the noble and his troopers; the imperial government did not interfere.] In fact, as Manucci says, "the generals and officers keep no fixed rule in paying their soldiers, for to some they will give twenty or thirty rupees, to others forty, fifty or a hundred."⁴ It seems that the troopers had normally to bring their own horses so that a man with two horses (*du-aspa*) was paid much more than a man with one horse (*yak-aspa*).⁵ As to actual scales of pay, we may judge them from the fact that in 1680 Tahauwur Khan was reputed for paying high salaries to his Turani troopers. None of them are reported to have received less than Rs. 60 or 50 per month, and most of them were *du aspas*.⁶ *Yak-aspas* recruited from Gujarat for imperial service in 1685 were not paid more than Rs. 30 per month.⁷ The pay of *sih-bandis*, troopers hired for specific purposes, presumably mounted on horses of sub-standard breeds, was much lower. In 1682 they were hired in Gujarat for local service in Prince Azam's 'sarkar' at the rate of Rs. 15 per month per head.⁸

The mode of payment of the salaries was equally varied. We have seen that a noble sometimes distributed his *jagir*, or a part of it, among his troopers, allowing them to collect and keep the revenue thereof. In some cases, the troopers received a *barat* or draft drawn on the revenue collector of their master's *jagir*, the latter honouring it out of the revenue collections.⁹ Even when the troopers were paid directly from the headquarters, they did not receive it fully "in coin", but "are always foisted off

¹ *Khulasat us Siyag*, f. 54b, Fraser, 86, f. 14b

² Manucci, II, 375

³ *Waga : Ajmer*, pp. 355-56, Aghar Khan's contingent consisted of only Afghans and Rajputs (Mamuri, f. 145b)

⁴ Manucci, II, pp. 378-79

⁵ When the imperial government recruited *sawars* for military service in Gujarat in 1658, men with two and three horses (*du-aspa sih-aspa*) were sanctioned on an average pay of Rs. 60 per month, the *yak aspa* received Rs. 30 per month (*Mirat : Ahmadi*, I, p. 315)

⁶ *Waga : Ajmer*, p. 355

⁷ *Mirat : Ahmadi*, I, p. 316 According to Bhim Sen things were so cheap in the Deccan in the early years of Aurangzeb's reign that the pay of a *sawar* did not exceed Rs. 15 (fifteen) per month.

⁸ *Mirat : Ahmadi*, I, p. 306

⁹ *Nigar Nama : Munshi*, p. 73

as respects two months pay with clothes and old raiment from the household"¹

[It was a common complaint that the pay of the troopers was always in arrears.] We find big nobles like Khan-i Jahan Barha and Istikhār Khan admitting that their troopers had pay-claims against them for arrears of five and six months.² Fryer describes how at Junnar "the new moon brought the soldiers to their several standards, against the Governor's house, by their Salam to refresh his memory of their pay, being fourteen months behind hand"³ Manucci declares as if it was the normal rule that "there is always due to them (the troopers) the pay for two or three years service" If the soldiers borrowed from the *sarraf*s on the strength of the pay due to them, the general or officer shared a profit in the interest with the *sarraf*s.⁴ And, indeed, the muster-masters hoped that distress might drive the soldiers to compound for half the pay due to them.⁵

[The treatment meted out to the troopers by the nobles was naturally not uniform.] The following passage about the exceptional favours shown by Tahauwur Khan to his Turani troopers shows, through an exception proving the rule, what was really to be expected

"The treatment of the said Khan towards this group is brotherly and he suffers many rude things from these persons. He does not insist on their standing guard on his camp (*chauki*), on their presence at his court (*haziri*), and on fines for absence (*waza i ghair haziri*)"⁶

PUBLIC WELFARE ACTIVITIES AND CHARITIES

[The Mughal nobility appropriated a very large portion of the surplus produce of the country and it is of interest to know how much of this they spent for the welfare of the ruled. The exact quantity of such expenditure, however, cannot be ascertained, but something can be said about their conception of works of public welfare.]

An illustration of the average noble's idea of the most suitable welfare activities is provided by the numerous buildings of public utility erected by Bakhtawar Khan in the earlier part of Aurangzeb's reign. The first in the list is a *sarai* (traveller's inn) which he built near Shahjahanabad and named Bakhtawar Nagar. It had separate quarters for travellers, who came to stay with their families. Nearby he built a mosque, flanked on either side by a *pucca* well and a bath, both for public use. He also built there a market place with shops (*katra*). Near the inn he laid out a garden, to the north of which he built a tank with steps. Half a *karoh* from the inn was a spring coming out of the Ridge. He built

¹ Manucci II pp 378-79

² *A'adabkha i Muza'fir Khan* f 37a b. *Itaqa i Ajmer* 91 105 cf. *Alkhabarat* 9 Ramzan 38 R.

³ Fryer I 541. ⁴ Manucci II pp 378-79. ⁵ Fryer op cit. ⁶ *Itaqa i Ajmer* pp 355-56.

a bund over it in order to make a tank for the thirsty and a waterfall for the aesthetes. From here the water of the stream was led by a canal into the garden tank. He also built a bridge over a flood stream between Bakhtawar Nagar and Faridabad. Near Kottah at Bakhtawarpura, he built a mosque with a tank and a house for the residence of the poor. He also built rentable cells and verandahs for the maintenance of these buildings. Near Shahjahanabad, again, he built a bridge over the famous *Shah nahr*, the old west Jamuna Canal, and erected a mosque there. He also built two public gardens, one at Agharabad and the other at Lahore. Finally, he built a mosque at the tomb of Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh.¹ This list shows that to Bakhtawar Khan the best objects of buildings for public welfare were inns, bridges, wells, tanks, gardens and mosques. It is curious that though it was his duty to introduce theologians to Aurangzeb, he did not build any *madrassa* or theological college. Thus apart from what we hear of the efforts of other nobles in the direction of public welfare, it would seem that Bakhtawar Khan had exhausted all the possibilities of public works according to the notions of the time. Shaista Khan was well known for his inns and bridges built all over the country at the cost of lakhs of rupees.² Mir Jumla constructed a great tank and a garden at Haiderabad.³ Mir Khalil built a big tank called *Khahl Sagar* at Narnol.⁴ Irij Khan built an inn or *sarai* near Illichpur,⁵ and so on. The mosques constructed by the nobles were, of course, more numerous. Ghaziuddin Khan is also known to have built a *Khanqah* at Delhi.⁶

Sometimes the nobles also opened large free kitchens. In 1660 when a famine raged over Northern India, Aurangzeb ordered all *mansabdars* of 1 000 and above to open free kitchens.⁷ Although the distress alleviated through public works of this type should not be underrated, it is obvious that their objectives were very limited. Relief of exceptional and immediate distress, the comfort and convenience of travellers, provision of drinking water, construction of places of worship—these activities sufficed to satisfy the conscience of the great. Works of irrigation, hospitals and academic institutions lay beyond the normal horizons of the nobility.

[The Mughal nobility was by no means indifferent to literature and art. Many nobles patronised fine arts and letters, many being themselves good scholars and poets. What they lacked was the conception that literature and art could best prosper and flourish through public institutions, i.e. schools and institutes of higher learning. The result was that the nobles patronised art and learning not so much by building

¹ *Mirat-al Alam* II. 252a 53b

² *Ma asir-al Umara* III pp 530-53

³ *Ibid* I pp 268-72

⁴ *Alamg Nama* p 611

⁵ *Ma asir-al Alamgiri* p 223

⁶ *Ibid* I pp 785-92

⁷ *Ma asir-al Umara* II p 878

For the free kitchens opened by Shaista Khan see *Fath-ya Ibriya* f 132a

and maintaining institutions as by supporting and employing individual scholars, physicians, poets and artists. Many nobles earned a reputation as patrons in this field.¹ A few nobles also dabbled in science and alchemy. Thus Danishmand Khan, to cite a well known case, employed Bernier in order to discuss with him new principles of medicine.² A number of nobles were themselves good scholars and poets.³ The Mughal nobility was, therefore, by no means uncultured or divorced from intellectual pursuits. What it lacked was a desire to offer science and learning a sustained encouragement, which could only have come through the establishment of academic institutions.

HAREM AND HOUSEHOLD

The nobles maintained very "large establishments of wives, servants, camels and horses".⁴ Indeed, the household, of which the *harem* was the main part, must have absorbed a very large part of the income of the nobles.

As a rule, a noble had "three or four wives, the daughters of worthy men" All lived together in the noble's *mahal* or palace, which consisted of an enclosure surrounded by high walls Each wife had a separate apartment and numerous slaves, of her own —10, 20, or even 100 according to her fortune¹ The large retinue of slaves—slave-girls and eunuchs—had to be provided primarily on account of exceptional regard for the seclusion of aristocratic ladies from the sight of strangers Fryer comments on the numerous spies on the wives of the nobles—"toothless old women and beardless eunuchs They also wait on ladies to hand them necessaries as food, water, meat and the like taking them at the door, as to prevent unlawful intruders"²

Inside the palace, luxury reigned There were gardens and tanks within the palace enclosure³ The Mughal gardens are justly famous Great pains were taken to ensure a supply of running water, feeding tanks and forming waterfalls⁴ The life inside the noble's *harem* is thus described by Manucci, who claims to have had the confidence of Naval Bai, the wife of Asad Khan

"The ladies love to regale themselves with quantities of delicious stews, to adorn themselves magnificently, either with clothes or jewellery, pearls, etcetera, to perfume their bodies with odours and essences of every kind To this must be added that they have permission to enjoy the pleasure of the comedy and the dance, to listen to tales and stories of love, to recline upon beds of flowers, to walk about in gardens, to listen to the murmur of the running waters, to hear singing and other similar pastimes"⁵ Wine also flowed "In the cool of the evening they drink a great deal of wine, for the women learn the habit quickly from their husbands" The noble himself retired to the *harem* in the evening to drink and enjoy music and dance till midnight⁶

Since the gardens and luxurious life of the nobles was hidden behind high walls, one can understand Bernier's complaint that in India you could not see and enjoy the country houses of the great as in France⁷ It did not mean, however, that the Mughal nobles spent any less on their *harem*, gardens and domestic luxuries Bhim Sen says, for example, that Amanat Khan, although he was a *mansabdar* of 700 only, had built a spacious and magnificent house at Fazilpur (Burhanpur) with a garden attached to it, and a number of tanks in the house were fed by a canal⁸

¹ Pelsaert, pp 64-65 Pelsaert wrote in the time of Jahangir but his account could be taken as true for that of Aurangzeb as well.

² Fryer I p 328 Even a physician was allowed to enter only after the greatest precautions taken to prevent him from seeing anyone (Manucci II p 352)

³ Pelsaert p 64 Bernier pp 243 246-47

⁴ See e.g. *Murat-al Alam* ff 252b-53a. See also Villiers Stuart *Gardens of the Great Mughals* a pleasant book largely based on field observation

⁵ Manucci, II pp 352-53 ⁶ Pelsaert, 65 cf Manucci, II p 351 ⁷ Bernier p 233

⁸ *D Iksha* f 27a.

Besides their women, the nobles had their animals. Daud Khan, for example, used to spend annually Rs. 250,000 on his pet animals which included tigers, hawks and falcons.¹

Outside their houses also the nobles maintained considerable pomp and splendour. Bernier says that they 'are never seen out-of-doors but in the most superb apparel, mounted sometimes on an elephant, sometimes on horseback, and not infrequently on a *palkey* attended by many of their cavalry, and by a large body of servants on foot, who take their station in front and at either side of their lord, not only to clear the way, but to flap the flies and brush off the dust with tails of peacocks, to carry the pioquedant and spittoon, water to allay the Omraha's thirst, and sometimes account book and other papers".²

FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE NOBILITY

The reign of Aurangzeb saw a developing crisis in the *jagirdari* system, which was bound to affect the very foundations of the standing of the nobles. The extravagant mode of life of the Mughal nobility has been frequently discussed. Bernier had discovered that "there are very few wealthy *Omrahs*, on the contrary most of them are in embarrassed circumstances and deeply in debt". He thought this was due to their large establishments and to the "costly presents" they had to offer to the king.³ Bhum Sen in the last years of the reign described the acute financial difficulties of the nobles, but attributed them to other causes. The cultivators had ceased cultivating the soil and so not a copper coin reached the *jagirdars*. Moreover, little could be done to encourage cultivation, since the *jagirs* were so quickly transferred. At the same time on various pretexts and excuses, the clerks of the imperial government put up claims (*mutaliba*) against the nobles under all kinds of items, fines, repayment of loans, etc.⁴ There is no doubt that the Deccan wars, by devastating vast areas and increasing military burdens, ruined a number of the nobles. A noble like Inayatullah Khan, for example, reported in a petition to the Court that all his elephants and camels had died so that the money lenders (*sahukars*) had no security on which to advance him loans.⁵

The *Akhbarat* of the last years are full of complaints from nobles that they were impecunious and needed help from the Treasury.⁶ There was a large number of nobles desiring to leave the Deccan for the North,⁷ while a number of Deccan nobles deserted to the Marathas.⁸

¹ Manucci, IV p. 255. ² Bernier, pp 213-14. ³ Bernier p 213. ⁴ *Dilkhusha* ff 139a 141a.

⁵ *Akhbarat*, 4th Jamada, II, 46 R.Y. ⁶ See, e.g. *Akhbarat*, 14th Safar 44 R.Y.

⁷ *Akhbarat*, 27th Shawwal 38 R.Y., 15th Ziqada, 39 R.Y., 4th Zilhajja, 39 R.Y.

⁸ *Dilkhusha*, ff. 140a-155a.

This financial strain on the nobility was a natural consequence of the acute and increasing financial crisis of the Mughal Empire, which became noticeable in the later part of the 17th century. The brunt of the crisis perhaps fell on the lower nobility, but even the higher nobility could not fully escape its effects. However, the first item to be affected was not the luxuries of the nobles, but as we have seen, their military contingents. Such short-sightedness, inevitable in a class so much devoted to pomp and splendour, led to the growing military weakness of the Empire. Bhim Sen is not, perhaps, far wrong when he puts, as the first cause of the success of the Marathas, the fact that the Mughal military commanders did not maintain their full contingents.¹ This in turn brought further losses to the Empire and a further decline in the income of the nobles. And so the vicious circle went on, enveloping the entire nobility, until the nobles, their *harems* and eunuchs, elephants and tigers, all disappeared.

CONCLUSION

AURANGZEB's reign forms the stage of transition from the climax of Mughal Empire under Shahjahan to its disintegration in the 18th century. Signs of such disintegration had become quite apparent many years before Aurangzeb closed his eyes. The failure in the Deccan, the increasing power of the Marathas, the rebellious and recalcitrant attitude of various elements within the Empire, all bore an ominous message for the future.

The study of the nobility, which has been attempted in the foregoing pages, must be viewed against the background of this crisis of the Empire as well as the tendencies inherent in the nobility itself towards disintegration.

The history of the nobility under Aurangzeb may be studied under two clearly marked divisions—the first from the time of his accession up to 1678, and the second from 1679 up to his death in 1707. Prior to the outbreak of the Rajput war and Aurangzeb's subsequent involvement in the Deccan, there was no significant increase either in the number of the *mansabdars* or in the internal racial and religious composition of the nobility that had been in existence since the days of Akbar. During this period, the 'foreign' nobility, that is nobles who had themselves come to India as well as those who were born in India but belonged to families that had migrated to India, continued to occupy a leading position, with the Persians out-numbering the Turanis. Large promotions were given to the Rajputs initially, but by 1678 they had suffered a slight set back, their proportion among the nobles holding the rank of 1,000 and above declined from 18.7 per cent under Shahjahan to 14.6 per cent during the period 1658-78. At the same time Aurangzeb gave greater preference to Afghans than had been given to them by his predecessors. The general stability of Aurangzeb's nobility is shown by the large number of *khanazads*, or nobles whose fathers or other close relations had been in the Imperial service. During this period (1658-78) nearly a half of Aurangzeb's nobles are known to have belonged to this category, and if more could be known about certain nobles, their actual proportion would probably be higher. However, it is significant that a large proportion of new-comers were also able to attain to high ranks in the nobility.

A study of the *mansabdar* system suggests that there was no apparent laxity, in comparison with earlier periods, in enforcing the branding regulations, i.e. in compelling the *mansabdars* to maintain contingents required by the *sawar* ranks. Aurangzeb seems to have made no

change worth noticing in the system of *mansabdari* regulations or the pay scales. He tried to follow them rigidly just as they had stood in the time of his father. The reduced military obligations and the reduced scales of pay were both inherited from Shahjahan. Aurangzeb also continued to enforce the escheat system, though with some restraint. He is said to have abolished the previous assertion of the imperial right to dispose of or confiscate the property of deceased nobles, but, in fact, there are cases where he did order seizure of their property. There is, therefore, no reason to believe that prior to his departure for the Deccan, Aurangzeb's authority over the nobles had suffered in any way and that the obligations of the *mansabdars* were no longer strictly imposed.

In the same way the system of *jagir* assignments continued to work tolerably well till Aurangzeb's involvement in the Deccan, and the principle of periodic transfers, which was meant to prevent nobles from forming local ties and becoming autonomous potentates, was rigidly adhered to throughout the reign of Aurangzeb.

Finally, Aurangzeb's policy towards the various sections of the nobility, though varying here and there from that of his predecessors, was not without its own restraints. The Rajput war is said to have been partly the result of his policy of discrimination against the Rajputs, but the majority of the Rajput *mansabdars* were not alienated. Nor did Aurangzeb tolerate any well marked factions and groupings, and no factions grew up till his very last days, when we find Ghaziuddin Khan and Zulfiqar Khan leading two distinct groups.

It is, therefore, not possible to locate the source of the crisis in the affairs of the Empire in any change in the nature and composition of the nobility prior to Aurangzeb's departure for the Deccan. It is, however, possible to say that as it was constituted, the nobility was bound, with the passage of time, to create an unfavourable situation for the Empire. It has been suggested that the system of *jagir* transfers led to oppression by the *jagirdars*, and this oppression, in turn, to rebellion by the oppressed. We have left this an open question. It is true that as administrators and army-commanders, the Mughal nobles of Aurangzeb, specially of his later years, cannot be given a clear certificate. Whether the lack of functional training and specialisation had anything to do with the administrative incompetence of a number of nobles is not directly obvious. But what we know for certain is that the nobles were, by far and large, corrupt and open bribe-takers, and in this they were but pale imitators of the Emperor himself. They often misused their administrative authority to compel merchants and peasants to pay them illegal dues. Immense as were the resources of the nobility, it is difficult to claim that they were devoted to channels leading to positive economic development. The nobles no doubt, patronised luxury goods and services, but only an insignificant part of their resources seems to have been laid out as

'capital', whether in trade or in advances to artisans. On the other hand, their habit of engrossing and monopolising was a serious detriment to trade, and they are not known to have made any attempt to encourage science and new techniques of production. The recipients of their patronage were chiefly religious men and poets, who praised them in the present world and prayed for their welfare in the next. Once a serious military crisis appeared in the Deccan, the Empire did not have an adequate reserve of physical and moral resources to cope with it.

The Rajput War and the prolonged Deccan campaigns had a disastrous effect on the nobility. Aurangzeb's annexations in the Deccan were not the work of a military steam roller, but of a slow and cumbersome machine, which sought energy and strength by recruiting deserters bribed to come over from the enemy. The long war which followed took a heavy toll of life from the Mughal contingents, increased the weakness of the nobility, and diverted the Emperor's attention more and more towards the Deccan, while the administration of North India suffered. The Deccan involvement led to a great influx of the Deccan nobles into the Mughal aristocracy. There was a very great increase in the numerical strength of the nobility, but while the Deccanis (the Bijapuris, the Haiderabadis and the Marathas) were recruited wholesale and given extraordinarily high ranks, the recruitment and promotion of the other older sections suffered. Mamuri speaks eloquently of the depressed position of the *khanazads*. The Marathas, practically insignificant a generation earlier, now outnumbered the Rajputs. Again and again Aurangzeb and his ministers attempted to stop fresh recruitment, but their military and diplomatic needs led them to continue the grant of *mansabs* to new-comers. But a stage arrived, when though *mansabs* were awarded, *jagirs* could not be given, since owing to increase in the number of claimants and the financial strain on the treasury,¹ little was left to be assigned in *jagirs*. When this came to be the case, and when various *jagirdars* held their *jagirs* in disturbed territory where revenue could not be collected, the nobles could no longer be expected to maintain contingents required by their *mansabs*. This, in turn, as Bhimsen saw, further weakened the military strength of the Empire and encouraged fresh rebellions and disturbances.

Once the competition for good *jagirs* became intense and the confidence in the stability of the Empire was shaken, factionalism within the nobility was bound to grow more intense. The factions of Ghaziuddin Khan, Firuz Jang and Zulfiqar Khan were the natural result of this situation. With the growth of such factions and rivalries within the nobility, the cohesion and unity in imperial policy and military enterprise naturally suffered. Moreover, it was suspected, perhaps not without justice,

¹ Which precluded transfer of land from the *Khalisa* to *jagirs*.

that some nobles were thinking of carving out independent or semi-independent principalities for themselves—an ambition which came to be only too openly and widely held after the death of Aurangzeb.

One has to be careful in passing moral judgements in history, but it may be correct to say that even from the view-point of the Mughal nobility itself its chief fault was its failure to change and adapt itself to a new developing situation not only in India, but in the whole world. Nothing can remain static and yet survive. Aurangzeb's attempt to give a new religious basis to the Empire may indicate that he felt that a change was called for; but the complete failure of this policy showed that religious revivalism could be no substitute for a thoroughgoing overhaul of the Mughal administrative system and political outlook.

APPENDIX

LIST OF MANSABDARS OF AURANGZEB HOLDING THE RANKS OF 1,000 ZAT AND ABOVE

A *Mansabdars* WHO HELD OR REACHED THE RANK OF 1,000 ZAT AND ABOVE
DURING THE PERIOD, 1658-1678

LIST OF NOBLES

175

Mansabdars of 5,000 and above							
S.No	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
		7,000/7,000 (2 3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	AI 907, S D A 52, M U, III 568-77
1.	Umdat ul Mulk, Mirza Raja Jai Singh Kachwaha	7,000/7,000 (2 3h)	India	Turani		Father	AI 117, M.U, III 821-28
2	Mirza Shuja, Najabat Khan, Khan i Khanan	7,000/7,000 (2 3h)	India	Irani		Father	AI 130, M U, II 690-707
3	Mirza Abu Talib, Shaista Khan, Amir-ul Umara.	7,000/7,000 (2 3h)	India	Irani		Father	M.A. 142, A M T 121a, M U, I 791 813
4	Mir Malik Husain, Khan i Jahan Bahadur, Zafar Jang Kokaltash	7,000/7,000 (6 000 x 2-3h)	India	Irani		Father	AI 331 32, M U, III 599-604
5.	Maharaja Jaiwant Singh Rathor	7,000/7,000 (5,000 x 2 3h)	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	

<i>S.N. Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Afaralha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
6 Mir Muhammad Said, Mir Jumla, Muazzam Khan, Khan-i Khana, Sipahsalar	7,000/7 000 (5,000 × 2 3h)	Iran	Irani	Deccani	Father	Al 563, M U, III 530 55
7 Khadijullah Khan	6,000/6 000 (2 3h)	Iran	Irani	—	Brother	Al 119, M U, I 775 82
8 Shah Nawaz Khan Safvi	6 000/6,000 (5,000 × 2 3h)	Iran	Irani	—	Father	Al 209 10, M U, II 670 76
9 Umdat ul Mulk, Jafar Khan	6,000/6,000 (4,000 × 2 3h)	India	Irani	—	Father	Al 162, M U, I 531 35
10. Mirza Lahrasp, Mahabat Khan	6,000/5 000 (3,000 × 2 3h)	India	Irani	—	Father	Al 754, M U, III 590 95
11. Rana Raj Singh	6 000/6,000 (1,000 × 2 3h)	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	Al 194, M U, II 206-08
12. Shambhaji	6,000/6,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	MA 142, <i>Jami al Insha</i> f 76a
13 Muhammad Amin Khan	6 000/5,000 (1,000 × 2 3h)	India	Irani	Deccani	Father	Al 813,855, MA 121, M U, III 613 20
14 Mulla Ahmad Naitha	6 000/6,000	India	Indian	Deccani	—	Al 919 20, T M 1076 A H, M U, III 562 66
15. Husain Pasha, Islam Khan Rumi	6 000/6 000	Turkey	Turani	—	—	MA 87-88, T U 'A'

16	Mir Muzaffar Husain, Fedai Khan Koka 'Aram Khan	6,000/4,000	India	Irani	—	Father	Al. 1061; T M 1089 A.H.; T U. 'A'; M U, I 247-53
17	Kaj Nayak	6,000/-	India	Indian	Deccani-Zamindar	—	Dilkusha, 59b
18	Sayid Ahmad s/o Sayid Makhdum, Sharza Khan Bujapuri	6,000/-	India	Turani	Deccani	—	B. S 691
19	Shaikh Mir Khawafi	5,000/5,000 (2 3h)	—	Irani	—	—	Al. 156-57, M U, II 668-70
20	Muhammad Qasim, Qasim Khan, Mu'tamad Khan	5,000/5,000 (2-3h)	India	Irani	—	Father	Al. 1027, M U, III 95-99
21	Raja Ram Singh Kachwaha	5,000/5,000 (2 3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	Atk 19th Rabi II, 12th R.Y.; M U, II, 301-03
22	Jalal Khan, Dilir Khan	5,000/5,000 (3,000 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	Afghan	Brother	Al. 1030, M U, II 42-56
23	Muhammad Tahir, Wazir Khan	5,000/5,000 (2,000 x 2-3h)	Iran	Irani	—	—	Al. 880, M U, III 936-40
24	Sayid Mahmud, Nasiri Khan Khan i Dauran	5,000/5,000 (2,000 x 2 3h)	India	Indian	—	Father	Al. 126, 179, T M 1077 A.H, M U, I 782-85
25	Sayid Mir Khawafi, Amir Khan	5,000/5,000 (1,000 x 2-3h)	—	Irani	—	Brother	Al 661; M U, II 476-77, T U. "S"
26	Muhammad Ibrahim, Ghaurat Khan, Shuja 'at Khan, Khan i Alam	5,000/5,000	India	Turani	—	Father	Al. 117; M U, II 869-72, T U. Sh.
27	Sayid Shah Muhammad, Murtaza Khan	5,000/5,000	Bokhara	Turani	—	—	Al. 870, T M 1089 A.H.; M U., III 597-98

<i>S.No</i>	<i>Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, etc. Zamindar, etc.</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
28.	Muhammad Ibrahim, Asad Khan	5,000/5,000	India	Irani	—	Father	Al. 880, M U, I 310-21
29.	Yadgar Beg, Lashkar Khan, Jan Nisar Khan	5,000/5,000	India	—	—	Father	M A. 105, T.M. 1081 A.H.; M U, III 168-71
30.	Ibrahim Khan s/o Ali Mardan Khan	5,000/5,000	Iran	Irani	—	Father	Al 426, M U, I 295-301
31.	Maluji Deccani	5,000/5,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Al. 427; M U, III 520-24
32.	Raja Rai Singh Suodia	5,000/5,000 (500 x 2 3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	Al. 1033, T.M. 1083 A.H.; M U, II 297-301
33.	Daud Khan Qureshi	5,000/4,000 (3,000 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	—	—	Al. 1033; M U., II 32-37
34.	Sarfraz Khan Deccani	5,000/4,000 (1,000 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	Deccani	—	S D.A. 48, M U, II 469-73
35.	Mir Khalil, Khan-i-Zaman, Musfakhar Khan	5,000/4,000	India	Irani	—	Father	S D A. 111; M A. 144; M U, I, 785-92
36.	Mirza Muhammad Maubhadi, Aslat Khan	5,000/4,000	Iran	Irani	—	—	Al. 855; M U, I 222-25
37.	Mukarram Khan Safvi, Murad Kam	5,000/4,000	India	Irani	—	Father	Al. 267; M U., III 583-86

38.	Ibhlās Khan, Abul Muhammad	5 000/4 000	India	Indian	Afghan Deccani	—	Al 990, M A 81, M U, II, 59
39	Tahir Shaikh, Tahir Khan	5 000/3 000	Balkh	Turani	—	—	Al 960, M U, II 751 54
40	Muhammad Beg, Zulfiqar Khan	5 000/3 000	Iran	Irani	—	—	Al 157, M U, II 89 93
41	M r Ziauddin Husain Islam Khan	5 000/3 000	—	Turani	—	—	Al 823, M U, I 217 20
42	Abdur Rahman s/o Nazar Muhammad Khan	5 000/2 500	Balkh	Turani	—	—	Al 267, 341, M U, II 809 12
43	Mulla Shafiq Yardi, Danuhmand Khan	5 000/2 500	Iran	Irani	—	—	Al 880, T M 1081 A H
44	‘Alsul Mulk Tumi, Fazal Khan	5 000/2 500	Iran	Irani	—	—	Al 831, M U, III 524-30
45	Bahman Yar I tuqad Khan Murza	5 000/1 000	India	Irani	—	Father	Al 762, T M 1082 A H, M U, I 232 34
46	Bahram	5 000/1 000	Turan	Turani	—	—	M U, I 431 44, Al 114
47	Shaikh Abdul Qawi Irtasad Khan	5 000/400	—	—	—	—	Al 856, Farhat, 197a, T M 1077 A H, M U, I, 225
48	Champat Bundela	5 000/	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	—	Dilkusha, 15 b
49	Ranmast Khan Panni, Bahadur Khan	5 000/-	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Dilkusha, 68b, M U II 64
50	Netaji (Mohd Quli Khan, when embraced Islam)	5 000/-	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Al 971, M U III 577 80, Mirat ul ‘Alam, 205a
51	Hakim Daud, Taqarrub Khan	5 000/-	Iran	Irani	—	—	T U ‘T’, M U, I 490-93

<i>Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
<i>Mansabdars of 3 000 to 4 500</i>						
52 Ghazi Bijapur Randula Khan	4 000/4 000 (1 000 × 2 3h)	India	Indian	Deccani	—	AI 76, MU, II 309
53 Yawant Rao Kartalab Khan	4 000/4 000 (1 000 × 2 3h)	India	Indian	—	—	AI 76, MU, III 153
54 Rai Singh Rathor	4 000/4 000	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	AI 288, AMT 124a, MU, II 235-36
55 Shah Beg Khan	4 000/4 000	—	Turan	—	—	AI 439, AMT 124a
56 Shafullah, Tarbiyat Khan Brias	4 000/4 000	Turan	Turan	—	—	AI 845, MU, I 493 98
57 Mir Shams-uddin Mukhtar Khan	4 000/4 000	India	Iran	—	Father	AI 598, MU, III 620 23
58. Heshdar Khan s/o Multafat Khan	4 000/4 000	India	Iran	—	Father	AI 47 833, TM 1082 A H, MU, III 943 46
59 Ghalib Khan Dajapuri	4 000/4 000	India	—	Deccani	—	AI 596, 598, MA 33, MU, II 685
60 Mir Miran Amur Khan s/o Khalil Ullah Khan Yazdi	4 000/3 000 (2 3h)	India	Iran	—	Father	MA, 139, MU, I 277 78
61 Mirza Jafar, Alahwardi Khan s/o Alahwardi Khan Turkman	4 000/3 000 (2 3h)	India	Iran	—	Father	AI 1056, TU 'A', MU, I 229 32, TM 1079 A H.

62	Inder Man Dhandera	4 000/3 000 (500 x 2 3h)	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	—	AI 43, 339, MU, II 265 66
63	Mirza Sultan Safva	4 000/3 000	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 880, MU, III 581-83
64	Qabad Khan, Mir Akhur	4 000/3 000	Turan	Turani	—	—	AI 290 634, MU, III 99 102, A M T 124a
65	Namdar Khan	4 000/3 000	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 1057, MU, III 830-33
66	Shakh Farid alias Ikhlās Khan Ihtsham Khan	4 000/3 000	India	Indian	—	Father	AI 215 855, Mirat i Afab Numa, f 573, T M 1075A H, MU, I 220-22, A M T 124b
67	Pir Muhammad Aglar Khan	4 000/3 000	India	Turani	—	—	Khafi Khan, II 246, MU, I 274-77
68	Mir Khan s/o Khalilullah Khan	4 000/3 000	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 917 M A 82, MU, 781
69	Jadaun Rai Deccani	4 000/2,500	India	Indian	Maratha-Zamindar	Grand- father	AI 161
70	Mulafat Khan, Azam Khan	4 000/2 500	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 75, MU, III 500-03
71	Rao Dhao Singh Hara	4 000/2 500	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	AI 267, MU, II 305 07, A M T 123b
72	Rad Andaz Beg Shuja'at Khan	4 000/2 500	India	Irani	—	Father	MA 116, Kamwar, 256b, T M 1084 A H, MU, II 679 81, A M T 124b
73	Khawaja Rahmat Ullah, Sarbuland Khan	4 000/2 500	India	Turani	—	—	MA 139, MU, II 477-79, AI 304 976

<i>S.No</i>	<i>Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan Zamindar, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
74	Fairullah Khan	4 000/2 000	India	Iran	—	Father	AI 870, MU, III 28 30
75	Qawamuddin Khan of Afshan	4 000/2 000	Iran	Iran	—	—	MA 130 Mamur, f 149b, MU, III 103-15
76	Mir Muhammad Inshaq, Mukarram Khan	4 000/1,500 (600 × 2 3b)	India	Iran	—	Father	MU III 696-701, Akh 11th Raba II 37th R Y
77	'Abad Khan, Qulij Khan	4 000/1,500	Turan	Turan	—	—	AI 1056, MU, III 120 23
78	Darajji	4 000/1,300	India	Indian	Maratha	—	AI 47
79	Daud Khan panni	4 000/-	India	Indian	Afghan Deccan	—	MU, II 63 68, S D A. 171
80	Razruddin Muhammad Haidara badi	4 000/-	—	—	Deccan	—	SDA 25
81	Tahawur Khan, Padshah Quli Khan	4 000/-	India	Iran	—	Father	AMT 123b, MU, I 447 53, TM 1092 AH
82	Qutbuddin Khan Kherbgi	3 500/3,500 (2,000 × 2 3b)	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	AI 1033, Akh 29th Rabi II 8th R.Y., MU, III 102 08 <i>Dastur-ul Amsl: Shahyacham,</i> Add 6398, f 25a
83	Raja Raj Rup of Nurpur	3,500/3,500 (500 × 2 3b)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	AI 198 625, TM 1072 AH, MU, II 277-81

84	Raja Anrudh Gaur	3,500/3,000 (2-3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	M U, II 276-77
85	Raja Sujen Singh Bundela	3,500/3,000 (500 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	Al 342, 486, 908, A M T. 124b, M U, II 291-95
86	Fateh Rohela, Fateh Jang Khan	3,500/3,000	India	Indian	Afghan	Uncle	Al. 290, M U., III 22-26
87.	Sa'adat Khan s/o Zafar Khan	3,500/3,000	India	Irani	—	Father	Al. 195; M U., II 461-63
88	Mir Ziauddin Ali Maahbadi, Siyadat Khan	3,500/2,500	—	Irani	—	Father	T M. 1069 A II.; M U, II 463 65
89	Hasan Ali Khan Bahadur	3,500/2,500	India	Irani	—	Father	Al. 452; M A 92, 93; M U, I 593 99
90	Saiyid Sultan, Salabat Khan Barha, Ikhtias Khan	3,500/2,500	India	Indian	—	Father	Al. 190; T U. 'A'; M U., II 457-60
91.	Abdur Rahman Bujapuri, Sharza Khan	3,500/2,000	India	—	Deccan	—	S D A. 70, T U. 'Sh'
92	Muhariz Khan	3,500/2,000	Badrakh- shan	Turani	—	—	Al. 957; M U, III 595-97; A M T. 125a
93.	Mir Ahmed Khawafi, Mustafa Khan	3,500/2,000	India	Irani	—	Father	Al. 490, 1049; M U, III 516-18; A M T. 125a; English Factories, 1661-64, p. 103
94.	Rao Karan Bharatiya	3,500/2,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	Al 855; A M T. 125b, M U, II 287-91
95.	Abdur Razzaq Gilani, Izzat Khan	3,500/2,000	—	Irani	—	—	M U., II 475

S.No	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan Zamindar etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
96.	Mir Sultan Hussain Jit khar Khan s o Asaf Khan	3,500/1,200	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 158, 880, T M 1092 A H, M U, I 252 55
97	Dil'ost Sardar Khan	3 000/3 000 (2 500 x 2 3h)	India	Turani	—	Father	AI 140 1050, M U, II 422 23
98.	Mir Muhammad Ishaq Irfat Khan	3 000/3 000 (1 000 x 2 3h)	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 127, M U, I 203 06
99	Gharanfar Khan s o Alahwardi Khan Turkman	3 000/3 000 (1 000 x 2 3h)	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 864, T M 1077 A H, M U, II 866-68
100.	Mir Ahmad Sa dat Khan s/o Sa adat Khan	3 000/3 000 (500 x 2 3h)	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 1050
101	Ihamullah, Rashid Khan	3 000/3 000 (500 x 2 3h)	India	Indian	—	Father	AI 76 231, M U, II 303 05
102	Faraji Diccani	3 000/3 000	India	Indian	Maratha	Brother	AI 140, 231, 242, M U, III 520-24
103	Muhammad Tahir, Saf Si tan Khan	3 000/3 000	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 334, 880, Akh 19th Rajab, 9th R Y M U, II 738-40
104	Mirza Khan G s of Abdur Rah m Khan	3 000/3 000	India	Irani	—	Grand- father	AI 1033, A M T 126a
105.	Mirza Khan Manuchir	3 000/3 000	India	Irani	—	Father A.H.	M U, III 586-89, T M 1083

106	Muhammad Yusuf, Shamsher Khan Naser Khan	3 000/2 500 (1 000 x 2 50)	—	—	—	—	Al 196, 1056
107	Hayat Tarin Shamsher Khan	3 000/2 500 (500 x 2 50)	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	Al 195 647, T M 1083 A H, M U, II 677 79
108	Saifuddin Mahmud alias Faq rullah Sa f Khan	3 000/2 500	India	Turani	—	Father	Akh 5th Ramzan, 10th R Y M U, II 479 85
109	Abdullah Khan Sared Khan	3 000/2 500	India	Turani	—	Father	Al 419 762 M U II 807 08
110	Kirat Singh	3 000/2 500	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	Al 1061, M U, III 156-58
111	Hasan Khan Deccani	3 000/2 500	India	Indian	Afghan Deccani	—	Al 45 T U "H
112	Muzaffar Lodi Lodi Khan	3 000/2 500	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Al 291
113	Bakhuyar Khan Khawas Khan	3 000/2 500	India	Indian	Afghan	—	S D A 73, Al 132
114	Shamsuddin Kheabgi	3 000/2 000	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	Al 45 M U, II 676-77
115	Abdullah Beg Yakataz Khan Mukhlis Khan	3 000/2 000	Turan	Turani	—	Father	Al 117, 291, T M 1070 A H, M U, III 968 71
116	Abdullah Beg Ganj Ali Khan	3 000/2 000	Iran	Iran	—	Father	Al 964 M U, III 155
117	Saryad Izzat Khan, Gharat Khan	3 000/2 000	India	Indian	—	—	Al 855 56 M A 150
118	Girdhar Das Gaur	3 000/2 000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Brother	S D A 28, M U, II 255 56 A M T 126a

130.	Abdul Kafi, Nawazish Khan	Iran	Iran	3 000/1 200	—	Father	Al 474, T. M. 1075 A H ; M. U., III 828-30
131.	Mir Isa, Hummat Khan s/o Islam Khan Badakhshi	India	Turani	3 000/1 000 (500 x 2-3h)	—	Father	Al 880; M A 71; M U, III 946-49
132.	Ahmad Kherbgi Ikhlas Khan	India	Indian Afghan	3 000/1 000	—	—	Al 77, T M 1072 A H
133.	Bairam Deo Suodia	India	Indian Rajput-Zamindar	3 000/1 000	—	Father	Al. 762, S D A 112, M U II 452-54
134.	Muhammad Badi Sultan	Turan	Turani	3 000/700	—	Father	Al 339, M U, III 636-37
135.	Raghu Nath Rai Rayan	India	Indian	3 000/700	—	—	Al 763, M U., II 282
136.	Mir Muhammad Ashraf, Ashraf Khan, Inmad Khan	India	Iran	3 000/500	—	Father	Al 762, 856; M U, I 272-74
137.	Sayid Ali Ruvvi Khan	India	Turani	3 000/500	—	Father	Al. 1049, M U, II 307-09 A M T 124b
138.	Raghu Nath Singh Suodia- Chandrawat	India	Indian Rajput	3 000/300	—	—	Akh 10th Ramzan, 13th R Y., Kamwar, 250b
139.	Shaikh Mirak Harawi	Iran	Iran	3 000/200	—	—	Al 396; M U, III 518-19
140.	Darab Khan s/o Mukhtar Khan	India	Iran	3 000/-	—	Father	T. U 'D', M. U., II 39-42
141.	Mir Taqi	—	Iran	3 000/-	—	Uncle	Al 755, 880, M A. 97; M U, III 939
142.	Raja Debi Singh Bundela	India	Indian Rajput-Zamindar	2 500/2 500 (500 x 2-3h)	Manabders of 1,000 to 2,700	Father	Al. 206, 758, S D A 117; M U.; II 295-97

<i>S.No</i>	<i>Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zemindar, etc.</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
143	Bheel Afghan, Purdil Khan	2,500/2,000 (2-3h)	India	Indian	Afghan	—	AL 334, 758
144	Iraj Khan	2,500/2,000	India	Irani	—	Father	AL 1030; MU, I 268-72; A.M.T. 126b
145	Alah Yar Beg, Alah Yar Khan	2,500/2,000	—	Turani	—	—	Hatim Khan, 20b; AL 141, 831; T.M. 1074 A.H; M.U., I 216-17
146	Masud Yadgar, Ahmad Beg Khan, Masud Khan, grandson of Ahmad Beg Khan	2,500/2,000	India	Turani	—	Grand- father	AL 78, 158, 196, A. M. T. 126b
147	Sayid Mubarak, Murtaza Khan	2,500/2,000	India	Turani	—	—	AL 832; M. U., III 644-46
148	Anup Singh	2,500/2,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zemindar	Father	M U, II 289-91
149	Sa'adat Khan son in law of Khalifa Sultan	2,500/2,000	Iran	Irani	—	—	AL 212
150	Subh Karan Bundela	2,500/2,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zemindar	—	AL 301, 565, 1034, A M. T. 131a
151.	Abu Talib, Aqidat Khan	2,500/2 000	India	Irani	—	Father	AL 140, 334
152	Khwaja Barkhurdar, Ashraf Khan, Barkhurdar Khan	2,500/2 000	India	Indian	—	Father	S D A. 74, M. U, I 206- 207; T. U. (S.V.)

153	Nusrat Ullah Nusrat Khan	2 500/1 500 (700 x 2 3h)	India	Turani	—	Father	Al 141, 1061
154	Baba Ji Bhonola	2 500/1 500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Al 54
155	Bhagwant Singh s/o Satar Sal Hara	2 500/1 500	India	Indian	Rajput <i>Zemindar</i>	Father	Al 474-75, A M T 126b
156	Manku B Lal Deccani	2 500/1 500	India	Indian	Deccani	—	Al 472
157	Rao Amar Singh Chandrawat	2 500/1 500	India	Indian	Rajput	Grand father	Al 856, Akh 29th Raba II, 8th R Y, M.U., II 145-47
158	Afrasyab Beg Afrasyab Khan	2 500/1,500	Turkey	Turani	—	—	MA 87, 151-52, M U, I 244-46
159	Huamuddin	2 500/1,500	India	Irani	—	Father	M U, I 584-87
160	Mana Ji Bhonola	2 500/1 500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S D A. 7, Al 128, Hatim Khan, 16a
161	Shuja at Khan alias Shad Khan Mughal Khan	2 500/1 400	India	Turani	—	Father	Al 193 M A 97, 153
162	Rustam Rao	2 500/1 200	Ind a	Indian	Maratha	—	Al 47
163	Saiyid Sher Zaman Barha Muzaffar Khan	2 500/1 200	India	Indian	—	Father	Al 54 291, M U, II 465
164	Mir Masum Masum Khan	2 500/1 200	India	Irani	—	Father	Akh 13th Ramzan, 13th R Y, M U, II 676, A M T 128a

<i>S No. Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub-groups Rajput, Afaralkha, Afghan, Zemindar, etc.</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
165. Beg Muhammad Kheabgi, Dindar Khan	2,500/1,200	India	Indian	Afghan	—	AL 965
166. Qazi Nizam Kardazi, Mukhlis Khan	2,500/1,000	India	Indian	—	—	AL 48, 195, 294, 860; M.U., III 566-68
167. Muhammad Munim, Munim Khan	2,500/1,000	India	Irani	—	Father	AL 45, 454; M.U., III 589.
168. Mahdi Quli Khan	2,500/1,000	—	—	—	—	AL 304
169. Saif Bijapuri	2,500/1,000	India	—	Deccani	—	AL 440; M. A. 496
170. Muhammad Kamgar, Kamgar Khan s/o Jafar Khan	2,500/1,000	India	Irani	—	Father	AL 856; M. A. 140
171. Sabal Singh Suodia	2,500/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	S. D. A. 108; M. U., II 463-69
172. Trimbakji Bhonsla	2,500/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	AL 48; <i>Dagfiar-i Dewani</i> , 19th Zulhij 6th R. Y.
173. Mir Astari, Aqil Khan Razi	2,500/700	India	Irani	—	—	AL 981; Akh. 15th Shawwal, 10th R. Y.; M.U., II 821; <i>Riyazul Shara</i> , 196a
174. Mir Muhammad Mahdi, Ardutani, Hakim-ul-Mulk	2,500/500	Iran	Irani	—	—	AL 960; M.A. 70; M. U., I 599-600

175	Muhammad Aqil Barlas, Tahawur Khan	2,500/500	—	Turani	—	—	Al 447
176	Ahmad Beg, Zulqadar Khan	2,500/500	India	Turani	—	—	Al 448, A M T 126b
177	Wazir Beg, Iradat Khan	2,500/400	—	—	—	—	Al 232, 566, A M T 126b
178	Saiyid Hidayatullah	2,500/200	India	Indian	—	Father	Al 473, M U, II 456-57
179	Raja Ekram Singh of Guler (Punjab)	2,500/-	India	Indian	Rajput Zorundar	Father	M Akbar, <i>The Punjab under the Mughals</i> , 223
180	Muhammad Quli Mutaqad Khan	2,000/2,000 (1,800 x 2 3h)	India	Turani	—	Father	M A 80, Al 964, M U, II 870 71
181	Mubarak Khan Niyazi	2,000/2,000 (1,000 x 2 3h)	India	Indian	Afghan	Grand-father	Al 454, 475, M U, III 511-13
182	Sultan Beg, Shah Quli Khan	2,000 2,000 (1,000 x 2 3h)	—	—	—	—	Al 860, T U (S V)
183	Husain Beg Khan	2,000/2,000 (500 x 2 3h)	—	—	—	—	Al 218
184	Saiyid Hasan Barlas, Ikram Khan	2,000/2,000 (500 x 2 3h)	India	Indian	—	Father	Al 347, 634, M U, I 215-16, A M T 128b
185	Mir Muhammad Hadi, Hadi Khan s/o Rafiuddin Sadr i Iran	2,000/2 400	Iran	Iran	—	—	Akh 13th Ramzan, 13th R Y
186	Mujahid Bijapuri	2,000/2,000	India	Indian	Deccani	—	Al 140
187	Abdullah Beg Sarai, Abdullah Khan	2,000/2,000	India	Turani	—	—	Al 47, 874

S.No	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
188	Raja Nar Singh Gaur	2 000/2 000	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	Al 268, 865
189	Muhammad Salih, Makarmat Khan	2 000/2 000	—	—	—	—	Al 294, 960, Akh 13th Ziqada, 9th R.Y
190	Raja Todar Mal	2 000/2 000	India	Indian	—	—	Al 874, 885, M U, II 286-87
191	Muhammad Ali Beg, Ali Quli Khan s/o Ali Mardan Khan	2 000/2,000	Iran	Irani	—	Father	Al 885, M.A. 109, 110, Kamwar, 255a, A M T 128a
192	Sayyid Abdul Nabi	2 000/1,500 (700 x 2 3h)	India	Indian	—	Father	Al 960, Kamwar, 249a, M U, II 448
193	Barzan Beg Qaladar Khan	2,000/1,500 (500 x 2 3h)	—	—	—	—	Al 194, 885
194	Jagat Singh Hara s/o Muktand Singh Hara	2 000/1 500 (500 x 2 3h)	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	Al 221, 1034, Diksha, 79b, M U, III 510
195	Naraji Deccani	2 000/1 600	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Akh 13th Ramzan, 13th R.Y
196	Arslan Quli, Arslan Khan	2 000/800 (2 3h)	India	Irani	—	Father	Al 817, 1067, M U, I 277
197	Murza Muhammad, Khanjar Khan	2,000/1,500	India	Turani	—	—	Al 817, 870, T U (S V)
198	Mulla Yahiya, Mukhlis Khan	2 000/1,500	India	Indian	Deccani	—	Al 871, M U, III 565

199	Sayid Ali s/o Afzal Khan	2 000/1 500	India	—	Deccan	—	A1 834
200	Poran Mal Bundela	2 000/1 500	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	—	A1 986
201	Fatch Ullah Khan s/o Sa'id Khan Tarkhan	2 000/1 500	India	Turan	—	Father	A1 339,400, T M 1069 A H
202	Sayid Hazan Khan Barha s/o Sayid Durr Khan	2 000/1 500	India	Indian	—	Father	TU (SV), MU, II 414-15
203	Khawja Obedullah Khan	2 000/1 200	—	—	—	—	A1 473, M A 88
204	Vyas Rao or Bhas Rao	2 000/1 200	India	Indian	Maratha	—	A1 48
205	Ali Quli Beg, Ali Quli Khan	2 000/1 000	—	—	—	—	A1 291, A M T 131a
206	Wah Mahallar	2 000 1 000	—	—	—	—	A1 45
207	Dalaji	2 000/1 000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	A1 48
208	Khushial Beg Qasbi al Quli Khan Saadat Khan	2 000/1 000	—	Turan	—	—	A1 471,914
209	Mir Ibrahim Husan Multafat Khan	2 000/1 000	India	Iran	—	Father	Akh 25th Rabi II, 19th R Y, A1 880, M U, III 611 13
210	Sayid Munawwar Khan Barha	2 000/1 000	India	Indian	—	Father	A1 1034, M U, II 465 68
211	Saidik Abdul Karim Thanesari	2 000/1 000	India	Indian	—	—	A1 220
212	Sayid Ferroz Khan Barha Ikhtas Khan	2 500/1 500 (500 x 2 3h)	India	Indian	—	Uncle	A1 440 1034, M U, II 473- 75, Fathiya Ibriza 158b

<i>S.No Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Cre p</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
213 Medni Singh s/o Prithi Singh of Srnagar	2 000/1 000	India	Indian	Rajput <i>Zami dar</i>	—	AI 604, Kamwar, 235b
214 Tanuji	2 000/1 000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	AI 47
215 Prithi Singh s/o Raja Jaswant Singh Rathor	2 000/1 000	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	AI 917, T M 1077 A H.
216 Muhammad Ali Khan	2 000/1,000	India	Iran	—	Father	AI 964, M U, III 625-27
217 Nurat Khan Qaladar Khan	2 000/1 000	—	—	—	—	AI 981, Akh 19th Rajab 9th R Y
218 Ani Rai Brahman	2 000/1,000	India	Indian	—	—	S Ahmad, "Umrat Humud" 64
219 Marzhamat Khan	2 000/900	—	—	—	—	AI 972
220 Jahangir Quli Khan	2 000/900	—	—	—	—	Akh 9th Ramzan, 13th R Y, A M T 132a
221 Muhammad Isma il Itiqad Khan	2,000/1 000	India	Iran	—	Father	M A. 156, 158
222 Isma il Kheibgi Husanrai Janbaz Khan	2 000/500 (2-3h)	India	Indian	Afghan	—	AI 45,464, 635, T U (S V.) M U, III 777-78
223 Yaqut Khan	2 000/700 (100 x 2 3h)	India	Indian	Deccani	—	S D A 19

224	Qazalbash Khan	2,000/800	—	Irani	—	Al. 291
225	Abdullah B-g Askar Khan Najm Sani	2,000/750	India	Irani	—	Al. 465; Akh. 16th Ramzan, 13th R.Y.; M.U., II 809
226	Iubasr Khan	2,000/700	—	—	—	Al. 856
227.	Syed Sultan Karbalas	2,000/700	India	Irani	—	Al. 880
228	Doyanat Khan, Hakim Jamal Kashi	2,000/700	—	Irani	—	B N. II, 728; Al. 594
229	Yalingsh Khan Bahadur	2,000/700	India	Turani	—	M A. 156; Manucci II 43; M.U., III 971-72
230	Kamal Lodi, Halbur Khan	2,000/600	India	Indian	Afghan	Al. 77,375
231	Mir Imamuddin, Rahmat Khan	2,000/600	Iran	Irani	—	Al. 140,855-56; T.M. 1076 A.H; M.U., III 111-112
232	Ruh-ullah Khan s/o Khalullah Khan	2,000/600	India	Irani	Father	Al. 870, M.U., II 309-315
233.	Yakataz Khan	2,000/600	—	—	—	Al. 1062; M.A. 104
234	Muhammad Ali s/o Taqarrub Khan	2,000/500	India	Irani	Father	Al. 856; M.A. 140
235	Mir Murad Mazandani, Gharat Khan	2,000/400	Iran	Irani	—	Al. 54
236.	Zauddin, Rahmat Khan	2,000/300	India	Irani	Father	M.U., II 283-85

<i>S.No</i>	<i>Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
237	Sayyid Masud Barha	2,000/300	India	Indian	—	—	Al. 268
238	Muhammad Beg. Teer Andaz Khan	2,000/300	India	Iran	—	Father	S D A 193, A.M.T. 127a
239	Sayyid Muzaffar Barha, Shuja'at Khan	2,000/250	India	Indian	—	Father	Al. 129, T.M. 1069 A.H.
240	Mulla Abdul Salam Lahori, Teacher of Dara Shukoh	2,000/-	India	Indian	—	—	Farhat, 197a
241	Ri'ayat Khan	1,500/1,500 (2-3h)	—	—	—	—	Al. 400
242	Fahar Singh Gaur of Indirkhi	1,500/1,000 (2-3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	Yar Das, 94a
243	Murad Qutb Sultan Ghakkar	1,500/1,500 (500 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	—	—	Al. 219, 635
244	Mir Fateh, Fateh Khan	1,500/1,000 (2-3h)	—	—	—	—	Al. 342, 680, 917
245	Dilr Khan s/o Bahadur Robela	1,500/1,000 (800 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	Add 279a; Al. 965
246	Shahbaz Khan Afghan	1,500/1,500	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Al. 197, 475, 625

247	Mir Muhammad Murad, Sayid Mohammad Khan	1,500/1,500	—	—	—	S D A. 74
248	Hayat Afghan, Zabardast Khan	1,500/1,500	India	Indian	Afghan	Al. 291
249	Fauzdar Khan	1,500/1,500	India	Indian	Afghan	Al. 342, 625
250	Khawja Inayatullah	1 000/700	—	—	—	Al. 339, 395
251	Gopal Singh s/o Raja Sarup	1,500/1,500	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Al. 1056
252	Kamil Khan	1,500/1,500	India	Indian	Afghan	Al. 1044; Akh 20th Rabi II, 12th R.Y.
253	Begun Deccani	1,500/1,500	India	Indian	Maratha	Akh 22nd Shaban, 4th R.Y.
254	Sayid Abdur Rahman, Dilawar Khan	1,500/1,500	India	Indian	—	Father <i>Dagfar-i Drazani</i> , No. 2986; Hatun Khan, 14s
255	Sarang Dhar Zamindar of Jammun	1,500/1,500	India	Indian	Zamindar	Al. 286-87
256	Hasan s/o Dilawar Khan Deccani	1,500/1,500	India	Indian	—	S D A. 37
257	Jagat Singh	1,500/1,400	India	Indian	Rajput	<i>Dagfar-i Drazani</i> , No. 2986
258	Kezri Singh Bharnya	1,500/1,400	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Al. 1047
259	Sidi Fautad, Fautad Khan	1,500/1,200	India	Indian	—	Kamwar, 250b; M U., I 503, T M 1092 A.H.
260	Rambhaji Deccani	1,500/1,200	India	Indian	Maratha	Al. 293

S.No	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
261	Sikandar Rohela	1,500/1,200	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Al. 291
262	Mas'ud Mangli, Mangli Khan	1,500/1,000 (200 × 2.3h)	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Al. 1039
263	Qalandar Beg, Qalandar Khan	1,500/1,000 (200 × 2.3h)	India	Turani	—	Father	S D A 74, M U, I 192-94
264	Rai Makrand	1,500/1,200	India	Indian	Zamindar	—	Al 885
265	Bhoj Raj Kachwaha	1,500/1,200	India	Indian	Rajput	—	Selected Waga'i of the Deccan, 52, Al 917
266	Mitr Sen Bundela	1,500/1,200	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	Al. 302, 1052; A M T. 132b
267	Dildar Beg, Dildar Khan	1,500/1,000	India	Turani	—	Father	Al 140
268	Kamgar Khan s/o Kamyab Khan	1,500/1,000	India	Iran	—	Father	Al. 141, 457, 1061
269.	Muhammad Ismail, Ismaili Khan s/o Najabat Khan	1,500/1,000	India	Turani	—	Father	Al. 755; M U, II 781
270	Daku Ji	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Al. 48
271.	Muhammad Sharif Polakji	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	—	—	Al. 54
272.	Muzi Afghan	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Al. 454-55

273.	Hameed Kakur, Kakur Khan	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Alh. 19th Rajab, 9th R.Y. Al. 77, 218; Hatim Khan, 20a, 24a Al. 199, 287
274	Raja Man Singh of Guler (Punjab)	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	Al. 270, 982; T.U. (S.V.)
275.	Harjis Gaur	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	Al. 270; T.M. 1079A H.
276	Chatar Bhuj Chauhan, Zamindar of Ajaun	1,500/1,000	—	—	—	—	Al. 270, 448
277.	Aqa Yusuf	1,500/1,000	Iran	Irani	—	Father	Al. 399
278	Mir Rustam Khawafi	1,500/1,000	—	—	—	—	Al. 448; Kamwar, 260a
279.	Mir Ibrahim, Mir Turuk	1,500/1,000	—	—	—	—	Al. 197
280	Abul Baqa	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	Al. 447, 1056; A.M.T. 131b; M.U. II 227-28
281	Raja Amar Singh Narori	1,500/1,000	India	Turani	—	Uncle	Haum Khan, 54b; Al. 240
282	Yazdani, Cousin of Hasan Ali Khan Alamgir Shahi	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	Al. 304, 428
283	Raja Kuhar Singh Taunur	1,500/1,000	India	Iranu	—	Father	Al. 856; M.A. 130; M.U., III 646-50
284	Mir Ibrahim, Mohitasham Khan s/o Shaikh Mir	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	Al. 334
285.	Udai Bhan Rathor	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	—

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
286	Sayid Ibrahim Dara Shukohi, Mustafa Khan	1,500/1,000	—	—	—	—	AI 964
287	Muhammad Salih Tar Khan	1,500/1,000	India	Turani	—	Father	AI 447, MU, III 560-62
288	Ali Quli, Tashrif Khan, Muftakhar Khan	1,500/1,000	—	Iran	—	Father	AI 565
289	Firuz Mewati, Firuz Khan	1,500/1 000	India	Indian	—	—	AI 440, TM 1075 AH
290	Man Singh s/o Rup Singh Rathor	1,500/700	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	Adab 315b, AI 158, 447, MU, II 270
291	Jag Ram Kachwaha	1,500/1 000	India	Indian	Rajput	—	AI. 1056
292	Asadullah, Iqram Khan s/o Mulla Ahmad Nautia	1,500/1 000	India	Indian	—	Father	AI 957, TU (SV); MU, III 564-65
293	Farhad Chela	1,500/1 000	—	—	—	—	Akh 24th Shaban, 11th R Y.
294	Raghu Ji s/o Manaji Bhorala	1,500/1 000	India	Indian	Maratha Zamindar	Father	SD A 7
295	Mir Ghiyasuddin	1,500/900	—	—	—	—	Daglar s Drazani, No 2986
296	Sharza Rao Kawa	1,500/900	India	Indian	Maratha	—	SD A 7
297	Mustafa Khan Kashu	1,500/900	Iran	Iran	—	—	Akh 30th Zulhij, 13th R Y; MU, III, 637-41

LIST OF NOBLES



201

298	Murza Niamatullah, Sohrab Khan	1,500/900	India	Iran	—	Father	Al 885, SDA 74, MU, I 586-87
299	Jalal Afghan	1,500/800	India	Indian	Afghan Deccani	—	Al 972
300	Raghu Nath Singh Bhartiya	1,500/900	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	Al 1061-62
301	Buzurg Umteed Khan	1,500/900	India	Iran	—	—	Al 140,856,956, MU, I 453 54
302	Mir Razuiddin	1,500/800	—	—	—	—	Al. 862
303	Salabat Deccani	1,500/700 (100 x 2 3h)	—	—	Deccani	—	SDA 5
304	Raghu Nath Singh Meerath	1,500/800	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	Alk 29th Rabi II, 8th R Y ; A.M.T 132a, 20th Ziqada, 10th R Y
305	Yahya Pasha	1,500/700	Turkey	Turani	—	—	MA. 110, Kamwar, 255a
306.	Raji s/o Afzal Khan	1,500/700	India	—	Deccani	—	Al 834, A.M.T 131b
307.	Sardar Qiyam Khan, Alaf Khan	1,500/700	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Al 290
308.	Marud Khan	1,500/700	—	—	—	—	SDA 74
309	Hizbar Khan's/o Alahwardi Khan	1,500/700	India	Iran	—	Father	MA 145, MU, III 498
310	Mir Muhammad Muazzam, Siyadat Khan, Muazzam Khan	1,500/700	India	Iran	—	Father	Al 210,334, MU, II 676, A.M.T 127b

<i>S.N. Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
311. Abul Fatch s/o Shaista Khan	1,500/700	India	Iran	—	Father	Al 140
312. Saifuddin Saifi, Kamyab Khan	1,500/700	India	Iran	—	Father	Al 870, M U, III 479
313. Shaikh Abdul Aziz, Abdul Aziz Khan, Dilawar Khan	1,500/700	India	Indian	—	—	S D A 74; Al. 141; M A. 132, M U, II 686-88
314. Khwaja Nur, Mutamad Khan (funuch)	1,500/600	—	—	—	—	Al. 294, 448, 960
315. Mabesh Das Rathor	1,500/600	India	Indian	Rajput	—	Al. 163
316. Mir Faziullah, Faziullah Khan	1,500/600	India	Iran	—	Father	Al. 158, 1061
317. Raghu Nath Singh Rathor, s/o Sunder Das Rathor	1,500/600	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	Al. 635
318. Yusuf Bijapun, Yusuf Khan	1,500/600	India	Indian	Deccan	—	Al. 742, 880
319. Shafiqatullah, Sarawar Khan	1,500/600	India	Iran	—	Father	Al. 127, 880; M U., II 440-41
320. Muhammad Beg	1,500/600	—	—	—	—	Al. 903
321. Muhammed Darab Khan	1,500/600	India	Iran	—	Father	Al 917
322. Munawwar Khan Zamindar	1,500/600	India	Indian	Afghan-Zamindar	—	Defstar-i Dewani, No 2986; Al. 956

323	Mir Saleh son in law of Shah Nawaz Khan Safvi	1,500/500	—	—	Iran	—	—	AL 45, 334, T.M.L. 1074 A.H.
324	Karan Kachi	1,500/500	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	—	AL 52
325	Daulatmand Khan	1,500/500	India	Indian	—	Father	—	AL 93, 989
326	Mir Abul Fazl Mamuri, Mamur Khan	1,500/500	—	—	Iran	—	—	AL 53, 77
327	Farhad Beg, Ali Mardan Khani, Farhad Khan	1,500/500	Iran	Iran	—	Father	—	AL 268, 287, 820
328	Qabad Beg	1,500/500	—	—	Turan	—	—	AL 163, 290
329	Ishaq Beg	1,500/500	—	—	—	—	—	AL 195
330	Raja Prithi Chand	1,500/500	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	—	AL 237
331	Lutfullah Khan	1,500/500	India	Indian	—	Father	—	AL 918; M.L. A. 71; M.L.U., I 171-77
332	Muhammad Mansur, Makarnat Khan	1,500/500	Iran	Iran	—	Grand- father	—	AL 448, 755
333	Ali Beg Khan	1,500/500	Turkey	Turan	—	—	—	M.L. A. 87; M.L. U., I 244
334	Abdullah s/o Randula Khan	1,500/500	India	Indian	—	Father	—	Daghestan, No. 2996
335	Hussain Beg Khan Zig	1,500/400	Iran	Iran	—	—	—	AL 55; M.L.U., I 591-93
336	Hameduddin, Khanarad Khan	1,500/400	India	Iran	—	Father	—	AL 270, 594

<i>S.N.</i>	<i>Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan Zamindar, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
337	Mir Niamatullah s/o Khalidullah Khan Yazdi	1 500/400	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 270, M U, III 342
338	Alah Dad s/o Ikhtas Khan	1 500/400	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	AI 291, 573 74
339	Abdul Qadir, Diyanat Khan	1,500/350	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 917 M U, II 59
340	Mu'ın Khan	1 500/300	—	—	—	—	AI 832
341	Abdur Rahim Khan s/o Islam Khan	1,500/300	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 960, M U, II 812-13
342	Muhammad 'Abd, Nawazuh Khan s/o Zahid Khan	1,500/300	India	—	—	Father	M A 97, Kamwar, 252b, M U, II 371-72
343	Muhamad Sadiq, Dilawar Khan	1,500/200	—	Turani	—	—	AI 232, 206, 287
344	Murad Khan, Ilufat Khan	1,500/250	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 870, M U, II 733
345	Hakim Salih Shurazi, Salih Khan	1,500/250	Iran	Irani	—	—	AI 1061-62
346	Shah Beg Khan Kashghari, Shah Khan	1,500/500	Turan	Turani	—	—	AI 401; M.A. 158, Kamwar 263b, 265b
347	Sayid Feroz Rustam Khani	1,500/200	India	Indian	—	—	AI 161

348.	Shaikh Nizam Quraishi	1,500/100	India	Indian	—	—	AL 1034
349.	Hakim Muhammad Amin Shirazi	1,500/50	Iran	Iranf	—	—	AL 399
350.	Sardar Beg, Ihtimam Khan	1,500/—	India	Turanf	Father	—	A.M.T. 131a
351.	Mirza Muhammad Tahir, Inayat Khan	1,500/—	India	Iranf	Father	—	M. U., II 762
352.	Shaikh Ali Bijaspuri	1,500/—	India	Indian	Afghan-Deccani	—	Diksha, 25b
353.	Ahmad Khan s/o Sidi Miftah	1,500/—	India	Indian	Deccani-Zamindar	Father	M. U., I 582
354.	Muhammad Beg Turtman, Kartala Khan	1,500/—	Iran	Iranf	—	—	M. U., II 706-8; T. U. (S.V.) AL 326, 343
355.	Sher Singh Rathor	1,000/1,000 (2-3h)	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	AL 441
356.	Maharawal Jaswant Singh of Dungarpur	1,000/1,000 (800 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	Abh. 16th Zühij, 38th R. Y.; Ojha, Vol. III, Part I, 115
357.	Inder Singh s/o Rao Rai Singh	1,000/1,000 (700 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	S.D.A. 121; M.U., II 236
358.	Bahram s/o Qazalbash Khan	1,000/1,700	India	Iranf	—	Father	AL 486, 1039
359.	Raja Maha Singh Bahaduriya	1,000/1,000 (500 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	AL 1044; M.U., II 229-30
360.	Shaikh Abdul Hamid s/o Shaikh Mansur Bijaspuri	1,000/1,000 (100 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	Deccani	Father	S. D. A. 47

<i>S.N</i>	<i>Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc.</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
361.	Ram Singh s/o Ratan Rathor	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	AL 486
362	Sarbaj Khan	1,000/800 (600 × 2-3h)	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Akh. 5th Jamada, II, 12th R. Y.
363.	Qadir Dad Khan	1,000/800 (400 × 2-3h)	India	Turani	—	Father	Hatim Khan, 164a; AL 1030; A.M.T. 192a
364	Umar Tarun	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Afghan	—	AL 270, 287-88
365	Abdul Hameed Bujapuri	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Deccani	—	AL 163, 291
366	Chatru Ji Deccani	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	AL 206
367.	Mir Baqar Khan	1,000/1,000	India	Irani	—	Father	AL 206, 573; A.M.T. 131b
368.	Mahmud Dilraq	1,000/1,000	—	Turani	—	—	AL 487; <i>Mirast ul-Mam</i> , 160a-b
369	Imam Abardi	1,000/1,000	—	—	—	—	AL 635
370.	Man Dhata	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	AL 647-48
371	Murad Khan, <i>Zamindar</i> of Tibet	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Zamindar	—	AL 860
372.	Raja Jai Singh	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	AL 964
373	Raja Bahruj	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	AL 340; T.N.L. 1076 A. H.; M. U. II 219

LIST OF NOBLES

		India	Iran	Father	S D A 74, Akh 17th Rabi II 12th R. Y.
374	Rustam Khan s/o Qazalbash Khan	1,000/900	—	—	Al. 232, 856
375	Ghaurat Beg, Shuja' Khan	1,000/900	—	—	Al. 862-63
376	Sayid Anwar	1,000/900	—	—	Al 290; T. U. (S.V.)
377	Sarfraz Khan Beg	1,000/900	—	—	Al 308, 960
378	Qalandar Daudzai, Qalandar Khan	1,000/900	Indian	—	Al 1062; M. U., III 530
379	Kunda Ji Deccani (Embraced Islam)	1,000/800	Indian	—	Al. 293
380	Sayid Bahadur Barha	1,000/800	Indian	—	Al. 216, T. U. (S.V.); Ruq No 5/10 p 11; <i>Fathya Isriya</i> 158 b
381	Imam Quli Qarawal, Aghar Khan	1,000/800	Iran	—	Al. 45
382	Sayid Nasruddin Khan	1,000/800	Indian	—	M U., III 966-67
383	Mirza Ruhullah s/o Yusuf Khan Tashqandi	1,000/800	Turani	Father	—
384	Mir Burhani	1,000/800	—	—	Al 1050
385	Saufullah Arab	1,000/800	—	—	Al 45
386	Suraj Mal Gaur	1,000/800	Indian	Father	Al. 192

S.N.	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
387	Inderman Bundela	1,000/700	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	<i>Daf̄tar-i D̄rawan</i> , 2983; S.D.A. 112; AL. 989
388	Khawaja Shah, Sharif Khan	1,000/700	—	—	—	—	M. A. 140
389	Ghulam Muhammad Afghan	1,000/700	India	Indian	Afghan	—	AL. 475
390	Hasan Beg	1,000/700	—	—	—	—	AL. 163
391	Darwesh Beg Qaqshal	1,000/700	—	Turani	—	—	AL. 303
392	Mana Ji s/o Wancrath Ji	1,000/700	India	Indian	Maratha	—	<i>Daf̄tar-i D̄rawan</i> , No. 2986
393	Tama Ji <i>Zamindar</i> of Kachh	1,000/700	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	AL. 625
394	Haji Ahmad Sa'id s/o Maulana Muhammad Sa'id	1,000/700	India	Indian	—	—	<i>Fartat</i> ; 198b-99a; AL. 885
395	Kamaluddin s/o Dilir Khan	1,000/700	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	M. A. 140
396	Sayyid Muqtadar	1,000/600	—	—	—	—	AL. 217
397	Abul Makarim s/o Iftikhar Khan	1,000/600	India	Irani	—	Father	AL. 334
398	Sayyid Harnid Bukhari Mujahid Khan	1,000/600	—	Turani	—	Father	AL. 249, 918, M. U., III 598
399	Mirza Ali Arab, Qaladar Khan	1,000/600	India	Irani	—	Father	S.D.A. 74; AL. 565, M. U., III 115-20

400.	Daran Khan	1,000/600	—	—	—	Brother	Al. 140, 843
401.	Muhammad Abid, brother of Fairullah Khan	1,000/600	India	Irani	—	—	Al. 960
402.	Bhim Singh of Srinagar	1,000/500	India	Indian	Rajput-Zemindar	Father	Al. 964; M. A. 105
403.	Salyid Ahmad Khan Khattab	1,000/600	—	—	—	—	<i>Dafdar-i Dezzani</i> , 2906
404.	Garthu Ji i/o Wankar Rao	1,000/600	India	Indian	Maratha	—	M. A. 149; Al. 216, 903
405.	Nuri Beg, Turkiaz Khan	1,000/600	—	Turani	—	—	Al. 55, Hatim Khan, 16b
406.	Saun Singh of Kali Bhett	1,000/500	India	Indian	Rajput-Zemindar	—	Al. 78
407.	Daulat Afghan	1,000/500	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Al. 78, 487
408.	Muhammad Muqum, Muqum Khan	1,000/500	India	Turani	—	Father	—
409.	Inayat Afghan	1,000/500	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Al. 268
410.	Mir Arab Bakhari	1,000/500	—	Irani	—	—	Al. 271
411.	Abbas Afghan	1,000/500	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Al. 270
412.	Kalyan Singh of Bandhu	1,000/500	India	Indian	Rajput-Zemindar	—	Al. 215
413.	Darwesh Muhammad	1,000/500	—	—	—	—	Al. 221
414.	Abdul Bari Ansari	1,000/500	India	Indian	—	—	Al. 291
415.	Qadir Dad Ansari	1,000/500	India	Indian	—	—	Al. 635

<i>S.No. Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
416. Asad Kaibi, Asad Khan	1,000/500	India	Irani	—	—	<i>Dafar : Dewani, No 2986, AI 404, 565</i>
417. Daud	1,000/500	India	Indian	—	—	AI 291
418. Mir Ali Akbar	1,000/500	—	—	—	—	<i>Dafar : Dewani, No 2986</i>
419. Mir Baqi, Baqi Khan	1,000/500	Iran	Irani	—	Father	AI 966
420. Tatar Beg, Uzbek Khan	1,000/500	—	Turani	—	—	AI 52, 53; Haum Khan, 15a, 28b, 565
421. Bhao Singh, Mural Khan	1,000/500	India	Indian	Zamindar	Father	AI 981, MU, II 281
422. Hamid Khao, s/o Shaikh Mir	1,000/500	India	Irani	—	Father	AI 856
423. Sadi Ibrahim	1,000/500	India	Indian	Deccani Zamindar	—	AI 626
424. Sayyid Shuja'at Khan, Bahadur Bhaktar	1,000/500	India	Indian	—	Father	MU, II 460 61
425. Mir Bahadur Dil, Jan Sipar Khan	1,000/500	India	Irani	—	Father	SD A. 29, MU, I 535 37
426. Raghu Ji Choparay	1,000/500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	SD A 107
427. Nurul Hasan	1,000/500	—	—	—	—	AI. 565
428. Prem Singh, Zamindar of Srasagar	1,000/500	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	—	AI 872

429.	Iftikhar, Mufathhir Khan s/o Fakhir Khan	1,000/450	India	Irani	—	Father	Al. 401, 635, 892; M.U., III 27-28
430.	Mukhtar Beg, Nawazish Khan	1,000/400	Turkey	Turani	—	Father	M.A. 152; M.U., I 247
431.	Mir Mahmud, Aqdat Khan	1,000/400	Iran	Irani	—	Brother	M.A. 109, 113; Kamwar, 255b, M.U., I 224-25
432.	Jamal Khan	1,000/400	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	Al. 147
433.	Manohar Das Suodia	1,000/400	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	Al. 140
434.	Khudawand Habibi, Habesh Khan	1,000/400	India	Indian	—	—	Al. 45
435.	Wali Beg Kalali	1,000/400	India	—	—	—	Alh. 9th Ramzan, 13th R.Y. Al. 876
436.	Muhammad Salim	1,000/400	India	Indian	—	—	Al. 196 A.H. 8th R. Y.
437.	Shaukh Nizam s/o Shaukh Farid	1,000/400	India	Indian	—	Father	Al. 399; Haidim Khan 30b; M.U., I 222
438.	Malik Jewan, Dakhtiyar Khan	1,000/400	India	Indian	Afghan-Zamindar	—	Al. 742; T.M. 1076 A.H.
439.	Ahmad Beg Najim Sani	1,000/400	India	Irani	—	Brother	Al. 885
440.	Ali Beg, Ibunam Khan	1,000/400	India	Irani	—	Father	Al. 215; M.U., III 498
441.	Gada Beg	1,000/400	—	—	—	—	Al. 870
442.	Raja Sher Singh, Zamindar of Chamba	1,000/400	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	Al. 843

<i>S.N. Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
443 Khwaja Sadiq Badakhsh	1,000/400	Turan	Turani	—	—	Al 977
444 Sayyid Yadgar Husain Barha	1,500/600	India	Indian	—	—	Al 1062, Hatim Khan, 56b Akh 17th Zilhiy, 20th R.Y
445 Banwali Das Bhartiya	1,000/400	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	Al 1047, A M T. 132a
446 Isadai Bakhuyar	1,000/350	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Al 1034
447 Sayyid Zannul Abidin Bukhari	1,000/300	—	Turani	—	—	Hatim Khan, 13b, Al 45
448. Abu Muslim	1,000/300	—	—	—	—	Al 206
449 Sayyid Mirza Sabzwari	1,000/300	Iran	Irani	—	—	Al 346
450 Sayyid Ali	1,000/300	—	—	—	—	Al 918
451 Darbar Khan Khwayasara	1,000/300	—	—	—	—	Al 960
452 Pahlia Wijai	1,000/300	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Akh 13th Ramzan, 13th R Y
453 Haji Muhammad Shafi, Shafi Khan	1,000/300	—	—	—	—	Akh 22nd Safar, 20th R.Y.; Al 870
454 Muhammad Shuja, Shuja'at Khan s/o Qiwamuddin Khan	1,000/300	Iran	Irani	—	Father	M A. 153, Kamwar, 263a, M.U, III 114-115
455 Baktawar Khan	1,000/250	—	—	—	—	Al 960, M A. 140, T U (SV)

456	Nazir Khan Khwajasara	1 000/250	—	—	—	—	AL 742
457	Mansur Nasir Khan brother of Abdullah, King of Kaibghar	1 000/250	Turan	Turani	—	—	AL 762
458	Muhammad Qasim Ali Mardan Khan	1 000/250	Iran	Irani	—	Father	AL 263
459	Mir Mahdi Yardi	1 000/200	—	Irani	—	—	AL 163
460	Niamatullah s/o Husamuddin Khan	1 000/200	India	Irani	—	Father	AL 52
461	Khwaya Kalan Kifayat Khan	1 000/200	—	—	—	—	AL 77
462	Isa Khan	1 000/200	—	—	—	—	ALA. 13th Ramzan, 13th R.Y.
463	Qutab Kaush	1 000/200	—	Irani	—	—	AL 263
464	Mir Abul Hasan Shah Shuja	1 000/200	—	—	—	—	AL 161
465	Amanullah	1 000/200	India	Irani	—	Father	AL 197, MU, 1232
466	Muhammad Husain Sadoz	1 000/200	—	Turani	—	—	AL 210
467	Sher Afghan	1 000/200	India	Indian	Afghan	—	AL 287
468	Barq Andaz Khan	1 000/200	—	—	—	—	AL 861
469	Mulla Iwaz Wayh	1 000/200	Balkh	Turani	—	—	AL 392 ALA. 150 156
470	Mir Aziz	1 000/200	—	—	—	—	AL 861

S.No.	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
471	Amanat Khan Mirak Mumuddin	1 000/200	India	Iranian	—	Father	M A 110, M U, I 258 68
472	Mir Yaqub, Shamsher Khan	1 000/150	India	Iranian	—	Father	AI 195, M U, II 670, T M 1086 A.H
473	Khwaja Ismail Beg Kurmani	1 000/150	—	Iranian	—	—	AI 218, 487
474	Islam Quli	1,000/100	Turan	Turanian	—	—	M A 76, Kamwar, 249a
475	Mahdi, Cousin of Abdullah King of Kashghar	1 000/100	Turan	Turanian	—	—	AI 565 66
476	Inayat Khan	2,000/2 000	Iran	Iranian	—	—	M U, II 813-18 <i>The English, Factories</i> , 1661 64, 203, 205
477	Mir Abdul Mabud (Bhattari)	1,000/—	India	Indian	—	—	<i>Selected Wagon of the Decan</i> , 68
478	Chand Khan s/o Mir Murtaza	1 000/—	India	Turanian	—	Father	Mamuri, 149a, A M T 132a
479	Bhagwant	1 000/—	India	Indian Rajput	—	—	S D A. 104
480.	Itram Khan Sadr	1,000/—	—	—	—	—	A M T 131b
481	Raja Jaswant Singh Bundela	1 000/—	India	Indian Rajput Zamindar	—	Father	M A. 169, M U, II 293 94
482	Manu Ram	1,000/—	India	Indian	—	—	S D A. 40
483.	Raja Chatar Singh of Chamba (Punjab)	1 000/—	India	Indian Rajput-Zamindar	—	Father	M Akbar, "Punjab under the Mughals", 226

B. MANSABDARS WHO HELD OR REACHED THE RANK OF 1,000 *ZAT* AND ABOVE DURING THE PERIOD, 1679-1707
Mansabdars of 5,000 and above

<i>S. No. Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
1. Mirza Abu Talib, Shaista Khan, Amir-ul-Umara	7,000/7,000 (2-3h)	India	Irani	—	Father	T M. 5, A M T. 121a; M U, II 690-706
2. Mir Malik Husain, Khan-i-Jahan Bahadur, Zafar Jang Kotahish	7,000/7,000 (5,000 × 2-3h)	India	Irani	—	Father	M A 142; T M 9; A M.T. 121a; M U, I 798-813
3. Mir Shahabuddin, Ghaziuddin Khan Bahadur Firoz Jang	7,000/7,000 (3,000 × 2-3h)	Turan	Turani	—	Father	<i>Akh</i> 6th Jamada II, 46th R.Y.; Z A 163a, M.A. 302, 481; T M. 27; M.U, II 872-79
4. Sida Marud, Masud Khan	7,000/7,000 (2,000 × 2-3h)	India	Indian	Deccani-Zamindar	—	Isar Das, 126a, 144a; S D A. 222; Kamwar, 281b; B S.767; M A 315-16
5. Jarrubed Khan Bijapuri	7,000/7,000 (1,200 × 2-3h)	India	Indian	Deccani	—	<i>Akh</i> 20th Shaban, 37th R.Y.; Z A 164b; Kamwar, 301a; T.M. 17
6. Abdur Rauf Miyyana, Dilur Khan	7,000/7,000	India	Indian	Afghan-Deccani	—	Z A 164a; M A. 280; B S. 756.M.U., II 56-59; T.U., S.V.

LIST OF NOBLES

7	Raja Shahu	7,000/7,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S.D.A. 215, M.A. 332, <i>Rajaram-i Karim</i> , 23b, A.M.T. 121b, Kamwar, 231b, M.U. II 342-58
8	Shaikh Nizam Junaidi Haiderabad, Muqarrab Khan, Khan : Zaman Fatch Jang	7,000/7,000	India	Indian	Deccani	—	Z.A. 131b, T.M.B. M.A. 324, M.U. I 794-98
9	Sayid Makhdoom Sharza Khan, Rustam Khan	7,000/7,000	India	Indian	Deccani	—	S.D.A. 199, Z.A. 164a, M.A. 176, 280, 400, M.U. II 502-504, Chandr Bhan Brahman, Galdaria, 4b-5a
10	Sayid Abdul Qadir Khan	7,000/7,000	—	—	Deccani	—	M.A. 23rd Rajab, 39th R.Y., S.D.A. 222
11	Muhammad Ibrahim, Asad Khan	7,000/7,000	India	Irani	—	Father	S.D.A. 169, Z.A. 164b, M.A. 392, M.U. I 310-321
12	Az zuddin Bahramand Khan	7,000/7,000	India	Irani	—	Father	<i>Diyar-i-Dizari</i> , (Haiderabad), 25th Jamada II, 23rd R.Y., T.M. 16, M.A. 369, 374, M.U. I 454-57
13	Alauddin Nayak (Former <i>belahis</i> of Pidia Nayak)	7,000/7,000	India	Indian	Deccani	—	Kamwar, 301b, 309b
14	Habsh Khan ¹	7,000/7,000	—	—	Deccani	—	<i>Daftr-i-Deccan</i> , 18th Jamada II 33rd R.Y., No. 784

¹ Dr Yusuf Husain Khan has misread this name as Hasan Khan (S.D.A. 222)

<i>S.N. Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups—Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
15. Muhammad Ibrahim Khalilullah Khan, Mahabat Khan	7,000/6,000 (1,000 × 2-3h)	Iran	Iran	Deccani	—	S.D.A. 170, Z. A. 165a. M.A. 269, M.U., III 627-32
16. Chaghta Khan Bahadur, Fatch Jang Kaushghari	7,000/—	Turan	Turan	—	—	T.U., S.V.
17. Sayyid Muzaaffar Haidarabadi	7,000/—	—	—	Deccani	—	T.M. 1097 A.H.; Kamwar, 272b; M. A. 227
18. Ikhlas Khan, Khan-i-Alam	6,000/5,000 (2-3h)	India	Indian	Deccani	—	Z. A. 131b-132a; M. A. 324, 384; M.U., I 816-17; A.M.T. 121b
19. Mir Muran, Amur Khan	6,000/5,000 (3,000 × 2-3h)	India	Iran	—	Father	Akh 25th Shawwal, 25th R.Y. M.U., I 277-87
20. Ibrahim Khan s/o Ali Mardan Khan	6,000/6,000 (2,000 × 2 3h)	Iran	Iran	—	Father	M.A. 236, 497; Kamwar, 299b; T.M. 27; M.U., I 295-301
21. Rana Raj Singh	6,000/6,000 (1,000 × 2-3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	T. M. 1092 A.H.; M.U., II 206-8, A.M.T. 122b
22. Sayyid Latuf, Sarfaraz Khan Deccani	6,000/6,000 (1,000 × 2-3h)	India	—	Deccani	—	Akh 14th Shaban, 43rd R.Y.; Z.A. 162b, M.A. 480, 513; M.U., II 499 500

LIST OF NOBLES

23.	Daud Khan Panni	6,000/5,000	India	Indian	Afghan Deccani	Uncle	S. D. A. 171, Z. A. 161a; M. A. 483; M. U., II 63-68
24.	Muhammad Ismail, Itiqad Khan, Zulfikar Khan Bahadur Nurat Jang	6,000/5,000	India	Irani	—	Father	<i>Ragaim-i-Karaim</i> , 12a; <i>Akh.</i> 16th Shawwal, 45th R. Y.; M. A. 332, 374, 392; M. U., II 93-106
25.	Muhammad Amin Khan	6,000/5,000 (1,000 × 2-3b)	India	Iranu	Deccani	Father	A. M. T. 122a; M. U., III 613-620; Al. 855
26	Kanhuji Shurke	6,000/5,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	<i>Dafdar-i-Deccani</i> , No. 2980; M. A. 220, 495; Kamwar, 271 a; A. M. T. 122 a
27.	Mir Husaini Beg, Ali Mardan Khan Haiderabad	6,000/5,000	India	—	Deccani	—	Z. A. 125; M. A. 364; T. M. 20; M. U., II 824-25; A. M. T. 123a; <i>Dilkusha</i> , 95b
28.	Ismail Khan Mokha	6,000/5,000	India	Indian	Afghan-Zamindar	Deccani	M. A. 369; M. U., I 291-92; T. U., S. V.; A. M. T. 121b M. A. 395
29.	Satvad Dafalya	6,000/5,000	India	Indian	Maratha-Zamindar	—	Z. A. 163b; T. U., S. V.
30.	Hasan Khan Rohela	6,000/5,000	India	Indian	Afghan Deccani	—	<i>Akh</i> 19th Jamada II, 45th R. Y.; S. D. A. 204; Z. A.
31.	Husain Khan, Fatch Jang Khan Miyaana	6,000/5,000	India	Indian	Afghan Deccani	—	162a; M. A. 225; M. U., III 30-32
32.	Abid Khan, Qulij Khan	6,000/1,500	Turan	Turani	—	—	M. A. 185; T. M. 1098 A. H. M. U., III 120-23

<i>S.N. Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan Zamindar, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
33. Man Singh s o Sanbhaji	6 000/1 000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Kamwar, 281b, S D A 216
34. Rai Dhan	6 000/—	India	Indian	Maratha Zamindar	—	Dikshaiz 145b
35. Achpat Nayar	6 000/—	India	Indian	Deccani	—	Dikshaiz, 112b
36. Raja Ram Sing kachwaha	5 000/5 000 (2 3h)	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	Vir Vinod, II 1296, A M T 122b, T M 1099 A H, M U, II 301 303
37. Jalal Khan, Dhir Khan	5 000/5 000 (3 000×2 3h)	India	Indian	Afghan	Brother	Al 1030, T M 1093 A H, M U, II 42 56
38. Muhammad Beg Kartalab Khan, Shuja 'at Khan	5 000/5 000	Iran	Irani	—	—	M A 383, Kamwar, 294b, T M 14, M U, II 706-8, A M T 124a
39. Rana Jai Singh	5 000/5 000	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	M A 212, A. M T 122b, M U, II 208
40. Shuja 'at Khan Haidarabad	5 000/5 000	India	—	Deccani	—	M A 234, T U, SV, T M 1095 A H, A M T 123a
41. Achia Ji Nimbalkar Deccani	5 000/5 000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Alh 26th Rajab, 37th R Y, M A 271, Kamwar, 276b A M T 122b
42. Ruhullah Khan	5 000/5 000	India	Irani	—	Father	S D A. 169, Z A 165a, T M 3, M U II 309 315

LIST OF NOBLES

43	Rana Amar Singh II	5 000/5 000	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	<i>Vir Vinod</i> Vol. III 745, 749, 751, M A 404 S D A 183, T M 17
44	Abdul Muhammad Ikhlas Khan Miyana	5 000/5 000	India	Indian	Afghan	—	M A 506, M U, III 875, 927, Kamwar, 301a, <i>Murat- i Afshar Nama</i> , 578
45	Mir Qamruddin, Chin Qul J Khan Bahadur	5 000/5 000	India	Turan	—	Father	S D A 171, Z A 160b, M U II, 64-65
46	Ran Mast Ali Khan Pann Bahadur Khan, alias Rustam Khan	5 000/5 000	India	Indian	Afghan Deccani	—	Akh 17th Zilh J, 44th R Y, T M 20, M U, II 869 72
47	Mohammad Ibrahim, Ghalrat Khan, Shuja 'at Khan Khan-i Alam	5 000/5 000	India	Turan	—	Father	Akh 13th Shawwal 38th R Y Z A 164b
48	Nek Nihad Khan	5 000/5 000	India	Indian	—	Father	Diksha, 95b, M A 513, Khaifi Khan II, 370
49	Ahian Khan	5 000/5 000	—	—	Deccani	—	S D A 187, 206
50	Parya Nayak or Pidia Nayak	5 000/5 000	India	Indian	Deccani Zamindar	—	S D A 203
51	Malu Ji	5 000/5 000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S D A 205, Mamuri, 205b
52	Monsallah	5 000/5 000	—	—	—	—	
53	Jagna Nayak	5 000/5 000	India	Indian	Deccani Zamindar	—	

<i>S.N. Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
54 Padshah Quli Khan	5,000/5,000	—	—	Deccani	—	S D A 222
55 Khwaja Rahmatullah, Sarbuland Khan	5,000/4,000	India	Turani	—	—	T.M. 1000 A. H., M. U., II 477-79, AL 976; A.M.T. 124b
56 Bhaku Banjara	5,000/4,000	India	Indian	—	—	M. A. 393, A. M. T. 122b
57 Mir Muhammad Khalid Sipahdar Khan, Khan i Zaman, Muftakhar Khan	5,000/4,000	India	Irani	—	Father	M. A. 209, T. M. 1095 A. H.; M. U., I 785-92; A.M.T. 122b
58 Nagu Ji Mane or Naku Ji	5 000/4,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Alt. 8th Muharram, 44th R.Y., Dihaula, 122a
59 Sidi Salim Khan	5,000/4,000	India	Indian	Zamindar-Deccani	—	S. D. A. 207, Z.A. 164b
60 Mahram Khan	5,000/4,000	—	—	—	—	S. D. A. 219
61 Sayyid Muhammad Qaladar of Bangalore	5,000/4,000	—	—	Deccani	—	Isar Das, 131a-b
62 Muhammad Husain, Sipahdar Khan, Nasiri Khan	5,000/3 500 (500 x 2-3b)	India	Irani	—	Father	M. A. 481, 496; Kamwar 286b; M. U., II 949-51; <i>Mawat i-Afshar Nizma</i> , 583
63 Bahraj Pandhre	5,000/3,000 (500 x 2-3b)	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Alt. 1st Jamada II, 38th R. Y.

LIST OF NOBLES

64. Sa'adatmand Khan	5,000/3,000 (500 x 2-3h)	—	—	—	—	—	—	Alkh. 8th Jamada, I, 44th R.Y.
65. Sher Ilaz Khan	5,000/3,000	India	Indian	Afghan	—	—	—	Isar Das, 165b; Mamuri, 206a; Khafi Khan II, 532
66. Suma Shankar	5,000/3,000	India	Indian	Maratha Zamindar	—	—	—	Mamuri, 156b
67. Pars Ram	5,000/3,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	—	—	Isar Das, 126a
68. Sid Khan Muhammad s/o Sidi Masud	5,000/3,000	India	Indian	Deccani-Zamindar	Father	—	—	Waqai Papers Jaipur, 17th Ziqada, 47th R.Y.
69. Khevi	5,000/2,500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	—	—	M. A. 189; T.M. 1097 A.H.; M U, I 593-99
70. Hasan Ali Khan Bahadur Alamgir Shahi	5,000/2,500	India	Iran	—	Father	—	—	M. A. 324, 364, 384; T.M. 22; M. U, III 654-55; Kamwar, 279A
71. Shaikh Miran, Munawwar Khan or Mannu Khan	5,000/2,500	India	Indian	Deccani	—	—	—	M. A. 421; Kamwar, 291a; A. M. T. 123a
72. Sujan Rao or Shiv Bhan Rao	5,000/2,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	—	—	T. M. 6; S. D. A. 170; Z.A. 166a; M. A. 212, 369
73. Raja Bham Singh	5,000/2,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	—	—	Alkh. 24th Shawwal, 45th R. Y.
74. Saiyid Shah	5,000/2,000	—	—	Deccani	—	—	—	Defter-i-Deccani, No. 2978
75. Rana Ji Janardan	5,000/2,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	—	—	

<i>S.N. Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
76. Janku Ji	5 000/1 200	Ind a	Indian	Maratha	—	Akh 26th Rajab, 37th R Y
77. Jang Ju Khan Deccani	5 000/—	India	Indian	Afghan Deccani	—	T U S V
78. Nathu Ji Deccani	5 000/—	India	Indian	Maratha	—	A M T 123a
79. Pam Nayak Uncle of Pidia Nayak	5 000/—	India	Indian	Zamindar	—	Dilkusha, 95b, BS 750, T M 1099 A H
<i>Mansabdars of 3 000 to 4 500</i>						
80. Qasim Khan Kirmani	4 500/2 500 (1,000 x 2 3b)	Iran	Irani	—	—	Akh 15th Safar, 36th R Y, Khafi Khan II, 284, T M 7, M.U., III 123 26
81. Mir Shamsuddin, Mukhtar Khan	4 000/2 500 (2 3b)	India	Irani	—	Father	Akh 26th Rajab, 45 R Y, T M 1095 A H, M A 460, M U, III 620-23
82. Ghazi B Jaspuri Randula Khan	4 000/4 000 (1,000 x 2 3b)	India	Indian	Deccani	—	M U, II 309, A M T 124a
83. Muhammad Amir Shah Quli Khan	4 000/4 000	—	—	Deccani	—	S D A. 222, M A 194

LIST OF NOBLES

84	Yaswant Rao or Barwant Rao Deccani	4,000/4,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	M. A. 219; Kamwar, 271a, A. M. T. 123b
85	Shahb Abdullah, Ithmar Khan	4,000/4,000	India	Turani	—	—	Ala. 4th Rabi I, 42nd R.Y.; 15th Jamada II, 44th R.Y.; M. A. 324
86	Abdullah Khan adopted son of Abul Hasan of Haidarabad	4,000/4,000	India	Indian	Deccani	—	M. A. 303, A.M.T. 124a
87	Tarbiyat Khan Barlas, Shafullah	4,000/4,000	Turan	Turani	—	—	T.M. 1096 A. H.; M.U., I 495-98
88	Abdul Hamced	4,000/4,000	—	—	—	—	S.D.A. 124
89	Mahda Ji Naik	4,000/4,000	India	Indian	—	Father	S.D.A. 134
90	Muran b/o Nek Niyat Khan	4,000/4,000	India	Indian	—	Brother	Ala. 25th Jamada II, 44th R.Y.; S.D.A. 203
91	Ghalib Khan	4,000/3,500	India	Turani	—	—	M. A. 473; A.M.T. 124a
92	Muhammad Khalil, Zabardast Khan	4,000/3,000	India	Irani	—	Father	Ala. 22nd Ramzan, 40th R.Y.; 28th Muharram, 43rd R.Y.; M. A. 497; M. U., I 300; Kamwar 299a
93	Ibrahim Ghori	4,000/3,000	India	Indian	Afghan	—	S.D.A. 219
94	Muhammad Murad Khan, Saikat Jang Bahadur	4,000/3,000	India	Turani	—	Father	Mamun, 200a; Kamwar, 292b

THE MUGHAL NOBILITY UNDER AURANGZEB

S.No	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub-groups Rajput Mahratta Afghan Zamindar, etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
95	Mir Sadruddin, Saf Shikan Khan	4 000/3 000	Iran	Irani	—	Father	Z A 160 b, Kamwar, 273A, M U II 746-47
96	Izzat Khan Saf Shikan Khan	4 000/3 000	India	Indian	—	—	Mamuri, 174a, M A 150, Kamwar, 265a, A I 855
97	Siandar Bekhan, Atkandar Khan	4 000/3 000	Turan	Turani	—	—	M A 262 280, A M T 124a
98	Pir Muhammad, Aghar Khan	4 000/3 000	India	Turani	—	—	Khafi Khan, II, 246, Kamwar 268b, Isar Das, 164b, M U, I 274 77
99	Abdur Razzaq Lari	4 000/3 000	Iran	Irani	Deccani	—	S D A.195 M A.347, M U, II 818-21
100	Muhammad Ramzani, Abu Nasir, Shauka Khan II	4 000/2 500	India	Irani	—	Father	M A 442, 516, Kamwar, 294b, M U, I 292 93, A M T 124a
101	Rao Bhao Singh Hara	4 000/2,500	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	A I 267, A M T 123b, Gahlot, <i>Rajputana Ka Itihaz</i> , 74, Kamwar, 272b
102	Faizullah Khan	4 000/2 000	India	Irani	—	Father	M A 210, M U III 26-30, T M 1092A H, A M T 124a
103	Siandar Khan	4 000/2 000	India	Irani	—	Father	M U III 830 33

104	Mir Muhammad Ishaq, Mukarram Khan	4,000/1,500 (600 x 2-3h)	India	Iran	—	Father	<i>Ala. 11th Rabi II, 37th R.Y.;</i> M U, III 695-701; T M 56
105	Mir Muhammad Ibrahim, Mubtasham Khan	4,000/1,500 (500 x 2-3h)	India	Iran	—	Father	<i>Ala. 19th Ramzan, 25th R.Y.;</i> <i>Ala. 18th Shaban, 24th R.Y.</i>
106	Mir Muhammad Khalil, Tarbi- yat Khan, son of Darab Khan	4,000/2,200	India	Iran	—	Father	M A. 381, 485-505; T. M. 22, A. S. T. 123b, M U., I 490-503
107	Muhammad Amin Khan, Chin Bahadur	4,000/1,500	Turan	Turan	—	Uncle	Kamwar, 279b; M A. 481, 506, 518; M U. I 345-50
108	Mir Muhammad Askari, Aqil Khan Razi	4,000/1,000	India	Iran	—	—	T M. 8, M U., II 821 23; A. S. C. T 174b. <i>Riya-us-Shawa</i> , 176; <i>Musad-al Khwad</i> , 360-62
109	Abra' Khan, Iusad Khan	4,000/500	India	Iran	—	Father	A. M. T. 124b; M U. I 272-74; T U. S. V.
110	Mir Muhammad Hadi, Hakim ul Mulk	4,000/500	Iran	Iran	—	—	Z. A. 161a; M A. 562; Kamwar, 284b, 286a; M U. I 579-600
111	Shakh Ladu	4,000/—	India	Turan	Deccan	—	M A. 297; Kamwar, 279a
112	Raja Chhatar Sal Bundela	4,000/—	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamodar	Father	Kamwar, 291; <i>Dabihka</i> , 157b- 158a; M U., II 510-12
113	Raja Chavan Daffe s/o Satva Ji Daffe	4,000/—	India	Indian	Maratha-Zamodar	Father	<i>Alkhari</i> , Cited by Sarkar <i>History of Awangzeb</i> , V, 209
114	Siya Ji	4,000/—	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S. D. A. 178; Sharma, <i>The Rik- Pasi Policy of the Mughal Emperors</i> , 178

S. No	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub-groups Rajput Maratha, Afghan Zamindar, etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
115	Tahawur Khan, Paishah Qila Khan	4 000/—	India	Irani	—	Father	M A 188, A M T 123b, M U I 447 53, T M 1092 A H
116	Mol bhai Ali Askar Khan Handrabadi	4 000/—	India	—	Deccan	—	<i>Dikusha</i> , 95a, Kamwar, 286b M A 369, <i>Proceedings of the Deccan History Conference</i> , 1945, p 30, Document No 20, A M T 126a
117	Mir Shamsuddin alias Mukhlis Khan	3,500/3 000	Iran	Irani	—	Father	M A 374 405, T M 13, Z A 165b, Kamwar 289a, M U, III 641-44
118	Jan Spar Khan b o Darab Khan Bani Mukhtar	3 500/2,500 (1 000 x 2 3h)	India	Irani	—	Father	<i>Akh</i> 6th Zilhiy 39th R Y, 11th Ramzan 43rd R Y, A M T 127a
119	Itham ilah, Rasul Khan	3,500/3,000 (500 x 2 3h)	India	Indian	—	Father	S D A 181, M U II 303 305, Kamwar, 274b, A M T 124b
120	Mir Qamruddin Mukhtar Khan	3,500/3 000 (1 000 x 2 3h)	India	Irani	—	Father	<i>Akh</i> 5th Jamada I, 38th R Y, M A 220, 370, Kamwar, 275a, M U, III 655 60
121	Mughal Khan Arab Shaikh	3 500/3 000	Turan	Turani	—	Father	S D A 170, M A 246, M U, III 623 25
122	Muhammad Yar Khan	3,500/3 000	India	Irani	—	Father	<i>Akh</i> 8th Rabi II, 39th R Y, M A 384, 462, Kamwar, 296a, M U, III 706 711, <i>Mirat i Af-tab Numa</i> , 592
123	Mul ammad Sa'ed Feroz Khan	3,500/3 000	—	—	—	—	Isar Das, 164a

LIST OF NOBLES

						Isar Das, 164a
						Isar Das, 95a; Kamwar, 273a; A.M.T. 127a
124	Mian Hazin, Harbat Khan	3,500/3,000	—	—	Rajput-Zamindar	Father
125	Anrudh Hara of Bundi	3,500/3,000	India	Indian	—	Ala 26 Ramzan, 45th R.Y.; M.A. 485, 505, M.U. I 605-11
126	Hameduddin Khan Bahadur s/o Sardar Khan	3,500/2,800	India	Turani	—	M.A. 433, 439, 503; Kamwar, 292a, A. M. T. 124b; T.M. 30, M.U. III 692-94
127	Murza Sadruddin Muhammad Khan Safvi, Shah Nawaz Khan	3,500/2,500	India	Irani	—	Ala. 28th Shawwal, 33th R. Y; T. M. 5
128	Safi Khan	3,500/2,000	India	Irani	—	Kamwar, 277b; M. U. II 289-91; A.M.T. 124b
129	Anup Singh s/o Rao Karan Bhuratiya	3,500/2,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Mamuri, 200a; M.A. 513; Kamwar, 302a
130	Jakia Deshmukh	3,500/2,000	India	Indian	Maratha-Zamindar	M. A. 282; T. M. 7; M.U. III 949 51
131	Muhammad Hasan, Himmat Khan	3,500/2,000	India	Irani	—	Diftaika, 76a; M. A. 175; M. U. II 236 T. U. (Habib Ganj Collection) 206a
132	Indar Singh s/o Rai Singh	3,500/2,000 (100 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Ala. 25th Rabi I, 38th R.Y.; M. A. 350, Kamwar, 282a, 297b; A. M. T. 124b
133	Raja Udat Singh Bundela of Orcha	3,500/1,600	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	—

<i>S.No Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan Zamindar etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
134 Qawamuddin Khan of Afshan	3,500/1,500 ¹	Iran	Irani	—	—	M. A. 139, M. U., III 107-115; T. M. 1091 A. H.
135 Uday Singh Bundela	3,500/1,500	India	Indian	Rajput zamindar	—	M. U. II, 294, M. A. 473
136 Mir Muhammad Hasan, Khanzad Khan Ruhullah Khan II	3,500/1,200	India	Irani	—	Father	M. A. 340, 349, 385, 401; T. M. 16; M. U., II 315-317; A. M. T. 126b
137 Sayyid Ayub	3,500/700	—	—	—	—	Atk 19th Shazwal, 45th R.Y.
138 Sayyid Aughlan Siyadat Khan	3,500/500	Turan	Turani	—	—	Kamwar, 272a, 273a; M.U., II 494-96
139 Taru Ji or Paru Ji	3,500/—	India	Indian	Maratha	—	A. M. T. 125b
140 Raja Bharat Singh of Shahpur	3,500/—	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	J. S. Gahlot, <i>Rajpatsava Ka Itiha</i> , 558
141. Buzurg Umu'd Khan	3,500/—	India	Irani	—	Father	T. M. 6; M. U., I 453-54; A. T.M. 127a
142. Imam Quli, Aghar Khan	3,500/—	India	Turani	—	—	T. M. 3; T. U. "A"
143. Muhammad Ishaq, Tarbiyat Khan	3,500/—	India	Irani	—	Father	M. U., I 503; Kamwar, 296a; A. M. T. 124b

LIST OF NOBLES

144	Sultan Hussain alias Ifthar Khan s/o Abdul Hadi, Aslat Khan	3,500/—	India	Irani	Father	T M 1092 A. II; M U, I 252 55
145	Dildost, Sardar Khan s/o Sarfaraz Khan Chaghia	3,000/3,000 (2,500 x 2 Sh)	India	Turani	Father	Kamwar, 268b, T. M. 1098 A. II, M U, II pp. 422-23
146	Mir Ahmad, Sa'adat Khan S/o Sa'adat Khan	3,000/3,000 (500 x 2 Sh)	India	Irani	Father	AJ 1050, Kamwar, 277b
147	Taku Ji	3,000/3,000	India	Indian	Father	Ala. 10th Zaqada, 38th R.Y. (Left the Mughal service in 1694)
148	Dalpat Rao Bundela	3,000/3,000	India	Indian	Father	Dilwala, 157a; T. M. 23, M A. 392; M U, II 317-323
149	Basdev, Zamindar of Chaulan Kara	3,000/3,000	India	Indian	Father	M A. 493, A M T 125b
150	Abul Khaur	3,000/3,000	India	Indian	Father	M A 515, M U, II 637, Mamuri, 181b, Khafi Khan II, 392
151	Neta Ji s/o Jan Rao	3,000/3,000	India	Indian	Maratha	S.D A. 175
152	Dholu Ji s/o Sambha Ji	3,000/3,000	India	Indian	Maratha	S.D A. 176
153	Anand Rao	3,000/3,000	India	Indian	Maratha	Ala. 10th Ziqada, 38th R.Y.
154	Safoddin Mahmud, alias Faqir Ullah, Saif Khan	3,000/2,500	India	Turani	Father	Kamwar, 263a; Ala. 5th Ramzan, 10th R.Y. AJ 966; M U, II 479-83; A.M.T. 125b

¹Mamuri, (149b,) says that Qawamuddin Khan had the rank of 5,000/3,000 but the other sources do not confirm the statement of Mamuri.

<i>S.No Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
155. Shaikh Mir, Tahawur Khan, Fedai Khan	3,000/2,500	India	Irani	—	Father	M A 432, 493, M U, II 745-46
156. Abu Muhammad Khan Bijapuri	3,000/2,500	India	Indian	Deccani	—	M A 351, A M.T. 125a
157. Saleh Khan, Fedai Khan	3,000/2,500	India	Irani		Father	Akh 5th Jamada I, 38th R Y; M A 368, M U, III 33-34
158. Durga Das Rathor	3,000/2,500	India	Indian	Rajput	—	M A 395; Kamwar, 286b, 299b; Isar Das, 168a-b; A M.T. 125b
159. Bhan Purohit	3,000/2,500	India	Indian	Maratha-Zamindar	—	S D A. 187; (Name misread editor as Mhan Parbat in S D A 187.)
160. Lutfullah Khan	3,000/2,500	India	Indian	—	Father	Akh 3rd Safar, 36th R.Y., 27 Zilhij, 43rd R.Y; M A. 412, 441, M U, III 171-77
161. Hafizullah Khan s/o Sa'adatullah Khan	3,000/2,000	India	Indian	—	Father	M A 407, 432; T M 13, M U, II 520
162. Indar Singh s/o Rana Raj Singh	3,000/2,000	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	M A 405, 481; Kamwar, 286a, 289a

163	Kishna Ji	3,000/2,000	India	Indian	Mharatha	—	Icar Das, 117a b
164	Sayyid Qasim Barha, Shahamat Khan	3,000/2,000	India	Indian	—	—	Kaniwar, 260b, N U, II 631 63
165	Irj Khan Qazalbash	3,000/2,000	India	Irani	—	Father	Dilkusha, 77b, A M E. 121b, N U, I 263-72
166	Sharif Mulk, nephew of Abul Hasan of Haiderabad	3,000/2,000	India	—	Deccani	—	Kaniwar, 276b, N A 269; A M T 123b, N U, II 637-907
167	Lahkar Khan, Munawwar Khan Barha	3,000/2,000	India	Indian	—	Father	9 D A 171, Z A 165b; N U, II 463 60, N A 314
168	Muhammad Farragi	3,000 2,000	India	Indian	—	—	S. D A. 187
169	Mir sjo Miran	3,000 2,000	India	Indian	—	Father	S D A 203
170	Muhammad Ali	3,000/2,000	India	—	—	—	S D A. 263
171	Raja Udat Singh Bhaduriya	3,000/2,000	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	Kaniwar, 272a, 277b, Saeed Ahmad, <i>Urwat</i> <i>Hind</i> , p 63, A M T. 131b
172	Solrabb	3,000/2,000	—	—	Deccani	—	<i>Dafstr i Dezavi</i> , No 2978
173	Sumc Nayak	3,000/2,000	India	Indian	—	—	Kaniwar, 299b, 300b
174	Patang Rao	3,000/2,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Waqai papers Jaipur, 13th Zilhi, 25th R Y. Reference given by Dr Sa'ad Chandra

<i>S.N. Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc.</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
175. Jadrawat	3,000/2,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	<i>Dafdar i-Dewani, No.</i> 2990, 31st R.Y. of Aurangzeb
176. Jwas Ji Pandit	3,000 2,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Isar Das, 161a-b
177. Man Singh s/o Rup Singh Rathor	3,000/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	<i>Akh</i> 4th and 24th Shaban, 24th R.Y.; M.A. 405; M.U., II 270, Kamwar, 286b, 289b
178. Khawaja Hamid, Hamid Khan Bahadur s/o Abad Khan	3,000/1,700	India	Turani	—	Father	M.A. 481; A.M.T. 125b; M.U. III 765-69
179. Rao Ram Singh Hara	3,000 1,500 (200 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	<i>Akh</i> . 15th Rabi II, 44th R.Y.; M.A. 505; T.M. 23; M.U., II 323-24
180. Sayyid Sher Khan	3,000/1,500 (200 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	—	Father	<i>Akh</i> . 14th Zulhij, 25th R.Y; T.M. 1095 A H.
181. Mu'hammad Taqi, Atbar Khan alias Wafir Hasrabadi	3,000/1,500	India	—	Deccani	—	S D A. 170; Z A. 165b; M.A. 269; T.U. "A"
182. Ali Quli Khan	3,000/1,500	India	Irani	—	Father	S D A. 188; Kamwar, 288a
183. Abdul Qadir s/o Abdul Razaq Lari	3,000/1,500	India	Irani	Deccani	—	<i>Akh</i> . 27th Shawwal, 38th R.Y.; M.A. 271; Kamwar, 276b

184	Aziz Khan Bahadur Chaghita s/o Bahadur Rohela	3,000/1,500	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	T M 48; M A 518; <i>Ala</i> 4th Zilh J, 38th R Y.; Kamwar, 302b
185	Saiyid Hamid Khan, Mujahid Khan s/o Murtaza Khan	3,000/1,500	—	Turani	—	Father	Kamwar, 268b, 284a, M U, III 598
186	Badar Ji or Pada Ji	3,000/1,500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	M A 480; A M T. 125b
187.	Qalia Tajammul Zamundar of Tibbat	3,000/1,000 (500 x 2-3h)	India	Indian	Zamundar	Father	<i>Ala</i> 12th Rabi I, 43rd R.Y.
188	Mir Is, Himmat Khan	3 000/1,000 (500 x 2 3h)	India	Turani	—	Father	T M. 1072 A.H., M U., III 946-48
189	Burhanuddin, Iumad Khan, Fazil Khan	3,000/1,400	Iran	Irani	—	Uncle	T M. 14; <i>Ala</i> . 32rd Muharram, 44th R.Y., M. U, III 34-33; M.A. 317, 369, 424
190	Muhammad Sadeq, Fatch- Ullah Khan Bahadur Alamgur Shahi	3 000/1,400	Turan	Turani	—	—	M A. 384, 443, 472, 496; M U, III 40-47; Kamwar, 273a
191.	Muzram Khan, Siyadat Khan	3 000/1,200	India	Irani	—	Father	T M 10, S D.A. 170, M.A. 246, Kamwar, 274a
192.	Khuda Banda Khan	3,000/1,200	India	Irani	—	Father	T M 22, M U, I 814-16; M A. 432, 514
193	Kamgar Khan	3,000/1,000	India	Irani	—	Father	T M. 27, S D.A. 170, M.A. 405, M U, III 159-60, Kamwar, 289a

<i>S.No</i>	<i>Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput Maratha Afghan Zamindar etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
194	Nahar Khan	3 000/1 000	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Akh 11th Muharram, 46th R Y
195	Sayid Abul Hasan Haiderabadi	3 000/1 000	India	Indian	Deccani	—	S D A 168
196	Raji Rao	3 000/1 000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Akhbarat 38th R Y Sharma, "The Religious Policy, of the Mughal Emperors" p 179
197	Hukhtar Khan s/o Sharif Mulk Haiderabadi	3 000/1 000	India	—	Deccani	Father	M A 297, M U, II 689, Kamwar, 279a, A M T 125a
198	Sayid Mubarak, Murata Khan	3 000/1 000	India	Turani	—	—	Akh 9th Zilhij, 45 R Y, M U, III 644 46, M A 273
199	Hakim Siamsa Shamsuddin Khan	3 000/1 000	—	—	Deccani	—	M A 190, A M T 125b
200	Mir Ali Naqi Safi, Mirza Safi Khan	3 000/1 000	Iran	Irani	—	—	T M 23, M A 482, Kamwar, 299a, M U, III 653 54, A M T 126a
201	Amir Khan Sindhi, Mir Abdul Karim Multafat Khan, Khanazad Khan	3 000/1 000	India	Irani	—	Father	M A 330, T M 41, M U, I 303 310

LIST OF NOBLES

202.	Muhammad Badi Balkhi	3,000/700	Balkh	Turani	—	Father	AA, 5th Zilluj, 38th R.Y.; M.A. 350; Kamwar, 284b; M.U. III 636-37
203.	Sayyid Ali, Ruzi Khan	3,000/500	India	Turani	—	Father	M.U. II 307-309, A.M.T. 124b
204.	Raja Indian Singh	3,000/400	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	M.A. 217; T.M. II; M.U. II 303
205.	Shaikh Makhdom Thattavi, Fazl Khan	3,000/—	India	Indian	—	—	M.A. 191; M.U. III 32-33; A.M.T. 125a
206.	Shamsher Khan Tarni, Husam Khan	3,000/—	India	Indian	Afghan	—	M.U. II 633-34; A.M.T. 125a
207.	Jadaun Rai Deccani	3,000/—	India	Indian	Maratha-Zamindar	—	D.D. 121a, 70b; A.M.T. 125b
208.	Muhammad Ishaq, Najabat Khan	3,000/—	India	Turani	—	Father	T.M. 13
209.	Kair Andeh Khan Kambo Meeruthi	3,000/—	India	Indian	—	—	D.D. 121a, 125a; M.A. 441; Murat Afgh. News, 531
210.	Jagat Rai Deshmukh of Nusrat Abad	3,000/—	India	Indian	Maratha-Zamindar	—	A.M.T. 125b
211.	Nurullah Khan	3,000/—	—	—	—	—	Royas w. Salafin, p. 224, AA, 21st R.Y.
212.	Sayyid Murad Ali, Mubarak Khan	Umrao Ucam	India	Irani	—	Father	Rajput-i-Kawran, 3a b, 9a

<i>S. No. Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc.</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Amburites</i>
<i>Mansabdars of 1,000 to 2,700</i>						
213 Yalingshah Bahadur	2,700/700	India	Turani	—	—	Kamwar, 268a, 276b; M.U., III 971-72 Manucci, II, 43
214 Alah Yar Khan	2,500/2,500 (1,000 × 2.3h)	India	Turani	—	Father	Akh. 9th Shawwal, 25th R.Y.; T.M. 47
215 Raja Deba Singh Bundela	2,500/2,500 (500 × 2.3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	Mamuri, 154a; S.D.A. 117; Al. 758
216 Muhtash Beg, Nawazsh Khan	2,500/2,500 (500 × 2.3h)	Turkey	Turani	—	Father	Akh. 23rd Safar, 36th R.Y., M.A. 195; M.U., I 246-47; Kamwar, 268, 277b
217 Kishore Singh Hara of Kota	2,500/3,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	Akh. 28th Jamada, II, 39th R.Y.; <i>Dikusha</i> , 117b; M.U., II 323-24
218 Khawaja Muhammad Anif, Mujahid Khan	2,500/2,800	India	Turani	—	Father	Akh. 16th Rabi II, 39th R.Y.; Kamwar, 273a; M.A. 199, 241; M.U., III 123
219 Rustam Dil Khan	2,500/2,500	India	Irani	—	Father	<i>Hadiqa Alam</i> , 2b-3b; <i>Akh</i> 11th Ramzan, 43rd R.Y., M.A. 493- 94; Kamwar, 299b; M.U., II 324-28; T.M. 25

220.	Bahruz Khan	£,500/1,500 (1,000 × 2 3h)	—	—	—	—	4th 24th Rajab, 24th R.Y.
221.	Ibadullah	2,500/2,400	—	—	—	—	A M.T. 131a
222	Subh Karan Bundcia	2,500/2,200	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	A M.T. 123a
223	Raja Ram Singh Suodia	2,500/2,000	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	Father	S D A.171; M A. 332
224	Mir Muhammad Fazl, Qamruddin Khan	2,500/2,000	India	Turani	—	Father	S D A 179; M A. 297
225	Manku Ji Deccan s/o Tanka Ji	2,500/2,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S D A. 134
226	Mahan Ji s/o Manku Ji	2,500/2,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S D A. 179
227.	Sambha Ji Bandhara s/o La Ji Bandhara	2,500/2,000	India	Indian	Maratha	Father	S D A. 179
228	Sadhu Ji S/o Nogu Ji	2,500/2,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S D A. 179
229	Bhali Rao s/o Karhi Ji Bandhara	2,500/2,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Defter-i-Draam, No. 2981
230	Naro Ji Raghav	2,500/2,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Akh 2nd Rabi I, 43rd R.Y; A.M.T 125b; Akh. Ramzan, 45th R.Y.
231	Rao Budh Singh of Bundi	2,500/1,000 (2-3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-zamindar	—	M A 440; T M. 17
232	Muhammad Rashid, Arslan Khan, Khanazad Khan, Saeed Khan	2,500/1,800	India	Turani	—	Father	

S.No	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
233.	Arslan Quli, Arslan Khan s/o Jalilwardi Khan	2,500/800 (2 3h)	Ind a	Irani	—	Father	M U, I 277, A M T 128b
234	Tahir Shaikh, Tahir Khan	2,500/1,500	Turan	Turani	—	—	M U, II 751-54
235	Najabat Khan s/o Sayyid Muzaffar Handrabadi	2,500/1,500	India	—	Deccani	Father	Kamwar, 272b, 297a
236.	Abdul Qadir, Dianat Khan	2,500/1,500	India	Irani	—	Father	Akh 13 Rabi II, 39th R Y, M U, II 59 63, A M T 127b
237	Tharwar Khan, Najabat Khan s/o Mirza Shuja Najabat Khan	2,500/1,500	India	Turani	—	Grand father	S D A 170, M A 470, M U, II 870 72
238.	Mahad Ji Mane	2 500/1,500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Akh 11th Rajab, 39th R Y.
239	Shahh Abdullah (servant of Shah Alam)	2,500/1 000 (500 x 2 3h)	—	—	—	—	Z A 163b
240	Abdul Qadir Futabar Khan	2,500/1,500	India	Indian	—	—	S D A 181, Khafi Khan II, 402, M U III 565 66
241.	Fatch brother of Nekt Neyat Khan	2,500/1 500	India	Indian	—	Brother	S D A 203
242	Raghu Ji	2,500/1 500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Akh 5th 7 thij 38th R Y

THE MUGHAL NOBILITY UNDER AURANGZEB

<i>S.No Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput Maratha Afghan Zamindar etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
254 Hayat Beg Khan Baqi Khan	2 500/600	India	Turan	—	Father	Kamwar, 301b, 302a, M A 497 515 M U I, 458-61
255 Ahmadullah	2 500/400	—	—	—	—	Akh 20th Ramzan, 40th R Y
256 Muhammad Ibrahim, Multafat Khan Khanzad Khan	2,500/400	India	Iran	—	Father	M A 351, 407, 440, 459, T M 1692 A H, M U, III 611-13
257 Muhammad Masib, Mund Khan Khanzad Khan	2,500/400	India	Turan	—	Father	Akh 18th Shaban, 24th R Y, M U, III 949
258 Dindar Khan alias Maral mat Khan	2 500/250	India	Iran	—	Father	Kamwar, 270b, M U, III 833, A M T 126b
259 Inayatullah Khan	2,500/250	India	Iran	—	—	M A 441, 505, Kamwar, 288b, M U, II 828-32
260 Kahan Singh	2,500/—	India	India	Rajput Zamindar	Father	Akh 24th Rajab, 24th R Y.
261 Ghazanfar Khan S/o Qabad Khan	2,500/—	India	Turan	—	Father	Dilkusha, 124a-b, Kamwar, 286b 270b
262 Ram Chand Zamindar and Thander of Kalhanun	2,000/3 000	India	Indian	Maratha Zamindar	—	M A 423, A M T 127b
263 Rao Ram Chand s/o Dalpat Dundela	2 000/2,000 (1 000 x 2 3b)	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	Akh 27th Muharram, 44th R Y, A M T 127b

		India	Turani	—	Parents
264	Muhammad Quli, Mutaqad Khan.	2,000/2,000 (1,000 x 2 Sh)	—	—	—
265	Muhammad Hadi Haidarabadi, Hadi Khan	2,000/2,400	—	Deccani	—
266	Mahman Ji	2,000/2,000 (500 x 2 Sh)	India	India	—
267	Mara Ji (Maya Ji) s/o Arku Ji	2,000/2,000	India	India	—
268.	Jai Singh Sawar	2,000/2,000	India	India	Parents
269	Abdullah s/o Rustam Zaman Bhopuri	2,000/2,000	India	Deccani	Parents
270	Rao Dena Ji (Vena Ji) Sahi	2,000/2,000	India	India	—
271	Alah Dad Khan Khairgi (2 Sh)	2,000/1,000	India	India	Parents
272	Muhammad Ibrahim Qurebhi, Shamsher Khan	2,000/1,000 (600 x 2 Sh)	India	India	Uncle
273	Muhammad Taqis o Darab Khan Bani Mukhtar	2,000/1,500	India	India	Parents
274	Ijuma Khan	2,000/1,500	—	—	—

S.No	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub groups Rajput Maratha Afghan, Zamindar, etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
275	Lodi Khan	2 000/1 500	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Akh 13th Rajab, 24th R Y
276	Abdur Rasul Khan Bilgrami	2 000/1 500	India	Indian	—	—	S D A 191, Akh 16th Ziqada, 40th R Y, M U, II 836 37
277	Yasin Khan	2 000/1,500	—	—	—	—	Akh Jamada I, 44th R Y
278	Ram Singh s/o Ratan Rathor	2 000/1 400	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	Mamuri, 163b-164a, Al 486
279	Hasan Ali Khan Abdullah Khan Barha (Later Qutb-ul Mulk)	2 000/1 000	India	Indian	—	Father	Akh 26th Rajab, 45th R Y, M U, III 130-140
280	Shiv Singh	2 000/1 300	India	Indian	Rajput	—	S D A 171
281	Asadullah Ikram Khan Deccani	2 000/1 200	India	Indian	Deccani	Father	S D A 172, M U, III 564-65
282	Muhammad Ibrahim, Salabat Khan	2 000/1 200	—	—	—	—	S D A 170
283	Jafar Khan Murshid Quli Khan Kartalab Khan	2 000/1,100	India	Indian	—	—	M A 483, M U, III 751 53
284	Terma Ji	2 000/1 000 (100 x 2 3b)	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S D A 209
285	Afrauzayab Khan	2,000/1,000	Turkey	Turani	—	Father	Kamwar, 270a, M U, I 244- 46, A M T 131a

LIST OF NOBLES

286	Iru Ji Deccani	2,000/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Kamwar, 279a, Saeed Ahmad, "Umr-i-Husud", 373
287	Arju Ji s/o Shambha Ji	2,000/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	M A. 258
288	Sar Andaz Khan Panni Bijapur	2,000/1,000	India	Indian	Afghan Deccani	—	Akh 25th Ramzan, 47th R.Y.; M A 470, Farhat-ul-Nazim, 173a
289	Obedullah Khan b/o Khwaja Lutfullah Khan	2,000/1,000	—	—	—	Brother	M A. 459
290	Turkiaz Khan	2,000/1,000	Turan	Turani	—	—	Akh 5th Rajab, 24th R.Y.; Khafi Khan II, 473
291	Jegat Singh Hara	2,000/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput-zamindar	Father	Mamuri, 164a; Dikhuha, 79b; M U III, 510; A.M.T. 128b
292	Mirand s/o Nek Niyat Khan	2,000/1,000	India	Indian	—	Father	S D A. 203
293	Sidi Yaqut	2,000/1,000	India	Indian	Deccani Zamindar	Father	S D A. 207
294	Murtaza s/o Masud Khan	2,000/1,000	India	Indian	—	Father	S D A. 225
295	Kiahullah Khan Amanullah Khan	2,000/1,000	India	Irani	—	Father	T M 22; Kamwar, 275b, T U. "A", A.M.T. 128b
296	Abu Mansur, Iredat Khan, Iluqad Khan	2,000/1,000	India	Irani	—	Father	S D A 170, T M 14, M A. 251, 351
297	Murza Inayatullah, Saif Khan s/o Faqirullah	2,000/1,000	India	Turani	—	Father	T.M.25, A.M.T. 127b

S.No	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar, etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
298	Abdur Rahman Bijapur, Sharza Khan	2,000/1,000	India	—	Deccani	—	S D A 70, T U "5k"
299	Mako Ji	2,000/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Akh 20th Ramzan, 40th R Y
300	Haji Ali	2,000/1,000	—	—	—	—	Akh 20th Ramzan, 40th R Y
301	Sujan Singh w/o Anup Singh	2,000/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	Azam al Harb, 168, Akh Ziqada, 44th R Y.
302	Ghazi	2,000/1,000	—	—	—	—	S D A 207
303	Ani Rai Brahman dewan i tan	2,000/1,000	India	Indian	—	—	S Ahmad, Umrai Hanud, 64
304	Jahangir Quli Khan	2,000/900	—	—	—	—	Akh 9th Ramzan, 13th R Y ; Kamwzi, 277b; A M T 132a
305	Sayid Asmatullah Khan	2,000/900	India	—	—	Father	Akh 2nd Rajab, 43rd R Y, M A 381; A M T. 128a
306	Latuf Khan dewan of Ghazal Khan	2,000/700	—	—	—	—	Halat i-Mumalik Makhrat Al-mgmt 179a; Raqum-i-Karam, 5a
307	Abul Makarim Jan Nisar Khan	2,000/700	India	Iranian	—	Father	M A 341, M U I 537-40, Dil-kusho, 126a, Kamwar, 283a

LIST OF NOBLES

308.	Murza Mas'ud, Mas'ud Khan, Murtaza Khan	2,000/700	India	Irani	—	—	M A 402, 505, T M 22, M U, III 650 53
309	Nasir Beg, Aurang Khan	2,000/700	Turan	Turani	—	Father	M A 194
310	Bulbars Khan	2,000/600	Turan	Turani	—	—	M A 439, Kamwar, 292a
311	Abi Alam Handerabadi	2,000/500	—	—	Deccani	—	Akh 8th Ziqada, 39th R Y
312	Rao Ji	2,000/500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Akh 25th Jamada, II 44th R Y.
313	Babar Nabe	2,000/500	India	Indian	—	—	S D A 199
314	Shir Andas Khan or Teer Andas Khan	2,000/500	India	Irani	—	Father	S D A 198, T M 20, Kamwar, 297a
315	Dau Ji (left the Mughal Service in 1694)	2,000/500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Akh 10th Ziqada, 38th R Y
316.	Jau Ji	2,000/500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Akh 20th Ramzan, 40th R Y
317	Murza Muazz Fitrat Moavi Khan	2,000/400	Iran	Irani	—	—	M A 312; T M 2, Kamwar M U, III 633-36; Riyaz-ul-Sha- ra, f 337 Mirat-ul-Khiyal p 358
318	Muhammad Shuja, Shuja' at Khan, Saf Shikan Khan	2,000/300	Iran	Irani	—	Father	M A 153, M U, III 114-15, Kamwar, 263-b, 273a-b, A M T 128a
319	Darbar Khan Khawaja Sara.	2,000/300	—	—	—	—	T M 1096 A H, A I 960

<i>S No Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan Zamindar etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
320 Abdur Rahman Khan s/o Islam Khan Maahbadi	2,000/200	India	Irani	—	Father	T M 14; M U, II 67; Kamwar 289b
321 Mirak Mumuddin, Amanat Khan Khawafi	2,000/200	India	Irani	—	Father	M U, I 258-68, A M.T. 127a
322 Shah Khwaja Husain, Sharif Khan	2,000/—	—	Turan	—	—	T M 1093 A.H.
323 Hayat Shaikh, Mughal Khan, Tahir Khan	2,000/—	India	Turan	—	Father	Kamwar, 268a; T M 20, A.M. T. 125a
324 Sulaiman Khan	2,000/—	India	Indian	Afghan Deccani	Brother	M A. 518; <i>Farkhat-ul-Nazari</i> , 182b; A.M.T 128b; M U, II 64-68
325 Mir Jamaluddin Husain, Saidar Khan	2,000/—	India	Irani	—	Father	M A. 335, T M 2; Kamwar, 282a; M U I, 252
326 Uzbek Khan Naudarti	2,000/—	Turan	Turan	—	—	T U. "A"
327 Qazi Haider, Haider Khan, Munshi of Shivay	2,000/—	—	—	Deccani	—	Kamwar, 274b; M A 234; T.U "II"
328 Itmad Khan alias Mullia Tahir	2,000/—	—	Irani	—	—	Z A 163a, Khafi Khan, II, 380
329 Madho Ji Narain	2,000/—	India	Indian	Maratha	—	<i>Atkore</i> as cited by Sarkar, <i>History of Aurangzeb</i> , V, 211

S.N.O.	Name and Title	Rank held during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
341	Raja Jaswant Singh Bundela	1,500/1,000 (2 31)	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	S D A 150-51, Mamun, 165a; M A 273, M U, II 293 94
342	Pahar Singh Gaur, Zamindar of Inderkha	1,400/1,000 (2 3h)	India	Indian	Rajput-Zamindar	—	Istar Das, 94a
343	Nurul Dahr Barha, Sayid Saul Khan	1,000/700	India	Indian	—	Father	M A 266 341; Kamwar 283a
344	Shukrullah Khan Khawafi	1,500/1,000 (500 x 2 3h)	—	Irani	—	—	AA 20th Shaban, 37th R.Y.; Kamwar, 270a; T M 8
345	Gopal Singh s/o Raja Sarup Singh	1,500/1,500	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	A M F 131b, AI 1056
346	Shiv Ji s/o Maru Ji	1,500/1,500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S D A 177
347	Nur Singh	1,500/1,400	India	Indian	Rajput	—	AA 12th Shawwal, 40th R.Y.
348	Abdul Salam s/o Abdur Rahim Miyan	1,500/1,300	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	S D A 126
349	Wafadar Khan, Zabardast Khan g/s Saeed Khan	1,500/900 (400 x 2 3h)	India	Turani	—	Grand father	Kamwar, 275a, M A. 255; Haum Khan, 164a
350	Yaqub Khan	1,500/1,300	India	Irani	—	Father	Z A 163b, M A 495, M U, I, 300

351	Qalandar Beg, Qalandar Khan	1,500/1,000 (200 x 2.5h)	India	Turand	—	Father	Q D A 741, M U II, 172-191
352	Kakar Khan	1,500/1,200	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Atish Jafaria, 330 R V, M A 250, A M T 131b
353	Sida Iaulad, Faulad Khan	1,500/1,200	India	Indian	—	—	Kammar, 250s, 270s, T M 1002 A H
354	Nusrat Khan, Sipahdar Khan s/o Khan i-Jahan Kokaltash	1,500/1,000 (200 x 2.5h)	India	Irani	—	Father	Q D A 149, M A 241, Kammar, 270s
355	Bijaz Singh	1,500/1,200	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	Dzila Ma, 167b, M A 426, M U II 81
356	Azizullah Khan s/o Khalilullah Khan	1,500/1,000	India	Irani	—	Father	Kammar 246, M A 30441, M U II, 822-24
357	Mulkam Singh	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput commander	Father	M U II 147
358	Dirir Khan or Dilawar Khan s/o Bahadur Khan Rohela	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	Q D A 741, Kammar, 270s R V,
359	Shukrullah Khan Najm Sani, Askar Khan	1,500/1,000	India	Irani	—	Father	M A 242, Kammar, 270s
360	Sher Afgan	1,500/1,000	India	Irani	—	Father	A M T 131a, M A 241
361	Shakh Nurullah, Qalir Dad Khan Ansan	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	—	Father	Q D A 156, F M U, M U III, 143
362	Muhammad Mansur, Makamat Khan	1,500/1,000	Iran	Irani	—	Grandfather	M A 279, M U III, 432 Tur Das, 137s

THE MUGHAL NOBILITY UNDER AURANGZEB

S.N.O	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan Zamindar etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
363	Daundi Rao or Bonbur Rao	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	M U I,498, M A 382; A M T. 131a
364	Fredun Khan	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	—	Father	M A 506, A M T. 131b
365	Kan Rao (or Kushan Rao) s o Kaku Ji	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S D A 177, Akh Jamada, II, 44th R Y
366	Rana Ji	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Akh 5th Ziqada, 38th R Y.
367	Sayyid Ibrahim	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	—	—	Akh 1st Shaban, 24th R.Y.
368	Behari Chand s/o Dulpat Bundela	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	<i>Azam-ul Harb</i> , 168, <i>Farhat ul-Nazim</i> , 206b
369	Abdul Samad Khan	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Akh 19th Rajab, 43rd R Y. <i>Miraf i Afshab Numa</i> , 586
370	Sadhu Ji s o Shiv Ji Nelkar	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	Father	S D A 177
371	Shiv Singh s o Nur Singh	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	Kamwar, 297a, Akh 12th Shawwal, 40th R Y
372	Rao Ratan Singh, Islam Khan	1,500/1,000	India	Indian	zamindar	Father	M U II,147, Lendisyana, Diplomatic Correspondence of Aurangzeb, T U S V

373	Muhammad Jan Kartalab Khan	1 500/1 000	—	—	—	—	FM 28, AIA 45th R Y
374	Mir Husain b/o Rahim Khan	1 500/1 000	—	—	—	Brother	AIA 30th Muharram 43rd R Y
375	Hirday Sah Bundela	1,500/1 000	India	Indian	Rajput zamindar	Father	Akbar, 1st Jan 1707 A D cited by B D Gupta "Satar Sah Bundela" p 63
376	Aman Ullah Khan	1,500/700 (200×2 3h)	India	Irani	—	Father	MA 488, MU I, 293 95, AMT 128b
377	Param Deo s/o Kesri Singh Suodia	1 500/900	India	Indian	Rajput zamindar	Father	SDA 125
378	Mir Muhammad Husain Amanat Khan II	1 500/900	India	Irani	—	Father	MA 347, TM II, MU I, 287 90
379	Mustafa Khan Kashi	1,500/900	Iran	Irani	—	—	Kamwar, 286a, MU III, 637 41, Khafi Khan, II, 441
380	Shahbir Panni	1,500/900	India	Indian	Afghan	Brother	Akh Jamada, II, 44th R Y
381	Satar Sah Rathor	1,500/850	India	Indian	Rajput zamindar	—	SDA 171, Farhat ul Nazir, 206b, Akh. Rabi I, 45th R Y
382	Havan	1 500/800	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	SDA 208
383	Shah Razuddin Khan	1 500/800	—	—	—	—	AI 862, MA 187

Sl. No.	Names and Titles	Rank held during the period	Country of birth	Caste	Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar etc.	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
294	Raghu Nath Singh Meerath	1,500/800	India	Indian	Rajput	—	Kamwar, 266b, A M T 132
295	Saifuddin Khan Saifi Kamyab Khan	1,500/700	India	Irani	—	Father	Akh 11th Zilhu 25th R Y M U III 479
296	Alau Khan son Muzaffar Hafizabad	1,500/700	India	—	—	Father	M A 494, Kamwar, 272b, A M T 128b
297	Jafar Ali Yaminul Mulki	1,500/600 (100x2-3h)	India	Irani	—	—	Akh 29th Muharram, 43rd R Y.
298	Nand Nayak	1,500/700	India	Indian	—	—	S D A 205
299	Abul Hasan Khan	1,500/700	—	—	—	—	S D A 170
300	Talu Jaiso Bahr Ji	1,500/700	India	Indian	Maratha	Brother	S D A 176
301	Azhar Agha Rao's/o Farantu Ju.	1,500/700	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S D A 183
302	Sohrab Beg, Mirza Namatullah	1,500/600	India	Irani	—	Father	M A 251, M U I, 586 87
303	Sayad Yusuf Khan Bakhari	1,500/600	—	Turani	—	—	MA 517, Kamwar, 270b

LIST OF NOBLES

255

394	Sayid Mujeeb, Bakhsh Khan s/o Muzaffar Haidrabad	1 500/600	India	—	Deccani	—	Akh 2nd Rabi I, 36th R Y
395	Sangram Khan Ghorri al as Nahar Khan	1 500/600	India	Indian	Afghan	—	Akh 11th Muharram 46th R Y, Dilkusha 9ia
396	Sayid Badar s/o Sayid Abdul Hasan	1 500/600	India	—	—	Father	SDA.219
397	Khawaja Khan son in law of Syadat Khan Aughlan	1 500 600	Turan	Turani	—	Uncle	MA 518, Akh Ramzan, 45th R Y MU 1,503
398	Khawaja Nur, Mutamad Khan Khawajasara	1 500/600	—	—	—	—	TM 1095 AH, MA 195, AI 448 960 Kamwar 268b
399	Said Quli Khan Mahram	1 500/500	—	—	—	—	Azam al Harb 171
400	Shaikh Sulaiman Fazil Khan	1 500/500	India	Indian	—	—	LA 162b MA 189, TM 3, Kamwar 268a
401	Sardar Beg Ihtimam Khan Sardar Khan	1 500/500	India	Turani	—	Father	TM 4, MU II 491 94, Kamwar, 287b MA 250 295 314
402	Shakh Abdul Aziz Abdul Aziz Khan, Khidmat Talab Khan Bahadur	1 500/500	India	Indian	—	—	MU II 626 88, TM 1096 AH
403	Sarup Singh s/o Raja Udat Singh	1 500/500	India	Indian	Rajput zamindar	Father	MA 386, Dilkusha, 117b
404	Ayman Khan	1 500/500	—	—	—	—	Akh 5th Shaban 24th R Y

S.NO	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan Zamindar etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
405	Mir Abu Ala Balikh Arshad Khan	1,500/500	Balkh	Turani	—	—	Akh 10th Rabu I, 45th R.Y; T M 14
406	Jalu Ji s/o Saru Ji	1,500/500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S D A 174
407.	Aku Ji s/o Mahu Ji	1,500/500	India	Indian	Maratha	Father	S D A 206
408.	Padam Singh Bundela	1,500/700	India	Indian	Rajput zamindar	Father	Akh 1st Jan, 1707 A D cited by B D Gupta, Satar Sal Bundela, p 63
409	Syed Niaz Khan	1,500/500	—	Turani	—	—	M U II, 832
410	Talib Khawajaara, Khedmatgar Khan	1,500/350	—	—	—	—	M A 341, 350, T M 16
411	Hasder Quli	1,500/400	—	—	—	—	Akh 29th Muharram, 43rd R Y
412	Abdur Rahim Khan brother of Firus Jang	1,500/300	Turan	Turani	—	Brother	Akh 23rd Ziqada, 43rd R Y; M A 405
413	Rah mu'eddan Khan	1,500/600	Turan	Turani	—	Father	M A 481, A M T 131a
414	Kamdar Khan	1,500/300	—	—	—	—	Mumalik i Mahrusai Alam- gun, 201a

LIST OF NOBLES

415.	Shafiqullah, Sarawar Khan	1,500/250	India	—	Father	M A 255 M U II, 440-41, A M T 131b
416.	Hakim Salih Shirazi Salih Khan	1,500/250	Iran	Iran	—	Kamwar, 271b, A J 1061 62
417	Hakim Sadiq Khan, Hakim-ul- Mulk s/o Mohun Khan Shirazi	1,500/200	—	Iran	Father	Kamwar, 301b
418.	Shahi Khan or Shah Beg Kashghari (Abdullah Khan)	1,500/200	Turan	Turan	—	M A 175, Kamwar, 265b
419	Rahman Khan	1,500/200	—	—	—	Z A. 107a, Mumalik i Mahrusai Alamgiri, 179a
420	Bakhtawar Khan Khawarjara	1,500/-	—	—	—	T M 1095 A H, T U "S V", A M T 131b
421	Abdur Rahim Khan s/o Islam Khan Mashhadi	1,500/-	India	Iran	Father	T M 1093 A.H., M U II, 812-813, A M T 131a
422	Dev Afgan, Mutamad Khan	1,500/-	India	Iran	Father	M A 196, T M 1101/A H, Kamwar, 268b
423	Badurraman Mahabat Khani, Rashid Khan	1,500/-	India	—	—	M A 206, T M 7, Kamwar, 267b
424	Haji Shafi, Shafi Khan	1,500/-	—	—	—	T U "S V", Kamwar, 274a
425	Sayyid Avelat Khan II	1,500/-	India	Iran	Father	T U "S V"

<i>S.No</i>	<i>Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
426.	Husain Ali Khan Barha	1,500/-	India	Indian	—	Father	Khaf Khan II, 575, MU I, 321 33
427	Arslan Khan	1,500/-	Turan	Turan	—	—	MA 381; TU "S V"
428	Hiyas Khan	1,500/-	—	—	—	—	TU "S V"
429	Afzal Beg, Afzal Khan	1,500/-	Iran	Iran	—	—	Kamwar, 3023, TU "S V."
430	Alah Yar Khan, Humam Khan, Khlas Khan	1,500/-	—	—	—	—	FM 12
431	Khawaja Muhammad, Amanat Khan	1,500/-	Turan	Turan	—	—	MU III, 729 46, TU "S V"
432.	Mir Muhammad alias Kifayat Khan	1,500/-	India	Iran	—	—	TM 9
433.	Khawaja Abdullah	1,500/-	India	Turan	—	—	TM 9
434	Shahwar Khan	1,500/-	—	—	—	—	AM T 131a
435.	Aqa Raham, Qawamuddin Khan Afghani	1,400/1,000	Iran	Iran	—	—	Akh 9th Rajab 24th R Y, TM 1091 A H
436.	Bhali Rao's/o Saru Ji	1,200/1,200	India	India	Maratha	Brother	SD A 175

<i>S.No Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan Zamindar etc.</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
448. Mamur Khan, Dilir Khan ¹	1,000/1,200	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	Akh. 4th Ziqsda, 46th R.Y. Kamwar, 273a; A.M.T. 132.a.
449. Samandar Beg, Samandar Khan	1,000/1,200	—	—	—	—	Akh. 1st Mubarram, 45th R.Y.
450. Fazal Beg, Tahauwar Khan	1,000/1,000	Iran	Irani	—	Brother	Kamwar, 276b; M.A. 273; M.U. I, 425; A.M.T. 132a
451. Malu Jis/o Saru Ji	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S D A. 175
452. Raja Man Dhata	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput zamindar	Father	Kamwar, 270a; M.A. 207; M. Akbar, The Punjab under the Mughals, 225
453. Khawaja Yaqub Naqthbandi Bukhari, Sarbuland Khan	1,000/1,000	—	Turani	—	—	T.M. 1096 A.H.; Kamwar, 266a
454. Raja Bakht Buland, Dundar Khan	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	zamindar	—	M.A. 340; A.M.T. 132a
455. Sayyid Wayhuddin Barha	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	—	Father	Akh. 10th Rabi I, 45th R.Y.
456. Iradat Khan s/o Azam Khan Kota.	1,000/1,000	India	Irani	—	G. Father	M.A. 472; A.M.T. 131b

457	Muhammad Khan Bijapuri	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Afghan Deccani	—	Akh 15th Jamada II, 564b R.Y.
458	Muhammad Murad Khan	1,000/1,000	India	Irani	—	Father	MA 242, Kamwar, 273b
459	Rawal Ram Singh of Dungarpur s/o Khuman Singh	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Rajput zamindar	Father	Ojha, History of Rajputana, Vol III, Part I, 122
460	Ahmad Khan	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	—	Father	SD A. 170, MU I, 274; A.M.T. 128b
	Bayez s/o Jan Rao	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	SD A. 175
	Siva Ji s/o Saru Ji	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	Brother	SD A. 175
	Yasa Ji s/o Bahar Ji	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	SD A. 175
	Dalu Ji s/o Bahar Ji	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	SD A. 177
5	Anba Ji	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	SD A. 178
6	Naba Ji s/o Lahu Ji	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	—	SD A. 178
7	Sayid Asadullah s/o Sayid Ahmad	1,000/1,000	India	—	—	—	—
8	Mana Ji s/o Sambha Ji	1,000/1,000	India	Indian	Maratha	Father	SD A. 179
9	Abdul Majid Khan	1,000/1,000	—	—	—	—	Akh. 45th R.Y.

¹Presumably identical with Ma'mur Khan mentioned as holding 1000/1000 (2h-3h) in Aurangzeb's *farman* of A.H. 1089, tr. pub. in *Jour UP Hist Soc*, XVI (1943), p. 148

<i>S.No</i>	<i>Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan Zamindar etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
470	Kalyan Singh	1 000/1 000	India	Indian	Rajput	—	Ath. 20th Zulh j. 33th R.Y.
471	Waheed Khan s/o Jakiya	1 000/1 000	India	Indian		—	Kamwar, 287b.
472	Zafar Khan	1 000/600 (300x2 3h)	India	Iran		Father	Ath 20th Rajab 24th R.Y
473	Gopal Singh s/o Mulkam Singh Sodha (Hereditary Rank)	1 000 900	India	Indian	Rajput Zamindar	Father	ALU II, 147
474	Anba Ji s/o Moka Ji	1 000/500 (300x2-3h)	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S D A. 293
475	Muhammad Rafi	1,000 800	Iran	Iran		Uncle	Ath. 33th R.Y Vol IV p.54 ALU III 801-806
476	Saifullah Khan Mir Bahr	1 000 800	—	—		—	ALU II, 486-89, AL 45
477	Ram Rao s/o Ganpat Rao	1 000/400 (300x2-3h)	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S.D A. 204
478	Mana Ji s/o Nagu Ji	1,000/700	India	Indian	Maratha	Father	S.D A. 179
479	Khandu Ji s/o Jao Ji	1,000/700	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S D A. 173
480	Deo Ji s/o Manku Ji	1,000/700	India	Indian	Maratha	Father	S.D A. 178

<i>S.No Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan Zamindar etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
491 Muhammad Jafar s/o Mahram Khan	1 000/600	India	—	—	—	S D A 219
492 Raja Kalyan Singh zamindar of Bhadawar	1 000/600	India	Indian	Rajput zamindar	—	M A 382, Kamwar, 288a
493 Muhammad Jan, Atub Khan	1 000/600	India	Irani	—	Father	Z.A 161b, T M II, M U I, 255-58
494 Ahmad Saeed Khan	1,000/600	—	—	—	—	Azam at Harb, 197
495 Shakur Khan B japuri	1 000/500	India	Indian	Deccani	—	Akh 5th Zilbij, 47th R.Y
496 Barburdar Beg, Mir Ab'ul Salam Khan	1 000/500	India	Irani	—	Father	M U II 741 42
497 Bahr Ji	1,000/500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Akh 20th Ramzan, 40th R Y
498 Rad Andaz Khan	1 000/500	India	Irani	—	Father	Kamwar, 287b
499 Raja Bhagwant Singh s/o Jarwant Singh Bundela	1 000/500	India	Indian	Rajput zamindar	Father	Dilkusha, 96a, M U II, 294
500 Mustafa s/o Masud Khan	1 000/500	India	Indian	—	Father	S D A 225
501 Mirza Beg Khan	1 000/500	—	—	—	—	S D A. 211

LIST OF NONRES

265

502	Agha Khirad	1,000/500	—	—	—	S D.A. 208
503	Bir Ehan	1,000/500	India	Indian	—	S D.A. 203
504	Daryazid s/o Musa	1,000/500	India	—	Father	S D.A. 203
505	Badhay s/o Miran	1,000/500	India	Indian	Father	S D.A. 203
506	Abul Faiz s/o Dahir Khan Bajpur	1,000 400	India	Indian	Father	Alh. 45th R Y
507	Sayid Muhammad	1,000/400	India	Turani	Father	Alh. Rajd I, 45 R.Y. Jamada, II, 45th R Y
508	Miyana Khan	1,000/500	India	Indian	—	Alh. 16th Jamada, 45th R.Y.
509	Reys Sursaj Mal s/o Raja Bhum	1 000/500	India	Indian	Father	Alh. 15th Jamada, 45th R.Y.
510	Qazi Akram Akram Khan	1,000/500	India	—	—	M.A. 506 Proc. In L. Hist Congress, 1920, 219-221
511	Mir Bahadur Dil, Jan Sipar Khan	1 000/500	India	Irani	Father	T M 13, M.U. I, 533-37
512	Abdul Wahid, Mir Khan	1 000/500	—	—	—	S D.A. 172, M.A. 192
513	Sidi Ibrahim	1,000/500	India	Indian	—	Kamwar, 277b, AL 626
514	Bahadur Singh	1,000/500	India	Indian	Father	Kamwar, 277a, M.A. 405, A.M.T. 132a
515	Muhammad Sami, Nurat Khan s/o Khan i Jahan Kokaltash	1,000/500	India	Irani	Father	Alh. 16th Jamada I, 45th R.Y., M.A. 241, 246, Kamwar, 273a

THE MUGHAL NOBILITY UNDER AURANGZEB

<i>S No Name and Title</i>	<i>Rank highest during the period</i>	<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar etc</i>	<i>Father or other blood relation in service</i>	<i>Authorities</i>
516 Darab Khan	1,000/500	India	Irani		Father	M.U.II, 39-42; Kamwar, 265b, T.M. 1090 A.H.
517 Neta Ji s/o Khandu Rao	1,000/450	India	Indian	Maratha	Father	S.D.A. 210
518 Fatch s/o Hasan Rohela	1,000/450	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	S D A 208
519 Raja Manohar Das	1,000/400	India	Indian	Rajput zamindar	Father	Mamuri, 183b; AL 140
520 Shaikh Mustafa	1,000/500	—	—	—	—	Akh. 15th Raba I, 44th R.Y; Jamada I, 44th R.Y.
521 Bays Ji	1,000/500	India	Indian	Maratha	—	S.D.A. 187; Akb Jamada I, 44th R.Y
522 Abul Fatch s/o Khan-i- Jahan Kokaltash	1,000/400	India	Irani		Father	M.A. 406; A.M.T. 131b
523 Mir Ibrahim' Marahmat Khan s/o Amir Khan	1,000/400	India	Irani		Father	M.A. 481; M.U.III, 713
524 Yakataz Khan	1,000/400	Turan	Turan		—	M.U.I, 503; T.M. 1091 A.H. Kamwar, 267a, 288a
525. Muhammad Raza	1,000/400	India	—		Father	M.A. 516; A.M.T. 132a; M.U. II, 823

LIST OF NOBLES

		India	Irrel	Father	Kamwar 292a
516	Marahmat Khan s/o Ahawala Tal b, Shah Nawas Khan	1 000/400	India		Akh Rabi I 45th R Y
527	Dal Singh	1 000/400	Indian	Rajput zamindar	Akh Shaban, 45th R Y
528	Chet Singh	1 000/500	Indian	Rajput	<i>Dastur al Amal i-Shahjahan,</i> Add 6588, 22a, M Akbar, <i>The Punjab under the Mughals,</i> p 226
529	Raja Udal Singh of Chamba s/o Chatar Singh	1 000 600	Indian	Rajput zamindar	D Ikshia, 77b, Kamwar, 306a Akh 17th Zilhij, 20th R Y
530	Sulayd Karamullah Buta	1 000/500	Indian	—	Akh Shaban 45th R Y
531	Chandhuji	1 000/1 000	Indian	Maratha	Akh Shaban, 45th R Y
532	Rao Jughat	1 000/500	Indian	Maratha	Akh Shaban, 45th R Y
533	Barnuji	1 000/500	Indian	Maratha	M U I, 522 Akh Jamada I, 44th R Y
534	Rao Man Singh s/o Jai Ram Rai	1 000/500 (300x2-3h)	Indian	Maratha zamindar	Akh Rabi I, 45th R Y
535	Bhao Singh	1 000/500	Indian	Rajput zamindar	Akh 45th R.Y
536	Abdul Shatur Halderabad	1 000/400	Indian	Deccani	Akh 10th Jamada I, 36th R.Y Kamwar, 209b
537	Murtaza Quli Khan	1 000/300	—	—	

S. No	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Group	Sub-groups Rajput, Maratha, Afghan, Zamindar etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
538	Saif Khan s/o Saifuddin Mahmud	1,000/300	India	Turan	—	Father	M U II, 484-85
539	Sayyid Sharaf Khan	1,000/300	—	—	—	—	Z A 163b; T U "S.V."
540	Lang Nayak	1,000/300	India	Indian	—	—	S D A 203
541	Sharif	1,000/300	—	—	—	—	Z A 164a; Kamiwar, 263b
542.	Qutbuddin Khan ambassador of Turan	1,000/200	Turan	Turan	—	—	M A 440; A.M.T. 132a; <i>Farhat ul-Nagaran</i> , 178a
543.	Haqqat Khan	1,000/200	—	—	—	—	S D A. 172
544	Muhammad Zaman Khan Lohani	1,000/200	India	Indian	Afghan	Father	S D A. 218
545	Anwar Khan s/o Hakim Alcemuddin.	1,000/150	India	Indian	—	Father	Z A. 162b; S D A. 170.
546	Shah Mohan, Hasan Baksh Khan.	1,000/100	—	—	—	—	<i>Mumalik-i-Mahrusi Alamgiri</i> , 179a; Z.A. 107a
547	Inayat Khan Khawafi	1,000/100	Iran	Iran	—	—	M.U.II, 813-818
548	Muhammad Quli Khan	1,000/100	Turan	Turan	—	—	M A. 472, A M.T. 132a
549	Rustam, Mutamad Khan	1,000/100	India	Turan	—	Father	T M 18

LIST OF WORKS

269

540	Qabil Khan Mir Munshi brother of Abul Fatah Qabil Khan.	1,000/-	India	Indian	—	Brother	M. A. 100.91; Kamwar, 270a
551	Khawaja Yaqut Khan, Mahram Khan	1,000/-	India	Indian	—	—	T M. 26
552	Ibrahim Khan	1,000/-	India	Iran	—	Father	A. M. T. 131b Kamwar, 302a; <i>Offshoot</i> <i>Arab. News</i> , 533
553	Khawaja Musa Sarbuland Khan	1,000/-	—	—	—	—	A. M. T. 132a
554.	Parhutam Singh	1,000/-	India	Indian	Rajput	—	T M. 29
555	Abdur Rahim s/o Burhanu- ddin, Fayl Khan	1,000/-	India	Iran	—	Father	T M. 17
556	Jalaluddin Khan s/o Mir Miran	1,000/-	India	Iran	—	—	<i>Qasbur, History of Gurguch</i> , Vol. V, 273
557	Vyankat	1,000/-	India	Indian	Maratha Zemindar	—	D. N. 26a, 77b
558	Padam Singh s/o Rao Karan	1,000/-	India	Indian	Rajput	Father	<i>Word & Arab. News</i> 473
559	Niamatullah Khan s/o Ruhullah Khan	1,000/-	India	Iran	—	Father	M. A. 337
560	Haibatu llah Arsh	1,000/-	—	—	—	—	A. M. T. 131a
561	Baharat Khan	1,000/-	—	—	—	—	Mamurfi, 162a, 162A, 233
562.	Hashim	1,000/-	—	—	—	Deccani	—

S. No.	Name and Title	Rank highest during the period	Country of birth	Caste	Sub groups Rajput, Maratha Afghan Zamindar etc	Father or other blood relation in service	Authorities
63	Nand Lal	Amir (1000)	India	Indian		—	Farhat ul Nazim 207a
64	Jaydeo Raso Datta	High Rank	India	Indian	Maratha zamindar	Father	M U I, 522 <i>Dilkusha</i> 70b, Ikar Das, 138 Sarkar, <i>History of Aurangzeb</i> Vol V, 212
65	Muhammad Aslam Khan	High Rank	India	Iran	—	Father	M U III 666 667
66	Irad Bahadur Raso (Qaladar of Akbarabad)	High Rank	India	Iran		Grand father	<i>Dilkusha</i> 127a
67	Darji	High Rank	India	Indian	Maratha	Brother	Waqar Papers Jaipur, 17th Zaqada, 47th R Y (Reference given by Dr Salish Chandra)
68	Kabore Das, Qaladar of Sholapur	High Rank ^a	India	Indian	Rajput zamindar	Father	M A 228
69	Ajit Singh Rathore (for a short period)	High Rank ^a	India	Indian	Rajput zamindar	Father	Mirat i Akimadi I, 341, M U III 755 60

^a In the same authority Satar Sal Rathore is mentioned as amir, but in S D A. his rank is given as 1,000/500. So I have also placed Nand Lal in the category of *Azamu*.

^b Sholapur was the fort of considerable strategic importance and nobles of high rank were appointed there (Ak. 14th Zilhiy, 25th R Y).
^c Ajit Singh's actual mansab is nowhere given, it being only stated that he was granted a mansab and appointed *faujdar* and *Jagirdar* of *pergas* Jilor and Sanchor. His lieutenant Durga Das was given the rank of 3 000/2500 (See No 1-38). His own rank is therefore, likely to have been quite high.

570.	Madan Singh S'n Sambhaji	High Rank	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Iwar Das, 154b-155a, M A. 473
571.	Khelaji, Commander of Sambhaji	High Rank	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Iwar Das 155a
572	Ramaji, Commander of Sambhaji	High Rank ¹	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Iwar Das, 155a
573	Januji, Commander of Sambhaji	High Rank	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Iwar Das, 155a
574.	Sultan Husain, Ashan Khan, Mir Mahang	High Rank	India	Irani	—	—	M U.I, 201-203
575	Malbar Rao	High Rank	India	Indian	Maratha	—	Rajawade-Karnam, 22a

¹ Iwar Das says that the three Commanders of Sambhaji and his son Madan Singh were given *Masab-i-Miyah* Generally the *masab-i-Miyah* of 1,000 and above were recorded as having the *Masab-i-Miyah*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note The abbreviation 'Br. M.' represents the British Museum, 'I.O.', the India Office Library; and 'Bodl', the Bodleian Library, Oxford

A CHRONICLES

- YUAN CHAO-PI-SHI, *The Secret History of the Mongol Dynasty*, tr. (with intr and notes) Wei Kwei Sun, Aligarh, 1957.
- BABUR, *Babur Nama*, English translation (from the original Turki text) by A.S. Beveridge, London, 1922
- BAYAZID BIYAT, *Tazkara-i-Humayun wa Akbar*, ed M Hidayat Hosain, Bib Ind 1941
- ABUL FAZI, *Akbar Nama*, Bib Ind., Calcutta, 1873-87
- ABDUL QADIR BADAYUNI, *Muntakhab-ut Tauarikh*, ed Ahmad Ali and Lees, Bib Ind., Calcutta, 1865-68
- ASAD BEG QAZWINI, *Memoirs* MS Br M Or 1996
- ABDUL BAQI NIHAWANDI, *Ma'asir-i-Rahimi*, ed Hidayat Husain, Bib Ind. 1910-31.
- JAHAANGIR, *Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri*, ed Saiyid Ahmad Khan, Ghazipur and Aligarh, 1863-64
- MUTAMAD KHAN, *Iqbalnama-i-Jahangiri*, lithographed, Nawal Kishore, 1870
- MUHAMMAD SHARIF NAJAFI, *Majalis us-Salatin*, MS Br M Or 1903
- ABDUL HAMID LAHORI, *Badshah Nama*, ed Maulvi Kabiruddin and Maulvi Abdur Rahim, Bib Ind Calcutta, 1867-68
- AMIN QAZWINI, *Badshah Nama*, MS Br M Or 173, Add. 20,734 I have also used a transcript of Raza Library (Rampur) MS in the Department of History, Aligarh
- MUHAMMAD SALIH KAMBO, *Amal-i-Salih*, ed G Yazdani, Bib Ind Calcutta, 1923-46
- MUHAMMAD WARIS, *Badshah Nama* (Continuation of Abdul Hamid Lahori's *Badshah Nama*) Br M Add 6556, Or, 1675 Transcript in the Department of History, Aligarh (This MS is defective at the end, lacking the list of *mansabdars*)
- SIDHARI LAL, *Tuhfa-i-Shah Jahani*, MS I O 337
- MUHAMMAD SADIQ KHAN, *Shahjahan Nama*, MS Br M Or 174, Or 1671 The author has suppressed his identity and has given a fictitious name The autobiographical facts which he has given are palpably false Yet the author was a contemporary—indeed probably, a high officer—of Shah Jahan and the work is of considerable historical importance It gives us several important pieces of information missing in the official chronicles
- SHIHABUDDIN TALISH, *Fathiya-i-Ibriya*, MS Bodl Or 589 The first part of the book has been printed under the title *Tarikh-i-Muluk-i-Asham* Calcutta, 1848
- MUHAMMAD KAZIM, *Alamgir Nama*, Bib Ind., Calcutta, 1865-73
- HATIM KHAN, *Alamgir Nama*, MS Br M Add. 26,233 An abridgement of Muhammad Kazim's *Alamgir Nama*, but giving certain facts omitted by Muhammad Kazim.
- AQIL KHAN RAZI, *Waqai-i-Alamgiri*, ed Zafar Hasan, Aligarh, 1946 The attribution of the work to Aqil Khan Razi is not free of doubt. While some parts of this small work contain very interesting information, some statements, specially in the earlier portion, are difficult to believe, and suggest that its author was writing on the basis of hearsay
- SHAIKH MUHAMMAD BAQA, *Murat-al Alam*, MS Abdus Salam 84/314, Azad Library, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh
- SHAIKH MUHAMMAD BAQA, *Miral-i-Jahan Nama*, (A version of the preceding) MS Br M 1993
- ABUL FAZL MAJUMI, *Turikh-i-Aurangzeb*, MS Br M Or 1671 Continuation of Sadiq Khan's *Shahjahan Nama* Like Sadiq Khan, the autobiographical facts given by Abul Fazl

Mamuri appear also to be, at least in part, fictitious. No such officer is known to us from our other evidence.

- ALAH YAR BALKHI, *Ausaf Nama* : *Alamgiri*, MS Cambridge University Library, Brown Cat 100, Pers 477. A eulogy, in prose and verse, of Aurangzeb.
- SA'AT I NUHZAT I ALAMGIR PADSHAH, MS Brochet, 1, 703, Supp Pers 477.
- ISAR DAS NAGAR, *Futuhat-i-Alamgiri*, MS Br M Add 23,884.
- SUJAN RAI BHANDARI, *Khulasat-ut Tauarikh*, ed Zafar Hasan, Delhi, 1918.
- BHIM SEN, *Auska* : *Dilkusha*, MS Br M Or 23.
- SAQI MUSTA'ID KHAN *Ma'asir* : *Alamgiri*, Bib Ind Calcutta, 1871.
- NI'MAT KHAN : ALI, *Waqiat-i Ni'mat Khan* : *Ali*, lithographed, Nawal Kishor, Lucknow, 1928.
- Annals of Delhi Padshahat*, Assamese Chronicle, tr by S K Bhuyan, Gauhati, 1947.
- Alqab Nama*, MS Br M Or 1913, Containing titles of the princes and the nobles of Aurangzeb.
- RAI CHATURMAN SAKSENA, *Chahar Gulshan*, Abdus Salam, 292/62, Azad Library, Aligarh.
- Portion translated and annotated by Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar, *India of Aurangzeb* 1901.
- KAM RAJ, *A'zam-al Harb*, MS Br M Or 1899.
- MUHAMMAD HASHIM KHAFI KHAN *Muntakhab-al Lubab*, ed. K.D Ahmad and Haig, Bib Ind, Calcutta, 1860-74. Khafi Khan has copied extensively from Sadiq Khan and Abul Fazl Ma'muri, but for the reign of Aurangzeb he adds some new information.
- ALI MUHAMMAD KHAN, *Mirat* : *Ahmadi*, ed Syed Nawab Ali, Baroda, 1927 28.
- KAMWAR KHAN, *Tazkarat ul Salatin* : *Chaghata* MS Lytton, 40/2 Maulana Azad Library Aligarh.
- MIRZA MUHAMMAD BIN RUSTAM alias Mutamad Khan bin Qabad alias Driyanat Khan, *Tarikh-i-Muhammadi*, 2 Vols. MS I O 3890. I have also used the press copy of Part VI of the Vol II, edited by Mr Imtiaz Ali Arshi, 1960, being published by the Department of History Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh.
- GHULAM HUSAIN, *Riyaz us Salatin*, Bib Ind 1890.

B ADMINISTRATIVE LITERATURE, ACCOUNTANCY MANUALS, ETC.

- ABUL FAZI, *Ain* : *Akbari*, Nawal Kishor ed, 1882. The translation, where cited, is that of Blochmann (I) and Jarrett (II & III) revised by Phillott, Vol I, Calcutta, 1927 and 1939 and Sarkar Vols II and III, Calcutta, 1949.
- YUSUF MIRAK *Mazhar* : *Shahjahan*, A.D 1634, Vol II, ed. Pir Husamuddin Rashidi, Karachi, 1961. Vol II is devoted to the administrative history of Sind during the Mughal period down to 1634.
- Dastur-al Amal* : *Shahjahan* wa *Shuqqajiat* : *Alamgiri* MS Br M Add 6 583.
- Dastur-al Amal* : *Alamgiri* MS Br M Add. 6 599.
- Dastur-al Amal* : *Ilm* : *Nawisindgi* MS Br M Add 6,599 ff 134 185.
- Zawabi-i Alamgiri*, MS Br M Or 1641.
- Khulasat us Siyag*, MS Sir Sulaiman Collection, 410/143, Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh.
- HIDAYATULLAH BEHARI, *Hidayat-al Qawand* MS Abdus Salam Collection, 379/149, Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh.
- JAGAT RAI SHUJAI KAYATH SAKSENA, *Farhang* : *Kardani*, MS Abdus Salam Collection, 315/83 Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh.
- Dastur-Al Amal*, MS Bodl Fraser, 86.
- MUNSHI NAND RAM KAYASTH SRIVASTAVA *Siyag Nama*, 1694 96, lithographed Nawal Kishor, Lucknow, 1879.
- Dastur-al-Amal-i-Shah Jahans*, Late Aurangzeb, MS Sir Sulaiman Collection, 675/53, Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh.
- Haji KHAIRULLAH *Dastur* : *Jahan Kusht*, MS Abdus Salam Collection, 328/98 Azad Library Aligarh.

JAWAHAR MAL BEKAS, *Dastur-al Amal*, MS Subhanullah Collection 954/4 Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh

C. RECORDS AND DOCUMENTS INCLUDING COLLECTANEA

Records preserved at the Central Record Office (UP) Allahabad The Collection consists of farrmans, sale deeds, gift deeds, judgments, etc., and other documents concerning grants A few documents belong to the 16th, but most appertain to the 17th and 18th centuries

Jaipur Records (Sitamau transcripts) designated *Akhbarat-i-Darbar-i-Mualla* Daily court reports and news letters sent by the agent of the Raja of Amber The *Akhbarat* report the main transactions publicly contracted at the court such as appointments, promotions and demotions of the *mansabdars*, postings of officials, news received from provinces and expeditions, the Emperor's instructions on particular problems of administration, etc Documents preserved at Jaipur (now, at Bikaner) Transcripts of selected documents in the Department of History, Aligarh

Selected Documents of Shah Jahan's Reign, Daftar-i-Dewani Haiderabad 1950

Selected Waqas of the Deccan (1660-71) ed Yusuf Husain Khan Haiderabad 1953

Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign ed Yusuf Husain Khan, Haiderabad 1959

Waqas-i-Ajmer, A.D. 1678-80 Asafiya Library Haiderabad Far-i-Tarikh, 2242, transcript in the Department of History, Aligarh Nos 15 and 16 The volumes contain reports of a news writer who was first posted to Ranthambor, and then to Ajmer and finally accompanied the imperial army under Padshah Quli Khan in the Rajput war The reports give extremely useful information about the working of the Mughal administration and about the Rathor rebellion of 1679-80

Ikhtam-i-Alamgiri, ed Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar This is the Persian text of the *Anecdotes of Aurangzeb*, translated also by J. N. Sarkar

Collection of *Farrmans of Aurangzeb and Farrukh Siyar*, MS Fraser, 228

Imperial Farrmans of Aurangzeb and Farrukh Siyar (1577-1805 A.D.) granted to the Ancestors of the *Tikayat Maharni*, translation in English, Hindi and Gujarati by K. M. Jhaveri Bombay 1928

Some Firmans, Sanads and Patras (1578-1802) preserved in Bihar calendared by K. K. Datta Patra, 1967

D. COLLECTIONS OF LETTERS

KHAN JAHAN SA'YID MUZAFFAR KHAN BARHA *Ar-da-hi ha-i-Muzaffar*, pre 1656 MS Add 16859 This collection also contains a letter written by Uziz Koka to Jahangir

BALKRISHAN BARHAMAN, Letters of Shaikh Jalal Hise'ri and Balkrishan Barhaman written towards the end of Shahjahan's reign and early years of Aurangzeb MS Br M Add 16859

Insha-i-Zubdat ul Aras, MS in possession of Prof S. Nurul Hasan Aligarh Letters written by Aurangzeb to Shah Jahan relating to the Qandahar Campaign of 1652

AURANGZEB *Adab-i-Alamgiri* MS Abdus Salam Collection 326/96 Azad Library Aligarh A collection of letters written by Qabil Khan on behalf of Aurangzeb before his accession The letters are addressed to Shahjahan, prince Muhammad Sultan, Muazzam Khan Mir Jumla, Najabat Khan Khan-i-Douran Nasiri Khan and others This collection also includes letters written by Muhammad Sadiq on behalf of prince Akbar in 1680 during the Rathor rebellion

Ruqat-i-Alamgiri, ed Sayyid Najib Ashraf Nadvi Azamgarh 1930 Contains the correspondence of Aurangzeb with Shahjahan Jahan Ara Begam, Dara Shikoh, Shah Shuja, Murad Baksh and other princes and nobles, largely extracted by the editor from the *Adab-i-Alamgiri*

- MUNSHI BHAGCHAND, *Jam' al Insha* MS M Or 1702 Letters of Jai Singh and the letters exchanged between Mughal and Persian courts
- IZED BAKISH 'RASA', *Riyaz al Wadad*, A.D. 1673-1695 MS Br M Or 1725. The author's own letters
- BHUPAT RAI, *Insha : Roshan Kalam*, MS Abdus Salam Collection, 339/109, Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh Letters written on behalf of Ra'dandaz Khan, *faujdar* of Baswara.
- SHIVAJI, *Khutut : Shu'aj*, Royal Asiatic Society, London, MS 173
- AURANGZEB, *Raqam-i Karim*, MS, Sir Sulaiman Collection, 412/145, Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh
- AURANGZEB, *Kalimat : Tayyabat*, letters collected by Inayatullah Khan, MS, Abdus Salam, 322/92, Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh
- AURANGZEB, *Dastur-al 'Amal : Agahi* letters collected by Raja Bahar Mal in 1743, MS, Abdus Salam 323/93, Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh
- LEKH RAJ MUNSHI, *Matin-al Insha* or *Mufid-al Insha*, letters written on behalf of Ali Quli Khan, *faujdar* of Kuch Bihar, and collected by Champat Rai in 1700 A.D., MS Bodl 679
- Durr-al Ulum*, Collection of letters and documents belonging to Munshi Gopal Rai Surdaj collected and arranged by Sahib Rai Surdaj, A.D. 1688-89 Bodl MS Walkar 104
- MALIKZADA, *Nigar-Nama : Munshi*, lithographed, Nawal Kishor, 1882 A very important collection of letters and administrative documents
- Collection of letters, called in the *Lindesiana Catalogue* "Reports from the Deccan," but actually correspondence between Mewar and the Mughal Court etc., John Ryland Library, MSS 353
- SHAH WALI ULLAH, *Shah Wali ullah Ke Siyasi Maktubat*, ed with Urdu tr by K. A. Nizami, Aligarh, 1950

E BIOGRAPHIES AND TAZKIRAS

- SURAT SINGH, *Tazkira : Pir Hasru Ta'li*, written A.H. 1057, MS (probably autograph) in Library of the Department of History, Aligarh
- SHER KHAN LODI, *Mirat-al Khayat* litho Abdus Salam Collection 620/49, Azad Library, Aligarh.
- GHULAM ALI AZAD, *Khazana : Irarrah* Bib Ind
- Ma'asir-al Karim*, lithographed Haiderabad, 1913
- SHAH NAWAZ KHAN, *Ma'asir al Umara*, ed Mohi Abdur Rahim Bid Ind 1838 3 Vols
- The famous biographical dictionary of Mughal nobles
- KEWAL RAM, *Tazkirat-al Umara* MS Br M Add 16 703

F MISCELLANEOUS WORKS

- AMINUDDIN KHAN *Malumat-ul Afaq*, Nawal Kishor Edition, 1870 Essentially a work describing wonders of the world, and curious happenings it also describes the duties and functions of the officials of the Mughal government like the *Dewan : A la, Bakhsh, Darogha : Dagh : Tanah, Sadrus Sudur* and *Qanungo* etc and gives revenue tables. At the end of the book is given a table containing the pay schedules of *mansabdars*
- Tarikh : Arkan-i Ma'asir : Ta'miriya*, MS Br M Or 1772
- CHANDRA BHAN BARIHMAN *Guldasta*, MS Sir Sulaiman Collection, 666/44, Azad Library, Aligarh

G DICTIONARIES

- ABDUR RAHIM TATTAWI, *Fahang-i Rashidi*, A.D. 1653-54 Ed Abu Tahir Zulfikar Ali Murshidabad Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1875

- MUNSHI TEKCHAND 'BAHAR', *Bahar i Ajam*, A D 1739-40 Nawal Kishor, 1916
 ANAND RAM MUKHLIS, *Mirat-al-Istilah*, a glossary of technical terms, A D 1745 MS
 in Anjuman Taraqqi Urdu Library, Aligarh

H EUROPEAN SOURCES

- Early Travels in India* (1583-1619), ed W Foster, London, 1927
Jahangir and the Jesuits, tr C H Payne, London, 1930
Purchas His Pilgrimes, Vols III and IV, James Maclehose and Sons, Glasgow
 THOMAS ROE, *The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe*, 1615-19, ed W Foster, London, 1926
The English Factories in India, 1618-69, ed W Foster, 13 Vols Oxford, 1906-27 Since
 the volumes are not numbered, they have been cited by the years that each volume
 covers
 PETER MUNDY, *Travels*, Vol II *Travels in Asia*, 1630-34, ed R C Temple, Hakluyt
 Society, 2nd Series, London, 1914
 DE LAET, *Description of India and Fragment of Indian History*, tr J S Hoyland and annotated
 by S N Banerjee *The Empire of the Great Mogol*, Kitab Mahal, Bombay, 1928
 JEAN BAPTISTE TAVERNIER, *Travels in India*, 1640-67, tr V Ball, London, 1889
 FRANÇOIS BERNIER, *Travels in the Mogul Empire* 1656-68, tr A Constable, ed Smith
 JEAN DE THEVENOT, *The Indian Travels of Thevenot and Cœreri*, older translations, ed S N
 Sen, New Delhi, 1949
The English Factories in India, (New Series), ed Sir Charles Fawcett, Oxford, 1936
 JOHN MARSHALL, *Notes and Observations on East India*, ed S A Khan, *John Marshall in*
India, London, 1927
 THOMAS BOWREY, *A Geographical Account of Countries Round the Bay of Bengal*, 1669-79, ed
 R C Temple, Cambridge, 1905
 JOHN FRYER, *A New Account of East India and Persia being Nine Years Travel*, 1672-81, ed
 William Crooke, Hakluyt Society, 2nd Series, London, 1909, 1912 and 1915
 STREYNHAM MASTER, *The Diaries of Streynham Master*, 1675-80, ed R C Temple, Indian
 Records Series, London, 1911
 PELSART, *Jahangir's India*, tr Geyl & Moreland, Cambridge, 1925
 NICCOLAO MANUCCI, *Storia Do Mogor*, 1653-1708 tr W Irvine Indian Texts Series,
 Government of India, London, 1907-8

MODERN WORKS

- ABDUL AZIZ, *The Mansabdari System and the Mughal Army* Lahore 1945
 S AHMAD, *Umra i Humud* (Urdu)
 MUTAHMAD AKHAR, *The Punjab Under the Mughals*, Lahore, 1948
 SATISH CHANDRA, *The Parties and Politics at the Mughal Court*, (1707-40), Aligarh, 1959
 M S COMMISSARIAT *A History of Gujarat*, Vol II, (1573 to 1758) Orient Longmans, 1957
 W CROOKE *The Tribes and Castes of the North Western Provinces and Oudh* Calcutta, 1896
 H H DAS *The Norris Embassy to Aurangzeb*, Calcutta, 1959
 M FARUKI, *Aurangzeb and His Times* Bombay, 1935
 A FUHRER *The Monumental Antiquities and Inscriptions in the North Western Provinces and Oudh*,
 Allahabad, 1891
 JAYAN HARI, *The Agrarian System of Mughal India (1556-1707)* Bombay 1963
 IBN HASAN, *The Central Structure of the Mughal Empire and its Practical Working up to the Year*
 1657, Oxford, 1936
 D IRETON, *Punjab Castes*, Lahore, 1916
 WILLIAM IRVINE, *The Army of the Indian Mughals*, London, 1903

- R. P. KHOSLA, *The Mughal Kingship and the Nobility*, Allahabad, 1934
- LEVY, *Social Structure of Islam*, Cambridge, 1957
- W. H. MORELAND, *India at the Death of Akbar*, London, 1920
- + — *Agrarian System of Muslim India*, Cambridge, 1929
- + — *From Akbar to Aurangzeb*, London, 1923
- MAULANA SHIBLI NAUMANI, *Aurangzeb Alamgir Per Ek Nazar*
- GAURI SHANKAR HERRA CHAND OJHA, *Rajasthan Ka Itihaas* Vol. III, Ajmer, 1937.
- BENI PRASAD, *History of Jahangir*; 2nd ed Allahabad, 1930
- K. QAMUNGO, *Dara Shukoh*, Calcutta, 1952
- BISHESHWAR NATH REL, *Mauar Ka Itihaas*, Vol. I, 1940
- + P. SARAN, *The Provincial Government of the Mughals (1526-1658)*, Allahabad, 1941
- JADU NATH SARKAR, *History of Aurangzeb—Mainly based on Persian Sources*, 3 vols. Calcutta, 1912, 1916 and 1930
- *House of Shirazi* 1960
- *Shirazi and His Times*, 4th ed 1948
- *Studies in Aurangzeb's Reign*, Calcutta 1933
- *Mughal Administration*, Calcutta, 1920
- JAGDISH NARAIN SARKAR, *The Life of Mir Jumla*, Calcutta, 1951
- B. P. SAXENA, *History of Shah Jahan of Delhi*, Allahabad, 1958
- + S. R. SHARMA, *The Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors*, Oxford, 1940 2nd ed Bombay, 1962
- HAVIRAJ SHYAMAL DAS *Vir Vinod*, 4 Vols. This history of Mewar in Hindi which is based on an extensive study of Persian and Rajasthani sources, often gives full texts of *farmans* and *nuhans* issued by the Mughal Emperors and princes to the Ranas of Udiapur
- S. N. SEN, *The Military System of the Marathas*, Bombay, 1958
- V. A. SMITH, *Akbar the Great Mogul (1542-1605)* 2nd ed Oxford, 1919
- VILLIERS STUART, *Gardens of the Indian Mughals*, London, 1913
- THORN, *Memoir of the War in India*
- JAMES TOD *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, popular ed., 2 Vols. London, 1914
- + R. P. TRIPATHI, *Some Aspects of Muslim Administration*, Allahabad, 1936
- *Rise and Fall of the Mughal Empire*, Allahabad, 1956
- + H. H. WILSON 4 *Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms*, and C., of *British India*, London, 1875

INDEX

A

- Abbas Afghan, 119
 Abbasids, 63
 Abdul Aziz, 3, 47, 50, 53, 55
 Abdul Aziz Miyyana, 249
 Abdul Bari Ansari, 129, 200
 Abdul Hamid, 223
 Abdul Hamid B. Jaspuri, 206
 Abdul Hamid Lahori, 7, 8, 9n, 10, 22, 42n, 52, 54, 55, 57, 73n
 Abdul Jalil, 167n
 Abdul Karim, 104, 105
 Abdullab, s/o Rustam Zarnan B. Jaspuri, 243
 Abdullah Khan, Abdullab Beg Sarai, 124, 191
 Abdullab Khan Barai, s/o Hasan Ali Khan, 60n, 103, 244
 Abdullab Khan, s/o Alul Hasan of Gokun Is, 225
 Abdullah Khan, s/o Raudula Khan, 203
 Abdul Majid Khan, 261
 Abdul Nabi, 67n, 118, 152, 192
 Abdul Nabe, b/o Hasan Khan Rokela, 241
 Abdul Qadir, s/o Abdul Razzaq Lari, 236
 Abdul Salam, s/o Abdur Rahim Miyyana, 250
 Abdul Salam Lahori, 196
 Abdul Samad Khan, 69, 252
 Abdul Shakoor Haiderabadi, 267
 Abdul Wahab Bukhari, 146
 Abdur Rahim Khan, b/o Feroz Jang, 256
 Abdur Rahim Khan, s/o Islam Khan, 204, 257
 Abdur Rahman Khan, s/o Islam Khan Mashhadi, 248
 Abdur Rahman, s/o Nazar Muhammad Khan, 132, 179
 Abdur Rasul Khan Bilgrami, 22, 44
 Abdur Razzaq Gilani, 184
 Abdur Razzaq Lari, 147n, 226
 Abul, 70
 Abul Baqa, 199
 Abul Fateh, s/o Dilor Khan Bijaspuri, 265
 Abul Fateh, s/o Khan-i Jahan, 266
 Abul Fateh, s/o Shaista Khan, 202
 Abul Fazl (Allami), 14, 40, 50, 51, 54, 64, explanation of the moral basis of the Mughal state, 144
 Abul Fazl Mamuri, 11, 12, 18n, 22, 24, 27, 28, 53, 59
 Abul Hasan, 103
 Abul Khale, 231
 Abul Maksum, 201
 Abu Muhammad, 133, 196
 Abu Muhammad Khan B. Jaspuri, 237
 Abu Munim, 130, 212
 Abu Nasar, Muhammad Ramzani, 226
 Achaji Numbhar Bherani, 220
 Achaji Nayak, 220
 Afghan, 15, tribes of, 15, numbers of, 20-21
 Afrauyah Khan, Afrauyah Beg, 187, 244
 Afzal Khan, Afzal Beg, 259
 Agha Khurad, 265
 Agha Quli Khan, 19
 Agharabadi, 166
 Aghar Khan, Ismail Quli, 233
 Aghar Khan, Pir Muhammad, 164n, 181, 207, 226
 Agra, 97, 157n
 Agha, 7, 10, 15
 Ahmad Beg Kamul, 215
 Ahmad Beg Saym Sani, 211
 Ahmad Khan, 203, 261
 Ahmadnagar, 29, 103
 Ahmad Saeed Khan, 164
 Abdullab Khan, 254
 Ahmadullah, 242
 Alan Khan, 221
 Ahsan Khan, Mir Malang Sultan Hussain, 271
 Aisha Hanu, 143
 Ajit Singh, 160, 101, 270
 Ajmer, 147, 164
 Akbar, 4, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, policy of *sulh-i kul*, 16, 20, 21; Hindu *mansabdars* under, 31, 39, 40, 45, 53, 54, 63, 64, 74, 149
 Akbar (prince), 23, 101
 Akram Khan, Qazi Akram, 263
 Akuji, 256
 Alaf Khan, Sardar Qiyam Khan, 201
 Alah Dad Khan, 69, 148n, 201
 Alah Dad Khan Khesghi, 243
 Alah Yar Khan, Alah Yar Beg, 183, 238
 Alahwardi Khan Alamgir Shahi, 167n, 181
 alam, 141
 Alauddin Nayak, 217
 Ali Alam Haiderabadi, 247
 Ali Beg Khan, 203
 Alif Khan, 88

- Ali Mardan Khan, 52, 64
 Ali Mardan Khan Haiderabadī, Mir Husain Beg, 219
 Ali Quli Khan, Ali Quli Beg, 193
 Ali Quli Khan, Muhammad Ali Beg, 51n, 192, 234
 Allahabad, 147
 Amanat Khan, 145, 168
 Amanat Khan, Khwaja Muhammad, 258
 Amanat Khan, Mir Muhammad Hasan, 253
 Amanat Khan, Mirak Muinuddin, 214, 248
 Amar Singh Chandrawāt, 116
 Amar Singh Narori, *raja*, 126, 199
 Amar Singh II, *rana*, 221
 Amanullah Khan, 213, 253
amin 82, 83
 Amir Khan, Mir Miran, 62, 67, 80, 167n, 181
 Amir Khan, Saiyid Mir Khawafi, 176
 Amir Khan Sindhi, Mir Abdul Karim, 236
 Anand Rao, 231
 Anbaji, s/o Makaji, 262
 Ani Rai Barhaman, 194, 246
 Ankuji, 243
 Anrudh Singh Gaur, 183
 Anrudh Singh Hara, 229
 Antaji Khandakala, 186
 Anup Singh, 188, 229, 246
 Anwar Khan, 268
 Aqa Bahrām, 147n
 Aqa Yusuf, 199
 Aqidat Khan, Abu Talib, 188
 Aqidat Khan, Mir Muhammad, 211
 Aqil Khan Razi, Mir Askari, 57n, 89, 167n, 128, 190, 227
 Arab Khan, 62
 Arju Ji, 245
 Arjun Gaur, 116
 Arshad Khan, Mir Abul Ala Balkhi, 256
 Arslan Khan, Arslan Quli, 192, 240, 258
 Asad Kashi, 210
 Asad Khan, 67, 105, 107, 109, 110, 148, 168, 178, 217
 Asaf Khan, 42n 62n
 Asalat Khan, Mirza Muhammad Mashhadi, 122, 178
 Asalat Khan, s/o Muzaffar Haiderabadī, 254
 Asfandiyar, 259
 Asfandiyar Beg, 70, 117
 Ashraf Khan, 145
 Askandar Khan, Sikandar Be Khan, 226
 Askar Khan Haiderabadī, Muhibb-i-Ali, 228
 Askar Khan Najm Sani, Abdullah Beg, 116, 195
 Askar Khan, Shukrullah Khan Najm Sani, 251
 Assam, 15, 97
 Atibar Khan, Muhammad Taqi, 234
 Atish Khan, Muhammad Jan, 264
 Auchu Auhai Rao, 254
 Aurangabad, 89
 Aurang Khan, Nazar Beg, 69, 247
 Aurangzeb, 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 96, 97, *zat* and *sawar* ranks of the *mansabdars* under, 10-14, foreign and Indian elements amongst the *mansabdars* of, 17, Iranian supporters of, 19, attitude towards the Saiyids of Barha, 21, towards Kashmiris, 22, Rajputs under, 23-24, 30, and succession of the Marwar throne, 24-25, Indians and foreigners amongst the *mansabdars* of, 33-34, racial and religious composition of the nobility under, 35, 49, 56, *farman* regarding escheat, 65, extent of *Khalisa* under, 74
 Ayman Khan, 255
 Azam (prince), 59, 93, 110, 164
 Azam Khan Koka, 152
 Azimushshan, 156
 Aziz Khan Bahadur Chaghatai, 235
 Aziz Koka, 16
 Azizullah Khan, 251
 Babaji Bhonsle, 124, 189
 Babur, 15, 20
 Badakhshan, 52, 54
 Badarji or Padarji, 235
 Badaun, 39
 Badhay, 265
 Badil Bakhtiyar, 130, 212
 Baguji Deccani, 197
 Bahadur Khan, 20n, 89
 Bahadur Khan, Baqi Beg 113
 Bahadur Khan Kokaltash, Mir Malik Husain 62, 101, 103, 104, 105, 123, 151, 167n, 175, 216, property escheated, 67n
 Bahadur Khan, Rustam Khan, Ran Mast Ali Khan Panni, 221
 Bahadur Shah, 94
 Bahadur Singh, 265
 Baharji, 264
 Bahar Nahi, 247
 Baharji Pandhre, 222
 Bahrām, 69, 150, 179, 205

INDEX

- Bahram Khan, 269
 Bahramand Khan, 89, 107, 138, 145, 217
 Bahruj, *raja*, 206
 Bahruz Khan, 239
 Bauram Deo Sisodia, 114, 187
 Baswara, 147
 Baji Chavan Dast, 227
 Baji Rao, 236
bakhtsh: *sarkar*, 162
 Bakhsh Khan, Sayid Majeed, 255
 Bakhtawar Khan 32, 157, 165, 166, 212
 Bakhtawar Khan Khwajasara, 257
 Bakhtawar Nagar, 156, 166
 Bakhtawarpura, 166
 Bakhtiyar Khan, Khawas Khan, 125, 186
 Bakhtiyar Khan, Malik Jewan, 211
 Balban, 12, 39
 Bali Rao, 152
 Balkh, 52, 54
 Baluch, 15
 Bandhu, 15, 209
 Banwali Das Bhartiya, 212
 Baq Baq, *malik*, 39
 Baqi Khan, 59, 210
 Baqi Khan, Hayat Beg, 242
barawardi, 43, 45
 Bardwan, 41n
 Barkhurdar Khan, Ashraf Khan, Khwaja
 Berkhurdar, 188
 Barq Andaz Khan, 213
 Basdev, 231
 Basharat Khan, 269
 Bashir Imadul Mulik, 63n
 Basra, 13
 Bayazid, 64, 264
 Bayaji, 266
 Bedar Bakht, 26, 146
 Behari Chand, 202
 Bengal, 15, 147
 Beni Shah Darak alias Prakash Garh, 41n
 Beram Gam, 75
 Berner, 3, description of nobility, 16, 18, 19,
 23, 63, 66, denounced escheat, 68, 90
 Betuji Deccani, 124
 Bhog Chand, *muah*: 18n
 Bhagwant, 214
 Bhagwant Singh, 189
 Bhagwant Singh, s/o Jaswant Singh Bundela,
 264
 Bhagwant Singh Hara, 129
 Bhagwant Singh, *raja*, 223
 Bhaku Banjara, 222
 Bhalu Rao, 239, 259
 Bhan Purohit, 232
 Bhao Singh, 267
 Bharat Singh of Shahpura, *raja*, 230
 Bhim, 118
 Bhim, *raja*, 264
 Bhim Sen, 14, 78, 90, 150n, 152, 163, 164n,
 168
 Bhim Singh, 70
 Bhim Singh of Srinagar, 209
 Bhoj Raj Kachwaha, 198
 Bijai, s/o Jan Rao, 260
 Bijai Singh, 69, 251
 Bijapur, 26, 32, 59, 61n, 98, 102, 106
 Bikaner, 80
 Bikram Singh of Gular, *raja*, 191
 Bilgram, 214
 Bir Bhan, 265
 Birmuji, 267
 Bishan Singh, *raja*, 237
 Bithaldas, *raja*, 64
 Bivas Rao, 124
 Budh Singh of Bundi, 239
 Bughra Khan, 38n
 Bulbaris Khan, 247
 Burhanpur, 104, 175n
 Buzurg Umaid Khan, 201, 230
 Chaghta Khan Bahadur, Fateh Jang
 Kashghari, 218
 Chamba, 211
 Chand Khan, 214
 Chandhuji, 267
 Chandra Bhan Barhaman, 15
 Chanpat Bundela, 121, 179
 Chatar Sal Bundela, 227
 Chatgaon, 97
 Chatar Singh of Chambha, 214
 Chatlan Kara, 231
 Chatruji Deccani, 206
 Chatur Bhuj, 152, 153n
 Chatur Bhuj Chauhan, 199
 Chikra, 53
 Chet Singh, 267
 Chin Quli Khan, 109, 110, 221
 Circassians, 15
 Dadaji, 124, 193
dagh, 53, 54
 Dakuji, 126, 198
 Dalpat Rao Bundela, 26, 109, 110, 145,
 163n, 231

- Daluji, s/o Baharji, 261
dam, 45n 76
 Damaji Deccani, 122, 182
 Danushmand Khan, Mulla Shafiq Yazdi,
 14, 167, 179
 Darab Khan, 187, 266
 Darbar Khan Khwajasara, 212, 247
 Daran Khan, 209
 Dara Shukoh, 19, 21, 22, 23, 96, 97, 145
 Darwesh Beg Qaqshal, 208
 Darwesh Muhammad, 209
 Dataji Deccani, 186, 268
 Daud, 210
 Dauji, 247
 Daud Khan Panni, 108, 109, 110, 169, 182,
 219
 Daud Khan Qureshi, 105, 113, 145, 151
 Daulat Afghan, 130, 209
 Daulatmand Khan 127, 203
 Debi Singh Bundela, *raja*, 134, 238
 Deccan, 11, *jamadani* of, 28 and n
 Deccanis, definition of, 26, number of, 27,
 recruitment of, 28, exempted from
Khurak : *Filan* : *halqa*, 29, exempted from
 surety, 60-61
 Delhi, 157n , 166
 Denaji Salvi, 243
 Deoji, 262
 Devji, 270
 Dhamu, 146
 Dharmat, 23
 Dholuji, 231
 Dilawar Khan, s/o Alahdad Khan, 70
 Dilawar Khan, s/o Bahadur Khan Rohela, 251
 Dilawar Khan, Muhammad Sadiq, 204
 Dilawar Khan, Sayid Abdur Rehman,
 128, 197
 Dilawar Khan, Shaikh Abdul Aziz, 202
 Dildar Khan, Dildar Beg, 198
 Dildoz, 135
 Dilir, s/o Bahadur Rohela, 69
 Dilir Khan, 103, 104, 145, 177, 220
 Dilir Khan, Abdur Rauf Miyana, 216
 Dilir Khan, Mamur Khan, 260
 Dil Singh, 267
 Dindar Khan, Bakht Buland, *raja*, 260
 Dindar Khan, Beg Muhammad Kheshgi,
 126, 190
 Diyanat Khan, Abdul Qadir, 167n , 204, 240
 Diyanat Khan, Hakim Jamalai Kashi, 195
 Donbri Rao, 232
du-aspa-ni-aspa, 42-44, salary of, 45, obliga-
 tions of, 55
du-dami, 51
 Durag Singh Raja, 249
 Durga Das Rathor, 232
 Egypt, 15
 Empire, *jamadani* of, 28 and n
 Europe, 2
 Fazullah Khan, 116, 181, 226
 Fakhir Khan Najm Sani, 118
 Farhad Chela, 200
 Farhad Khan, Farhad Beg, 203
 Faridabad, 166
 Farrukh Siyar, 79
 Fateh, s/o Hasan Rohela, 265
 Fateh Jalaury, 69
 Fateh Khan, Mir Fateh, 196
 Fateh, b/o Nek Niyat Khan, 240
 Fateh Rohela, Fateh Jang Khan, 123, 183
 Fatehullah Khan, 193
 Fatehullah Khan Bahadur Alamgir Shahi,
 108, 137, 235
 Fauzdar Khan, 70, 197
 Faulad Khan, Sidi Faulad, 197, 251
 Faulad Khan Sidi Qasim, 249
 Fazil Khan, Hakim Ajaul Mulk Tuni, 14, 179
 Fazil Khan, Humad Khan, Burhanuddin 235
 Fazil Khan, *naiib* : *mir saman*, 66, 145
 Fazil Pur, 168
 Fazil Khan, Shaikh Makhdom Thattavi, 237
 Fazil Khan, Shaikh Sulaiman, 255
 Fazlullah Khan, Mir Fazlullah, 202
 Fedai Khan, s/o Ibrahim Khan, 263
 Fedai Khan Mir Muzaffar Husain, 62,
 147n , 177
 Fedai Khan, Salih Khan, 232
 Fedai Khan, Tahawwur Khan, Shaikh Mir,
 232
 Feranga, 59
 Feroz Khan Mewati, 116, 200
 Feroz Khan, Muhammad Saeed, 228
 Feroz Shah, 20, 63
foladar, 82
 France, 90n
 Fredun Khan, 232
 Gada Beg, 211
 Ganga Ram Gujarati, 104n
 Ganj Ali Khan, Abdullah Beg 114, 186
 Garkhujl s/o Wankar Rao, 209

INDEX

- gau-charai, 82
 Ghakkars, 15
 Ghaurat Khan, Mir Murad Mazandani, 195
 Ghaurat Khan, Sayyid Izzat Khan, 185
 Ghalib Khan, 225
 Ghalib Khan Bijapuri, 180
 Gharib Das, 70
 Ghazanfar Khan, 117, 184, 242
 Ghazi, 246
 Ghaziuddin Khan, Feroz Jang, 59, 109, 110,
 thinking to become independent after
 Aurangzeb, 111, 166, 173, 216
 Ghaznin, 62
 Ghulam Muhammad Afghan, 129, 208
 Gilan, 15
 Gurdhar Das Gaur, 115, 186
 Gokula, Jat, 98
 Golkunda, 26, 103, 105, 106
 Gopal Singh, 197, 250, 262
 Gopama, 99n
 Gopinath, 14, 99n
 Gorakhpur, 62
 Gujarat, 79, 80, 147, 150, 155
 Gulalbar, 139
 Gulbarga, 88
 Gurdhan Das Rathor, 118
 Habsh Khan, Khudawand Habshi, 129,
 211, 217
 Hadi Dad Khan, 124
 Hadi Khan, Mir Muhammad Hadi, 69, 191
 Hadi Khan, Muhammad Hadi Haiderabadi,
 243
 Hafiz Khan, 69
 Hafizullah Khan, 232
 Haibat Khan, Miyan Hazin, 229
 Haibatullah Arab, 269
 Haiderabad, 166
 Haider Khan, Qazi Haider, 248
 Haider Quli, 256
 Haji Ahmad Saeed, 208
 Haji Ali, 246
 Hakim Muhammad Amin Shirazi, 131
hal : *hasil*, 76
 Hameed Kakar, Kakar Khan, 59, 69, 130,
 199
 Hameeduddin Khan Bahadur, 229
 Hamid Khan, 59, 110, 234
 Haqiqat Khan, 268
 Harjis Gaur, 199
 Harmuz, 155
 Harnath Nachwaha, 58n
 Hasan, 253
 Hasan Abdal, 98
 Hasan Ali Khan Bahadur Alamgir Shahi, 223
 Hasan Bakhsh Khan, Shah Mohsin, 268
 Hasan Beg, 208
 Hasan Khan Deccani, 185
 Hasan Khan Rohela, 219
 Hasan Kheshti, 133
 Hashim, 269
hasil, 46
 Hatim Khan, 62
 Hayat Khan, 263
 Himmatt Khan Mir Isa, 126, 167, 186, 235
 Himmatt Khan, Muhammad Hasan, 229
 Himmatt Yar, 42n, 70
 Hindu, total number of *mansabdars* under
 Akbar, Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb,
 31 and n, 98 and n
 Hirday Shah Bundela, 253
 Husamuddin, 167n, 189
 Hizbar Khan, 201
 Hoshangabad, 62
 Hoshdar Khan, 128, 180
 Humayun, 15, 16
hundis, 162
huquq : *diwani*, 81
 Husain Ali Khan Barha, 167n, 258
 Husain Beg Khan Zig, 116, 129, 191, 203
 Husain Khan, Fateh Jang Miyaana, 219
 Ibadullah, 239
 Ibrahim Khan, 64, 103, 113, 131, 178, 218
 Ibrahim Qarbegi, 130
 Ifukhar Khan, 69, 165, 211
 Ifukhar Khan, s/o Shariful Mulik Haiderabadi,
 236
 Ifukhar Khan, Sultan Husain, 231
 Ihtumam Khan, Ali Beg, 211
 Ihtumam Khan, Sardar Beg, 205
yara, 83
ynas, 51
 Ijtima Khan, 243
 Ikhlās Khan, Abu Muhammad Miyaana,
 179, 221
 Ikhlās Khan, Ahmad Beg Kheshti, 125, 186
 Ikhlās Khan, Ihtumam Khan, Alah Yar
 Khan 258
 Ikhlās Khan, Ihtumam Khan, Shaikh
 Farid, 181
 Ikhlās Khan, Ikhlās Kesh, Debi Das, 241
 Ikhlās Khan, Khan : Alam, 148n, 218
 Ikhtisar Khan, Shaikh Abdullah, 225

- Ikhtisas Khan, Saiyid Feroz Khan Barha, 193
 Ikhtisas Khan, Salabat Khan Barha, Saiyid Sultan Husain, 182
 Ikram Khan, 62, 124, 191, 200
 Ikram Khan Deccani, Asadullah Khan, 244
 Ikram Khan Sadar, 214
 Ilahadad Faizi, 51
 Ilahwardi Khan, 133n.
 Ilhamullah, 126, 184
 Illichpur, 166
 Ilufat Khan, Murad Khan, 204
 Ilyas Khan, 258
 Imam Quli, 117
inam, 43, 80
 Inayat Afghan, 209
 Inayat Khan, 89, 130, 205, 214, 249
 Inayat Khan Khawafi, 267
 Inayatullah, 26n., 169
 Inayatullah Khan Kashmiri, 14, 21, 32, 93, 242
 Indarman Dhandera, *raja*, 123, 181, 208
 Indar Singh, 25, 79, 100, 101, 205, 229
 Indar Singh, s/o Rana Raj Singh, 232
 Inderkhi, 196
 Inderman, s/o Pahar Singh Bundela, 263
 Indian Muslims, 21
 Iradat Barha, 131
 Iradat Khan, 108, 115, 191, 261
 Iranis, 15, 17, 18; numbers of, 19, 59
 Irij Khan, 166, 188
 Irij Khan Qazalbash, 233
irmas, 51
 Isa Khan, 213
 Isar Das, 26n
 Ishaq Beg, 120, 203
 Islam Khan, 44n 64
 Islam Khan of Basra, 59
 Islam Khan, Mir Ziauddin Husain, 16n, 179
 Islam Quli, 214
 Ismail Beg, 119
 Ismail Khan, Muhammad Ismail, 198
 Ismail Khan Niyazi, 127
 Isu Ji Deccani, 245
 Itubar Khan, 195
 Itubar Khan Khawajasara, 131
 Itumad Khan, Ashraf Khan, 227
 Itumad Khan, Mulla Tahir, 248
 Itimaduddaula, 142
 Itiqad Khan, 167n, 194
 Itiqad Khan, Bahman Yar, 179
 Itiqad Khan, Iradat Khan, Abu Mansur, 245
 Izad Bakhsh Rasa, 83, 85, 167n, 270
 Izzat Beg, 89
 Jadaun Rai, 266
 Jadaun Rai Deccani, 181, 237
 Jadrawat, 234
 Jadu Rai, 122
 Jafar Ali Yaminul Mulki, 254
 Jafar Khan, 104, 143, 148, 153, 176
 Jagat Rai, s/o Dataji, 268
 Jagat Rai, *deshmukh* of Nusrat Abad, 237
 Jagat Singh, 90
 Jagat Singh Hara, 192, 245
Jagir, term, 3, 13; definition of, 74; extent of, 74; *mashrut* and *inam*, 75; principle of assignment, 79; scarcity of, 92, 95
jagirdar, 3, 7
jagir-i-lankhwah, 75, 80
 Jagjiwan, Udaji Ram, 189
 Jagna Nayak, 221
 Jagram Kachwaha, 200
 Jahan Ara Begam, 75n, 158
 Jahangir, alleged hostility towards Turanis, 16, 18, 19, 20, 42, 54; extent of *khalisa* under, 74; instituted *altun-i-tamgha*, 80, 102
 Jahangir Quli Khan, 89, 194, 246
 Jai Singh Kachwaha, Mirza Raja, 14, 17, 22, 43n, 45n, 55n., 75n, 97, 98, 103, 104n, 105, 106, 156, 175
 Jai Singh, *raja*, 206
 Jai Singh, *rana*, 220
 Jai Singh Sawai, 26, 163n, 243
 Jakia Deshmukh, 229
 Jalal Afghan, 201
 Jalal Khan Kakar, 186
 Jalaluddin Khan, 269
 Jaluji, 256
jama, see *jamadami*
jamadami, definition of, 46, 74, 75; long way from *hani*, 77, 81
 Jamal Khan, s/o Dilr Khan, 129, 211
 Jamal Nauhani Biyapuri, 180
 Jammun, 197
 Jamrud, 148
 Jamshed Khan, 89
 Jamshed Khan Biyapuri, 216
 Jaqbaz Khan, Ismail Kheshgi, 126, 194
 Jangju Khan Deccani, 224
 Jankuji, 224
 Jan Nisar Khan, Abul Makarim, 246
 Jan Rao, 231
 Jan Sipar Khan, Mir Bahadur Dil, 128, 210, 228, 265
 Januji, 271
 Jarwant Singh, appointed governor of Guja-

- rat, 23, 61n, 67, 80, holding *jagir* in
 Hisar, 80, 97, 100, 101, 103, 104, 112,
 147n, 148, 175
 Jaswant Singh Bundela, *raja*, 214, 250
 Jaswant Singh of Dungarpur, 259
 Jauji, 247
 Jaunpur, 147
 Jewaji Pandit, 234
 Jizya, 26, 99
 Junji, 110
 Jodhpur, 41n, 79, 100, 101
jurmana, 51, 52

 Kabul, 55, 147
 Kahni, *pargana*, 89
 Kahtanun, 242
 Kaiqabad, 38n
 Kaj Nayak, 177
 Kakar Khan, 251
 Kalal Khan, 138
 Kali Bheet, 209
 Kalyan Singh, 262
 Kalyan Singh of Bandhu, 209
 Kalyan Singh, *raja*, 263
 Kamal Jaluri, 82
 Kamal Lodi Harbuz Khan, 125, 195
 Kamaluddin Khan, 208, 241
 Kamdar Khan, 256
 Kamgar Khan, Muhammad Kamgar, 62,
 190, 235
 Kamgar Khan, s/o Kamyab Khan, 198
 Kamil Khan 197
 Kamyab Khan, Saifuddin Safvi, 202, 254
 Kanbuji Shirke, 219
 Kapur Singh Hara, 259
 Karan, *raja*, 80
 Karan Kachhi, 127, 203
karkun, 82
 Karnatik, 15, 110, 147
 Kartalab Khan, *dewan* of Bengal, 41n, 69
 Kartalab Khan, (Yaswant Rao), 122
 Kartalab Khan, Muhammad Jan, 253
 Kashmir, 18, 147
 Kashmuri, 59
 Kasimbazar, 158
 Katra, *pargana*, 41n
 Kerat Singh, 117, 185
 Kesari Singh Bhartiya, 197
 Keshaw Das, 70
 Khafi Khan, 11, 11, 10n, 51n, 53, 59,
 61n, 82
 Khair Andesh Khan Kambu, 237
 Khalilullah Khan, 112, 176
 Khalilullah Khan, Amanullah Khan, 245
khalisa, 74
khanazad, definition of, 11 & n, number of;
 12; percentage of, 12, resentment of, 29
 Khanazad Khan, Hameeduddin Khan,
 128, 203
 Khanazad Khan, Multafat Khan, Muha-
 mmad Ibrahim, 242
 Khanazad Khan, Muhammad Masih,
 Murid Khan, 242
 Khanazad Khan, Ruhullah Khan, II, Mir
 Muhammad Hasan, 230
 Khan Chand Bundela, 70
 Khanduji, 261
 Khan i Alam, Ghaurat Khan, Muhammad
 Ibrahim, 221
 Khan i-Dauran, Sayid Mahmud Khan, 140n
 Khan i-Jahan Barha, 165
 Khan-i Jahan Lodi, 20, 103
 Khan i Khanan, Abdur Rahim, 102, 103
 Khan-i Zaman, Sipahdar Khan, Mir Muha-
 mmad Khan, 222
 Khanjar Khan, Mirza Muhammad, 116, 192
khasa, 44
 Khawaf, 19n
 Khawaja Khan, 255
khawan Salar, 162
khazinadar, 162
 Kheluji, 269
 Khevi, 223
 Khidmatgar Khan Talib Khawajasara, 256
 Khidmat Talab Khan, Shaikh Abdul Aziz,
 225
 Khidmat Talab Khan, Shah Beg, 70
 Khuda Band Khan, 59, 109, 235
 Khuda Dad Khan Khasgi, 219
 Khuman Singh, 259
khurat i-dawwab, 50, 51
 Khurasani, 16, 19
 Khushhal Beg Kashghari, 116
 Khushhal Beg Qaqshal, Quly Khan, 125
 Khwaja Abdullah, 258
 Khwaja Abid Khan, 122
 Khwaja Abul Baqa, Ifukhar Khan, 113
 Khwaja Inayatullah, 197
 Khwaja Ismail Beg Kurman, 214
 Khwaja Kalan, Hafayat Khan, 129
 Khwaja Khuda Yar Khan, 69
 Khwaja Muhammad Arif, Mujahid Khan, 69
 Khwaja Muhammad Sadiq Badakhshi, 119
 Khwaja Obedullah Khan, 128, 193
 Khwaja Sadiq Badakhshi, 212

- Kifayat Khan, Khwaja Kalan, 213
 Kifayat Khan, Mir Muhammad, 258
 Kishan Singh, 242
 Kishan Singh Taunur, 118, 199
 Kishna Ji, 233
 Kishna Rao, s/o Kaku Ji, 252
 Kishore Das 270
 Kishore Singh Hara, 69, 238
 Kushtwar, 15
 Kolahpur, 148
 Kota, 238
 Kuch Bihar, 97, 98
 Kunda Ji Deccani, 207, 241
 Kurdistan, 15

 Lachman Pati, 249
 Lahore, 153n, 166
 Lang Nayak, 268
 Lashkar Khan Barha, 108, 147n
 Lashkar Khan, Jan Nisar Khan, Yadgar Beg, 178
 Latif Khan, 246
 Lodi Khan, Muzaffar Lodi, 123, 184, 244
 Lohgarh, 148
 Lutfullah Khan, 66, 153n, 203, 232

 Madan Singh, 271
 Madho Ji Narain, 248
 Maghol Khan Khawafi, 117
 Mahabat Khan Mirza Lakhtasp, letter of protest to Aurangzeb, 99, 104, 140n, 146, 147n, 176
 Mahabat Khan, Khalilullah Khan, Muhammad Ibrahim, 218
 Mahad Ji Mane, 240
 Mahan Ji s/o Manku Ji, 239
 Maha Singh Bhadoriya, 117, 205
 Maha Singh Bhadoriya, *raja*, 259
 Mahdi, 214
 Mahdi Quli Khan, 190
 Mahesh Das Rathor, 118, 202
mahi, 159n
mahi Maratib, 141
 Mahmanji, 243
 Mahmud, 62
 Mahmud Dil Zaq, 2 of
 Mahram Khan, Khwaja Yaqut, 269
 Mahram Khan, 222
 Mahrawal Jaswant Singh, 205
 Makarmat Khan, 192, 203
 Makarmat Khan, Muhammad Mansur, 251
 Maku Ji, 246
malbur-i-Khar, 140
 Malhar Rao, 271
malik, 38
 Malik Ambar, 29
mall i wayibi, 81
mallahi, 159n
 Maluji, 113, 178, 221, 263
 Malu Ji, s/o Saru Ji, 260
 Mamur Khan, 69
 Mamur Khan, Mir Abul Fazl Mamuri, 127, 203
 Mana Ji, 261
 Mana Ji, s/o Nagu Ji, 262
 Mana Ji, s/o Wanerath Ji, 208
 Mana Ji, s/o Ankuji, 243
 Mana Ji Bhonsla, 124, 189
 Man Dhata, *raja*, 259
 Mangli Khan, Masud Mangli, 180, 198
 Mani Ram, 214
 Manku Bilal Deccani, 189
 Manku Ji Deccani, s/o Tankaji, 239
 Manohar Das, 249
 Manohar Das, *raja*, 265
 Manohar Das Sisodia, 211
mansab, 2, 7, 14, evolution of 38
mansabdars, 2, number of 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, total of 13, 14, 16, 17
 Man Singh, 23, 200
 Man Singh, s/o Rup Singh Rathor, 234
 Man Singh, s/o Sambha Ji, 200
 Man Singh Kachwaha, *raja*, 102
 Man Singh of Gular, 126, 199
 Marahamat Khan, Mir Ibrahim, 194, 266
 Marahmat Khan alias Dmdar Khan, 242
 Marathas, 11, 14, 15, 28, number of 30
 Marwar, 100, 101
marwadat, 52
 Masud Khan, 201
 Masud Khan, Ahmad Beg, Masud Yadgar, 128, 188
 Masud Khan Sidi Masud, 216
 Masum Khan, Mir Masum, 189
 Maumin Khan Najm Sani, 103
 Mazandaran, 15
 Mednipur, 41n
 Medni Singh, 194
 Mcwar, 22
 Mir, s/o Miran, 233
 Mir Abdul Mabud Bhakkari, 214
 Mir Abul Hasan Shah Shujai, 213
 Mir Abul Ma'ali, 132
 Mir Ahmad, Sa'adat Khan, 127, 183

- Mir Ahmad Khawafi, Mustafa Khan, 184
 Mir Ali Akbar, 210
 Miran, 225
 Mirand, s/o Nek Niyat Khan, 245
 Mir Arah Bakhazri, 209
 Mir Aziz, 59, 213
 Mir Baqar Khan, 206
 Mir Burhani, 207
 Mir Ghayasuddin, 200
 Mir Husain, 253
 Mir Ibrahim, 199
 Mir Khan, Abdul Wahid, 265
 Mir Khan, Amir Khan, 140
 Mir Mahdi Yazdi, 213
 Mir Masum Khan, 125
 Mir Miran, 116
 Mir Mubarakullah, 70
 Mir Muhammad Ashraf, Ashraf Khan, Itmad Khan, 186
 Mir Muhammad Hadi, Hakimul Mulk, 227
 Mir Muhammad Ishaq, Iradat Khan, 184
 Mir Muhammad Ishaq, Mukarram Khan 182
 Mir Muhammad Latif, 70
 Mir Muhammad Mahdi Urdistani, 131, 190
 Mir Muhammad Saeed, Mir Jumla, 19, 97, 98, 121, 147n, 154, exempted the English traders from custom duties, 158, 176
 Mir Muhammad Sanji, 70
 Mir Murad Mazandani, Ghairat Khan, 125
 Mir Niamatullah, 204
 Mir Raziuddin, 201
 Mir Rustam Khawafi, 117, 199
 Mir Salih, 127, 203
 Mir Shamsuddin, Mukhtar Khan, 125, 179
 Mir Sultan Husain, Ifukhar Khan, 418
 Mir Taqi, 187
 Mirza Beg Khan, 264
 Mirza Hakim, 15
 Mirza Khan, s/o Abdur Rahim Khan, 185
 Mirza Khan Manuchhar, 185
 Mirza Muhammad Tahir, 167n
 Mirza Niamatullah, Sohrab Beg, 254
 Mirza Ruhullah, s/o Yusuf Khan Tashkandi, 207
 Mirza Safvi Khan, 148n
 Mirza Sultan Safvi, 122, 181
 Mir Ziauddin Husain, Hummat Khan, Islam Khan, 122
 Mirza Afghan, 127, 198
 Mirza Sen Bundela, 198
 Mohan Singh, 148n
 Mохtasham Khan, 69, 199
 Moïnullah Khan, 221
month-scale, 46-47
 Moreland, W. H., 3, 16, 39, 45 and n, 53, 54n, 63n, 68
 Mosvi Khan, Mirza Muiz Fitrat, 247
 Muzaffar Khan, Siyadat Khan, Mir Muhammad Muazzam, 201
 Mubarak Khan Niyazi, 191
 Mubarak Khan, Sayid Murad Ali, 237
 Mubariz Khan, 183
 Mufakhir Khan, Ifukhar Khan, 259
 Muftakhar Khan, Khan-i-Zaman, Mir Khahl, 178
 Muftakhar Khan, Saifullah Khan, 241
 Muftakhar Khan, Tashrif Khan, Aqa Quli, 200
 Mughal Khan, Arab Shaikh, 187, 228
 Mughal Khan, Muhammad Muqim, 114, 118
 Mughal Khan, Shuja'at Khan alias Shad Khan, 189
 Muhammad Abid, 209
 Muhammad Ali, 195, 233
 Muhammad Ali Khar, 194, 241
 Muhammad Amin Khan, 67, 75, 110, 136n, 146, 175, 176, 219
 Muhammad Amin Khan, Chin Bahadur, 227
 Muhammad Amin Shirazi, 205
 Muhammad Ashraf, 167n
 Muhammad Aslam Khan, 270
 Muhammad Badi Balkhi, 237
 Muhammad Badi Sultan, 186
 Muhammad Baqar, 88
 Muhammad Beg, 42n, 62, 116, 202, 258
 Muhammad Darab Khan, 202
 Muhammad Hasan Sildoz, 120, 213
 Muhammad Hashim, 81, 91, and n
 Muhammad Husain Kambo, 89
 Muhammad Ismail, s/o Najabat Khan, 129
 Muhammad Jafar, s/o Mahram Khar, 264
 Muhammad Jan Beg, 88
 Muhammad Kamyab, 70
 Muhammad Kazim, 8, 10, 23
 Muhammad Khan Bijapuri, 261
 Muhammad Latif, 67
 Muhammad Muazzam, see Shah Alam
 Muhammad Munim, 89, 127
 Muhammad Muqim, 130, 152
 Muhammad Murad Khan, 60, 70, 108, rivalry with Shuja'at Khan, 108n, 261
 Muhammad Murad Khan, Saulat Jang Bahadur, 225
 Muhammad Paragi, 233
 Muhammad Qasim s/o Sher Khan, 70
 Muhammad Qasim Ali Mardan Khan, 213

- Muhammad Quli Khan, 268
 Muhammad Rafi, 70, 262
 Muhammad Raza, 265
 Muhammad Sadiq, 130, 148n
 Muhammad Saeed, 167n
 Muhammad Salih, 70
 Muhammad Salih Kambo, 8, 9, 45n.
 Muhammad Salih Tarkhan, 115, 200
 Muhammad Salim, 211
 Muhammad Sardar, 70
 Muhammad Sharif, 70
 Muhammad Sharif Polakji, 127, 198
 Muhammad Tahir, *di ran* of Gujarat, 66
 Muhammad Taqi, 243
 Muhammad Yar Khan, 228
 Muhammad Zaman Khan Lahori, 268
 Muhkam Singh, 215, 251
 Muhtasham Khan, Mir Muhammad Ibrahim, 227, 259
 Muin Khan, 204
 Mujahid Bijapuri, 191
 Mujahid Khan, Khwaja Muhammad Arif, 238
 Mujahid Khan, Saiyid Hamid Khan, 235
 Mujahid Khan, Saiyid Hamid Bukhari, 208
 Mukand Singh Hara, 114
 Mukarram Khan, Mir Muhammad Ishaq, 227
 Mukarram Khan Safvi, Murad Khan, 132, 178
 Mukhlis Khan, Mir Shamsuddin, 228
 Mukhlis Khan, Mulla Yahya, 192
 Mukhlis Khan, Qazi Nizam Hardazi, 190
 Mukhtar Khan, Mir Qamruddin, 66, 228
 Mukhtar Khan, Mir Shamsuddin, 224
 Mulla Ahmad Naitha, 14, 59, 175
 Mulla Iwaz Wajih, 14, 82, 213
 Multafat Khan, Azam Khan, 106, 122, 167n, 180
 Multafat Khan, Mir Ibrahim Husain, 193
 Multafat Khan, Mir Khan Bahmani, 249
 Munawwar Khan, 202
 Munawwar Khan Barha, Lashkar Khan, 233
 Munawwar Khan, Shaikh Miran, 223
 Munim Khan, Muhammad Munim, 64, 190, 241
 Muqarrab Khan, Khan : Zaman, Fatch Jang, 103, 217
 Muqim Khan, Muhammad Muqim, 209
 Murad Bakhsh, 96 97
 Murad Khan, *zamindar* of Tibet, 206
 Murad Quli Sultan Ghakkar, 196
 Murid Khan, Bhao Singh, 210
 Murnhid Quli Khan, Kartalab Khan, Jafar Khan, 123, 244
 Murtaza, *s/o* Masud Khan, 245
 Murtaza Khan Mirza Matlab, 247
 Murtaza Khan, Saiyid Mubarak, 59, 188, 236
 Murtaza Khan, Saiyid Ibrahim, 113
 Murtaza Khan, Saiyid Shah Muhammad, 125, 178
 Murtaza Quli Khan, 267
 Musavi Khan, 167n
mushrif i-Khazana, 162
mushrif i sarkar, 162
 Mustafa *s/o* Masud Khan, 264
 Mustafa Khan Kashi, 200, 253
 Mustafa Khan, Saiyid Ibrahim Dara Shukohi, 200
 Mutabar Khan, Abdul Qadir, 240
mutaliba, 52
 Mutamad Khan, Dev Afgan, 257
 Mutamad Khan, Khwaja Nur, 202, 255
 Mutamad Khan, Qasim Khan, Muhammad Qasim, 177
 Mutaqad Khan, Muhammad Quli, 191, 243
 Muzaffar Khan, Muhammad Baqa, 249
 Muzaffar Khan, Saiyid Sherzaman Barha, 125, 189, 241
 Naba Ji, 261
 Nagu Ji Mane, 222
 Nahar Khan, Sangram Khan Ghor, 236, 255
 Najabat Khan, *s/o* Saiyid Muzaffar Haidara badi, 240
 Najabat Khan, Bahrawar Khan *s/o* Mirza Shuja, Najabat Khan, 240
 Najabat Khan, Mirza Shuja, 121, 157
 Najabat Khan, Muhammad Ishaq, 237
 Najaf Quli, 69
 Namdar Khan, 102, 180, 226
 Nand Lal, 270
 Nand Nayak, 254
naqqara, 141
 Narnol, 166
 Naroji Raghav, 239
 Nar Singh Gaur, *raja*, 192
 Naru Ji Deccani, 192
 Nasir Ali, 167n
 Nasiri Khan, 141

INDEX

- Nasir Khan, Mansur, 213
 Nasir Khan, Shamsheer Khan, Muhammad Yusuf, 184
 Nasiri Khan, Sayid Mahmud, 123, 176
 Nasiri Khan, Sipahdar Khan, Muhammad Husain, 222
 Nathu Ji Deccani, 224
 Nauniddha Rai, 99n
 Naval Bai, 168
 Nawazish Khan, Abdul Kafi, 187
 Nawazish Khan, Muhammad Abid, 204
 Nawazish Khan, Mukhtar Beg, 211, 238
 Nazir Khan Khwajasara, 213
nazir, 144
 Neknam Khan, 146n, 263
 Nek Nihad Khan, 221
 Neta Ji, s/o Jan Rao, 231
 Netaji, s/o Khandu Rao, 265
 Neto Ji, 179
 Niamatullah s/o Hisamuddin Khan, 129, 213
 Niamatullah Khan, 269
niaz, 144
 Niaz Khan, 70
niyar, 144
 Nur Khan, 70
 Nurul Hasan, 210
 Nurul Hasan Barha, 132
 Nurullah Khan, 154, 237
 Nur Singh, 250
 Nusrat Abad, 237
 Nusrat Khan, Muhammad Sami, 265
 Nusrat Khan, Nusratullah, 189

 Obedullah Khan, 245
 Orcha, 229
 Orissa, 62
 Oudh, 62, 147

 Padam Singh, s/o Rao Karan, 269
 Padam Singh Bundela, 256
 Padisah Quli Khan, 222
 Pahar Singh Bundela, 262
 Pahar Singh Gaur, 196, 250
 Pahlia Wija, 212
pahegi, term, definition of, 74, 92, Scarcity of, 93
 Pam Nayak, 223
 Param Dro, 233
 Para Ram, 223
 Parya Nayak, 221

 Patang Rao, 233
 Patan, *sarker*, 75
 Pelsaert, 63n, 68
 Persuji, 114, 184
 Poran Mal Bundela, 193
 Pratab Singh, 59
 Prem Singh, 210
 Prushutam Singh, 269
 Prithi Raj Thani, 119
 Prithi Chand, *raja*, 203
 Prithi Singh, 194
 Purandhar, 97, 105
 Purdil Khan, Bheel Afghan, 124, 188

 Qabad Beg, 203
 Qabad Khan, 69, 115, 180
 Qabil Khan, 14, 151, 215, 269
 Qadir Dad Ansari, Shaikh Nurullah, 209, 252
 Qadir Dad Khan, 206
qabz, 83
 Qaladar Khan, Baizan Beg, 192
 Qaladar Khan, Mirza Ali Arab, 208
 Qaladar Khan, Nusrat Khan, 194
 Qalandar Khan, Muhammad Shah Mughal, 126
 Qalandar Khan, Qalandar Beg, 199, 251
 Qalandar Khan, Qalandar Daudzai, 207
 Qalia Tajammul, *zamindar* of Tibet, 235
 Qamruddin Khan, Mir Muhammad Fazil, 239
 Qandahar, 55n., 102
 Qasim Khan, property escheated, 67n, 70, 112, 147n
 Qasim Khan Kirmani, 224
 Qazalbash Khan, 128, 195
 Qazi Abdullah, 105
 Qazi Nazam Karsarodi, 127
 Qazwini, 10, 74n
 Qiwamuddin Khan, 108, 182, 230
 Quli Khan, Abid Khan, 182, 219
 Quli Khan, Ahushhal Beg Qaqhal, 193
 Quli Khan, Muhammad Sharif, 120
 Qutbuddin Khan, ambassador of Turan, 268
 Qutbuddin Khan Kheshti, 134, 183
 Qurub Kashi, 213

 Ra'ad Andaz Beg, 126, 181
 Ra'ad Andaz Khan, 41n., 84, 264
 Raghuji, 200, 240
 Raghu Nath Rai Rayan, 186
 Raghu Nath, *raja*, 14, 145

- Raghu Nath Singh Bhartiya, 201
 Raghu Nath Singh Meerath, 201, 254
 Raghu Nath Singh Rathor, 202
 Raghu Nath Singh Sisodia Chandrawat, 186
rahdari, term, 81, definition of, 159n
 Raheri, 147
 Rahim Dad Khan, 108n
 Rahimuddin Khan, 110, 256
 Rahman Dad Khan, 260
 Rahman Khan, 257
 Rahmat Khan, Mir Imamuddin, 65 and n,
 117, 135, 195
 Rahmat Khan, Ziauddin, 195
 Rai Bhan, 220
 Rai Makrand, 198
 Rai Singh, *raja*, 59, honoured by *nam* assign-
 ments, 75, 112, 179
 Rai Sen, 147
raiya, 85
 Raja Ram, 106, 108, 110
 Raj Singh, Rana, 218
 Raji, 201
 Rajput, 4, 14, 15, clans of, 15, 16, 99, 100
 Raj Roop Kohistani, *raja* 124, 182
 Ramaji, 271
 Rambhaji Deccani, 197
 Ram Chand, 69
 Ram Chand, *zamindar* and *Thanedar* of
 Kahtanun, 242
 Ram Rao, 262
 Ram Singh Hara, 109, 163n, 234
 Ram Singh Kachwaha, 114, 177, 220
 Ram Singh Rathor, 114
 Ram Singh s/o Ratan Rathor, 206, 249
 Ram Singh Sisodia *raja*, 239
 Rana Amar Singh, 26
 Rana Gharib Das Sisodia, 134
 Ranaji, 252
 Ranaji Janardan, 223
 Rana Raj Singh, 22, 97, 121, 176
 Randola Khan, Ghazi Bijapuri, 122, 179, 224
 Ranga Rayal, *zamindar* of Karnatik, 143n
 Rani Hadi, 101
 Ranmasi Khan Panni, Bahadur Khan, 179
 Rao Amar Singh Hara, 181, 226
 Rao Dalpat, 69
 Rao Ji, 247
 Rao Joghat, 267
 Rao Karan Bharatiya, 183, 268
 Rao Man Singh s/o Jedaun Rai, 267
 Rao Ram Chand, s/o Dalpat Bundela, 70,
 242
 Rao Ratan Singh, 252
 Rao Satar Sal Hara, 113
 Rashid Khan, 152
 Rashid Khan, Badiuzzaman Mahabat Khan,
 257
 Rashid Khan, Ilhamullah, 226
 Rasik Das Karori, 81, 91,
 Ratan Rathor, 115
 Rawal Ram Singh of Dungarpur, 260
 Rawat Mal Jhala, 41n, 69
 Raziuddin Muhammad Haiderabadi, 181
 Rehman Dad Khan, 259
 Riyat Khan, 196
 Rizvi Khan, Sayid Ali, 187, 237
 Roop Singh Rathor, *raja*, 113
 Rubullah Khan, 60n, 75n, 146, 195, 220
 Russians, 15
 Rustam Ali Khan, Inayat Khan, 249
 Rustam Dil Khan, 60n, 238
 Rustam Khan, Feroz Jang Deccani, 112
 Rustam Khan, s/o Qazalbash Khan, 207
 Rustam Khan, Sayid Feroz, 117
 Rustam Rao, 124, 189
 Sa'adat Khan, 58, 182, 188
 Sa'adat Khan, Mir Ahmad, 231
 Sa'adatmand Khan, 223
 Sa'adullah Khan, 14, 44n, 52
 Sabal Singh Sisodia, 190
 Sadat Khan, 124
 Sadhuji, s/o Nagu Ji, 239
 Sadhuji, 252
 Sadiq Khan, 113
 Saeed Khan, Abdullah Khan, 115, 185
 Saeed Khan, Khanazad Khan, Arslan Khan,
 Muhammad Rashid, 239
 Safavid, kingdom, 17, 18
 Safdar Khan, Mirza Jamaluddin Husain,
 248
 Safi Khan, 186, 229
 Saf Shikan Khan, 70, 89, 108
 Saf Shikan Khan, Izzat Khan, 226
 Saf Shikan Khan, Mir Sadruddin, 226
 Saf Shikan Khan, Muhammad Shuja, 247
 Saf Shikan, Muhammad Tahir, 125, 184
 Safvi Khan, Mir Ali Naqi Safi, 236
 Saharanpur, 146
sah bandu, definition of, 163, 164
 Saif Bijapuri, 130, 190
 Saif Khan, s/o Saifuddin Mahmud, 268
 Saif Khan, Faqirullah, Saifuddin Mahmud,
 128, 167n, 189, 213
 Saif Khan, Murza Inayatullah, 245
 Saifullah Arab, 129, 207
 Saifullah Khan, 262

- Saiyid Abdullah Khan Barha, Saiyid Mian, 263
 Saiyid Abdul Qadir Khan, 217
 Saiyid Abul Hasan Haiderabad, 236
 Saiyid Ahmad, 118, 176
 Saiyid Ahmad Bukhari, 120
 Saiyid Ahmad Khan Khattab, 208
 Saiyid Alam Barha, 132
 Saiyid Ali, 193, 212
 Saiyid Anwar, 207
 Saiyid Asadullah, 261
 Saiyid Asalat Khan, 257
 Saiyid Ayub, 230
 Saiyid Azmatullah Khan, 246
 Saiyid Badan, 255
 Saiyid Bahadur Barha, 207
 Saiyid Bahadur Bhakkari, 118
 Saiyid Feroz, Rustam Khan, 204
 Saiyid Ghairat Khan, 119
 Saiyid Hasan Ali Khan Barha, 69, 134, 193
 Saiyid Hidayatullah, 191
 Saiyid Ibrahim, 252
 Saiyid Ibrahim, Dara Shukoh, 119
 Saiyid Jalal Khan Bukhari, 146
 Saiyid Karamullah Barha, 267
 Saiyid Mansur Khan, 127, 135, 186
 Saiyid Maqbul Alam Barha, 119
 Saiyid Masud Barha, 117, 196
 Saiyid Mirza Sabzwari, 212
 Saiyid Mudassar, 70
 Saiyid Muhammad, s/o Shujaul Muik, 259
 Saiyid Muhammad Khan, Mir Muhammad Murad, 197
 Saiyid Muhammad, Qaladar of Bangalore, 222
 Saiyid Munawwar Barha, 119, 193
 Saiyid Muqtadar, 208
 Saiyid Muzaffar Haiderabad, 218
 Saiyid Nahar Khan Barha, 120
 Saiyid Najabat Barha, 119
 Saiyid Nasiruddin Khan Deccani, 129, 207
 Saiyid Niaz Khan, 256
 Saiyid Nurul Ayan Barha, 119
 Saiyid Qasim Barha, 114, 132, 185
 Saiyid Quli Uzbek, 133
 Saiyid Saif Khan, Nurul Dahr Barha, 250
 Saiyid Salabat Khan, 115
 Saiyid Salar Barha, 117
 Saiyid Shah, 223
 Saiyid Shaikhan Barha, 135
 Saiyid Sheraf Khan, 268
 Saiyid Sher Khan Barha, 115, 186, 234
 Saiyid Shuja'at Khan Bahadur Bhakkari, 210
 Saiyid Sultan Karbalai, 195
 Saiyid Wajihuddin Barha, 260
 Saiyid Yadgar Husain Barha, 212
 Saiyid Yusuf, 126
 Saiyid Yusuf Khan Bukhari, 254
 Saiyid Zainul Abidin Bukhari, 212
 Salabat Deccani, 201
 Salabat Khan, Khwaja Mir Khawafi, 241
 Salabat Khan, Muhammad Ibrahim, 244
 Salih Khan, Hakim Salih Shirazi, 204, 257
 Samandar Khan, Samandar Beg, 69, 259
 Sambhaji Bandhara, s/o Laji Bandhara, 239
 Samugarh, 95
 Sanbhar, *pargana*, 156n
 Sarang Dhar of Jammun, *reja*, 129, 197
 Sar Andaz Khan Panni Bijapuri, 245
 Sarbaz Khan, 206
 Sarbuland Khan Khwaja Musa, 268
 Sarbuland Khan, Khwaja Yaqut Naqshbandi, 260
 Sarbuland Khan, Rahmatullah, 118, 182, 222
 Sardar Khan, Dildost, 69, 184, 231
 Sardar Khan, Ihtimam Khan, Sardar Beg, 255
 Sardar Singh Hara, 60n
 Sarfaraz Khan, 121, 207
 Sarfaraz Khan Deccani, 178
 Sarfaraz Khan, Saiyid Latif, 218, *sar i khalil*, 38
 Sarkar (of the nobles) definition of, 161
 Sarup Singh, 255
 Sarup Singh, *reja*, 259
 Satar Lal Rathor, 253
 Satnamis, 98
 Satvad Dafalya, 219
 Saun Singh, 129, 209
sauwar, term, 3, 10, 12, 40, 41, definition of, 44, 53
 Sazawar Khan, Isa Beg, 128
 Sazawar Khan, Shafiqatullah, 202, 257
 Shabbir Panni, 253
 Shafi Khan, Haji Muhammad Shafi, 212, 257
 Shah Alam, Prince, 22, 60n, 83, 88, opposed to the forward policy in the Deccan, 103
 Shahamat Khan, 62
 Shahamat Khan, Saiyid Qasim Barha, 233
 Shahbaz, 134
 Shahbaz Khan Afghan, 196
 Shah Beg Khan, 179
 Shah Jahan, 4, 7, 8, 9, and n, net increase in the *zat* and *sauwar* rank under, 10, 15, 19, 21, number of Rajput nobles under, 23, 24, 27, Hindu *mansabdars* under 31, 42, 43, 46, *farmen* regarding month scale,

- 40, 49, 50, 52, 54, 56, 64, extent of *khalsa* under, 74
- Shah Jahan Abad, 165, 166
- Shahi Khan, Shah Beg Khan Kashghari, 204, 257
- Shah Nawaz Khan, 62, 112
- Shah Nawaz Khan, Mirza Sadruddin Muhammad Khan Safvi, 229
- Shah Nawaz Khan Safvi, 147n, 176
- Shahpur, 230
- Shah Quli Khan, 255
- Shah Quli Khan, Muhammad Amir, 224
- Shah Quli Khan, Sultan Beg, 191
- Shahsawar Khan, 258
- Shahu, 29, 217
- Shaikh Abdulla, 240
- Shaikh Abdul Aziz, 128
- Shaikh Abdul Hamid, 205
- Shaikh Abdul Karim Thanasari, 193
- Shaikh Abdul Qawi, 14, 128, 179
- Shaikh Ali Bijapuri, 205
- Shaikh Anwar, 42n
- Shaikh Farid, 211
- Shaikh Ghulam Mustafa, 167n
- Shaikh Ikram, 66
- Shaikh Ladu, 227
- Shaikh Mirak Haravi, 187
- Shaikh Mir Khawafi, 121, 176
- Shaikh Muazzam, 117
- Shaikh Mustafa, 265
- Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh, 166
- Shaikh Nizam Qureshi, 205
- Shaikh Nizam, s/o Shaikh Farid, 120, 211
- Shaikh Raziuddin, Khan, 253
- Shaikh ul Islam, 105, 146
- Shaista Khan, Mirza Abu Talib, 19, property escheated, 67n, 97, 98, 102, 104, 105, hostile to the Marathas, 106, 121, 136n, 159, 166, 175, 216
- Shakir Khan, 70
- Shakur Khan Bijapuri, 264
- Shambhaji, 101, 103, captured, 106, 176
- Shamsher Khan Hayat Tarin, 185
- Shamsher Khan, Mir Yaqub, 214
- Shemsher Khan, Muhammad Ibrahim Qureshi, 243
- Shamsher Khan Tarin, Husain Khan, 237
- Shamsuddin Khan, Hakim Shamsa, 236
- Shamsuddin Kheshti, 123, 185
- Sharza Khan, Abdur Rehman Bijapuri, 123, 182, 246
- Sharza Rao Kawa, 200
- Sharza Khan, Rustam Khan, Saiyid Makhdoon, 217
- Sharif Khan, Shah Khwaja Husain, 208, 248
- Shariful Mulk Haiderabadi, 236
- Sheo Ram Gaur, 115
- Sher Afgan, 66, 69, 251
- Sher Andaz Khan or Teer Andaz Khan, 247
- Sher Baz Khan, 223
- Sher Khan, 88
- Sher Singh, *reja*, 211
- Sher Singh Rathor, 205
- Shivaji, 29, 97, 98, 103, 104, 136n
- Shivji, 250
- Shiv Singh, 244, 252
- Shuja, 19, 23, supporters of, 96-97
- Shuja' at Khan, Ghairat Khan, Muhammad Ibrahim, 41, 61, 124, 158, 177
- Shujat Khan Haiderabadi, 220
- Shujat Khan, Kartalab Khan, Muhammad Beg, 205, 220
- Shuja' at Khan, Muhammad Shuja, 212
- Shuja' at Khan, Saiyid Muzaffar Barha, 196
- Shuja Khan, Ghairat Beg, 130, 207
- Shukrullah Khan, 70
- Shukrullah Khan Khawafi, 250
- Sidi Ibrahim, 210, 265
- Sidi Khan Muhammad, 223
- Sidi Miftah, 89, 167
- Sidi Salim Khan, 222
- Sidi Yaqut, 245
- Sikandarpur, 62
- Sikandar Rohela, 126, 198
- Sipahdar Khan, Mukhtar Khan 173
- Sipahdar Khan, Nusrat Khan, 251
- Sivaji, s/o Saruji, 261
- Siyadat Khan, 75n
- Siyadat Khan, Mir Ziauddin Ali Mashhadi, 182
- Siyadat Khan, Muazzam Khan, 235
- Siyadat Khan, s/o Sayid Aughlan, 241
- Siyadat Khan, Saiyid Aughlan, 230
- Siyaji, 227
- Sohrab, 233
- Sohrab Khan, Mirza Niamatullah, 201
- Sorath, 147
- Srinagar, 15, 209, 210
- Subh Karan Bundela, 130, 188, 239
- Sujan Rao, 223
- Sujan Singh Bundela, 115, 182
- Sujan Singh, 246
- Sujan Singh Sisodia, 116
- Sulaiman Khan, 248
- Sulaiman Shukoh, 23, 145

- Sultan Husain, 118
 Sultan Singh, 263
 Sultan Yar, 135
 Sume Nayak, 233
 Sundar Das Sisodia, 59
 Suraj Mal Gaur, 207
 Suraj Mal, *raja*, 265
 Surat, 75n, 98, 154, 158
- tabinan*, term, 44, recruitment of, 163 64
 Tahawur Khan, Muhammad Aqil Barlas, 191
 Tahawur Khan, Padshah Quli Khan, 101,
 164, 165, 182, 228, 260
tahbazari, 159n.
 Tahir Khan, Mughal Khan, Hayat Shaikh,
 248
 Tahir Khan, Tahir Shaikh, 114, 179, 240
 Tajeks, 15
takfif-i dami, 77
 Takuji, 231, 254
talab, term, 43, 46, 50, 51, 52
 Talai Muhammad Yar Khan, Mir Sultan
 Husain, 241
 Tamaji, *zamindar* of Kach, 208
 Tanuji, 194
 Taqarrub Khan, Hakim Daud, 180
 Tarbiyat Khan Balas, Shafiullah, 60n,
 62, 108, 147n, 162n, 180, 225
 Tarbiyat Khan, Mir Muhammad Khalil, 227
 Tarbiyat Khan, Muhammad Ishaq, 230
Tarkai, 159n
 Tarmakji Bhonsla, 126
 Teemaji, 244
 Teer Andaz Khan, Muhammad Beg, 196, 247
 Tersuji, 230
 Tibet, 15, 206, 235
 Tilak Singh, 70
 Todar Mal, 14, 192
 Trans Oxiana, 15, 163, 164
 Trimbakji Bhonsla, 190
tuman, 38
 Turanis, 15, 17, 18, proportion of, 18, number
 of, 19, 59
 Turkataz Khan, Nur-i Beg, 209, 245
- Umar Tarin, 206
 Uzbek Khan Naudarti, 248
 Uzbek Khan, Tatar Beg, 210
 Uzbek, kingdom, 17, 18
- Vyas Rao or Biyas Rao, 193
 Vyankat, 269
- Waheed Khan, 201, 262
 Wakinkera, 110
 Wali Beg Kalali, 211
 Wali Dad, 70
 Wali Mihaldar, 125, 193
 Wancrathji, 208
 Wankar Rao, 209
watan-jagir, 13, 26, origin and definition of,
 79, 100
Waza i dam i-Chauthai, 50
Waza i ghair hazri, 165
 Wazir Khan, Mirza Askar, 148, 249
 Wazir Khan, Muhammad Salih, 117
 Wazir Khan, Muhammad Tahir, 121, 177
 William Norris, 151
- Yadgar Beg, 118
 Yahya Pasha, 201
 Yakataz Khan, 195, 266
 Yakataz Khan, Mukhlis Khan, Abdullah
 Beg, 123, 186
 Yalingsh Khan Bahadur, 195, 238
 Yaqub Khan, 250
 Yaqut Khan, 194
 Yasaji, s/o Baharji, 260
 Yasun Khan, 244
 Yaswant Rao Deccani, 225
 Yaswant Rao, Kartalab Khan, 179
 Yardani, 199
 Yusuf Khan Tashkandi, 207
 Yusuf Khan, Yusuf Bijapuri, 202
 Yusufzais, 98
- Zabardast Khan, Hayat Afghan, 62, 127,
 197
 Zabardast Khan, Muhammad Khalil, 225
 Zabardast Khan, Wafadar Khan, 250
zabt, 84
 Zafar Ahsan Khan, 114
 Zafar Khan, 167n, 171, 173, 262
- Uday Bhan Rathor, 199
 Uday Singh of Chamba, *raja*, 267
 Uday Singh, *raja*, s/o Maha Singh Bhaduriya,
 263
 Udat Singh Bhaduriya, 233
 Udat Singh Bundela, *raja*, 229

- Zainul Abidin Bukhari, 129 .
- zamindar*, 3, 4, 12, total number in the nobility 13, definition of, 84
- zat*, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 40, 41, definition of, 44; 53, pay of, 71-73
- Zulfiqar Khan Bahadur, Nusrat Jang, 59, 108, 109, 110, 138, *mahi marahib* conferred by Aurangzeb, 141; 148, 167n, 219
- Zulhqar Khan, Muhammad Beg, 179
- Zulqadar Khan, Ahmad Beg, 127, 191

ERRATA

- p 33 : l 6 from bottom : For '*64 mansabdars*' read '*63 mansabdars*'.
- p 34 : l. 14 from bottom : For '*12 mansabdars*' read '*13 mansabdars*'.
- p 34 : l. 11 from bottom : For '8' read '9'.
- p 54 : l. 22 : For '*so dagh*' read '*to dagh*'.
- p 103 : l. 33 : For 'Badhur Khan' read 'Bahadur Khan'.
- p 123 : No 27 : For 'Muftakhor Khan' read 'Muftakhar Khan'.
- p 132 : l 7 (sub heading): For '*Mansabdars of 5,000 to 4,500*'
read '*Mansabdars of 3,000 to 4,500*'.
- p 155 : fn 2 (last line) . For '161-164' read '1661 1664'.
- p 177 . No 24 : Under col 4 ('Group'), for 'Indian' read 'Turani'.
- p 242 . No 259 : Under col. 3 ('Country of birth'), for 'India' read 'Iran'.

- Zainul Abidin Bukhari, 129 -
zamindar, 3, 4, 12, total number in the nobility 13, definition of, 84
zat, 2, 3 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 40, 41, definition of, 44, 53, pay of, 71 73
- Zulfiqar Khan Bahadur, Nusrat Jang 5
 108, 109, 110, 138, *mafi maratib* conferred by Aurangzeb, 141, 148, 167n,
 Zulfiqar Khan, Muhammad Beg 179
 Zulqadar Khan, Ahmad Beg, 127, 191