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In this thesis I have tried to evince the position of the Rajputs as a group in the Mughal hierarchy. Akbar was the first Mughal Emperor who recruited the Rajput chiefs in his service. They enjoyed high position under Akbar. But—the debate among the modern historians about the deterioration in the status of the Rajput nobility under Jahangir and Shah Jahan attracted me to examine this problem thoroughly. I have taken into account the Rajput chiefs of whole of the Mughal Empire. It helps me to see their position in the context of other sections of the Mughal nobility. Besides, I have strived to show the status enjoyed by the different Rajput clans and individual chiefs within the Rajput nobility. I have worked out the factors responsible for the fluctuations in the fortunes of the different Rajput clans and individuals. However, wherever possible, the subsequent information has been used to perceive the Mughal-Rajput polity more clearly.
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Chapter I

THE RAJPUTS AND THE MUGHAL EMPIRE:
THE ANTECEDENTS UNDER AKBAR

Emperor Akbar realising the potentialities of local zamindārs absorbed them in the Mughal hierarchy. Among these zamindārs, Rajputs occupied an important place. By this time, they had established a number of principalities in large regions, while elsewhere they formed a dominant agrarian class. In their regions, they held strong forts for their defence. One of the reasons which prompted Akbar to conciliate with these local zamindārs is explained by 'Ārif Qandhari, historian of Akbar's early reign. According to him, there were some two or three hundred rājas (rāja-i zamindār, ruling chiefs) who possessed very strong forts. 'Ārif Qandhari says that since each fort would have taken one or half year to conquer, it was not possible for an Emperor of Hindōstān to conquer all the forts of rājas by force; it was thought better by Akbar to conciliate them. This was all the more advantageous, says 'Ārif Qandhari, since the Rajputs had determined to be sincere and loyal to the Emperor.¹ These chiefs played a considerable

role in extending his authority. Akbar rewarded them by assigning high mansab, offices and jagirs. Akbar cemented his bonds with them by contracting matrimonial alliances. Certainly, all of Rajput chiefs were not treated with equal generosity. The highest privileges were enjoyed by only a few of them. Abul Fazl has furnished us with the traditional figures of infantry and cavalry of some of the important Rajput clans. Obviously these figures are inflated; but the figures are indicative of the relative size of each of the different Rajput clans as popularly believed, at the end of Akbar's reign. The following table of the clans and their military strength shows the hierarchical position of the Rajput clans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>Cavalry</th>
<th>Infantry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rathor</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chauhan</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jadon</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Solanki</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ghelot</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kachamesha</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Panwar</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tunwar</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Barjucer</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, a pertinent question arises as to the criterion on whose basis these chiefs were enrolled in the service? The selection may also be viewed geographically: From what areas the favoured Rajputs came? For this purpose, relying upon the information in the Āin-i Akbarī, I have prepared a list of personae belonging to the different sarkāra where Rajput clans are recorded as zamīndārs. I have also prepared two maps showing the geographical distribution of zamīndārs of the different Rajput clans in Akbarī Empire.

Kachawaha

Bhār Māl was the first Rajput chief who along with a number of Kachwaha chiefs joined Akbar’s service in 1562. He entered into matrimonial ties with Akbar by marrying his daughter to him. Subsequently, in 1584 Bhagwant Dās’ daughter was given in marriage to Prince Salīm. \(^1\) Throughout Akbar’s reign, the Kachwaha nobles enjoyed a privileged position among the Rajput chiefs. They were assigned important offices. In 1572, when Akbar left for Gujarat, Bhār Māl was appointed vazīr-i mutlaq (Minister with Unlimited Powers) and was left behind at Agra. \(^2\) In 1583, Jagannāth and Lunkarān were

---

appointed to look after the department of armoury and communications. Raja Askaran was put in charge of the properties of the deceased. At the same time, Jagmāl got the charge of the department of purchase and sales. In 1584, when Akbar introduced two posts of sūbedārī in each sūba, Jagannāth, Raja Askaran, Raja Bhagwant Dāś and Kunwar Mān Singh were simultaneously appointed as sūbedārī of the sūbas of Ajmer, Āgra, Lāhore and Kābul respectively. In 1591, when the Khālīsa administration was reorganised and Akbarī Empire was divided into four divisions, Rām Dāś was made in charge of one of the divisions consisting of the sūbas Āgra, Allāhabād, Bihār and Bengāl. In 1596, when the exaction of taxābā was forbidden throughout the Empire, Rām Dāś was assigned the charge of the routes from Lāhore to Gujarāt. During the period 1595-1605, the offices of qilādār of three important forts Rohīta, Ranthambhore and Gwalior were respectively held by Mān Singh.

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p.511.
5. Ibid., p.603.
6. Ibid., p.670.
7. Ibid., tr. p.1251, F.N.1; Tāzaqān-1 Jahāṅgīrī, p.65.
Jagannath¹ and Rāj Singh.² Akbar appointed the Rajput nobles
to guard his harem; but Kachawaha nobles seem to have
especially preferred for this purpose. Rām Dās and Raisāl
darbārī were thus appointed guardians of harem.³

Towards the end of Akbar's reign, there were eleven
Kachawaha nobles out of thirty Rajput mansabdārs of 200 and
above. All the Kachawahas belonged to the sūba of Ajmer.⁴
They did not hold a compact or extensive territory,⁵ however.
They held zamīndāri rights in the sūbas of Ajmer and Āgra. A
part of the serkār of Ajmer was in the zamīndāri of Kachawahas.⁶
From other sources, one knows that the Kachawahas enjoyed
zamīndāri rights in Āmber,⁷ Dessa,⁸ Sāmbhar,⁹ Narāīna,¹⁰ Nāsta,¹¹

1. Akbarnāma, III, p.825; Muhta Nainsī-re-Khyāt, I, p.301.
3. Zakhirat-ul KhwānIn, II, pp.366-67; Ma'āshir-ul Umarī, II,
   pp.192-97, 192-94.
4. See Appendix 'B'.
5. See Map No.2
8. Ibid., p.156.
Sānganer, 1 Phāgī 2 and Mauzābād. 3 In sarkār Nāgore, the Shāikhwāl Khawāhās held Amarear 4 and Manohārānagar 5 in their zamīndāris.

In the sūbā of Āgra, seven parganās have Khawāhās recorded as the zamīndār-caste in the Āin-i Akbari. These were the parganās of Bilāspur in sarkār Kālpī, 6 Anthlabhabru in Alwar, 7 Khandala in Nārnāul 8 and Sahār and three parganās (Ribāl, Khokha, and Kharela) in sarkār Erach. 9 But no Khawāhā from these parganās of sūbā Āgra is known to have held any mansab.

Rāthors:

In the early years of Akbar’s reign, the Rāthors chiefs of Jedhpur, Bikāner and Merta joined Akbar’s service. Akbar contracted matrimonial ties with the chiefs of Jedhpur, Bikāner

1. Vīr Vīnād, p.1273, Sānganer was founded by Bhār Mal’s brother Sāngā.
2. Vakīl Nāma, dated 1693 A.D., RSA Bikāner,
4. Ibīd., p.318.
5. Akkurnāma, III, p.221.
6. Āin-i Akbari, II, p.244.
8. Ibīd., p.449.
9. Ibīd.
and Merta.\(^1\) Rathor chiefs were also assigned important offices. In 1586, Rāo Rāi Singh of Bīkāner was appointed one of the two sūbādārā of sūba Lāhore.\(^2\) In 1604, Akbar assigned pargana Shamsabād to Rāo Rāi Singh as his watan lāqīr.\(^3\) In 1596, Rām Rāi and Kesu Dās were appointed diwāna of the sūbas of Delhi and Āgra respectively. At the end of Akbar's reign, seven Rathor nobles held the mansabā of 10,800/2000.\(^6\) All of them, except Pratāp, chief of Baglāna, belonged to the sūba of Ajmer.\(^7\)

The Rathors were found as zamīndārā in five sūbas, namely, Āgra, Malwa, Gujarāt, Delhi and Ajmer. In the sūba of Delhi, they held zamīndārī rights in six pargānae belonging to the sarkār of Hisār Fīroza. The pargana of Bhatnār was in the bhūmī rights of Rathors.\(^8\) A part of the zamīndārī of the other five pargānae namely Bhangiwal, Bharangi, Toshān, Sidhmukh and Fathabād were held by them.\(^9\)

---

1. For the matrimonial ties, see Appendix 'B' of Chapter VI.
5. Ibid.
6. See Appendix A.
7. See Appendix A.
9. Ibid., pp.526, 527.
In sūba Mālwa, the Rathors enjoyed zamīndārī rights in the sarkār of Ujjain and Sārangpur. In sarkār Ujjain, they held the parganas Ujjain and Badhnāwar in their zamīndārī and in sarkār Sārangpur, they enjoyed zamīndārī rights in the parganas of Palpūn and Muhammadpur.

In sūba Āgra, the pargana Shamsabād in sarkār Kannauj had Rathor zamīndārī. In sūba Gujarāt, the Rathors are recorded against the pargana of Idar which belonged to the sarkār of Ahmadabad. Another large tract between Surat and Nandurbar, known as Baglāna was held by the Rathor chief Pratāp.

In sūba Ajmer, Rathors held the bulk of Western Rājastrān within their two great principalities of Jodhpur and Bīkāner. Jodhpur constituted a sarkār by itself and the principality of Bīkāner accounted for about half the sarkār of Bīkāner (which also contained Jaibāler). In sarkār Nāgaur, the pargana of Merta had Rathor zamīndārī.

2. Ibid., p.442.
3. Ibid., p.446.
4. Ibid., p.486.
5. Ibid., p.492.
6. Ibid., p.511.
7. Ibid., p.573.
Ghelotes:

In 1577, Rawal Askaran and Rawal Pratap, chiefs of Dungarpur and Bānswāra accepted Mughal suzerainty. Rawal Askaran also gave his daughter in marriage to Akbar. Neither of the chiefs received mansabs. Rawal Punja of Dungarpur and Rawal Samari of Bānswāra are noticed as mansabdārān only in the first decade of Shāh Jahān's reign. The principalities of Dungarpur and Bānswāra belonged to the sarkār of Sirohi within sūba of Ajmer.

Ghelotes held zamīndāri rights in the sūbas of Awadh, Agra, Delhi and Ajmer. In sarkār Awadh, pargana Panchhamnāth and in sarkār Lucknow, parganas Banjarmāu and Sandilāh were in their zamīndāri. In sūba Agra, their zamīndāris were in parganas of Jalesar and Maluk Sāh which belonged to the sarkārs of Agra and Kannauj respectively. In sūba Delhi, pargana of Deena belonged to them.

---

2. Lahorī, Bādshāhnāma, I, pp.305, 308.
4. Ibid., pp.413, 439.
5. Ibid., pp.443, 446.
6. Ibid., p.519.
Sisodias:

The Sisodias are a sub-clan of Ghelots.¹ In the early years of Akbar’s reign, Jagmāl who was disgruntled with his younger brother the famous Rāna Pratāp of Mewār joined Akbar’s service.² Another Sisodia chief who took up Akbar’s service was Sagar.³ Rāi Durga of Rāmpura also joined Mughal service.⁴ Rāi Durga was given some administrative offices. In 1584, he was one of the nobles who was put in charge of Khālisā administration.⁵ In 1586, he was appointed the deputy suḥdār of Ajmer.⁶

Sisodias held zamīndārī rights in the sūba of Mālwa and Ajmer. In sūba Mālwa, three parqānas Ringnad, Basarah and Jamiawāra, in sarkār of Mandsor, were in their zamīndārī.⁷ The sarkār of Chittor was actually the great Sisodia principality of Mewār; even though the Mughals had occupied large portions of Mewār, the A’in-i Akbārī records the Sisodias as the zamīndārī of Chittor.⁸

---

6. Ibid., p. 311.
8. Ibid., p. 509.
Bhātīs:

In 1570, the Bhātī chief Rāwal Har Rāj of Jaisalmer accepted Mughal suzerainty and gave his daughter in marriage to Akbar.¹ After Har Rāj's death in 1578, his son and successor Rāwal married his daughter to Prince Salīm².

The Bhātīs were scattered over the sūbas of Delhi, Lāhore, Multān and Ajmer. In sūba Delhi, they held a part of the parganas of Khizrabād and Sikandrabād as zamīndāre.³ In the sarkār of Sirhind, pargana Bhatinda was in their bhūmī rights.⁴ In the sūbas of Lāhore and Multān, they held a number of parganas.⁵ The Bhātīs of Lāhore and Multān were, however, Muslims⁶ and, therefore, separated from the Bhātī Rajputs in all but name. In sūba Ajmer the Bhātīs are recorded as zamīndāre in Jaisalmer,⁷ Pugal and Bikampur.⁸

---

2. Tuzuk-i Jahānaštī, pp.159-60.
4. Ibid., p.527.
5. See Appendix B
Hādaśā:

In the early years of Akbar's reign, Rāo Surjan Hāda of Bundī submitted to the Mughals. A large portion of sarkār Ranthambhore, which was in the possession of the Rāo, was taken by the Mughals. Rāo Surjan and his son Bhoj were taken into imperial service. In the sūba of Ajmer, the Āīn records the whole sarkār of Ranthambhor within the zamīndāri of the Hādas.

Chauhāṇa:

In 1595, there were two Chauhān chiefs Medini Rai and Rām Chand who held mansab. But the region from where they came, is not known. The Āīn-i Akbarī records the Chauhāns as zamīndāres in six sūbas, Awadh, Āgra, Mālwa, Gujarāt, Delhi and Ajmer. They held zamīndāri rights in as many as sixty pergānas. But unlike the Sisodias of Mēwār, Rāthors of Jodhpur and Hādas of Ranthambhore, they no longer possessed any large principalities. Their zamīndāri rights were scattered in the different

---

3. Āīn-i Akbarī, I, pp.161, 162.
4. Ibid., II, pp.509-11.
5. Ibid., I, p.227.
perganas and sarkārs. In sūba of Āgra, they are recorded against 32 perganas in the sarkār of Āgra - 6, Kannauj - 11, Kol - 7, Alwar - 4, Nārīnol - 3 and Kālpī-1. In sūba Malwa, they held zamīndāri rights of eleven perganas, nine of which were in the sarkār of Sārangpur, and the remaining two in sarkār Chandeli and Mandesor. In sūba Delhi too they held eleven perganas: sarkār Delhi - 5, Sirhind - 4, Bādāun - 1 and Sambhal - 1. In sūba Awadh, five perganas returned them as their zamīndārs, viz., 3 perganas in sarkār Awadh, one in Khairabād, and one in Lucknow. In sūba Gujarāt, three perganas of sarkār of Ahmadabād returned Chauhān zamīndārs. In sūba Ajmer, the zamīndārī of sarkār Ajmer was shared by the Chauhāns, Kachewānas and Afghāns.

1. See Map No.2.
2. For the names of the perganas, see Appendix 'B'.
5. Ibid, p.466.
6. Ibid., pp.518, 519, 520.
8. Ibid., p.523.
10. Ibid., pp.493, 494.
Panwàrs:

In the north-east of sarkar of Little Cutch (Jàmnagar), the pargana of Chaubisí was held by Panwâr Râjputa.¹ During Akbar's Gujarat campaign (1575-78 AD), Morvi which was held by Karan Panwâr was assigned to Khangar, chief of Cutch.² In 1592, it appears that Morvi was taken back from Khangar's son and successor Bhêra, and in 1593, again it was assigned to Karan.³ About another Panwâr chief Achal of Subd, it is stated that he sided with Sultân Muĥaffar in 1582 A.D.⁴

In the Âin-i Akbarî, the Panwâr chiefs Jagmûl and Sânga are noted as mangâbdâra⁵ but the region to which they belonged is not known.

The Panwârs held zamindâria in the sùbas of Âgra and Gujarât. In the sùba of Âgra, the parganâs of Bahi (sarkar Âgra) and Kampil (Kanauj) were held by Panwârs.⁶ In the sarkar of Payânwan, they held four parganâs namely Payânwan, Bhasanda,

3. Ibid., p.593. See also Ahsan Raza Khan, Chieftains in the Mughal Empîre, p.81.
5. Âin-i Akbarî, I, pp.227, 231.
6. Ibid., pp.443, 446.
Jarkoli, and Suchendi.¹ In sūba Gujarāt, they are recorded as zamīndārī in the parganas Dholqa (sarkār Ahmadabād), Baroda (sarkār Baroda) and Morvi (sarkār Sorath).²

Tunware:

Kishan Dās Tunwar who probably belonged to Gwāliar held a māngāb.³ The Tunware held zamīndārī rights in sūbas of Awadh, Āgra and Delhi. In the sūba of Āgra, five parganas Anhon, Badrhattah, Dandrolī, Rāipur and Gwāliar, all belonging to the sarkār of Gwāliar were in their zamīndārī.⁴ In sarkār Nāmrul, they held three parganas, viz., Singhārāth Udaipur, Kotputli and Kanori.⁵ In sarkār Erach, they held Bījpur.⁶ Moreover, in sūba Delhi, five parganas have them recorded as their zamīndārī,⁷ viz. pargana Path of sarkār Delhi and parganas Atkhera, Jamālpur, Muhim and part of ShāNZdash dīhāt in sarkār Hisār Firozah.⁸

¹. Āin-i Akbarī, I, pp.449, 450.
². Ibid., II, pp.494, 496, 487.
³. Ibid., I, p.229.
⁴. Ibid., pp.447, 448.
⁵. Ibid., p.454.
⁶. Ibid., p.448.
⁷. Ibid., II, pp.526, 527.
⁸. Ibid.
Bhaduriyas:

In the early years of Akbar's reign, the Bhaduriyas of Hatkant are mentioned as having been reduced to submission. ¹ In 1595, Mukutman and his nephew Bikrámjít held the mansab of 500 and 1000² respectively. The Bhaduriyas were quite numerous around the capital city of Āgra. Their military strength amounted to some ten thousand cavalry men and one lakh foot soldiers.³ They are recorded as zamīndār in the parganas of Hatkant and Ātāwah in the sarkār of Āgra.⁴ In pargana Ātāwah, they shared the zamīndārī with Brāhmans.⁵

Baghelas:

The Baghela chief Rām Chandra of Bhatta Gahora submitted early in Akbar's reign.⁶ Akbar also established matrimonial tie with the Baghela clan.⁷ Rāja Rām Chandra held the mansab of 2000 zāt.⁸ According to Suryamal Dās, Akbar gave the title

---

1. Akbarnama, II, p.78.
4. Ājn-i Akbari, II, pp.443, 444.
5. Ibid.
of 'Bhaiya' (brother) to the Rāja. ¹ In 1592, after the death of Rām Chandra, his son Balbhadra, who was at the court, was recognised as his successor. But Balbhadra died before reaching Bhatta. ² In Bhatta, the sardāra or chiefs placed the dead ruler's minor son Bikramjīt on the throne. ³ Akbar disapproved of this choice on account of his minority. ⁴ After a long struggle, the sardāra were subdued. In 1601, Akbar recognised Duryadhan, son of Balbhadra and the Mughal noble Bhārī Chand was appointed as his atēliq (Adviser). ⁵

The Baghalas held zamīndāri rights in the sūbas of Gujarāt and Allahabād. In sūba Gujarāt, pargāna Harsot of sarkār Baraṇaś was in their zamīndāri. ⁶ Other pargānas held by them were Sordhar, Gondal, Rayit and Dhanal. ⁷ Sūba Allahabād included the principality of Bhatta Gahora with its capital Bandogarh in the sarkār of Bhatta Gahora (corresponding to the modern princely state of Rewa). ⁸

---

1. Vīr Vīnā, p.556.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
7. Ibid., p.489.
8. Ibid., p.728.
Bundelas:

In 1573, Raja Madhurak Sah of Orcha recognised Mughal suzerainty. But he defied imperial orders from time to time. After his death in 1591, his son Rām Chand succeeded him. Towards the end of Akbar's reign, Rām Chand held the mansab of 500 zāk. In 1602, when Bir Singh Deo Bundela killed Abūl Fażl, Rām Chand was sent with Rāi Rāyān to pursue Bir Singh.

The zamīndāris of Bundelas were in sūbas of Āgra and Mālwa. In sūba Āgra, the three parganas Parāich, Bardun and Khāndbājrah in sarkar Payānwan had Bundelas as their zamīndāris. In sūba Mālwa, they shared the pargana Bara of sarkar Chandeli with Kāyaatha.

Dhandhera:

In 1564, Jagman of the Dhandhera clan submitted to the Mughals. Akbar used to go to the regions of Dhandhera for

1. Akbarnāma, III, p.77.
2. Ibid., pp.209-10, 230, 261.
3. Ibid., pp.604-5, 628, 750.
7. Ibid., p.460.
hunting excursions. In 1599, after the death of Jagman, his son Chhatr Bhog sought imperial recognition as his father’s successor. Abūl Fażl calls him one of the chief būmīs (zamīndārs) of Mālwa. He controlled a large tract in the central India.

Jādons:

Rāja Gopāl Dās and Sānwal Dās of Kāruñi are known to have joined Akbar’s service. A certain Tūlī Dās Jādon also held a mansāb. At the time of his death, Gopāl Dās held the mansāb of 2000 zāt.

Jādons held zamīndārī rights in sūbae of Mālwa, Gujarāt and Āgra. In the sūba of Mālwa, pargāna Nolai of sarkār Ujjain returned Jādons as zamīndārs. In sūba Gujarāt, they held

2. Ibid., III, p.832; Isbālīnāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.504.
4. Ibid.
7. Ibid., p.229.
the pargana Visālnagar in sarkar Pattan. 1 In sūba Āgra, the whole sarkar Mandhāri is assigned to them. 2

Pundīra:

In the early years of Akbar’s reign, Bakhtmal, chief of Mau in the Panjāb hills submitted to the Mughals. 3 Towards the end of Akbar’s reign, his successor Rāja Bāso (1580–1613), seems to have gained the mansab of 1500 zāt. 4 The principality of the Pundīr chiefs of Mau comprised the parganas of Mau, Dhameri, Paithān and Shāhpur in the sūba of Lāhore. 5 In the sūba of Āgra and the sarkar of Kol, the parganas Akberabād, Jalāli, Sikandra Rāo and Malekpur were in their zamīndārī. 6 In pargana Payānwan also, they enjoyed bhūmi rights. 7 Pargana Fatehpur belonging to the sūba of Delhi and sarkar of Sirhind was controlled by the Pundīrs. 8

1. A’in-i Akbarī, p.495.
2. Ibid., pp.450–51.
3. Akbarānāma, II, p.50.
4. Ibid., III, p.821; Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.23.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid., p.528.
Barujars:

During Akbar's reign, no chief of the Bargujar clan is known to have held mansab. For the first time in 1611, Anup Rāy Bargujar on saving Jahāngīr from a tiger was granted a mansab. However, from the Āin-i Akbarī, it appears that the Bargujars held zamindāris in the sūbas of Delhi and Āgra. In sūba Delhi, they held three parganas Jadwār, Majhāula and Naroli in the sarkār of Sambhal, pargana of Hindaun in sarkār Delhi and Manglur in sarkār Sahāranpur.

In sūba Āgra, they held the pargana Pahāsu and Khurja and a part of pargana Shikārpur in sarkār Kol. They held three parganas Balhār, Balheri and Deoti-Sanjari in sarkār Alwār. In sarkār Āgra, the Bargujars held the single pargana of Banāwar.

Gauris:

None of Gaur chiefs are known to have served under Akbar.

It is for the first time during Prince Shāh Jahān's rebellion

1. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.90; Pelsaert, p.53.
3. Ibid., p.525.
4. Ibid., p.447.
5. Ibid., pp.451, 452.
6. Ibid., p.443.
that Gopāl and Bal Rām Gaur who were previously in the service of Rāo Ratan Hāda left it and joined the Prince. After Shāh Jahān’s accession, a number of Gaur nobles were taken into service.

Towards the end of Akbar’s reign, Gaurs held zamīndāri parganas of rights in the sūbas of Delhi, and Awadh. Four sūba Delhi namely Chaupālah, Shāhi, Lakhnor and Neodhana, all of sarkār Sambhal, had Gaur zamīndāra. In sūba Awadh, Gaurs are recorded as zamīndāra in pargana Chhatayapur of sarkār Khairabad. Unfortunately, it is not possible to say whether any of the Gaurs who joined imperial service under Shāhjahān came from these areas.

Solankīs:

The Solankīs were one of the zamīndār clans of the sūbas of Mālwa and Gujarāt. In sūba Mālwa they are recorded

4. Ibid., p.437.
as zamīndārī in Rāisīn, pargana of sarkīr Rāisīn. In suba Gujarāt, they held zamīndārī rights in pargana Ahmadnagar of sarkīr Ahmadabād. The first Solankī chief enrolled in Mughal service seems to have been Narhar of Nainwa (in Mālwa), who was given a mansab during the reign of Shāh Jahān.

Sodas:

It seems that the Sodas of Amarkot accepted Mughal suzerainty in Akbar's time. In 1591, we notice that a certain Rāi of Amarkot rendered military support to the Mughal army in Thatta. But it appears that none of the Seda chiefs was given any noticeable mansab in Akbar's time. According to the Aīn-i Akbārī, the Sodas held a large tract in the sarkāra of Bhakkar and Nasarpur in their control.

Jhālas:

In 1585, the Jhāla chief Rai Singh submitted to Akbar. But we do not find any Jhāla chief in the Mughal mansab hierarchy.

2. Ibid., p.495.
The authority of the Jhālas extended over the parganas of Birmāngāon, Halwād, Wadhwāhan, Koha, Daran-Gadra, Bījāna, Patri, Sahāla, Baroda, Jhinjhūwāra, Saujan, Dhulhār and Mandal in Saurashtra.¹

Ujjainyas:

In 1565, 'All Quī Khan-i-zamān launched an expedition against the Ujjainyas of Jagdishpur. After a long struggle, Rāja Gajpatī Ujjainya was compelled to surrender to the imperial forces. The fort of Jagdishpur was occupied.² The Rāja rendered military service to the Mughal army against Dāud Khān Kārrānī of Bengāl.³ There were occasional uprisings by the Ujjainyas⁴ but eventually in 1600 A.D. Dalpat Ujjainya submitted to Prince Dānyāl⁵ and gave his daughter in marriage to the Prince.⁶ None of the Ujjainya chiefs seems to have received mansab during Akbar's reign.

---

1. Ā'in-i Akbarī, II, p.487.
4. Ibid., pp.168-70, 188-9, 323.
5. Ibid., p.790.
6. Ibid., p.826.
The zamindari rights of the Ujjainyas were in the suha of Bihār and Mālwa. In sarkar Rohtas (sūba Bihār) they controlled a territory comprising the parganas of Uchna, Bihiya, Bhojpur, Arra, Pīrā, Nauner, Panwār, Danwār, Diāna and Bargaon. In suha Mālwa, the four parganas of Ujjain, Unhel, Panbhār and Dipālpur of sarkar Ujjain have Ujjainyas as zamīndārī. But it is not certain if these had any contact with the Ujjainyas of Bihār.

Manhas or Jamwāli:

Rāja Kapoor Chand of Jammu submitted to Akbar as early as 1564, when the Rāja was directed to serve in the expedition against Ādām Khān Ghakkar. But the chiefs of Jammu intermittently defied the Mughal authorities. However, till the end of Akbar's reign, none of the Manhas chiefs received any mansab.

5. In 1590, Parasrāma, the then chief of Jammu collaborated with the rebel chiefs of sūba Lāhore. He submitted to Zāin Khān Kekaltāsh and offered nāshkash to Akbar (Akharnāma, III, p.383). Again in 1592, Lāl Deo, chief of Jammu neglected to join an expedition to Kāshmir but submitted soon after (Akharnāma, III, p.631). In 1602, when Rāja Bāsu rebelled, the chief of Jammu wavered in his allegiance to the Mughals. But on Husain Bēg's besieging Jammu, the chief submitted. (Akharnāma, III, p.808).
The Manhas held zamindāris in seven parganas of sūba Lāhere. Out of the seven, five parganas, viz. Bhalot, Bhadrān, Ban, Mankot and Jammu belonged to the sarkār of Rechnāu Dōb; and the remaining two Akhandor Ambaran and Mangh were in Chanchat Dōb.

Katochi:

The Katoch chief Rām Chandra of Guler seems to have accepted Mughal suzerainty in 1563. He was sent in the expedition against Ādam Khān Gakkhar. In 1572, when Rāja Jai Chand of Nagarkot rebelled, Rām Chandra arrested the Rāja and sent him to the Mughal court. In subsequent years, he collaborated with other hill chiefs who were in rebellion; but he submitted soon. Again in 1603, upon a revolt of Rāja Jagdish Chandra, the successor of Rām Chandra, the fort of Guler was captured by the Mughals and put into the charge of Rām Dās Udāwat. In

1. Āin-i Akbarī, II, pp.544, 545, 546.
2. Ibid., pp.546, 547.
5. Akbarnāma, III, p.983. See also, Ahsan Raza Khan, Chieftains during the reign of Akbar, pp.45-46.
Akbar's time, none of the chiefs of Guler was assigned a mansab.

Another Katoch chief Dharam Chand of Nagarkot seems to have submitted to the Mughals in 1557. But in 1572, for some unknown reasons, the then chief Jaichand was seized by the Mughals. In Jai Chand's absence, his minor son Bidhi Chand challenged the Mughals. After assigning Nagarkot to Birbal, he (Akbar) sent an expedition against Bidhi Chand. Eventually, the Mughal forces succeeded in subduing Bidhi Chand and a treaty was concluded. Bidhi Chand once again defied the Mughals and joined the revolts of the hill chiefs in 1590. But once again he submitted. Further, in 1598, and 1602, we notice that Bidhi Chand's successor Tilok Chand collaborated with the rebellious hill chiefs. The revolt was put down and consequently Tilok Chand submitted to the Mughals. However, during Akbar's reign, none of the chiefs of Nagarkot succeeded in obtaining mansabs. The Katochas held zamindari rights in the pargana of Guler and Nagarkot belonging to the sarkar of Barī Deab of sūba Lāhore.

4. Akbarnāma, III, p.36.
5. Ibid., p.583.
6. Ibid., pp.742, 808, 819.
Pratap Singh Verma (1559-1596) accepted Akbar's authority. In 1578, when Toder Mal was sent to Punjab to make a settlement with the hill chiefs, Pratap Singh Verma was forced to surrender Rihlu, Chari and Gharoh to the Mughals. Chamba, a mahal of sarkar Rechnau doān in sūba Lāhore, was in the zamīndāरī of Surajbansis.

Sena Chandrabansis:

In 1591, Bahādur Shāh, chief of Kishtwār accepted Mughal suzerainty. But he supported the rebel Chak chiefs of Kashmir against the Mughals. At last in 1604, when the Chak chiefs were subdued, Bahādur Shāh himself submitted to the Mughals. In theūn's time too the family held zamīndāरī rights in the valley of Kishtwār.

4. Ibid.
6. Ibid., p.835.
Sambarsis:

In 1381, Rājā Rudra Chand of Kumāon supported the rebel 'Arab Bahādur who created trouble in Bareilly and Sambhal. But the Mughal forces forced the Rājā to submit to them. In 1589, when the Rājā came to the court to render homage to Akbar, the latter presented him a robe of honour, 101 horses and a few parganas were assigned to him in his 'īqtā', presumably out of territory held by him by hereditary succession. A large territory extending from Tibet to Sambhal was controlled by the chiefs of Kumāon.

At the time of Akbar's death in 1605, there were 30 Rājput mansabdārs out of a total of 95. In numerical strength, they comprised 31.5% of the total mansab holders of Akbar. Rājput chiefs held as high mansab as 42,200/14650 out of the total mansab of 2,08,000/98,950. The percentage of the mansab

2. Ibid., p.533.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p.537.
of Rājput chiefs comes to 20.29 in the ṭāṭ mansāba and 24.85 in guwār mansāba.¹

It is significant that the majority of the Rājput chiefs who joined Akbar's service came from sūba of Ajmer. Out of 30 Rājput chiefs, 21 belonged to the sūba.² These 21 Rājput chiefs enjoyed the lion's share in the total mansāba of Rājput chiefs. The 21 Rājput chiefs held the mansāba of 41,500/13,700 out of the total of mansāba of 56,300/18,700 given to Rājputs.³ The province of Ajmer is reported to have contained 90,000 cavalry⁴ which was in excess by four times of the reported strength of the whole of the zamīndār cavalry of the Mughal Empire.⁵

The Rājput chiefs basically being zamīndār maintained their own retainers in their principalities. These could in time be presented as troops for the muster and brand. Perhaps, due to this consideration, Akbar paid lower rates on their

---

1. See Appendix 'B'. For the total mansāba of the Mughal Empire, see Irfan Habib’s ‘Mansāb System’- 1593-1637’ A.D., pp.221-28.
2. See Appendix 'A'.
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4. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.168. In the A’in-i Akbarī (II, pp.500-13) cavalry figures of the sūba of Ajmer were 56,900.
5. The total cavalry strength of the Mughal Empire was 3,84,558. See, Irfan Habib, ‘Zamīndār in A’in-i Akbarī’, P.I.H.C., pp.320-23.
contingents in comparison to their counterpart Türk and İran nobles, who did not similarly have a home recruiting ground.

Among the Rājputa under Akbar, the Kachawāhas came to enjoy a dominating position. All of the Kachawāha chiefs, except one belonged to the sūba of Ajmer. Rāja Bhagwān Dās and then Mān Singh held important charges and had close access to Akbar himself. Next were the Rāthors, all of whom except one were again from the same sūba. It is also noteworthy that among the hill Rājput chiefs, only Pundīr chief of Mau was taken into imperial service towards the end of Akbar’s reign.

The important administrative affairs were assigned either to the Kachawāhas or Rāthors. Among the Rāthors, Rāo Rāi Singh of Bikāner was a particular favourite of Akbar. Rāi Durga Chandrāwat of Rāmpura was also given high office.

There was no direct connection between the high position of a Rājput clan in Mughal nobility and the extensiveness of its zamindāri possessions. The Kachawāhas, compared to other major clans, had no large principality, to begin with, to serve for their base. But still among Rājput high mansab went to the territorial chiefs, and not to simple 'soldiers of fortune' as

in the case of the other sections of the nobility. There were, of course, other factors as well, such as loyalty and close relationship with the Emperor and the performance of the chiefs in service, which also determined the positions enjoyed by individual Rājput chiefs in Akbar's bureaucratic apparatus.
### MANŞABS HELD BY ALIVE RĀJPUT CHIEFS IN 1605 A.D.

#### KACHAWAREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mān Singh</td>
<td>7000/6000</td>
<td>A.N., III, 839; Shāhnawāz Khān (M.U., II, 168) holds 7000/7000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Rāj Singh</td>
<td>4000/3000</td>
<td>Ibid., 839; Iqbāl, 510.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Rām Dās</td>
<td>2000/1200</td>
<td>Tuzuk, 9; Iqbāl, 508.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Bhāo Singh</td>
<td>1000/ 500</td>
<td>Iqbāl, 508; M.U., III, 360; T.U., p. 133; In A.N., III, 836-37, his mansab as 7000 which is obviously a mistake.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RĀTHORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Pratāp of Baglāna</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>A.N., III, 770; Tuzuk, 196.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dalpat a/o Rāi Rāi Singh</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Ain, I, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kesha Dās Māru of Merta</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Ain, I, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dalpat a/o Mota Rāja of Jodhpur</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Vigat, II, 492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sabal Singh a/o Meta Rāja</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Ibid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUNDELAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rām Chand a/o Madhukar</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Ain, I, 228; Tuzuk, 39; T.U., f. 157a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BHADURIYAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rāja Mukund</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Z.K., I, 234; A.N., III, 834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SISODIAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sagar</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Ain, I, 230; Vigat, II, 491-92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DHANDHERAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rāja Jagman of Dhandhera</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>A.N., III, 832; Iqbal, 504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hādes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rāi Bhoj</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Tabagāt, II, 455; Iqbal, 481; Tuzuk, 66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUNDĪRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rāja Bālu</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>A.N., III, 821; Tuzuk, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUNWARS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Raja Shyām Singh</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>A.N., III, 832; Iqbal, 904.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BHĀTĪS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rāwal Bhīm of Jaisalmer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAGHELAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rām Dāś Baghala of Bandhogarh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bikramājīt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANDRĀWAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rāi Durgā Chandrāwat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 'B'

LIST OF THE PARGANAS HELD BY RĀJPUT GLANS IN ZAMĪNĀRĪS IN 1595 A.D.

KACHAWĀHAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Suba</th>
<th>Serkār</th>
<th>Pargana</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Āgra</td>
<td>Kālpi</td>
<td>Bīlāspur</td>
<td>Āṭīn, II, 444.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>Erach</td>
<td>Riabanah</td>
<td>Ibid., 448.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Khākes</td>
<td>Ibid., 449.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Kharela</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>Alwar</td>
<td>Anthlah Babru</td>
<td>Ibid., 451.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>Nārīnol</td>
<td>Khandela</td>
<td>Ibid., 454; Z.K.,II,367.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>Sahūr</td>
<td>Sahār</td>
<td>Āṭīn, II, 455.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ajmer</td>
<td>Ajmer</td>
<td>Āmber</td>
<td>A.N., III, 339.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Deesa</td>
<td>A.N., II, 156.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Narāina</td>
<td>M.K., I, 144.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Neota</td>
<td>A.N., III, 65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Sānganer</td>
<td>V.V., 1275.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Phāgi</td>
<td>Vakīl Report, 1693 A.D., RSA, Bīkāner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Mauzabād</td>
<td>M.K., I, 314.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>Nēgora</td>
<td>Amarsar</td>
<td>Ibid., 318.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Manoharpur</td>
<td>A.N., III, 221.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Hisar</td>
<td>Bhatner</td>
<td>Ain, II, 526.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Bhagwal</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>BharangI</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Toaham</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Sidhmukh</td>
<td>Ibid., 527.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Fatehabad</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Malwa</td>
<td>Ujjain</td>
<td>Ujjain</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Badnawar</td>
<td>Ain, II, 457.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Sarangpur</td>
<td>Palpun</td>
<td>Ibid., 462.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Muhammadpur</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Agra</td>
<td>Kannauj</td>
<td>Shamsabod</td>
<td>Ibid., 446.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gujarat</td>
<td>Ahmedabad</td>
<td>Idar</td>
<td>Ibid., 486.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Baghena</td>
<td>Ibid., 492.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ajmer</td>
<td>Jodhpur</td>
<td>All the pariwas of Jodhpur sar kār</td>
<td>Ibid., 511.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Bikāner</td>
<td>Some pariwas of Bikāner sar kār</td>
<td>Ibid., 513.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Nāgaur</td>
<td>Kota</td>
<td>A.H., III, 195.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GHELOTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GHELOTS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Awadh</td>
<td>Awadh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SISODIAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SISODIAS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mālwa</td>
<td>Mandsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ajmer</td>
<td>Chittor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BHĀTĪS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BHĀTĪS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Sirhind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Rechna Doāb</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Multān</td>
<td>Multān (Birun-i Panjnad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Dipālpur (Jalandhar Doāb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Dipālpur (Bari Doāb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Birun-i Panjnad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Awadh</td>
<td>Awadh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Awadh</td>
<td>Awadh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Agra</td>
<td>Agra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Agra</td>
<td>Agra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Agra</td>
<td>Agra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Agra</td>
<td>Agra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Kanauj</td>
<td>Kanauj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Kanauj</td>
<td>Kanauj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Kanauj</td>
<td>Kanauj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Kanauj</td>
<td>Kanauj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Kanauj</td>
<td>Kanauj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Kol</td>
<td>Kol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Kol</td>
<td>Kol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Agra</td>
<td>Kol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>Alwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>Nārnol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mālwa</td>
<td>Chanderī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>Sārangpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>Mandesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Gujarat</td>
<td>Ahmadabād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>,,</td>
<td>,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place 1</td>
<td>Place 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Ajmer</td>
<td>Ajmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Badēun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Sambhal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Sirhind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PANWĀRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place 1</th>
<th>Place 2</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Āgra</td>
<td>Āgra</td>
<td>Bari</td>
<td>Afn, II, 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Kanauj</td>
<td>Kampil</td>
<td>Ibid, 446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Payānwan</td>
<td>Payānwan</td>
<td>Ibid, 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Bhassanda</td>
<td>Ibid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Jharauli</td>
<td>Ibid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Sahandi</td>
<td>Ibid, 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Gujarāt</td>
<td>Ahmadabād</td>
<td>Dhalka</td>
<td>Ibid, 494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Baroda</td>
<td>Baroda</td>
<td>Ibid, 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Serath</td>
<td>Mervi</td>
<td>Ibid, 487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Chotla</td>
<td>Ibid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place 1</td>
<td>Place 2</td>
<td>Place 3</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Awadh</td>
<td>Bahrāīch</td>
<td>Firezabād</td>
<td>À’in, II, 437.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dandrolī</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rāipur</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gwālier</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Erēch</td>
<td>Bījpūr</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ketputli</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kanwarī</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Narwar</td>
<td>The whole Narwar sarkār</td>
<td>Ibid., 450.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Puth</td>
<td>Ibid., 518.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamālpūr</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shāhndah Dīhāt</td>
<td>Ibid., 527.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muhīndī</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shahārīyas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place 1</th>
<th>Place 2</th>
<th>Place 3</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Agra</td>
<td>Agra</td>
<td>Etāwah</td>
<td>À’in, II, 443.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hatkānt</td>
<td>Ibid., 444.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Baghelas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place 1</th>
<th>Place 2</th>
<th>Place 3</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gujarāt</td>
<td>Breach(south)</td>
<td>Harṣat</td>
<td>À’in, II, 496.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Serath</td>
<td>Gondal</td>
<td>Ibid., 489.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Serdhar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Sub-District</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Gujarāt</td>
<td>Sarath</td>
<td>Rayit</td>
<td>Āin, II, 489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Dhanak</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Allāhabād</td>
<td>Batha Gahora</td>
<td>whole sasākār</td>
<td>A.N., III, 726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUNDELAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Sub-District</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Āgra</td>
<td>Payānwan</td>
<td>Parancha</td>
<td>Āin, II, 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Budhon</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Khāndbājrah</td>
<td>Ibid., 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Mālwa</td>
<td>Chanderi</td>
<td>Bāra</td>
<td>Ibid., 460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DHANDHERAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mālwa</td>
<td>A large tract known as Dhandhera in the Central India was in their zamindārī</td>
<td>A.N., III, 731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JĀDONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Sub-District</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mālwa</td>
<td>Ujjain</td>
<td>Nelai</td>
<td>Āin, II, 457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Gujarāt</td>
<td>Pattan</td>
<td>Vīsalnagar</td>
<td>Ibid., 495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Āgra</td>
<td>Sākār Mandālar was in their zamindārī</td>
<td>Ibid., 450-51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUNDĪRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Sub-District</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lāhore</td>
<td>Barī Dāb</td>
<td>Mau Nūpur</td>
<td>Z.K., III, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Dhamāri</td>
<td>De laet, p.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Paithān</td>
<td>Z.K., III, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Shāhpūr</td>
<td>Huthcison, I, 213, 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Āgra</td>
<td>Kāl</td>
<td>Akbarābād</td>
<td>Āin, II, 447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City 1</td>
<td>City 2</td>
<td>City 3</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Sikandra Rān</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Malakpur</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Payānwan</td>
<td>Payānwan</td>
<td>Ibid., 449.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Sirhind</td>
<td>Fathpur</td>
<td>Ibid., 528.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BARGUJARS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City 1</th>
<th>City 2</th>
<th>City 3</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Kol</td>
<td>Pahāsu</td>
<td>Ibid., 447.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Khurjah</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Shikārpur</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Alwar</td>
<td>Balhār(Bairohar)</td>
<td>Ibid., 451.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Balehtta</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Devati Sanchārī</td>
<td>Ibid., 452.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Jharsa</td>
<td>Ibid., 518.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Sambhal</td>
<td>Jadwār</td>
<td>Ibid., 522.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Majhaula</td>
<td>Ibid., 523.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Naroli</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Sahāranpur</td>
<td>Manglaur</td>
<td>Ibid., 525.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GAURS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City 1</th>
<th>City 2</th>
<th>City 3</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Sambhal</td>
<td>Chaupala</td>
<td>Ibid., 522.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Shāhī</td>
<td>Ibid., 523.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Lakhner</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Nodhana</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOLANKIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Town 1</th>
<th>Town 2</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mālwa</td>
<td>Rāisin</td>
<td>Rāisin</td>
<td>Āñ, II, 458.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gujarāt</td>
<td>Ahmadābād</td>
<td>Ahmadnagar</td>
<td>Ibid., 493.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SODAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sind</td>
<td>A large tract in the ārkāra of Bhakkar and Nasarpur was held by them.</td>
<td>Āñ, II, 557.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JHĀLAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gujarāt</td>
<td>Saureshtra</td>
<td>Viramgāon</td>
<td>Āñ, II, 487.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Halvad</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wadhān</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kōha</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Darān Gadrā</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bījāna</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patri</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sahāla</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barode</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jhinjhuwāra</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sāujan</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dhumār</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>, ,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandel</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UJJAINYAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unhel</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panbīhār</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dīpālpur</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bihīya</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bhojpur</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arra</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pīrā</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nāner</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panwār</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danwār</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dīāna</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baragān</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jagdispur</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MANHAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Rechnau Deōb</th>
<th>Bālot</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lāhore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Balot</td>
<td>Āin. II, 544.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bhadraon</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bān</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jāmmu</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jassina</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mankat</td>
<td>Ibid., 545.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chenahat Deōb</td>
<td>Akhandu</td>
<td>Ibid., 546.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambaran</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mangh</td>
<td>Ibid., 547.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### KATOCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lāhore</td>
<td>Dari Dāb</td>
<td>Āīn, II, 543.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Hutchinson, I, 134-35.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SURAJBANSĪ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lāhore</td>
<td>Rochnāu Dāb</td>
<td>Hutchinson, I, 298.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SENA CHANDRABANSĪ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### SOMBANSĪG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>A large tract extending from Tibet to Sambhal was controlled by Sambansā</td>
<td>Forishta, II, 420.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Lāhore</td>
<td>Dari Dāb Kāmra</td>
<td>Āīn, II, 543.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Darwah</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Chat Vankāla</td>
<td>Ibid. 542.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TERRITORIES OF RĀJPUT ZAMĪNDAR CLANS-NO1. 1595 A.D
(Based on the Āin-i-Akbarī)
Chapter II

JAHANGIR AND RÄJPUT CHIEFS

The position of the Räjput nobles under Jahangir is a much debated question. S.R. Sharma was first to say that the position of the 'Hindus' in the Mughal service was threatened after Jahangir's accession 'by the events connected with Khusrav's rebellion'. In this connection, he cited the cases of Män Singh who came under suspicion and of Räi Räi Singh who had actually rebelled.¹ By comparing the total of zât mansâbe and offices held by the Räjput nobles towards the end of Akbar's reign with those of the early years of Jahangir's reign, Refaqaât Ali Khan even suggests that Jahangir had reversed Akbar's Räjput policy depriving Räjputs of high positions in the nobility as well as the administration. He has also cited a letter of 'Azîz Koka, addressed to Jahangir in which it was alleged that as a consequence of Jahangir's policy of favouring Irânîs and Indian Muslims, the position of the Turânî and Räjput nobles was adversely affected.² This thesis has been re-examined by Athar Ali on the basis of the evidence relating to the

¹. The Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors, pp.70-71.
². The Kachhawahas under Akbar and Jahangir, p.196.
position of the Rājput nobles at different points of time during Jahāngīr's reign to indicate two distinct phases of Jahāngīr's Rājput policy: (a) First eight years of Jahāngīr's reign when the position of the Rājputs suffered a set-back and (b) last 13 years of Jahāngīr's reign when certain Rājput nobles favoured by the king were promoted to high mangāba. According to him, by 1621, the Rājputs seem to have recovered the ground they had lost on account of Jahāngīr's distrust of some of Rājput clans during the first few years after his accession.\(^1\) As against this thesis, in a recent study, Afzal Hussain holds that the position of the Rājput nobles as a whole did not suffer at all under Jahāngīr. Only the members of the house of Āmber were isolated from the court. Commenting on 'Azīz Koka's letter, Afzal Hussain says that actually, when 'Azīz Koka states that the position of the Rājputs was undermined, he apparently has in his mind the isolation of the house of Āmber.\(^2\)

The above summary of the contending views of the modern historians about the position of the Rājput nobles under Jahāngīr underlines the need of a more detailed examination of the existing evidence on this problem. It would perhaps enable

---


2. 'The Emperor's Relations with the Nobility under Akbar and Jahangir', PIHC, 1977, cyclostyled copy is available in the Department of History, Aligarh.
one to arrive at a more balanced conclusion if the total of the mansabs held by the Rajput nobles as well as by the individual clans comprising the groups at different points of time during Jahangir's reign is worked out. This information combined with the evidence relating to the bestowal of titles and offices on individual Rajput noble from time to time might give some idea of the nature of the changes that came in their position as a group and also the circumstances which underscored these changes. In this study, however, it should be our attempt to explain the changing fortunes of the entire Rajput group as well as the individual clans comprising it in the background of the major political developments.

For the purpose of this kind of analysis one could divide the reign of Jahangir into three phases corresponding roughly to the main phases of the history of the court politics under him, namely (a) from 1605 to 1612, (b) 1612 to 1621, (c) 1621 to 1627. The phase (a) was the period preceding Jahangir's marriage to Nur Jahân when he was systematically promoting a new set of nobles to create a counter weight within the nobility against the highly placed nobles of Akbar's time, many of whom had opposed his accession and were suspected of sympathising with Khwaja during his rebellion in 1606.\(^1\) The phase (b) covers the

---

period of ten years when following Jahāngīr’s marriage with Nur Jahan in 1611, the members of Itimāduddaula’s family received rapid promotions which resulted in strengthening the position of the Irānī nobles at Court. This situation was interpreted by Azīz Koka, a contemporary Tūrānī noble of high standing, as the outcome of Jahāngīr’s deliberate policy of preferring Irānīs and Indian Muslims over the Rājputas and Tūrānīs. Besides Itimāduddaula’s family, several other non-Tūrānī clans among whom Irānīs were more conspicuous, improved their position. The family members of Mahābat Khān, Khān-i Jahān Lodi and ‘Abdullāh Khān Fīroz Jang were also given bold promotions during this period. On the other hand, the fortunes of the family of Shaikh Salīm Chishti, a clan of Indian Shaikh-zādās who had risen to prominence during the phase ‘a’ dwindled.


4. In 1612, the members of Shaikh Salīm Chishti held the total mānsāba of 14,200/12,450. By 1622, the total of the mānsāba was reduced to 5000/3,500. See, Afzal Husain, ‘The Family of Shaikh Salīm Chishti during the Reign of Jahangir’, Medieval India – A Miscellany, Vol. II, p.63.
In the phase 'c', even after a rift had occurred between Khurram and Nūr Jahān the trend of improvement in the position of the members of Ītimāduddaulā's family was not interrupted. It was during this period that Khurram's revolt (1622-23) and the Mahābat Khān's zamaq coup d'État (1626) took place. Apparently, these revolts contributed to strengthening Nūr Jahān's hold over Jahāngīr which she continued to use to secure high promotions for her proteges, many of whom happened to be the members of Ītimāduddaulā's family.

It would be fruitful to ascertain as to in what manner the position of the Rājput nobles was affected by the twists and turns of the factional alignments at Jahāngīr's court during these three phases. For this purpose, we have prepared the lists of the mansab held by the Rājput nobles in 1611-12 and 1621. In each of these lists we have included all those Rājput nobles who are mentioned as being in the active service in the year to which it relates. In these lists, however, only zāt mansab are taken into account. The information regarding suwār ranks of the nobles is incomplete for the years 1605 and 1611-12.

2. In Abūl Fazl and Nizāmuddīn Ahmad's lists of mansabdārān, which were comprised in 1595, only the zāt rank is mentioned, but not the suwār rank. In a recent study, it has been established that the suwār rank came into being around 1595-96. Even though in so many cases, the suwār rank is not mentioned. See, Shireen Moosavi, 'Evolution of Mansab System under Akbar till 1595-96', IHC, Hyderabad, 1978.
and therefore, it cannot be used in an analysis aiming at working
out the comparative significance of the various clans in terms of
their status in the military hierarchy of the Mughal Empire. In
any case, inadequacy of information on 

suwār ranks of the nobles
should not totally hamper an analysis of this nature. As in the
Mughal hierarchy the status of a noble was determined basically
by his zāt mansab. ¹ A comparative study of the zāt mansab held
by the different clans should be considered a sufficient basis
for working out their changing fortunes during the period under
review. The information furnished in the above lists is given
in a tabular form for the purpose of the present discussion. We
have prepared two tables 'A' and 'B' in which the comparative
strength and position of the individual clan in terms of their
numerical strength and the total zāt mansabs held by them in the
Mughal service between 1605 and 1611, and 1611 and 1621 is repre-
sented.

From the table 'A', it would appear that between 1605 and
1612, the over all position of the Rajput nobles when judged in
terms of the numerical strength, registered a decline. Their
total strength came down from 31 to 26, while on the other hand,
the total of zāt mansabs held by them was pushed up from 58,300
to 66,200. ² The slight decline in the over all strength of the

². See, Table 'A'.

Rajput nobles indicated in our table cannot be taken as suggesting a deliberate policy of reducing the strength of the Rajputs with the Mughal service. If one takes into account the newly recruited Bundila Chief, Bir Singh Deo, who is counted in our table among the 26 nobles serving during this period, then the net fall in the strength of the Rajput nobles would come up to 5. Among these five nobles who disappeared from the service during 1605-12 without any one from their clans being appointed in their place were Salhadi, Sakat Singh Kachawaha, Rai Rai Singh Rātnor, Mukut Mān Bhaduriya, Bikramājit Saghela and Kishan Singh Tunwar. The picture that emerges from this break-up does suggest a policy of putting a limit on the recruitment of new nobles from the clans who had perhaps become suspects in Jahāngīr's eyes as a result of their role in the controversy over succession. But this cannot certainly be confused with an over-all policy of discouraging the recruitment of Rajputs in the service. Fresh recruitment or replacement of

6. *Pathal Pathã-re-Khyāt*, pages are not mentioned,
deceased chiefs by their heirs belonging to Bundila, Kachwaha, 
Hāda and Chandrāwat clans, during the same period is an example 
indicating that during this period Jahāngīr was not averse to 
taking all those Rājput nobles in the service who were willing 
to collaborate with the Mughals and whose devotion and loyalty 
to his own person, he did not have any doubts or misgivings.

This policy of Jahāngīr is borne out more clearly by the 
break up of the total zāt mansab held by different clans in 
1605 and 1611-12. Firstly, one finds that a number of Rājput 
nobles holding minor positions in 1605 were given rapid promo-
tions during the subsequent six years. The chiefs who received 
such promotions belonged to the Pundīr, Bundila, Hāda, and 
Sisodia clans. For instance, Rāja Bāso was raised from 700 to 
3500 zāt. The rapid promotion of Rāja Bāso is significant.

It may be explained in the light of the Rāja’s collaboration 
with Jahāngīr in 1602, when the latter had rebelled against his 
father Akbar. Rām Chandra Bundila was promoted from 500 to 
1000 zāt. Sager Sisodia was promoted from 200 to 3000 zāt.

2. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.23.
5. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.54; Tazkīrat-ul Umarī, MS. p.141. In 
the Rāhā Rāma, his mansab is mentioned as 5000 zāt. But 
Semeni says that it is an exaggeration. History of Mewar, 246.
The manseeb of Tunwar chief Shyām Singh was increased from 1000 to 1500 zāt. In June 1607, after the death of Rāi Bhoj Hāda who held the manseeb of 1000 zāt, his son Ratan Singh was elevated to the higher position of 2000/1500 with the title of Sarbuland Rāy. Jahangir also felicitated Rāo Ratan to assign pargana Mau in inām (an assignment without obligation).

Among the fresh recruited nobles of this period the most conspicuous case was that of Bir Singh Deo Bundila. He was defying the imperial authority during the last three years of Akbar's reign, but was taken into the service in 1606, getting the manseeb of 5000/2000. Further, after Jahāngīr's accession, when Bir Singh's elder brother Rām Chandra rebelled, he was deprived of his watan jāgīr Orcha and conferred upon Bir Singh Deo. But when in 1607, Rām Chandra submitted, Jahāngīr to ensure his loyalty and support, married his daughter in 1609.

2. Tabagāt-i Akbarī, II, p.435; Inbālnāme-i Jahāngīrī, p.481; Surya Mal Hīra, a court historian of Bundi writing his treatises on the rulers of Bundi exaggerates to say that Bhoj held the manseeb of 5000 zāt. Vama Bhaekar, III, p.2290.
5. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.100.
6. Ibid., pp.41-42.
8. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.77.
Moreover, it was apparently with an aim to keep a check on the ambitions of his favourite Bir Singh Deo that Jahāngīr was anxious not only to retain in the service Bir Singh's brother and his adversary, Rām Chandra but also solaced him by marrying his daughter.

But on the other hand, the mansab of the chiefs belonging to Chandrāwat, Baghela clans declined for one or another reason. In 1608, after the death of Durga Chandrāwat who held the mansab of 4000 zāt, his successor Chāndu Singh was assigned the mansab of 700 zāt only. The total mansab of the Baghela chiefs declined marginally from 2100 zāt to 2000 zāt. In 1610, Rāja Bikramjit Baghela who held the mansab of 100 zāt rebelled and was deprived of his mansab which caused a marginal fall in the total mansab of the Baghelas. The mansab of another Baghela chief was, however, not disturbed. Rāma Deo Baghela continued on his mansab of 2000 zāt. Similarly, Rāja Mukut Man Bhaduriya continued on his mansab of 2000 zāt.

1. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.63-64.
Another interesting feature indicated by Table 'A' is the obvious improvement in the position of Kachawaha and Rathor clans during 1605-12. The total mansaba of the Kachawahas increased from 29,700 to 30,500 zūl, while those of Rathors including the chiefs of Jodhpur, Bikaner, Merta and Baglana went up from 10,300 to 12,500 zūl. But in both these cases the increase in total mansaba is the result of marked rise in the mansaba of the favoured groups or the individuals. A close scrutiny of the changes that came in the position of the individual sub-clans of these two clans would show that side by side with the rise in the mansaba of favoured sub-clans there was a simultaneous fall in the mansaba of the sub-clans that had come to be suspected of having sympathies for Khushru.

The table indicates that in the Kachawaha clan, the non-Rājāwaṭ nobles, who favoured Jahāngīr's candidature for the throne in 1605, were rewarded. The total mansaba of the non-Rājāwaṭ nobles almost doubled from 5,400 to 11,000 zūl. The mansaba of the two Shaikhawat nobles Rāisal Darbāri and Rāi Manohar were enhanced from 3,000 zūl, 400 zūl to 5,000 and 1,000 zūl.

1. See, Table 'A'.
2. Ibid.
4. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.54, 112.
Similarly, Rām Dās Udāwat was promoted from 2000 to 5000 zāt.\(^1\)
In addition to this the title of Rājā and Rājā Karan were also bestowed upon Rāisāl Darbārī\(^2\) and Rām Dās Udāwat\(^3\) respectively. This becomes particularly conspicuous when viewed in the light of the fact that the title of Farzand held by Mān Singh\(^4\) was not conferred upon his successor following his death.\(^5\) The mansābas of the members of Rājāwat clan who opposed Jahāngīr's candidature appear to have declined marginally from 24,300 to 19,500 zāt.\(^6\) Partly this fall in their mansābas was the result of Jagannāth's death whose successor was given a comparatively lower mansāb.\(^7\) In the case of two of the Rājāwat nobles Sakat Singh and Sahlādī who held the mansābas of 1600 zāt and 700 zāt,\(^8\) is not known anything after 1605. These cases together go

5. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.130.
6. See, Appendix 'A'.
7. In 1609, after the death of Jagannāth who held the mansāb of 5000/3000, his son Karam Chand was given the mansāb of 2000/1500. See, Akhārnāma, III, pp.786, 89; Jahāngīr-i-Jahāngīrī, p.474; Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.74; Ma'āshir-ul Umarā; I, p.116. For the date of his death, see Visi Vinod, p.223.
9. Ibid., 837; Takhīrat-ul Umarā; p.149.
contributing to the marginal fall in the mansaba of the Rājāwats indicated by Table 'A'. But this cannot be interpreted as an attempt on Jahangir's part to discard Rājāwats and to push them to a subordinate position to non-Rājāwat sub-clans. On the other hand, withholding the promotions temporarily which were bound to undermine their position within the Kachawāha clan, Jahangir continued to prefer the Rājāwat ruling family for the purpose of matrimonial ties. His first Kachawāha wife, a daughter of Bhagwān Dās died in 1605. In 1606, he asked for the hand of one of Mān Singh's grand daughters (a daughter of Jagat Singh). Mān Singh promptly agreed to this proposal and gave his grand daughter in marriage to Jahangir, although it was in total disregard of Hindu customary rule prohibiting marriage between a widower and a niece or grand daughter of his deceased wife.

Although, as we have already noticed, the total mansaba of the nobles belonging to the ruling family of Bikānēr declined, the increase in the total mansaba of the Rāthores was mainly owing to promotions received by the Rāthores of Jodhpur whose mansaba increased from 3000 to 5,500 jāt. The details of these

2. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.68.
3. See, Table 'A'.

---
promotions are as follows: In 1608, the mansabs of Suraj Singh and Kishan Singh were increased from 2000/2000 to 3000/2000 and 1000/500 to 2000/1500 respectively. Sabal Singh continued on his mansab of 500 zat. Another Rathor chief who received promotion was Kesho Das Maru of Merta. He was raised from 300 zat to 1500/1500. As against this, one notices a sharp fall in the mansabs of the two Rathor nobles of Bikaner. Initially, Jahangir had promoted Rai Rāi Singh from 4000 to 5000 zat. But on his death in 1612, his son Dalpat was given a comparatively lower mansab of 1500/500. One might guess that in giving comparatively lower mansab to Rai Rāi Singh's successor, Jahangir was partly influenced by his suspicion that the chief of Bikaner had sympathised with Khusrau in 1606. Another Rathor, Pratap of Baglāna, also did not receive any increment after Jahangir's accession and his mansab remained static at 3000 zat.

2. Ibid., p.72.
5. Ibid., p.23.
6. Ibid., pp.111-12.
7. Ibid., pp.41-42; Jahangir's *fərman* to Rāi Rāi Singh, dated Nov. 1607, RSA Bikaner.
Thus it could be seen that during this period in respect of the mansab, the Rajputs as a group improved their position. Jahangir, particularly showed favour to a particular set of the Rajput nobles who had supported his claim to the throne from the beginning. Those who had opposed him were not given further promotions down to 1612.

However, in respect of offices, the Rajput nobles as a whole suffered heavily. After Mân Singh's removal from the governorship of Bengāl in 1606, none of the Rajput chiefs is known to have been appointed by Jahangir as a governor of a sūba. In contrast to this, during Akbar's reign, on one occasion (1586-87) as much as six Rajput nobles were simultaneously holding the charges of four contiguous sūbas. Bhagwant Dās and Rāi Rāi Singh Rāthor were the governors of sūba Lāhore. While Mân Singh and Āskaran Kachawahā were the governors of Kābul and Āgra respectively, Jagannāth and Rāi Durga Chandrāwat were the governors of sūba Ajmer. Further, in 1592,

1. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.7; Riāz-va-Salātīn, p.170; R.P. Tripathi incorrectly says that Mân Singh was transferred from Bengāl to Bihār (Rise and Fall of the Mughal Empire, p.567-68). Actually, at this time, Jahāngīr Quli Khān was the governor of Bihār. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.101.
Udai Singh Rāthor (Mota Rāja) along with Wulīj Khān was assigned the charge of sūba Lāhorā. Besides governorships, the Rājput nobles also lost several other important offices which they failed to regain till the end of Jahāngīr's reign. Under Akbar, three important forts, Rohtās, Ranthambhor and Gwālior were held by the Rājput nobles Mān Singh, Jagannāth and Rāj Singh respectively down to 1605. But soon after Jahāngīr's accession all these nobles were removed from the positions they were holding under Akbar. In 1608, when Mān Singh was sent to Deccan, Rohtās had been taken away from his charge. After Jagannāth's death in 1609, Ranthambhor was assigned to Rām Dās Udāwat, but he died in 1613. Subsequently, down to the end of Jahāngīr's reign, none of the Rājput nobles is known to have held the charge of this fort. It was apparently in pursuance of the same policy that in 1614 Rāj Singh was replaced by Shaikh Mōdā as the commander of Gwālior fort.  

3. Akbarnāma, III, p.825; Muḥta Nainsī-re-Khvāt, I, p.301.  
5. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.74.  
7. Maktubat-i Khān-i Jahān Muzaffar Khān-wa-Gwālior nāma, MS. f.199b; Tārīkh-i Gwālior, MS. f.23; Shaikh Mōdā was brother of Muʿazẓam Khān Shaikh Bāyāzīd, the grandson of Shaikh Salīm of Fatahpūr.
II

The Table 'B' indicates that between 1612 and 1621, the numerical strength of Rājput nobles increased from 26 to 29, while on the other hand in term of total mansābā held by them the position of the Rājputs declined. Their total mansābā during this period fell from 66,200 to 60,900 zāt.\(^1\) As it is shown by a perusal of this table, the increase in absolute strength of the Rājput nobles was the result of fresh recruitments of 9 nobles belonging to the clans of Hūda (1), Sisodia (3), Bhadūrīya (1), Katoch (1) and Rāthor (2) clans. At the same time successors of 6 nobles (including 2 Kachawahās and one each belonging to Baghela, Bhadūrīya, Dhandhera and Tunwar clans) who died during this period, were not taken into service. The total of the mansābā of the nobles who died during this phase (13,000 zāt) was larger than that of the new recruits (8,000 zāt).\(^2\) This resulted in the marginal fall in the total mansābā of the Rājput nobles.

In the case of the Kachawahā and Rāthor clans, Jahāṅgīr appears to have continued the policy that he had adopted in the beginning of his reign which led to a marginal decline in the

---

1. See, Table 'B'.
2. Supra.
position of the Kachawäha clan and enabled the Rāthors other than those of Bikāner to improve their position. During the period 1612-21, the number of the Kachawäha chiefs in the Mughal service further declined from 9 to 7. On the other hand, the number of the Rāthor nobles increased from 6 to 8.¹

A scrutiny of the mansaba held by nobles belonging to different Rājput clans between 1612 and 1621, Jahāngīr by and large followed a policy that adversely affected the position of the clans already in the service. While on the other hand, a number of new clans were recruited in the service for the first time under Jahāngīr which did not allow the position of the Rājputs as such to suffer a sizable decline in total mansabs. The following cases of fresh recruitments accounting for this situation deserve to be mentioned. The fresh recruits Anüp Singh Badgujar, Rāja Sangrām and Dabī Chand, who were taken in the service, were assigned the mansaba of 2000/1600,² 1500/1000³ and 1500/500⁴ respectively. Among these newly recruited nobles, the most favourite was Badgujar chief Anüp Singh who had saved Jahāngīr from a furious tiger.⁵ In addition to mansab, he was

1. See Table 'B'.
2. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīr, p.266.
3. Ibid., p.314.
4. Ibid., p.304.
5. Ibid., pp.89-90; Pelsaert, Jahangir's India, pp.52-3.
granted a paraga Anüp Shahr in the sarkar of Kol as watan and was also given the title of Anī Rāi Singh Dalān. Moreover, he came to be trusted by Jahāngīr so much that he was appointed by the King as the qilādār of Gwalior fort and Prince Khusrau was put in that fort under his custody.2

One of the ways in which Jahāngīr contributed to the decline in the strength of the clans continuing in the Mughal service since Akbar's time was that he did not enrol as mansab-dārs the successors of many of the ordinary Rājput nobles, not belonging to the ruling families of Āmber, Jodhpur, Bundi, Bikaner and Jaisalmer. It is illustrated by the following examples: After the deaths of three senior nobles Rām Deo Baghela (d. 1618 AD), Rāj Jagman Dhanchera (c. 1613 AD) and Shyām Singh Tunwar (d. 1617 AD), who held the mansab of 2000 zāt, 3 1,000 zāt 4 and 1500 zāt 5 respectively, none of their successors are known to have been assigned mansab. About

1. See Chapter IV on Watan Jāgīr.
Mukut Man Bhaduriya who held the mansab of 2000 in 1612, nothing is known while his successor Bikramajit Bhaduriya seems to be in the imperial service but one does not know about his mansab. In 1614, Bikramajit was sent with Prince Khurram against Rana Amar Singh of Mewar. However, Bikramajit died in 1617 AD. Another cause of decline noticeable in the position of the entrenched clans was the policy of giving to begin with a lower mansab to the successor of a chief which would, apparently, conformed to the income of the watan inherited by him. The following cases of this nature can be cited: 

(a) In 1614, after the death of Raja Bāao Pundir, chief of Mau who held the mansab of 3500 zāt, his successor Suraj Mal was given the lower mansab of 2000/2000 with the title of Raja. In 1618, Suraj Mal revolted and was replaced by his younger brother Jagat Singh who was granted the mansab of only 1000/500; 
(b) In 1616, death occurred of Rawal Bhim Bhati who held the mansab of 3000 zāt. His successor, Kalyān Singh was assigned the mansab of 2000/1000.

---

5. Ibid., p.264. Shaikh Farid Bakkari says that he was given the mansab of 1000/1000. Zakhirat-ul Khawanin, II, p.387.
Further, Jahāṅgīr seems to have followed a policy of showing special favour to those Rājput chiefs who either held lesser positions since Akbar's reign or were taken into service only after Jahāṅgīr's accession. Among the Hādas, for example, another member of the ruling family of Bundī, Hīrday Narāīn was taken in the service with the mansab of 1200/600. Similarly, the mansab of the Bundila chiefs rose to 5600/5400 which are accounted for by the increase in mansab of newly recruited Bir Singh Bundila. Bir Singh was the first Bundila chief who reached the status of 5000/5000. He was also felicitated with the title of Maharājā and was assigned a large territory in jāgīr in the central India. This would have given him effective control over the route which led to the Deccan. But at the same time, the mansab of Bir Singh's rival among Bundilas declined. In 1618, after the death of Rām Chandra Bundila who held the mansab of 1000 zāt, his successor Bhārat was given the lower mansab of 600/400.

2. See Table 'B'.
During this period, the *mansab* of the Sisodias rose up vertically. In 1615, after taking up the Mughal service by Rana Amar Singh of Mewar, their *mansab* increased from 3000/1000 to 14000/8200. Rana Amar Singh was assigned the *mansab* of 5000/1000. In the case of the Sisodia chief, Jahāṅgīr had made many exceptions in the Mughal policy towards the Rājpūts. Amar Singh was exempted from rendering military service personally. He was allowed to depute his heir-apparent with 1000 horsemen to serve under Jahāṅgīr. Besides, two more members of the Sisodia ruling family, Kunwar Karan and Shyām Singh were taken into service with the *mansab* of 5000/5000 and 2500/1400 respectively. But in 1618, after the death of Sagar Sisodia, who held the *mansab* of 3000/2000, his son Mān Singh was assigned the lower rank of 1500/800, while Chandra Singh Chandrawat of Rāmpūra continued in his *mansab* of 700 zāt.

1. Compare the Tables 'A' and 'B'.
2. Maḥta Naṣīr-ṣe-Khvaṭ, I, p.29; Amar Singh died in 1619 AD.
5. Ibid., p.138.
Rawat Megh Singh on account of his personal grudge against Rana Amar Singh joined the Mughal service with the mansab of 400/200. He was deputed with Raja Vikramajit to put down the rebels in Kangra. Rawat Megh Singh's son Narhar Das was also granted the mansab of 80/20. From Prince Khurram's nishan, dated 1027 AH/1618 AD, to Rawat Megh Singh, it appears that the Rawat failed to join Vikramajit in Kangra. Consequently, Jahangir ordered to cease the mansab and jagir of the Rawat. But on Kunwar Bhim's assurance to Prince Khurram for early arrival of the Rawat his mansab and jagir were not ceased. Rawat Megh Singh seems to have been promoted to 500/250. Besides his brother whose name is not mentioned in Jahangir's farman, was granted the mansab of 60/20. Other three persons who were attached to the command of the Rawat were Phul Das, Hari Das and Paras Ram. Each of them was given the mansab of 20 zat. But Rawat Megh Singh and others did not go to Kangra; therefore, they were dispossessed from their mansabs and jagirs.

1. Shyamal Das has reproduced Jahangir's farman to Rawat Megh Singh. It is translated into Hindi. See, Vir Vinod, p.252.
2. Ibid.
3. For Prince Khurram's nishan to Rawat Megh Singh, see, Vir Vinod, pp.253-64.
4. For Jahangir's farman to Rawat Megh Singh, see, Vir Vinod, pp.253-64.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
The total mansaba of the Kachawáha chiefs, in this period, fell from 30,500/13,500 to 13,200/6,450 while those of the Rathor chiefs increased from 11,500/5,500 to 15,700/7,450. It is significant that this fall in the mansaba is discernible in case of the Rajawat as well as non-Rajawat nobles. The mansaba of the Rajawats and non-Rajawats came down from 19,500/11,500 to 11,500/5,100 and 11,000/10,800 to 1,300/1,200 respectively. For this it would appear that the fall in the mansaba of the Rajawat nobles was only marginal; apparently the bulk of the reduction in the total mansaba of the clan was caused by the removal from the scene one prominent non-Rajawat noble Ram Dás Udáwat. After Jahangír's accession Ram Dás Udáwat became his favourite and reached the status of panjhažarı mansabdär. But his role in the expedition against Malik Ambar in 1611 annoyed Jahangír. After his death in 1613, none of his successors is reported as having received a mansab. Moreover, on the death of two other senior non-Rajawat nobles, their successors were given reduced mansaba. These nobles were Raisal Darbáří and Ráí Manohar who died between 1612 and 1621. While

1. Compare the Tables 'A' and 'B'.
2. For the mansaba of the Rajawat and non-Rajawat nobles, see, List No. 'B' and 'C'.
Rāisāl Darbāri's son Girdhar Das was given the mansab of 1200/900. Prithvi Rāj, son of Rāi Manohar got the mansab of 700/450. On the other hand, marginal fall in the total mansabs of the Rājāwat nobles was caused by the deaths of Mān Singh (7000/7000), Maha Singh (4000/3000) and Rāj Singh (3500/3000). But their successors were taken into service with reduced mansabs which partly made up for the total fall caused by the deaths of the three senior Rājāwat nobles. By the end of 1621, their successors Bhāo Singh, Jai Singh and Rām Dās Narwāri had attained the mansabs as of 5000/3000, 1000/1000 and 1500/700 respectively. Karam Chand continued on his mansab of 2000/1000.

The increase in the mansabs of the Rāthor clan took place because of the fresh recruitments of 100 Rāthor nobles and the increases in the mansabs of senior Rāthor nobles already in the service from the beginning of the reign. Karam Sen Rāthor was

2. Ibid., p.239; Tazkīrat-ul Umarā: MS. f.133.
4. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.192; According to Shāh Nawāz Khān, he held the mansab of 1000/500. Ma'āsir-ul Umarā; III, p.568.
taken in the service with the mansab of 1000/300.¹ The mansabs of the senior Rathor nobles, Pratap of Baglana, and Keshu Das Naru of Merta were enhanced from 3000 zat and 1500/1000 to 4000 zat² and 2000/1200.³ Further, one notices that after Dalpat, the chief of Bikaner (m. 1500/1000), rebelled and was killed in 1614, his successor Suraj Singh attained the mansab of 2000/2000.⁴ But in the case of Rathor chiefs of Jodhpur, one notices a marginal fall in the mansab which came down from 5,500/3,725 to 5000/2,750.⁵ This fall occurred because of the death of Kishan Singh (m. 2000/1500) in 1615 and the assignment of a minor mansab of 500/225 to his successor Jagmal.⁶ But in the case of the main line of the ruling family of Jodhpur, did not follow the policy of giving considerably reduced mansabs to the successor of a deceased chief, which did not allow the fall in the total mansab of the Rathors considerably. For example, after the death of Suraj Singh who held the mansab of 3000/2000 in 1612, his successor Gaj Singh was also assigned the same

¹ Tuzuk-i Jahangiri, p.143.
² Ibid., p.203.
³ Ibid., p.192.
⁴ Ibid., p.126.
⁵ Compare the Tables 'A' and 'B'.
⁶ Tuzuk-i Jahangiri, p.277; Tezkirat-ul Umarg; MS. p.150.
mangab of 2000/2000. Another Rāthor noble, belonging to the main line of the ruling family, Sabal Singh continued to hold a mangab of 500/225 throughout this period.

III

As we have noticed, during the period 1612-1621 AD, the position of the Rājput nobles in the Mughal service declined in terms of the mangabs held by them. But on the other hand, the list of Shāh Jahān's mangabdār furnishing by Lāhorī shows that by the 10th R.Y. of Shāh Jahān's reign (i.e. 1637), the total mangab of the Rājput nobles were more than the figure for the years 1605-12. This would suggest that the Rājput nobles were able to regain their lost position and improved it further during the intervening period of 1621-1637. It is, of course, obvious that partly this improvement in their


3. In 1612, the Rājput nobles held the total mangab of 69,700/24,940 while in 1637, the total mangab of the Rājput nobles were 80,350/58,280. For reference, see Table 'B' of this chapter and Table 'A' of the next chapter.
position was the result of new appointments and increases ordered by Shāh Jahān after his coming to the throne. But partly at least the ground for this improvement must have been prepared as a result of the developments of the last six years of Jahāngīr's reign. It can be imagined that the cleavage which occurred between Jahāngīr and his son Shāh Jahān helped the Rājput nobles to improve their position; both the sides tried to win over the Rājput nobles by showing them favours. Similarly, when Mahābat Khān fell out with Nūr Jahān and captured the central government for a brief period in 1626, he also, like Shāh Jahān, tried to secure his own position by showing favours to some of the Rājput nobles.

On the whole, it seems, during the last six years of his reign, Jahāngīr went out of his way in ensuring that the chiefs of the more important clans in his service remained placated. This is reflected in mansab promotions and titles received by them during this period. During 1623, Jahāngīr bestowed the title of 'Mahārāja' upon his favourite Bundila chief, Bir Singh Deo, who had already reached the mansab of 5000/5000.¹ At the same time, Bir Singh's son Jujhār Singh was given the mansab of 2000/1000² and by the end of Jahāngīr's reign, Jujhār Singh had

¹. _Tuzuk-i Jahāngīr_, p.356.
². _Ibid_.

already been raised to 4000/4000. During the same time, another Bundila chief Bhārat Singh was promoted from 1500/1000 to 3000/2000. Apparently, Jahāngīr was going out of his way to placate the Bundila chiefs who controlled a strategically placed territory on the route to Burhānpur. This was the first occasion when any Rajput chief was given the exalted title of mahārājā by the Mughal Emperor and moreover, it is also the only occasion when Jahāngīr preferred to bestow this title on any one of his nobles.

During the same period (1621-1627 AD) a number of Kachawāhas also improved their positions, the mansab of three of them were enhanced. Kachawāha chief Jai Singh's mansab was increased from 2000/1000 to 4000/3000. Rām Dās Narwārī was promoted from 1500/700 to 2000/1000. Rāja Girhar was raised from 1200/900 to 2000/1500. As a matter of fact, during this period, Jahāngīr appears to be very anxious to keep his Kachawāha nobles in good humour. This is borne by an episode recorded by Jahāngīr

2. Ibid., pp.212-14.
5. Ibid., p.356; Tezkīrat-ul Umarā; MS. p.143.
himself. In 1623, while the imperial army was pursuing Shāh Jahān in Gujarat, there arose a quarrel between the Sayyids of Bārha and the retainers of Girdhar Kachawahā. In the scuffle that ensued, Girdhar and his twenty-six retainers were killed. As a punishment for this killing, Sayyid Kabir, a member of the powerful clan of Saādat-i Bārha was executed. It is correctly noticed by Athar Ali that the Mughal rulers ordinarily avoided executing an officer of the state. In this light, the decision of Mahābat Khān, the noble who was in command of the army to execute Sayyid Kabir on the insistence of the Rājputs and Jahāngīr’s reference to this episode in the Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī in a manner suggesting his approval of the difficult decision that his commander had to take, goes to indicate the significance that was attached by the King and the nobles cooperating with them at this time, to the willing cooperation of the Rājput nobles with royalists. In pursuance of the same policy, the leading members of the Rāthor clan were also felicitated by increasing their mansāb. Rāja Gaj Singh of Jodhpur was promoted from 3000/2000 to 5000/5000 while Suraj Singh Rāthor of Bīkāner was raised from 2000/2000 to 3000/2000.

1. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.374-75. Though we do not come across the mansāb of Sayyid Kabir but from the passage of Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī (pp.374-75), it is known that Sayyid Kabir maintained troopers under his command.
3. Lāhorī, Bādshāhnāma, I, p.158; Ma'āṣir-ull Umarā', I, p.571.
Further, to strengthen the relations with the ruling families of Jodhpur and Āmber, Jahāngīr established new matrimonial ties with them. In March 1624, Prince Parwiz married the sister of Rāja Gaj Singh. In 1625, Prince Dāwer Bakhsh married the sister of Rāja Jai Singh.

The Hāda chief Sarbuland Rāy became the favourite of Jahāngīr for the loyal services rendered by him since the beginning of his reign. He stood firmly on Jahāngīr's side during Shāh Jahān's revolt. In a skirmish with Shāh Jahān's forces at Burhānpur, Sarbuland Rāy, who was posted there as hākim, distinguished himself. His son Gopi Nath, who chose to flee from the battle field, was disowned by him. Finally, when the imperial forces succeeded in overcoming rebels in the Deccan, as a reward for his royal services, Sarbuland Rāy was promoted from 2500/1500 to 5000/5000 with the title of 'Rām Rāy' which was considered the highest honour in the Deccan. Moreover,

1. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.380; Mārwār-re-Pargana-re-Vigat, I,108.
4. Ibid.
during this period, Sarbuland Ray's son Madho Singh and his brother Hirday Narain enjoyed the mansab of 1000/600\(^1\) and 1200/600\(^2\) respectively.

Another Rajput clan which came to prominence during this period and earned the confidence of the imperial authority was the Bhaduriyas controlling the parganas Chandawar, Hatkant and Rapri in the vicinity of Agra as their zamindari.\(^3\) Bhaduriyas, according to Farid Bhakkarī, were known as the "protectors of the fort of Akbarabad". When in 1623, taking advantage of Jahangir's absence from Agra, Shāh Jahān advanced against the capital, Bhoj Bhaduriya came forward to check him. He sent a message to Shāh Jahān saying, "The wealth, country, fort and treasury belong to the Prince, but so long as Emperor Jahāngīr is alive, he cannot take possession of these".\(^4\) The stout opposition of the Bhaduriya chief, apparently forced Shāh Jahān to withdraw from Agra without making an attempt to occupy it.

---

2. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīri, p.322; Tazkīrat-ul Umarā', f.158.  
4. Ibid. Bhaduriya chief who played this role was not Bikramajit as mentioned by Sheikh Farīd Bhakkarī, but he was Bikramajit's son Bhoj Bhaduriya. Bikramajit had died in 1617 AD. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīri, p.192.
on this occasion. This attitude of the Bhadūriya chief suggests that around this time, he was close to Jahāngīr and for his unflinching loyalty to the Mughal ruling family enjoyed the fullest trust and confidence of the king. Farīd Bhakkari's statement ascribing to Bhadūriya's role of protectors of the fort of Akbarābād might be interpreted as indicating the degree of reliance that Jahāngīr used to place on their support. It is significant that Bhoj Bhadūriya's firm stand in support of Jahāngīr on this occasion did not earn the entire Bhadūriya clan Shāh Jahān's hostility. Shāh Jahān, apparently, understood the logic of Bhoj's stand that he was duty bound to be loyal to the reigning Emperor. As we shall see in the next chapter, Shāh Jahān after his accession continued his father's policy of favouring Bhadūriyas, though it is true, under Shāh Jāhan one does not hear of Bhoj any more.

At the time of Shāh Jahān's revolt, Anī Rai Singh Dalān Bāqīyānī, who was favourite of Jahāngīr, was on the North-Eastern frontier at Ghazni to fight with the Uzbeks. 1 Next year in 1625, he was appointed to seize the fort of Kangra. 2 In 1626, when Jahāngīr came to know that twenty two lakh rupees

2. Ibid., p. 423.
were being carried from Bengāl to be handed over to Mahābat Khān, who was in Thatta, he deputed Ani Rāi Singh Dalān, Safdar Khān, Sipahdār Khān and others to seize the treasury. At Shahbād, Ani Rāi Singh and his associates succeeded to seize the treasury. However, Ani Rāi Singh attained the rank of 3000 zāt. But after Shāh Jahān's accession, he submitted to him at Akbarabād.

Further, Pundir chief Jagat Singh of Mau rebelled twice between the period from 1621 to 1627, even then he secured promotions in his mansab. Initially, Jagat Singh rebelled in favour of Prince Shāh Jahān but his revolt was crushed and he rejoined the imperial service. Again in 1626, when Jahangir was in Kābul, Jagat Singh left the imperial service and fled to his watan Mau. However, the imperial forces forced him to submit to the king. Despite these revolts, Jagat Singh was able to improve his position from 1000/500 to 3000/2000.

1. Ma'āsir-i Jahāngrī, pp.460, 462.
2. Pelsaert, p.53.
5. Ma'āsir-i Jahāngrī, 447.
Towards the end of Jahangir's reign, when Mahabat Khan fell out with Nur Jahān and captured the central government for a brief period in 1626, he also tried to secure his position by showing favours to some of the Rājput nobles. There are extant interesting ferman of Jahangir of the period when he was under Mahabat Khan's control which suggests that Mahabat Khan was trying to cultivate relations with Jai Singh of Amber and Suraj Singh Rāthor of Bikaner. From two of these ferman, dated January 1625 and August 1625 addressed to Suraj Singh and Jai Singh, it seems that both the chiefs did not fully approve of Mahabat Khan's removal from the Deccan and were tardy in extending cooperation to Khan-i Jahān Lodī who was replaced as the commandant at Burhānpur. At this time, apparently Jahangir and Nur Jahān on their part were anxious to secure the cooperation of the Rājput nobles in the impending tussle with Mahabat Khan. They tried to persuade them to help Khan-i Jahān Lodī. Jahangir, even goes to the extent of threatening them with dire consequences including dismissal from the imperial service if they would fail to extend full cooperation to the new commander.

About the same time Nur Jahān also wrote to Jai Singh a letter urging upon him to cooperate with Khān-i Jahān Lodi.¹ Subsequently, Jai Singh remained with Khān-i Jahān and cooperated with him which earned him a khilat from the Empress in December 1625.² However, throughout this time Jai Singh and Suraj Singh appear to have been on the best of terms with Mahābat Khān. The latter, soon after taking Jahāngīr into prison in March 1626, had issued fārmāna to Jai Singh and Suraj Singh Rāthor in which the king was made to place on record the 'favourable reports' made by Mahābat Khān regarding their roles in the Deccan.³ It was clearly a friendly gesture on the part of Mahābat Khān aimed at further strengthening the bond of friendship and understanding between them. From the fact that these nobles were not reported to have made any move during this period, showing their resentment over Mahābat Khān's action suggest that these overtures of the latter were not entirely fruitless. On the other hand, when Mahābat Khān stayed at Ranthambhār on his way to Kābul from Deccan, Sisodia chief Rāṇa Karan extended help of one thousand troopers to the former.⁴

---

2: Ibid.
But after the failure of coup d’etat, when Mahābat Khān reached Mewār, Rāna Karan became indifferent to Mahābat Khān. One may presume that the Rājput chiefs by and large cooperated with Mahābat Khān in running of the routine administration as long as the king was under his control. But after the collapse of Mahābat Khān’s attempted coup d’etat, the Rājput chiefs drew back from him and switched over their support to the new focus of imperial authority controlled by Nur Jahān.

On the other hand, Shāh Jahān also realised that by winning over some of the senior chiefs to his side, he would greatly strengthen his position. He tried to gain their active support, but was not very successful. In April 1626, when Jahāngīr was under the custody of Mahābat Khān, Shāh Jahān made a futile attempt to persuade Jai Singh to join him. He addressed a letter to Jai Singh wherein emphasizing the ties of kinship between them, he sought the latter’s help. Later, in June 1626, while Shāh Jahān was on his way to Thatta via Jodhpur, he contacted his Rāthor-in-laws to gain their support. He sent his Rāthor wife to Jodhpur to persuade her relations to help Shāh Jahān in the impending struggle for the throne. But his

2. Shāh Jahān’s letter to Jai Singh, RSA Bikaner, N.173; Shāh Jahān addressed Jai Singh as khālu because Shāh Jahān’s step mother was the sister of Jai Singh.
endeavours towards this end were not very successful. He could muster the active support of only two chiefs. Jagat Singh Pundir and Jagmāl Rāthor who held the mansab of 1000/500 and 500/225 respectively. Other staunch supporters of Shāh Jahān among Rājput chiefs were Bhim Sisodia, Gopāl Dās Gaur and Bal Rām Gaur. It seems Bhim Sisodia did not hold any mansab in the imperial service, he was apparently enrolled directly in Shāh Jahān's contingent as one of the officers of the Prince some time prior to the battle of Bilochnpur. He distinguished himself in the battle of Bilochnpur and as a reward, Shah Jahan granted him the mansab of 5000/5000 with the title of 'Maharaja'. Before Bhim Sisodia was killed in the battle of Tonā, he had acquired the status of 6000/5000 in Shah Jahan's service. Regarding Gaur chiefs Gopāl Dās and his son Bal Rām it is known that they were in service of Sarbuland Ray Hada before they joined Shah Jahan. They were, however, quite close to Shah Jahan during this time. In March 1624, Shah Jahan appointed

4. Ahwāl-i Shahzadgī-ī Shah Jahan, pp.52, 62; Lahori, Badehdn-
   name, I, p.123.
Gopal Das as commandant of the fort of Asir.¹ Gopal Das and Bal Ram were killed in Thatta in course of a skirmish with the forces of local zamindars.² After their deaths, Siv Ram, son of Gopal Das and Bhata Das, son of Bal Ram were enrolled in Shah Jahan's service and continued to serve Shah Jahan down to his accession.³ They emerged as influential Rajput nobles during Shah Jahan's reign.

Further, Shah Jahan's revolt caused split in the ruling Rajput clans. In case of the Ujjainya clan, one finds that in September 1624, when Shah Jahan was in Bihar, Narayan Mal and his brother Pratap joined Shah Jahan's service with the mansabs of 5000/5000 and 3000/2000⁴ respectively. Other brothers of Narayan Mal were given the total mansab of 2000/1000.⁵ But later on Narayan Mal's brother Satyjit and his certain son defected to the imperial side.⁶ While in service, reverse, the Bundila chief Bir Singh Deo was devoted to Jahangir

¹. Tuzuk-i Jahangiri, p.371.
³. Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, pp.250-25; 263-64.
⁶. Ibid., 779.
but his son Pahar Singh had joined Shah Jahan when he was in Bihar with a large contingent. He was induced to take up this step on account of his quarrel with his father Bir Singh Deo Bundila. Pahar Singh was given the mansab of 5000/5000 by Shah Jahan and one of his younger brothers who had accompanied him was assigned the mansab of 3000/2000. Three other brothers of Pahar Singh, who had also joined Shah Jahan, were granted the total mansab of 2000/1000. In October 1624, after the battle of Tons in which Shah Jahan was defeated, Pahar Singh defected to the imperial side.

Similarly, in case of the Kachawaha and Rathor clans, the chiefs of these clans Raja Jai Singh Kachawaha and Gaj Singh Rathor supported Jahangir while lesser important members of their clans joined Shah Jahan. In the Kachawaha clan, Manrup Kachawaha who did not hold any mansab during this period backed Shah Jahan. In the Rathor clan, Prithvi Raj, Bhim and Akhey Raj who also did not hold any mansab sided with Shah Jahan.

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
Thus, it emerges that during the first six years of his reign, Jahāṅgīr, over all, adopted liberal policy towards the Rājput nobility which enabled the Rājput nobles to improve their positions in regard of the mansab. Jahāṅgīr was much more liberal towards those Rājput chiefs who supported his claim to the throne. Though, apparently, Jahangir did not punish the Rājput chiefs who opposed his succession but certainly he restrained to give them further promotions. In assignment of offices, Rājput nobles suffered heavily.

Between 1612 and 1621, the total mansab of the Rājput chiefs declined. During this period, after the deaths of the senior nobles, either their successors were not taken in the imperial service or the successors were taken in the service were assigned lower mansab. But within the Rājput nobility, Jahāṅgīr felicitated to those Rājput chiefs who were recruited in the imperial service after his accession.

Towards the end of Jahāṅgīr's reign, Shāh Jahan's revolt and the tussle between Nūr Jahān and Mahābat Khān paved the way for the Rājput chiefs to improve their position. In these crises, the important Rājput chiefs backed Jahāṅgīr to put down the revolts but a few who either enjoyed lesser status in the Mughal hierarchy or the Rājput chiefs who did not hold mansab, supported Shāh Jahan.
### Table 'A'

**MANSABS HELD BY THE RAJPUT CLANS IN 1605 A.D. AND IN 1611-12 A.D.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>Number of Nobles in 1604-5</th>
<th>MANSAB 1604-5</th>
<th>Number of Nobles in 1611-12</th>
<th>MANSAB 1611-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Kachawaha</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Rathor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bhaduriya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Baghela</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Chandrahat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Bhati</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Tunwar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Hada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Dhandhera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Pundir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Bundila</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Sisodia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58,300</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 'B'

**MANSABS OF THE RAJPUT CLANS IN 1620-21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>Number of Nobles</th>
<th>Mangab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rathor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15,700/7,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kachawaha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13,200/6,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sisodia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14,000/8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Bundila</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,600/5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Hada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,700/2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Bhati</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000/1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Badgujar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000/1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Jamwal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500/1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Katoch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500/500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Pundir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000/500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Chandrawat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,900/34,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For the mangab of individual chief and source, see appendices.
Appendix 'A'

MANSABS HELD BY THE ALIVE RĀJPUT CHIEFS
IN 1611-12 A.D.

KACHAWĀHAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Rai Manohar Shaikhwat</td>
<td>1000/1000</td>
<td>Tuzuk, p. 112.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RĀTHORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kesho Das Maru of Merta</td>
<td>1500/1000</td>
<td>Tuzuk, pp. 9, 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Dalpat s/o Rai Singh</td>
<td>1500/1000</td>
<td>Tuzuk, p. 111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Pratap or Baharjiv of Baglana</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>Tuzuk, p. 196.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Source(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ram Chandra</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Vigat, II, p.492.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNDIRS</td>
<td>1. Raja Basu</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>Tuzuk, p.23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISODIAS</td>
<td>1. Rana Sagar</td>
<td>3000/1000</td>
<td>Tuzuk, p.34; T.U., p.141.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAGHELAS</td>
<td>1. Ram Deo Baghela</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Ain, I, p.161; Died in 1618 A.D., V.V., 556.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HADAS</td>
<td>1. Ratan entitled Serbuland Ray</td>
<td>1500/1240</td>
<td>Tuzuk, p.66.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contd..
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DHANDHERAS</td>
<td>Raja Jagman</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>A.N., III, p.832; Iqbal, p.504; Tuzuk, p.118.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUNWARS</td>
<td>Shyam Singh</td>
<td>1500/1200</td>
<td>Tuzuk, p.37; T.U., f.141; Died in 1618.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDRAWATS</td>
<td>Chandu</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>M.U., II, pp.143-44.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 'B'

**MANSABS HELD BY THE ALIVE RÄJPUT CHIEFS IN 1620-21 A.D.**

### KACHAWÄHAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### RÄTHORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Pratap of Baglana</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td><em>Tuzuk</em>, p.203.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>--- b/o Raja Gaj Singh</td>
<td>500/225</td>
<td><em>Tuzuk</em> (p.277); probably, he is Sabal Singh of Kewal Ram (<em>T.U.</em>, p.153) and Sagat Singh of Mañei (<em>Vigat</em>, II, p.492).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Group     | Name                      | Amount   | Source
|-----------|---------------------------|----------|--------|
|           | Bharat                    | 1500/1000| Tuzuk, pp.271, 355.
| Sigudias  | Kunwar Karan              | 5000/5000| Jahangir's farman to Karan, V.V., II, pp.240-49.
|           | Man Singh, s/o Sagar      | 1500/800 | Ibid., p.310; T.U., f.157.
| Badgujaras| Ani Rai Singh Dalan       | 2000/1600| Tuzuk, p.266.
| Pundirs   | Jagat Singh, s/o Basa     | 1000/500 | Tuzuk, p.264.

contd......
### JAMWALS OR MANHAS

1. **Raja Sangram of Jammu**  
   1500/1000  
   *Tuzuk*, p.314.

### HADAS

1. **Ratan entitled Sarbuland Ray**  
   2500/1500  
   *Tuzuk*, p.272.

2. **Hirday Narain b/o Ratan**  
   1200/ 600  
   *Tuzuk*, p.322; *T.U.*, f.158.

### KATUCHS

1. **Debi Chand of Guler**  
   1500/ 500  
   *Tuzuk*, p.304.

### CHANDRAWATS

1. **Chandy Singh**  
   700  
   *M.U.*, II, pp.147, 48.
Chapter III

SHĀH JAHĀN AND RĀJPUT CHIEFS

In the preceding chapter, we have seen that before Prince Shah Jahan, the position of the Rajput nobles as a whole declined. At the same time new comers, belonging to the Sisodia, Bundila and Bargujar clans, became prominent. During Prince Shah Jahan's rebellion most of the Rajput chiefs remained loyal to Jahangir, and only a few Rajput chiefs actively supported the Prince. However, after Jahangir's death the situation changed dramatically, especially after Shāh Jahān's successful occupation of Gujrat and triumphal march to Āgra. Though, like the other nobles, the Rajput chiefs too hastened to acknowledge him as Emperor, the new sovereign's attitude could not but be complicated by their past conduct, as he would judge it in each individual case.

One index of this is the mansab evidence. In Shāh Jahān's reign, we are fortunate in possessing fairly comprehensive mansab lists of the nobles. 'Abdul Ḥamīd Lāhorī, has furnished mansab lists of Shāh Jahān's nobles who held the mansab of 500 and above, for the 10th and 20th regnal years. For the 30th year, a similar list has been provided by Wārisa. From other sources we encounter mansabs of some Rajput chiefs not included in these lists. On
the basis of this evidence, we have compiled lists of Rajput nobles, with their mansabs, for the three years, spaced at ten lunar decades, viz., 1637, 1647, and 1656. We have classified the mansabs according to the clans of the nobles. Along with these lists, we have also prepared a list of offices held by the Rajput chiefs at different points of time. This information should provide us with a much sounder base for the study of the fortunes of the Rajput nobility during the reign of Shah Jahan.

From our table of mansabs, it is evident that after Shah Jahan's accession, the numerical strength as well as the mansab figures of the Rajput nobles increased substantially. In 1621, according to information compiled mainly from the Tuzuk, there were 29 Rajput nobles who altogether held the mansabs of 58,300/34,100\(^1\) while by the end of 1637, their numerical strength was sixty two and their mansab figures were 84,350/59,780.\(^2\) But this comparison may be misleading since the list of 1621 is probably very incomplete, having been compiled simply from incidental references in Jahangir Memoirs.

---
1. See Appendix 'B' of chapter II.
2. See Table 'A'. For the mansab of an individual Rajput chief, see the appended list of mansabs held by the alive Rajput chiefs in 1637 A.D.
After his accession, Shāh Jahān rewarded the Gaur family whose members Gopāl and Bal Rām had been killed in his cause in Sind. The descendants of Gopāl and Bal Rām became trusted favourites of Shāh Jahān. In 1637, there were five Gaur nobles whose total mansāb amounted to 8,200/5,500.¹ Shāh Jahān, after his accession recruited Bēthal Dās, son of Gopāl Dās in the imperial service with the mansāb of 3000/1500.² He was also granted the title of Rāja, and presented with a flag, a horse, an elephant and Rs.30,000.³ In 1630, when he distinguished himself in the campaign against Khān-i Jahān Lodi in an engagement near Dholpur, he was promoted to 5000/2000.⁴ In 1631, an important office such as the Castellan (qilādār) of Ranthambhor was assigned to him.⁵ In 1633, he was appointed the Governor (faujdār) of sūba Ajmer.⁶ By the end of Shāh Jahān’s 10th R.Y. (1636-1637 A.D.), he held the mansāb of 4000/3000.⁷ Moreover, Dhandhera was granted to him in watan-jāāir.⁸

¹ See Table 'A'.
² Lāhori, I, pp.117-18.
³ Ibid., Ma‘āṣir-ul Umarā; II, pp.250-52.
⁵ Ma‘āṣir-ul Umarā; II, pp. 250-54.
⁶ Lāhori, I, p.476; Iskāla Taba Tabai, p.94.
⁷ Lāhori, I, p.296.
⁸ Ibid., p.8.
Bethal Das's brother Girdhar Das was also taken in the imperial service with the mansab of 500/200. In 1636, when Girdhar Das killed Jujhar Singh Bundila and captured the fort of Jhansi, in reward, he was appointed the qiladar of the fort of Jhansi.

Siv Ram, son of Bal Ram Gaur, was granted the mansab of 1500/1000. In 1636, he is known to have held the office of qiladar of the fort of Aiar. Besides, two more Gaur nobles Sangram and Kirpa Ram held mansabs of 1500/600 and 700/700. In 1632, Kirpa Ram was appointed faujdar of chakla Hisar.

Similarly, the Sodha chief Rana Jodha of Amar Kot, who had helped Prince Shah Jahan to pass through his territory was rewarded with the mansab of 800/300.

Seeing that Shahjahan's mother was a Rathor princess, of Jodhpur, it is not surprising that the fortunes of the Rathors

1. Lahori, I, p.324.
3. Lahori, I, p.305.
6. Ibid., p.316.
7. Ibid., p.432.
improved substantially. In 1621, there are known to have been only five nobles holding recorded mansab from amongst the Rathors of Jodhpur; 1 in 1637 there were 10. Shah Jahan naturally exalted with mansab those Rathor chiefs who had sided with him during his rebellion; Prithvi Raj, Bhim and Bhar Mal were so rewarded. By the end of 1637, Prithvi Raj and Bhim held the mansab of 2000/1700 2 and 1500/800 3 respectively. Jagmal was also assigned the mansab of 1500/800; 4 but he was killed in 1628 in encounter with Khan-i Jahan Lodi. His successor Hari Singh was given the mansab of 1000/800. 5 Similarly, in 1629, when Girdhar Das, who held the mansab of 1000/500, was killed again in the campaign against Khan Jahan, 6 his son Udai Bhan was given the mansab of 600/400 with the title of Raja. 7 Other Rathor nobles who were already in the service were given promotions. The mansab of Jagmal was increased from 500/225 to 1500/700. 8 But in 1629, after his death in battle, none of his

---

1. See Table 'B' of the chapter II.
2. Lāhori, I, p.301.
3. Ibid., p.306.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., p.308.
6. Ibid., p.310.
7. Ibid., p.319; Bānke Dās-re-Khव, p.178.
descendants seems to have received any mansab. Another Rathor chief Sabal Singh was promoted from 500/225 to 900/800.¹ Similarly, the mansab of Karamat Rathor enhanced from 1000/300 to 1500/800.² In 1629, when he was killed, his four sons were taken into imperial service. In 1637, his sons Shyam Singh, Jagannath, Nand Ram and Mahesh Das altogether held mansab of 1950/880.³

The principal Rathor noble was, of course, the ruler of Jodhpur. It is noteworthy that though Raja Gaj Singh fought against Khan-i Jahan Lodi and Jujhar Singh Bundila and also served in the Deccan expeditions, he was not given any promotions. His mansab remained static as 5000/5000.⁴ It is possible that either his mansab was already considered the highest that any Rajput noble could aspire to, or Shah Jahan did not forgive him for his role during his rebellion.

On the other hand, Rao Sur Singh of Bikaner who had sided with Jahangir received a promotion. In 1630, when the Rao distinguished himself in the campaign against Khan-i Jahan Lodi, he was

---

¹ Lahori, I, p.312.
³ For the mansab of the individuals, see Appendix 'A' of this chapter.
raised from 3000/2000 to 4000/3000. After the death of the Rao in 1631, his two sons Karan Singh and Satsaìl were granted mansab of 2000/1500 and 500/200 respectively. In 1632, Karan Singh was sent on the Deccan expeditions and when in 1635, the fort of Daulatabad was occupied, he was appointed the qiladar of that fort.

In the Kachawaha clan, Manrup Rajawat who sided with Prince Shah Jahan in the rebellion was taken into imperial service with the mansab of 3000/2000. In addition, he was presented a horse with silver saddle, an elephant and Rs.2500. After his death in 1630, his son Gopel Singh was given the mansab of 900/600.

Though the Kachawaha Ruler of Amber, Jai Singh, had sided with Jahangir, his last-minute switch-over to Shah Jahan's cause after Jahangir's death, probably secured him favour; though it

1. Lahori, I, pp.120, 295, 296, 297; Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, pp.211-12.
3. Ibid.
5. Lahori, I, p.299.
6. Ibid., p.118.
7. Ibid., p.312.
should be remembered that the Amber rulers had traditionally attracted imperial favour. In 1628, when Raja Jai Singh was sent with Qasim Khan Jujwani to crush the rebels of Mahaban, he was promoted from 4000/2500 to 4000/3000. In 1629, when the Raja was sent with Shaista Khan in Deccan, he was promoted to 4000/4000. In 1635, he obtained the rank of 5000/4000, and was despatched with Khan-i Zaman, Governor of Balaghat. By the end of 1637, Jai Singh had attained the mansab of 5000/5000.

Another Rajawat noble Ram Das Narwari who had also served in imperial forces sent against Prince Shah Jahan, did not receive any increase in his mansab. He continued with his mansab of 2000/1000. Two Rajawat nobles Narsin Das (2000/-) and Karam Chand (2000/1500) who had fought against Shah Jahan are no longer mentioned. On the other hand, four new Rajawat nobles namely Har Ram (700/300), Rup Singh (700/300), Ugar Sen (600/400) and Mathura Das (500/400) seem to have been recruited.

1. Lahori, I, p.120.
2. Ibid., pp.196, 204, 205, 296; Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, 568-69.
5. Ibid., p.303.
Therefore, between the period from 1621 to 1637, the overall strength of the Rajawat nobles increased from five to seven but in term of mansabs, their position declined slightly from 11,500/5,100 to 11,300/800.\(^1\)

On the other hand, after Shah Jahan's accession, the position of non-Rajawat nobles was strengthened in regard to number as well as mansabs. During the period from 1621 to 1637, their number increased from two to five and their total mansabs from 1,900/1,350 to 3,400/2,100.\(^2\) Shah Jahan admitted two new Shaikhawat nobles Ugar Sen and Nar Singh Das with the mansabs of 800/400\(^3\) and 500/400\(^4\) respectively. During the last years of Jahangir (1621-27), two Shaikhawat nobles Prithvi Raj and Girdhar Das, holding mansabs of 700/450 and 2000/1500 respectively, had died.\(^5\) By the end of 1637, Prithvi Chand's son, Tilok Chand, and Girdhar Das's son, Bhoj Raj, held mansabs of 800/500\(^6\) and 800/400\(^7\) respectively. Besides, one significant

---

1. Compare Table 'B' of the second chapter and 'A' of the third chapter.
2. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p.322.
5. See mansab list of 1621 A.D. attached to chapter II.
7. Ibid.
development was the grant of a **mansab**, for the first time, to a member of the Naruka clan. Chandra Bhan Naruka was taken into imperial service with the **mansab** of 500/400.¹

Among the Sisodias, Kunwar Bhim had been a loyal partisan of Shah Jahan, losing his life in his cause in 1624. After his accession, Shah Jahan admitted his son Rao Rai Singh into imperial service with the high **mansab** of 2000/1000; the title of Raja was also conferred upon him.² In addition, he was presented with a horse, an elephant, a robe of honour, a dagger and Rs. 20,000.³ In 1634, he took part in the campaign against Jujhat Singh Bundila, and by the end of 1637, he had acquired the rank of 3000/1500.⁴

As for Rana Karan Singh, when Jahangir died and Prince Dawar Baksh was installed on the throne in January 1628, Shah Jahan on his way from the Deccan to the North, stayed in Mewar where the Rana presented him peoshkae. In return, Shah Jahan presented a **khilat** and confirmed the Rana in his **mansab** of

---

¹ Lahori, I, p.322.
5000/5000. Rana Karan Singh died soon after; his son Jagat Singh was assigned the same mansab of 5000/5000 with the hereditary title of Rana. It seems that the prerogative enjoyed by the chiefs of service Mewar in respect of rendering to the Mughals through their substitute continued under Emperor Shah Jahan. Even the number of troopers in the Mughal service were reduced from 1000 to 500. Now Rana Jagat Singh's uncle Arjun with 500 troopers was conditioned to render service in the Deccan on behalf of the Rana.

While the ruling family of Mewar thus retained its position in the Mughal nobility, the fortunes of two other Sisodia families may also be noted. In 1621, there were two Sisodia nobles Man Singh and Shyam Singh who held the mansab of 1500/800 and 2000/1400. But after 1621, nothing is known about them. After Shah Jahan's accession, Shyam Singh's son Madho Singh held the mansab of 500/250 but after his death in 1634, none of his kinsmen is known to have held the mansab. Similarly, Man Singh's

1. Lahori, I, p.80.
2. Ibid., p.161.
5. Lahori, I, p.323.
son Fateh Singh held the mansab of 800/200. After his death in 1629, other members of his family also received or held mansab. By the end of 1637, his nephew Gokul Das held the mansab of 900/500. Sujan Singh, uncle of Man Singh and Shyam Singh, brother of Man Singh enjoyed the mansab of 800/300 and 1000/500 respectively.

After Shah Jahan's accession, the position of the subordinate sardars of the Rana of Mewar who had joined imperial service, further improved. About Chandu Singh Chandrawat of Rampura who held the mansab of 700 zat during Jahangir's reign, nothing is known. But in Shah Jahan's 3rd R.Y. (1630-1631 A.D.), Chandu Singh's son Duda appears with a mansab of 1500/1000. In the same year, he won promotion to 2000/1500 and served against Khan-i Jahan Lodi. In 1634, he was sent with Mahabat Khan against Bijapur, and he died in battle. Subsequently, his son Hathi Singh was given the mansab of 1500/1000 with the title of

1. Lahori, I, p.316.
2. Ibid., p.312.
3. Ibid., p.315.
4. Ibid., p.310.
5. Ibid., p.302.
6. Ibid., p.299.
7. Ibid., p.305.
Another Chandrawat chief Hari Singh, younger son of Chandu Singh held the mansab of 500/400. After his death in 1635, no kinsmen of his seems to have immediately inherited his mansab.

Moreover, two important nominal subordinates of the Rana were taken directly into imperial service by Shāh Jahān. Though the ancestors of Rawal Punja of Dungerpur and Rawal Samrāl of Bānawārama had accepted the suzerainty of Emperor Akbar, they had not received mansabs. Shāh Jahān after his coming to the Mughal throne, assigned the mansab of 1500/1500 to Rawal Punja of Dungerpur. Similarly, Rawal Samrāl of Bānawārama was granted a mansab of 1000/1000. Rawat Har Dās Jhāla of Sādri thikāna was granted the mansab of 500/100. Later on in 1631, Har Dās was killed in the campaign against Khān Jahan Lodi.

The Jhāṅgīr’s cause during Shāh Jahān’s rebellion. Consequently, after Shāh Jahān’s accession, their

1. Lāhorī, I, p.305.  
5. Ibid., p.307.  
6. Ibid., p.325.  
7. Ibid.
adversely position seems to have been slightly/affected, their total mansab declining from 7,200/6,200 to 7,100/5,400. Initially, Shah Jahan confirmed Ratan Singh and his son Madho Singh on their mansab 5000/5000 and 1000/600 respectively. From the Factory Records, we gather that Rao Ratan was fined Rs.1,50,000 by Shah Jahan which he could not pay till his death. In 1631, after the Rao's death, when his successor Satrual came to court with the presents, Shah Jahan accepted the presents, but asked him to remit the fine before his departure to his chiefdom Bundi. We also know that when Rao Ratan was at Burhanpur, he had purchased tapestry worth Rs.18,450 from agent Willoughby of the British Company. Out of this amount, the Rao paid Rs.1000 only. From the subsequent factory reports, we know that Rao Ratan died without being made the payment. When his successor was approached, he declined to make the payment to a British agent. In 1631, after Ratan Singh's death, his territory Bundi was divided into

1. Compare the Table 'B' of the chapter II and table 'A' of this chapter.
3. Ibid., p.184.
5. Ibid. (1630-33 A.D.), p.90.
6. Ibid., pp.131, 139, 213, 214; See also The English Factoriae (1634-36 A.D.), pp.54, 55, 63, 217, 257, 280-91, 294.
two parts. His son Madho Singh was assigned the pargana of Kota and Falsa with the mansab of 2500/1500, 1 and his grandson Satrasal was granted the pargana of Bundi and Kankar with a mansab of 3000/2000 together with the title of Rao. 2 Subsequently, both rendered loyal service. It was Madho Singh who pursued and killed Khan-i-Jahan Lodi. 3 Madho Singh also took part in the expedition against Jujhar Singh Bundila. In reward, he was promoted to 3000/1600. 4 In 1635, he along with Khan-i Dauran distinguished himself in the campaign against Jujhar Singh and was raised to the rank of 3000/2000. 5

In 1635, Satrasal Hade accompanied Shah Jahan to the Deccan where he played an important role against the expedition against Shahji Bhonsale. 6 He was promoted to 3000/2000. 7 Besides, Satrasal’s younger brother Indrasal was also taken into imperial service with a mansab of 600/300. 8 On the other hand, the mansab of Mirdas Narsin Hade who held the mansab of 1200/600 in 1621,

1. Lahori, I, p.401.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., pp.350-51; Ma'asir-ul Umara, III, pp.453-56.
5. Ibid.
7. Ibid., p.177.
8. Ibid., p.320.
was curtailed to 500/100. The reason for this demotion is not known.

In the case of the Bundila clan, Shah Jahan adopted a liberal attitude after his accession. Unlike other Rajput chiefs who had opposed his rebellion, they were not debarred from further promotions. In 1624, Pahar Singh had joined Prince Shah Jahan's service for a time, but after the defeat of Shah Jahan in the battle of Tons, Pahar Singh had defected to the imperial side. Nevertheless, Shah Jahan, after his accession, promoted him from 2000/1200 to 3000/2000. Further, in 1630, he was granted the title of Raja. Moreover, his three brothers, Chandraman, Bhagwan Das and Beni Das were taken into imperial service with mansabs of 1500/800, 1000/600 and 500/200 respectively.

5. Ibid., p.306.
6. Ibid., p.309.
7. Ibid., p.324.
Similarly, Bharat Bundila continued to obtain promotion. He was promoted at the accession, from 1500/1000 to 3000/2500. In 1630, his mansab was enhanced to 3000/3000, and in 1632, to 3500/3000. At the time of his death in 1635, he had acquired the rank of 4000/3600. His son Debi Singh was taken into service with the mansab of 2000/2000.

The relations with Jujhār Singh, the principal Bundila ruler was, however, complex and led to a complete rupture twice. Jujhār Singh was one of the favourites of Jahāngīr and had been active in the suppression of the rebellion of Shāh Jahān. Nevertheless, when Jujhār Singh after his father Bir Singh’s death (1627 A.D.) came to Shāh Jahān, he was granted the chiefship of Bundila clan with the mansab of 4000/4000 and the title of Rāja. Later, he was promoted to 5000/4000. His son Vikramajit was also assigned the mansab of 1000/1000. But when Shāh Jahān

1. Lāhorī, I, p.120.
2. Ibid., p.191.
4. Ibid.
5. Lāhorī, I, p.296.
8. Lāhorī, I, p.294; Qazwīnī, 1526.
wanted to resume the unauthorised gains of his father Bir Singh, Jujhar Singh fled from the imperial court. It is significant that his brothers Pahar Singh and Bharat Bundila were sent against him. At last, Jujhar Singh was forced to submit, whereupon Shah Jahan not only recognised him as Raja of Orcha but also increased his mansab to 5000/5000. ¹ Subsequently, Jujhar Singh was sent with Azam Khan, subedar of the Deccan, against Khan-i Jahan Lodi. But again in 1633, Jujhar Singh after a short stay in the Deccan returned to Orcha and began to extend his territory at the cost of local zamindara.² His violent capture of Chauragarh led to Shah Jahan's ordering a full-scale campaign against him, during which both he and his son Vikramajit were killed.³ Shah Jahan conferred Orcha with the mansab of 2500/2500 and the title of Raja upon Bharat Singh's son Debi Singh.⁴ Thus the territory restored to the family of Ramchandra from whom Jahangir had taken it in 1611 to assign it to his favourite Bir Singh Deo.⁵

---

¹ Lahari, I, pp.294, 302; II, 294.
² Ibid., I, p. 302; II, p.294.
³ Ibid.
⁴ Ibid., p.13.
Thus, it emerges that Shah Jahan after his accession tried to keep the Bundila chiefs in good humour. But within the Bundila clan, Shah Jahan patronized particularly the members of the rival branch to that of ruling chief Jujhar Singh. Consequently, at the time of Jujhar Singh's revolt, Shah Jahan utilized their services against him. However, if one compares the mansab strength of Bundila chiefs at the different points of time, one would find that after Shah Jahan's accession, initially, the mansab of the Bundila chiefs increased remarkably. By the end of 1634 A.D., their mansab reached its pinnacle at 18,500/16,000. ¹ This liberality might have flowed from a recognition of the strategic importance of the Bundilas in controlling the route to the Deccan.² But Jujhar Singh's rebellion brought about a great decline in Bundila fortunes, although they remained an important clan in the Mughal nobility to the very end. By the end of 1637, their mansab had come down to 8,500/5,600 which was lower than that of the mansab of 9,500/6,200³ enjoyed by the Bundila chiefs towards the end of Jahangir's reign.

---

¹ For these mansab figures, see the individual mansab of the Bundila chiefs, K.K. Trivedi, 'Rajput clans in the Mughal nobility, The Bundala Case'. The aggregate mansab figures 15,900/14,340 furnished by Trivedi are wrong. See, PIHC, Bhubaneswar, 1977.


³ Compare Table 'A' of this chapter and 'B' of the second chapter.
It seems that the rebellions of Khan-i Jahan Lodi and Jujhar Singh Bundila prompted Shah Jahan to take other chiefs of central India in the imperial service. The Jadon chiefs Jagmal and Mukund of Kerauli were assigned mansab of 500/300 each. Similarly, Nahar Solanki and Narhar Das Jhala of Naqawa were admitted to imperial service with the mansabs of 500/400 and 500/200 respectively. In 1631, after the death of Narhar Das, in the battle of Khan-i Jahan Lodi, his son Dayal Das Jhala was assigned the mansab of 500/250.

In case of the Ujjainyas, we noticed that in 1624, when Prince Shah Jahan was in Bihar, Narain Mai and his brother Pratap had joined the Prince. It seems that after Shah Jahan's defeat in the battle of Tons, the Ujjainya chiefs had left the side of the Prince. But after Shah Jahan's accession, Pratap Ujjainya, who was assigned the mansab of 3000/2000 in 1624, was taken into imperial service with a lower mansab of 1500/1000 which probably

1. Lahori, I, pp.322, 323.
2. Ibid., p.322.
3. Ibid., p.323.
4. Ibid.
7. Lahori, I, p.305.
did not satisfy him. He, thereupon, rebelled, and was killed in 1636.¹

On the other hand, the Bhaduriyas, who had resisted Shah Jahan when he had besieged Agra, were treated favourably by Shah Jahan after his coming to the throne. In 1628, the Bhaduriya chief Kishan Singh played a distinguished role in the expedition against Jujhar Singh Bundila.² In 1631, he was sent with Shaista Khan against Nizam Shah.³ In 1636, he was sent with Khan-i Zaman against Shahji Bhonala.⁴ Towards the end of 1637, Kishan Singh held the mansab of 1000/600.⁵ Besides, Rai Ganaah and Baden Singh Bhaduriya also enjoyed the mansabs of 1000/600⁶ and 500/200⁷ respectively.

The Badgujar noble Ani Rai Singh Dalan who was one of the favourites of Jahangir continued to get favours from Shah Jahan.

¹ Lahori, I, p.305.
² Ma'asir-ul Ummara, III, pp.150-52.
³ Ibid.
⁴ Ibid.
⁵ Lahori, I, p.309.
⁶ Selected Documents of Shah Jahan's Reign, p.29.
⁷ Lahori, I, p.324.
After Shah Jahan's coming to the throne, he was promoted to 3000/1500. Further, in 1631, after the death of his father Bir Narain who held the mansab of 1000/600, the title of Raja was conferred upon him.1 After his own death in 1637, his son Jay Ram was assigned the mansab of 1000/800.2 This suggests that Shah Jahan adopted liberal attitude towards the chiefs who had then strong holds around the capital city of Agra. In pursuit of the same policy, Shah Jahan seems to have raised Lakhmi Sen, Chauhan chief of Ajaun to the mansab of 800/500.3

On the other hand, among the hilly Rajput chiefs, Jagat Singh Pundir who rebelled twice against Jahangir on behalf of Shah Jahan, did not receive any promotion during the first ten years of Shah Jahan's reign. He continued on his mansab 3000/2000.4 However, in 1635, he held the office of thanedar of Bangash.5 The mansab of other hill Rajput chiefs seems to have declined after Shah Jahan's accession. In 1621, Raje Sangram of Jammu and Debi Chand of Gujer enjoyed the mansabs of 1500/1000 and 1500/500 respectively, but afterwards nothing

1. Lahori, I, p.299.
4. Ibid., I, p.314.
5. Ibid., p.298.
is known about them. Subsequently, after Shah Jahan's accession, Raja Sangram's successor Raja Udal Singh held the mansab of 500/250. Similarly, Debi Chand's successor Rup Chand enjoyed the mansab of 1000/600 but in 1635, after his death in battle against Prithvi Raj of Srinagar-Garhwal, his successor Man Singh was given the mansab of 900/850.

However, Shah Jahan did recruit some more hill Rajput chiefs in the imperial service. Kunwar San Sana of Kishtwar and Katoch chief Chandra Bhan of Kangra were admitted with the mansabs of 1000/300 and 500/300 respectively.

II

Between the period from 1637 to 1647 A.D., as it is obvious from Table '8' that the number as well as the mansabs of the

1. Lahori, I, p.323.
2. Ibid., p.309.
3. Ibid., p.312.
4. Ibid., p.311.
5. Ibid., p.322.
Rajput chiefs increased. Their number went up from 62 to 71 and their mansab rose from 84350/59780 to 92,150/74,480.¹

During this period, position of the Rathors declined in the imperial service. Their number came down from thirteen to ten and their mansab fell from 16,600/13,270 to 15,300/14,300.² This was, perhaps, partly due to mortality. During this decade, seven Rathor nobles died. Out of these seven, the descendants of four were taken into service. After Raja Gaj Singh's death in May 1638, his younger son Jaswant Singh was granted the title of Jodhpur instead of the eldest son Amar Singh. It is explained by the official historian that the choice was made by the Emperor in accordance with Rathor custom.³ He was given the mansab of 4000/4000 with the title of Raja.⁴ In January 1639, when he accompanied Shah Jahan to Kabul, his mansab was raised to 5000/5000.⁵ In 1642, he accompanied the Qandhar expedition commanded by Dara Shukoh.⁶ After his return from there in January 1645, he was appointed acting subedar of Akbarabad (Agra)

¹. Compare the Tables 'A' and 'B'.
². Ibid.
³. Lahori, II, p.98.
⁴. Ibid.
⁵. Ibid., p.133.
⁶. Ibid., pp.162, 177.
till the return of Shaikh Farid Fatehpuri from Kabul. 1 By the end of 1647 A.D., Jaswant Singh had acquired the rank of 5000/5000 with 2500 do aspa sin aspa. 2

Jaswant Singh's elder brother Amar Singh who was over-ruled in regard of succession to the saddi of Jodhpur, was sought to be made content by promoting him from 3000/2500 to 3000/3000 with the title of Rao. 3 He was also granted watan jagir in the pargana of Nagore. 4 Subsequently, in July 1644, there was dispute between Rao Amar Singh and Rao Karan of Bikaner over the boundary between their jagirs. This case was referred to Mir Bakhshi Salabat Khan who was suspected by Amar Singh of favouring Rao Karan. Amar Singh assassinated Salabat Khan in Shah Jahan's court. He was killed in the ensuing struggle. 5 At the time of his death, he held the mansab of 4000/3000. 6 In spite of his conduct, his son Rao Rai Singh was granted the mansab of 1000/700. 7

2. Ibid., p.719.
3. Ibid., p.97; Ma'asir-ul Umarā; II, pp.230-37.
4. His grand son Inder Singh continued to hold the watan jagir in the pargana of Nagore. Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign, p.121.
7. Ibid., p.733.
In 1641, Maheesh Das was promoted from 1000/600 to 1000/1000 and was posted with the Qandhar expedition of Dara Shukoh.\textsuperscript{1} In 1643, he was raised to the mansab of 2000/2000 and pargana Jalore was granted to him as his watan jagir.\textsuperscript{2} In 1645, he was promoted to 3000/2500.\textsuperscript{3} In 1646, after his death, his son, Ratan Singh, was promoted from 400/200\textsuperscript{4} to 1500/1500.\textsuperscript{5} Subsequently, in 1656, in exchange of Jalore, the pargana of Ratlam was granted to him in watan-jagir.\textsuperscript{6} After the death of Maheesh Das, his brother Jaswant Singh was assigned the mansab of 500/250.\textsuperscript{7} In the case of another Rathor chief Hari Singh of Kishangarh who held the mansab of 1500/900\textsuperscript{8}, at the time of his death in 1644, his successor Rup Singh was assigned the mansab of 2000/1000.\textsuperscript{9}

Three other Rathor nobles Bhim Singh (1500/800)\textsuperscript{10} Sebal Singh (900/800)\textsuperscript{11} and Jagannath (800/400)\textsuperscript{12} were not succeeded

\textsuperscript{1} Lahori, II, pp.136, 230, 294, 484, 549.
\textsuperscript{2} Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, pp.445-47.
\textsuperscript{3} Lahori, II, p.554.
\textsuperscript{4} Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, pp.445-47.
\textsuperscript{5} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{6} Raghuvir Singh, Ratlam Raiya ka Pratham Itihas (Hindi), pp.95-98; The Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol. XXI, 240-41.
\textsuperscript{7} Lahori, II, p.748.
\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., p.373; Vir Vinod, II, p.527.
\textsuperscript{9} Lahori, II, p.373.
\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., p.730.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., I, p.312.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p.317.
by their heirs at least to the extent of obtaining any significant mansab. Their total mansab came up to 3,100/900. As for the four sons of Karamsi who held all together, total mansab of 1100/350\(^1\) in the 10th R.Y. (1637 A.D.), no further information about them is provided in our sources.

Three new Rathor nobles Gordhan (800/400),\(^2\) Govind Das (500/250)\(^3\) and Keeri Singh (500/100)\(^4\) obtained places in Imperial service. The total strength of their mansab was 1800/750. Moreover, two senior nobles received further promotions in their mansab. Shyam Singh was promoted from 600/400 to 1500/600.\(^5\) Another Rathor noble Prithvi Raj was raised from 2000/1700 to 2000/2000.\(^6\) In 1644, Prithvi Raj was appointed the qiladar of Daulatabad fort.\(^7\) In 1646, he was recalled from Daulatabad and appointed the qiladar of Agra fort along with Baqir Khan.\(^8\)

\(^1\) See Appendix 'A'.
\(^2\) Lahori, II, p.740.
\(^8\) *Ibid.*
The total mansab of the Rathors of Bikaner declined during this period from 2900/2,100 to 2000/1500.¹ During this decade (1637-1647 A.D.) Rao Karan did not receive any promotion in his mansab. He continued on his mansab of 2000/1500 while nothing is known about Shatrusal who held the mansab of 700/600 in 1647 A.D.²

The number of the Kachawaha nobles during this period increased from eleven to eighteen, and their mansab increased from 11,800/8,600 to 17,700/16,000.³ The Rajawats accounted for thirteen of the 18 Kachawaha nobles and enjoyed the bulk (14,100/13,200) of the total mansab granted to Kachawahas.⁴

The four senior Rajawat nobles received promotions in their mansab. Jai Singh was promoted from 5000/5000 to 5000/5000 all do aspa sin aspa.⁵ In 1639, the title of 'Mirza Raja' which was enjoyed by great grand father Raja Man Singh, was conferred upon him.⁶ Uger Sen (800/400) Mathura Das (500/400) and

1. Compare Tables 'A' and 'B'.
2. Lahori, I, p.316.
3. Compare Tables 'A' and 'B'.
4. See list 'B' of mansabs.
6. Ibid., p.145.
Gopal Singh (900/600) were raised to 800/600,\(^1\) 700/400,\(^2\) and 1000/1000,\(^3\) respectively. Nine new Rajawat nobles were taken into imperial service. They held, in total, the mansabs of 5,600/4,100.\(^4\) Three Rajawat nobles Har Ram, Rup Singh and Ugar Sen, son of Shatru Sal, died during this decade. The strength of their total mansabs was 2000/1000.\(^5\)

Similarly, the number as well as the mansabs of the other Kachawahas also increased. Their number rose from four to five and their mansabs went up from 2,600/1700 to 3,600/2,400.\(^6\) Two senior Shaikhawat nobles Tilok Chand and Nar Singh Das were raised from 800/500 and 500/400 to 1000/500\(^7\) and 800/800\(^8\) respectively. Bhoj Raj, son of Raisal who had earlier held the mansab of 800/400\(^9\) is not heard of during this decade. Two new Shaikhawat chiefs Ram Chand and Kanhi Ram were granted the mansabs

---

4. For the mansab of individual Rajawat chief, see Appendix 'B'.
5. See Appendix 'A'.
6. See Appendix 'B'.
of 600/400\(^1\) and 500/200\(^2\) respectively. Another chief Chandra Bhan Naruka received promotion; his mansab being raised to 700/500 from 500/400.\(^3\)

The Gauras continued to prosper during this decade. Their number increased from five to eight and their total mansab went up from 8,700/6,500 to 12,100/9,650.\(^4\) Bithal Das, chief of Gaur clan was particularly favoured. In 1638, when Shah Jahan was going to Lahore, he appointed Bithal Das qiladar of Agra.\(^5\) In 1641, he was assigned the office of subedar of Agra.\(^6\) In 1643, he was promoted from 4000/3000 to 5000/3000.\(^7\) In 1646, he was sent to Balkh and Badakhshan with Prince Murad and his mansab was raised to 5000/4000.\(^8\) By the end of 1647, he had acquired the rank of 5000/5000.\(^9\) In 1646, his son Anirudh was also taken into imperial service with the mansab of 1500/1000.\(^10\) In 1646,

\(^1\) Lahori, II, p.745.
\(^2\) Ibid., p.731.
\(^3\) Ibid., p.742.
\(^4\) Compare the Tables 'A' and 'B'.
\(^5\) Lahori, II, p.110.
\(^6\) Taba Tabai, p.94; Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, pp.256-57.
\(^7\) Lahori, II, p.321.
\(^8\) Ibid., pp.398, 479.
\(^9\) Ibid., p.720.
\(^10\) Ibid., p.730.
his second son Arjun was also posted with the army of Prince Murād, and is then said to have held the mansab of 1000/700. ¹

Girdhar Dās, the brother of Bithal Dās also earned promotions during this period. In 1642, his mansab was raised from 500/200 to 1000/400. ² By the end of 1647, he had reached the rank of 1000/800. ³ In 1646, Sīv Rām Gaur was served in the army of Prince Murād Bakhsh. ⁴ During this decade, however, he did not receive any increase in his mansab and stayed at his mansab of 1500/1000. ⁵ But in 1647, he was appointed to the important charge of qillādār of Kābul fort. ⁶ Another Gaur chief Kirpa Rām was promoted from 700/700 to 800/750. ⁷ Two new Gaur nobles Manohar Dās, brother of Rāja Bithal Dās, and Mukund Dās, son of Gopāl Dās were taken into imperial service with mansabs of 500/200⁸ and 800/200 respectively. ⁹ In 1642, after the death of

1. Lāhorī, II, p.733.
2. Ibid., p.701.
3. Ibid., p.733.
4. Ibid., p.484.
5. Ibid., p.730.
6. Ibid., p.641.
7. Ibid., p.739.
8. Ibid., p.750.
9. Ibid., p.741; See also Ranawat, M.S., Shah Jahan ka Hindu Mansabdar (Hindi), p.104.
Sangram Gaur, chief of Gunnor, Morvi Gond, his official, deprived his son Bhupat from the succession and usurped himself. He also disowned the allegiance of the Mughals. Consequently, an expedition under the command of Khan-i Dauran was launched against him. Eventually, Morvi Gond was forced to submit to the Mughal forces. But we do not find holding any mansab either of Bhupat or any successor of the deceased Raja Sangram who enjoyed the rank of 1500/600.

The number of Sisodias in the Mughal service remained at five, but their mansabs went up from 8,700/6,800 to 11,700/8100. The mansab of Rana Jagat Singh continued to stay at 5000/5000. Shah Jahan continued to show favour to Rao Rai Singh, the son of his supporter, Maharaja Bhim. In 1642, Rao Rai Singh was sent with Prince Dara Shukoh on the Qandhar expedition. Subsequently, he was deputed with Saeed Khan Zafar Jang to crush the revolt of Jagat Singh of Mau. He was promoted from 2000/500 to

1. Lahori, II, pp.370-72; For details, see B.P. Saksena, History of Shah Jahan of Delhi, pp.121-22.
3. Compare Tables 'A' and 'B'.
5. Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, pp.299-301.
6. Ibid., pp.299-301.
Similarly, another Sisodia chief Sujan Singh continued to receive promotions in his mansab. In 1644, he was promoted from 800/300 to 1000/400. In 1645, he was promoted to 1000/500 and next year, he was sent with Prince Murad Baksh on the Balkh and Badakhshan campaign. By the end of 1647, Sujan Singh had acquired the mansab of 1500/500. Two new Sisodia chiefs Narain Das and Hamir Singh were taken into imperial service with the mansabs of 700/300 and 500/300. But Sisodia chiefs Shyam Singh and Gokul Das who held the mansab of 1000/500 and 900/500 at the end of the previous decade are no longer heard of.

The number and mansabs of the Ghelet chief, who were the subordinate sardars of the Sisodia chief of Mewar, do not change. Rawal Punja of Dungarpur and Rawal Samarsi of Banawara continued

---

5. Ibid., p.743.
on their mansab 1500/1500\(^1\) and 1000/1000\(^2\) respectively. Similarly, the mansab of the Chandrawat chief remained at 1500/1000. In 1644, after the death of Rao Hathi Singh who held the mansab of 1500/1000; his successor Rao Rup Singh was given the same mansab of 1500/1000.\(^3\) On the other hand, the mansab of the chief of Sadri underwent an increase. In 1631, after the death of Har Das Jhala (500/200), his successor Rao Rai Singh was taken into service. By the end of 1647 A.D., he enjoyed the mansab of 1000/700.\(^4\)

The number of Hada chiefs in the imperial service came down from four to three and their total zat mansab declined from 7,100 to 6,700 while their total suwar rank increased from 5,400 to 6,300.\(^5\) There is no reference to Hirday Narain who held the mansab of 500/100.\(^6\) Madho Singh who served the Mughals in the various expeditions received promotions in his suwar rank only.

2. Ibid., p.732.
3. Ibid., p.730.
4. Ibid., p.733.
5. Compare the Tables 'A' and 'B'.
In 1638, he was sent to Kabul with Prince Shuja. In 1640, he served under Prince Murad in Kabul. Next year, in 1641, Madho Singh's mangab was raised from 3000/2000 to 3000/2500. Further, in 1643, he was promoted to 3000/3000. Madho Singh distinguished himself in the Balkh and Badakhshan campaign under Aurangzeb; he was appointed to guard the fort of Balkh. By the end of 1647, he had acquired the rank of 3000/3000 with 2000 do aspa sih aspa.

Though Rao Satrael served in the campaigns of Qandhar and Balkh and Badakhshan under the command of Princes Dara Shukoh and Murad Bakhsh, even then he did not receive any promotion during this period. In 1646, when Prince Murad Baksh came away from Balkh and Badakhshan, the Rao without permission retreated to Peshawar. This annoyed Shah Jahan. Therefore, he continued on his previous mangab of 3000/3000. But his brother Indrasal's mangab was raised from 600/300 to 800/400.

---
2. Lahori, II, pp.37, 217; Ma'asir-ul Umarii, II, pp.454-55.
4. Ibid., p.308.
5. Ibid., p.678.
6. Ibid., p.722.
7. Ibid., pp.293, 484; Ma'asir-ul Umarii, II, pp.261-63.
9. Ibid., p.177; Ma'asir-ul Umarii, II, pp.261-63.
Both the number of mansabdars and the total of mansabs of the Bundila chiefs appear to have declined during the period from 1637 to 1647 A.D.¹ The number of the Bundila chiefs in the imperial service came down from five to three and then zat mansabs fell from 8500 to 7000. Their suwar ranks however went up from 5,600 to 7,800.¹ Pahar Singh continued to obtain favours from Shah Jahan, and he received promotions in his suwar rank. In 1642, when Champat Bundila, a retainer of Jujhar Singh rebelled, Pahar Singh was promoted from 3000/2000 to 3000/2000 with 1000 do aspa sinh aspa² and deputed against him; Champat was forced to submit to Pahar Singh.³ Further, in 1645, he was sent with Ali Mardan Khan to Badakhshan and in 1646, again Pahar Singh was included in the army of Prince Murad Bakhsh to Balkh and Badakhshan expeditions.⁴ At this occasion, the mansab of Pahar Singh was increased by converting 1000 suwar into do aspa sinh aspa (his rank now being 3000/3000 with 1000 do aspa sinh aspa).⁵ By the end of 1647, Pahar Singh had reached the still higher rank of 3000/3000 with 2000 do aspa sinh aspa.⁶

¹. Compare the Tables 'A' and 'B'.
². Lahori, II, p.303.
On the other hand, Debi Singh Bundila who served under Prince Murad Bakhsh in the Balkh and Badakhshan campaigns¹ did not receive any promotion and his mansab remained unchanged at 2500/2000.² Similarly, the mansab of Chandraman son of Bir Singh Dso remained static as 1500/800.³ Moreover, in 1641, after the death of Bir Singh's sons Bhagwan Das and Beni Das who held the mansabs of 1000/800 ⁴ and 500/200⁵, none of their heirs was given any mansab.

The mansabs of Jadon clan declined for one reason or another. Their cumulative mansabs fell from 1000/600 to 500/400.⁶ Nothing is known about Mukund Jadon, who had held the mansab of 500/300 in 1637.⁷ The mansab of another Jadon chief Jagman of Karauli increased from 500/300 to just 500/400.⁸ Some other chiefs belonging to central India received promotions in their

---

3. Ibid., p.731.
4. Ibid., p.734.
5. Ibid., p.741.
6. Compare Tables 'A' and 'B'.
**mansab** during this period. Rāwāt Dayāl Dās Jhāla was promoted from 500/250 to 700/500.\(^1\) Nahar Solanki of Nainwa was raised from 500/400 to 800/400.\(^2\)

We have seen that immediately upon the death of Mitrāsen Tunwar of Gwalior in 1630, none of his heirs are known to have gained a **mansab**. But it seems that some time after Mitrāsen's death, his son Kishan Singh was taken in the imperial service and in 1647 held the **mansab** of 500/500.\(^3\)

During this decade (1637-1647 A.D.), the total **mansabs** of the Bhaduriyas declined from 2500/1000 to 1000/1000.\(^4\) In 1644, after the death of Kishan Singh Bhaduriya (1000/600), his successor Rāja Badan Singh who already held the **mansab** of 500/200 in 1637, was promoted to 1000/1000.\(^5\) The **mansab** of Rāi Ganesh Bhaduriya, who held the **mansab** of 1000/600\(^6\) in 1637, is not recorded in the subsequent decade.

---

1. Lāhorī, II, p.742.
4. Compare the Tables 'A' and 'B'.
The mansab of Bargujar chief, Raja Jai Ram received enhancements in this decade. In 1639, his mansab was increased from 1000/800 to 1000/1000.\(^1\) Besides, his four sons were taken into imperial service, but it appears that they were assigned the mansab\(^2\) less than 500 zat as none of them is recorded holding mansab in the chronicles. Subsequently, Jai Ram was sent with Prince Murad Bakhsh to Kabul.\(^3\) In 1646, when he was sent on the expedition of Balkh and Badakhshan with Prince Murad Bakhsh, his mansab was raised to 1500/1000.\(^4\) When Balkh was occupied, he was sent in pursuit of Nazar Muhammad.\(^5\) In recognition of his services, he was promoted to 1500/1000.\(^6\) Further, his mansab was raised to 1500/1500.\(^7\) Till his death in 1647, he rendered distinguished services in Balkh and had acquired the mansab of 2000/1500.\(^8\)

---

1. Lahori, II, pp.4, 146; Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, pp.241-42.
2. Lahori, II, p.4.
8. *Ibid.*, pp.608, 727; See also *Ma'asir-ul Umara*, tr. I, p.731. Here, his suwar mansab is noted 500 which is obviously a slip.
In 1641, after the death of Chauhan chief Lakhmi Sen who held the mansab of 800/500,¹ his successor Chatrbhuj was given the lower mansab of 700/500.² But during this period, five fresh Chauhan chiefs were taken in the imperial service. In 1647, Pratap Chauhan held the mansab of 600/500.³ Other Chauhan chiefs, namely, Ballu and his kinsmen Vaini Das and Sakat Singh enjoyed the mansabs of 500/300,⁴ 400/150⁵ and 500/250⁶ respectively. Ballu Chauhan rendered services in the campaigns of the North-west frontiers.⁷ Moreover, Chauhan Sonagra chief, Chatrbhuj was also admitted to the imperial service with a mansab of 700/500 some time before 1647 A.D.⁸

Among the hill Rajputs during this decade (1637-1647 A.D.), Jagat Singh Pundir did not receive any promotion in his mansab and continued on his mansab of 3000/2000.⁹ But, on the other

¹ Lahori, II, p.314.
² Ibid., p.742.
³ Ibid., p.743.
⁴ Ibid., p.747.
⁵ Muhta Nainsi-re-Khyat, I, 234.
⁶ Lahori, II, p.748.
⁷ Ibid., p.485.
⁸ Ibid., p.742.
⁹ Ibid., p.724.
hand, important offices were assigned to him. In 1639, he was appointed the faujdar of Bangash. At the same time, his son Rajrup was given the faujdar of Kangra valley. In 1641, the office of faujdar of Kangra valley was transferred from Rajrup to Jagat Singh. Upon condition of paying four lacs per annum to the imperial treasury, he was authorised to collect the pehkash from the other hill zamindars. Subsequently, Jagat Singh and Rajrup revolted but they were forced to submit. Jagat Singh was taken into imperial service with the same mansab of 3000/2000. Further, he was sent with Dara Shukoh to Qandhar where he was entrusted with the charge of the fort of Qalat. In 1645, he was sent on the Badekhshan expeditions in which he rendered distinguished services. In the Sarab and Andrab region he built a fort of timber. However, in 1645, after Jagat Singh's

7. Ibid., pp.466, 467; Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, pp.241-42.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
death, his son Rajrup was given the mansab of 1500/1000 with the
title of Raja. The mahals which were held by him as watan jagir
were conferred upon him in inam. He was also assigned the charge
of the said timber fort. In the same year, in reward of his
distinguished services in the North-western frontier, his mansab
was raised to 2000/1500. By the end of 1647, he had acquired
the rank of 2000/2000. Besides, the strength of contingent
against the mansab, he maintained five hundred horses and two
thousand infantry. The payment of this extra contingent was made
from the imperial treasury of Kabul.

Here, it is important to note that after Jagat Singh's
revolt, Shah Jahan readmitted him in the imperial service without
any severe punishment. It seems that out of the following two
considerations weighed with Shah Jahan for taking such a lenient
attitude (a) During this period, Shah Jahan was facing the problem
of the North-western frontier. Hill Rajputs being familiar with
a severely cold climate were ideal soldiers for the Northwest.
(b) Jagat Singh and his retainers could be used against other hill
Rajputs, whose territories had not been properly subjugated.

1. Lahori, II, pp.481-82.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p.455.
4. Ibid., p.726.
5. Ibid., pp.481-82.
At the same time some of the other Rajput chiefs of the Punjab hills rendered military service on the North-western frontier and they also played a role in quelling the revolt of Jagat Singh Pundir. Yet one does not find any significant change in their position in the Mughal hierarchy. Man Singh of Guler served with Prince Murad and Aurangzeb in the North-west and moreover, in 1641, he was sent against Jagat Singh Pundir, but he did not receive any further promotion. He continued on his previous mansab of 900/850. Kunwar Sen of Kishtwar received a minor increase in his suwār rank, from 1000/300 to 1000/400. Raja Prithvi Chand of Chamba, who distinguished against the revolt of Jagat Singh Pundir, was taken in imperial service with the mansab of 1000/400 and the title of Rāja. But in 1641, after the death of Chandra Bhān of Kangra who held the mansab of 500/300, no mansab was granted to his successor.

1. Lāhorī, II, pp.264, 266, 274.
2. Ibid., p.738.
3. Ibid., p.736.
4. Ibid., pp.273, 274, 276; Hutchison, pp.204-5.
III

From Table 'C', it is evident that the total number as well as the total mansab of the Rajput nobles continued to rise during the third decade of Shāh Jahān's reign. The number of the Rajput nobles increased from 71 to 80 and their total mansab strength went up from 95150/79880 to 1,23,150/1,03,530.¹

Even during the third decade (1647-1657 A.D.), the Rathor clan continued to enjoy the leading position among the Rajput clans. Their total number increased from 14 to 23, and their total mansab went up from 20,000/16,950 to 28,950/24,230.² Among the Rathors, the premier position was naturally enjoyed by the members of the Rathor clan of Jodhpur. In number, they increased from 10 to 19 and their total mansab rose from 15,300/14,300 to 24,050/20,575.³ Raja Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur, who served with Princes Aurangzeb and Dāra Shukoh in the Qandhar expeditions, was promoted from 5000/5000 with 5000 ḏo ṭespa sīh ṭespa to 6000/5000 with 5000 ḏo ṭespa sīh ṭespa.⁴ In 1654, he was raised to the mansab of 6000/6000 with 5000 ḏo ṭespa sīh ṭespa.⁵

¹. Compare the Tables 'B' and 'C'.
². Ibid.
³. Ibid.
⁴. Wāris, pp.166-69, 202-5.
⁵. 'Amal-i Śāliḥ, III, p.69; Maḥāsir-ul Ummāl; II, pp.268-69.
In 1648, another senior noble Rup Singh was promoted from 2000/1000 to 2500/1200 and he was sent to Qandhar with Aurangzeb.¹
In 1649, he was raised to 3000/1500.² In 1652, when he was sent with Prince Dara Shukoh to Qandhar, he was promoted to 4000/2500.³
In 1654, he was sent to Chittor against Rana Raj Singh and now again his mansab was raised to 4000/3000.⁴

In 1651, Rao Rai Singh was sent to Qandhar with Prince Aurangzeb and his mansab was increased from 1000/700 to 1500/800.⁵ Further, Rai Singh served in the Qandhar and Chittor expeditions.⁶
In 1655, Sulaiman Shukoh, eldest son of Dara Shukoh married the sister of Rao Rai Singh,⁷ and in 1656, his rank was raised to 1500/1000.⁸ The matrimonial alliance with Dara Shukoh's son was not without political considerations. As we know that Rao Rai Singh was dissatisfied with Shah Jahan on account of his father Amar Singh's death at the Mughal court.⁹ It is possible that

---

2. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
8. Waris, f.262b; Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, pp.234-37.
Sulaiman Shukoh's marriage with Rai Singh's sister was designed to assuage his feelings and restore the prestige of that branch of the Rathor house.

During this decade (1647-1657 A.D.), two more Rathor nobles Gordhan and Kears Singh were promoted from 800/400 to 1000/500 and 500/100 to 600/200 respectively. Moreover, as indicated in the list 'C' of mansabdars, ten new nobles were brought into imperial service; altogether they enjoyed an aggregate mansab of 2850/2430.

Between 1647-1657, four Rathor nobles died. Out of these four, the descendants of two were taken into imperial service in the lower capacity. Prithvi Raj served with Aurangzeb and Dara Shukoh in the Qandhar expeditions. In 1654, he took part in the campaign against Rana Raj Singh of Mewar. In the same year, he was appointed governor of Ajmer province. Further, in 1556, he

1. Waris, f.264b.
2. Waris, f.268b.
3. See, Appendix 'C'.
5. Ibid, pp.273-75.
was sent with Aurangzeb to the Deccan. But in spite of these services, he did not receive any increase in his mansab, which continued to be 2000/2000. However, at the time of his death in 1657, three kinsmen of his, Kesar Singh, Jagat Singh and Ram Singh held the mansab of 600/200, 700/300, and 500/200 respectively.

During this decade (1647-1657), Shyam Singh who served with Aurangzeb in the Qandhar expedition was promoted to 3000/1500. In 1647, he held the office of the faujdar of Bagiana. But after his death in 1657, his son Udai Bhan was taken in the imperial service with the lower mansab of 1000/500.

Ratan Singh Rathor, after serving in the Qandhar, Mewar and Deccan expeditions, had acquired the status of 2000/2000.

2. Ibid., MS. f.261b.
3. Ibid., f.269a.
4. Ibid., f.267b.
5. Ibid., f.270a.
6. Ibid., f.260b.
7. Ibid., f.263b.
8. Ibid., f.263b.
But after his death in 1656, none of his heirs is known to have been granted a mansab. Similarly, in 1657, after his death of Jai Singh who held the mansab of 500/150\(^1\), there is no record of any of his heirs holding any mansab.

The mansabs of the Rathor chiefs of Merta and Bikaner were also increased during this period. Udai Bhan, chief of Merta was promoted from 700/400 to 800/500.\(^2\) In 1649, Rao Karan of Bikaner was raised from 2000/1500 to 2000/2000\(^3\) and he was also appointed the qiladar of the Daulatabad fort.\(^4\) Further, he was raised to the status of 3000/2000.\(^5\) Moreover, a kinsman of his Banmali Das, son of Rao Karan was taken into imperial service with the mansab of 1000/100.\(^6\)

However, Prince Aurangzeb was annoyed with Rao Karan owing to his negligence in attending the tula dan ceremony.\(^7\) In 1654,

2. Ibid., f.266a.
6. Vir Vind, p.373.
7. Prince Aurangzeb complained to Mirza Raja Jai Singh for not attending the tula dan ceremony by Rao Karan. The nishan is preserved in RSA Bikaner.
when Aurangzeb went to the Deccan, where the Rao was already posted, his mansab was curtailed. 1 Subsequently, in 1655, when Aurangzeb made tajwiz to raise Rao Karan’s mansab, Shāh Jahān turned it down. 2

Regarding the Kachawāhā clan, it is interesting to note that the number of the Kachawāhā nobles in the imperial service was reduced from eighteen to fourteen while their mansab strength increased marginally from 17,700/16000 to 18700/18500. 3 The number of the Rajāwat nobles came down from thirteen to nine but their total mansabs increased from 14,000/13200 to 15000/16000. 4 During this decade (1647-1657 A.D.), five Rajāwat nobles died, namely, Sangram, Mathura Dās, Ugar Sen, Prithvi Rāj, and Kishan Singh who together held mansabs of 2,900/1500. 5 While on the other hand, two fresh Rajāwat nobles Kirat Singh and Mahru, sons of Rāja Jai Singh were admitted into imperial service with the mansabs of 1000/9006 and 900/900. 7 Among the fresh recruits,

3. Compare Tables ’B’ and ’C’.
4. See the mansab list ’C’.
5. Wāris, p.267a; p.218. About Sangram, Prithvi Rāj and Kishan who held the mansabs of 700/500, 500/250 and 500/250 is nothing known.
Kirat Singh was treated with particular favour. In 1651, he was appointed the faujdar of serkar of Mewat. At the same time, he was also assigned pargana Kama Pahari for his watan jagir.

Four senior Rajawat nobles earned promotions after rendering services in the different expeditions. In 1648, Raja Jai Singh was sent to Balkh with Prince Aurangzeb. In 1649, his mansab was raised from 5000/5000 with 2000 do aspa sinh aspa to 5000/5000 with 3000 do aspa zig sinh aspa, and he was directed to proceed to Qandhar with Prince Aurangzeb. After the failure of that expedition, Jai Singh along with Prince Aurangzeb came to court. At this time, he is known to have held the office of faujdar of Delhi. Subsequently, he was appointed to pacify the Mewat region. Thereupon performing meritorious services, he was rewarded with the promotion of 5000/5000 with 4000 do aspa sinh aspa. Later on, Jai Singh served in the Qandhar and Mewar expeditions, but

3. Waris, pp.74-76.
4. Ibid., pp.84-95; Ma'asir-ul Umara, III, pp.570-75.
6. Ibid.
8. Ibid., pp.202-205, 276.
he did not receive any increment in mansab. His eldest son Ram Singh’s mansab was, however, raised from 1000/1000 to 3000/2000.¹

Amar Singh Narwari, who served with Princes Aurangzeb and Dara Shukoh in Qandhar² had his mansab raised from 1000/600 to 1500/1000.³ Other Rajawat nobles Jay Ram and Ajab Singh were promoted from 900/600 to 1000/800⁴ and 800/300 to 800/400.⁵ However, the mansabs of the two Rajawat nobles Gopal Singh and Úgar Sen remained static as 1000/1000 and 800/600.⁶

The number of Kachawaha nobles other than Rajawats was reduced from six to five and their total mansab strength decreased from 4,300/2900 to 3700/2500.⁷ But it is interesting to note that while the number as well as the mansabs of the Shaikhawat nobles came down, the number as well as the mansabs of the Naruka nobles underwent an increase. The number of the Shaikhawat nobles came down from five to two and their total

¹ Waris, f.260b.
² Ibid., pp.74-76, 202-05.
³ Ibid., f.262b.
⁴ Ibid., f.263b.
⁵ Ibid., f.266b.
⁶ Ibid., ff.263b, 266a.
⁷ See, mansab list 'C'.
mansab from 3,600/2400 to 1,800/1300.\textsuperscript{1} Nothing is recorded during this decade, about the mansabs of three Shaikhawat nobles Tilok Chand, Pam Chand and Kanhi who previously held the mansabs of 1000/500,\textsuperscript{2} 600/400\textsuperscript{3} and 500/200\textsuperscript{4}. No fresh recruitment is known to have taken place from the Shaikhawat clan. Of the two remaining senior Shaikhawat nobles, Bhoj Rāj was promoted from 700/500 to 1000/500.\textsuperscript{5} But the mansab of Nar Singh Dās remained static as 800/800.\textsuperscript{6}

In the Naruka clan, one notices that two fresh nobles, Fateh Singh and Hari Singh were taken in the imperial service with the mansabs of 700/300\textsuperscript{7} and 500/300.\textsuperscript{8} But Chandra Bhan Naruka did not receive any promotion and he continued on his mansab of 700/500.\textsuperscript{9}

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] See, mansab list 'C'.
\item[2.] Lāhori, II, p.735.
\item[3.] Ibid., p.745.
\item[4.] Ibid., pp.750-51.
\item[5.] Waris, f.264b.
\item[6.] Ibid., f.265b.
\item[7.] Ibid., f.268a.
\item[8.] Ibid., f.269a.
\item[9.] Ibid., f.267a.
\end{itemize}
The fortunes of the members of the Gaur family continued to rise. Their number increased from eight to twelve, and their total mansab pushed up from 12,100/9,650 to 14,100/11,700.¹

In 1647, Bithal Das Gaur was promoted from 5000/4000 to 5000/5000 with 1000 do aspa sinh aspa, and he was sent to Kabul.² In 1649, he was raised to the status of 5000/5000 with 2000 do aspa sinh aspa, and deputed with Prince Aurangzeb on the Qandhar expedition.³ In 1651, after the death of Bithal Das, his eldest son Anirudh was promoted from 1500/1000 to 3000/3000 with 2000 do aspa sinh aspa.⁴ The title of Raja was also conferred upon him.⁵ In addition, he was appointed the qiladar of the fort of Ranthambhor in succession to his father. Bithal Das' second son Arjun was promoted from 1000/700 to 1000/1000.⁶ In 1651, Arjun was sent to Qandher with Prince Aurangzeb and his mansab was raised to 2000/1500.⁷ Shrin and Harjas, two other sons of the Raja Bithal Das,

1. See, Tables 'B' and 'C'.
were taken into imperial service with mansabs of 1000/400\(^1\) and 500/200.\(^2\) Bithal Das' brothers Bhan Singh, Bahram B and Ranchohor were also granted the mansabs of 500/200,\(^3\) 500/200\(^4\) and 500/150\(^5\) respectively.

Three other senior Gaur nobles earned promotions during this period. Girdhar Das, who served in the Gandhar and Mewar expeditions, was raised from 1000/800 to 2000/2000.\(^6\) In 1655, Girdhar Das was appointed the qiladar of Agra fort.\(^7\) In 1657, when Girdhar Das was made the faujdar of Agra, his son Parduman was appointed the qiladar of Agra fort.\(^8\) Moreover, his second son Harjan was taken into imperial service with the mansab of 500/300.\(^9\)

Another noble Siv Ram who served in the Gandhar and Mewar expeditions, was promoted from 1500/1000 to 2000/1500.\(^10\) In 1648

1. Waris, f.264b.
2. Ibid., f.269b.
3. Ibid., f.269b.
4. Ibid., f.270a.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
9. Ibid., f.269a.
10. Ibid., pp.74-76, 166-69, 273-75, f.269a.
he held the office of the qiladar of Kabul. He was also honoured with the title of Raja. Mahesh Das Gaur's mansab was also raised from 500/200 to 800/400; and in 1652 he was appointed the qiladar of Asirgarh. Only Kirpa Ram Gaur did not receive any promotion in his mansab, and continued on his mansab of 800/750.

The numerical as well as the mansab strength of Sisodia increased substantially. Their number doubled from five to ten and their mansab figures went up from 11,700/8100 to 21,200/12,300.

In October 1652, after the death of Rana Jagat Singh who held the mansab of 5000/5000, his heir-apparent Raj Singh was given the same mansab of 5000/5000 with the hereditary title of Rana. In 1654, Rana Raj Singh rebelled but after his submission, his mansab of 5000/5000 was restored to him. But he lost a certain amount of territory, so that although his rank remained the same, his income certainly was reduced.

4. Ibid., p.194.
5. Ibid., p.266a.
6. See Tables 'B' and 'C'.
Rai Singh Sisodia who was one of the favourites of Shah Jahan, rendered his services in the Balkh and Badakhshan, Qandhar and Mewar expeditions.\(^1\) When he distinguished himself in the Qandhar expeditions, he was raised to 5000/2500 from 4000/2000.\(^2\) Sujan Singh Sisodia who served in the Qandhar expeditions was promoted from 1500/500 to 2000/800.\(^3\) His son Fateh Singh was also taken into imperial service with the mansab of 500/200.\(^4\) Sujan Singh's brother Biram Deo who served in the Qandhar expeditions succeeded in rising to a mansab of 3000/1000.\(^5\) Another Sisodia noble Sabal Singh who was taken into service during this period and served in the Qandhar expeditions and reached the rank of 2500/500.\(^6\) Similarly, Sunder Das and Sultan Sisodia, who also took part in the Qandhar and Mewar expeditions held the mansabs of 700/300\(^7\) and 500/100\(^8\) respectively. Garib Das and Channa Sisodia enjoyed the mansab of 1500/700\(^9\) and 500/200.\(^10\)

8. Waris, f.270b.
On the other hand, two Sisodia nobles namely Narān Dās and Hamir Singh who held the mansabes of 700/300 and 500/300 died, it is not clear whether any parts of these mansabes were passed on to their heirs.

It is interesting to note that during this decade (1647-1657 A.D.), the subordinates of the Rāna of Mewār, who had joined imperial service, improved their positions - Rāo Rup Singh Chandrāwat, who held the mansab of 1500/1000 in 1647 A.D. was promoted to the mansab of 2000/1240. After his death, in 1651, his son Rāo Amar Sāngh was taken in the imperial service. Amar Singh served in the Qandhār expeditions and acquired the rank of 2000/1000.

During this period (1647-1657 A.D.), the total mansabes of the Ghelot chiefs increased marginally from 2500/1000 to 3100/3100. The mansabes of Rawal Punja of Dungarpur and Rawal Samarī of

5. See, Tables 'B' and 'C'.
Banswara remained stationary as 1500/1500\(^1\) and 1000/1000\(^2\) respectively. But the Chandrawat chief Girdhar Das, son of Rawal was Punja/for the first time taken into imperial service with the mansab of 600/600.\(^3\) Similarly, the Jhala chiefs also improved their positions marginally. The mansab of Rai Singh Jhala remained unchanged at 1000/700.\(^4\) But Rawat Dayal Das Jhala's brother Barsa was taken into the imperial service with the mansab of 500/250.\(^5\) The mansab of another Jhala noble, Rawat Dayal Das who served in the Qandhar expeditions was, however, increased from 700/500 to 900/500.\(^6\)

The Bundila chiefs, who had suffered a decline in number as well as total mansab in the end of the first ten years of Shah Jahan's reign, improved their positions in the third decade (1647-1657 A.D.). Their number doubled from three to six and their total mansab went up from 7000/7800 to 8000/10200.\(^7\)

---

1. Waria, f.262b.
2. Ibid., f.263b.
3. Ibid., f.268a; pp.74-76, 166-69, 273-75.
4. Ibid., f.263b.
6. Ibid., f.265b; pp.166-69, 202-05.
7. Compare Tables 'B' and 'C'.
Pahar Singh Bundila, who served in the Qandhar expeditions under Aurangzeb in 1649, was promoted from 3000/3000 with 2000 do aspa sih aspa to 4000/3000 with 3000 do aspa sih aspa. In 1652, Pahar Singh also served with Prince Dara Shukoh in the Qandhar expeditions. But till his death in 1654, he did not receive further promotion. After his death, his son Sujan Singh was promoted to 2000/2000 with do aspa sih aspa. The title of Raja was also conferred upon him. In 1656, he served with Qasim Khan against Prithvi Singh of Srinagar-Garhwal. Afterwards, he was sent to the Deccan to serve under Prince Aurangzeb. After Pahar Singh's death his second son Indraman was also taken into imperial service with a mansab of 500/200. Indraman also served in the campaign against Prithvi Singh of Srinagar-Garhwal.

2. Ibid., p.198; See also Ranawat, Shah Jahan ke Hindu Mansabdare, p.27; Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, pp.256-260.
8. Ibid., pp.343-65.
and he was subsequently promoted to 500/400. Two of Pahar Singh’s brothers Puran Mal and Chandra Bundila who served with Prince Aurangzeb in the Qandhar expeditions enjoyed the mansab of 1500/1500 and 1500/800 respectively.

It seems that during the third decade (1647-1657 A.D.), the zat mansab of Debi Singh Bundila was reduced from 2500 to 2000 zat, while his suwar rank was enhanced from 2000 to 3000. But after his participation in the Qandhar expeditions with Aurangzeb and Dara Shukoh, he was appointed the faujdar of sarkar of Bhilsa in the suba of Malwa. Towards the close of Shah Jahan’s reign, Champat Bundila, who did not belong to the Bundila royal family of Orcha, was taken in the imperial service with the mansab of 500/500.

During the third decade (1647-1657 A.D.), there was no substantial change in the position of the Hada nobles. Their

1. Waris, f.269a.
2. Waris, pp.73-76, 95-96, 202-205.
3. Ibid., f.262b.
4. Ibid., p.204; Ranawat, Shah Jahan ke Hindu Mansabdars, p.31.
6. Ibid.
8. Ibid., p.282.
9. Ibid., f.269a.
number in the imperial service remained at three. The total **ruk mansab** of the three Hada nobles increased from 6,800 to 7,800, but their **suwar** rank remained unchanged at 6,400.¹

In 1648, when Rao Satral Hada distinguished himself in the Balkh and Badakhshan campaigns,² and he was promoted from 3,000/3,000 to 3,500/3,500.³ He was subsequently sent to Qandhar with Aurangzeb and Dara Shukoh.⁴ In 1656, Satral was sent to the Deccan to serve under Aurangzeb.⁵ There he performed distinguished service,⁶ so that towards the end of the decade, he held the **mansab** of 4,000/4,000.⁷

In 1648, after the death of Madho Singh who held the **mansab** of 3,000/3,000,⁸ his son Mukund Singh was assigned the **mansab** of 2,000/1,500.⁹ In the same year, he was promoted to 2,000/2,000.¹⁰

---

1. Compare Tables 'B' and 'C'.
6. Ibid.
8. Ibid., p. 260a.
10. Ibid.
After serving with Aurangzeb in the Qandhar expeditions, he was promoted to 2500/2000. In 1654, after he had served in the Qandhar expedition under Dara Shukoh, he was promoted to 3000/2000. Upon Madho Singh's death, his younger son Mohan Singh was also taken into imperial service and given the mansab of 800/400. Another Hada noble Indrasal, who held the mansab of 800/400, died in 1651. After his death none of his heirs is known to have taken into imperial service.

The mansabs of the Bhaduriya and Bargarh chief's declined because of the deaths of some senior nobles during this period. Badan Singh Bhaduriya who served with Aurangzeb and Dara Shukoh in the Qandhar expeditions rose to the rank of 1500/1400. But in 1654, after his death, his son, Maha Singh was assigned the lower mansab of 1000/800 with the title of Raja. Towards the close of Shah Jahan's reign, he was promoted to 1000/1000 and

4. Ibid., f.266a.
5. Ibid., pp.75-76, 202, 205; Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, pp.228-30.
appointed the faujdar of Khanwa. In 1648, after the death of Raja Jai Rām Bargujar who held the mansab of 2000/1500, his son Amar Singh was given the mansab of 500/500 only with the title of Raja.

Chauhān chiefs ChatrbhuJ and Ballu served with Aurangzeb and Dāra Shukoh in the Qandhār campaigns and in reward of their services, their mansabs were increased. ChatrbhuJ was promoted from 700/500 to 1500/1500 with do aspa sinh aspa. In 1654, the pargana Dun was assigned to him as his wetan jagīr. Another senior Chauhān noble Ballu who also served in the Qandhār expeditions was promoted from 500/300 to 700/300. But Ballu’s son, Sakat Singh who served in the Qandhar expeditions and held the mansab of 500/250 is not mentioned as mansabdār in the mansab lists of Waris and Ṣāliḥ Kambu. Nothing too is known

5. Wāris, f.262b.
6. Ibid., p.302.
7. Ibid., pp.74-76, 202-03; f.267a.
8. Ibid., pp.74-76, 202-03.
about the mansab of Pratap and Vaini Das who previously enjoyed the mansab of 600/500\(^1\) and 400/100.\(^2\)

During this decade (1647-1657 A.D.), the mansab of Kishan Singh Tunwar and Chatr bhuj Songar who served in the Qandhar expeditions\(^3\) were enhanced from 500/500 to 1000/500\(^4\) and from 500/500 to 600/600.\(^5\) But the Jadon chief Jagman who also served in the Qandhar campaigns\(^6\) did not receive any promotion and his mansab remained unchanged at 500/400 till his death in 1657 A.D.\(^7\)

We have no information of mansab held by Baghela and Bhati chiefs previous to this decade. Perhaps, they held mansab of less than 500 zat which were not included in the mansab lists of Lahori and Waria. But in Shah Jahan's third decade (1647-1657 A.D.), Baghela and Bhati chiefs enjoyed high mansab. Anup Singh Baghela and his son Fateh Singh held the mansab of 3000/2000 + 1000 do aspas aspas\(^8\) and 500/200\(^9\)

4. Ibid., p.264a.
5. Ibid., p.268a.
6. Ibid., pp.74-76, 202-05.
7. Ibid., p.269a.
8. Ibid., p.260a.
respectively. Sabal Singh Bhati and Prithvi Raj Bhati enjoyed the mansabs of 1000/700\(^1\) and 700/300\(^2\).

Among the hill Rajput chiefs, Katoch chief Raja Rajrup of Mau continued to enjoy a predominant position. Rajrup served with Aurangzeb in the Qandhar expeditions.\(^3\) In 1650, after his performance in battle, Rajrup was promoted from 2000/2000 to 2500/2500.\(^4\) He was also appointed qiladar of the Kasmir fort.\(^5\) Again, in 1652, he was promoted to 3000/2300.\(^6\) Subsequently, he served with Dara Shukoh in the Qandhar expedition but did not receive any further promotion.\(^7\)

Prithvi Raj of Chamba and Raja Man Singh of Guler did not earn any promotion in their mansabs during this period. These chiefs are not known to have participated in any of the Qandhar, Mewar or Srinagar-Garhwal expeditions. Therefore, Prithvi Raj and Man Singh continued on their mansabs of 1000/400\(^8\) and 900/850.\(^1\)

---

2. Ibid., F.267a.
3. Ibid., pp.74-76, Rm 94-95.
5. Ibid.
8. Waris, F.264b.
9. Ibid., F.265a.
Upon the revolt of Prithvi Singh of Srinagar-Garhwal, Shah Jahan called upon the Kumaun chief Rai Tilok Chand to help in the rebellion; and he was assigned the mansab of 800/400.¹

In September 1654, after the death of Sangram Singh, the chief of Jammu, who held the mansab of 1500/1000,² his heir Sarangdhar was assigned a mansab of 700/500³ only. Moreover, at the time of his death Sangram Singh was the faujdar of Burhanpur.⁴ Sarangdhar was only favoured with the post of the thanedar of Manjrodh in the Deccan.⁵

Thus, it emerges that throughout Shah Jahan's reign, the total number as well as the total mansabs of the Rajput nobles increased considerably. In the first decade of Emperor Shah Jahan's reign, the Rathor, Gaur, Kachawaha and Sisodia nobles who sided with the Emperor in his rebellion were rewarded by promotions. Besides, new Rajput chiefs were also recruited in the Mughal service. The revolts of Khan-i Jahan Lodi and Jujhar Singh Bundila prompted Shah Jahan to keep the Rajput nobles in

¹. Waris, p.266a.
². Tuzuk-i Jahangiri, p.314.
⁴. Ibid., p.276.
⁵. Ibid.
good humour. Shāh Jahān also sought to attach his favourite Rajput nobles to himself by conferring new *watan-jāgīre* upon them. Moreover, important offices such as *sūbedār*, *faūldār* and *qilādār* were assigned to them. But the position of Bundila and Hāda nobles, who opposed Shāh Jahān in the rebellion, suffered radically.

The visible rise in the number and *mangab* of the Rajput nobles in the second and third decades of Shāh Jahān's reign is explained in light of the Balkh, Gandhār and Mewār expeditions. The large *mangab* enhancement at the end of third decade (1656 A.D.) does coincide with the wars of Bijāpur and Golconda. This rising fortunes might also be due to the fact that Dārā Shukoh wanted to secure their loyalty to his cause. However, in the next chapter, we shall see how far the Rajput chiefs who were favoured by Shāh Jahān stood firmly with him in the war of succession.
Table 'A'

MANŞABS OF THE RÄJPUT CLANS IN 1637 A.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>Number of Nobles</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rathor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19,650/15,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kachwaha</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13,300/15,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sisodia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,700/7,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Gaur</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,200/5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Bundela</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,500/5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Bhaduriya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,500/1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Hara</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,100/5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ghalet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,500/2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Jadon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000/600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Katoeh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,300/1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Bargujar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000/800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Chandrawat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500/1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Chauhan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800/500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Jhala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500/250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Pundir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,000/2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Sedha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800/300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Sena</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000/300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Solanki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500/400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 62, 84,350/59,780
### Table 'B'

**MANSABS OF THE RAJPUT CLANS IN 1647 A.D.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>Number of Nobles</th>
<th>Mansabs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rathor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kachawaha</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Gaur</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sisodia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Chauhan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Bundila</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Hara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ghelot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Jhala</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Bargujar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Bhaduriya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Chandrawat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Katoch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Pundir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Surajbansi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Sana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Solanki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Jaden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Sengar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Tumwar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<p>| 71   | 92,150 | 74,480 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>Number of Nobles</th>
<th>Zat</th>
<th>Suwar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rathor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28,950</td>
<td>24,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kachawaha</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Gaur</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Bundela</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sisodia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>12,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Hara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ghelot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Baghela</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Bhati</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Chauhan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Jhala</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Bhaduriya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Pundir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Tunwar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Bargujar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Jamwal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Kateeh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Surajbansi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Sambansi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Songar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Chandrawat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

90 123,150 103,530
### Appendix 'A'

**MANŞABS HELD BY ALIVE RAJPUT CHIEFS IN 1637 A.D.**

#### BARGUJARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Jay Ram s/o Ani Rai Singh</td>
<td>1000/800</td>
<td>Lahori, I, 308.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BHADURIYAS

1. Badan Singh 500/200 Lahori, I, 324.
2. Kishan Singh 1000/600 Ibid., 309.

#### BUNOILAS

2. Chandraman 1500/800 Ibid., 306.
3. Bhagwan Das s/o Bir Singh Deo 1000/600 Ibid., 309.
4. Beni Das s/o Bir Singh Deo 500/200 Ibid., 324.
5. Pahar Singh s/o Bir Singh Deo 3000/2000 Ibid., 205.

#### CHANDRAWAT

1. Rao Hathi Singh s/o Rao Duda 1500/1000 Lahori, I, 305.
### CHAUHANS

1. Lakhmi Sen, zaminder of Ajaun 800/500  
   Lahori, I, 314.

### GAURS

1. Raja Bethal Das 4000/3000  
   Lahori, I, 296.
2. Siv Ram s/o Bal Ram 1500/1000  
   Ibid., 305.
3. Sangram, zaminder of Gannur 1500/600  
   Ibid., 306; Ranawat, 19.
4. Kirpa Ram Gaur 700/700  
   Lahori, I, 316.
5. Girdhar Das b/o Raja Bethal Das 500/200  
   Ibid., 324.

### SISODIAS

1. Rana Jagat Singh Sisodia 5000/5000  
   Lahori, I, 294.
2. Raja Rai Singh s/o Maharaja Bhim Singh 3000/1500  
   Ibid., 299.
3. Shyam Singh 1000/ 500  
   Ibid., 310.
4. Gokul Das 900/ 500  
   Ibid., 312.
5. Sujan Singh 800/ 300  
   Ibid., 315.

### RATHORS

1. Raja Gaj Singh 5000/5000  
   Lahori, I, 294.
   Ibid., 298.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Father</th>
<th>Credit/Debit</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Hari Singh s/o Kishan Singh</td>
<td>1000/800 Ibid., 308.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Sabal Singh s/o Raja Surej Singh</td>
<td>900/800 Ibid., 312.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Mahesh Das s/o Dalpat Rathor</td>
<td>800/600 Ibid., 313.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Satrassal s/o Rao Sur Bhurtya</td>
<td>700/600 Ibid., 316.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Raja Udai Bhan s/o Raja Girdhar</td>
<td>600/400 Ibid., 319; B.K., 178.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEHLOTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Father</th>
<th>Credit/Debit</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rawal Punja, zaminder of Dungarpur</td>
<td>1500/1500 Lahori, I, 304.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Rawal Samarsi, zaminder of Banawara</td>
<td>1000/1000 Ibid., 307.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HADAS

1. Rao Satral g/o Rao Ratan 3000/3000 Lahori, I, 297
3. Hirda-y Narain 500/100 Ibid., 328.
4. Indralal g/o Rao Ratan 600/300 Ibid., 320.

JADONS

1. Raja Jagman 500/300 Lahori, I, 322.
2. Mukand 500/300 Ibid., 323.

JHALAS

1. Rawat Dayal Das 500/250 Lahori, I, 323.

KACHAWAHAS

1. Raja Jai Singh 5000/5000 Lahori, I, 294.
2. Ugar Sen (Sheikhwat) 800/400 Ibid., 314
3. Har Ram a/o Bhagwan Das 700/300 Ibid., 317
4. Rup Singh 700/300 Ibid.
5. Ugar Sen a/o Satral 600/400 Ibid., 319.
6. Mathura Das 500/400 Ibid., 322.
7. Tilok Chand g/o Rai Manchar (Sheikhwat) 800/500 Ibid., 314.

contd...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Father</th>
<th>Landholding (in Rupees)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bhej Raj a/o Rai Sal Darbari (Shaikhwat)</td>
<td>800/400</td>
<td>Lāhorī, I, 314.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nar Singh Da-š a/o Dwarka Das (Shaikhwat)</td>
<td>500/400</td>
<td>Ibid., 322.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gopal Singh a/o Raja Manrup</td>
<td>900/600</td>
<td>Ibid., 312.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chandra Bhan Narwak</td>
<td>500/400</td>
<td>Ibid., 322.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ram Das Narwarī</td>
<td>2000/1000</td>
<td>Ibid., I, pp.83, 303; died in the 13th R.Y., M.U., II, 226-28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Katochs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Father</th>
<th>Landholding (in Rupees)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chandra Bhan zamindār of Kangra</td>
<td>500/300</td>
<td>Lāhorī, I, 322.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Raja Man Singh</td>
<td>900/500</td>
<td>Ibid., 312.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pundirs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Father</th>
<th>Landholding (in Rupees)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raja Jagat Singh a/o Raja Bāso</td>
<td>3000/2000</td>
<td>Lāhorī, I, 298.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sochās**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Father</th>
<th>Landholding (in Rupees)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rana Jedha, zamindār of Amarkot</td>
<td>800/300</td>
<td>Lāhorī, I, 315.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sena Chandrabansis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Father</th>
<th>Landholding (in Rupees)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raja Kunwar San of Kishthwar</td>
<td>1000/300</td>
<td>Lāhorī, I, 311.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Solankis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Father</th>
<th>Landholding (in Rupees)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nahar Solanki</td>
<td>500/400</td>
<td>Lāhorī, I, 322.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 'B'**

**MANSABS HELD BY ALIVE RĀJPUT CHIEFS IN 1647 A.D.**

### BARGUJARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rāja Jai Rām</td>
<td>2000/1500</td>
<td>Lāhori, II, 727.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BHADURIYAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rāja Badan Singh</td>
<td>1000/1000</td>
<td>Lāhori, II, 732.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUNDILAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rāja Pahār Singh a/o Bīr Singh Deo</td>
<td>3000/3000</td>
<td>Lāhori, II, 722.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>do aspa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eih aspa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rāja Debi Singh a/o Bhārtiya Bundila</td>
<td>2500/2000</td>
<td>Ibid., 725.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chandraman</td>
<td>1500/800</td>
<td>Ibid., 731.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHANDRĀWATS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rāo Roop Singh</td>
<td>1500/1000</td>
<td>Lāhori, II, 730.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHAUPHANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chatzbhūj</td>
<td>700/500</td>
<td>Lāhori, II, 742.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pratāp Singh</td>
<td>600/500</td>
<td>Ibid., 743.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ballu Chauhān</td>
<td>500/300</td>
<td>Ibid., 747.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vainī Dās a/o Ballu</td>
<td>400/100</td>
<td>M.K., I, 234.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sakat Singh a/o Vainī Dās</td>
<td>500/250</td>
<td>Lāhori, II, 748; M.K., I, 234.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAURS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Raja Bethal Das</td>
<td>5000/5000</td>
<td>Lahori, II, 720.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Anirudh s/o Bethal Das</td>
<td>1500/1000</td>
<td>Ibid., 730.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Siv Ram</td>
<td>1500/1000</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Girdhar Das</td>
<td>1000/ 800</td>
<td>Ibid., 733.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kirpa Ram</td>
<td>800/ 750</td>
<td>Ibid., 739.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Arjun s/o Raja Bethal Das</td>
<td>1000/ 700</td>
<td>Ibid., 733.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rai Mukund Das</td>
<td>800/ 200</td>
<td>Ibid., 741; Ranawat, 104.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SISODIAS</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rana Jagat Singh</td>
<td>5000/5000</td>
<td>Lahori, II, 719.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Narain Das</td>
<td>700/ 300</td>
<td>Ibid., 743.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hamir Singh</td>
<td>500/ 300</td>
<td>Ibid., 747.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RATHORS</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Raja Jaswant Singh</td>
<td>5000/5000</td>
<td>Lahori, II, 719.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Roop Singh g/e Kishan Singh</td>
<td>2000/1000</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ratan Singh</td>
<td>1500/1500</td>
<td>Ibid., 729.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*contd...*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CEHLOTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rawal Punja</td>
<td>1500/</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Lahori, II, 721.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HADAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**JADONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**JHALAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rai Singh</td>
<td>1000/</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Lahori, II, 733.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Raja Jai Singh</td>
<td>5000/5000</td>
<td>2000 da aspa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sin aspa</td>
<td>Lāhori, II, 719.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kunwar Rām Singh</td>
<td>1000/1000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 732.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s/o Jai Singh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Gopal Singh s/o</td>
<td>1000/1000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manroop Singh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Rāja Amar Singh</td>
<td>1000/600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 734.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Jagrām</td>
<td>900/600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 738.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Rāi Tilok Chand</td>
<td>1000/500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 735.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Nar Singh Dās s/o</td>
<td>800/800</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 739.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dwārka Dās</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ugar Sen</td>
<td>800/600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Shoj Rāj</td>
<td>700/500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 742.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Sangrām</td>
<td>700/400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Mathura Dās</td>
<td>700/400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Paim Chand g/o Rāi Manohar</td>
<td>600/400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 745.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Ugar Sen g/o Rāja Mān Singh</td>
<td>300/200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 749.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Kanhi s/o Balbhadr</td>
<td>500/200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheikbāwa-t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Prithvi Singh, great-grand</td>
<td>500/250</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 748.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>son of Rāja Mān Singh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Kishan Singh, great-grand</td>
<td>500/250</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 748.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>son of Rāja Mān Singh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KATOCMS

1. Rāja Mān Singh of Guler  900/950  Lāhorī, II, 738

PUNDĪRS


SENA CHANDRABANSĪS

1. Rāja Kunwar Sen of Kishwar  1000/ 400  Lāhorī, II, 736.

SOLANKĪS

1. Nāhar  800/ 400  Lāhorī, II, 740; M.K., I, 220.

TUNWARS


SONGARS


SURAJBANSĪS

1. Rāja Prithvi Chand of Chamba  1000/ 400  Lāhorī, II, 756.
Appendix 'C'

MANSABS HELD BY ALIVE RĀJPUT CHIEFS IN 1637 A.D.*

BARGUJARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rāja Amar Singh</td>
<td>500/500</td>
<td>Waris, f.269b.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BAGHELAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>do as pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sih aspa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Fāteh Singh b/o Anoop Singh</td>
<td>500/200</td>
<td>Ibid., f.271a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BHADŪRĪYAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Maha Singh s/o Badan Singh</td>
<td>1000/800</td>
<td>Waris, f.264a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BHĀTĪS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rawal Sabal Singh</td>
<td>1000/700</td>
<td>Waris, f.264b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Prithvi Rāj</td>
<td>700/300</td>
<td>Ibid., f.267b.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUNDILAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>do as pa</td>
<td>sih aspa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 do as pa</td>
<td>sih aspa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contd..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Char Bhuj</td>
<td>1500/1500</td>
<td>de supra eih eih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Bhma s/o Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td>1000/400</td>
<td>Waris, p.264b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Harjas a/o Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td>500/200</td>
<td>Waris, p.269b.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHANDRAWATS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Puran Mal b/o</td>
<td>1500/1500</td>
<td>Ibid., p.263a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pahar Singh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Inder Man a/o Pahar Singh</td>
<td>500/400</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GAURS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Bhma s/o Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td>1000/400</td>
<td>Ibid., 264b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Kirpa Ram</td>
<td>800/750</td>
<td>Ibid., 266a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Manahar Das b/o</td>
<td>800/400</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Harjan a/o Girchar Das</td>
<td>500/300</td>
<td>Ibid., 269a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Harjas a/o Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td>500/200</td>
<td>Ibid., 269b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Bhma Singh b/o Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td>500/200</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Harsa b/o Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td>500/200</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Harsa b/o Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td>500/200</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Bhma Singh b/o Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td>500/200</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Bhma Singh b/o Raja Bathal Das</td>
<td>500/200</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHAUHANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Char Bhuj</td>
<td>1500/1500</td>
<td>de supra eih eih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Ballu</td>
<td>700/300</td>
<td>Ibid., p.267b.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

M.V., II, 276-77; Waris, p.260a; V.V., 369.
### GEHLOTS

1. Rawal Punja  
   1500/1500  
   Waris, 262b.

2. Rawal Samarsal  
   1000/1000  
   Ibid., 263b.

3. Girdhar Dass a/o Rawal Punja  
   600/600  
   Ibid., 268a.

### HADAS

1. Rao Satrasal  
   4000/4000  
   Waris, 25a.

2. Mukund Singh  
   3000/2000  
   Ibid., 260b.

3. Mohan Singh a/o Madho Singh  
   800/400  
   Ibid., 266a.

### JAMWALS

1. Sarangdhar a/o Raja  
   Sangram Singh of Jammu  
   700/500  
   Waris, 267a.

### JHALAS

1. Rai Singh  
   1000/700  
   Waris, 262b; V.V., 372.

2. Rawat Dayal Dass  
   900/500  
   Waris, 265a.

3. Barse or Parse, b/o  
   Rai Singh  
   500/250  
   Ibid., 217; Ranawat, 37, 95, 108.

### KACHAWAHAS

1. Raja Jai Singh  
   5000/5000  
   4000  
   Waris, 259b.

2. Ram Singh a/o Raja  
   Jai Singh  
   3000/2000  
   Ibid., 260b.

3. Raja Amar Singh  
   1500/1000  
   Ibid., 262b.

4. Gopal Singh a/o Manroop  
   1000/1000  
   Ibid., 263b.

contd...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>First parcel</th>
<th>Second parcel</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Kirat Singh s/o Raja</td>
<td>1000/900</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jai Singh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Jagrām</td>
<td>1000/800</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ugar Sen</td>
<td>800/600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 266a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ajab Singh</td>
<td>800/400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 266b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Nar Singh Dās s/o</td>
<td>800/800</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 265b;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dwārka Dās</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ranawat, 95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Mahru s/o Raja Jai</td>
<td>900/300</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.V., 374.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KATOCHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>First parcel</th>
<th>Second parcel</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rāja Man Singh s/o</td>
<td>900/850</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wāris, 265a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāja Roop Singh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUNDĪRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>First parcel</th>
<th>Second parcel</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**RĀTHORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>First parcel</th>
<th>Second parcel</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Maharāja Jaswant Singh</td>
<td>6000/6000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wāris, 259b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5000 da aśna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000 da aśna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Roop Singh</td>
<td>4000/4000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 260a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Shyām Singh er Rām Singh s/o Karamai</td>
<td>3000/1500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contd...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rāi Singh g/o Rāja Gaj Singh</td>
<td>1500/1000</td>
<td>Ibid., 262b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Udai Bhān s/o Shyām Singh</td>
<td>1000/500</td>
<td>Ibid., 264a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Goltān Dās</td>
<td>1000/500</td>
<td>Ibid., 264b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mahesh Dās</td>
<td>1000/500</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rāja Udai Bhān s/o Girdhar</td>
<td>800/500</td>
<td>Ibid., 266a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sher Singh s/o Rām Singh</td>
<td>800/300</td>
<td>Wāris, 266b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jagat Singh s/o Prithvi Rāj</td>
<td>700/300</td>
<td>Ibid., 267b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kesri Singh s/o Prithvi Rāj</td>
<td>600/200</td>
<td>Ibid., 268b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rām Singh b/o Prithvi Rāj</td>
<td>500/200</td>
<td>Ibid., 270a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nāhar s/o Rāj Singh</td>
<td>900/400</td>
<td>Ibid., 265a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sujān Singh s/o Muhkam Singh</td>
<td>1000/500</td>
<td>Ibid., 264a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ishwar Singh s/o Rām Singh</td>
<td>600/200</td>
<td>Ibid., 268b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rāi Banmali Dās s/o Rāo Kāran of Bikāner</td>
<td>1000/100</td>
<td>V.V., 373.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fateh Singh s/o Mahesh Dās</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Bahi, p.12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jujhār Singh s/o Singh</td>
<td>200/25</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rup Singh s/o Goltān Dās</td>
<td>400/50</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ratan Singh s/o Goltān Dās</td>
<td>200/25</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Udai Singh s/o Rām Singh</td>
<td>100/30</td>
<td>Ibid., 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kalyān Dās s/o Mahesh Dās</td>
<td>400/400</td>
<td>Ibid., 17.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sisodia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rāna Rāj Singh</td>
<td>5000/5000</td>
<td>Wāris, 260b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rāi Singh</td>
<td>5000/2500</td>
<td>Wāris, 197; M.U., II, 298-300.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bīrām Dāś b/o Sujān Singh</td>
<td>3000/1000</td>
<td>Wāris, 261a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sabal Singh</td>
<td>2500/1500</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contd...
7. Chana Sisodia 500/200  *Waris*, 270a. He is noted as Hubba Sisodia by Ranawat, p.38.
8. Sultan Sisodia 500/100  *Waris*, 270b.
9. Sunder Dās 700/300  *Ibida*, 213; Ranawat, 213.

**SOMBANSIS**

1. Rāi Tilok Chand of Kumaon 800/400  *Waris*, 266a; *Vigat*, II, 294.

**SONGAR**


**SURAJBANSIS**

1. Prithvī Chand of Chamba 1000/400  *Waris*, 264b.

**TUNWARS**

1. Rāja Kishan Singh 1000/500  *Waris*, 264b

* I owe for this mansab information of Waris' Bādshāhnāma, (MS. i.o. Lib.), to Sunita I. Zaidi.
### OFFICES HELD BY RAJPUT CHIEFS DURING SHĀH JAHĀN’S REIGN (1627–1658 A.D.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Bethal Dās</td>
<td>Gaur</td>
<td>Qilādār of Ranthambhor</td>
<td>M.U., II, 250-54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Bathal Dās; his son Anirudh Gaur was made his deputy</td>
<td>Gaur</td>
<td>Subadār of Ajaer</td>
<td>Tabā Tabā, 94; M.U., II, 250-54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>Siv Rām</td>
<td>Gaur</td>
<td>Qilādār of Fort Asir</td>
<td>Lāhorī, I, 304; M.U., II, 263-64.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Qilādār of Qalat in the province of Qandhār</td>
<td>M.U.,II,240-41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1645-46</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1646-47</td>
<td>Kishan Singh</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Giladhar of Jula or Chula</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sept.1647</td>
<td>Shyam Singh</td>
<td>Rathi</td>
<td>Fauidar of Baghna</td>
<td>Warias, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sept.1650</td>
<td>Rao Karan</td>
<td>Rathi</td>
<td>Giladhar of Daulatabad</td>
<td>Warias,126;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>c.1650</td>
<td>Mirza Raja</td>
<td>Kachawaha</td>
<td>Fauidar of Delhi</td>
<td>Z.K.,III,118.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sept.1650-</td>
<td>Kishat Singh</td>
<td>Kachawaha</td>
<td>Fauidar of Mewat</td>
<td>Farmen, nishan and Manhura, n.77, RSA Bikaner,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>M.U.,II,156-58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>May 1653</td>
<td>Nan Singh Dasa</td>
<td>Shai-</td>
<td>Giladhar of Khaibor</td>
<td>Ibid., 234.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Feb.1654</td>
<td>Kishan Singh</td>
<td>Kachawaha</td>
<td>Giladhar of Taragarh</td>
<td>Ibid., 254.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarangdhara g/a Raja Sangram</td>
<td>Jumal</td>
<td>Thanaedar of Manjroth</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Nov. 1654</td>
<td>Raja Deb Singh</td>
<td>Bundela</td>
<td>Faujdar of Bhinor or Billes</td>
<td>Ibid. M.U., II, 295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter IV

THE AUTONOMOUS PRINCIPALITIES: WATAN JÄGIRS

As Irfan Habib has pointed out, the watan-jägirs originated from admission of zamindara or territorial chiefs into the Mughal service. The jägirs allotted to zamindara entering the Mughal service within their old dominions were known as their watanas and then were allowed to remain with their families.¹ Nurul Hasan holds that the Mughal emperors treated the hereditary dominions of the autonomous chiefs as watan jägirs. There was no difference between ordinary jägir and watan jägir except the latter was hereditary in nature and immune from transfer.² Although theoretically the King was entitled to determine the succession to the watan-jägirs, it was ordinarily allowed to take place according to the customary rules of the individual ruling clans.³

3. Ibid. See also Chapter V on Succession to Watan-jägirs.
It is not known as to exactly what conditions were offered to the Rajput chiefs with respect to their principalities at the time of their joining Akbar's service. One cannot, however, fail to note that the term *watan jagir* does not occur in any one of records and chronicles of Akbar's reign. Even Abul Fazl does not refer to the original principalities or *zamindaris* of the Rajput chiefs in the imperial service as *watan jagirs*. He calls these places by terms like *mafitin*, *massan*, *manzil*, *bunchah*, *khana* and *zamindari* etc.\(^1\) Even when, at one place, he refers to Jodhpur as the *jaqir* of Mata Raja, he does not use any prefix to indicate the special nature of this assignment.\(^2\)

This would strongly suggest that the arrangement under which the *parganas* of hereditary principalities of the Rajput nobles came to be treated, during the 17th century, as their permanent *jaqir* or *watan jagirs*, did not exist in all its essential features during the 16th century.

Yet it is known in many cases the chiefs recruited in the Mughal service under Akbar continued to enjoy special rights.

---

1. *Akbarnama*, Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1873-87, III, 15, 184, 220, 221, 326.

and privileges within their original zaminderis as well as in relation to members of their clans. This situation tended to resemble the arrangement that later existed in the form of watan-jagirs.

One may infer that till 1573 or in other words till the introduction of dagh-i-chahra regulations, the assignments of the Rajput chiefs recruited in Akbar's service during sixties were confirmed mainly to their hereditary principalities. It is important to note, in this connection, that, till 1573, one does not come across any instance of the bestowal of a jagir on a Rajput noble in region far removed from his original dominion. From this it may be deduced that till this time, their original dominion were the only territories that were left with them as their assignments. The earliest and the only direct evidence about the bestowal of a jagir on a Rajput chief prior to 1573 is a statement by Badauni that in 1570, pargana Arail was given as jagir to Raja Ram Chandra of Bhatta.¹ But as we knew on the authority of the Afghan chronicles Tarikh-i Khan-i Jahani that till Sikandar Lodi's reign Arail was a part of the Bhatta principality.² One may, therefore, treat this evidence as

¹. Murtishah-ut Tawazih, II, p.120.
². Tarikh-i Khan-i Jahani Lodi, p.179. In the Ain-i Akbari, Abul Fari says that pargan Shatta comprised thirty nine villages but the names of the pargana are not mentioned. In the Akbarnama (III, p.720), we find that the territory of Shatta was in the zaminderi of Baghelas.
suggesting the restoration of the *pergana* originally held by the Baghela to him rather than the bestowal of a new *jagir*. Akbar's practice of assigning to the chiefs the *perganae* situated within their own dominions is also borne by three stray references in the *Akbarname*, *Muhta Nainsi-re-Khyat* and *Dalpat Vilas*. In 1573, Sambhal and Bikaner were in the *jagirs* of the chiefs in whose ancestral territories these were located.¹ In 1577, Akbar laid the foundation of the fort of Mul Manoharnagar and after the completion of the fort, Akbar assigned it to Manohar Das, *zaminder* of that place.²

Regarding Amber we do not come across a clear cut statement anywhere in the sources of Akbar's reign, including *Akbarname*, to the effect that it was left in the *jagir* of Bhar Mal or any one of his successors. Yet on the basis of indirect evidence, one may infer that at the time the Kachawahas were recruited into the Mughal service, Bhar Mal was allowed to retain his original territory as a *jagir-cum-military* charge. For instance, it is known that subsequent to Bhar Mal's entry in Akbar's service, he as well as his successors were usually in attendance upon the King or serving in various capacities in

---

2. *Akbarname*, III, p.221.
the different parts of the empire, but unlike the ordinary nobles, they were having their personal establishments at Amber. They would occasionally visit Amber and hold marriage ceremonies of the members of their family and similar other functions in that place. It is in the context of such occasions that Abul Fazl uses the terms mautin and maakan, which tends to indicate that from the very beginning the territories of the original zamindarias of the Kachawaha chiefs entering the Mughal service were treated as their permanent headquarters or even jagirs.

A similar policy was pursued in the case of the thikanae and pattas of the ordinary Kachawaha chiefs like Amarsar, Sambhar, Lawan, Naraina and Deesa. It may be presumed that in their capacities of military commanders or hakims, the Kachawaha nobles of lesser ranks holding their thikanae or pattas as jagir-sam-military charges, were in a subordinate position to the Rajewat chief of Amber. At least this much is fully established that even after the entry of Kachawaha nobles in the

2. Ibid.
Mughal service the ordinary Kachawaha chiefs continued to regard the Rajawat chief as their superiors and leaders. This is borne by the fact that on occasions the king himself would be forced to take help from the Rajawat chief for pacifying an individual Kachawaha noble's feeling disgruntled for one or the other reason. For instance, in 1572, it was only at Bhagwant Das' intervention that Rupai was persuaded to apologize for his rude behaviour towards Akbar.¹ Again, in 1583, Akbar had to take the help of Jagannath for persuading Udai Singh to give up his insistence that his mother should perform sati along with the dead body of his father.²

However, it appears that while conferring the pergonas of their original principalities on the Rajawat chiefs, Akbar had taken some of the mahals of the pergonas of Amber under his direct control. These mahals were given by the Emperor as jagirs or ma'afis grants to men of his choice who were not always Kachawahas. It is known on the strength of a document, preserved in the Rajasthan State Archives, Bikāner that around 1597, Akbar had given village Punvaliya in perguna

2. Ibid., p.402; Ma'āgir-ul Umarā, II, p.110.
Amber as udak (madad-i ma'ash) to Dhani Ram Joshi, a Brahman.\(^1\) Similarly, Sangani, a mahal in pargana Amber was given as jagir to Ram Das Udawat in 1572.\(^2\) At the same time, Ram Das was also appointed the kotwal of Sangani.\(^3\) This evidence is an ample indication of the fact that in 1597, a part of the revenues of pargana Amber were controlled by the central government.

Akbar's policy of taking away a part of the revenues of the principality of a chief entering his service and of giving them as assignment to men of his own choice is borne still more clearly from the manner in which Akbar appears to have curtailed the extent of the territory held by the Rathor chief of Jodhpur on the death of Rao Chandra Sen. This is suggested by the fact that the rulers of Jodhpur are reported to have controlled vast territory before they took up service under Akbar. The chiefs of Jodhpur possessed Jodhpur, Bhadrajah, Jaler, Siwana, Sancher, Phalodi, Merta, Ajmer, Chetati, Tonk, Toda and Malpura under their control.\(^4\) But on Chandra Sen's

\(^1\) The document is available in the old records file of Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner.

\(^2\) Itāhāt-i Akbarī, II, p.442; Ma'asir-i Rahimī, I, p.604.

\(^3\) Ibid.; Muhta Nainsi-re-Khyat, I, p.331.

\(^4\) Marwar-re-Pargana-re-Vigat, I, pp.43-45.
death in 1583, Udaí Singh's territory was limited to pargana Jodhpur.\(^1\) Apparently, the original pargana of the Rathor chiefs other than Jodhpur were either taken into khelisa or were assigned to the petty Rathor chiefs who were entering the imperial service in their individual capacities. It might be assumed that this policy of assigning small jagirs to petty Rajput officers in the territory taken away from an autonomous chief was conceived by Akbar as an effective instrument for breaking the resistance of a chief reluctant to submit to him on the terms that he was offering. This policy became discernible first of all in the case of the Rathors of Jodhpur when they were being pressurised by Akbar to submit to him. In 1559, when Jaitaran was annexed from Jodhpur, it was assigned as jagir to two Rathor sardars, Kalyan Das and Gopal Das\(^2\) and pargana Sojat was assigned as jagir to Rao Ram Rathor.\(^3\) Similar cases of assignments are also traceable in the territory of Mewar. In 1568, Rao Surjan Hada, a subordinate sardar of Rana Pratap of Mewar, was allowed to retain his territory Bundi on entering Akbar's service.\(^4\) Another similar case was that of

\(^1\) *Mewar-ra-Pargana-ra-Vigat*, I, pp.76-77.
\(^3\) *Akbarnama*, III, p.34.
\(^4\) *Muhta Mainsi-re-Khyat*, I, pp.110, 112.
Rao Durga of whom, on taking up the Mughal service, was allowed to hold his thikana Rampura. 1 Rawal Askaran of Dungarpur and Rawal Pratap of Banswara, when they crossed over to the Mughal, were not disturbed in their thikanaas. 2 After the entry of these sardaras into the imperial service, their thikanaas held by them were recognised as jagirs granted to them by the Emperor. This is clearly suggested by evidence relating to the entry of ruler of Mewar in the Mughal service in 1615. At this time, these thikanaadars were no more treated as subordinates of the Rana. Even after the treaty of 1615, between the Rana and the Mughals, they continued to be in the service of the Mughal rulers and their original thikanaas were treated as their watan-jagirs.

The entry of the Rajput chiefs in the Mughal service brought about in fact as well as in theory drastic change in their position. First, their semi-autonomous control over their charge would not be concomitant with their jurisdiction as the jaserdars of the area. They could be deprived of one or the other position by the king at his will. This policy was in consonance with the notion that the nobles were in the position

1. *Vir Vined*, pp.983-84.
of the royal threshold (handagan-i dargah). This notion laid the basis for Akbar's exercise of the royal power for curtailing the privileges and claims of the Rajput chiefs in regard of their ancestral territories.

As already suggested, the pattas and thikanaa of the minor Rajput chiefs were recognised as their jagirs on their entry in the Mughal service. As a consequence of this practice, the control of the bigger chiefs entering the Mughal service with their original principalities would basically be that of the hekims or feviders of the areas and obviously they would not have the same kind of claim over the revenues of their zamindaries as must have been the case earlier. Thus, it would seem that the situation of administrative jurisdiction inside the Rajput territories at that entry stage must have been rather fluid.

In this situation, one might imagine, the Rajput chiefs would tend to become sensitive regarding their position vis-a-vis their zamindaries or wetans and they would be prone to resist any move to further limit their jurisdiction over these territories. This kind of tension between the central authority and the newly recruited Rajput chiefs tended to accentuate on

---

account of two kinds of developments: First, as a result of the rise of the chiefs in the imperial hierarchy to higher mansab (or whatever categories of status obtained at the time), the income from their jagirs located within the erstwhile principalties would no longer be sufficient to meet their salary bills and, therefore, the Emperor would be called upon to make additions to their existing jagirs. For this purpose, it would be necessary to assess, properly, the jana of the jagirs located in their original principalities through official machinery evolved for this purpose, thus reinforcing the process of the extension of the imperial administration over the territories left under the control of the chiefs. On the other hand, the assignment of the jagirs to these chiefs in different provinces and their appointment to command any higher offices in the state would physically remove these people from their dominions. This would have provided an opportunity to the Emperor to appoint his own officers for administering these areas. Naturally, the chiefs on their part would be anxious that their status as the semi-autonomous rulers of the territories concerned should not be

1. Sometime around 1573, Akbar started giving jagirs to the Rajput chiefs outside the territory of their hereditary principalities. In 1573, Raja Man Singh held Khiljiwara in jagir. *A.H.,* III, p.43; *M.K.,* I, 342.

2. This happened, for instance, in the case of the Kashawaha nobles who were stationed in the Punjab sometime before 1578 and were given jagirs there. *Akbarnama,* III, p.248.
disturbed and they should be allowed to control them through their agents while they were serving in positions requiring their prolonged absence from their previous charges. It would, however, seem that Akbar was not prepared to concede these privileges to the chiefs and was gradually taking steps for the integration of the administration of their territories with those of the rest of the Empire. This caused friction between the imperial authority and the chiefs. In the case of the Rājput nobles, evidence suggesting such a friction is not altogether lacking.¹

The friction noticed above seems to have become particularly sharp in 1575, when Akbar attempted to abolish jagāra and reduced his nobles to the position of the servants of the state, paid in cash.² An accompanying measure was the appointment of the kurūrīa all over the Empire for managing the newly created

¹. There are references to the appointment of Kurūrīa in Bikāner and Sāmbhār. It was resented by the Rājput chiefs. Muhamad Mainsī-ī-Khāyāt, I, p.306; Dalpat Vilās, p.33.
². Akbarnāma, III, p.69. Abūl Fāżl says, “accordinly, he promulgated the branding regulation, the conversion of the imperial territories into crown lands and the fixing the grades of the officers of state”. There are divergent views among the modern historians regarding this measure. Moreland has interpreted Abūl Fāżl’s above passage as a drastic action to put the bulk of his service on cash salaries, and take the northern provinces under direct administration. (The Agrarian System of Mūsulmān India, p.96), while M.P. Singh has cited several cases suggesting that the jagāra already assigned to nobles were continued to be held by them even after the promulgation of the above order. (‘Akbar’s Resumption of Jagāra, 1575 - a Re-examination’, The Proceedings of Indian History Congress, Mysore, 1966, pp.208-9).
khaliisa territories. It seems that while introducing these measures an attempt was made to resume the jagirs of the Rajput nobles located within their zamindaria. The fact that at least for sometime around 1575, Sambhar was taken into khaliisa is borne out by Muhta Nainsi's testimony but he also tells us that this was resisted by Kachawaha chief Vijay Ram holding this parana. Similar evidence relating to Bikaner is available in the Dalpat Vilas. According to this source, when kuriarre reached Bikaner in 1575, ostensibly to take over the parana from the Raja, Rao Rai Singh's son Bhupat barred their entry into the parana and eventually they were obliged to return from there without fulfilling their assignment.

Possibly, after the abortive attempt of 1575 to abolish jagirs, Akbar gave substantial concessions to the

1. Muntakhab-ut Tawariikh, II, p.189. "In this year a new idea came into his mind for improving the calculation of the country, whether dry or irrigated, whether in towns or hills, in desert and jungles, by rivers, reservoirs, or wells were all to be measured, and every such piece of land as, upon cultivation, would produce one krar of tankas, was to be divided off, and placed under the charge of an officer to be called kraji, who was to be selected for his trustworthiness, whether known or unknown to the revenue clerks and treasurers so that in course of three years all the uncultivated land might be brought into cultivation, and the public treasury might be replenished. Security was taken from each one of these officers".

3. Dalpat Vilas, p.33.
nobility with an aim to mollify them. One important concession that he appears to have given to the Rajput nobles was that he exempted their jagirs located in their zamindari territories from resumption. After 1575, we do not come across any instance of the resumption or attempted resumption of the existing jagirs of a Rajput chief located in his original zamindari. Apparently, with the passage of time, this practice tended to establish a distinction between the two types of jagirs: ordinary jagirs and the jagirs located in the original zamindari. Towards the end of Akbar's reign, it would appear that the jagirs of the chiefs located in their zamindari as distinct from their ordinary jagirs, came to be designated as watan-jagirs. This designation is for the first time used in the context of such assignments around 1604 in one of Akbar's farman to Raja Rai Singh of Bikaner, preserved in the Rajasthan State Archives. It is stated in this document, "Whereas the said mahal (Shamsabad) had been attached to the jagir of Rathors since long, we have, as a token of great favour, bestowed both the parganas (Shamsabad and Nurpur) upon him (Rai Rai Singh) as the watan-jagir."

1. Akbar's farman to Rai Rai Singh of Bikaner. The farman (N. 14) is preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner. The term watan-jagir is used in farman for the assignment of revenues of one of the mahals of pargana Shamsabad to Rai Rai Singh on a permanent basis. From Ain-i Akbari, one comes to know that pargana Shamsabad was at this time in the zamindari of the Rathors. Ain-i Akbari, II, tr. Jarrett, Calcutta, 1949, p.196. Blechmann, Ain. II, p.507. The predecessors of Rai Singh resided in Shamsabad.
This earliest reference to the institution of *watan-jāgīr* in the Mughal records tends to specify the following characteristic features of the institution emerging at the time:

(a) That *watan-jāgīr* was given on a permanent basis, a logical corollary of which would be that, ordinarily, it would continue in the line of assignees from generation after generation.

(b) That *watan-jāgīr* would be located in a mahal included in the zamīndārī of the assignee.

(c) That the imperial authority could create the *watan-jāgīr* at its will for a noble in any part of the Empire.

II

A detailed scrutiny of the existing evidence suggests a gradual development in the specific characteristics of *watan jāgīr* during the reign of Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān. While studying the working of this institution during this period, we have also made use of the evidence coming from the second half of the 17th century wherever it can usefully shed light on the institution in the earlier phase.
At the time of a Rajput noble's entry in service, he was given an initial mansab carrying a salary bill that approximated to the estimated revenue of his zamindari, which was treated as his watan-jagir. However, the basic feature of watan-jagir was its freedom from transfer. This is borne out clearly from a passage in the Tuzuk-i Jahangiri. Jahangir says, I halted in the pargana of Badnor. This pargana from the time of my father has been in the jagir of Kesho Das Maru and infact, had become a kind of watan to him. He had constructed gardens and buildings. Out of these, one was a step well (baoli) on the road, which appeared exceedingly pleasant and well made. It occurred to me that if a well had to be made everywhere on a road side, it should be built like this one.¹

This indicates that owing to the permanent interests created by the Mughal Emperor in recognition of watan jagir, the holder would take keen interest to improve the area held as watan jagir. It was only on the rare occasion of a grave lapse or fault that a watan jagir became vulnerable to resumption. In 1647 on the complaint of the peasants of the watan jagir of Pratap Singh Chauhan, the jagir was transferred, and his rank was curtailed.² In another case, pargana Rawat, which was held

¹ Tuzuk-i Jahangiri, 203.
² Shaikh Farid Bhakkari does not mention the specific place held by Pratap Singh Chauhan as watan jagir. But he says that his watan lies between Delhi and Narnol. Zakhurat-ul Khawanin, III, p.115.
From Indar Singh's petition, dated Rabi-us Sani 1089 AH/June 1678, addressed to Aurangzeb, it transpires that according to the Rajput perception of the prevailing custom at the time of the chief's succession to the gaddi, he was to be given a mansab equal to the income of the watan. The petition reads as follows:

"The petition of Indar Singh, son of Rao Rai Singh. It is submitted that it is a custom of the Rajputs to assign the villages belonging to the mahal of the watan to the Rajputs. At the time of necessity, they sacrifice their lives. Owing to this, after the death of the watanadar, a mansab, equal to the dema (i.e. jamadami) of the watan is conferred (on the Rajputs). Four lakh dema of the mahal of the watan in Nagor are in excess (of the sanctioned salary). It is hoped that either the mansab may be increased (so as to have the pay cover the) excess amount, or the excess amount be written off (from the jam). It was ordered that an increase of 300 ruwars in the mansab (of Indar Singh) be made."

2. Selected Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign, p.121.
Inder Singh's statement that the entire revenues of his watan ought to be controlled by the holder of the watan, is corroborated by a number of examples in which the income of the watan jagir was adjusted in the sanctioned pay-claims of the Rajput chiefs. For instance, from Jahangir's farman to Rana Karan of Mewar dated 1024 AH/1615 AD, it is obvious that the jamadami of Mewar was included in the Rana's salary. 1 Similarly, one can see from the Marwar-re-pegana-ri-Vigat, the jamadami of pegana Jodhpur was always adjusted in the pay bills of the Rathor chiefs. 2 An order of Aurangzeb conferring mansabs of 7000/7000 with 5000 do aspe sin aspe and 2000/1800 on Mirza Raja Jai Singh and his son Kirat Singh respectively, is reproduced in the Marwar-re-pegana-ri-Vigat. 3 The revenues of the watans of these two nobles namely Amber and Kama Pahari were included in their salary claims. In 1654, the jama of Dun, which was the watan of Chaturbhuj Cheuhan, were adjusted against his salary. 4 An incident mentioned in a news report from Ajmer shows that the revenues of pegana Mangrol, the watan of Prag Das Gaur were included in his salary bill. 5

1. Jahangir's farman to Rana Karan, Vir Vinod, II, p.239.
3. A salary statement containing the details of the mansabs, jagirs, etc. of Mirza Raja Jai Singh and Kirat Singh has been reproduced in the Marwar-re-pegana-ri-Vigat, II, pp.488-89.
Apart from such documentary evidence we have statements to the same effect in our authorities. In 1616, Jahangir assigned Jaisalmer to Rawal Kalyan in his tankhwah jagir. Man Singh Gaur was assigned his watan, village Sample as part of his tankhwah jagir. It is, therefore, established beyond doubt that watan jagir was a part of tankhwah jagir of a chief and that it was not in addition to his salary against his mansab.

But there was another way in which the revenues of the watan of a chief could be left under his control without assigning these in his tankhwah. The revenues of watan were allocated to the chief concerned as his inam. In 1620, Raja Rup Chand Guleri, who distinguished himself in the Kangra campaign, was rewarded by converting half of his watan into inam; the rest was left to him as his tankhwah or watan jagir. In another case, Jahangir seems to have conferred Kumaon as inam on Bahadur Chand. Under Shah Jahan, a whole principality (the hill chiefdom of Nurpur) is shown to be held as inam:

1. Tuzuk-i Jahangiri, p.163; Raja Bhim Narain was assigned Gasha in watan jagir. Tuzuk-i Jahangiri, p.192.
2. Wajai Sarker Ranthambor wa Aimer, p.356.
3. An assignment without any obligation.
5. Waria, p.331.
"It was reported (to the king) that Raja Jagat Singh had died at Peshawar, a khilat was sent to his eldest son Rajrup and he was raised to the mansab of 1500/1000. (He) was designated Raja and the mahal of watan which were held by his father as inam, were also conferred upon him."

At the time of chief's first entry into the imperial service, it was not always necessary that the whole of his territory as chief would be recognised as his watan jagir. It was at the discretion of the Mughal Emperor as to how much part of the territory of a chief was to be fixed as his watan jagir. When Prata-p of Palamau entered imperial service, his whole territory was assigned to him as watan jagir against the mansab of 1000/1000. In case of the Hada chiefs of Bundi, we know that whole Ranthambor sarker was held by them in their zamindari; but only a few parganas namely Bundi, Kanker, Paleta and Kota were assigned in watan jagir to them. Some chiefs might not even be allowed a watan jagir at all. Merta, which was in the zamindari of the Rathor chief Kesoo Das Maru, was never assigned to him in watan jagir.

1. Laheri, Badshahnama, II, pp.481-82.
2. Ibid., pp.360-61.
4. Laheri, Badshahnama, I, p.401.
5. In 1619, Merta was in the k jagir of Prince Khurram. Marwar-re-Pakana-re-Vijat, I, p.104. It was assigned to certain Saudullah. Nadai Almir, pp.89-90, 112, 377.
Apart from the recognition of chief's territories as 

**watan jagir**, the Mughal Emperor could create the rights of 

**watan jagir** in any part of the Empire. In 1604, Akbar granted 

**parqana** Shamsabad to Raja Rai Singh of Bikaner in **watan jagir**.  

It is interesting to note that the **za-mindārs** of this **parqana** 

were Rathors; and Abūl Fazl particularly says that the ancestors 

of the Raja belonged to Shamsabad.  

Akbar is also known to have 

conferred **parqana** Narain in **watan jagir** on Narain Dās Khangārot.

The Mughal Emperor used to encourage the nobles to bring uncultivated land under cultivation, and to establish new settlements. 

To promote such schemes, the Mughal Emperors created permanent 

rights in favour of a person who established a town or a city. 

When Raja Kishan Singh Rathor founded Kishangarh, Jahāngīr 

recognised this place as his **watan jagir**.

Upon performance of meritorious services, the Mughal Emperors honoured their Rājput chiefs by bestowing **watan jagirs**

1. Akbar's **fārmān** to Raja Rāi Singh of Bikaner, preserved in 
   **ASA, Bikaner**;
upon them. In 1610, when Ani Rai Singh Dalan saved Jahangir's life from a tiger, he was given pargana Anup Shahr in watan jagir. In 1638, when Shah Jahan conferred the succession to the qaddi of Marwar upon Jaswant Singh, supplanting his elder brother Rao Amar Singh, he granted the latter some pargana of serker Nagor for his watan jagir. In 1642, pargana Jalor was given to Mahesh Das Rathor in the watan jagir.

Watan jagir was also created in the troublesome regions of the Empire so that the holders might be induced crushing the rebels effectively. For crushing Mewati refractorys, Shah Jahan assigned Kama Pahari to Kirat Singh Kachwaha in watan jagir.

5. Waris, p.138; Khafi Khan, III, p.701; Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, p.196; In 1650-51, Masum Quli Khan alias Shujat Khan, faujdar of Juna-ghar, who had killed recalcitrant zaminder of Junagarh, built a fort in Masumabad. He petitioned to Shah Jahan for grant of the watan dori and faujdari of Masumabad, but he was granted only the faujdari of the place. Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supp., p.216.
On similar considerations, the Dun was given to Chaturbhuj Chauhan in the *watan jagir*. \(^1\) Further, we find from a Vakil's Report that in September 1693, Ratan Singh Kachawaha solicited the grant of Nau Nehra in *watan jagir* to quell the rebels there. \(^2\)

We have said that the estimated income (*jama*) of the *watan jagir* determined the minimum *mansab* that had to be assigned to every succeeding Rajput chief. But it should not be considered that the *watan jagir* remained a fixed unit once it was recognised by the Mughal Emperors. The Emperors could increase or reduce the size of the *watan jagir*. In 1630, when the Kachawaha nobles distinguished themselves in the war against Jujhar Singh Bundela and Khan-i Jahan Lodi, Shah Jahan increased their *watan jagirs* as well as *mansabas*. \(^3\) As for the *watan jagir* of the Rathor chiefs of Jodhpur, we know that *paragna* Jodhpur was a small unit until the reign of Raja Gaj Singh, but at a certain time during the reign of Jaswant Singh, other *paragnas* were

---

1. Ware, p.302; Sayyid Khan Jahan Barha, *nobis* desired to get *watan jagir* to quell the recalcitrants in the vicinity of Gwalior. *Maktubat-i Muzaffer Khan-i, Khan-i Jahan*, MS. ff.4a and b.


annexed to the pargana of Jodhpur former thereafter its sub-units or tappas.\(^1\) This consequently enlarged the extent of pargana Jodhpur which was held by the Rathor chiefs as their watan jāgīr.\(^2\) With the enlargement of the watan, the mansaba of the chiefs of Jodhpur at each accession were also raised, as seen below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Raja</th>
<th>Rank at the time of accession</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Raja Udaí Singh</td>
<td>1000/800</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>Jodhpur Khvāt, I, 207; Rajput Polity, 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Raja Jaswant Singh</td>
<td>4000/4000</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>Lāhorī, II, 97.(^3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The map appended to this chapter shows the changes that occurred in the watan jāgīr of the Rajāwat chiefs of Amber.

Raja Mān Singh (1589 - 1614 A.D.) held Amber and Khānder in the

---

1. In the Ḍin-i Akbarī (II, 364, 511) Āsop, Pāli, Āhu, Dandel, Bhadrājun, Indraśti, Palpere (Piper), Bilere, Bahila, Dunara, Khinewār, Gundoj, Mahēwa, etc. have been described as separate parganas, but in the Waghāl Sarkār Ranthambher wa Ajmūr (337, 374-5, 382-3, 469, 607) and Māhrūr re-Pargan-re Vīkat (I, 143-6, 154-5, 164, 168-9, 203-4), these parganas (as tappas) have been mentioned as belonging to the pargana of Jodhpur. Sunita Buchwar, 'Assignment of Jāgīr in Rajputana', PINC, Jodavpur, 1974.

2. Ibid.

In 1614, after Man Singh's death, his successor Bhao Singh was assigned *watan jagir* in Amber. In 1620, a part of the revenues of *pergana* Amber was held by Nur Jahan. She seems to have assigned these revenues in *jilara* (revenue farm) to Mirza Raja Jai Singh. In 1686, Ram Singh held the *perganas* of Amber and Chekeu in *watan jagir*. Raja Bishen Singh is known to have held the *perganas* of Amber, Deoti, Baswa, Newai and Phagi in the *watan jagir*. We can see from our map that the *watan jagir* granted to the Rajawat chiefs, did not form a compact area, but consisted of scattered territories in different sarkars and subas.

A *watan jagir* was normally not resumed, but in case of specific fault or rebellion of a chief, the Mughal Emperor could resume the rights of *watan jagir*. In 1613, when Raja Jagman failed to perform satisfactory service in the Deccan, Jahangir confiscated Dhandhera - his *watan jagir* - and assigned it to

4. *Vakil Register* (Persian), preserved in the RSA Bikaner.
Mahabat Khan.¹ In 1650, when there was a dispute over the question of succession to the seat of Jaisalmer, Shah Jahan seems to have assigned Jaisalmer to Abdul Ghani Khan as jagir.² He was also appointed the feuider of Jaisalmer.³ In case of the revolt of a Rajput chief, his watan jagir could be resumed. In 1642, when Jagat Singh Pundir rebelled, Shah Jahan resumed his watan jagir which comprised the parganas of Mau, Nurpur and Taragarh and assigned these to Najabat Khan.⁴ Sometimes, a part of the watan jagir could be seized. In April 1656, Shah Jahan resumed two parganas namely Swamra and Ramkot, which were in the watan jagir of Bahadur Chaud of Kumaon, and assigned them to Rai Makrand, the feuider and amin of Bareilly.⁵ A part of the revenues of pargana Tosina, held by Muhkam Singh in watan jagir, was similarly resumed.⁶ These instances go against the statement of the Rathar sardars of Jodhpur who are said to have made to the effect that during the rule of the imperial dynasty, no bumi or zamindar had been turned out of his watan even on the commission of specific fault.⁷

3. Ibid.
4. Lahori, Bedshahnama, II, pp.262, 278.
III

Once the chiefs took up Mughal service, they were left free at least partly in the management of their own territories. When the chief obtained mansab, his original territory was usually treated as his watan lāqīr. Theoretically, this should have meant that the chief could have no more powers in his territory than would be possessed by an ordinary lāqīrdār, the only difference being that the holder of watan was not subject to transfer. Indeed, some officials such as qilādārs, qāzīs, etc., were appointed by the Emperor within the watan of the Kachawāhās. In 1619, Nasrullah, the son of Fatehullāh, who held the mansab of 500/400, was appointed qilādār of Āmber;¹ and in 1680 Sidi Qāsim Khān.² A series of references to qāzīs (judges) appointed to Āmber by the Imperial Court can be traced. Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ was appointed qāzī of Āmber in 1680.³ Subsequently, Azmatullāh was appointed qāzī of Āmber in place of Saiyid Muḥammad.⁴ In 1689, Muḥammad Fāzīl was made qāzī of Āmber by Imperial order,⁵ and in

¹ Tuzuk-i Jahānīrī, p.274.
² Ṿaqqāṭ Pānār, n.200, RSA Bikaner.
³ Ibīd., n.221, RSA Bikaner.
⁴ Khatūt-i Abkārān (Persian), R.N.24, RSA Bikaner.
⁵ Ṿaqqāṭ Pānār, R.N.148, RSA Bikaner.
1692 Muhammad Saeed was given the same office.\(^1\) The Wazai Sarkar Ranthambhor wa Ajmer shows that the Wazainawis of Ajmer could send his deputy (qamashta) to Amber.\(^2\)

We find the qazi and qiladar similarly appointed. In 1615, Mulla Jamal was appointed qazi of Chittor.\(^3\) In 1680, Udawat Bhatiya was appointed the qiladar of Chittor.\(^4\)

Sundry cases of appointments of qazis in other watan jagirs are also met with. In 1679, the qazi was appointed in Soipur which was the watan jagir of Manohar Das.\(^5\) The same year a Mughal official called miraaz in Jaisalmer.\(^6\)

But by and large, except perhaps for the qazi, and qiladar (in case of a fort retained in imperial control), the imperial officials such as faudars, qanunooes and chaudhurises were not appointed in the watan jagirs. Marwar until Jaswant Singh's death had no qanunoo.\(^7\) When Jodhpur was annexed to the

---

khélies upon Jassawnt Singh’s death, a number of Mughal officials such as fauídãr, kotwâl, qilâdâr, karóí etc. were appointed; 1 and these appointments show that until then these offices either did not exist or were not filled by imperial appoint-ees.

The administration of the watan-légir was largely carried out by the officials of the chiefs; and an effort is made below to delineate the structure of administration found in the chief’s territories in Rajasthan.

The pradhâną seems to have exercised an important position in the chiefs’ governments. In the absence of the chief, the pradhâň used to control the administration. This office is found to have existed in Mewâr, 2 Amber, 3 Jodhpur, 4 Bîkâner 5 and Jaisalmer. 6 In some states, the pradhâň was designated vâkîl 7 and musâhib. 8 The office was not necessarily hereditary. 9 But

4. Ibid., I, pp.86, 97, 102, 129, 137; II, pp.27, 421, 446; Nâinge-ra-\khvât, III, pp.117-18.
5. Vâr Vînâd, p.487.
6. Ibid., p.1766.
7. In Khândala and Mânsâpur, pradhân was called vâkîl; Zakhîrât ul-Khawâjânín, p.110; Makhâ’ir-ul-Vâsâ; II, pp.173-4.
8. In Sîrihî, he was called musâhib. See, Tuzuk-i Jahângîrî, I, (tr.), p.292; Vâr Vînâd, II, pp.818, 161; Wâsă‘là’t-Aimèr, p.34. Tod holds that at Udaipur he is called khânîqâr, at Jodhpur pradhân, at Jaipur musâhib, at Kota qilâdâr and diwan – a regent. Tod, I, p.216. In Vâsâb Shâhànî, written in the 19th century, he is called sarhâfa and amtâva, pp.2228, 2299.
this office sometimes did continue generation after generation in the same family. For example, after the death of Shamashah, Rana Amar Singh appointed his son, Jiva Shah, pradhan of Mewar. After Jiva Shah's death, his son Akhey Raj was elevated to this office. It was theoretically a matter of choice for the chief to appoint or remove the pradhan. Raja Suraj Singh appointed Govind Das Bhati as pradhan of Jodhpur. But at least in two cases we know that the Mughal Emperor insisted on having a particular person as pradhan. When Jaswant Singh was a minor, Shah Jahan appointed Rathor Raj Singh Khinvawat as pradhan of Jodhpur. After the death of Raj Singh in 1640, again the Emperor appointed Rathor Mahesh Das as the pradhan of Jodhpur.

However, in 1643, when Jaswant Singh had come of age, he dismissed Mahesh Das from the office of pradhan and appointed Rathor Gopal Das as his pradhan. After the removal of Gopal Das in 1648, Prithvi Singh Govindasat Bhati was appointed to this office.

In 1660, Prithvi Singh was dismissed by Jaswant Singh and Rai Bhagwant Das champawat was appointed the pradhan of Jodhpur.¹

From the above description, it seems that normally only Rajputs were appointed to fill the office of pradhan in Marwar. In Sirohi chieftdom a Baghela Rajput, Ram Singh was the pradhan of Amar Singh Deora.² In Bundela territory too, Raja Bir Singh Das Bundela assigned the office of pradhan to Kirpa Ram Gaur.³ But in Mewar, the Kayasthas and Banias too were eligible for this office. Bhama Shah, pradhan of Rana Amar Singh, was an Oswal Bania.⁴ Bhag Chand, pradhan of Rana Jagat Singh, was a Kayastha.⁵ Dayal Das, pradhan of Rana Raj Singh, was again a Bania.⁶ In Bikaner and Khandela too, one notices non-Rajput pradhans. Pradhan Karam Chand of Bikaner was a Bachawat Bania.⁷ Raisel Darbari's pradhan Mathura Das Bengali was also a non-Rajput.⁸

³. Shaikh Jalal Hisari, Gwalior Nama, f.139b.
⁴. Vir Vinod, p.231.
⁵. Ibid., p.1032.
⁷. Vir Vinod, p.487.
In Karauli, Khande Rai and Nawal Singh, pradhan of Gopal Pal Jadon were both Brahmans.¹

The pradhan’s functions were civil as well as military in nature. Govind Das Bhati, pradhan of Raja Sur Singh brought about changes in the revenue-administration of Jodhpur.² Pradhan Muhta Karam Chand of Bikaner supervised the erection of the Bikaner fort in the absence of Rai Singh posted to the Deccan.³ The pradhan seems to have been in charge of the forts; and without his formal permission, it was not possible to visit the fort. In November 1632, Peter Mundy wanted to visit the fort of Akbarpur which was in the charge of Raja Mitrasen Tunwar; but Mundy dropped the idea because it might have taken much time to obtain permission of the Raja through his pradhan.⁴ Maharana Jagat Singh of Mewar sent his pradhan Bhag Chand on an expedition against Rawal Samarai of Banswara.⁵ Dayal Das Bania, pradhan of Rana Raj Singh conducted a military campaign in Madelgarh.⁶

1. Vir Vinod, p.1500.
2. Ibid., pp.817-18.
3. Ibid., p.487.
5. Vir Vinod, p.1032.
The pradhān’s position became even more crucial during the absence of the chief. When Raisāl Darbārī was in Deccan, his sons rebelled against him. Mathura Dās Bengālī, the pradhān of Raisāl suppressed the rebellion.¹ On the other hand, in the absence of Rai Singh of Bikaner, his pradhān Karam Chand Bachawat allured Prince Dilip Singh to kill his father and usurp the throne.² In Jodhpur, the pradhān could grant pattas to the sardārs on behalf of the chiefs.³

Pradhān also used to conduct war-or-peace negotiations. When Mota Rāja Udai Singh defeated Dungarsi Bhati, the chief of Bikampur signed a treaty through his pradhān.⁴ Similarly, Rāja Mān Singh sent his pradhān to Rāo Chandra Sen of Jodhpur to acquire the fort of Pokaran.⁵ In 1611 A.D., Raja Bāso Pundir of Mau deputed his pradhān Purohit Vyās to collect an image from Rāna Amar Singh of Mewā-r.⁶

¹ Letter from Jaswant Singh to Nainsi, Basta No. 12/53, Jodhpur Records, RSA Bikaner; G.D. Sharma, Rajput Polity, p.131.
² Letter from Jaswant Singh to Nainsi, Basta No. 12/53, Jodhpur Records, RSA Bikaner; G.D. Sharma, Rajput Polity, p.131.
³ Letter from Jaswant Singh to Nainsi, Basta No. 12/53, Jodhpur Records, RSA Bikaner; G.D. Sharma, Rajput Polity, p.131.
⁴ Letter from Jaswant Singh to Nainsi, Basta No. 12/53, Jodhpur Records, RSA Bikaner; G.D. Sharma, Rajput Polity, p.131.
⁵ Letter from Jaswant Singh to Nainsi, Basta No. 12/53, Jodhpur Records, RSA Bikaner; G.D. Sharma, Rajput Polity, p.131.
In Kumaon, during Raja Lakhmi Chand's reign (1597-1621 A.D.), his brother Sakti Gosain, who was blind, managed the affairs of the State. He appointed three officials known as serdars, faujdars and nagis. Sardar used to administer the districts. The faujdars were military commandants. Nagis (neg - dastur or due) were subordinate officials of the army as well as of the civil administration. During Trimal Chand's reign (1625-1638 A.D.) Narotam Joshi and Dinkar Galli were appointed wazir and chaudhary respectively. Bithal Gosain was assigned the office of diwan.

The next important office was that of the diwan or desh-diwan. He was appointed by the chiefs. To cite a specific instance, Raja Suraj Singh appointed Joshi Devi Dutt, the diwan of Jodhpur. Sukhmat Subhawat Singhvi was desh diwan towards the end of Raja Gaj Singh's reign. After his death, Pratap Chand Singhvi assumed the office of desh diwan. In 1654, Mian Farasat was appointed desh diwan of Jodhpur. Raghunath Baid

   ia. Ibid, p.558. 
4. Ibid., p.133.  
was the next person elevated to this office. In 1657, Muhta Nainai was appointed the *desh diwan*. After Muhta Nainai's removal, in 1666, Raghunath Bhati was appointed to the post. He enjoyed the office until Jodhpur was included in *khalisa* in 1679-80. Suraj Singh of Bikaner appointed *diwan* by Maheshwari Rathor Muhta Kalyan Keshodasat. Thus Rajput as well as non-Rajputs enjoyed the office of *desh-diwan*.

In Mewar and Bundi, pradhan discharged the functions of *diwan*. Sometimes, the *diwan* was also assigned the functions of *fauidar*. In 1706, Ram Chana held the offices of *diwan* and *fauidar* of Amber simultaneously. Sometimes, even the *hakim of pargana* used to enjoy the office of *diwan*. The *diwan* managed essentially the finances of the *desh*. Muhta Nainai, the celebrate *diwan* of Jodhpur, kept a full record of *jama* and *hasil* of every village as his *Vigat* shows. Sometimes even the *diwan* was

4. *Davl Das re Khvat*, p.139.
sent on military expeditions. Muhta Nainsi was sent to capture the fort of Pokaran. In 1624, when there was a tussle between Karan Singh of Bikaner and Amar Singh Nagori over the transfer of Nagor, the former, who was in Delhi, asked his diwan Muhta Jaswant Singh to despatch an army against Amar Singh. Further, when a certain diwan of Buds Singh of Bundi took part in the battle between Buds Singh and Bhim Singh of Kota, the diwan was killed in battle.

In Jodhpur, during Jaswant Singh's reign, a new post tan diwan was created. The tan-diwan used to help the dash diwan in his manifold duties. But the tan-diwan's main functions were to maintain accounts of the salary of pataadores. In 1654, Pancholi Dalhadrat was the tan-diwan of Jodhpur, he seems to have misappropriated considerable sums; he was consequently dismissed.

2. Deval Das re Khati, p.162.
5. Ibid., p.131.
Similar to the Mughal Bekhahī, an official of the same designation used to be appointed in Jaipur and Jodhpur and Mewār. His duties included maintenance of records of the army and muster of the troops. He was also the pay-master general of the state. A certain Māya Rām was the bekahī of Rāja Bishan Singh (1688-1700) of Amber.

The faujdār was mainly a military official. Faujdārs found in the territories of the chiefs seem usually to have been appointed by the chiefs. Bhim Singh appointed Madhav Singh Jhāla the faujdār of Kota. After Madhav Singh's death, his son Madan Singh got the appointment. After Madan Singh's death, his son Hīmmat Singh became the faujdār of Kota. In 1593, Gopāl Dās held the office of faujdār of Kota by the chief's appointment. In 1594, Chando son of Isardās was appointed the faujdār of Badnor by its chief. In 1617, Raja Gaj Singh

2. See the documents Sivāh chahār Ghaurā Nagdī, RSA Bikaner.
4. 'Arzdāshīt, pp.53, 91.
6. Ibid., pp.1472-73.
8. Ibid.
appointed Bhati Gopal Das faujdar of Jalore. 1 Faujdars were paid by the chiefs usually through assignment of jagir out of the chief's own territories. In Kota, Madhav Singh, the faujdar was given village Nainta in his jagir. 2 In Amber, Gaj Singh Rajawat was the faujdar of the deeh during Sawai Jai Singh's time. 3 In the Panna state of Chhatarsal Bundela, faujdar was appointed in every pargana to maintain the law and order. 4 It seems that usually this office was assigned to the Rajputs. Sometimes, this office was also held by the diwan. 5 In Bundi, the offices of faujdar and qiladar were amalgamated and the qiladar used to discharge the functions of faujdar. 6

The hakim seems to be the name of a recognised pargana official in Jodhpur and Jaipur. Whenever the chief received parganas in jagir from the imperial court, a hakim was sent to take charge of the pargana on behalf of the chief. In 1615, when Raja Suraj Singh of Jodhpur received Phalodi in jagir,

3. Vakil Reporta (Rajasthan), RSA Bikaner.
Muhta Jaimal was sent as the *hakim* of Phalodi.¹ In 1620, when Raja Gaj Singh received Jalor in *jaigar*, Bhat Gopal Das Asawat was appointed the *hakim* of Jalor.² In 1625, when Raja Gaj Singh received Nagor in *jaigar*, a certain Ramo was appointed the *hakim* of Nagor.³ In 1660, Bhaireav Dass Kitawat was the *hakim* of Badnor.⁴ He used to keep the account of the revenues of /paragana/. Sometimes, non Rajputs were also granted the office of *hakim*, as when in 1615, Jaimal was appointed the *hakim* of Phalodi, he was a muhta or *bania*.⁵ Besides revenue administration, he used to maintain law and order in the *paragana*. He seems, therefore, to have maintained troops under his command. A certain *hakim* maintained 70 foot soldiers.⁶ Further, in village Kalyanpur, when a certain person discovered a potential copper mine, the finds were handed over to the *hakim* of *paragana* Awari which was in the *jaigar* of Raja Ram Singh of Amber.⁷ It seems that the *hakims*

¹ Vidat, II, p.7.
² Ibid., p.107.
³ Ibid., p.110.
⁴ Ibid., p.128.
⁵ Ibid., pp.7, 107, 110, 373.
⁶ Ibid., p.7.
⁷ Ibid., p.308.
⁸ Arzdahht, pp.25, 26.
were paid according to their status or size of jurisdiction. The hakim of Jodhpur and Merta were paid Rs.200/- per annum.\(^1\) The hakim of Sojat, Phalodi, Siwana and Jaitaran were paid Rs.100/- per annum.\(^2\)

The kotwal or chief of the Police of a town was found in most Rajput principalities.\(^3\) His functions were to maintain law and order in the town. Sometimes, he was sent on expeditions. We find that Govind Das, kotwal, was sent on an expedition against the Buloch during the reign of Raja Gaj Singh of Marwar.\(^4\) In Jodhpur, a shigdar, performed the duties of the kotwal; the shigdar was appointed by diwan on behalf of the chief.\(^5\) During the reign of Maharaja Jaswant Singh, the office of shigdar was held by Ragho Das, the son of Kumbh Karan Champawat.\(^6\) During the reign of Raja Ajit Singh Shobawat Dayal discharged the functions of shigdar (or low-ranking revenue official).\(^7\) However, from the Marwar re Pargana ri Vigat, it seems that the offices

\(^1\) Vigat, II, pp.126, 128.
\(^2\) Ibid.
\(^3\) Ibid., p.482.
\(^4\) Ibid., I, p.123.
\(^5\) Rajput Polity, p.135.
\(^6\) Ibid.
\(^7\) Ibid., p.136.
of the katwāl and shiqdar existed simultaneously in Jodhpur. 3
It seems that the shiqdārs were assigned patta in lieu of their services. Under Rāja Jaswant Singh, Jogi Das Kushlawat, shiqdar was assigned patta worth Rs.500 in the villages of Kudi and Bhatia. 2

Usually, Mughal Emperors assigned the charge of the forts lying in the territories of the chieftains to these chiefs themselves. The chiefs in turn used to appoint gilēdārs to control the forts. 3 Sometimes, it seems that even diwān could nominate some person to be gilēdar. Muhta Nainsī assigned the charge of Pokaran fort to Manohar Dēśa Bidawat. 3 But this must have been with the chief's approval.

Thañēdārs were appointed in the parganas by the chiefs. In 1615, Sikhro was appointed thañēdar of Phalodi by Rāja Suraj Singh of Jodhpur, 5 in 1658 Govind Dēśa Gopāldēsoṭ was the thañēdar of Phalodi. 6 The office of hakīm did not dispense with the more

2. Hukumat re-Behi, p.231.
3. Ibid., pp.482-3.
4. Ibid., p.306.
6. Ibid., pp.61-3; Vir Vigad, pp.496-97.
lowly one of thanedar. In 1615 Suraj Singh Rathor appointed Muhta Jaimal as hakim and Sikhra as thanedar of the pargana Phalodi.

Potdar (from Pers. fotadar) was the pargana-level treasury official. The word Potdar is a Hindi corruption of the Persian fotadar – the treasurer in the Mughal Official terminology. The revenue collectors used to deposit their collections (hasil) with him. Some allowance was separately claimed from the peasants for the potdar; this being given the name potdari.

Besides these officials, one comes across a number of other petty officials in Marwar, such as kamdar, wagai navis, patwari and munshi. Moreover, a number of derogas were

1. Narain Singh Bhati, editor of Vigat holds that hakim was also called thanedar, I, p.16.
4. Arsatte Pergame Chateau.
6. Ibid., I, p.112; II, pp.63, 73, 93, 419, 463. He was the official of pattadars to collect the land-revenue from the threshing field. Rajput Polity, p.112.
7. Vigat, II, pp.419, 482.
appointed to look after the various types of stables, household, mints, harem, stores of cloth etc.¹

From the above description it would appear that the administrative apparatus of the Rajput chiefs was considerably influenced by the pattern of the Mughal administration.² Indeed, the jagir system of the Mughal Empire was duplicated on a small scale in most of the larger Rajput principalities. This does not necessarily mean that the pattas originated in the jagir system; what is argued is that in its actual working it tended to be closely similar to the Mughal institution. In Marwar, Mewar, Bikaner and Amber territories, we have abundant information about the assignments of the pattas to the sardars and others in return for maintenance of military contingents or in payment for other services. The chiefs not only assigned pattas out of their irkat watan,³ but also out of their additional temporary tankhwah jagirs.⁴ The pattas in Marwar were of two kinds, viz.

¹ Vicyat, II, pp.482-83.
² Irfan Habib, The Agrarian System of Mughal India, p.186.
³ Bernier, pp.39, 208; Mughal Documents of Aurangzeb's Reign, p.121; V.V., p.780.
⁴ Hukumat re Bahi, p.230.
chākri-kā patta and ga'ir chākri ka patta. These may correspond to the imperial tankhwāh and in'ām jāqīrā. In Mewār, Rāna Karan introduced the assignment of patta to his soldiers but Rana Amar Singh II abolished the transferable nature of the pattas. These pattas were known as the pakkā patta or the kāla patta (permanent assignment). In Mewār, Rana Amar Singh assigned the pargana of Begum worth 2,50,000 takās to Rawat Megh. In Jaisalmer, there were two types of assignments: (a) bauf which was the permanent assignment, and (b) pattadar which was transferable assignment.

In Kumaon, during the reign of Lakhmi Chand (1597-1621 A.D.), his brother Sakti Gosain systemized the land-revenue administration. He introduced the bīsī system as the standard measure of crops. He also marked out the villages for the personal expenditure of the chiefs. These villages were named as but kara villages. Further, we know that the assignments were made to the soldiers in lieu of their services to the state and these assigned villages were known as bīsī bandūk. Sometimes, on showing valour, the Raja of Kumaon granted land to a person.

1. G.D. Sharma, Rajput Polity, pp. 128, 156.
2. Vīr Vīnd, p. 780.
3. M.K., I, p. 64. For the assignment of pattas by the Rānas of Mewar, see also M.K., I, p. 69.
This grant was known as rot. In 1981, when Purshotam Gangoli showed bravery against the ruler of Dati, Raja Rudra Chand granted the land to him in rot, *(brave-deed).* Besides assignments, to their *sardars,* servants and others, the chiefs made assignments to their wives, sisters and daughters. Maharaja Jaswant Singh assigned Dahipuro village in *pargana* Sojat, worth Rs.2000/- to his wife Bhatiyani. Another wife Davri was given the village Dhakri in *pargana* Sojat worth Rs.2000/-. Rani Hadi held some villages in the *parganas* of Sojat and Jaitaran in *patte.* He also granted *pattas* to his foster sisters *(dhai bahan)* village Savanio in *pargana* Sojat, worth Rs.600/-, being assigned to Sarupo, the foster sister of the Maharaja. In 1857, Raja Karan Singh of Sikaner assigned the *bhoo* *(revenues)* of village Tajasar to Sujanda, wife of prince Satruaal. He assigned the *bhoo* of village Tajasar to his daughter Pranmati. In Kumaon, the assignment made to the *Degri* *(female apartment)* was known as *gal.*

There were also revenue-grants corresponding to the Mughal madad-i ma'ash. Such lands were granted to the Charans (falconer) Puronits and Vaishyas (physicians) etc. These grants are known as udak and asaan. Raja Man Singh of Amber is said to have granted six villages to the Charans. Rao Karan Singh of Bikaner made the grant of village Gersar to Charan Thakuri Cholawat. These grants like madad-i ma'ash were treated as permanent assignments. Rarely did a chief resume such grants. When in 1586, Raja Udai Singh of Jodhpur revoked the sasan grants of Charans, the latter committed suicide. One of the Charans even complained to Emperor Akbar, but the Emperor did not respond. Similarly, in Mewar when Rana Amar Singh II (1698-1710 A.D.) resumed the sasan grants from the Bhattas, a number of Bhattas committed suicide. In Hukumat re Bahi of Marwar the villages granted to the Brahmanas and Vaishyas are named. The size of the grant in term of revenue varies from Rs.100 to Rs.2000.

2. Vir Vinod, p.1285.
3. Bikaner re Patta re Gevan ri Vigat, p.69.
5. Ibid., p.719.
6. Hukumat re Bahi, pp.233-34.
Bikaner, Rao Karan Singh assigned two villages to Gussain Rughnathji for the maintenance of the temple of Shri Ballabhji. In Kumaon, these grants were called *katardar* or *khanjardar*. The Raja of Kumaon instead of signing on these grants used to draw a rude figure of a dagger. In 1602, Raja Lakhmi Chand (1597-1621 A.D.) granted a village to Jageswar Temple. In 1603, he made grant to the Bageswar temple. In 1616, another grant was made to Mahadeo Joshi.

Besides, the chiefs sometimes conferred even *bhumi* (*zamindari*) rights upon their *sardars*. In 1620, a certain *sardar* was granted *bhumi* rights in Jodhpur. This again paralleled the Mughal emperors' practice of awarding *zamindari* rights in special cases. In Jaisalmer, *bhumi* used to pay Rs.1 *annas* and paisa 7 or Rs.1½ per man to the state. They were also expected to render military service to the chief, but the chief in lieu of this used to pay. The *bhumi* and *thakura* constituted a class

1. *Bikaner re Patta re Gavan ri Vigat*, p.3.
3. For more grants, see Atkinson, p.566.
4. See, B.L. Bhadani, 'The Allodial Proprietors - The Bhumias of Marwar', presented to IHC, Bombay, 1980; available in the Department of History, A.M.U.
comparable to zamīndārs in the Mughal Empire. In Āmber, according
to traditions, the Thākur used to pay a fixed peshkaš to his
overlord. For example, Thākur Puranmalet of Nimera used to pay
Rs.10,000/- per annum to the Rājāwat chief of Āmber. Similarly,
Thakur Nathawat of Chamau and Thakur Khangīrot of Digī used to
give Rs.50,000 and 70,000 to the Rājāwat chief of Āmber.¹ The
chief could create a thikāna for his favourite sardār. In
Jodhpur, Maharaja Jaswant Singh gave village Mayakar as thikāna
to Rathor Āsākaraṇ.² The chief also used to enjoy the privilege
of sanctioning succession to one of the sons of the deceased
thakur. In Bīkāner in 1628, after the death of Thakur Manar
Dasji of Bhukar-kera, Rāja SuraJ Singh conferred succession upon
his eldest son Karam Sen.³ But in Jodhpur in one case, the chief
set aside the law of primogeniture and granted succession to a
person of his choice. In 1616, after the death of Govind Dāsa
Bhāti of Lewra, Rāja SuraJ Singh granted succession to his
youngest son Prithvi Rāj.⁴ However, from Mewār, it seems that
it was considered necessary on the part of a thikānedār to send

2. G.D. Sharma, Rajput Polity, p.124.
3. Devāl Dāsa re Khvāt, p.159.
dastur to every succeeding chief. It was treated as acceptance of the suzerainty.¹

It seems that some kind of the concept of watan or permanent assignment began to emerge in the Rajput kingdoms. Muhta Nainsi has used the word utan which is apparently corrupt form of watan. In case of certain places, he says they were the utan of this or that person. For instance, he says that Devers held 52 villages of pargana Udaipur in their utan,² or that Chyar Chapauri of pargana Udaipur was the utan of Rathors.³ There is an interesting piece of information about the creation of watan in Jaisalmer, Rawal Kalyan Das (1614-1627 A.D.) conferred Lathi village as utan upon a certain Jaswant Singh.⁴ This shows some kind of permanent rights of watan holders. But owing to the paucity of evidence it is not possible to understand the full significance of such assignments.

The Rajput chiefs had their own systems of estimation of the revenue-paying capacities of various localities so as to

---

2. M.K., I, p.36.
3. Ibid.,
4. Ibid., II, p.79.
enable *patta*-assignments to be made properly. These were the equivalents of *jamadami* in the Empire. In Marwar the estimates were called *rekh*, and in Amber *tan*.

Recent study has established that the *rekh* and *tan* terms are equivalent to the Mughal term *jamadami*.\(^1\) These estimates were built on a certain amount of information collected about actual revenue realization. The *wagai nave* of Ajmer reported at the time of the annexation of Jodhpur, that the chiefs of Jodhpur maintained the revenue-records in Hindi.\(^2\) But our best evidence for this is Muhta Nainsi's *Marwar-re-Pargana-re-Vigat* in which the detailed information about the revenues of Marwar is set out village by village. From Amber come the *Areattas*, the well-known detailed documents setting out revenue of Rajawat chiefs of Amber (later Jaipur).\(^3\) These records present a full information about the land-revenue and cesses which were collected from the peasants.

---


3. *Areattas* of different parganas, SAR, Bikaner.
As for the land-revenue demand, it seems that it varies from region to region. In some parts of Mārwār, the land-revenue was taken at the rate of 1/3 of produce, while in Āmber and Jaisalmer, it was 1/2² and 1/8 respectively. These variations were partly dependent on the fertility of the soil or the kind of crops grown, partly on customary institutions. By and large, it would seem that the land-revenue in Rājput States was levied on the same principles as in the Mughal Empire. In Jaisalmer it might have been comparatively moderate, but otherwise it is as harsh as in the Mughal Empire. One interesting feature was the concessions given to certain castes such as Rājputs, Brahmans, etc., who constituted upper village strata in most areas.

1. Mārwār-re-Pargana-re-Vigat, I, 96-97; 326.
2. Arsattas of parganas Āmber, Narāīna and Bhātri.
3. Āīn-i Akbarī, I, 505; Tod, II, 226.

WATAN JÄGĪRS OF RĀJAWAT CHIEFS OF AMBER
(1604 - 1700 A.D.)

[Map of regions such as Agra, Najaur, Alwar, Ranthambore, etc., with boundaries marked.]
Chapter V

MUGHAL PARAMOUNTCY AND CONTROL OVER SUCCESSION

The question of control of succession among 'Native Princes' by the Paramount Power was a matter that attracted much legalistic debate during British rule, notably in relation to the proclamation of the Doctrine of Lapse. The Mughals do not seem to have developed a well-thought out theory, but their practice seems to have been clear enough. The Emperors are known to have frequently intervened to regulate succession to the chiefdoms of the Rajput ruling clans in their service.\(^1\) Such interventions by the Mughal rulers were generally accepted by the chiefs and their sardārs without much resentment or protest. It was only in the case of Aurangzeb's action in setting aside the claim to succession of the posthumously-born son of Jaiwant Singh in favour of Indra Singh that the exercise of this prerogative by the king led to a rebellion. A case,

---

1. The Emperors used to mark the tiqa on the forehead of every succeeding chief. In case a chief was exempted from coming to the Court for this ceremony, some nobles of the Emperor were sent to the succeeding chief's headquarters for performing the ritual. Sometime after coming to the throne, Aurangzeb assigned the task of applying the tiqa on the foreheads of the succeeding chiefs to his wazir Ağad Khan. In May 1679, he abolished this ritual as it was considered violation of the spirit of Shareṣṭ. But this did not at all detract from his power to regulate succession among the Rajput clans in his service. Tuzuk-i-Jahânānī, pp.104, 289; Mihâ'ir-i-Almâ'î, pp.175-76. Sri Ram Sharma's statement based on Mihâ'ir-i-Almâ'î that Shāh Jahān delegated the power of applying the tiqa to his wazir is not borne out from the perusal of Mihâ'ir-i-Almâ'î (The Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors, pp.92, 108).
however, is made out by Athar Ali that even in this case, "Aurangzeb was not stepping beyond custom and precedent in overlooking Ajit's claim and selecting Indra Singh".¹ It is implied in this statement that the resentment of Rathor sardāra over what they might have regarded as the violation of custom by Aurangzeb was not an important factor contributing to their rebellion. On the other hand, in a recent study, G.D. Sharma has contended that Indra Singh's succession was in violation of the custom. He says, "the Rathores' apprehension was that the acceptance of Indra Singh as the ruler of Jodhpur would establish a precedent by which a direct descendant of a Rāja could be divested (of succession) by the Mughal Emperor".² But before one accepts any one of these views as finally established, it would be best to ask one important question: Was there a generally accepted prerogative of the Mughal Emperor, applicable to all Rajput clans or chiefdoms, so that one could speak of a uniform practice or precedent in Mughal India.

In the ensuing discussion evidence of the practice followed by the Mughal emperors in each one of the Rajput clans

² G.D. Sharma, 'Marwar War as Depicted in Rajasthani Sources (1678-79 A.D.)', Journal of Indian History, Vol. 43, No.1, 1973, p.34.
is analysed separately. This discussion is arranged here in a chronological order. An attempt is also made to ascertain whether the forms in which the Mughal rulers intervened in the affairs of individual clans conformed to the customs observed in the same clans before their joining the service of the Timurid rulers.

The earliest known case of imperial intervention in a Rajput succession dates back to 1576 A.D. when Akbar debarred Dudā, the eldest son of Surjan, the Hārā chief of Bundī, on the charge that he had collaborated with Rānā Pratāp. It is significant that this did not evoke protest or objection from any section of the Hārā sardārā, and this might be construed as indicating their tacit acceptance of the Emperor's right to intervene in such matters. It would appear that among the Haras the custom provided for the overlord's right to exclude a person from succession or to depose a chief and grant succession to any other member of the ruling family. In 1554, for instance, Sultan, the chief of Bundi, had been deposed and his nephew, Surjan was enthroned by his overlord Rānā Udal Singh of Mewār.2

From the case cited above it seems that after Surjan Hārā joined Akbar's service in 1569 the customary privileges of the overlord previously enjoyed by the ruler of Māwār were transferred to the Mughal Emperor. There is ample evidence indicating a tendency on the part of the Mughals to occasionally exercise these privileges to regulate the affairs of the Hārā ruling family. In 1683, Aurangzeb decided to instal at Kota, the deceased chief's uncle Kishor Singh, setting aside the claim of his nephew Pam Singh who was favoured by the sardār.1 Similar cases of intervention by the Mughal rulers in the affairs of the Hārās during the early 18th century are also on record. Bahādur Shāh excluded the sons of Rām Singh from succession as punishment for the chief's action in opposing him in the war of succession.2 Farrukh-siyar went a step further when in 1712, he dispossessed the ruling chief Budh Singh and placed on the gaddī Bhīm Singh, son of Rām Singh.3 These cases go to show that the customary powers of an overlord to regulate succession within the family of Hārā chiefs were exercised by the Mughal Court down to the first quarter of the 18th century without evoking a hostile response from any section of the Hārās.

The Timurid rulers also exercised powers to partition or re-unite the existing chieftainship within Hārā ruling family. According to Lāhorī in 1631, after the death of Rāo Ratan, Shāh Jahān assigned Rāo Ratan's watan Bundī and Kankar to his grandson Shatrusāl and Kota and Falaita to his younger son Mādho Singh. But in 1707, after the death of Rām Singh, Bahādur Shāh re-united the two principalities by assigning Kota to Būdh Singh, a chief of Bundī. In the early history of Mēwār there existed a precedent for this measure. In 1527, Rānā Ratan Singh had divided the territory of Dungarpur between two brothers, Jāgmāl and Prithvī Rāj. The Hāra sardārās seem to have acquiesced in the decisions of the Mughal rulers to split and then re-unite their principality. One may guess that on account of their long association with Mēwār as a subordinate clan, the Hārās were influenced by the custom prevailing in that kingdom.

There are on record two cases of intervention by the Mughal rulers to regulate succession in the Bhātī ruling clan of Jaisalmer. In 1616 A.D. Hāwā Shīīm died without leaving

1. 'Abdul Hamīd Lāhorī, Badshah Nāma, I, p.401; Bankē Des-rā-Khyāt, p.149; Vams Shaaker, N, pp.2530-44.
behind any issue. Jahāngīr acting at his own initiative tried to end uncertainty within the clan by granting the tīka to Bhim's younger brother Kalyān. The other case is of Shāh Jahān's intervention after Rāwal Manohar's death in 1649, to exclude from the gaddī Rām Chandra, a distant relative of the deceased ruler who was sought to be installed as chief by the sardārs. On this occasion, Shāh Jahān granted the tīka to Rāwal Manohar's nephew Sabal Singh, which was eventually accepted by Bhātī sardārs without any protest. This was an interesting precedent as it suggests that the Mughal Court was anxious that the succession should remain confined to the immediate circle of the chief's kinsmen.

On the death of famous Kachwaha chief, Mān Singh in 1614 Jahāngīr granted the tīka to his surviving son Bhāo Singh. From Jahāngīr's remarks in the Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī regarding Bhāo Singh's elevation to the gaddī of Amber, one gets the impression that in his own estimate, he considered his decision as amounting to a partial violation of the custom regulating succession in the Kachwaha clan. It seems that he was told by those supporting

1. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.159-60; Muhta Nāinsī-re-Khvāt, II, pp.98-102.
2. Muhta Nāinsī-re-Khvāt, II, p.103; Vir Vīnag, p.1764.
4. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.130. In text Māhā Singh has wrongly been described as the father of Jagat Singh. But in Regers' translation of Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, this mistake has been corrected. (Pub. Munshi Ram Manohar Lal, Delhi, 1960, I, 266).
the claim of Mahā Singh, son of Mān Singh's deceased eldest son Jagat Singh that by their custom, succession should strictly adhere to the principle of primogeniture, the right of the eldest son when dead passing on to his son. But the fact remains that they eventually acquiesced in Jahāngīr's decision without any protest. It goes to suggest that Jahāngīr's decision on this occasion was within the customary framework and the aggrieved party was not in a position to make an emotional issue out of it. As a matter of fact there did exist a precedent in the early history of the Kachwaha clan that could be cited in support of Jahāngīr's decision.1

Regarding the Kachwahaeas, there is also a case in which the Mughal Emperor tried to replace a reigning chief by a person of his own choice. But this move was firmly resisted by clan as a whole and finally the king was forced to restore status quo. In 1707, Bahadur Shah removed Sawai Jai Singh from the qaddi and installed his younger brother Bijay Singh, since Jai Singh had opposed him in the war of succession; when Sawai Jai Singh resisted the move, his watan Amber was taken in the khāliṣa.2 But Sawai Jai Singh continued his struggle till his restoration


2. Tarikh-va Salatin Chakhta, p.24; Me'sir-ul Umera', II, pp.51-52; Satish Chandra, Parties and Politics at the Mughal Court, pp.30-31.
to the qaddi of Amber in 1712.\(^1\) This suggests that the Rajput clans submitted to the decision of the Emperor in such matters only when he was confining himself to custom. But whenever the king tried to impose any decision which was totally violative of the customary law they did not hesitate in resisting.

In the Baghela clan, it is interesting to note that in 1592 when Balbhadr, chief of Bhatta died, Akbar did not approve the succession of the deceased's son Bikramajit who was a minor.\(^2\) Even on the insistence of the sardārs of Bhatta, Akbar refused to grant the succession to Bikramajit.\(^3\) After nine years, in 1601, Akbar installed Duryodhan, a younger son of Balbhadr on the qaddi of Bhatta.\(^4\)

In the Bundela clan, in 1607, when Rām Chandra revolted, Jahāngīr dislodged him from the qaddi of Orchha and conferred the succession upon Rām Chandra's younger brother Bār Singh Deo who was a favourite of Jahāngīr.\(^5\) In 1628, when Jujhār Singh, son of Bir Singh rebelled against Shēh Jehān, the latter dispossessed

---

3. *Ibid*.
the former from the qaddi and restored it to the family of Rām Chandra. Rām Chandra's grand son Debi Singh was elevated to the throne of Orcha.¹

Further, in 1618, when Suraj Mal Pundir of Mau rebelled, Jahāngīr dethroned him; his younger brother Jagat Singh was elevated to the qaddi.² In 1623, when Jagat Singh sided with Prince Shāh Jahān, Jahāngīr deposed him from the throne of Mau and installed his younger brother Mādho Singh on the qaddi. But after Jagat Singh's submission to Jahāngīr, the qaddi of Mau was restored to him.³

In the Bhaduriya clan son from a concubine was considered to be illegitimate and therefore he was not allowed to succeed. In 1643, when Kishan Singh died, he left only a son born from his concubine. Shāh Jahān set aside his claim and conferred the tika on Kishan Singh's nephew Badan Singh.⁴

The solitary known case of intervention by the Mughal Emperor to regulate succession in Sisodia ruling clan of Mewar

---

² Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.264.
³ Ibid., II, p.289.
⁴ Lāhori, Bādshāhnāma, II, p.348.
deserves special notice though it is of dubious authenticity. If true, it points to a tendency on the part of the Mughals to uphold established custom. On the death of Rana Rāj Singh in 1680, the sardars placed on the qaddi his younger son Bhim Singh. The eldest son Jai Singh felt aggrieved and approached Aurangzeb to set aside Bhim Singh’s succession. Aurangzeb intervened to remove Bhim Singh. The title of Rana and the tīka of Udaipur was granted by the king to Jai Singh.1

A survey of the cases of Mughals’ intervention to regulate succession among the Rāthor ruling clans of Jodhpur, Bikaner and Kishangarh go to show that by and large they tried to adhere to the principle of direct succession from father to son. In case of a chief dying without leaving behind a son the succession of brother2 or nephew3 was normally recognised; there was no Doctrine of Lapse in case of failure of direct heirs.

1. Futūhāt-i ʿAlamgīrī, MS. BM. 23884, Rotograph available in the Department of History, Aligarh, ff.80a and 81a.


3. In 1649, when Hari Singh of Kishangarh died issueless, Shāh Jahān sanctioned the succession to the deceased’s nephew Rup Singh. Lahori, Pādshāh Nāma, p.373; Vir Vinod, II, p.527.
However, in an exceptional situation, the Mughal rulers did not hesitate to interfere in the customary law of the clan and used their discretion to settle the question of succession. For instance, in 1581, after the death of the rebel Rao Chandra Sen of Jodhpur, there was dispute over succession among the sons of the deceased chief. Akbar superseded the claims of direct heirs and sanctioned the tika to a person of his own choice. The dead chief's brother Udai Singh who was already in Akbar's service was elevated to the gaddi of Jodhpur.

Similarly, the right to depose a reigning chief and replace him on the gaddi by a favourite chosen from amongst person eligible for succession was occasionally exercised. For instance, when Raja Jaswant Singh sided with Dārā Shukoh in the war of succession, Aurangzeb at one stage, disposed the Rāja from 'rājā' and 'marzbhāni' of Jodhpur and bestowed them upon his nephew Rao Rai Singh of Nāgor. But after his accession, the new Emperor revoked his earlier order and Jaswant Singh continued as the Rāja of Jodhpur. In January 1667, Aurangzeb deposed

2. Ibid.
Rao Karan of Bikaner who had rebelled and enthroned his son Anup Singh. This right exercised by Aurangzeb was supported by one clear precedent in the early history of Sisodia chief's relations with the clans subordinate to him.

Among the Rathors of Marwar, there was the peculiar custom of giving precedence to the son of the favourite Rani over other sons including the eldest one. This custom was respected by the Mughals. In 1594, after Udai Singh's death, his younger son Sur Singh being a son of the favourite wife of the dead ruler, was awarded the qaddi. On the same ground, in 1638, after Gaj Singh's death, Shah Jahan sanctioned the succession of his eleven-year old son Jaswant Singh and the claims of his elder brother Amar Singh were overlooked. But apparently the Mughals regarded this practice a deviation from the general custom and in this respect they were prepared to make an exception only in the case of Marwar chiefs. When a similar custom was sought to be invoked in Bikaner, the move was summarily scotched.

---

1. Aurangzeb's farman to Anup Singh, dated January 11, 1667, RSA, Bikaner; Muskha-i Dilkusha, MS. 33a & b.
by Jahāngīr. In 1611, when Ray Rai Sāṁgh tried to enthronize his younger son on the plea that the latter was from his favourite wife, Jahāngīr did not confirm the succession and awarded the tīka to the eldest son, Dalpat.¹

From a closer examination of the positions taken by Aurangzab after Jaswant Singh’s death in 1678 over the question of succession to the gaddi of Jodhpur it emerges that while all the time trying to ensure Indra Singh’s continuation as the new chief,² he was anxious to give an impression of adhering to the existing custom that by and large conformed to the principle of primogeniture. It is, for example, borne out by Aurangzab’s announcement, in July 1679, that, when Jaswant Singh’s sons, (who had already been brought to Delhi by this time)³ "would come of age, mansab and rāj would be granted (to them)".⁴ The fact that Aurangzab was obliged to make such a statement in spite of having already granted the tīka to Indra Singh is very significant. The implication of this announcement was that after the sons of the deceased Rāja had come of age, one of them would

---

replace (or at least succeed) Indra Singh on the gaddi of Jodhpur.
But on the other hand, it is obvious that from the very beginning
Aurangzeb was anxious to ensure Indra Singh's succession; and
after having granted the tīka to him on 26 May 1679, he was not
prepared to revoke it. The manner in which he hastened to
announce the conferment of the tīka on Inder Singh even after
getting the news of the birth of Jaswant Singh's sons indicates
his real anxiety in the matter. Similarly, after these children
were brought to his presence and their being legitimate sons of
the deceased Rāja was fully established, Aurangzeb apparently
tried to take shelter behind the plea that succession of an
infant was not permissible. In this context, it is interesting
to note that while indicating the age limit for succession, he
chose to remain ambiguous. He did not clearly say that minors
were excluded from succession as this would have gone against
the precedent set by his predecessor by giving tīka to Jaswant
Singh at the age of eleven. Apparently, the Rathor sardārs were
not impressed by the fine distinction that Aurangzeb tried to
draw between a minor and an infant and were convinced that by
installing Indra Singh on the gaddi after rejecting the claims
of the sons of the Rāja, the king was committing a flagrant

1. Naṣir-i Ḥamdi, pp.175-76.
2. Ibid., pp.172-73.
violation of their custom. After the Rathor sardāra escaped from Delhi with Ajit, the surviving infant,¹ Aurangzeb resorted to a plea that the sole surviving son of the Rāja was with him and the child named by the rebelling Rathors as Ajit Singh was only a pretender.² Thus, it would appear that down to 1688, when Muḥammadī Rāj died,³ Aurangzeb continued to stick to the fiction that he would place the surviving son of the deceased Rāja on the qaddi at an appropriate time. In this, Aurangzeb exposed himself to a contradictory position. After having already recognised Indra Singh as the lawful ruler of Jodhpur, how could he remove him from that position at a later date without violating the custom. There did not exist any precedent justifying the removal of a chief without establishing a charge of rebellion or disloyalty against him. The Rathor sardāra could not have missed this obvious contradiction in Aurangzeb's position. Apparently, they desisted from raising this point in their negotiations with the royal officers as it could have involved an admission that Indra Singh was already installed on the qaddi which they were not prepared to concede at any cost. It is, therefore, quite understandable that, on the one hand,

1. Me'āṣir-i Ālamoīrī, pp.178-79.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p.318; Futūḥat-i Ālamoīrī, f.144b.
thay firmly rejected Aurangzeb's assurances as of no consequence and on the other hand, continued to argue their contention that in the presence of Jaswant Singh's son no one else could succeed to his gaddi.¹

From this discussion, it emerges that while using their prerogative of conferring the tika, the Mughal rulers, by and large adhered to the principle of primogeniture and the customs of the clans.² This practice was generally accepted by the Rajput chiefs. They would ordinarily submit to a decision of the king, setting aside a candidate favoured by them provided his choice did not violate the framework of the customs of the respective clans. In this respect, problems arose only when the limits set by custom to the overlord's discretion were sought to be deliberately ignored by the Emperor. In the case of the Rathors of Jodhpur in 1679, Aurangzeb did take a position which though ostensibly consistent with the general principle underlining the customary law in effect violated the form in which it was applied to that particular clan. In the eyes of Rathor sardāra apparently, there was no justification for excluding a person

---

¹ According to the Rathor sardāra of Jodhpur, "the zamīndārī of the country of Mārwār was the property of Rāja Jaswant Singh and after his death by the law of inheritance the zamīndārī of the country devolves on his sons. In the presence of the sons of the late Jaswant Singh, Indra Singh had no right to succeed". Wanāl Sarkār Ranthambhor wa Alam, transcribed copy, Department of History, Aligarh, pp.245-46.

from succession on the plea that he had not come of age. They were convinced that Aurangzeb was using this plea to transfer chiefship to a different branch of the ruling family by circumventing the custom, and it was this that provoked them into defiance.

The reaction of the Rathor sardars, however, entirely based on moral indignation against changing the line of succession. Indar Singh was supported by sardars who had been exiled from Jodhpur to Nagor where they had accompanied his grand father. They were now coming back triumphant to claim a dominant position in the state. Their return would naturally eclipse, and very probably, destroy those who had served Jaswant Singh and had so far ruled the roost in Marwar. Inevitably they were not, at any cost, prepared to accept Indar Singh as the chief. So long as Jaswant Singh's queens had not given birth to the infants, it could not be known whether they were to be sons or daughters; so Jaswant Singh's sardars had willy nilly to be passive. At that time they were prepared to go to the farthest in offering submission simply in order to avoid Indar Singh. Thus Rani Hadi declared to prefer Jodhpur's inclusion into the khālisa territory instead of accepting Indar Singh as the chief of Jodhpur.¹ But

¹. Waghī Sarkār Ranthambhor wa Almer, pp.277-78.
the birth of the sons changed the situation entirely.¹

¹. In a recent study, Hallissey (The Rajput Rebellion Against Aurangzeb, pp.92-3) offers a different interpretation. He says that the Rathor sardārs were annoyed with Jaswant Singh who, with the help of the Mughals, adopted a policy of centralization which ultimately hampered the clan-authority in Jodhpur state. Consequently, after Jaswant Singh's death, his sardārs looked forward to reassert their clan-authority. He, further, holds that though Inder Singh's succession on the seat of Jodhpur was legitimate, the Rathor sardārs refused to accept him as their chief with the idea that he, being the candidate of Aurangzeb, would continue the policy of Jaswant Singh to submerge their clan-authority. This led the sardārs to oppose Inder Singh in favour of Ajit's succession.
Chapter VI

THE RAJPUT MARRIAGES OF THE IMPERIAL HOUSE

One important aspect of the relationships between the Timurid rulers and the Rajput nobles was a tendency on the part of the Mughal rulers and princes to take into marriage the daughters and nieces of the Rajput chiefs in their service. These so-called matrimonial alliances came into vogue simultaneously with the entry of the Rajput chiefs into the Mughal service in considerable strength under Akbar. As is well known, the first chief to enter the Mughal service and offer his daughter in marriage to Akbar was the Kachawaha chief, Bhār Mal. The other Rajput chiefs who followed in his footsteps, were the Rathor chiefs of Jodhpur, Bikaner and

1. Tarikh-i 'Alī, MS. f.145; Akbarnāma, II, pp.137-58; Muntakhab-ut Tawārīkh, p.50; Tahānat-i Akbarī, p.256; Zubdat-ut Tawārīkh, MS. f.148a; Tuzuk-i Jahāngirī, p.7; Iqādddd-i Jahāngirī, f.135; Tarikh-i Dilkusha, MS. f.539b; Khulasat-ut Tawārīkh, f.374; Muntakhab-ul Lubāb, pp.130-39; Naqsh-ul Umerā, I, pp.111-12; Tazkīrat-ul Umerā, MS. 'B'; Tod, p.376; Mulla Abdul Baqi, the author of Ha'afa-i Habīl (I, p.694) says that Akbar married the daughter of Bhaqwān Dād which is incorrect.


Merta, the Bhāṭī chief of Jaiselmer and the Ghelet chief of Dungarpur. But all these, unlike Bhāmal, joined Akbar's service and established matrimonial ties with him only after he had captured Chittor and overrun most of Mewar. Apparently, it was on account of the early cooperation that the Mughalees received from the ruling family of the Kachawahas that these came to be treated by the former as most favoured among their Rajput nobles. The Kachawahas and to a lesser degree the Rāthoras were given the particular privilege of giving their daughters and nieces to Mughal princes in marriage throughout the sixteenth, seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries. Apparently, in the cases of other chiefs such marriages were contracted only at the time of their entry into the royal service; and the princesses married did not receive the high status accorded to those from the Kachawaha and Rāthor houses.

5. Another Rajput clan who remained exceptionally devoted to the Mughal cause, once they had joined the service down to 21 R.Y. of Aurangzeb's reign.
6. See Appendix 'C'.

While assessing the position of the Rājput in the Mughal service, it would, therefore, be appropriate to examine the nature and working of these marriages between the Rājput clans and the ruling family in some depth.

One may examine this problem in the following manner: First of all one should assess the available evidence regarding the various factors that were responsible for Akbar's policy of establishing matrimonial ties with the Rājput clans in his service. Secondly, one may compare the total number of marriages contracted with the Rājput princesses by Akbar, Jahāngīr, Shāh-jahān and Aurangzēb to ascertain whether this tendency becomes prominent with the passage of time or it recedes into background after Akbar; or there are different phases when such marriages are encouraged or discouraged.

II

One of the factors, which seems to have led to the policy of establishing matrimonial ties with the Rājput chiefs, was the existence of a well established practice among the Timurides of securing the loyalties of the chiefs by marrying into their families. There are numerous instances to illustrate
this tendency. Yusuf Mirak, the author of Mazhar-i Shāh Jahānī, a local history of Sindh, compiled during Shāh Jahān’s reign, says that Arghun and Tārkhāna (who also belonged to Timurid tradition) used to marry the daughters of the chiefs of Sameja Unra, a local tribe of Sindh. Babur and Humayun also married the daughters of the local chiefs to secure their loyalties. On 28 January 1519, Babur married Mubarak Begam, a daughter of Malik Shāh Mansoor, the chief of the Yusufzais, with a view to conciliate 'the Yusufzai horde'. Similarly, in 1555, Humayun married the daughter of Jamāl Khān Mewatī, 'to soothe the mind of the zamīndārs'.

On the other hand, it was also an established practice amongst the Rājput chiefs to have similar ties with the non-Rājput groups in a subordinate position to them. They used to take as their wives girls belonging to the non-Rājput bhūmī families of their regions without making any distinction on the basis of caste. The Kachawaha chiefs, for instance, used to

marry into the families of the Meena chiefs. The Meenas appear to have been displaced by the Kachawahas as the leading zamīndāres of the Amber region sometime before 1560. They still constituted a considerable section of the local landed class down to the end of the 17th century. In establishing matrimonial ties with them, the Kachawahas must have been motivated by a desire to conciliate the Meena chiefs.

A practice already existed among the Rājputs to agree to give their daughters in marriage to the non-Rājput superior chiefs and rulers. From Appendix 'B', it is evident that this tradition dated back to the middle of the 15th century. A scrutiny of the evidence relating to individual cases, however, reveals that most of these marriages took place owing to the pressure of circumstances. For example, in 1445, Rāja Bhān of Idar, after he was defeated by Maḥmaud Shāh of Gujarat, married his daughter to the latter. Rāo Jodha (1415–1488), gave his daughter in marriage to Shahs Khān Qayam Khānī, the chief of

---

1. Nalita Māinolera-Khyat, I, pp.312, 324. Bihār Mal's brother Mupal and Mānaī Barbārī had wives belonging to the Meena and Jāt communities.

2. Between 1557 and 1560, Bihār Mal ousted the Meena chief from Lavan. See, Jaiwars-Ki-Vansavali, MS. pages are unmarked; Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, II, pp.282-83; Vār Vinoda, II, p.1276; Jelaur ka Itihās by H. Sharma, p.70.

Jhunjnu, to save himself from the threat of Qiyām Khanīs.\(^1\)

Similarly, a daughter of Rāo Lun Karan of Bikaner (1470-1526 AD) was married to Nahār Khan Qiyām Khanī to end a long standing feud between the two families.\(^2\) Mádeo (1511-1562 AD), the ruler of Jodhpur, also established matrimonial ties with his three non-Rājput neighbours. He gave his daughters in marriage to Islām Shāh Sūr\(^3\) and the latter's commander, Ḥājī Khan,\(^4\) the hakim of North-Eastern Rājputana. Another of his daughters and a grand-daughter were married to Sulṭām Māhmud Baigra of Gujarāt\(^5\)

---

1. Qiyām Khān Rāsā, pp.36-37, Shama Khān Qiyām Khānī belonged to the Chauhan Rājput family of Darera. His forefathers were converted to Islām during Sultan Firoz Shāh's reign (Qiyām Khān Rāsā, pp.13-14; Muḥta Naini-re-Khyāt, III, pp.373-73). Shama Khān had matrimonial alliance with Sulṭān Bahlool Lodi (Qiyām Khān Rāsā, p.37). Fadan Khān, one of the descendants of Shama Khān, joined the service of Humayun. After Humayun's death, Fadan Khan gave his daughter in marriage to Akbar. From Ain-i Akbari (MS. f.248a), it appears that the Qiyām Khānī had zamindāri rights in Fatehpur and Jhunjnu of Shaikhwātī. Jahāngīr gave Fatehpur as al thawq nāgīr (अत्यावासी) to Alaf Khān (Qiyām Khān Rāsā, p.39). On 26 November 1620, Alaf Khān was given the charge of Kāngra fort and his mansab was fixed at 1500/4000 (Jahāngīr-i Jahangīrī, p.320). During Aurangzeh's reign, a sardar of Qiyām Khānī, Alaf Khān held a mansub of 1900/700 (Ainānī Nāma, p.290), M. Ather Ali (The Mughal Nobility under Aurangzeh, p.201) holds that Alaf Khan was an Afghan which is, obviously, a slip. He was not an Afghan but he was a Shaikhzādā. For detailed study, see, Sunita Budhwar, 'A Qām Khānī Shaikhzādā Family of Fatehpur - Jhunjnu', PIHC, Hyderabad, 1978.

2. Qiyām Khān Rāsā, p.49.


4. Ainānī Nāma, MS. f.178b; Māhrār-re-Pasana-re-Vīgat, I, p.52; Banke Dāa re Khvāt, p.20.

5. Māhrār-re-Pasana-re-Vīgat, I, p.52; Banke Dāa re Khvāt, 38.
and Daulat Khān, the chief of Nāgor\textsuperscript{1} respectively. It would appear that having established these ties with his three powerful neighbours, Māldeo had become very influential and he expanded his territory at the cost of smaller chieftains.\textsuperscript{2} Māldeo came to be regarded as “the most potent chieftain of Hindustān” by the Persian chronicles of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{3} Further, Bhār Mal who gained the throne of Amber after ousting Akbaran, offered his daughter in marriage to Ḥājī Khān\textsuperscript{4} to wean away the later from his rival Askaran and secure Ḥājī Khān’s support for his claim to the seat of Amber. Similarly, Viram Dev Rāthor of Merta, after having been ousted from Merta by Māldeo, gave his daughter in marriage to the chief of Jālores, a Muslim, in the hope of re-occupying Merta with his help.\textsuperscript{5} Sometimes such marriages would be made in the hope of receiving rewards. For

\textsuperscript{1} Wādi‘at-i Mughalār, MS. p.56b; Tārīkh-i Daudī, p.156; Bānke-Bīrānī, Khyālat, p.20.

\textsuperscript{2} In 1531, when Māldeo became the Rāja, he had Jodhpur, Sojat and Jaitaran under his sway. Later on, he conquered a number of neighbouring parganas. He extended his possessions by subjugating Bhandārān, Jālores, Sīwān, Sānchā, Phaladi, Merta, Ajmer, Chātā, Tonk, Toda, Mālpura and Sāmbhār. See, Mārwār-re-Pargana-re-Vigat, I, pp.43-45.


\textsuperscript{4} Jālores-i Vadhavālī, MS. pages are unmarked.

\textsuperscript{5} Mārwār-re-Pargana-re-Vigat, II, p.52-54.
instance, Karasal Rāther of Merta, who gave in marriage his sister to Daulat Khān Nāgorī, received Khinvasar village of Aṣep nargana.¹ Such marriages are also traceable in Kashmir where the Sultāns established matrimonial alliances with the hill Rājput chiefs. Bahādur Singh, the chief of Kishwar (1570-1588 AD) gave one of his daughters in marriage to Sultān Ālī Shāh.² Another daughter of his was married to a nephew of the Sultān.³

III

A perusal of Appendix 'C' giving a list of marriages contracted by the Mughal rulers, from Akbar down to Aurangzeb, highlights certain interesting features of the Mughal policy in this respect.

Firstly, it would appear that in most cases the establishment of matrimonial ties accompanied the entry of the

³. Ibid., p.499.
chiefs concerned into royal service. For instance, in January 1562, Bhar Mai joined Mughal service and as a part of agreement gave his daughter in marriage to Akbar. Similarly, in 1570, Rāi Balyān Mal of Bikaner gave his two nieces in marriage to the Emperor and joined the Mughal service. About the same time, Rāwal Har Rāi of Jaisalmer married his daughter to Akbar and Rāo Chander Sen of Jodhpur married his sister to the Emperor and entered royal service. In 1573, while entering into an agreement with Rāja Jai Chand of Nagarkot, it was made a condition that the Rāja would give his daughter in marriage to Akbar. In March 1577, at the time of joining the Mughal service, Rāwal Askaran of Dungarpur gave his daughter in marriage to Akbar. In 1581, Kesha Dās Rāthor of Merta married his daughter to the Emperor and entered the royal service. In May 1597, Rāja Lachmi Narain of Cooch Bihar’s entry in the Mughal service was

5. Akbar Nāma, III, p.36.
accompanied by the establishment of matrimonial tie. It is quite understandable that the chiefs, entering the royal service, should be called upon to attach themselves to the royal family by special ties. This would explain the large number of such marriages taking place during Akbar's reign when most of the important Rajput clans joined imperial service. During the reigns of Jahāngīr, Shāh Jahān and Aurangzeb the number of such marriages seems to have declined. As the marriages evinces, during the reigns of Akbar, Jahāngīr, Shāh Jahān and Aurangzeb, respectively, 34, 7, 4, 8 marriages are recorded of Mughal Emperors and princes with princesses from families of local chiefs. A different pattern is found in the number of matrimonial ties contracted by the Mughal Emperors with the different families of Mughal nobilities.

However, the two leading families of the Rajput chiefs, namely Kachawahā of Āmber and Rěthora chiefs of Māruār, were


2. See, Appendix 'C'.

3. Afzal Husain, 'Marriages among Mughal nobles - an index of Status and Aristocratic integration', *PIHC*, 1972. According to the table furnished by the author, the reigns of Akbar, Jahāngīr, Shāh Jahān and Aurangzeb saw 71, 47, 41 and 73 such marriages respectively.
singed out for a special treatment in this respect. As already observed, the Mughal rulers continued to take brides from these two houses down to Bahadur Shah's reign.\(^1\) It would appear that in this respect, the Raja\-\-wat sub-clan of the Kachawahas was the most favoured family till the end of Akbar's reign.\(^2\) But apparently after Jahangir's accession, a sort of parity was maintained between the Kachawahas and the Rathores. In all, down to Bahadur Shah's time, there took place 7 marriages with princesses belonging to the house of Jodhpur while 5 brides were taken from the Kachawa chief's of Amber.\(^3\) The details of marriages in Rajput families after Akbar are as follows:

Jahangir's first Kachawa wife, daughter of Bhagwant Dasa, committed suicide on 6th May 1605.\(^4\) Three years later in

\[\text{References}\]

1. In March 1714, Ajit Singh Rathor of Jodhpur gave his daughter in marriage to Farrukh Siyar. See, Muntakhab-ul Lubab, p.736; Ma'asir-ul Umar, III, p.757.

2. Cf. Badami, Muntakhab-ul Tawarih, II, p.341. It can be clearly deduced from the manner in which Salim's marriage with Bhagwant Dasa's daughter is reported that it was his first wedding. The fact that a girl from the Kachawa ruling family was selected to become the first legal wife of the heir apparent, clearly indicates that till then this particular family enjoyed a special status among the Rajput chieftains in royal service.

3. See Appendix 'C'.

1608 A.D., Jahāngīr asked Mān Singh for the hand of his grand-daughter (a daughter of Jagat Singh), which amounted to conferring a special honour upon the Kachawaha clan. ¹ Although Jahāngīr was not happy with the Rāja on account of his collaboration with Khusrau on the issue of succession, he preferred to maintain the matrimonial ties with the Kachawaha ruling family.

Jahāngīr also established matrimonial tie with the Bundila chief of Orcha. In 1609, after the revolt, when Rām Chandra submitted, he gave his daughter in marriage to Jahāngīr. ² It is important to note that during the period of Khusrau's revolt, matrimonial ties contracted between the Kachawaha and the Rāthor clans. In 1625, another Kachawaha princess, the sister of Mirzā Rāja Jai Singh, was married to Dāwar Baksh. ³ Earlier to this, in 1624, Prince Parwaz married the sister of Rāja Gaj Singh. ⁴ But Shāh Jahān, who was born of a Rāthor

---

1. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.68, 69; Ma’āsir-i Jahāngīrī, MS. f.97a; Mantakhab-ul Lubab, I, p.259; Ma’āsir-ul Umara, II, pp.141-42; cf. Ather Ali (The Mughal Nobility under Aurangzeb, p.142) who suggests that it was regarded as a sign of honour for a noble that his daughter should be demanded in marriage by a Mughal Emperor.

2. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.77.


princess and was himself married to a Rāthor princess during Jahāngīr's life time did not have a Kachawaha wife. But in 1654, Prince Sulaiman Shukoh married the daughter of Rāo Ameer Singh of Nāgar. One of the noteworthy features of Shāh Jahān's reign was to establish matrimonial ties with the hill Rājput chiefs. Prince Shuja is known to have married the daughter of Rāja Gaur Sen of Kishtawar. In 1658, when Sulaiman Shukoh was in Srinagar-Garhwal, he married the daughter of Rāja Prithvi Singh. During Aurangzeb's reign, the number of marriages between the members of the royal family and princesses from the Rājput families remained almost same.

IV

When Jahāngīr married Jagat Singh's daughter, her maternal grandfather Bhoj Hāra of Bundī who was also in royal

5. Maqṣūm, pp.133a, 156a.
6. See, Appendix 'C'.
service expressed his resentment over it. Jahāngīr was greatly displeased with the Hāra chief on account of this attitude. As a matter of fact such a prejudice on the part of the Haras and their disapproval of the marriages between the daughters and nieces of Rājput chiefs with the Mughal Emperors went back to Akbar's reign. In 1569, Surjan Hāra of Ranthambor submitted to the Mughals and had taken up service under Akbar on the condition that he would not be asked to give his daughter in marriage to the Emperor. Apart from the Haras this feeling was also shared by a number of individual chiefs belonging to certain other clans. It appears that, to begin with, a section of the Rāthor chiefs of Mārwār were also opposed to the idea of the establishing matrimonial ties with the imperial family, but the opposition had been usually overruled by the reigning chief. For instance, in 1585, Kallā, a nephew of Motā Rāja, strongly objected to the marriage of the Rāja's daughter with Prince Salim, but his objection was disregarded by the Rāja, and upon his showing disaffection, he was destroyed a year later with the help of the Mughals.

It is probable that at the heart of the matter was the question whether the Mughal Imperial family was or was not superior in status to the Rājputs. As we have seen the Rājputs were not averse to themselves marrying for political reasons women from lower castes; but the idea of 'giving daughters' to them was not acceptable. Even the Rājput chiefs intervened in the matters where the lower castes tried to marry in the upper castes. According to Muhta Nainsī, a Meena bhumia of Bundī wished to marry a daughter of a Brahman, the latter resisted and sought protection of the Hara chief.¹ Similarly, Shyamal Dāś informs us that when a certain Dungar Bheel tried to marry the daughter of a mahajan by force, Rāwal Bir Singh Ghelet of Dungarpur intervened in the matter and punished the Bheels.² Thus to the loyal Rājput chief's refusal to give a princess to the Mughal Court might signify contempt for the status of the dynasty he himself served; on the other hand, the fact still remained that the Imperial Family was of another religion, and the princess who married, went out of the fold of her forefathers. The political loyalty here conflicted with the ritualistic prejudice of ages; and yet the former so frequently worn out.

¹ Muhta Nainai ra Khvāt, I, p.97.
² Vīr Vīnād, II, p.1003.
There is no basis for the assumption that the Rājput chiefs who established matrimonial ties with the Mughal Emperors were treated as out-castes. Such assumption, often reflected in the writings of modern historians,¹ is entirely based on Tod's testimony which is not corroborated by the contemporary authorities. On the contrary, if one studies the pattern of matrimonial ties among the leading Rājput families during the period 1547-1667, it would emerge that the chiefs whose daughters were married to the Mughal rulers and princes continued to be treated as the members of the caste and no stigma attached to them on account of their relationship with the royal family or for that matter any other Muslim superior chief. For example, the Sisodias and Haras of Bundi did not give their daughters in marriage to the Mughal Emperors but they married their daughters to those very Rājput chiefs who had matrimonial ties with the Mughal Emperors, or, like the Rāthors, with some Muslim chiefs.²


2. There took place a number of marriages among the Sisodias, Haras, Bhotis and the Rāthors.
   (a) Rāna Sānga (24th March 1481-April 1527) of Mewar married Dhan Bāi, the daughter of Va'āgh, the son of Rāo Suja Rāther (M.K., I, p.102).
   (b) Rājkanvari, the daughter of Māldeo Rāther (4 Dec. 1511 - 9 Nov. 1562) was married to Surtān, the son of Surjan Hāra. (M.P. re Vigat, I, p.53; R.K., p.20).

......contd.
The Kachawahas of Amber and Rathors of Jodhpur and Bikaner who were the first Rajput clans to establish matrimonial

contd......

(a) Rāimal, the son of Maldeo Rāthor, married Rattan Kanverī, the daughter of Surjān Hāra (1554–1583) of Bundi (B.K., p. 19).

(d) Rāna Udai Singh (4 Aug. 1522 – 28 Feb. 1572) of Mewar married Karavati, the daughter of Rāo Chandra Sen of Jodhpur (B.K., p. 22).

(e) Rāj Ray Singh Rāthor (1541-1611) of Bikaner married Jaswantde, the daughter of Rāna Udai Singh Sisodia of Mewar (D.V., pp.12-13).

(f) In 1637, Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur married Rām Kanverī, the daughter of Chatsirāl Hāra of Bundi (Warla, p.241; M.U., I, pp.405-06; M.P. re-Vigat, II, p.462; M.L., I, p.43).

(g) In 1655, Jaswant Singh Rāthor of Jodhpur married the daughter of Biram Deve Sisodia (Wāris, p.298; M.U., II, p.881).

(h) Jaswant Singh (1627-1678) of Jodhpur married a Sisodia princess of Mewar (Bernier, p.37).

(i) Jaswant Singh married the daughter of Soreb Sisodia (M.U., I, p.754).


(k) In 1622, Amar Singh, the son of Gaj Singh Rāthor of Jodhpur married a princess of Udaipur (M.P. re-Vigat, I, p.107).


(m) Bhān, son of Saker Singh Sisodia and the grandson of Rāna Udai Singh, married Rāj Kanver, the daughter of Mota Rāja of Jodhpur (M.K., I, p.26).

(n) Rāna Sāng's son Bhej Rāj married the daughter of Viram Deve Rāthor of Merta (Vir Vāned, p.362).

(o) Rāna Rāj Singh (1652-1680) married Chārumatī, the daughter of Rāj Reop Singh Rāthor of Kishangarh (V.V., p.476).

(p) Rāna Rāj Singh married the daughter of Sabal Singh Bhātī of Jaisalmer (V.V., p.476).

(q) In 1632, Anoop Singh of Bikaner married Rāna Rāj Singh’s sister (Abid., p.461).
ties with the Muslim rulers at an early date continued to enjoy a high status in the Rajput society. Precisely, during the period they established matrimonial ties first with Afghan chief, Ḥājī Khān, and later on with the Mughal rulers, they went on contracting similar ties with the other Rajput clans without apparent difficulty.

The establishment of matrimonial ties between the Mughal ruling family and the Rajput clans was the direct outcome of the recruitment of the Rajput chieftains into the imperial service in considerable strength. According to the established custom of the Timuride and the Rajputs, the hereditary chiefs entering into the service of a ruler were expected to offer their daughters or nieces in marriage to the members of the ruling family. Apparently, the caste restrictions were not considered by many, though not all Rajput clans, binding enough to prohibit such marriages. Even prior to these matrimonial ties with the Mughal ruling family, the Rajput chiefs were having similar ties with certain Muslim chieftains of Northern Rajputana and Gujarāt.

contd......

In most cases, the marriage of a Mughal ruler in the family of a Rājput chief would take place only once, that is, when the chief of that particular clan entered royal service. This would explain the fact that the largest number of such marriages took place during Akbar's reign. In this respect an exception was made in the cases of Rājāwat chiefs of the Kachawaha clan and the Rāthor chiefs of Jodhpur. These two families were given the privilege of marriages with the Imperial house down to the end of the seventeenth century. The privilege was most frequently accorded to the Rājāwat chiefs till Jahāngīr's time; but from Shāh Jahān's reign onwards, it seems, the Rāthor chiefs of Jodhpur were given precedence. Such inter-marriage was thus proclaimed as a sign of status of the particular Rājput family within the Mughal nobility and was by no means a badge of disrepute.
Appendix 'A'

MARRIAGES CONTRACTED BY THE MUGHAL RULERS WITH THE GIRLS BELONGING TO THE FAMILIES OF LOCAL CHIEFS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER, DOWN TO HUMAYUN'S DEATH - 1555.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Timurid Rulers</th>
<th>Racial Characteristics of local chiefs</th>
<th>Sources and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>28th Jan. 1519</td>
<td>Bābur married Mubārek Begam, the daughter of Melik Shah Mansūr, the chief of Yusuf Zai (Kābul)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bābur Nāma, tr. A.S. Beveridge, p.375.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Date is not mentioned</td>
<td>Humayun married Shaikhzādā, daughter of Jamāl, the brother of Hasan Khān Mewātī</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.N., II, p.48.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 'B'


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>The Rajput chiefs who gave their daughters in marriage to Non-Rajput chiefs</th>
<th>Racial characteristic of Non-Rajput chiefs</th>
<th>Sources and Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1445 AD</td>
<td>Bhan of Idar gave his daughter in marriage to Mahmud Shâh of Gujarât.</td>
<td>Gujarât</td>
<td>Mirât-i-Sikandari, p.49, tr.23; Vir Vindā, II, 995.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1415-1486</td>
<td>Rao Jodha, the chief of Mārwar, gave his daughter in marriage to Shams Khān Qiyām Khānī, chief of Jhunjnu &amp; Fatehpur</td>
<td>Qiyām Khānī (Jhunjnu &amp; Fatehpur)</td>
<td>Qiyām Khan Raso, pp.36-37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>13 Jan. 1470 - 29th June 1526</td>
<td>Rao Leon Karan's daughter was married to Nâhar Khān</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>Ibid., p.49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4 Dec.1511 9 Nov.1562</td>
<td>Rātnāvatī, the daughter of Māldeo was married to Mājī Khān a commander of Sâlim Shâh Sur</td>
<td>Afghân</td>
<td>Afsâne-i Shâhân, MS. f.178b; M.P.-re-Vigat, I, 52; B.K., p.20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>Kankāvatī, the daughter of Māldeo was married to Mahmood Baigra of Gujarât</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>M.P.-re-Vigat, I, p.52; B.K., p20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>Lâl Bāi, the daughter of Mâldeo Râther of Jedhpur was married to Sur Pâdshâh (perhaps Islâm Shâh Sur)</td>
<td>Afghân</td>
<td>B.K., p.20.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. 13 Jan. 1538 - 23 July 1593
   One of the daughters (Nāgor) of Mata Rāja of Jodhpur was married to Chiram Khān of Nāgor.

8. 31 July 1541-1581
   Dhan Bāi, the daughter (Nāgor) of Rāo Chander Sen, the son of Māldeo was married to Daulat Khān of Nāgor.

9. 1547 - Jan. 1574
   Bhūr Mal married one of his daughters to Hāji Khān.

10. Date is not mentioned
    Rāwal Pa-ta of Rārothra married his widow daughter to Gajnī Khān, chief of Jālōr.

11. -do-
    Virām Deva Rāthor (1477-1543) of Merta gave his daughter in marriage to a chief of Jālōr.

12. -do-
    Karamāl Rāthor of Merta gave his sister Bhāga Bāi in marriage to Daulat Khān Nāgorī.

M.P._-re-Vīgat, I, p.89. Chiram Khān is not identified.

Waqist-i Mushtaqī, MS. p.96b; Tarikh-ī Daudi, p.156; B.K., p.22; V.V., II, 808.

Jaipur ki Vanshevalī, MS., pages are unmarked.

M.K., II, p.97.

M.P._-re-Vīgat, II, pp.52-54.

B.K., p.67.
Appendix 'C'

MARRIAGES CONTRACTED BY THE MUQHAL RULERS WITH THE GIRLS TAKING FROM THE FAMILIES OF THE LOCAL CHIEFS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER FROM 1562 TO 1707

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Marriages</th>
<th>Racial characteristics and place</th>
<th>References and other Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>9th Aug. 1564</td>
<td>Akbar married the daughter of Mian Mubārak Shāh of Khāndesh</td>
<td>(Deccani) (Khāndesh)</td>
<td>A.N., II, 230-31; T. ALPİ, p. 615.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>15th Nov. 1570</td>
<td>Rāi Kalyān Mal gave his niece in marriage to Akbar</td>
<td>Rāthor (Bīkaner)</td>
<td>A.N., II, 358; D.V., 14-15; M.T., 133; V.V., II, 174, 485.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>Rāi Kalyān Mal gave another niece in marriage to Akbar. She was daughter of Bhīnve Rāj, a brother of Kalyān Mal</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>D.V., 14-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Nov. 1570</td>
<td>Rukmavaṭi, the daughter Rāthor of Māldeo was married to Akbar</td>
<td>Rāthor (Jodhpur)</td>
<td>Muskaḥa-i-Dīkkuṣa, tr. p. 18; B.K.s., p. 20; Tod, II, p. 22; V.V., II, 174.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. 1573  Akbar married the daughter of Rāja Jai Chand of Nagarkot

9. March 1577  Akbar married the daughter of Rāwal Āskaran of Dungarpur

10. 1581  Kesha Dās married one of his daughters to Akbar

11. 16th Feb. 1584  Prince Salīm married the daughter of Bhagwant Dās

12. 26th June 1586  Akbar married the daughter of Said Kāhan Gaskhar

13. -do-  Prince Salīm married the daughter of Rāi Rāl Singh of Bikaner

14. 1587  Prince Salīm married the daughter of Mota Rāja of Jodhpur

15. 1590  Prince Salīm married the daughter of Mirzā Sāmpat

16. 1st Jan. 1592  Prince Salīm married the daughter of All Rāi, the ruler of Tibet

17. October 1592  Akbar married the daughter of Shame Cak of Kashmir

18. -do-  Prince Salīm married the daughter of Mubārak [Kashmir] Khān, the son of ʻHasan Cak of Kashmir

Notes:

Akbar married the daughter of Rāja Jai Chand of Nagarkot

Gehlot (Dungarpur)

Rāthor (Merta)

Kachawaha (Amber)

Gakhar

Rāthor (Bikaner)

Rāthor (Jodhpur)

Nagarkot

A.N., III, 36.

Ibid., 196, 210.

M.P.-re-Vigat, II, 69-70.

A.N., III, 494.

Ibid.; M.T., II, 353;

T. &. II, 145; V. V., II, 168-69.

A.N., III, 603; T. J., tr., 19; M.J., 10a;

M.L., I, 245-46; M.U., II, 180-81; T.U., 155;

T. &., II, 267; V. V., II, 182, 815.

A.N., III, 582.

Ibid., 603; M.T., 376.

A.N., III, 626.
20. 2nd Oct. 1595 Daniel married the daughter of Rāi Mal, the son of Rāi Māldeo Rāthor (Jodhpur) Ibid., 696.
21. May 1597 Akbar married the daughter of Rāja Lachmi Narain of Cooch Bihar Cooch Bihar Jaipur ki Vanshevali pages are unmarked; cf. also A.N., tr. H. Beveridge, 1068, f.n.2
22. March 1604 Prince Salīm married the daughter of Adil Khan of Bījapur Deccani (Bījapur) A.N., III, 827; T.D., MS 576b; M.L., I, 216.
23. Date is not mentioned Akbar married the daughter of Fadan Khān Qiyām Khān Rāsa, 54.
24. -do- One of the daughters of Rāo Chander Sen Rāthor (Jodhpur) B.K., 22.
27. -do- Akbar married into the family of Tunwar chiefs Tunwar (Gwalior) Z.K., I, 104 (from Z.K., II, tr. Jarrett, 198, it appears that Tunwar zamīndārs were concentrated around Gwalior)
28. -do- Akbar married into the family of Baghela chiefs Baghela (Bhāta) Z.K., I, 104.
29. -do- Prince Salīm married the daughter of Kashe Dās Rāthor Rāthor (Merta) T.I., I, 19; Waris, 238.
30. -do- Daniel married the daughter of Dalpat Ujjainya the Rāja of Bhojpur Ujjainya (Bhojpur) A.N., III, 826.
31. -do- Akbar married Goharun (Chandāwar and Nişā Begam, the sister Jalesar) of Shaikh Jamāl Bakh- tīyār

32. -do- Prince Salīm married the daughter of Darya Mālbhās

33. -do- Prince Salīm married the sister of Abiya Cak (Kashmir) Kashmirī, the son of Abdul Cak

34. -do- Prince Daniyal married the daughter of Abdullah Biluc

JAHĀNGĪR

1. 28th May 1608 Jahāngīr married the daughter of Rāja Jagat Singh s/o Mān Singh Kachawaha (Amber) T.J., 68, 69; M.J., 57; M.L., I, 159; M.U., II, 141-2.

2. 1st Feb. 1609 Jahāngīr married the daughter of Rām Chander Bundela Bundela (Orcha) T.J., 77.

3. 22nd Nov. 1614 Jahāngīr married the daughter of Rāja Lachmī Nārain of Cooch Bihar Cooch T.J., 131.

4. -do- Jahāngīr married another daughter of Lachmī Nārain of Cooch Bihar -do- -do-

5. April 1624 Prince Perwez married Manbhāvatī, the sister of Rāja Gaj Singh Rāhor T.J., 308; M.P.-re- Vīcet, I, 108.

7. Prince Khurram married Rāthor (Jodhpur) the daughter of Rāo Sakat Singh, son of Mata Rāja

---

SHĀHJAHĀN

1. 1654 Prince Sulaiman Shukoh Rāthor (Nāgor) married the daughter of Amar Singh Rāthor of Nāgor

2. 1655-56 Prince Sulṭān Muḥammad Deccani married the daughter of (Golcunda) 'Abdu'llāh Qutub Shāh of Golcunda.

3. Prince Shuja married the daughter of Rāja Gaur Sen of Kishtavar

4. 1657-58 Sulaiman Shukoh married Garhwāl the daughter of Prithvī Singh

---

AURANGZEB

1. 17th Nov. 1661 Prince Moḥd. Muḥammad Rāthor (Kishangarh) married the daughter of Rup Singh Rāthor, Rāja of Kishangarh

2. 3rd May 1669 Prince Aẓām married Assam Rahmat Bāno, the daughter of the King of Assam

3. 2nd Jan. 1676 Prince Muḥammad Sulṭān Kishtawar married the daughter of Rāja of Kishtawar
4. 1st Sept. 1676  Prince Mohd. Akbar married the daughter of Allah Quill Gakhar, the son of Murad Quill Gakhar

5. 5th July 1678  Prince Mohd. Azam married the daughter of Kirat Singh s/o Mirza Raja Jai Singh

6. 26th July 1681  Prince Azam married Shahar Bano, the daughter of Adil Shah of Bijapur

7. 30th July 1681  Kam Bakhsh married Kalyan Kanwar, the daughter of Amar Chand, a brother of Jagat Singh of Manoharpur

8.  Prince Muhammad married the daughter of Wutb-ul Mulk
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Chapter VII

SOCIAL INTERCOURSE BETWEEN THE MUGHALS AND THE RÄJPUTS

An eminent sociologist Professor J. Goody says that the marriage policy is the most important factor in the change of cultural features. It would be, therefore, natural to assume that the marriage contracted between the women of the leading Räjput clans and the members of the Mughal ruling family must have brought about a certain degree of cultural transformation among both the groups. An attempt is being made here to study and analyse the impact of these marriages on the two groups and determine the extent of success they achieved in assimilating the various features of two cultures. To begin with one would like to study the nature of various ceremonies performed on these occasions and also the treatment of the Räjput princesses in the Royal harem with special reference to the Kachawäha princesses. In this connection all those instances that would go to suggest the nature and extent of the influence exercised by these princesses on the private lives and outlook of the rulers must also be taken into

consideration. At the same time, it must also be investigated as to how far the marriage alliances influenced the religious as well as social outlook of the Rajput chiefs and particularly those of the Kachawāha chiefs. Further, it will be examined, as to how far did the Kachawāha nobles cooperate with the Mughal Emperors with respect to some of their measures aimed at promoting a change in the cultural outlook of the nobility as such.

It appears that to begin with, while performing the marriage ceremonies, both sides were treated on an equal footing and the customs of both the Mughals and the Rajputs were observed. 1 When Jahāngir married the sister of Kalyān Dās, the marriage ceremony was performed by Hindū rituals. 2 This implies that the daughters of the Rajput chiefs taken into marriages by Akbar were not converted to Islām. This practice appears to have continued during Jahāngir's reign as well. 3 In the accounts of Jahāngir's marriages with the Rajput princesses there is no reference to the conversion of the brides.

2. Mārāwar re Pargana ri Vigat, II, pp.440-41. Kalyān was the nephew of Mota Raja of Jodhpur.
3. In the account of Jahāngir's marriages with the Rajput princesses, there is no reference to the conversion of the brides. Cf. Tuzuk-i Jahāngirī, pp.60, 69, 77, 131, 380.
But as is well-known, this policy was reversed by Aurangzeb. It is known that when in 1661, Prince Mu'izzam married the daughter of Roop Singh Ráthor, the bride was converted, perhaps with the concurrence of her father, to Islám.¹

On the occasion of Prince Salím's marriage with the daughter of Bhagwant Dás in 1584, the marriage rites of both the Hindus and the Mughals were observed. While the proposal for this match came from the parents of the bride which was in conformity with the Rájput practice,² the marriage proper was solemnised first through and presided by a qází, fixing the mihra of the bride at two crore tankas, and later through the Hindu rituals of going round the fire. When the bride's litter moved in procession from her father's house to the royal camp, gold coins were scattered by Akbar all along the way. Raja Bhagwant Dás gave in dowry several strings of horses, one hundred elephants, a large number of slave boys and girls of Abyssinian, Indian and Cireesian origin, golden and silver vessels with jewels. The Rája also presented Persian, Turkish

¹. *Malāsir-i ʿAlamgīrī*, pp.3-4; *ʿAlamgīr Nāma*, pp.639-41.

². At another occasion (1608), the initiative came from the side of the royal family. Observing the Mughal custom, a sum of Rs.80,000 was sent to the bride's family as sákhāq (marriage present). *Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī*, pp.67-68.
and Arabian horses with golden saddles to the nobles, present at the marriage ceremony. In this connection, it is significant that Badauni who particularly noticed these details, has not criticised Akbar for allowing the marriage of his son to be solemnised in addition to and through Hindū rituals repugnant to the basic spirit of Islam. This would suggest that by the time Badauni compiled his book, this practice had come to be looked as an accepted norm even by persons of orthodox views so far as the marriages of the members of the Royal Family with the Hindū women were concerned. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, one may assume that on the occasion of Jahangir's second marriage into the Kachawaha family in 1608, the same procedure must have been followed. The only difference in the procedure, which is noted by Jahangir was that the initiative for the match this time came from the side of the Mughal ruler.

Further, it seems that the Rajput princesses in the Mughal harem had full freedom to practice their religion. They also appear to have been instrumental in bringing about a notable


2. Tuzuk-i Jahāngirī, p.60.
change in the cultural outlook of the ruling family, making them generally tolerant in matters pertaining to religion and prompting them occasionally to participate in cultural functions and festivals of the Hindus. Badāuni, for instance, attributes Akbar's tolerant attitude towards the Hindus and a tendency on the latter's part to participate in Hindu festivals and rituals to the growing influence of his Rajput wives. ¹ Badāuni further holds that Akbar, being influenced by his Hindu wives, prohibited the eating of beef, onions and garlic. At least this practice continued during Jahāngīr's reign. ² Jahāngīr is known to have hunted wild boars and presented their meat to Rajputs. ³ Even the Mughal ladies showed respects for the cows. There is a nishān of Hamīda Bāno Begam dated September 29, 1581, instructing the imperial officials of pargana Mahavan of sarkar Agra for grazing the cows of Bithlĕshwar. She also instructed that no one molest or disturb the cows from grazing. ⁴ It would appear that the

1. Badāuni holds that Akbar celebrated the haj festival of the Hindus in compliment to his Hindu wives. In 1581, he prostrated himself before the Sun and the fire in public. Further, he says that when in the evening, the lamp and the candles were lighted in the court, every one had to rise up respectfully. Akbar also celebrated the rākhi festival which was followed by his chiefs and nobles. Muntakhab-ut Tawārikh, II, pp.261-62.

2. Tazkira-i Pīr Mas'ūd Tālīf, f.36b, Dep'tt. of History, Aligarh; see also Pelsaert, Jahāngīr's India, p.21.

3. The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe, pp.103, 157, 284; Coryat, p.281.

4. S.I. Tirmizi, Edicts from the Mughal Harem, pp.1-5.
tendency to accept Hindu cultural practices manifested itself at an early stage in Akbar’s life when he was still under the influence of the ‘uлемы. From a passage in Muntakhab-ut Tawarikh one gathers that as early as mid-seventies, Akbar used to put on yellow garments, made of a silken cloth, a Rajput practice was considered repugnant to the rules of shari‘at by the orthodox people. 1 Naturally, a taste for such garments would be acquired by Akbar in the company of his Rajput wives. Towards the close of his reign, Akbar had started observing some of the typical Hindu rituals in clear violation of shari‘at. It is known on the authority of Abūl Fāzīl that after Hamida Bāno Begām’s death in 1604, Akbar had his head and moustaches shaved after the Rajput custom. 2 Further, it seems that the innate respect of the Mughal rulers for the sentiments and scruples of the others must have acted as an additional factor. In this regard, they were least concerned with the rules of shari‘at. For instance, in June 1595, when Rāi Rāi Singh of Bikaner was ill, Akbar asked the Rāi to go on tirath (pilgrimage to sacred places of worship). 3 In August 1639, Shāh Jahān granted 200 bighas of land in purana

3. Akbar’s farānān to Rāja Rāi Singh of Bikaner. See, A Descriptive List of Faramān, Manahura and Nishāna, p.5.
Baikunthpur for the maintenance of chatrī of deceased mother of Rāja Man Singh.¹

From Tuzuk-i Jahāṅgīrī, it appears that the Hindū practices established by Akbar, continued to be observed during Jahāṅgīr's time. The practice that on the occasion of rakhi festival the Hindū nobles would bind on the King's wrist costly 'strings of rubies and royal pearls and flowers jewelled with gems of great value' was discarded for sometime by Jahāṅgīr on account of the nobles indulging in extravagance. Henceforth, only the Brehmans would be allowed to tie pieces of silk on the King's wrist according to their own custom. But in 1613, Jahāṅgīr revived the abandoned practice and allowed the Hindu nobles to bind rakhi on his wrist.² There is also available evidence in Tuzuk-i Jahāṅgīrī, suggesting that the festival of Diwāli was celebrated by Jahāṅgīr in an elaborate manner. In 1614, Diwāli was celebrated at Jahāṅgīr's court by having gambling bouts for three consecutive nights.³ In the same year Dashehra festival was celebrated with the usual decoration of

2. Tuzuk-i Jahāṅgīrī, p. 120.
3. Ibid., p. 131.
elephants and horses. In 1659, on the occasion of 'Id-ul Fitr, Aurangzeb presented a khilaf to Jaswant Singh.

A close scrutiny of the surviving evidence also suggests that from around 1577, Akbar's Rajput wives started taking an interest in matters of state policy. Rafiuddin Shirazi says that Akbar, in the influence of one of his Hindu wives, obviously promulgated an order of banning the sale and purchase of slaves. She argued that if slaves were continued to be exported on such a large scale, after sometimes there would be shortage of man-power in the Empire. And the influence of these Rajput wives was exercised against the measures recommended by the orthodox elements tending to discriminate against the Hindus. According to Baduni, in 1577, the Rajput ladies pleaded with Akbar for the release of a Brahman from Mathura, accused of using abusive language against the prophet. After the man was executed by Abd-un Nabi without proper trial, they protested to the king against this arbitrary attitude of him the Sadr-us Sudur and instigated/to take steps against Abd-un Nabi. If one is to believe Baduni, this episode was one of

2. 'Ālamgir Nāma, pp.404-05. Glau, I, p.231; Raja Jaswant Singh and Raja Jai Singh both were given an elephant each on the occasion of 'Id in the 12th R.Y. Lahori, II, p.144.
the prime factors contributing to the latter's fall in the estimate of the King.

Similar instances of the Rajput wives of the King taking part in high politics and trying to influence the course of events according to their own judgment or inclinations can be cited from Jahangir's reign. It is known that Jahangir's first Kachawaha wife, intervened over the issue of succession after Akbar's death. She disagreed with her relatives who were sponsoring Khusrau's candidature and tried to dissuade her son from claiming the throne against his father. According to Jahangir, "she constantly wrote to Khusrau and urged him to be sincere and affectionate to him". Being frustrated in these efforts, she committed suicide. Similarly, in 1613, on the occasion of the festival of Dashehra, Jahangir's wives pleaded for Khusrau's release from prison and succeeded in securing a pardon for the Prince.

On the other hand, ladies belonging to the imperial harem, Rajput princesses as well as others, occasionally entered into correspondence with the Rajput chieftains seeking to influence them politically. In 1627, Shāh Jahān's Rāthor wife went to

---

Jodhpur and stayed there for eight days canvassing support from among her relatives for her husband’s claim to the throne against other contenders. Available evidence indicates that Shah Jahan’s favourite daughter Jahân Âra Begam (entitled Begam Sâhiba) maintained occasional correspondence with Mirza Râja Jai Singh regarding political and administrative matters. In 1640, she sent a letter to Jai Singh for the verification of Hem Singh’s claim of being a real son of Raja Chatr Sâl. Apparently, she sought this verification from Jai Singh as she was approached by Hem Singh for a recommendation for the grant of a mansab to him. There is available yet another letter addressed to Jai Singh dated September 1651, commending his service in suppressing the Mawâti rebels in pargana Kâmân and Pahârî and asking him to come to the court so that he may be sent to lead an expedition against Gandhâr. During the war of succession, in 1658, Nâdira Bâno Begam, wife of Dâra Shukoh, urging upon Jai Singh to devote himself fully to the operations against Shuja.

Dāra Shukoh congratulated Mirza Rāja Jai Singh on the birth of the latter's grandson and wished to be Mirza's guest on his way to Āmber.¹

As a matter of fact the blood ties created by the matrimonial alliances between the Mughal ruling family and the Rajput clans were attached great importance by both the sides. Sometimes, the members of the royal family would not feel aversive to seeking help from their Rajput relatives in their mutual disputes. We know at least one such episode from Jahāngīr's reign which relates to Khurram's revolt, during 1621 to 1627. In April 1626, Khurram sent a letter to Jai Singh addressing him as khālu wherein he had asked the Rāja to help him against his father.² There exists ample evidences showing that the ties between the Mughal ruling family and the Rajput clans tended to raise the latter almost to the position of the members of the ruling family which distinguished them even from ordinary Rajput nobles. It is known on the authority of Bānke Dēs that after Hamīdā Bāno Begam's death in 1604, all the Rajput nobles except Rāo Shoj Hāra and Rāo Durga Chandrāvat who were not

1. A Descriptive List of Faramāns, Nishāns and Manahurs, p.33.
related to ruling family, had their heads shaved,¹ which is the customary Hindu practice of condoling the death of an elderly relative. On the other hand, we know in imitation of Hindu custom of celebration of Death Anniversary, Jahangir is known to have celebrated the death anniversary of Akbar in 1613, which was against the tenets of Islam.²

From all indications, it is evident that the Rajput wives and their relatives used to have considerable influence over the Mughal Emperors. The Rajput ladies related to the royal family in different capacities were treated with exceptional honour and much confidence was reposed in them. Jahangir was particularly attached to his Kachwaha wife, daughter of Bhagwant Das, referred to above. She, on her part, had such a great affection for Jahangir's person that she would be prepared to sacrifice her relations with her own brother as well as son, if it came to a choice between them and her husband. According to Jahangir, it was on account of her great shock over the misconduct of her brother Madho Singh that she committed suicide in 1603. Jahangir, it is reported in the Tuzuk-i Jahangiri, did not take food and water for four days after her death.³ Again,

---

it was an indication of the considerable prestige enjoyed by the Rājput ladies related to the royal family that in 1572, Dāniyāl born of a concubine, was given into the care of Akbar's Kachawāha mother-in-law, Bhār Mal's wife.

Akbar considered the Rājput chiefs so faithful that he assigned the charge of surveillance of the Royal Harem to them. Among the Rājputs, Kachawahās were the favourites of Akbar for this job. Rām Dās Udawat and Rāisal Darbārī were entrusted with the charge of looking after the harem. The Rājput chiefs were also relied for guarding the chauki where the Mughal Emperors

1. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.15.

2. Akbar Nāma, II, p.373. Sujān Rāi Bhandārī (Khulāsat-ut Tawārikh, p.374) informs us that Jahāngir was born of Bhār Mal's daughter. But this appears rather improbable and near contemporary authorities. Secondly, the manner in which Jahāngir's upbringing is recorded in Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī (pp.40-41) suggests that soon after he was born, he was given in the care of Shaikh Salīm Chishti's daughter. If the mother of the baby had been a Kachawāha lady, as suggested by Sujān Rāi, there is no reason, why the chroniclers would not have indicated it. It would also look extraordinary that in such a case, the new born baby (Dāniyāl) would have been separated from his mother and given in the care of another lady. If Akbar could trust his Kachawāha mother-in-law, Bhār Mal's wife, in the case of Dāniyāl, why would he not similarly show trust for a child who was related to her more closely. Lastly, if Jahāngir's mother had been a Kachawāha lady, the Jesuite of Jahāngir's reign would not have been highlighted only the fact of Khusraw's having been born of a Hindū woman. See, Jahangīr & Jesuite, tr., C.H. Payne, p.111.

used to encamp in the course of their journey. In 1596-97, Rāgho Dās Kachawāha is known to have guarded the chauki of Akbar in Punjab. Similarly, in 1606-07, Keshe Dās Māru Rāthor was appointed to guard the chauki of Jahāngir.

It would be wrong to suppose that after Rājput princesses were taken into marriages by the Mughal Emperors, all contacts were stopped between them and their parents. As a matter of fact, these marriages promoted more frequent and closer social inter-course between the Mughal ruling family and their Rājput-in-laws. There are ample evidences to show that the Rājput wives of the Mughal rulers would occasionally visit their parents and relatives. It is recorded in Akbar Nāme that in 1573, Akbar's Kachawāha wife visited Āmber to condole with her parents over the death of their son, Bhupat, killed during Gujarāt campaign. According to a Rājput chronicle, in 1627, Shāh Jahān sent his Rāthor wife to Jodhpur to influence her relatives to support him against other contenders for the throne.

2. Ibid., p.85.
3. M.L. Reychaudhury assumes that the Hindū wives of the Muslims were all dead to the family of their fathers and the social inter-course between the Rājput nobles and their daughters came to about after marrying their daughters to the Muslims. The Din-i Ilahi, p.143.
At times the Mughal Emperors would personally visit their Rajput-in-laws on the occasion of death and marriages. In 1594, Prince Salīm went to Āmber to condole with his brother-in-law, Mān Singh, on the demise of Bhagwant Dās, who had died in 1589.\(^1\) In August 1601, when Rām Dās's son Din Mīn Dās died, Akbar went to the house of Rām Dās to condole with him.\(^2\) In May 1638, when Gaj Singh expired, Prince Murād went to the house of Jaswant Singh to condole with him.\(^3\) When Raja Gaj Singh of Jodhpur was on death-bed, Shāh Jahān went to see him at his house.\(^4\) The Mughal Emperors also used to visit their Rajput-in-laws on the occasions of marriages and such other ceremonies in the family. In 1569, after the fall of Ranthambor, Akbar visited Bhagwan Dās's quarter and participated in a feast.\(^5\) In 1601, Akbar personally went to the house of Rām Dās on the occasion of the marriage of the latter's daughter with Shyām Singh.

---

4. Nuskehā-i Dilkusha, f.64b.
and presented to the couple five lakh dāms.¹ According to Muhta Nainsī, Akbar had taken personal interest in arranging the match of Durjan Singh Shaikhawat's daughter with Sur Singh Rāthor of Jodhpur.² In October 1654, Prince Dāra Shukoh conveyed his congratulations to Mirza Rāja Jai Singh on the birth of his grandson.³

It would appear that this climate of cordiality and close social bonds between the Mughal rulers and their Rājpūt-in-laws, particularly the Kachawāhas and the Rāthrōs, was not disturbed in any significant manner down to Shāh Jahan's reign. It is known that when Jaswant Singh married Bīrām Dēv Sisodia's daughter in 1655, Shāh Jahan made a present of ten thousand rupees to the couple.⁴ One may thus conclude that during Jahāngīr's reign, this kind of social contacts between the ruling family and the Kachawāha and the Rāthor clans were maintained in the same manner as under Akbar. Apparently, these were considered routine matters and therefore, were not reported in the chronicles. It is possible that sometime after Jahāngīr's

2. Muhta Nainsī-re-Khvāt, I, p.325.
3. Descriptive List of Farmāns, Manṣūre and Niṣhāna, p.33.
accession these contacts were temporarily interrupted owing to
his estranged relations with Mān Singh resulting from the
latter's support of Khusrau's candidature on the issue of
succession. However, it is known on good authority that the
Kachawāha chiefs were rehabilitated in Jahāngīr's favour after
1608 and close social contact between the royal family and the
family of Kachawāha chiefs were fully resumed.

One interesting aspect of the consequences that
flowed from the matrimonial alliances and consequential close
contacts at a social and cultural level between the Mughal ruling
family and various Rājput clans was the setting in motion of a
process of limited kind of Islāmization among the Rājput clans
enrolled in the Mughal service. This process manifested itself
mainly in the form of growing interest particularly among the
Kachawāhas in the Persian language and their involvement in the
literary and cultural tradition handed down through the medium
of Persian language. Among the Kachawāhas in Jahāngīr's service,
Rāo Manohar Shaikhāwat (pen name 'Tausanī') was regarded as a
distinguished Persian poet.¹ Badāuni while praising 'Tausanī's
'intellectual power' remarks, "since a Hindū had so much poetic
genius and ecstatic feeling, I have recorded these verses".² Even

Jahangir who had a rather dim view of the intellectual powers of the members of the Kachawaha clan acknowledges Rao Manohar’s proficiency in Persian language and goes on to remark that he was not ‘without intelligence’.

It seems the impact of Islamic tradition on Rao Manohar’s family was quite considerable which must have been partly the consequence of their acquaintance with the Persian literature. As a youth Rao Manohar was called Muhammad Manohar by his family members. Later on, after he came under Akbar’s influence, he seems to have dropped ‘Muhammad’ from his name and came to be addressed as Mirzã Manohar.

Mirzã Manohar’s surviving Persian verses shed interesting light on the cultural outlook of the sections of the Kachawaha nobility that have already been exposed to one or the other degree to the influence of Islamic tradition in


2. It is said that during the 14th century, Mokal, the ancestor of Rao Manohar had no issue. He became a father through the blessings of Sheikh Burhân. Thus he named his son as Sheikhjî. Therefore, he became patriarch of the Shaikhâwât branch. According to the Sheikh’s preaching, the Shaikhâwât do not eat pork and all meat in which blood remains. *Zekhîrāt-ul Khâwâniyûn*, Ms. p.110; *Bânke Deâ re Khvâhte*, p.130; *Ma‘âşir-ul Umaré*, II, 170-72.


India. His poetry permeates with a monotheistic approach and in harmony with intellectual attitude then current in Hindūstān, tends to conform to the philosophy of sulh-i-kul. He goes out of his way in ridiculing and decrying the dogmatic attitudes. This kind of non-dogmatic and sympathetic attitude towards Islam religion and its followers was also the hallmark of the attitude of many other Kachawāha nobles serving under Jahāngīr. For instance, Mān Singh, who had refused to be enrolled as Akbar’s murid so bluntly is credited with building the jāmā

1. The following are the verses of Manohar:

For references, see 

1. Muntakhab-ut Tawārīkh, III, pp.201-2; 
Ma‘ṣīr-i Rāhimi, I, pp.259-56; 
Zakhiyat-ul Khawātin, I, p.220; 
Dabistān-i Mazāhib, p.152; 
Ma‘ṣīr-ul Umarā, II, p.117. For more complete, see Mirāt-ul Alam, I, p.556.

Masjid of Lāhore and Rāj Mahal. Mān Singh is also known to have given a madaḍ-i maʿāsh grant of 14 bighas of land in pargana Hajipur from his jāgīr for the maintenance of the tomb of a Muslim saint. On the other hand the Rājput chiefs also brought with them the Hindi poets. Suraj Singh brought a poet from the Charan community and introduced him to Jahnāgīr. The latter liked his poetry and presented an elephant to him. Mirza Abūr Rahīm is known to have been well-versed in Hindi and Sanskrit. He used to compose poems in Hindi. Further, it is known from the Zakhlrat-ul Khawānīn that Mān Singh provided liberal facilities to his Muslim retainers for observing their religious duties. But this did not mean that Mān Singh and his fellow Kachawahā chiefs were no longer Hindūs. On the contrary, there is evidence showing that they looked with disapproval on any suggestion that they should accept Islām. They would go to the extent of even ridiculing a person making such a proposal. When

1. Zakhlrat-ul Khawānīn, I, pp.107-8. Bānī Prasād, the annotator of Maṣāīr-ul Umārā (I, p.405, f.n.3) incorrectly says that the mosque was built by Aurangzeb.
3. Madaḍ-i Maʿāsh grant. For text, see R.N. Prasad, Raja Man Singh of Amber, p.172.
5. Vir Vinod, p.231.
Shāh Daulat, a Muslim saint, asked the Rāja to accept Islām, he ironically replied that it was not in his power to do so, unless the seal put on his heart is removed, and therefore, the saint should first pray to God to remove this seal and make him inclined towards Islām, and only then he could accept Islām.¹

The Kachawāh nobles had close friendly relations with the high nobles of Tūrānī as well as Irānī origin. For instance, Mān Singh was particularly close to Ābdur Rahīm Khān-i Khānān, an Irānī by origin. According to Farid Bhakkari, the sons of Ābdur Rahīm Khān-i Khānān used to address Mān Singh as dadaji. While the latter on his part used to pay them some kind of pocket money allowance regularly.² It is known that when Khān-i Khānān got victory over Pindāra in Deccan, there he got an icon of four armed Vishnu which he presented to Rāja Suraj Singh.³ Similarly, Mān Singh was very close to Āzīz Koka, the senior most Tūrānī noble of the realm. As already noticed, both of them were a party to the move of a section of the nobility to place Khursau on the throne after Akbar. After Jahāngīr's

---


³. Rieu, I, p.196. This icon is known to have been preserved in Jodhpur Fort.
accession, when Man Singh was planning to withdraw to Bengal, ‘Azīz Koka had sent his family members to the Rāja’s residence at Āgra so that they might accompany him.¹ When Rām Dās was on military expeditions in the Deccan, he hosted a dinner to ‘Abdullah Khān and other nobles.²

Mahābat Khān who had Rājput retainers in large numbers in his contingent had established very close relations with them. When he gave his daughter in marriage to Khwāja Naqshbandī, Jahāngīr objected and sent some nobles to bring Mahābat Khān’s daughter to the court. Mahābat Khān became much perturbed. But when the Rājputs came to know the fact, they assured him that at any cost his daughter, whom they considered their daughter too, would not be allowed to be taken from them until their death.³ Mahābat Khān’s closeness with the Rājputs is also borne out by a number of cases in which he recommended to assign mansāb to Rājput chiefs. On the recommendation of Mahābat Khān, Jahāngīr assigned mansāb to Pratāp Singh Chauhān and his brother Kishan Singh Chauhān.⁴ Similarly, at the time of his father’s

¹. Derbār-i Akbar (Hindi), p.124.
². Dutch Chronicle of Mughal India, p.62.
⁴. Ibid., p.115.
death, Rao Karan of Bikaner was minor but on Mahabat Khan's recommendation, he was taken into the imperial service. In 1634, when Mahabat Khan died, the Rajputs brought his corpse from Burhanpur to Delhi. Further, one knows that when camp of Prince Azam's wife was surrounded by the Marathas, the Haras offered their lives in defence of her camp by exclaiming that "the honour of the Chaghtais is one with the honour of the Rajputs".

On the occasion of the festival of holi, Bahadur Khan used to visit his Rajput friends. In 1672, on holi festival, Bahadur Khan, who was in Deccan, visited the houses of Raja Subhan Singh, Rao Rai Singh Rathor, Raja Anup Singh Rathor and Muhkam Singh Chandrawat. His sons Mir Ahsan and Mir Mohsin used to pray with the Rajputs.

After Jaswant Singh's death, his two wives Rani Jademdi and Rani Kachawahi gave birth to two sons in Lahore. At the birth ceremony, a number of Muslim nobles were invited to attend the function. They offered presents. Sarbuland Khan,  

2. Ma'sair-ul Umarat, II (tr.), p.27.  
Kābulī Khān, Aṣad Khān and Ināyat Khān made presents of Rs.50,000
Rs.40,000, Rs.25,000 and Rs.20,000 respectively. Subsequently,
when the message of the birth of the two princes reached Jodhpur
Nawāb Khān-ī Jahān Bahādur Khān and Tāhir Beg faujdār went to
congratulate to Rānī Deorī, a widow of Jaswant Singh. She
felicitated Nawāb Bahādur Khān and Tāhir Beg with the presents
of mohāra and studded turbans. Khān-ī Jahān Bahādur Khān
looked upon Jaswant Singh as his brother. Therefore, after
Jaswant Singh's death, he was also in favour of Ajit Singh's
succession. He was against the policy of Aurangzeb for destr-
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Chapter VIII

RAJPUT CHIEFS IN THE WAR OF SUCCESSION

Athar Ali has established beyond any reasonable doubt that the war of succession was not a fight among the different religious groups. The groups of nobles who participated in the struggle in favour of the contending princes for the throne cut across the religious and racial barriers. From Athar Ali's list of mansabdars of 1600 and above, who supported the Mughal princes, it is evident that even the Rajput nobles individually sided with the rival Mughal princes according to their own interests or choice.\(^1\) However, in this chapter, first we shall examine, who among the Rajput chiefs supported Dara Shukoh and Aurangzeb and what was the attitude of these princes towards the Rajput nobles? Secondly, what were the reasons which prompted different Rajput nobles to side with the contending princes?

At the time of Shāh Jahān's critical illness in September 1637 and later on the rumour of his death prompted Prince Shāh Shuja, who was in Bengal, set out for Agra in hope of

---

getting succession. This was greatly resented by Shāh Jahan who immediately sent Sulaiman Shukoh with Mirza Rāja Jai Singh and Anirudh Singh Gaur to check Prince Shuja. At this time, Mirza Raja was promoted to 6000/6000 with 5000 do aspa sūn aspa, and Anirudh Singh was raised to 3500/3000 with do aspa sūn aspa.  

Furthermore, all commanders including the Rajputs, who had been sent from the Imperial Court to the Deccan to serve with Aurangzeb were recalled. In accordance with the order, Shatruśāl Heda, Mahābat Khān and Najābat Khān were the first to move to Agra. Others who followed Shatruśāl and Mahābat Khān included Debi Singh Bundela, Sujan Singh Bundela, Amar Singh Chandrawat and Rām Singh Kachawaha, Rāja Karan Singh of Bikaner, leaving behind his two sons Keerī Singh and Pem Singh with Aurangzeb, made his way to his watan Bikaner. Afterwards, throughout the war of succession Karan Singh stayed at Bikaner, which suggests that he adopted an indifferent attitude towards the struggle. But unlike other chieftains, even after Aurangzeb’s

1. Ámāl-i Śāliḥ, III, p.277.
2. Ibid., p.278; Ma'āṣir-ul Umarā', II, pp.276-77.
accession, he continued to stay within his chiefdom prompting Aurangzab to order an expedition in August 1660 under the command of Aamir Khan Khawaf.1 If one goes to the background of Karan's attitude, would find that in 1654, when Prince Aurangzab went to Deccan, Karan's mansab was curtailed.2 Further, in 1655, when the Prince made a tajwiz to raise Karan's mansab, Shahn Jahang turned it down.3 This must have displeased the Rao, though it is not clear why he should have become unsympathetic to Aurangzab, who had recommended his promotion.

As Mured revolted in Gujarat and Aurangzab made preparations to join him, steps had to be taken by the Imperial Court to counter any moves they might make. To block the possible route of Rajputana, Dera Shukoh who was with Shahn Jahang in Agra contacted Akhay Raj Deora of Sirohi and Rana Raj Singh of Mewar. Dera Shukoh in his nishan dated 4th October 1657 instructed Rao Akhay Raj to adopt every possible measures to prevent Aurangzab and Mured from entering his territory. The Rao was

1. Ma'asir-Á'lamgiri, p.32; Ma'asir-ul Umará, II, pp.287-90.
2. This has been pointed out by Prince Aurangzab in his letter to Mirzâ Raja Jai Singh. The nishan is preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner, S.N.221, old N.69; see also, Ma'asir-ul Umará, II, pp.287-90.
3. Adab-Á'lamgiri, MS. ff.37b, 38a; Raudât-i Á'lamgiri, pp.114-15.
also asked that if he required assistance, he could get from Jaksura where Raja Jaswant Singh's forces were stationed. Eventually, Akhey Røj was warned of the disastrous results if joined Prince Murâd. In February 1658, Dâra Shukoh also wrote to Râna Røj Singh of Mewar for assistance. He asked the Râna that either he should send two thousand troopers or he should join the imperial force personally against Aurangzeb.

On the other hand, Aurangzeb sent a khilât and jewelled ring to the Râna and solicited his support. Aurangzeb also promised the Râna to restore all the territories annexed from Mewar in 1654 as a punishment for his fortification of Chittor. Further, Aurangzeb in his nishân assured the Râna that he would follow the religious policy of his ancestors, declaring that "a king who practises intolerance toward the religion of another is a rebel against God".

Meanwhile, on 14th February 1658, the forces of Sulaiman Shukoh and Prince Shuja met at Bahâdurpur near Banaras;

1. For Dâra Shukoh's nishân to Rao Akhay Røj of Sirsi, see Vir Vined, pp.1106-7.
2. For Dâra Shukoh's nishân to Râna Røj Singh, see Vir Vined, pp.432-35.
3. For Aurangzeb's nishân to Râna Røj Singh, see Vir Vined, pp.423-26.
Shujā was defeated and fled towards Bengāl. On the way, Rāja Gopāl Ujjainya, who had been granted the mansab of 1000/800 recently, plundered the forces of Shujā. In reward, the booty obtained by him was left to him. Shāh Jahān also congratulated Jai Singh and in reward his mansab was raised to 7000/6000 with 5000 do aspa sin aspa.  

In order to meet the threat from Murād and Aurangzēba, Shāh Jahān appointed Rāja Jaswant Singh with a number of Rājput nobles to assume charge of Mālwa. The Rāja was promoted to 7000/7000 + 6000 do aspa sin aspa with the title of Maharāj. 

In the Hukumat-ra-Bahi, we find the list of mansabdāres who were attached with Jaiwānt Singh for Mālwa. From this list, it is evident that 75 Rājput nobles were despatched with the Maharāj. Most of these were Rathores, being 13 in number and holding the mansab of 17,450/19,930. Sisodias were next with total mansab of 13,600/7,550. The third and fourth were the Hādas and Gaurs.

---

1. This was mentioned in Prince Dāra Shukoh's nişān to Mīrzā Rāja Jai Singh. The nishān is preserved in Rājasthān State Archives, Bīkāner, S.N.232, Old N.86.  

2. This was pointed out in Prince Dāra Shukoh's nişān to Rāo Akhāy Rāj of Sirohī; op. cit.  

3. 'Ama'l-i Šālih, III, p.279; In Ma'āṣir-ul Ummārī, II, pp.575-77 at this time, his mansab is mentioned as 7000/7000 with 5000 do aspa sin aspa.  

4. 'Ama'l-i Šālih, III, p.285; Ma'āṣir-i 'Ālamgīrī, pp.3-4; Hukumat-ra-Bahi, p.3.
with mansabs of 9,300/7,040 and 9,200/5,405 respectively. Six Bundela and eight Kachwaha nobles carrying the mansabs of 5,750/5,750 and 4,850/3,650 were also included. Among other clans there were 5 Chandrawat, 6 Jhala and 7 Chauhans with total mansab of 2,900/1,445, 2,700/1,130 and 2,200/1,505 respectively. There was one each from Ghelot, Bhadohiya and Tunwar clans, holding the mansabs of 1000/1,200, 1000/800 and 1000/500.¹ After reaching Malwa, Siv Ram Gaur was appointed the qilladar of the fort of Mandu.²

On the other hand, the Rajput nobles Subh Karan Bundela, Bhagwant Singh Hada, Manohar Das Hada, Karan Khichdi, Raja Sarangdhar, Raghu Nath Singh Rathor and Indraman Dhandhera accompanied Aurangzeb to the North.³ Here, it is noteworthy that some of the Rajput chiefs who sided with Aurangzeb might have had cause for animosity against Shah Jahān or they were of the minor position. For instance, Shah Jahān had taken away the zamindari of Dhandhera from Indraman and conferred it

---

1. See the list, attached to the end of this Chapter.
2. 'Aalamgir Nama, pp.95, 102; Ma'asir-ul Umarī, II, p.265.
Moreover, Indrman had been arrested and imprisoned in the fort of Junair. When Aurangzeb started for the north, he released him and awarded him the mansab of 3000/2000. Subh Karan Bundala because of Aurangzeb’s personal invitation came and joined his service. He was granted the mansab of 1000 zat. Raja Sarangdhar held a minor position in the Mughal hierarchy. He held the mansab of 700/500. In absence of information regarding the mansab of the other nobles in the sources one may safely presume that they had previously held mansab lower than 500 zat. Apparently, no very high Rajput noble initially supported Aurangzeb, while two high Muslim nobles Najabat Khan (5000/5000) and Zulfiqar Khan (4000/2000) sided with Aurangzeb.

Champat Bundala, who had rebelled against Shah Jahan, was persuaded by Subh Karan to take Aurangzeb’s service.  

---

3. Ibid.  
6. Ather Ali in his list of mansabdārs, who supported Aurangzeb, has shown that Bhagwant Singh Hāda held the mansab of 2500/800. Actually, Bhagwant Singh seems to have been given this mansab after the battle of Samungazar. Mughal Nobility Under Aurangzeb, pp.121-130; Alangīmāwa, p.190.  
quently, Champat helped Aurangzeb to cross the river Chambal from an unknown little ford. In reward Aurangzeb assigned him the mansab of 5000 zat.

Before the battle of Dharmat, Dara Shukoh in his nishan, dated 11th April 1658, again instructed Rao Akhay Raj of Sirohi for not allowing Prince Murad to enter his territory. He was told that any booty seized by him from Murad, would be awarded to him. However, Murad did not take the road to Ajmer at all, but joined Aurangzeb for a dash into Malwa.

Eventually, on 15th April 1659, the battle of Dharmat was fought in which Jaswant Singh was defeated; a number of Rajput nobles under him were killed. Prominent among them were Sujan Singh Sisodia, Ballu Chauhan, Mukund Singh Hada, Mohan Singh Kanha, Jujhar Singh Hada, Dayal Das Jhala, Arjun Gaur,

2. Brissac, p.164; Bernier, p.43. But in Alamgir Name (p.78), his mansab is mentioned as 1000/500. It is exaggerated in Chait Prakash: "When Aurangzeb ascended the throne, he distinguished Raja Champat with great honours, granted him a mansab, or command, of twelve thousand men, and a jagir free of revenue, from Deraha to Mulkumar, and thence to the Jumna. A History of the Bundelas, p.34.
3. For Dara Shukoh’s nishan to Rao Akhay Raj, see Vir Vinod, pp.1109-10.
Raja Jaswant Singh fled to Jodhpur. Similarly, Amar Singh Chandrawat, Raja Raja Singh Sisodia, Raja Sujan Singh Bundela fled to their home principalities.

Debi Singh Bundela and Amar Singh Narwas who were with Jaswant Singh now defeated to Murad and Aurangzeb respectively. Saun Singh, chief of Kalibhit and Alam Singh Gaur, chief of Gunnur also submitted to Aurangzeb. We can here see that the chiefs, whose watana, situated around the vicinity of the route from Dharmat to Agra, were forced by circumstances to join the victorious Prince Aurangzeb. But in the case of Allah Singh Gaur, additional factor moved him to join Aurangzeb. Alam Singh had been antagonised by Shah Jahan who had wrested the fort of Gunnur from his predecessor and assigned it to Muhammad Šaikh. Any way this exodus of the Rajput nobles was

1. 'Alamgir Namâ, pp.66, 70; Wechnika, p.93.
2. Ma'asir-i 'Alamgiri, p.3.
3. 'Alamgir Namâ, pp.70-71; Ma'asir-ul Umarâ; II, pp.146-48; Viz Vird, 986-87.
4. 'Alamgir Namâ, pp.70-72; Mirāt-ul 'Alam, p.31; Ma'asir-ul Umarâ' II, pp.297-301, 292-94.
6. ibid.
not unique in the sense that at the same time, nobles belonging to other sections of the nobility also defected to the victorious Prince. One can enumerate the cases of Nasiri Khan, Diler Khan Afghan, Mukhlas Khan and Saifuddin Mahmud who now joined Aurangzeb. They were awarded high mansabs and lofty titles by Aurangzeb.

Both the Princes Dara Shukoh and Aurangzeb started preparations for the next battle. Shah Jahan in his firman dated April 25th, 1658, apprised Mirza Raja Jai Singh of the defeat of Jaswant Singh in the battle of Dharmat; the Mirza Raja was asked to join Dara Shukoh in the ensuing struggle. But it seems that Jai Singh remained busy with Sulaiman Shukoh in pursuing Prince Shuja. There, Jai Singh distinguished himself in subduing the fort of Monghyr. Consequently, Bahraj, remainder of Monghyr deserted Prince Shuja and joined the imperial forces in pursuing the fleeing Shuja. Again, Mirza Raja Jai

2. Ibid.
Singh along with Sulaiman Shukoh was summoned to Agra but the Raja seems to have been tardy in compliance with the imperial order. Therefore, now Shah Jahan in a complaining tone stressed the necessity of his presence in the ensuing battle with Aurangzeb. 1

If one goes to the background to search out the causes behind the Mirza Raja's lack of enthusiasm towards Dara Shukoh, one would find that in the third campaign of Qandhar (1653 AD), the relation between them had become greatly strained. Dara Shukoh asked the Raja to make an assault on the fort of Qandhar, but he refused with the plea, "we Rajputs are not very clever in digging trenches and siege work. Better let the Prince hand over this battery to whomever he pleases". Upon further persuasion by the Prince, Jai Singh categorically replied, "The assault cannot be made by me. Your Royal Highness may inflict any punishment for this fault of mine. I have no more business with Qandhar". 2 Moreover, it seems that Jai Singh

1. Shah Jahan's farman to Jai Singh, Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner, old n.122, s.n.96.

2. Letsif-ul Akhbar, 35a, 157b. For more exchange of such dialogues between Dara and the Raja, see (Ibid., 20a, 184b) where Dara in a sarcastic manner says: "this is the third time that you have come to Qandhar. If you fail this time also.....how will you show your face to the women of Hindustan"? Manucci (I, p.229) says that Dara once insulted Jai Singh by humorously remarking that the Raja looked like a musician. See Qanungo's Dara Shukoh, pp.53,61.
was annoyed with Shah Jahan because of the growing affluence of the newly inducted Rajput clans in the Mughal hierarchy which were overshadowing the Kachwaha chiefs who once had enjoyed the leading position among the Rajput nobles. Jai Singh had inimical relations with Raja Bithal Das Gaur, who had become a favourite of the King after his accession. This is borne out by Dara Shukoh's nishan in which he instructed the Raja to maintain cordial relations with Bithal Das, 1

On the other hand, Aurangzeb conveying the news of his victory of Dharmat to Rana Raj Singh, sought his help. 2 But in the absence of the response of the Rana in the sources, one may suppose that the Rana still avoided siding with any of the rival Princes.

In the battle of Sanugarh, Dara Shukoh was defeated and he had to flee towards Delhi and then the Punjab. In this battle Rajput nobles Rup Singh, 3 Ram Singh Rathor, Shatrusal Hada, Siv Ram, Bhim and Arjun Gaur, 4 fighting on Dara Shukoh's

1. Dara Shukoh's nishan to Jai Singh, Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner, Old N.87, S.N.223.
2. For Aurangzeb's nishan (dated May 1658) to Rana Raj Singh, see Viz Vinaid, pp.419-24.
3. Alamgir Name, pp.95, 105; Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, p.265.
side, lost their lives. On the side of Murād and Aurangzeb, Garib Dās Sīodē was killed and Subh Karam Bundela was severely injured. Another Bundela chief Debi Singh was rewarded by Aurangzeb through appointment as feujdār of Bhīlā.¹

After Samongazi, some more important Rājput nobles defected to Aurangzeb. Kunwar Ram Singh Kachawaha deserted Dārā Shukho and joined Aurangzeb.² Similarly, Ram Singh's father Mirza Rāja Jai Singh and Rai Rai Singh Rathor of Nagor who were with Sulaiman Shukho abandoned him and joined Aurangzeb at Mathura.³ In reward, Aurangzeb assigned a jāgīr worth one crore dāna to the Mirza Rāja.⁴ Sīodē chief Rāi Rāi Singh who after the battle of Dharmat had gone to Mewār came back and joined the service of Aurangzeb.⁵ Others who joined Aurangzeb

⁴ 1. Mirāt-ul-'Alam, p.51; Muḥta Naini-re-Khvāt, I, p.31.
⁵ 4. Ibid., II, pp.251-55.
⁶ 5. Ibid., pp.239-37, 569-75; Vīr Vinēd, II, p.685. Manucci says that Aurangzeb did not rely on the Mirza Rāja and therefore Aurangzeb instead of assigning him any important charge, sent him to Sambhar as 'governor' of that place. Shaheen-de-Hamir, I, p.305.
included Kalyan Singh Baghela, Aniruch Gaur, Bhas Singh Hada, Kirit Singh Kachawaha, Girdhar Das Gaur, Sabal Singh Sisodia, Jagat Singh Hada, Suraj Mal and Manohar Das Gaur. Thus after this decisive victory one by one almost all the Rajput nobles submitted to Aurangzeb.

Rajrup, chief of Mau-Nurpur in compliance with the imperial order had joined Dara Shukoh, at the time of his flight from Agra to Lahore. But later on when he saw Dara's weak position, he retired home. Subsequently, when Aurangzeb succeeded in bringing the Punjab under his sway, Rajrup joined Khalilullah Khan in the Punjab. He was now promoted to 3500/3500 and appointed thanedar of Chandi, situated on the border of the principality of Srinagar-Garhwal.

When Sulaiman Shukoh engaged in his campaign against Shuja came to know about his father's defeat, he wanted to join

1. Alamgir Name, pp. 220-21. Athar Ali has shown that before the battle of Sambongar, Rana Raj Singh, Rajrup Kohistani and Man Singh of Guler were with Aurangzeb but from a close scrutiny of the sources cited by Athar Ali, one finds that these nobles joined Aurangzeb after his victory in the battle of Samongar. The Mughal Nobility under Aurangzeb, pp. 121-130.


3. Alamgir Name, pp. 179-199.
his father by marching through the route of Saharanpur. But Rajrup, who was the thanadar of Chandi, prevented him from doing so and forced him to retire to Srinagar where the chief Prithvi Raj extended hospitality to him. He also gave his daughter in marriage to Suleiman Shukoh. In January 1656, when Prithvi Raj's dominions had been threatened by an imperial expedition, Dara Shukoh had obliged him by introducing his son Hidini Ray to the King and securing him pardon.

In order to prevent any chance of Raja Jaswant Singh's collaborating with Dara Shukoh, Aurangzeb summoned the Raja from Jodhpur. In response, Jaswant Singh despatched a contingent under the command of his sardar Mahesh Das. Subsequently, Jaswant Singh himself joined Aurangzeb at the bank of Sutlej in Punjab during the latter's pursuit of Dara Shukoh. Aurangzeb's victory in the battle of Sanongar prompted Rana Raj Singh to congratulate the victor. The Rana sent his

1. AlamgirNama, pp.142-143, 178-179; Storia de Mogar, I, p.130.
2. Tarikh-i Shah Shuja'i, M.S. pp.153b, 156a.
5. AlamgirNama, p.183; Ma'āṣir-i Alamgiri, p.3; Hukumat-re-Bahā, p.34.
son Sultan Singh and uncle Hari Singh to congratulate Aurangzeb. Aurangzeb giving no chance to Dara Shukoh to win over the Rana at any stage, promoted him from 5000/5000 to 6000/6000 + 1000 do aspa sih aspa. In accordance with his earlier promises, he assigned pargana Mandelgarh, Badnor and Giyaspur to the Rana. Moreover, Dungarpur, Banswara and Devalya whose chiefs had fought against Aurangzeb were also assigned as cha\'ir\textsuperscript{\textdegree}amli j\textsuperscript{\textdegree}aqir\textsuperscript{\textdegree} to the Rana. In addition, two crore d\textsuperscript{\textdegree}ama were also granted to him in in\textsuperscript{\textdegree}am\textsuperscript{\textdegree}.

Aurangzeb’s pursuit of Dara Shukoh, left Agra open to an attack from Shuja. When Aurangzeb came to know about Shuja’s move towards Agra, he immediately decided to return. The forces of Aurangzeb and Shuja came face to face at Khajwa. Before the battle, Suraj Singh Bundela defected from Aurangzeb’s camp and went to his home Orchha. But two other Bundela chiefs Subh Karan and Indraman who aided with Aurangzeb distinguished themselves in the battle. Subh Karan’s younger brother Prithvi Raja succumbed to injuries. Raja Jaswant Singh who was with

1. 
2. Aurangzeb’s parg\textsuperscript{\textdegree}an to Rana R\textsuperscript{\textdegree}aj Singh, dated August 16, 1658, reproduced in the Vir Vinod, II, pp.432-38.
3. Bhima Sen, N\textsuperscript{\textdegree}akha\textsuperscript{\textdegree}i Dilkush\textsuperscript{\textdegree}, tr. p.16.
4. Ibid.
Aurangzeb made a secret compact with Shuja and left the battle field and hastened home.\(^1\) Now Aurangzeb, in retaliation ordered him deposed, and the chiefship of Jodhpur was conferred upon the Raja's nephew Rai Rai Singh.\(^2\) He was also raised to the \textit{mangab} of 4000/4000.\(^3\) Pargana Merta, Jaitaran, Sojat, Siwana and Phalodi were confiscated from Raja Jaswant Singh and assigned to Rai Rai Singh. Muhammad Amin Khan, Mir Bakhshi was sent to seize Jodhpur from the Raja.\(^4\)

Meanwhile Dara Shukoh, who had retired from the Punjab, had reached Gujarat via Sind. Jaswant Singh contacted and persuaded him for not going towards the Deccan and asked him to march against Aurangzeb.\(^5\) Accordingly, Dara set out for Ajmer and on his way, he succeeded in securing the help of Rao Akhay Raj of Sirohi.\(^6\) When Aurangzeb came to know about these developments, he decided to march to Ajmer. Prince Muhammad 

\(^1\) \textit{Amal-i Salih}, III, pp.323, 329; \textit{Hukumat-re-Bahi}, pp.34-36.

\(^2\) \textit{Alamgir Name}, p.288; \textit{Hukumat-re-Bahi}, pp.35-36.

\(^3\) \textit{Hukumat-re-Bahi}, p.36.

\(^4\) \textit{Ibid.}; \textit{Me'asir-i Alamgiri}, p.17; Bernier, p.85.

\(^5\) \textit{Me'asir-i Alamgiri}, p.18; \textit{Alamgir Name}, p.300; Waqiat-i Alamgiri, pp.109-11. But in \textit{Hukumat-re-Bahi} (p.36), it is stated that Dara Shukoh sent his son Sipah Shukoh to Jaswant Singh for help.

\(^6\) \textit{Hukumat-re-Bahi}, p.36.
Sultan and Muazzam Khan (Mir Jumla) along with such Rajput nobles as Amar Singh Chandrawat, Sujan Singh Bundela, Subh Karan Bundela, Indraman Dhandhera, Ram Singh Rajawat, Kunwar Sardar Singh Sisodia and Shao Singh Hada, Chatur Bhuj Chauhan were left behind to pursue Shuja. The march of Aurangzeb towards Ajmer, bewildered Jaswant Singh who contacted Mirza Raja Jai Singh to arrange a reconciliation with Aurangzeb. Mirza Raja secured pardon for Jaswant Singh with the condition that he would not help Dara Shukoh. Consequently, in the battle of Deorai, Jaswant Singh did not lend any support to Dara Shukoh. Now Aurangzeb countermanded his earlier order and restored Jodhpur and the title of Maharaja to Jaswant Singh. In this battle, Raja Rajrup played a distinguished part on the side of Aurangzeb. Dara Shukoh and his forces settled their camps in the Aravalli ranges which appeared quite strongly protected. But Rajrup and his soldiers who were experienced in

3. Wagiat-i Alamgiri, p.126; Alamgir Name, pp.221, 231; Ma'asir-ul Umara, II, 305-6. He was the son of Shatrujai Hada. After Shatrujai's death in the battle of Ramongar, Shao Singh joined Aurangzeb's service with the mansab of 3000/2000 and the title of Rau.
5. Hukumat-re-Bahi, p.37. See also Bernier, p.86.
climbing and fighting in the hilly regions succeeded in attacking Dara's forces from the back of the mountainside. Eventually, Dara and his forces were routed and fled towards Thatta. Mirza Raja Jai Singh and Bahadur Khan pursued Dara Shukoh. Near the Bolan Pass a local chief Jiwan arrested Dara Shukoh and his younger son Sipihr Shukoh and handed them over to the imperial forces. Subsequently, they both were executed. Jai Singh and Bahadur Khan were renumerated with the presentation of 200 and 100 horses respectively. In addition, Jai Singh received one lakh rupees as a gift.

Aurangzeb now turned towards Sulaiman Shukoh who was with Prithvi Raj in Srinagar. Aurangzeb despatched Rajrup and Kunwar Ram Singh to deal with Prithvi Raj. On persuasion by Jai Singh, Prithvi Raj surrendered Sulaiman Shukoh to the imperial forces.

Thus it emerges that initially the majority of the Rajput chiefs espoused Shah Jahan's and Dara Shukoh's cause,

1. Alamgir Nama, p.293; Ma'asir-ul Umera, II, pp.279-81.
3. Ibid., pp.27, 28.
deeming it to be their obligation to the throne. Even after
the battle of Dharmat, the powerful Rājput chiefs instead of
joining Aurangzeb either fled to their chiefdoms or remained
with Dāra Shukoh. Only a small section of the Rājput nobles
who were aggrieved with the imperial authorities went over
to Aurangzeb. But after the decisive battle of Sāmangar, the
Rājput chiefs had no course except to submit to Aurangzeb.
These moves of the Rājput chieftains were not peculiar since
this was the line of conduct followed practically by all
sections of the nobility.
THE MANSABS OF RAJPUT NOBLES WHO SUPPORTED SHAH JAHAN IN THE BATTLE OF DHARMAP

-------

SISODIA

1. Raja Rai Singh s/o Bhinve 5000/5000 Hukumat-ra-Bahi, 8.
4. Fateh Singh s/o Sujan Singh 500 Ibid.
5. Daulat Singh s/o Sujan Singh 300 Ibid.
6. Ram Chand s/o Sujan Singh --- Ibid.
7. Sunder Das s/o Gokul Das 900/ 400 Ibid., 12.
8. Ram Singh s/o Man Singh 400/ 150 Ibid., 15.

GAUR

1. Udai Bhan 400/ 200 Hukumat-ra-Bahi, 8. Ibid.
2. Hari Bhan 300/ 200 Ibid.
3. Hiramani, cousin of Kirpa Ram Gaur / 40 Ibid.
4. Parshu Ram 100/ 35 Ibid.
5. Raja Shiva Ram 2500/2500 Ibid., 9.
6. Sada Ram 400/ 200 Ibid.
7. Suraj Mal s/o Shiva Ram 300/ 200 Ibid.
8. Arjun s/o Bithal Das 2000/1500 Ibid., 10; Mamuri, 89b.
10. Bhinve s/o Bithal Das 1000/ 500 Ibid.
**HARA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Homestead</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Jujhar Singh</td>
<td>400/200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Kanhi Ram</td>
<td>300/200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fateh Singh</td>
<td>200/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mohan Singh s/o Madho Singh</td>
<td>800/400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 13.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUNDELAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Homestead</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Raja Sujan Singh</td>
<td>2500/2500</td>
<td>&lt; 500</td>
<td>do aspa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sin aspa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hukumat-re-Bahi, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Indra Singh s/o Sujan Singh</td>
<td>500/500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Jag Dev s/o Narhar Das</td>
<td>400/100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Chut Rang s/o Chandraman</td>
<td>200/100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Parbat Singh s/o Chandraman</td>
<td>150/50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATHOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Homestead</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Raja Jaswant Singh</td>
<td>7000/7000</td>
<td>+ 5000</td>
<td>do aspa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sin aspa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hukumat-re-Bahi, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Fateh Singh s/o Mahesh Das</td>
<td>250/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hukumat-re-Bahi, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Mahesh Das s/o Suraj Mal</td>
<td>1000/500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., 11.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contd....
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Rupsi s/o Gordhan</td>
<td>400/50</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ratan s/o Gordhan</td>
<td>200/25</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Udal Singh s/o Ram Singh</td>
<td>100/30</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Kalyan Das s/o Mahesh Das</td>
<td>400/400</td>
<td>Ibid., p.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Maha Singh s/o Kesho Das</td>
<td>400/200</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Raja Roop Singh</td>
<td>4000/3000</td>
<td>Amal-i Salih, III, 227; Hatim Khan, 29a; Alamgir Nama, 95, 102.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHANDRAWAT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rao Amar Singh s/o Hari Singh</td>
<td>2000/1000</td>
<td>Hatim Khan, 21a; Alamgir Nama, 65, 710; Hukumat ra Bahi, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sajan Singh s/o Bithal Das</td>
<td>300/200</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Jagat Singh s/o Madho Singh</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KACHAWAHA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Raja Amar Singh Narwari</td>
<td>1500/1000</td>
<td>Hukumat ra Bahi, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Jagat Singh s/o Amar Singh</td>
<td>150/60</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Prithwi Singh s/o Jujhar Singh</td>
<td>400/400</td>
<td>Ibid., 15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GHELOT

1. Rawal Samarsi of Banswala 1000/1000 +200 do aspa
   sin aspa  Hukumat re Bahir, 11.

### CHAUHAN

1. Chattrbhuj 1000/600  Hukumat re Bahir, 11.
3. Ballu s/o Sawant Singh 700/300  Ibid.
4. Tulchi Das s/o Ballu 300/60  Ibid.
5. Narhar Das s/o Ballu 200/30  Ibid.
6. Govind Das s/o Achal Das 100/15  Ibid.
7. Rukmand s/o Prithvi Raj 500/200  Ibid.

### JHALA

1. Dayal Das s/o Narhar Das 1000/500  Hukumat re Bahir, 12.
2. Ragho Das 500/250  Ibid.
3. Indrabhan 300/100  Ibid.
4. Jagannath s/o Narhar Das 200/---  Ibid.
5. Udei Bhan s/o Jagannath 200/30  Ibid.

### SHAIKHAWAT

1. Var Singh Dev s/o Dwaraka Das 800/800 +200 do aspa
   sin aspa  Hukumat re Bahir, 12.
2. Vijay Singh s/o Dwaraka Das 300/---  Ibid.
3. Jai Chand s/o Delpat 500/250  Ibid.
4. Shyam Chand s/o Balbhadra 200/40  Ibid.
BHADURIYA

1. Maha Singh 1000/ 800 Hatim Khan, 29b;
Alamgir Nama, 30, 240;

TUNWAR

1. Kishan Singh 1000/ 500 Hatim Khan, 21a;
Alamgir Nama, 65;
Amal-i Salih, III, 467.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Rajput chiefs who constituted a powerful class within Indian society were assigned an important place in the Mughal hierarchy by Akbar. Clearly, it was these chiefs who constituted the bulk of his Rajput nobility, since Akbar had little inducement to give ranks to Rajputs who did not have a territorial base or following or, in other words, who were not already large zamindars. Once admitted to the nobility, they were treated at par with the Turānī, Irānī and other sections of the nobility. This naturally generated confidence among the Rajput chiefs. From the very beginning, Akbar cemented his bonds with them by contracting matrimonial ties with many of them. This signified to many a recognition of the high dignity of the Rajputs, rather than the reverse. Rajput chiefs, on their part, played an important role in expanding Akbar's Empire in far-flung areas. The Kachewāhās having earned the confidence of Akbar, enjoyed the highest position among the Rajput chiefs. Next in favour was the Rathor family of Bikaner, with Rāo Rāj Singh at its head. Perhaps they were the favourites of Akbar because they accepted the Mughal suzerainty almost voluntarily.
The majority of the Rājput chiefs was taken in the Imperial service from the sūba of Ajmer or Rājasthān. This was obviously to be expected since it was this sūba which contained the most powerful Rājput principalities, including Mewār and Mārwā-r. These principalities, big and small, had a very large number of cavalry troops, as noted by Jahāṅgīr, and this meant that once the chiefs were won over, the Mughals would have access to an exceptionally large reserve of armed force.

Throughout Akbar's reign, the Rājput nobles enjoyed an important position in the Mughal nobility. But at the time of Akbar's death, there was a tussle among the nobility over the issue of succession. Like the Turānī, Irānī and other sections of the nobility, Rājput chiefs were also divided between the contending candidates - Prince Jahāṅgīr and Prince Khurram. Reja Mān Singh, in league with Mirzā Azīz Koka, was in favour of Khurram's succession, while Rām Dīś Udāwat and Rājī Sāl Darbārī espoused the cause of Jahāṅgīr. It seems that Jahāṅgīr, after his accession, had adopted a policy of reserve towards the established Rājput chiefs who had opposed him, while he sought to promote the lesser chiefs who had been his supporters. Jahāṅgīr followed an almost similar policy in respect of the high Akbarghānī nobles of other racial groups, trying to curtail their power by bringing into prominence his own protégés, the Jahāṅgīrshāhī nobles. The high favour shown to the Bundela clan,
and then the Sisodias after 1614 Mewār Settlement, suggest Jahāngīr's anxiety to favour those who were personally linked to him. This was also at the root of his insistence on deciding the succession to tīka in the chieftains.

The following Table assembles in compact form our information about the mansābā held by the Rājputs out of the total mansābā during the period 1605-57. There is a significant decline in the Rājput share of the total mansābā between 1605 and 1621, but thereafter it showed a slight but consistent recovery till near the close of Shāh Jahān's reign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Jāmadām</th>
<th>Total mansābā of the Mughal Empire in dām</th>
<th>Total mansābā nobles</th>
<th>Percentage of the Mughal nobles</th>
<th>Total mansābā of the Rājput nobles</th>
<th>Percentage of the Rājput nobles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1605 AD</td>
<td>5,83,46,90,344</td>
<td>2,08,000/58,950</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,300/18,700</td>
<td>28.02/31.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1612 AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,08,200/147,550</td>
<td></td>
<td>66,200/24,940</td>
<td>21.44/16.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1621 AD</td>
<td>6,30,00,00,000</td>
<td>4,48,350/272,610</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,700/34,100</td>
<td>13.5/12.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1637 AD</td>
<td>6,57,73,57,623</td>
<td>6,33,000/441,845</td>
<td></td>
<td>84,350/59,780</td>
<td>13.33/13.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1647 AD</td>
<td>9,15,09,00,776</td>
<td>6,76,600/597,575</td>
<td></td>
<td>92,150/74,480</td>
<td>13.62/12.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1657 AD</td>
<td>9,12,24,45,846</td>
<td>8,05,700/680,145</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,17,150/101,280</td>
<td>14.54/14.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Jāmadām figures, see Irfan Habib, The Agrarian System of Mughal India, p. 355; for the total mansābā of the Mughal nobles from 1605 to 1637 AD (except that of 1612 AD, which has been taken from the unpublished thesis of Afzal Husain, The Role of Family Groups of Nobles in Mughal Politics, Department of History, Aligarh) see, Irfan Habib, 'Mansab System, 1595-1637' PIHC, 1967.

The total mansābā of the alive nobles during 1647 AD and 1657 AD are computed from the lists of Lāhorī's Bādshāh Nāma and Wāris' Bādshāh Nāma.
In absolute terms the mansabs of the Rajput chiefs continued to increase from Akbar to the close of Shāh Jahān’s reign, but this rise could not keep pace with the rise of the total mansabs of the Mughal nobility.

This indicates that the non-Rajput nobles were recruited in large numbers after 1605. Jahāngīr’s tilt towards the family members of Nūr Jahān is worth citing here. He also favoured members of the families of Shaikh Salīm Chishti, Abūlāh Khān Firuz Jang, Khān-i Jahān Lodi and Mahābat Khān. Moreover, the influx of the Deccan nobles too started from Jahāngīr’s reign and their number increased under Shāh Jahān.

As far as the assignment of administrative offices is concerned, the Rajput chiefs seem to have been largely passed over during this period. None of the Rajput chiefs is known to have held governorship or faujdāri under Jahāngīr after Mān Singh’s recall from Bengāl. But Shāh Jahān began to assign such offices to them. Even then, the Rajput chiefs could not attain the status their predecessors had already enjoyed under Akbar.

On the other hand, in regard to the payment to the retainers of the Rajput chiefs, Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān, unlike Akbar, treated them at par with the Tūrānī and Irānī nobles. This parity might have been granted because by this time the Tūrānī and Irānī nobles were allowed to recruit the indigenous retainers in their contingents.
An important feature of the basis on which the Rājput chiefs were made part of the nobility, was the recognition of their hereditary territories as their watan jāgīra. It was deemed a permanent assignment, but it carried a jamādāmi like ordinary jāgīra. The jamādāmi of their watan jāgīra was adjusted in the chiefs' pay-bills, so that unless the jamādāmi was nominal (which in most cases, it was not), the chiefs did not gain monetarily by holding the watan jāgīra. But at the same time, it ensured the Rājput chiefs a minimum fixed mansāb which would accord with the jamādāmi of the watan jāgīra. This minimum mansāb thus practically became hereditary. Besides these hereditary dominions, certain favourite Rājput nobles were given new watan jāgīras. The first case of the creation of watan jāgīra can be traced back to the end of Akbar's reign. It was, on the other hand, rare for the Mughal Emperors to take away watan jāgīra from the chiefs, except by way of punishment for some fault or upon rebellion. Generally, the Rājput chiefs were left free to manage the affairs of their watan jāgīra as they wished. But the chiefs themselves seem to have followed the general pattern of the Mughal administration, though there were numerous local variants.

The Mughal Emperors sometimes subverted the chiefs' power by establishing direct links with their thikānedāra who
were taken into Imperial service as mansabdārs. These thikān-
dārs thus became chiefs in their own right and their thikānās
became their watan jāgīres. This process diminished the power
of the big territorial chiefs. But before any major disinte-
gration could take place in the Rājput chiefdoms, the Mughal
Empire itself began to decline which offered an opportunity for
the principal chief of the tribe to reassert his authority over
those thikānādārs and sardārs, who had separated themselves from
their traditional overlord. This can especially be seen in the
subsequent history of the Āmber principality (Jaipur State).
Some of the thikānādārs had, however, became so strong by now
that they did not yield to their erstwhile lord. This can be
seen in Mewār. The chiefs of Bundī, Kota, Dungarpur and Bānawāra
who had been at one period sardārs of the Sisodia chief, now
headed separate principalities.

In questions of succession the Mughal Emperors
normally followed the custom prevailing in the Rājput clans.
It is noteworthy that after joining the Mughal service, the
authority of the Paramount Power proved normally adequate to
prevent those internal feuds over succession which had been so
common a feature of Rājput dynastic history. This certainly
gave stability to Rājput principalities, and also linked the
chiefs in some kind of customary dependence to the Empire. The
principalities probably also benefited economically from the
jāgīre given to the chiefs outside the watan, in lieu of
promotions given upon service. The extra revenues flowed into the home principality.

An outcome of the Mughal-Rajput polity was to establish matrimonial ties between the Imperial Family and the Rajputs. For this there had been precedents: The marriages sealed the political tie, and, as we have said, awarded some kind of special status to the Rajput clan concerned. It was considered necessary to take the bride at the time of the chief's first entry into service. The powerful Rajput clans such as the Kachawaihas of Amber and Rathors of Marwar were given the privilege of fresh matrimonial ties with the Mughal ruling family. There is no basis to say that the Rajput chiefs who gave their daughters in marriage to the Mughals were deemed outcasts by their peers. The Rajput chiefs who had established such ties with the Mughals continued to receive princesses in marriage of those Rajput chiefs who had obtained from matrimonial alliances with the Mughals. Rather, it seems that the social position of the Rajput clans, who had matrimonial ties with the Mughals was considerably enhanced. There was little caste or religious bitterness that was aroused at the time by these marriages; on the other hand, they more firmly bound important Rajput clans to the Mughal Court.

The Rajput chiefs served as military commanders in various regions of the Mughal Empire. They established new towns
and villages in these territories. Mān Singh founded the famous city of Rāj Mahāl in Bengāl. Rāo Karan established Karanpura in Deccan. Rām Dās Kachawāha and Rāo Manohar established gardens in Punjāb. Mān Singh built a temple in Orissa and a mosque at Rāj Mahāl. Bīr Singh Deo Bundela also built a temple in Mathura. Rāo Karan made grants to the temple of Nāsik in the Deccan. The Rājput chiefs thus contributed much towards a cultural unification of the Empire in geographical terms.

The Rājputs played a significant role in the war of succession. Until the decisive battle of Sāmugarh, Rājput chiefs (except a few petty chiefs) either supported Shāh Jahān and Prince Dāra Shukoh or remained neutral. But after this battle, the Rājput chiefs, foreseeing the feeble position of Prince Dāra Shukoh, began to shift their loyalty to Aurangzēb. In this the Rājputs' attitude was not exceptionally opportunistic. Uptil the War of Succession of 1707–09, the tradition in the Mughal nobility was that the nobles supporting a defeated prince would go over to the victor without loss of life or rank. Thus once the battle of Sāmugarh proved who the successful candidate was, the Rājput chiefs by and large hastened to make their peace with him, and were, in line with the Mughal tradition, accepted by the victor with full honours.
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