



THE KACHAWĀHĀS UNDER JAHĀNGĪR

Dissertation Submitted for M. Phil Degree

By

S. INAYAT ALI ZAIDI

Roll No. 1 Enrolment No. L-170

**Under the Supervision of
IQTIDAR ALAM KHAN**

**CENTRE OF ADVANCED STUDY
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh
1975**

C O N T E N T S

P r e f a c e	1 - ii
Abbreviations	
i. I n t r o d u c t i o n	1 - 16
ii. The Political Role of the Kachawāhā Nobles during Jahāngīr's Reign.	17 - 39
A p p e n d i x	40 - 49
iii. Ordinary Kachawāhā Troopers serving the Mughul Empire: Composition And Structure of the Contingents of the Kachawāhā Nobles.	50 - 67
A p p e n d i x 'A'	68 - 70
A p p e n d i x 'B'	71 - 83
iv. The Pattern of Matrimonial Ties Between the Kachawāhā Clan and the Mughul Ruling Family with Special Reference to Jahāngīr's Reign.	84 - 103
A p p e n d i x 'A'	104
A p p e n d i x 'B'	105 - 106
A p p e n d i x 'C'	107 - 112
A p p e n d i x 'D'	113 - 122
A p p e n d i x 'E'	123 - 126
v. The Aspect of Cultural Synthesis.	127 - 142
B i b l i o g r a p h y	143 - 150

P r e f a c e

I feel it is my pleasant duty to express my thanks to the scholars without whom it would have been impossible for me to complete this dissertation in this shape. In this regard, first and foremost, I am very grateful to Professor Irfan Habib who provided me with valuable suggestions regarding some problems whenever I met him. Moreover, his sympathetic attitude encouraged me to finish this work as soon as possible. It is undoubtedly true that without the supervision of Mr Iqtidar Alam Khan, it was not an easy task for me to finish it. Nevertheless, if there is any error in this dissertation, I am solely responsible for it. I wish to express my thanks to Mrs. Anjum ALAM who always showed hospitality to me whenever I went to see Mr Khan during the holidays.

I am greatly indebted to Professor R.H. Hilton and Mr R. Henry who went through the manuscript and made some corrections.

I am particularly thankful to Mr I.A. Zilli who always provided his valuable time to check my draft even when occupied with his own thesis.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank my teachers and colleagues to whom I am deeply indebted.

I am grateful to Dr. Aminuddin and Professor B.D. Sharma who created in me the interest to do research. Others to whom I am indebted for their help are Dr. M.P. Singh, ^{Messrs} Afzal Husain, Iqbal Husain and Aitmaduddin Qazi. I should

also like to thank my friend Sunita Budhwar for her help in correcting the type script and in adding the diacritical marks.

I am also beholden to the authorities and staff of the Research Library, Centre of Advanced Study of History, Aligarh and Anoop Sanskrit Library, Bikaner and the State Archives of Rajasthan, Bikaner.

Lastly, it is also my duty to express my thanks to Mr A.A. Zaidi who typed my dissertation very carefully.

S. Inayat Ali Zaidi

ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations have been generally used in the tables and the appendixes only.

A.N.	<u>Akbar Nāma</u>
Āyīn	<u>Āyīn-i Akbarī</u>
Bernier	<u>Travels in the Mogul Empire</u>
D.V.	<u>Dalpat Vilās</u>
D.K.	<u>Dayāl Dās-rē Khyāt</u>
G. Table	<u>Geneological Table of the Kachawāhā Clan</u>
J.V.	<u>Jaipur-ki Vanshāvelī</u>
Kanbu	<u>Amal-i Šālih</u>
K.T.	<u>Khulāsāt-ut Tawārīkh</u>
Lāhorī	<u>Bādshāh Nāma</u>
M.P. Vigat	<u>Mārwar-rē pargana-rē Vigat</u>
M.K.	<u>Muhtā Nainsī-rē Khyāt</u>
M.T.	<u>Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh</u>
M.R.	<u>Ma'āsir-i Rahīnī</u>
M.L.	<u>Muntakhāb-ul Lubāb</u>
M.U.	<u>Ma'āsir-ul Umarā</u>
M.J.	<u>Ma'āsir-i Jahāngirī</u>
M.A.	<u>Ma'āsir-i Ālamgirī</u>
T. Alfi	<u>Tārīkh-i Alfi</u>
T.D.	<u>Tārīkh-i Dilkushā</u>

Tod	<u>Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan</u>
T.U.	<u>Tazkarāt-ul Umarā</u>
T.J.	<u>Tūzuk-i Jahāngiri</u>
V.V.	<u>Vir Vinod</u>
Wāris	<u>Bādshāh Nāma</u>
Z.K.	<u>Zakhirāt-ul Khawānin</u>

CHAPTER I

I N T R O D U C T I O N

Regarding the origin of the Kachawāhā clan, the modern scholars hold divergent opinions. Some literally following Kachawāhā traditions linked their lineage to Kush, the son of Rām.¹ Others, taking a clue from an inscription in Sasbāhu temple dated V.S. 1150/1093 A.D., in which Lakshman, an ancestor of Duleh Rāy, (who is recognised by the traditions as a Kachawāhā) is mentioned as belonging to 'Kachapghāta' line, trace back the ancestry of the Kachawāhā clan to him.²

Sahasra
Bāhā

The surviving traditions are almost unanimous in suggesting that original homeland of the Kachawāhās was Narwar in the vicinity of Gwālior.³ But there exists considerable divergence between the details given in versions recorded by the author of Gwālior Nāma and Tod. According to Tod, it was certain Duleh Rāy (1007-1037), who after having been expelled from his homeland

What is
source
Tod

1. Compare, Muhtā Naīnsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.288; Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, II, p.280; Rājputānā Gazetteer, compiled by KG Erskine, II, p.135; cf. RN Prasad, Raja Man Singh of Amber, p.1; where-in he literally accepting the Kachawāhā tradition, Ayodhyā is described as 'original home' of the Kachawāhās.
2. Sasbāhu Inscription, cited by HC Ray, The Dynastic History of Northern India, p.822; compare, ML Sharma, History of the Jaipur State, p.17, It is argued that the word Kachawāhā is a colloquial form of 'Kachapghāta'.
3. Maktubāt-i Khān-i Jahān- Muzaffar Khān-wā-Gwālior Nāma Waghairā, Ms. ff.151a-b; Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, II, pp.280-81.

Narwar, by his brother Sorā Singh, came with his mother to the Eastern Rājputāna and established himself there.¹ According to Muhtā Nainsī, he wrested Dhoondhar from the Mēenas. After Duleh Rāy's death his son Kākil (1037-1039) founded Ambēr.² However, in the Gwālior Nāma, it is stated that a Kachawāhā chief of Gwālior, Punjan, married the only daughter of Puraṇ Mal, a Dēorā chief of Ambēr. The latter not having any male issue persuaded his son-in-law to settle at Ambēr around 1087.³ In the light of ^{the} date worked out on the basis of the evidence contained in Gwālior Nāma, it is difficult to accept Shyāmal Dās's view that Punjan was a contemporary of Prithvī Rāj Chauhān of Ajmēr and had accepted him as his 'sāmant'.⁴

The evidence regarding the history of the Kachawāhā clan settled around Ambēr for the period preceding 1502, is rather scattered and fragmentary. Shyāmal Dās, on the authority of an earlier source, Rāimāl Rāsā, refers to one of the Kachawāhā chiefs, Kilhan who was sāmant of Rānā Kumbhā.⁵ He was

-
1. Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, II, pp.280-81.
 2. Muhtā Nainsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.290; Vir Vinod, p.1296; Tod says that Duleh Rāy's son Kākil wrested Dhoondhar and the latter's son Maidul Rāo conquered Ambēr from the Mēenas. Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, II, p.281.
 3. Maktubāt-i Khān-i Jahān-Muzaffar Khān wā-Gwālior Nāma, Ms. ff.151a-b; From Jalāl Hisāri's account, one gathers that it was about 113 years before Shamsuddīn Iltutmish's attack upon Gwālior in 1200 A.D., the Kachawāhā chief, Punjan had migrated from there to Ambēr. This would suggest that he had moved to Amber sometime around 1087 A.D. Shyāmal Dās (Vir-Vinod, 1269) who places Punjan's reign 1070-1097 A.D., partly corroborates the date worked out as on the basis of Jalāl Hisāri's version.
 4. Vir-Vinod, p.1269.
 5. Ibid.; Rāimāl Rāsā was written during Rānā Rāimāl's reign (1473-1508) in Sanskrit.

apparently, a contemporary of Qutubuddin and Iltutmish and was subdued by the latter.¹ After Iltutmish's death, the Kachawāhās appear to have discarded their allegiance to the Sultāns of Delhi and remained independent of Delhi down to 1328 when Muhammad Tughluq forced their chief Kūntal to accept his overlordship.² From an inscription found at Sambhar, it is borne out that the Kachawāhā territory continued to be controlled from Delhi down to the Fīruz Shāh Tughluq's reign.³

All the historical evidence relating to the Kachawāhās settled around Ambēr go to show that whenever they were free from the pressure or the interference of the central authority exercised from Delhi or Āgrā, they tended to come under the political hegemony of the Sīsodiās of Mēwār.⁴ Towards the beginning of the 16th century the ruling chief of the Kachawāhās, Prithvī Rāj (1502-1527) was an under-study of Rānā Sāngā.

-
1. Maktubāt-i Khān-i Jahān wa Gwālior Nāma, Ms. ff.152a-b.
 2. Futuh-us Salātin, p.466.
 3. For the inscription, see, Published Muslim Inscriptions of Rajasthan, p.23. Sambhar is situated in 27°55'N and 75° 11 E.
 4. According to Shyamal Dās, during Rānā Kuabhā's reign (1433-1468), the Kachawāhā chief, was a sāmānt of the Sīsodiā chief of Mēwār.

Again, the Kachawāhā chief, Prithvī Rāj (1502-1527), seems to have come under the political hegemony of Rānā Sāngā (Vīr Vinod, pp.369, 1269).

Apparently, P. Saran and S.P. Gupta's view in so far as they say that Ambēr was 'subject to Jodhour till the beginning of the 16th century' is not very convincing. Compare, The Provincial Government of the Mughals, p.141; S.P. Gupta, 'The Expansion of the Kachawaha Territory in Mughal Times', Proceedings of Indian History Congress, 1965, p.177.

After the defeat of the Rājputs in the battle of Kanawā (1527), the Kachawāhās who had fought in 1527 on the side of Rānā Sāngā¹, came under Bābar influence² and remained attached to the Mughuls down to 1540.³ The contacts between the Kachawāhās and the Mughuls were revived after the re-establishment of the Mughul authority at Delhi in 1556; the Kachawāhā chief Bhār Mal⁴ having

1. Vir Vinod, p.369.

2. cf. Chāndron Jītasōn- Vithu Sujo-ro-Kiyo, Ed. by Tassetori, p.32; Bābar had occupied Ambār. Compare, Iqtidar Alam Khan, 'Note on the Chronology of early moves of Humāyūn', Proceedings of Indian History Congress, 1972, p.404, F.N. 43.

3. The Kachawāhā chief Furan Mal was in the service of Humāyūn. See, Akbar Nama III, p.606.

After Humāyūn's overthrow in 1540, the Kachawāhās came under the influence of the Surs. In 1547, the Kachawāhā chief, Bhār Mal, established matrimonial alliance with the Afghān commander Hāji Khān. See, Jaipur-kī Vanshavēli, Ms., pages are unmarked, Jaipur-kā- Sankhchipt Itihās, Ms., pages are unmarked.

4. In the Persian sources Bhār Mal's name is spelt variously. Abūl Fazl gives three versions. Bahārah Mal (جہارہ) (Akbar Nāma, II, p.20), Bihārī Mal (بہاری) (Akbar Nāma, II, pp.45, 155) and Bārā Mal (بارہ) (Akbar Nāma, II, p.373). But Alāuddulā Qazwīnī and Arif Qandhārī, the earlier authorities for Akbar's reign call him Bhar Mal (بہار) (Nafāis-ul Ma'āsir, Ms. f.68a, Tārīkh-i Akbarī, I, pp.99, 126), Nizāmuddīn refers to him as Bhārā Mal (بہارہ) (Tabaqāt-i Akbarī, II, p.382). Apparently, Badāūnī accepts this pronunciation but spells the name Bhārah Mal (بہارہ). The text edited by Ahmad Ali and Lees renders this name as Pahāra Mal (پہارہ) which is obviously a slip. Jahāngīr (Tūzūk-i Jahāngīrī, p.7) writes as Bhārah Mal (بہارہ) and Muhtad Khān (Iqbāl-nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.122) mentions him as Bārāh Mal (بارہ). Shaikh Farīd (Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, p.103) and Shāh Nawāz Khān (Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.111) have Bhārā Mal (بہارہ). Kēwal Rām (Tazkīrāt-ul Umarā, f.132) refers him as Bhār Mal (بہار).

*Sans. inscrip
7/12/21*

The Rajasthani sources, Muhtā Nainsī (Muhtā Nainsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.291), Bānkē Dās (Bānkē Dās-rē-Khyāt, p.124) and Shyāmal Dās (Vir Vinod, II, p.1273) spell the name as Bhār Mal (بہار). As indicated above, Alāuddulā Qazwīnī, Arif Qandhārī and Kēwal Rām give the same pronunciation. This should naturally be preferred.

switched over his allegiance from the Surs to the Mughuls¹ notwithstanding his close relationship with the Sur general of the region, Hājī Khān, who in 1557, was trying to mobilise local support to stem the Mughul penetration of Northern Rājputānā². At the same time, Kachawāhās also appear to have utilised comparative inactivity of the Mughul power in Northern Rājputānā during the Regency of Bairām Khān to extend and consolidate their principality at the cost of other local elements, particularly the Meena zamīndārs,³ which may have been the provocation for Mirzā Sharfuddīn's stringent measures against them in 1562.⁴

1. Akbar Nāma, II, p.20, Bhār Mal, who was with Hājī Khān when he was besieging Nārnaul, helped the Mughul commander Majnun Khān to proceed to Delhi unmolested. Subsequently, after the Mughul victory at Panipat, Bhār Mal was called to Delhi by Bairām Khān on Majnun Khān's advice. Ibid., p.45.
2. From a passage in Afsāna-i Shāhan (Ms., f.178b), one comes to know that even after visiting Mughul court in 1556, /was friendly towards the Sur Commander Hājī Khān, when the latter fleeing from Panipat came to Rājputānā with the intension of crossing into Gujarāt. While he was harassed by the ruler of Mēwār, Bhār Mal, on the other hand, showed great consideration to Hājī Khān's Wakil, 'Ālam Chand Bhāt, whom the latter had sent to Ambār at the time of setting out for Gujarāt.

/Bhār Mal

Iqtidar Husain Siddiqui (Afghan Despotism in India, p.107) suggests that 'Ālam Chand Bhāt was a Kachawāhā and a relative of Bhār Mal. But a scrutiny of the relevant passage of Afsāna-i Shāhan, does not support such an assumption. One can only conjecture that 'Ālam Chand belonged to the Bhāt caste of Rājputānā. On Bhāt caste, see, Bishop Heber in Northern India, ed. by Laird, pp.268-69.

3. Between 1557 and 1560, Bhār Mal ousted the Meēna Chief from Lawān (situated in 26°46'N and 76°13'E). See, Jaipur-ki-Vansāvali, Ms., Pages are unmarked; Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, II, pp.282-83, Vir Vinod, II, p.1276, Jaipur-kā-Itihās by H. Sharma, p.70.
4. Akbar Nāma, II, pp.156-58, Tārīkh-i Alfi, f.151

It is in this background that Akbar's decision in 1562 to enroll Bhār Mal and his relatives into the nobility and to marry one of Bhār Mal's daughter should be viewed. While it is not the occasion to go into a detailed discussion of the circumstances that facilitated this development, it may be noted that the terms on which the Kachawāhās were taken into the Mughul service were such that had far reaching consequences for the Kachawāhā clan as well as the Mughul Empire as a whole.

The terms offered to the Kachawāhās and later on to other Rājput chiefs as well, by Akbar while enrolling them in his service, in most cases, included the establishment of matrimonial ties between the ruling family and the clans entering the imperial service¹ which was to a large extent responsible for the transformation that came about in the cultural outlook of both the Mughul ruling family as well as the nobles in general. The special privilege allowed to the chiefs to employ the members of their own clans in considerable strength as their subordinates and retainers and the recognition of their special relationship with the territories of their hereditary principalities, were some other aspects of these terms that deserve to be noticed in this respect. In this dissertation we shall discuss at some length the position of the Kachawāhā nobles under Jahāngīr with respect to matrimonial alliances and the resulting cultural transformation of the group, the composition and organisation of their contingents and their over all political role in separate chapters. We have not devoted a full chapter to the problem of the administration of the original principalities as the evidence relating to this aspect is general and

1. As it is well known that in most cases, a Rajput clan entering service would also give a girl belonging to family of the chiefs in marriage to a member of the Ruling family. In this respect an exception was made only in the case of Sisodias and Haras. See, infra, Chapter IV, where it is argued that in the most cases the establishment of matrimonial ties accompanied the entry of the chief concerned in the royal service.

See Introduction

it is difficult to reconstruct a comprehensive picture of the working of the arrangement during Jahāngīr's reign. In the following, however, the developments that led to the coming into existence of the institution of watan-jā-gīr towards the close of Akbar's reign are traced briefly. We have also noted some of the features of this institution that were discernable under Jahāngīr.

II.

It is not known as to exactly what conditions were offered to the Kachawāhā chiefs with respect to their principalities at the time of their joining Akbar's service in 1562. One cannot, however, fail to note that the term watan-jā-gīr does not occur in any one of records and chronicles of Akbar's reign. Even Abū'l Faḥl does not refer to the original principalities or zamīndāris of the Rājput chiefs in the imperial service as watan-jā-gīrs. He calls these places by terms like mautin, maskan, manzil, Bungāh, Khāna and zamīndārī etc.¹ Even when, at one place, he refers to Jodhpur as the jā-gīr of Mota-Rāja, he does not use any prefix to indicate the special nature of this assignment.²

This would strongly suggest that the arrangement with respect to the

1. Akbar Nāma, II, pp.339, II, 15, 184, 220, 221, 326.

2. Ibid., 662.

hereditary principalities of the Rājput nobles, namely, the institution of watan-jā-gīr, that we come across in 17th century, was not visualised in all its features at the time of their entry into the Mughul service in considerable strength during fifteen sixties and seventies. Yet in many cases the chiefs recruited in the imperial service were allowed to continue to enjoy certain rights and privileges within their zamīndārīs as well as in relation to other members of their clans which tended to resemble the arrangement that later existed in the form of watan-jā-gīrs.¹

-
1. Although no direct evidence is available in this respect, yet on the basis of certain stray and indirect pieces of evidence, one can safely infer that till 1573 or in other words till the introduction of dāgh system the assignment of the Rājput chiefs recruited in the Mughul service during sixties were confined 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 jā-gīr on a Rājput noble in any other than his own zamīndārī. However, the earliest and the only direct evidence about the bestowal of a jā-gīr on a Rājput chief within the territory claimed by him as his zamīndārī dates back to 1570 when, according to Badāūnī (ii/p.120) pargana Arail was given in assignment to Rāja Rām Cāhander of Bhattā. In any case from two stray references taken from Muhtā Nainsī-rē-Khyāt (i/p.306) and Dalpat Vilās (p.33) regarding Sāmbhar and Bikānēr respectively, it appears that in 1575, these two places were in the jā-gīrs of the chiefs.

For the fact that the Rājput nobles of Akbar would be mostly served under the chiefs of their own clans and that Akbar respected the special relationship that existed between them, many instances can be cited even from the history of the Kachawāhā clan. cf. Akbar Nāma, III, pp.49-50, 402 and also infra.

Regarding Ambēr we do not come across a clear cut statement anywhere in the sources of Akbar's reign, including Akbar Nāma, to the effect that it was left in the ja-gir of Bhār Mal or any one of his successors. Yet on the basis of indirect evidence, one may infer that at the time, the Kachawāhās were recruited into the imperial service, Bhār Mal was allowed to retain his original territory as a ja-gir-cum-military charge.¹ The same was perhaps the policy in the case of the thikānās and pattās of the other Kachawāhā chiefs like Amarsar, Sāmbhar, Lawān, Nārāina and Deosa,² with the only difference that in their capacities of military commanders or hakims, the Kachawāhā nobles of lesser ranks holding their thikānās or pattās as ja-girs-cum-military

-
1. One kind of indirect evidence that we have, goes to establish that the Rājāwat chiefs continued to have their headquarters at Ambēr and would visit that place occasionally even after their entry into Akbar's service. It is in this context that Abū'l Fazl uses the terms mautin, and maskan, cf. Akbar Nāma, II, p.339.

Furthermore, it is known that, in 1572, Rām Dās was ja-girdār as well as 'Kotwāl' of Sāngānir, a mahall in pargana Ambēr. (Tabaqāt-i Akbarī, II, p.442; Ma'āsir-i Rahīmī, I, p.804; Muhtā Nainsi-rē-Khyāt, I, p.331). This tends to confirm the impression that to begin with, for considerable time, the Kachawāhā nobles were allowed to hold their hereditary territories in and around Ambēr as ja-gir-cum-administrative charges.

2. This is clearly borne out by evidence cited in the preceding foot-note regarding Sāngānir that was left under Rām Dās as ja-gir-cum-administrative charge. Amarsar, Sāmbhar, Lawān, Nārāina and Deosa were held by Rāo Loonkaran, Akhēy Rāj Bānkāwat, Khangar and Rupsī respectively on a hereditary basis as their pattās and thikānās (Muhtā Nainsi-rē-Khyāt, I, pp.302, 304, 318; Akbar Nāma, II, pp.156-57.

Were they
mautidars -

charges, were, in all probability, in a subordinate position to the Rājāwat chief.¹ This would suggest that, practically speaking, Bhār Mal remained in semi-autonomous control of his dominion for a considerable time even after entering Akbar's service, though at a theoretical plane his position had undergone a drastic change. First, his semi-autonomous control over his charge would not be concomitant with his status as the jā-girdār of the area. He could be deprived of one or the other position by the King at his will.² As already suggested after the entry of a number of other Kachawāhā chiefs into the imperial service, the pattās or thikānās held by them would be

-
1. This is an inference that one may draw on basis of the evidence suggesting that the hold of the Rājāwat chief over ordinary Kachawāhā nobles quite considerable. So much so that on occasions the King himself would be required to take help from the Rājāwat chief for pacifying an individual Kachawāhā noble's feeling disgruntled on one or the other account. For instance, in 1572, it was only at Bhagwant Dās's intervention that Rupsī was persuaded to apologise for his rude behaviour towards Akbar. Again, in 1583, Akbar had to take the help of Jagannāth for persuading Udaī Singh to give up his insistence that his mother should perform sati along with the dead body of his father. See, Akbar Nama, III, pp. 49-50, 402, Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.110.
 2. Compare: Athar Ali, The Mughal Nobility under Aurang-zib, pp.63-64; Iqtidar Alam Khan, The Political Biography of a Mughal Noble - Munim Khān Khār-i Khānā, p.xii, In certain respects the relationship between the King and nobility under Akbar was treated at par with that of the master and slave. It was denoted by use of the term bandgān dargāh for the nobility. The introduction of the practice of escheat under Akbar was an indication of the change occurring in theoretical basis of the relationship between the Timurid King and his nobles. It is thus clear that on entering the Mughul service a hereditary chief like Bhār Mal would be accepting a certain status that would be radically different from his earlier position.

recognised as jā-gīrs, granted to them by the Emperor.¹ Consequently, in the new situation, over all these places, the control of the Rājāwat chief would basically be that of the hakim or fauj-dār of an area and he would not have the same kind of claim over their revenues as must have been the case earlier. Thus it would seem that the situation of administrative jurisdictions inside the Kachawāhā territory at that early stage must have been rather fluid.

In this situation the Rājāwat chiefs would, naturally, tend to become sensitive regarding their position vis-a-vis their zamīndārīs or waṭans 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 Rājput chiefs tended to be accentuated on account of a two-fold development: First, as a result of the rise of the chiefs in the imperial hierarchy to higher mangabs (or whatever categories of status obtained at the time), the income from their jā-gīrs located within the erstwhile principalities would no longer be sufficient to meet their salary

1. It may be assumed that the thikānās or pattās of the following sardārs of Bhār Mal, who had also joined the imperial service, were recognised as their jā-gīrs:

<u>Sardār</u>	<u>Thikānā/Pattā</u>	<u>R e f e r e n c e</u>
(i) Rupsī	Dēosa	<u>Akbar Nāma</u> , II, p.156, <u>Tabaqāt-i Akbarī</u> , 387.
(ii) Loon Karan	Amarsar	<u>Ibid.</u> , pp.338-39, <u>Akbar Nāma</u> , III, p.221, <u>Zakhirāt-ul Khawānir</u> I, p.219.
(iii) Khangar	Nārāina	<u>Tabaqāt-i Akbarī</u> , p.386, <u>Muhtā Nānsī-rē Khyāt</u> , I, p.304, <u>Vir Vinod</u> , p.1273.
(iv) Akhēy Rāj or Bānkā	Lawān	<u>Āyir-i Akbarī</u> , p.184, <u>Muhtā Nānsī-rē Khyāt</u> , I, p.302, <u>Vir Vinod</u> , p.1277.

bills and, therefore, the Emperor would be called upon to make additions to their existing jā-gīrs.¹ For this purpose, it would be necessary to assess, properly, the jama^f of the jā-gīrs 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 jā-gīrs to these chiefs in different provinces and their appointments to command any higher office in the state would physically remove these people from their dominions.² This would provide an opportunity to the Emperor to appoint his own officers as the commanders, hākims or faujdārs of those 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 disturbed and they should be allowed to control them through their agents while they were

-
1. It seems, some time around 1573, Akbar started giving jā-gīrs to the Rājput chiefs out side the territory of their hereditary principalities. Some of the early instances are as follows:

<u>Noble</u>	<u>Pargana or pargana assigned</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>R e f e r e n c e</u>
a. Mān Singh	Khichiwārā	1573	<u>A.N.</u> , III, p.43; <u>M.K.</u> , I p.342.
b. Rāja Gajpatī Ujjainiyā	Bhojpur, Behiya Chit and Ballia	1573	<u>Bayazid</u> , p.319.
c. Rāī Rām Rāthore	Sojat	1573	<u>A.N.</u> , III, p.34.

2. This happened, for instance, in the case of the Kachawāhā nobles who were stationed in the Punjāb sometime before 1578 and were given jā-gīrs there. (cf. Akbar Nāma, III, p.248).

servicing 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 these territories with that of the rest of the Empire. This caused friction between the imperial authority and the chiefs. In the case of the Kachawāhā 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 jā-gīrs 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 Kururīs all over the Empire for managing the newly created Khālīṣa territories.³ It seems that while introducing these measures

1. Muhtā Nainsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.306, There is a reference to the appointment of a Kururī in Sāmbhar located within the zamīndārī of the Kachawāhā chiefs. In the quarrel that arose over this appointment, Bijay Rām, a Rājāwat chief was killed. cf. Akbar Nāma, III, p.117 and Badāūnī, II, p.189. The Kururīs were appointed for the first time in 1575.
2. Akbar Nāma, III, p.69, Abū'l Faḥl says, "accordingly, 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 the Abū'l Faḥl's above passage as "drastic action to put the bulk of his service on cash salaries, and take the northern provinces under direct administration. (The Agrarian System of Moslem India, p.96), while M.P. Singh has cited several cases suggesting that the jā-gīrs already assigned to nobles were continued to be held by them even after the promulgation of the above order. (Akbar's resumption of jā-gīr, 1575 - a Re-examination' The Proceedings of Indian History Congress, Mysore, 1966, pp.208-09).
3. Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh, 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 kror of tankas, was to be divided off, and placed under the charge of an officer to be called krorī, 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".

Rachin conjectural

an attempt was made to resume the jā-gīrs of the Kachawāhā nobles located within their zamīndārīs. The fact that at least for some time around 1575, Sambhar was taken into khālīṣa is borne out by the evidence contained in Muhtā Nāinsī-rē Khyāt, a move which was resisted by the Kachawāhā chiefs whose jā-gīrs were located in the area.¹ Similar evidence relating to the same period is available concerning Bikaner which tends to suggest that it was a general policy.²

One can only conjecture that when Akbar restored the jā-gīrs of the nobles in general, those of the Kachawāhā chiefs located in the territory of Amber were also given back to them. But it is also possible that some of the maḥālls of the resumed jā-gīrs in Amber territory were either retained in khālīṣa or were given away as jā-gīrs or m'afī grants to individuals not belonging to the Kachawāhā clan. This is borne out by documentary evidence suggesting that around 1594, in one of the maḥālls of pargana Amber, there existed a madad-i ma'āsh grant given by Akbar to a Brāhman.³

1. Muhtā Nāinsī-rē Khyāt, I, p.306.

2. Dalpat Vilās, p.33.

3. There is available a document in the old records file of Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner, testifying the fact that Akbar had given the village Punvaliyā in pargana Amber as udak (madad-i Ma'āsh) to a Brāhman, Dhanī Rām Joshī.

Possibly, after the abortive attempt of 1575 to abolish jā-gīrs, Akbar gave substantial concessions to the nobility with an aim to mollify them. One important concession that he appears to have given to the Rājput nobles was that he exempted their jā-gīrs located in their zamīndārī territories from the rule dictating frequent transfers from one place to another, though this was nowhere explicitly stated or laid down as a regulation. Apparently, with the passage of time, this practice tended to establish a distinction between the two types of jā-gīrs. Towards the end of Akbar's reign, it would appear that the jā-gīrs of the chiefs located in their zamīndārī regions as distinct from their ordinary jā-gīrs, came to be designated as waṭan-jā-gīrs. This designation is for the first time used in the context of such assignments, around 1604.¹

It would thus follow from the above discussion that the institution of waṭan-jā-gīr acquired all those features that are discerned by Irfan Habib and Athar Ali, mainly during Jahāngīr's reign.² However, not much evidence has survived from Jahāngīr's reign which might enable one to see as to what extent the features of this institution described by Athar Ali and Irfan Habib

-
1. Akbar's farmān to Rāī Rāī Singh of Bīkānēr. The farmān (N.14) is preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner. The term waṭan-jā-gīr is used in farmān for the assignment of revenues of one of the mahālls of pargana Shamsābād to Rāī Rāī Singh on a permanent basis. From Āyin-i Akbarī, one comes to know that pargana Shamsābād was at this time in the zamīndārī of the Rāthores. Āyin-i Akbarī, Tr. II, p.196.
 2. Irfan Habib, The Agrarian System of Mughal India, pp.184-85, Athar Ali, The Mughal Nobility under Aurangzib, pp.79-80.

mainly on the basis of evidences surviving from the second half of the 17th century, apply to the waṭan jā-gīrs of Kachawāhā nobles serving under him. One stray evidence that we have, in any case, goes to suggest that under Jahāngīr, the Rājāwat chiefs were not allowed to hold all the mahālls of pargana Ambēr in their waṭan jā-gīr. It is known that in 1622, one of the mahālls of Ambēr was in the jā-gīr of Nūr Jahān which she had given away in ijārā to Jai Singh.¹

1. In 1622, Nūr Jahān issued a nishān to Mirzā Rājā Jai Singh, asking him to deliver the revenues of Ambēr which was given to him as ijārā. It indicates that partly revenues of Ambēr were in Nūr Jahān's jā-gīr. See, nishān, N.168, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner.

CHAPTER II

THE POLITICAL ROLE OF KACHAWĀHĀ NOBLES DURING JAHĀNGĪR'S REIGN.

In this chapter an attempt will be made to study the political role of the Kachawāhā nobles during Jahāngīr's reign. In this connection, we shall examine the stand of the Kachawāhās on the issue of succession and the manner in which that affected their fortunes during the early years of Jahāngīr's reign. It would also be of interest to study the role played by the Kachawāhās in the important episodes of Jahāngīr's reign like Khurram's revolt, Mahābat Khān's revolt and the tussle between Shāh Jahān and Nūr Jahān towards the end of Jahāngīr's reign. Such a study might help in working out the main stages of the twists and turns that occurred in the fortunes of the Kachawāhā chiefs serving under Jahāngīr, enabling one to assess the significance of the evidence suggesting certain amount of retrogression in the position of the Rājput nobles after Akbar's death¹ in a proper perspective.

As it is well known, the rise of the Kachawāhā family in the Mughul service dates back to the reign of Emperor Akbar. In 1562, Bhār Mal, the head of Kachawāhā clan was the first Rājput chief who gave his daughter in marriage to Akbar and joined his service.² Alongwith him a number of other Kachawāhā

1. Jahāngīr is reproached by Khān-i Aẓam for discriminating against the Rājput and Chaghtāis (Tūrānī) nobles in favour of the Khurāsānīs (Īrānīs) and Shaikh-zādās. Maktubāt-i Khān-i Jahān Muzaffar Khān-wa-Gwāliornāma Waghaīra, Ms. ff.19a-b; Hawkins, Early Travels in India, Ed. by Foster, pp.106-7.

2. Akbar Nāma, II, pp.156-57.

chiefs also entered the Mughul service.¹ They played a vital role in the expansion of the Mughul Empire. Akbar rewarded them with high mansabs, lucrative ja-girs and important offices and titles. The Kachawāhā nobles throughout remained Akbar's favourites among the Rājput nobles.² During Akbar's critical illness in 1605, the important Kachawāhā nobles were sharply divided over the issue of succession. While the Shaikhawāt chief, Raisāl Darbārī and Udāvāt chief, Rām Dās supported Salīm,³ the latter's son, Khusrāu had the backing of the Rājāwat chiefs, Mān Singh and his brother Mādho Singh.⁴

During this time, there were in all nine Kachawāhā nobles in active service. Among them six were Rājāwats, two Shaikhawats and one belonging to the old leaf of Kachawāhā clan, identified as Udāvats. Total of the mansabs held by these nobles during the last one year of Akbar's reign came up to 27,400 zāt and

-
1. Akbar Nāma, II, pp.161-62.
 2. In 1595, the total of mansabs held by the Kachawāhā nobles came up to 20,450. While that of the mansabs held by the Rāthores of Jodhpur, Bīkānēr and Maīrtā put together was 6,550. The total of mansabs held by the Sīsodīas of Mēwār, the Bhātīs of Jālsalmēr and the Hārās of Bundī was 1,700, 500 and 900 respectively. See, Āyīn-i Akbarī, Ed. Blochmann, II, pp.224-231; Tabaqāt-i Akbarī, pp.381-390.
 3. Risālā-i Tārīkh-i Asad Bēg Qazwīnī, ff.51-52; Tārīkh-i Khān-i Jahān Lodī, II, p.659; A Contemporary Dutch Chronicle of Mughal India, Tr. by Narain and Sharma, p.32; Delaet, The Empire of Great Mogol, Tr. by Holland and Banerjee, p.171; Ma'āsir-ul Umārā, II, p.168; Pāthalpothā-re-Khyāt, Ms. pages are unnumbered. Reference is taken from R.N. Prasad, Raja Man Singh of Amber, pp.112-14.
 4. Risālā-i Tārīkh-i Asad Bēg Qazwīnī, Ms. ff.51-52; Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.26.

22,200 suwār.¹ The total of mansabs held by the above sub-clans were as follows: The Rājāwats enjoyed highest mansabs which totalled up to 22,000 zāt and 14,800 suwār; the mansabs of Shaikhāwats and the lone Udāvāt noble put together came up to 5,400 zāt and 3,600 suwār.² It seems that the over all position of the Kachawāhā clan in terms of mansabs held by them was not basically altered as a result of Jahāngīr's succession. As a matter of fact, after Jahāngīr's accession, the mansabs of many of the Kachawāhā nobles were increased which pushed up the total of the mansabs held by them from 27,400 zāt and 19,400 suwār to 29,500 zāt and 26,100 suwār. But in this connection one cannot fail to note that at this occasion, the increase in the mansabs of the Rājāwat chiefs who had initially supported Khusrāu's candidature was nominal while that in the case of the non Rājāwat chiefs like Rām Dās Udāvāt and Rao Manohar Shaikhāwat was quite substantial. Among the Rājāwats the senior most chief, Mān Singh did not receive any increase whatsoever even at the occasion of Jahāngīr's accession. This naturally tended to make the non-Rājāwat nobles comparatively more important. It can be

1. Among the nine Kachawāhā nobles in the Mughul service in 1605, the following was break-up of those belonging to different sub-clans:

		<u>Rājāwats</u>	
<u>Name</u>		<u>M a n s a b</u>	
		1,000 <u>zāt</u>	500 <u>suwār</u>
1. Bhāo Singh		1,000	500
2. Jagannāth		5,000	3000
3. Mādho Singh		3,000	2000
4. Mahā Singh		2,000	300
5. Mān Singh		7,000	6000
6. Rāj Singh		4,000	3000
		<u>Shaikhāwats</u>	
1. Manohar		400	400
2. Raisāl Darbārī		3,000	3000
		<u>Udāvats</u>	
1. Rām Dās		2,000	200

(For references, see, Appendix.)

2. See, supra.

*favour to nobles
rather than clans.*

gauged from the ratio that now obtained in the total of the mansabs held by the Rājāwat and non-Rājāwat chiefs. During the 1st year of Jahāngīr's reign, the total of the mansabs held by the Rājāwats came up to 22,500 zāt and 19,500 suwār,¹ While that of the non-Rājāwat chiefs came up to 7000 zāt and 6,600 suwār.² If these figures are compared with those for the last year of Akbar's reign, one can see that the marginal increase in the mansabs of the Kachawāhā clan, after Jahāngīr's accession, was the direct result of the increases given to the non-Rājāwat chiefs. These were Rām Dās Udāvāt and Raisāl Shaikhāwat who had supported Jahāngīr in the tussle for succession.

From the above, it would emerge that after his accession while Jahāngīr was not particularly hostile towards the Rājāwat nobles who had initially

1. The names and mansabs of Rājāwat nobles in the Mughul service at this time were as follows:


<u>Name</u>	<u>M a n s a b</u>	
	<u>zāt</u>	<u>suwār</u>
1. Bhāo Singh	1,500	1,500
2. Jagannāth	5,000	3,000
3. Mādho Singh	3,000	3,000
4. Mahā Singh	2,000	2,000
5. Mān Singh	7,000	6,000
6. Rāj Singh	4,000	3,000

For references, see, Appendix.

2. The names and mansabs of Shaikhāwat and Udāvāt nobles in the Mughul service at this time were as follows:

<u>Name</u>	<u>M a n s a b</u>	
	<u>zāt</u>	<u>suwār</u>
1. Manohar	1,000	600
2. Raisāl Darbāri	3,000	3,000
3. Rām Dās Udāvāt	3,000	3,000.

For references, see, Appendix.

DISS
954.0256
K5272 Ka

TH5350

opposed his candidature and did increase their mansabs slightly,¹ he was quite liberal towards the Shaikhawat nobles, Raisal Darbari and Rao Manohar and the lone Udavat noble, who were his staunch supporters over the issue of succession. Apparently, he was inclined to give the later group substantial increases in mansabs which resulted in marginal improvement in the position of the Kachawahā clan as such.

of the

But by 1612, the total/mansabs held by the Kachawahā nobles came down from 29,500 zāt and 26,100 suwār to 27,000 zāt and 24,300 suwār. Apparently, it occurred owing to substantial fall in the mansabs of the Rajawat nobles during the preceding six years. Since the 1st R.Y., the total of mansabs held by the Rajawat nobles fell from 22,000 zāt and 19,500 suwār to 16,000 zāt and 13,500 suwār. During this period, the non-Rajawat nobles continued to receive increases in their mansabs, the total of mansabs held by them rose from 7000 zāt and 6,600 suwār to 11,000 zāt and 10,800 suwār.² But this increase in the mansabs of the

-
1. For the fact that Mān Singh and several other Rajawat nobles had sympathized with Khusrāu and the non-Rajawat nobles like Raisal Darbari, Manohar and Rām Dās Udavat had supported Salīm, see, supra....
 2. The names and mansabs of Rajawat nobles in the Mughul service at this time were as follows:

N a m e	M a n s a b	
	<u>zāt</u>	<u>suwār</u>
1. Bhāo Singh	2000	1000
2. Karam Chard	2000	1500
3. Mahā Singh	3000	2000
4. Mān Singh	5000	5000
5. Rāj Singh	4000	3000

For references, see, Appendix.

The names and mansabs of non-Rajawat nobles in the Mughul service at this time were as follows:

1. Manohar	1000	800
2. Raisal Darbari	5000	5000
3. Rām Dās Udavat	5000	5000

For references, see, Appendix.



Diss
V344J
L5

TH-5350

non-Rājāwat nobles, who were small in numbers, could not compensate for the heavy loss suffered by the Rājāwat nobles. The fall in the total of the mansabs held by the Rājāwat chiefs was mainly the result of three-fold developments:

- (a) Deliberate reduction in the mansabs of some of the highly placed officers;
- (b) awarding of lower mansabs to the successors of the Rājāwat chiefs who died in the meanwhile,
- (c) Removal of two of the senior Rājāwat chiefs from the imperial service on account of natural death.

The year we met here also

Apparently, despite Jahāngīr's initial attitude of not disturbing the position of the Rājāwat nobles his relations with them continued to be far from satisfactory. Something seems to have happened during the first seven years of Jahāngīr's reign that induced the King to adopt a discriminatory attitude towards the Rājāwat nobles. Around 1608, when Mān Singh came to the court from Rohtās his mansab was reduced from 7000/7000 to 5000/.....¹

The Rājāwat nobles who died between 1605 and 1612 were: (a) Jagannāth (1609) and (b) Mādho Singh. While Jagannāth's successor, Karam Chand was given

1. For the fact that towards the end of Akbar's reign Mān Singh was holding the mansab of 7000/7000, see, Appendix. Jahāngīr has not recorded any curtailment in his mansab. On the other hand from Jahāngīr's declaration of amnesty issued just after his accession, one may conclude that Mān Singh retained his mansab of 7000/6000 for some time during the early years of Jahāngīr's reign. (Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.6). But, Hawkins, writing in 1613, includes Mān Singh in the category of the mansabdars of 5000. This suggests that, by 1613, Mān Singh's mansab had already been reduced. One can only conjecture that this happened in 1608 when Mān Singh was recalled to the court from Rohtās. At that occasion Jahāngīr was certainly hostile towards him. This is borne out by the observations that he makes in the Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī about Mān Singh, whom he calls a hypocrite. (Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.65).

the manṣab of 2,000/1,500¹, none of Mādho Singh's sons is known to have received any manṣab.

Further, it would appear that during the same period (1605-12) the Rājāwat nobles also lost most of the high offices that they were holding since Akbar's reign. After Mān Singh's removal from the governorship of Bengāl in June 1606,² none of the Rājāwat chiefs is known to have been appointed by Jahāngīr as a governor of a sūba or entrusted the command of any expedition. In contrast to this, during Akbar's reign, at one occasion (1586-87) as much as four Rājāwat nobles were simultaneously holding the charges of four contiguous sūbas. While Bhagwant Dās and Mān Singh were governors of Lāhore and Kābul respectively,³ Jagannāth and Āskaran were holding the charge of sūbas Ajmār and Āgrā.⁴ Besides, governorships, the Rājāwat nobles also lost, during this time, several other important offices which they failed to regain till the end of Jahāngīr's reign. During the period 1595-1605, three important forts, Rohtās, Ranthambhore and Gwālīor, were held by the Rājāwat nobles Mān Singh,⁵ Jagannāth⁶

-
1. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.74. For Jagannāth's manṣab at the time of his death which was 5000/3000. see, Appendix.
 2. Ibid., p.7; Riāzus Salātīn, p.170. R.P. Tripathi incorrectly says that Mān Singh was transferred from Bengāl to Bihār. (Rise and Fall of the Mughal Empire, pp.367-68). At this time, Jahāngīr Qulī Khān was the governor of Bihār. (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.101).
 3. Akbar Nāma, III, pp.492, 511; Tabaqāt-i Akbarī, II, p.368; Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīr I, p.105; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.105; Tazkirāt-ul Umarā, f.144.
 4. Akbar Nāma, III, pp.511, 518; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, pp.162-63.
 5. Akbar Nāma, III, Tr. p.1251, F.N.1; Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.65; Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.32.
 6. Akbar Nāma, III, p.825; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, I, p.515; Muhtā Nānsī-re-Khyāt, I, p.301.

and Rāj Singh¹ respectively. At the time Mān Singh was sent to Deccan in 1608, Rohtās seems to have been taken away from his charge.² After Jagannāth's death in 1609, Ranthambhore was assigned to Rām Dās Udāvāt.³ Apparently, it was in pursuance of the same policy that later on in 1614-15 Rāj Singh was replaced by Shaikh Modā as the commander of Gwālior.⁴ During Jahāngīr's reign no doubt the Kachawāhā nobles continued to serve in important military expeditions, but generally care was taken not to allow them to hold independent charge of the armies to which they were attached.⁵

1. Akbar Nāma, III, pp.764, 825; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, I, p.515; Tārikh-i Gwālior, Ms. f.22a. The statement in Gwālior Nāma (Ms. f.158b) that Jai Singh held the office of qilādār of Gwālior is obviously wrong as Jai Singh was born in 1605. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.192.

2. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.74.

3. Ibid., p.98; Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.58; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.271.

4. Maktubāt-i Khān-i Jahān Muzaffar Khān-wa-Gwālior Nāma, Ms. f.159b; Tārikh-i Gwālior, Ms. f.23a. Shaikh Modā was brother of Muazzam Khān Shaikh Bayazīd, the grandson of Shaikh Salīm of Fatehpur.

5. There is only an exception of Mahā Singh who was made the Commander of the expedition sent against Rājā Bikramājēet of Bandhugarh in May 1610. (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, Tr. I, p.176).

In October 1605, Mādho Singh, Jagannāth, Raisāl Darbārī, Mahā Singh and Manohar were despatched to serve under Parwīz against Rānā Amar Singh of Mewar. (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.7, 8).

In August 1606, Jagannāth was attached to the expedition against Rai Singh and his son Dalpat headed by Muizzul Mulk Bakhshī. (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.36)

In July 1607, Mahā Singh and Rām Dās were sent with Tāj Khān against the rebels of Bangash. (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.53).

In July 1609, Mān Singh was sent to Deccan with 'Abdur Raḥīm Khān-i Khānān (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.71, W. Finch, Early Travels in India, Tr. by Foster p.131, Qāyam Khān Rāso, p.62). In the same year, Rāj Singh and Karam Chand were despatched with Parwīz to Deccan (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.72, Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.172.)

In September 1611, Rām Dās Udāvāt was sent to Deccan with 'Abdūllāh Khān Uzbēg and Dārāb Khān Fīruz Jang. (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.98, Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.58). Mahā Singh, Manohar and Raisāl Darbārī are also known to have served in Deccan (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.156, 157; Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, Ms. f.110; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, pp.173-74; Ma'āsir-i Rahīmī, I, p.86; Tazkārāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.145). In September 1618, Prithvī Chand was sent to Kāngrā with Bikramājēet (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.238). Bhāo Singh was also deputed to serve in Deccan around October 1619. (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.281). In December 1623, Jai Singh, Rām Dās Narwarī, Girdhar, Nārāin Dās and Karam Chand were deputed to serve under Parwīz and Maḥābat Khān against Khurram. (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.356, 358; Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.204.)

Thus, it emerges that some time after his accession, Jahāngīr sought to undermine the power and prestige of the Rājāwat nobles. Simultaneously, he systematically promoted the non-Rājāwat nobles possibly with an aim to counter balance the authority of the Rājāwat nobles who were recognised as the leaders of the Kachawāhā clan. Jahāngīr's attitude in bestowing the titles of Rājā on Raisāl Darbarī¹ and that of Rājā Karan on Rām Dās Udāvat² respectively around this time was, apparently, in line with the same policy. This becomes particularly conspicuous when viewed in the light of the fact that the title of farzand held by Mān Singh was not conferred upon his successor following his death.³

Any cases of
clash?

Apparently, during this phase Jahāngīr had a deliberate policy of engineering a change in the leadership pattern within Kachawāhā clan. As it is well known, traditionally the Rājāwat ruling family were recognised as the superior chiefs. Towards the end of Akbar's reign in case of misbehaviour by a Kachawāhā noble the matter was referred to Mān Singh.⁴ But Jahāngīr

-
1. Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, p.110. Obviously, Raisāl got this title some time before 1616 when he is presumed to have died. For a discussion of Raisāl's death, see, Appendix.
 2. Rām Dās was entitled Rājā Karan in September 1611. see, Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.98; Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, p.240; Ma'asir-ul Umarā, II, p.156.
 3. In July 1614, after Mān Singh's death, the title of Mirzā Rājā, which was held by Mān Singh during Akbar's reign, was conferred upon Bhāo Singh. See, Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.130; Lāhorī, Bādshāh Nāma, II, p.145.
 4. In February 1592, Bal Rām, nephew of Bhagwant Dās fell from Akbar's favour on account of his misconduct. He was sent off to Bihār to be disciplined by Mān Singh. Akbar Nāma, III, p.605. (The rendering of this passage by Beveridge is misleading).

seems to have encouraged Rām Dās Udāvāt to play such a role. As early as December 1605, when grandsons of Bhagwan Dās, Abhāy Rām, Bijāy Rām and Shyām Rām, having been involved in some incident at the court, were planning to run away to Mēwār, Jahāngīr referred their case to Rām Dās Udāvāt. It is, however, significant that Rām Dās refused to stand surity for the conduct of these persons belonging to the ruling family of the Rājāwat sub-clan.¹ This might also indicate that as a result of differences amongst Kachāwāhā nobles over the issue of succession their clan solidarity had been undermined considerably which apparently facilitated Jahāngīr's subsequent attempt to build up non-Rājāwat chiefs in his service as a counter-weight against the powerful Rājāwat nobles like Mān Singh, Jagamāth, Mādho Singh and Rāj Singh.²

However, it would be wrong to presume from the above that Jahāngīr had decided to discard the Rājāwat chiefs altogether. As a matter of fact the Rājāwat chiefs in the Mughul service were too powerful and prestigious persons to be ignored completely by the new king. He was advised, in 1605, to eliminate the entire Kachawāhā clan from his service as a punishment for the 'misbehaviour' of some of them but Jahāngīr turned down this suggestion saying, "These people had been treated kindly and educated by my revered father, I carried on the

1. Tūzūk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.12-13; Ma'āsir-i Jahāngīrī, Ms. ff.38a-b; Muhtā Ma'nsī-re-Khyāt, I, p.302. Abhāy Rām, Bijāy Rām and Shyām Rām were the sons of Akhēy Rāj, son of Bhagwān Dās. But Niāmat Allāh (Tārīkh-i Khān Jahān wa-Makhdzān-i Afghānī, II, pp.669-70), incorrectly states that Akhēy Rāj and Abhāy Rām, the sons of Bānkā rebelled against Jahāngīr. Actually, Akhēy Rāj who was also known as Bānkā had died in March, 1601. Abūl Fazl (Akbar Nāma, III, p.786) refers to him as Akhēy Rāj and Fa'izī Sirhindī (Akbar Nāma, Ms. f.250a) calls him as Bānkā Rāj.

2. See, infra.

same benevolence to them and justice demands that many shall not be chastised for the fault of one".¹ Apparently, Jahāngīr seems to have pursued a double edged policy with regard to the Rājāwat chiefs. While trying to undermine their position within the Kachawāhā clan he continued to prefer the Rājāwat ruling family for the purpose of matrimonial ties. His first Kachawāhā wife, a daughter of Bhagwān Dās, died in May 1605. In 1608, 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 Jahāngīr² although it was in total disregard of Hindū customary rule prohibiting marriage between a widower and a niece or grand daughter of his deceased wife.

The process of decline in the manṣabs of the Kachawāhā nobles continued even after 7th R.Y. (1611-12). By 12th R.Y. (1616-17) there had taken place a marked fall in the manṣabs of the Rājāwat as well as non-Rājāwat nobles. During 1612-18, total of the manṣabs held by the Kachawāhā nobles fell from 27,000 zāt and 23,300 suwār to 12,300 zāt and 9,200 suwār. While the manṣabs held by the Rājāwat nobles came down from 16,000 zāt and 13,000 suwār to 11,000 zāt and 8,000 suwār, those of the non-Rājāwat nobles were reduced from

This continues your history!

-
1. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.12-13.
 2. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.68;
Ma'āsir-i Jahāngīrī, Ms. f.57b.

11,000 zāt and 10,800 suwār to 1,300 zāt and 1,200 suwār.¹ From this it would appear that during this period fall in the manṣabs of the Rājāwat nobles was only marginal; bulk of the reduction in the total manṣabs of the Kachawāhā nobles was caused by the removal from the scene of three prominent non-Rājāwat nobles. On the other hand, marginal fall in the total manṣabs of the Rājāwat nobles was caused by the death of Mahā Singh and Rāj Singh. But their successors were taken into service with reduced manṣabs, which partly made up for the fall in total, caused by their removal from the scene.² Moreover, two of the junior Rājāwat nobles, Mān Singh's son Bhāo Singh and Rām Dās Narwarī received substantial increases in their manṣabs during the same period.³ This was in marked

1. The names and manṣabs of the Rājāwat nobles in the Mughul service at this time were as follows:

<u>N a m e</u>	<u>M a n ṣ a b s</u>	
	<u>zāt</u>	<u>suwār</u>
1. Bhāo Singh	5000	3000
2. Jaī Singh	1000	1000
3. Karam Chand	2000	1500
4. Nārāin Dās	2000	2000
5. Rām Dās Narwarī	1000	500

For references, see, Appendix.

The names and manṣabs of Shaikhāwat nobles in the Mughul service at this time were as follows:

1. Girdhar	800	800
2. Prithvī Chand	500	400

For references, see, Appendix.

2. In 1617, after Mahā Singh's death, his son Jaī Singh took up the imperial service with the manṣab of 1000/1000 (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.192). Similarly, after Rāj Singh's death in September 1616, his son Rām Dās joined the imperial service and received the manṣab of 1000/400. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.138.
3. In April 1617, Bhāo Singh was raised from 4000/3000 to 5000/3000 (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.184). In August 1616, Rām Dās Narwarī's manṣab was increased from 1000/400 to 1000/500. (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.164.)

contrast of the attitude adopted by Jahāngīr during this time regarding the non-Rājāwats. The successor of the senior non-Rājāwat noble, Rām Dās Udāvat, who died in 1613, was not assigned any manṣab. The successor of Raisāl Darbārī and Rāo Manohar, who also died between 1612 and 1618 only received minor manṣabs. While Raisāl Darbārī's son was given the manṣab of 800/800,¹ the son and successor of Rāo Manohar got a manṣab of 500/300.²

In this connection, it is of interest to note that the above marked retrogression in the position of the Kachawāhā nobles in terms of the manṣabs held by them roughly coincided with the rise to high positions of a number of the members of the family of I'timāduddaula.³ Apparently, bold promotions received by them during the period that the so-called Nūr Jahān Junta was in power accounted for the stagnation or even a retrogression in the position of the groups already established in the higher echelons. Another group whose manṣabs appear to have dwindled during the same period were the members of the family of Shaikh Salīm Chishtī.⁴ But by pointing out this

1. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.146.

2. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.157, In April 1617, his manṣab was increased to 500/400. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.161.

3. Irfan Habib, "The Family of Nur Jahan during Jahangir's reign, a political Study", Medieval India - A Miscellany, Vol. I, p.95. In 1605, the total of the manṣabs held by the members of the family of I'timāduddaula came up to 4000 zāt. By 1621, they accumulated the total manṣabs of 30,500 zāt and 25,300 suwār.

4. In 1612, the members of Shaikh Salīm Chishtī held the total of manṣabs of 14,200 zāt and 12,450 suwār. By 1622, the total of their manṣabs was reduced to 5000 zāt and 3,500 suwār. See, Afzal Husain, "The Family of Shaikh Salīm Chishtī during the reign of Jahāngīr", Medieval India - A Miscellany, Vol. II, p.63.

How? coincidence we are not suggesting that the change so clearly visible in the position of the Kachawāhā nobles during 1612-22 was entirely a result of the influence wielded by Nūr Jahān and Khurram in the administration. It was apparently, an incidental outcome of the circumstances leading to the rise of I'timāduddaula's family to positions of importance. A perusal of Jahāngīr's attitude towards the Kachawāhās from the beginning of his reign would suggest unfolding of a policy aimed at further strengthening his grip over that powerful clan in general and over the Rājāwat ruling family in particular by not giving bold promotions to them and by playing one family against the other.

Jahāngīr had succeeded in weakening the position of the Rājāwat nobles through a policy of encouraging the non-Rājāwat sub-clans within the Kachawāhā group which apparently remained operative up to 7th R.Y. (1611-12). Subsequently, he changed his attitude towards them. Having humbled the Rājāwat chiefs, Jahāngīr appears to have embarked upon a policy of strengthening his grip over them. After Mān Singh's death in 1614, Jahāngīr intervened over the issue of succession and ensured the elevation to the gaddī of Ambēr a person of his own choice amongst the members of the Rājāwat family. Overruling the claim of Jagat Singh's son, Mahā Singh, Jahāngīr conferred the tikā upon Mān Singh's younger son, Bhāo Singh. Mahā Singh was pacified by raising him from 3000/2000 to 4000/3000 and conferring upon him Garha as inām. In addition to this, in 1615, the title of Rāja was also bestowed upon him.¹ The Kachawāhā

1. Tūzūk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.130, 146; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.175. cf. Rifaqat Ali Khan, 'A Note on Jahāngīr And the Rājputs, 1605-1612', Proceedings of Indian History Congress, 1960, p.225.

eld Gābāw
nobles in general as well as the Rājāwat chiefs acquiesced in this interference of the King which was in violation of the customary law governing succession among the Rājput̄s.¹ It was a clear indication of their weakness that they were forced to submit silently to the further tightening/imperial control over their clan.

It is, however, interesting to note that by the 18th R.Y. (1622-23) none of the non-Rājāwat nobles was holding any manṣab.² While on the other hand, during the same period, Jahāngīr gave bold increases in the manṣabs of some members of the Rājāwat clan. For instance, Jai Singh, who succeeded Bhāo Singh in 1621 had his manṣab augmented from 2000/1000 to 3000/1400.³ Similarly, along with him in 1623 Rām Dās Narwarī's manṣab was increased from 1000/500 to 2000/1000.⁴ Anyhow, by these examples, one should not be misled to think that Jahāngīr had become very liberal towards the Kachawāhā nobles in general. As a matter of fact despite these promotions between 1618 and 1624 the total of manṣabs held by them fell from 12,300 zāt and 10,200 suwār to 10,500 zāt and

1. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.106.

2. After the death of Girdhar Shaikhāwat (1623) and Prithvī Chand Shaikhāwat (1620), none of their sons is known to have held manṣab during Jahāngīr's reign.

3. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.337,359.

4. Ibid., pp.164, 358.

6,900 suwār.¹ Apparently, this fall in the total manṣabs of the Kachawāhā nobles explains the evidence suggesting that during Jahāngīr's reign a considerable number of ordinary Kachawāhā troopers took up service under Mahābat Khān, Āṣaf Khān, Surat Singh and Gaj Singh after having left the contingents of the Kachawāhā nobles.² It is interesting to note that these nobles received bold increases in their manṣabs precisely during 1612 and 1627.³

1. The substantial fall in the manṣabs of the Rājāwat nobles is explained that in October 1621, after the death of Bhāo Singh (manṣab: 5000), his successor Jai Singh held the manṣab of 3000/1,400. During this period (1618-24), the rest of the Rājāwat nobles Rām Dās Narwarī, Nārāin Dās, Chatr Sāl and Karam Chand held the manṣabs of 2000/1000, 2000/2000, 1,500/1000, 2000/1500 respectively. See, Appendix.
2. See, supra, Chapter III.
3. In 1605, Zamānā Bēg, entitled Mahābat Khān, held the manṣab of 500. By 1628, he was holding a manṣab of 7000/7000, Dur-Aspa Sih aspa. (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.10; Lāhorī, Bādshāhnāma, I, p.171; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, III, p.399.)

In 1612, Āṣaf Khān held the manṣab of 1000/300. By 1626, he was raised to 7000/7000. (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.106; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, I, p.153).

In 1608, Suraj Singh held the manṣab of 3000/2000. At the time of his death (1619), he held the manṣab of 5000/5000. (Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.73, 141; Hawkins, Early Travels in India, Ed. by Foster, p.98. Thus Muhtā Nainsī's statement that Suraj Singh never received the manṣab of 5000/5000 is not acceptable. cf. Mārwar-re-Pargana-re-Vīgat, I, p.95).

After Suraj Singh's death (1619), his son Gaj Singh was given the manṣab of 3000/2000. By 1628, he was holding the manṣab of 5000/5000. (Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, pp.223-24; Mārwar-re-Pargana-re-Vīgat, I, p.108).

At the time of Khurram's rebellion almost the entire Kachawāhā clan, including Jai Singh, Girdhar, Rām Dās Narwarī and Nārāin Dās remained firm in their allegiance to Jahāngīr,¹ the only exception in this respect being Man Roop, son of Jagannāth, who is known to have sided with Khurram.² In March 1623, Rām Dās Narwarī took part in the battle of Bilochpur along with Mahābat Khān and other nobles against Khurram. Khurram was defeated and in reward Rām Dās Narwarī was promoted to 2000/1000.³ After this discomfiture, Khurram entered Rājputānā and plundered Amber and Lālsot⁴ in the absence of Jai Singh who had been summoned to court.⁵ At that occasion Jai Singh was promoted to 3000/1400⁶ and was sent along with Parwiz and Mahābat Khān and several other Kachawāhā nobles like Girdhar, Rām Dās Narwarī and Nārāin Dās to pursue Khurram.⁷ They overtook Khurram near Māndu⁸ and in the battle that

-
1. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.360; Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.584.
 2. Lāhorī, Bādshāh Nāma, I, pp.122-23; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, I, p.516.
 3. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.358.
 4. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.359-60; A Contemporary Dutch Chronicle of Mughal India, Tr. and Ed. by Narain and Sharma, p.60.
 5. Jahāngīr's farmān to Jai Singh, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner, N-1.
 6. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.359.
 7. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.360; Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.584. In printed text of Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, published by Royal Asiatic Society of Bengāl and its translation from Karachi wrongly mentions Gaj Singh Rāthore, the chief of Jodhpur as Kachawāhā instead of Jai Singh. Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.204, Urdu Translation, published from Karachi, p.186.
 8. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.367; Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.584.

ensued, Kachawāhās played a distinguished role. This is borne out by Jahāngīr's farmān, dated 20th July 1623.¹ During the same campaign, when the imperial army reached Ahmadābād, a trifle incident led to a bitter fight between the Sayyids of Bārha and the followers of Girdhar in which Girdhar and twenty six of his servants were killed. The Kachawāhās were, however, pacified by awarding capital punishment to Sayyid Kabīr who was apparently held responsible for the incident.²

Subsequently, Jaī Singh and other Kachawāhā nobles, seem to have followed Parwīz and Mahābat Khān in Deccan. In March 1624, Jahāngīr sent a khīlat to Jaī Singh and asked him to continue to serve under Parwīz and Mahābat Khān.³ In March 1624, Jaī Singh and other Kachawāhā nobles seem to have retired from Deccan with Parwīz and Mahābat Khān. On Jahāngīr's orders Parwīz and nobles attached to him proceeded towards Allahābād to check Khurram's advance into the Dōab region.⁴ In a farmān issued on 25th September 1624, Jahāngīr praises the Rāja for the services he had rendered during this campaign.⁵ Some times in October 1624, there took place a battle near Jaumpur between the imperial

-
1. Jahāngīr's farmān to Jaī Singh, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner, N-2.
 2. Tūzūk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.374-75; Tazkirāt-ul Umarā, f.143. Tod, wrongly states that Girdhar was killed near Jamuna river. Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, II, p.318.
 3. Jahāngīr's farmān to Jaī Singh, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner, N-3.
 4. Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.589.
 5. Jahāngīr's farmān to Jaī Singh, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner, N-4.

army commanded by Parwīz and Khurram's forces. In this battle Jaī Singh distinguished himself.¹

Soon after Khurram's defeat, Jaī Singh along with Parwīz and Mahābat Khān returned to Deccan. Meanwhile, it seems Mahābat Khān had fallen out with Nūr Jahān and came to be suspected by her of harbouring sympathies for Khurram. Apparently, it was owing to Nūr Jahān's intervention that Mahābat Khān was replaced by Khān-i Jahān Lodī as the effective commander of the imperial forces in Deccan.² It is not known to any degree of certainty as to what was Jaī Singh's real stand on this occasion but from Jahāngīr's farmān, dated 7th August 1625, preserved in the Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner, it seems that Jaī Singh did not fully approve of Mahābat Khān's removal from Deccan and was a bit tardy in extending co-operation to the new commander. Apparently, Jahāngīr and Nūr Jahān on their part were anxious to secure Jaī Singh's co-operation in the impending tussle with Mahābat Khān. They tried to persuade him to help Khān-i Jahān Lodī. Jahāngīr, in his farmān, dated 23rd August 1625, goes to the extent of threatening him with dire consequences including dismissal from the imperial service if he would fail to extend full co-operation to the new commander.³ About the same time Nūr Jahān also

1. A Dutch Chronicle of Mughal India, pp.69-70; Vīr Vinod, II, pp.286-87.

2. Nūr Jahān's nishān to Jaī Singh, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner, N-170.

3. Jahāngīr's farmān to Jaī Singh, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner, N-7.

wrote to Jaī Singh a letter urging upon him to co-operate with Khān-i Jahān. Consequently, Jaī Singh remained with Khān-i Jahān Lodī and co-operated with him, which earned him a khīlat from the Empress in December 1625.¹ However, throughout this time Jaī Singh appears to have been on best of terms with Mahābat Khān. The latter soon after taking Jahāngīr prisoner on 21st March 1626,² had a farmān issued in the name of Jaī Singh in which the King was made to place on record the 'favourable reports' made by Mahābat Khān regarding Jaī Singh's role in the Deccan.³ It was clearly a friendly gesture on the part of Mahābat Khān aimed at further strengthen the bond of friendship and understanding between them. But these efforts of Mahābat Khān to enlist the support of the Rājāwat chief did not effect the attitude of the Kachawāhā nobles in general in any significant manner. None of the Kachawāhā nobles is known to have supported Mahābat Khān in his attempted coup d'ete.

When Khurram came to know about Mahābat Khān's coup, he proceeded towards north. It seems that before setting out towards north, in April 1626, Khurram made a futile attempt to persuade Jaī Singh to join him. He addressed a letter to Jaī Singh wherein emphasising the relationship between him and the Rājā, he sought the latter's help.⁴ Jaī Singh, however, remained neutral in

-
1. Nūr Jahān's nishān to Jaī Singh, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bīkānēr, N-172.
 2. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.402.
 3. Jahāngīr's farmān to Jaī Singh, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bīkānēr. This farmān was issued on 26th March 1626. N-11.
 4. Khurram's letter to Jaī Singh, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bīkānēr.

the ensuing struggle between Shāh Jahān and the central government dominated by Nūr Jahān. He stayed back in Deccan and remained busy in the operations against Malik Ambar's followers.¹ Apparently, the central authorities, who were busy in putting down Shāh Jahān during this time, were also anxious that Jai Singh as well as Gaj Singh, the chief of Jodhpur should remain in Deccan while these two, apparently, in view of the approaching tussle over succession wanted to reach the safety of their waṭans. On 6 September 1626, a farmān, forbidding Jai Singh and Gaj Singh from leaving Deccan, was issued.² Eight months later (May 1627), Jai Singh's mansab was raised to 4000/2500 and he was entitled rāja. The pargana Chātsu was added to his ja-girs.³ This was obviously meant to secure Jai Singh's support for Nūr Jahān's protege in the impending tussle over succession which was clearly in sight.

At the time of Jahāngīr's death Jai Singh was still in Deccan. On receiving the news of Dāwar Bakhsh's accession,⁴ Jai Singh set out for Lāhore in the company of Khān-i Jahān. On the way, Jai Singh and Gaj Singh separated from Khān-i Jahān who was not prepared to support Shāh Jahān's candidature and proceeded to join the latter near Ajmēr.⁵

-
1. Jahāngīr's farmān to Jai Singh, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikanēr, issued on 11th June 1626, N.12, Malik Ambar had died in May 1626.
 2. Jahāngīr's farmān to Jai Singh, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikanēr, N.13.
 3. Jahāngīr's farmān to Jai Singh, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikanēr.
 4. Dāwar Bakhsh sent a farmān to Jai Singh in which he informed the latter about his accession. The farmān is preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner, N.176.
 5. Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.617.

Thus it emerges that the position of the Kachawāhā nobles who had opposed Jahāngīr's accession were not affected during the first one or two years of Jahāngīr's reign. After his accession, Jahāngīr gave promotions to the Rājāwat as well as the non-Rājāwat nobles. These promotions helped the Kachawāhā nobles as such to improve their position in terms of the mansabs held by them. However, it seems that sometimes between 1605 and 1612, Jahāngīr was induced to a discriminatory attitude against the Rājāwat nobles. During this time, Jahāngīr humbled the Rājāwat nobles in regard to their mansabs, offices, titles and generally care was taken not to assign to them independent commands of expeditions. They were not raised to high mansabs but also encouraged to compete with the Rājāwat nobles for leadership of the Kachawāhā clan. During this period, Jahāngīr's attitude towards the non-Rājāwat nobles, who were his staunch supporters over the issue of succession, was quite liberal. Despite this, Jahāngīr did not discard the Rājāwat nobles completely. He continued to prefer the Rājāwat sub-clan for the purposes of matrimonial ties. Apparently, Jahāngīr's attitude towards the Rājāwat nobles at this time was motivated by a desire to strengthen his control over them after having weakened their position. He was certainly not planning to eliminate them completely.

However, from 7th R.Y. (1611-12) onwards, there was a steady fall in the mansabs of the Kachawāhā nobles. By 12th R.Y. (1616-17), there had taken place marked fall in the mansabs of the Rājāwat as well as the non-Rājāwat nobles. Jahāngīr intervened over the choice of Mān Singh's successor and bestowed tika on a person of his own choice whose claim was not fully

endorsed by the established practice. During this time, Jahāngīr had abandoned his earlier policy of encouraging the non-Rājāwat nobles. Both the leading sub-clans of the Kachawāhā group suffered a regression in their position as a result of Jahāngīr's apathy towards them. By 18th R.Y. (1622-23), none of the non-Rājāwat nobles held any manṣab while a sharp decline had taken place in the manṣabs of the Rājāwat nobles.

At the time of Khurram and Mahābat Khān's revolts the Kachawāhā nobles by and large remained loyal to Jahāngīr. Notwithstanding the understanding and friendship seems to have existed between Jai Singh and Mahābat Khān and the latter's efforts to enlist the active support of the Kachawāhā chief, he remained a distant spectator of the developments at the court resulting in Mahābat Khān coup d'ete and his subsequent discomfiture. However, after the news of Jahāngīr's death had become known, the Kachawāhā chief threw his full weight behind Shāh Jahān which caused a breach between him and Khān-i Jahān Lodī who supported Nūr Jahān's candidate for the throne.

A P P E N D I X

In the following is cited the evidence relating to the mansabs held by the Kachawāhā nobles at different points of time between 1595 and 1627. In this list the notices regarding the nobles belonging to different sub-clans are grouped together in alphabetical order.

BHĀO SINGH RĀJĀWAT :

Bhāo Singh was a son of Mān Singh.¹ His name is not included in the list of mansabdārs given in Āyīn-i Akbarī and Tabaqāt-i Akbarī. In March 1605, he held the mansab of 1000/500.² But in Akbar Nāma, the zāt rank of Bhāo Singh is mentioned 7000 which is obviously a slip.³ In Jahāngīr's 1st R.Y. (1605-1606), he was raised to 1,500.⁴ In March 1608, his mansab was increased to 2000/1000.⁵ But according to Shāh Nawāz Khān, at this occasion, he was raised to 2000/2000.⁶ In July 1614, his mansab was increased to 4000/3000.⁷ Further,

-
1. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.10; Muhtā-Nāinsī-re-Khyāt, I, p.298.
 2. Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.508; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, III, p.360; Tazkīrat-ul Umarā, Ms. f. 133.
 3. Akbar Nāma, III, p.837.
 4. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.10; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, III, p.360.
 5. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.66.
 6. Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, III, p.360.
 7. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.130; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, III, pp.360-61; Tazkīrat-ul Umarā, Ms. f.133.

in April 1617, he was promoted to 5000/3000.¹ At the time of his death (October 1621), he held the mansab of 5000.²

Chatr Singh Rājāwat :

He was a son of Mādho Singh.³ According to Shāh Nawāz Khān, during the end of Jahāngīr's reign, he held the mansab of 1,500/1000.⁴ Further, nothing is known about his career during Jahāngīr's reign.

Jagannath Rājāwat :

He was a son of Bhār Mal.⁵ In 1595, he held the mansab of 2,500.⁶ In 1599, he is known to have enjoyed the mansab of 3,000.⁷ In March 1601, he was raised to 5,000.⁸ In 1609, at the time of his death,⁹ he held the mansab of 5000/3000.¹⁰

-
1. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.184; Ma'asir-ul-Umarā, III, p.361; Tazkarāt-ul-Umarā, Ms. f.133.
 2. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.337.
 3. Muhtā-Nainsī-re-Khyāt, I, p.299; Ma'asir-ul-Umarā, III, p.322.
 4. Ma'asir-ul-Umarā, III, p.322.
 5. Akbar Nāma, II, p.155; Muhtā-Nainsī-re-Khyāt, I, p.301.
 6. Āyin-i Akbarī, 181.
 7. A Contemporary Dutch Chronicle of Mughal India, pp.25-26.
 8. Akbar Nāma, III, p.786; Iqbal Nāma-i-Jahāngīrī, p.474.
 9. Vir Vinod, p.225.
 10. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.75.

Jai Singh Rajawat :

Jai Singh, son of Mahā Singh¹ held the mansab of 1000/1000 in September 1617.² But according to Shah Nawaz Khan, at this occasion, he held the mansab of 1000/500.³ In October 1621, he was raised to 2000/1000.⁴ In April 1623, his mansab was increased to 3000/1,400.⁵ Further, in May 1627, he was raised to 4000.⁶ However, one may assume that at this time his suwār rank was 2,500 or less as it is known on the authority of Bādshāh Nāma that in Shāh Jahān's 1st R.Y. (1627-28), his suwār rank was still 2,500.⁷

Karam Chand Rajawat :

Karam Chand son of Jagamāth⁸ held the mansab of 2,000/1,500 in September 1609.⁹ Further, nothing is known about any increase in his mansab during Jahāngīr's reign.

-
1. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.191; Muhtā Nainsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.297.
 2. Ibid., p.192.
 3. Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, III, p.568.
 4. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.337.
 5. Ibid., p.359.
 6. Jahāngīr's farmān to Jai Singh, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner.
 7. Lāhorī, Bādshāh Nāma, I, p.120.
 8. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.74; Muhtā Nainsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.301, In Ma'āsir-ul Umarā (I, p.516), his name is given as Rām Chand.
 9. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.74, Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, I, p.516, Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.155.

Mādhō Singh Rājāwat :

He was a son of Bhagwant Dās¹ and brother of Mān Singh.² But in Takmilā-i Akbar nāma and Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, he is mentioned as nephew of Mān Singh which is a slip.³ However, he was a member of the Rājāwat ruling sub-clan.⁴ But Jahāngīr incorrectly refers him as belonging to the Shaikhāwat branch.⁵

In 1595, he held the manṣab of 1,500.⁶ Nizāmuddīn followed by Shaikh Farīd Bhakkārī and Kēwal Rām includes him in the category of Akbar's manṣabdārs of 2,000.⁷ In 1603, he was raised to 3,000/2,000.⁸ After Jahāngīr's accession, he received the manṣab of 3,000.⁹ Afterwards nothing is known about the career of Mādhō Singh.

Mahā Singh Rājāwat :

He was a son of Jagat Singh, the eldest son of Mān Singh.¹⁰ Bainsi

-
1. Tabaqāt-i Akbarī, p.385; Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, p.221; Muhtā Nānsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.299; Ma'asir-ul Umarā, III, pp.321-22; Tazkarāt-ul Umara, Ms. f.157.
 2. Muhtā Nānsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.299.
 3. Akbar Nāma, III, p.833, Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.7.
 4. Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, Ms. f.110; Muhtā Nānsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.299; Bankē Dās-rē-Khyāt, pp.124, 299.
 5. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.7.
 6. Āyin-i Akbarī, p.182.
 7. Tabaqāt-i Akbarī, p.385; Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, p.221; Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.157.
 8. Akbar Nāma, III, p.820.
 9. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.7.
 10. Akbar Nāma, III, p.763; Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.7; Iqbal Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.465; Muhtā Nānsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.297.

Prasad says that he was a son of Mān Singh which is obviously a slip.¹ However, his name is not included in the lists of mansabdārs given in Āyīn-i Akbarī and Tabaqāt-i Akbarī. In March 1605, he held the mansab of 2000/300.²

After Jahāngīr's accession, he was raised to 2000/2000.³ In April 1612, he was raised to 3000/2000.⁴ In July 1614, his mansab was increased to 3,500/2,500.⁵ Further, in July 1616, he was promoted to 4000/3000.⁶ One does not come across the evidence suggesting further increase in the mansab till his death in 1617.⁷

Mān Singh Rājāwat :

Mān Singh, son of Bhagwant Dās⁸ was a member of the Rājāwat ruling sub-clan.⁹ But at one place, the author of Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn describes him as belonging to the Shaikhāwat branch which is obviously a mistake.¹⁰

-
1. Bains Prasad, History of Jahangir, pp.121-22.
 2. Akbar Nāma, III, p.839; Ma'āsīr-ul Umarā, II, p.175; Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.145.
 3. Tūzūk-i Jahāngīrī, p.7.
 4. Tūzūk-i Jahāngīrī, p.106; Ma'āsīr-ul Umarā, II, p.175; Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.145.
 5. Tūzūk-i Jahāngīrī, p.130; Ma'āsīr-ul Umarā, II, p.175; Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.145.
 6. Tūzūk-i Jahāngīrī, p.161; Ma'āsīr-ul Umarā, II, p.175; Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.145.
 7. Tūzūk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.186-87; Ma'āsīr-ul Umarā, II, p.175; Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.145.
 8. Akbar Nāma, III, pp.157-58.
 9. Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, p.106; Ma'āsīr-ul Umarā, II, p.111; Bānkē Dās-re-Khyāt, p.123; Vir Vinod, p.1276.
 10. Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, p.103.

In 1595, he held the mansab of 5,000.¹ On 26 August 1605, he was raised to 7000/6000.² But according to Shāh Nawāz Khān, at this occasion, Mān Singh was raised to 7000/7000.³ Mān Singh is not known to have received any increase during Jahāngīr's 1st R.Y. One may, therefore, assume that his mansab during this time remained what it was at the time of Akbar's death. However, R.N. Prasad seems to have misunderstood Ma'āsir-i-Jahāngīrī's⁴ text in making the statement that during the first R.Y. of Jahāngīr's reign, Mān Singh's mansab was 5000.⁵ However, it appears that between the period 1606-1613, Mān Singh was demoted to 5000. Hawkins (1608-13) writing his account in 1613, includes Mān Singh in the list of the mansabdārs of 5000.⁶ It is corroborated by the author of Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn and Muhtā Nāinsī.⁷ Mān Singh died in July 1614.⁸

Nārāin Dās Rājāwat :

He was a son of Khangar and grandson of Jagmāl, a brother of Bhār Mal.⁹

-
1. Āyin-i Akbarī, p.181.
 2. Akbar Nāma, III, p.839; Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.510.
 3. Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.168.
 4. Ma'āsir-i Jahāngīrī, Ms. f.36a.
 5. R.N. Prasad, Raja Man Singh of Amber, p.120.
 6. Hawkins, Early Travels in India, Ed. by Foster, p.98.
 7. Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, p.109; Mārwar-rē-Pargana-rē-Vīgat, II, p.492.
 8. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.130.
 9. Āyin-i Akbarī, p.181; Akbar Nāma, II, pp.156-57; Muhtā Nāinsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.304.

Towards the end of Jahāngīr's reign, he held the mansab of 2000.¹

Rāj Singh Rājāwat :

He was a son of Āskaran and a nephew of Bhār Mal.² In 1595, he held the mansab of 900.³ In 1604, he was raised to 3,500/3,000.⁴ In 1605, his mansab was augmented to 4000/3000.⁵ But according to Akbar Nāma in 1605, he was raised to 3000 which is obviously a slip because already in 1604, in the same source, his mansab is mentioned 3,500/3000 as noted above.⁶ However, one does not come across the evidence suggesting any increase in his mansab till his death in 1615.⁷

Rām Dās Narwarī Rājāwat :

He was a son of Rāj Singh.⁸ After his father's death in 1615, he received the mansab of 1000/400.⁹

1. Mārwar-rē-Pargana-rē-Vīgat, II, pp.492-93.

2. Akbar Nāma, II, p.155; Āyin-i Akbarī, p.185; Muhtā Nainsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.303.

3. Āyin-i Akbarī, p.183.

4. Akbar Nāma, III, p.826.

5. Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.510; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, pp.171-72.

6. Akbar Nāma, III, p.836.

7. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.138.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid. Bainsi Prasad, the annotator of Ma'āsir-ul Umarā (Tr. II, p.579), at this occasion, confounded this Rām Dās to Rām Dās Udāvat.

In August 1616, he was raised to 1000/500.¹ Further, in 1617, his mansab was increased to 1,500/700.² But at this occasion, in the printed text of Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, the name of Rām Dās's father is/a slip³ because Rām Singh, son of Jai Singh was born in September 1635.⁴ In 1623, he was raised to 2000/1000.⁵ One does not come across the evidence suggesting further increase in his mansab during Jahāngīr's reign.

Mentioned as Jay Singh which is

Girdhar Shaikhawat :

Girdhar was a member of Shaikhawat branch being a son of Rāisāl Darbārī.⁶ In 1616, he held the mansab of 800/800.⁷ In July 1618, he was raised to 1000/800.⁸ In March, 1621, his mansab was increased to 1200/900.⁹ Further, in October 1622, he was raised to 2,000/1,500.¹⁰ One does not come across the evidence suggesting further increase in the mansab till his death in December 1623

1. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.164.
2. Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.172; Āyir-i Akbarī, Tr. Blochmann, p.510.
3. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.207.
4. Vir Vinod, p.1295, H. Beveridge, the editor of Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī (Tr. by A. Rogers, p.418) also stands on the same view.
5. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.358.
6. Ibid., p.7; Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, Ms. f.110; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.172; Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.152; Muhtā Nānsī-re-Khyāt, I, p.321.
7. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.146; Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.143.
8. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.248; Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.143.
9. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.332.
10. Ibid., p.356; Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.143.
11. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.374-75.

Manohar Shaikhawat :

Manohar son of Loonkaran¹ belonged to the Shaikhawat branch.² In 1595, he held the mansab of 400.³

Prithvi Chand Shaikhawat :

He was a son of Manohar Shaikhawat.⁴ In April 1616, he received the mansab of 500/300.⁵ In July 1616, he was raised to 500/400.⁶ In 1618, his mansab was increased to 700/450.⁷ He died in January 1620.⁸

Raisāl Darbārī Shaikhawat :

He belonged to the Shaikhawat branch.⁹ In 1595, he held the mansab of 1000/250.¹⁰ In 1602, he was raised to 2,500/1250.¹¹ In 1603, his mansab was

-
1. Akbar Nāma, III, p.221; Tabaqāt-i Akbarī, 338-39; Ma'āsir-i Rahīmī, I, pp.85-56.
 2. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.54.
 3. Āyin-i Akbarī, p.184.
 4. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.161.
 5. Ibid., 157.
 6. Ibid., p.161.
 7. Ibid., p.239; Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.133.
 8. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.304.
 9. Ibid., p.7; Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, Ms. f.110; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.172; Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.152.
 10. Āyin-i Akbarī, p.182.
 11. Akbar Nāma, III, p.809.

increased to 3000.¹ After Jahāngīr's accession in 1605, he received the manṣab of 3000 i.e. perhaps 3000/3000.² At the time of his death, he held the manṣab of 5000.³ He died perhaps between 1606-1616 as it is known that his son Girdhar was given the manṣab and tikā of Khandēlā in 1616.⁴

Rām Dās Udāvāt :

He comes from the old leaf of the Kachawāhā clan. He is identified as Udāvāt by his father's name Udā.⁵ In 1595, he held the manṣab of 500.⁶ In March 1605, he was raised to 2000/200.⁷ In 1605, Jahāngīr raised him to 3000.⁸ In 1613, at the time of his death⁹, he held the manṣab of 5000.¹⁰

-
1. Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.152.
 2. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.7.
 3. Shīkhar Vansotpatī, p.21.
 4. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.146; Muhtā Nainsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.321.
 5. Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, p.238; Muhtā Nainsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.331; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.331.
 6. Āyin-i Akbarī, p.184.
 7. Akbar Nāma, III, p.837.
 8. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.9.
 9. Ibid., p.123.
 10. Hawkins, Early Travels in India, p.98; Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, p.240.

CHAPTER III

ORDINARY KACHAWAHĀ TROOPERS SERVING THE
MUGHUL EMPIRE : COMPOSITION AND STRUCTURE
OF THE CONTINGENTS OF THE KACHAWAHĀ NOBLES

It seems one great anxiety of the Mughuls from the very beginning, was to recruit ordinary retainers in the contingents commanded by the nobles from among various Indian groups. From a perusal of Bāburnāma, one gets the impression that owing to the general hostility of the common people towards the Mughuls, Bābur had found it difficult to augment his armed forces. For this purpose, he seems to have relied mainly on whatever co-operation he was able to get from certain sections of the Afghān and Shaikhzāda nobles recruited to his service after the battle of Panīpat.¹ One can only conjecture that those retainers (referred to by Bābur as Tarkash bandān) who were recruited in Hindūstān with the help of the Afghān nobles² would be mainly Indian Muslims, the Afghāns as well as others, having close links with their erst while chiefs. Apparently, after Hūmāyūn's defeat at the hands of Shēr Shāh, the Afghāns must have been almost totally eliminated from the Mughul contingents. Naturally, Akbar could not entirely depend on the recruitment of soldiers for the fast expanding contingents of his officers on the non-Afghān

1. Bāburnāma, Tr. Beveridge, A.S., pp.523-24.

2. Cf. Bābur Nāma, Tr. p.526, wherein it is stated that in May 1526, Shaikh Ghulām joined Bābur's service with his retainers. For the fact that by 1527 a considerable part of the contingents of Bābur's even Tūrānī nobles consisted of Hindūstānī retainers. See, Ibid., p.538.

groups among the Indian Muslims. It would seem that by taking into Imperial service the Rājput chiefs, Akbar might have hoped to obtain the extra advantage of being able to utilise the services of ordinary Rājput peasants as retainers on a wider scale.¹ We have no evidence to ascertain the number of the Rājputs or for that matter retainers belonging to any other Hindū community in the contingents of the Mughul nobles before 1561. But one may assume that these elements must have been there to some extent. Naturally enough, with the entry of a considerable number of Rājput chiefs in the service, the over all strength of Hindu retainers in the Mughul armed forces would also go up. Initially, this would be mainly accounted by those constituting the contingents of the Rājput chiefs. It is however known that with the passage of time the number of Rājput retainers in the contingents of all the nobles became considerable. In certain cases, some of the Tūrānī and Irānī nobles would have mainly the Rājputs as their retainers. The most interesting case in this respect was that of Mahābat Khān.² It is, therefore, quite understandable that while deciding to take the Rājput nobles in his service in large numbers. Akbar must have had in mind this aspect as well.

-
1. cf. Akbar Nāma, Vol. II, p.204. Abūl Faḍl justifies the abolition of Jizyah in 1564 on the ground that under Akbar 'those belonging to other religions' were also rendering military service to the state. The context in which this statement occur suggests that it refers not only to the Rājput chiefs but to common Hindūs also.
 2. In 1626, five or four thousand Rājputs, in the service of Mahābat Khān played an important part in establishing his control over the Imperial camp. See, Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.402; Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.601; Fatah Nāma-i Nūr Jahān Bēgam, Ms., f.27a, Ma'āsir-i Jahāngīrī, Ms., f.198b, Amfā'āl-Akhabār, Ms. f.234, The Travels of Peter Mundy, II, p.205, Storia de Mogor, II, p.164, Ma'āsir-il-Umarā, III, p.392, Vir Vinod, II, p.307.

II. Ordinary Kachawahā Troopers in the Service of the Mughul Nobles:

There exists sufficient evidence suggesting that, during Jahāngīr's reign, a considerable number of Kachawahās as well as non-Kachawahā Rājput̄s were included in the contingents of the nobles belonging to different categories.¹ This would be true for the reigns of Shāh Jahān and Aurangzib as well. 'Arz-ochahra' documents, preserved in Andhra Pradesh Archives, Hyderābād, establish conclusively that from Shāh Jehān's reign onwards, the Tūrānī, Irānī, Afghān and the Shaikhzāda nobles would have a considerable number of Rājput̄ troopers in their contingents.² To give a specific example, one knows on the authority of Abūl Faẓl Māmūrī, that the contingent of Aghar Khān, a noble of Aurangzib's period, consisted entirely of Rājput̄ and Afghān retainers.³

For Jahāngīr's reign, one is able to prepare a long list of Rājput̄s serving in Mahābat Khān's contingent, The list appended at the end of this Chapter giving the names of 21 such persons and those of the places where their pattās were located, has been prepared mainly with the help of information derived from Muhta Nāinsi-re-Khyāt. It would be of interest to note that in this list of 21 persons, 8 are Kachawahās, 7 Chauhāns, 1 Sisodīa, 2 Rātheres.

-
1. See, Table 'A', There can be cited many such cases from the later Mughul period also. Some of the nobles of that period are known for having mainly the Rājput̄ as their retainers. One such noble of the period was Khān-i Daurān. See, Tārīkh-i Shāhadāt-i Farrukhsiyar-wa-Julus-i Muhammad Shāh, p.132, cited by Z.U. Malik, A Mughul Statesman of the Eighteenth Century: Khān-i Daurān, pp.56-57. One also comes across a reference in Bānke Das-re-Khyāt, p.132 to a certain noble of the same period who had in his service Kumbo Harrājot Parihār.
 2. R.A. Alavi, "New Light on Mughal Cavalry", Medieval India: A Miscellany, Vo. II, Table 'F', pp.95-97.
 3. Abūl Faẓl Ma'mūrī, Tārīkh-i Aurangzib, Ms. f.145b, cited by M. Athar Ali, The Mughal Nobility Under Aurangzib, p.164.

and 3 Bhātīs.¹ Some of these persons are described as holding pattās or sub-assignments which would go to show that they were mostly petty officers in the service of the noble. It is also worth noting that all these sub-assignments are described as located in Rājputānā. This might be interpreted as indicating a tendency on the part of the Mughul nobles having ja-girs in Rājputānā to give sub-assignments to their Rājput subordinates in the regions located close to latter's native places.²

One may further conjecture that the ordinary troopers employed by these Rājput petty-officers would generally belong to their own clans. It may, therefore, be assumed that the proportion of the ordinary troopers belong to the various Rājput clans within the contingent of a noble like Mahābat Khān, would correspond to that found among petty-officials employed by him. However, as we have no estimate of the total number of the petty officers in the service of Mahābat Khān, it is not possible to get any idea of the ratio that would ordinarily obtain between Rājputs and other categories of the troopers in the contingents of the Mughul nobles other than the Rājputs.

Another interesting feature in this respect seems to be the presence of a considerable number of Kachāwāhās in the contingents of the chiefs of Mārwar holding imperial mangabs during the period, 1572-1700. There is appended at the end of this chapter another list of 165 persons who were in the service

1. See Table 'A'.

2. Op. Cit.

of the Rāthore chiefs at different points of time during this period. In this list are included the names of persons holding pattās of different values ranging from Rs.1000 to Rs.25000.¹ The biggest pattā of Rs.25000 was held by a Kachawā^{ha}, Rām Singh Shaikhāwat.² Out of these 165 persons, 23 were the Kachawā^ahās, 4 Sīsodīās, 14 Dēwērās, 6 Songar Chauhāns, 66 Bhātīs, 1 Sānkhla, 48 Chauhāns, 2 Muslims and 1 Chāran.³ It may, however, be noted that none of the Kachawāhās is described as holding a pattā of less than Rs.3000.⁴ Taking a clue from Muhtā Nainsī's statement that the value of a pattā assigned for one horseman would be Rs.1000,⁵ it may be assumed that most of the Kachawāhās employed by the Rāthores were petty-officers having under their command 3 or more horsemen. One may thus conclude that, throughout the 17th century, which includes Jahāngīr's reign, a considerable number of Kachawāhās were serving in the contingents of the Rāthore chiefs as petty-officers. Though on the basis of the information available, it is not possible to say with any degree of certainty as to what was the exact position in this respect under Jahāngīr.

The tendency on the part of the Kachawāhā troopers to take up service under the non-Kachawāhā nobles during Jahāngīr's reign would partly be a

-
1. See, Table 'B'.
 2. Muhtā Nainsī-rē-Khyāt, I, p.319.
 3. These figures are derived from Table 'B'.
 4. See Table 'B'.
 5. Mārwār-re-Pargana-re-Vīgat, II, pp.408-10.

consequence of a notable fall in the total of the mansabs held by the Kachawāhā nobles. A comparison of the total suwār ranks held by the Kachawāhās under Akbar with those of Jahāngīr's reign brings forth telling results. The Kachawāhā mansabdārs of Akbar's reign who continued to serve under Jahāngīr, commanded 26,100 suwārs.¹ But on the death of each/^{one} of these nobles his successor was granted comparatively a smaller rank by Jahāngīr. Hence, a situation was gradually arrived at wherein while the total number of the Kachawāhā nobles in the Mughul service increased, the number of troopers commanded by them went down sharply. Thus we find that in the 10th R.Y. of Shāh Jahān's reign (1637-38) the total of the suwār ranks of the Kachawāhās came up to only 11,000²

1. See, supra.

2. This is borne out by the fact that during Shāh Jahān's 10th R.Y., the following Kachawāhā nobles held the mansabs:

S.No.	Name	Mansab	
		Zāt	Suwār
1.	Jai Singh	5,000	5,000
2.	Rām Dās Narwarī	2,000	1,000
3.	Dwārka Dās	1,500	500
4.	Gopāl Singh	900	600
5.	Tīlok Chand	800	500
6.	Ugar Sēn	800	400
7.	Bhoj Rāj	800	400
8.	Har Rām	700	300
9.	Roop Singh	700	300
10.	Udai Bhān	600	400
11.	Ugar Sēn	600	400
12.	Nar Singh	500	400
13.	Chander Bhān	500	400
14.	Mathura Dās	500	400
Total		15,900	11,000

For reference, see Lāhorī, Bādshāh Nāma, Vol. I, pt.II, pp.294-322.

almost half of the corresponding number for the end of Akbar's reign. One may thus assume that a large number of the retainers belonging to the Kachawāhā clan who would lose employment as a result of gradual reduction in the total suwār ranks held by the Kachawāhā nobles during Jahāngīr's reign/would become available to join the contingents of other nobles.¹

III. Composition of the Contingents :

It is a plausible hypothesis that from the very beginning a majority of the retainers in the contingents of the Kachawāhā nobles belonged to their own clan. Those from among the Kachawāhās given imperial mansabs exclusively to two leading sub-clans, namely, the Rajawats and Shaikhāwats; the former being more numerous and enjoying higher mansabs. The third most numerous and influential sub-clan of the Kachawāhās, the Narookās were by and large excluded from imperial service.² The same was true of rest of the minor sub-clans like the Umbhani, Nindarkā, Kundalkā, Ralnot, Karnawat, Jogī and the Hamirpotā Kachawāhās. These people were mainly employed by the Kachawāhā nobles in their contingents. Narookās were exclusively employed by the Rājāwat nobles. Under the Rājāwat chiefs of Amber, the command of the vanguard was traditionally entrusted to the Narookās. For example, Lal Singh Narookā used to command

1. See, Infra.

2. A few Narookās seem to have entered the imperial service during Shāh Jahān's reign. Chander Bhān Narookā, for instance, was given a mansab of 500/400. See, Bādshāh Nāma of Lāhorī, p.322; Vir Vinod, p.376.

the vanguard in Bhār Mal's contingent.¹ Ālu Khān Narookā served as the commander of the vanguard under Mān Singh.² They also held important posts in the contingents of the chiefs of Ambēr. Bhāinru Narookā was the faujdār of the elephant stable in the contingent of Mān Singh.³ Similarly, the Kumbhānī and the Nīdarkā Kachawāhās served under the Rājāwat chiefs,⁴ while the Kundalkā, Raihot and the Karnāwat Kachawāhās rendered service, mainly under the Shaikhāwat chiefs of Manoharpur. The Karnāwat Kachawāhās apparently had the status of Pradhāns (some kind of local chiefs or zamīndārs) in Manoharpur.⁵

It would, however, be incorrect to assume that all the members of these sub-clans would be serving under the respective Rājāwat and Shaikhāwat chiefs on account of their feudal obligations or some other kind of traditional ties. One often comes across evidence suggesting that the members of the same sub-clan would be serving under different chiefs. For instance, while some of the members of Jogī and Hamīrpotā sub-clans rendered service to the chief of Ambēr and some others to the chief of Nārāina. This would bring out that not all the members of a sub-clan would be serving necessarily under their superior chiefs who had traditional claims over them. It would be reasonable to assume that all those taking up service under chiefs not having any traditional claim over their sub-clans would be doing so in return for payment through pattā.

1. Vir-Vinod, II, p.1375.

2. Akbar Nāma, III, p.336; Muhtā Nāinsi-rē-Khyāt, I, p.315. During operations against Mirzā Hakīm's forces around Nilab in January, 1581, the command of the vanguard of the army sent under Mān Singh was held by Ālu Khān Narookā.

3. Muhtā Nāinsi-rē-Khyāt, I, p.313; Bānkē Dās-rē-Khyāt, p.124.

4. Muhtā Nāinsi-rē Khyāt, I, pp.329-330.

5. Ibid., 329, 332. It would tend to suggest that the service rendered by them to the Shaikhāwat chiefs would be in the nature of a feudal obligation rather than in lieu of a sub-assignment or pattā.

Lastly, in addition to the retainers belonging to their own clans, the Kachawāhā nobles also employed a considerable number of retainers belonging to other Rājput as well as non-Rājput groups. Among the Rājput retainers other than Kachawāhās, there were persons belonging to such diverse groups as the Bhātīs, Songars, Sānkhilā, Sodhās and the Panwārs. Most of these appear to be mercenaries, not necessarily belonging to the Kachawāhā territories whose services were hired on the basis of payment through pattās.¹

1. The following Rajput chiefs belonging to Sodhā, Bhāti, Sānkhilā, Songar and Panwār clans are reported to have been in the service of the Kachawāhā chiefs of Ambēr.

The Sodhās of Amarkot: According to Muhtā Nainsī the descendants of Viram Dēve Sodhā were in the service of the chief of Ambēr. Ratan Singh Sodhā's sons, belonging to the same family, were also in their service. It is known that one of the sons of Ratan Singh, Shēr Khān (apparently a Muslim) was given Murādā (situated in 75° 10'E. 26° 56'N) in pattā. (M.K., I, 356).

/family Bhātīs of Pugal (a pargana in sarkār Bikanēr, see Ayīn, Tr. II, p.282) and Khaījalārā (could not be identified): According to Bānkē Dās, Rāipālot Bhāti of Khaījalārā served under Bhagwant Dās (B.K., p.117), Aso Bhāti served under Bhagwant Dās (M.K., II, p.145). Nārāin Dās Bhāti and Patto Bhāti, belonging to the same family, served under Mān Singh and Mādho Singh respectively. (M.K., II, pp.145, 151); Manohar Dās and his brother, Rāgho Dās Bhāti, belonging to the same/served under Bhagwant Dās's son, Pratāp Singh (Ibid., p.152, B.K., p.153). Mahēsh Dās Bhāti belonging to the same family served under Mān Singh's son, Sabal Singh (M.K., I, p.150).

One of the Sānkhilā families of Runichā (same as Run, a pargana in sarkār Nāgore, See Ayīn, Tr. II, p.282) served under the chiefs of Ambēr. Bālkaran Sānkhilā was in the service of Mān Singh. He was given 84 villages in pargana Run as pattā located Mān Singh's jāgīr in sarkār Nāgore. (M.K., I, p.342).

Mādho Dās Songar (region not known) served under Mirzā Rāja Jai Singh (B.K., p.153).

Kishan Singh Panwar (region not known) served under Rām Dās Kachawāhā. Khyāt of Pātalpothā, Ms., cited by R.N. Prasad, Raja Man Singh of Amber, p.116.

On the other hand, it will be erroneous to suppose that the Rājput chiefs, as is stated in Storia-do-Mogor and Nādir-az-zamānī, had only Rājput retainers in their contingents.¹ From Khulāṣat-us Siyāq, it is known that the Rājput nobles were to have one sixth retainers in their contingents from non-Rājput groups.² The description given in Khulāṣat-us Siyāq (compiled in 1703) would apply more appropriately to the situation obtaining under Aurangzib. But one may infer that the trend must have been there under Jahāngir and Shāh Jahān.³ It is, in any case, known that the Kachawāhā chiefs had Muslim soldiers in their army even before their joining the Mughul service. Hasan Khān Sur, the father of Shēr Shāh Sur, was for some time in the service of Rāimāl Shaikhāwat, the grand father of Rāisāl Darbārī.⁴ They appear to have continued to employ the Muslims in their contingents after joining the Mughul service. Mān Singh had a considerable number of Muslim soldiers in his contingent.⁵

-
1. Storia-do-Mogor by Mamucci, II, pp.407-08; Nādir-az Zamānī by Khusāl Chand, Ms. f.1072; cited from Irvin, The Army of the Indian Mughals, p.36.
 2. Khulāṣat-us Siyāq, Ms. f.54b; compare, Athar Ali, The Mughal Nobility under Aurangzeb, p.164.
 3. Cf. 'Arz-o-chahra documents', preserved in Andhra Pradesh Archives, Hyderabad, show that under Shāh Jahān, the Hindū nobles employed a considerable members of Muslim troopers; See, R.A. Alavi, "New Light on Mughal Cavalry", Medieval India - A Miscellany, Table 'F', p.97.
 4. Akbar Nāma, I, p.147; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.172; Tazkirāt-ul Umarā, Ms. f.152; Ayin-i Akbarī, I, Tr. Blochmann, p.462; compare, K.R. Qanungo, Sher Shah and His Times, p.7
 5. Zakirāt-ul Khawānīn, I, p.107; Rāja Ajeēt Singh (1681-1724) of Jodhpur also seems to have employed Muslim retainers in his contingent. A certain Badar Khān, son of Hasan Khān, is mentioned as having been in his service. See, Mārwar-rē-Pargana-rē-Vīgat, II, p.410.

In addition to this, the Kachawāhā chiefs also employed non-Rājput Hindū retainers in their contingents. For example, the charans were also included in their contingents. Their work was to encourage the soldiers by their martial music during the course of a battle. Hāpā Chāran, who was in the service of Mān Singh, played martial music during the Battle of Ahmedābād (1573).¹ Side by side with these functions, these people performed certain military functions as well.² Hāpā Chāran, for instance, had one hundred elephants under his command.³ There can be also cited similar cases regarding the Rājput chiefs other than the Kachawāhās. These retainers would generally belong to castes and communities settled in the territories under the sway of the respective chieftains. They may not necessarily be restricted to the so-called martial races or groups recognised as Kchatriyas. Many of them would belong to such aboriginal communities, settled in Rājputānā as the Bhīls,⁴ Mēenas,⁵ Thorīes⁶ and the Chatiyās.⁷ Rānā Prataṭ of Mēwār employed

1. Akbar Nāma, III, p.55; Vir-Vinod, II, p.1283.

2. Storia-do-Mogor, II, p.411.

3. Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, pp.106-07; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.168; Vir-Vinod, II, p.1283.

-in

4. They lived in the region extending from Ajmēr/to Gujarāt. Ānand Rām Mukhīlis, an 18th century writer, holds that they were robbers and skilful hunters, wearing clothes mostly of leaves. See, Mar'at-ul Istilāh, Ms., f.184b; cited by W. Irvine, The Army of the Indian Mughals, p.170.

5. Mēenas were settled in Ambēr, Kota, Bundī and Mēwār territories. See Tod, II, p.282.

6. A criminal tribe described by Tod as expert thieves. They were scattered all over Rājputānā. Their services would be sometimes employed for escorting caravans. Ibid, p.261.

7. Chatiyās or Jāts were mainly an agricultural community. They were scattered in Rājputānā, Funjāb, Indus, Yamuna and Ganges. Ibid., I, p.88.

Bhīls in his army.¹ Similarly, Sānval Dās, an officer of Rānā Rāj Singh had only Mēenas, Thorīes and Chatiyās in his corps.²

IV. Organisation of the Contingents :

It is significant that most of the members of a family would have a tendency to serve under the same chief: For instance, most of the members of a family of Akhēy Rāj Bhātī of Pugal were in the service of Bhagwant Dās's son Pratāp Singh.³ Similarly, all the family members of Sihar Sānkhlā of Runīchā served/under the chiefs of Ambēr.⁴

Another significant aspect of the organisation of the contingents of the Kachawāhā nobles appears to be an implicit recognition of the principle of hereditary succession so far as their Rājput followers were concerned. On the demise of a head of a family, his eldest son would take his place as the head of the sub-clan or family serving a particular chief. Sometimes the son would inherit the titles and perhaps offices also held by his father. For instance, it is known that the title of Rao that was given by Bhār Mal to Lāl Singh Narookā⁵ continued in his family down to Jai Singh's time. Lāl Singh's grandson

1. Rāj Ratnākar, Ms. f.35a, cited by G.N. Sharma, Mewar and the Mughal Emperors, p.8.

2. Waqāf-Sarkār-i Ranthambhore-wā Ajmēr, pp.436-37.

3. Muhtā Nāinsi-rē-Khyāt, II, p.282.

4. Ibid., I, p.342.

5. Ibid., I, p.318; Vir-Vinod, II, p.1375.

Kalyān Singh also held the same title under Jaī Singh.¹ Similar instances can be cited regarding almost all the sub clans and families serving as retainers of the Kachawāhā chiefs.²

Another notable aspect of the organisation of the contingents of the Kachawāhās appears to be the existence of a distinct hierarchy marked by titles and offices of different kind as well as differences in the emoluments. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the entire set up would tend to be a replica of the organisation of the Mughul officers. Titles like Rāo and Bētā (son) would be given to individuals to distinguish them from others;³ There

1. Muhtā Nainsi-re-Khyāt, I, p.318.

2. There are a number of instances of families continuing in the service of the Kachawāhā chiefs for generations. These are other than the Narookās about whom we have already quoted an example in the text. Some of these instances are given below:

After the demise of Rām Shāh Kachawāhā, his eldest son took his place and served Mirzā Rājā Jaī Singh (M.K., I, p.310). Similarly, after the death of Rāj Singh, his son Kēsri Singh took his place and served under Mirzā Rājā Jaī Singh (M.K., I, p.317). After the demise of Va'aghaji Kachawāhā, his eldest son, Budh Singh, took his place under Mān Singh. After the death of Budh Singh, his son Shyām Singh succeeded him and served under Mirzā Rājā Jaī Singh (M.K., I, pp.308-09). Similarly, it is known about a Sānkhilā family who joined service under Bhār Mal and continued down to Mirzā Rājā Bhāo Singh's time (1621). (M.K., I, p.342).

It appears that the same situation was prevailing in the contingents of the Rāthores chiefs of Jodhpur. In 1623, Shas Mal Bhātī, belonging to Jaīsalmēr, joined the service of Rājā Sur Singh. He was given fourteen villages including village Oasa in pattā. After his death, his son Kēshe Dās succeeded him and received five villages including Oasa in pattā. (M.K., II, pp.96-97; See, Table 'B' also).

3. The title of Rāo was given to Lāl Singh Narookā and later to his grandson, Kalyān Singh, by the Kachawāhā chiefs. Fateh Singh and his son, Kalyān Mal, belonging to the same family were treated as his own children by Mirzā Rājā Jaī Singh. See, M.K., I, p.318; V.V., II, p.1375.

survive evidences suggesting the existence of offices and positions under these nobles which would invariably carry with them special responsibilities as well as emoluments.¹ The person occupying such offices would enjoy higher or distinct positions as compared to rest of the members of the contingents.

In certain cases, individuals serving under the Kachawāhā chiefs would be employing their own retainers for which they would be paid by the chief in the form of pattās. This would tend to create within the contingent of a Kachawāhā noble two kinds of troops, one would be the category of gentleman trooper or a petty officer, holding a considerable sub-assignment and second, ordinary horsemen in the direct employment of the chief as well as that of one of his subordinates.² It is significant that some times even individual horsemen in the direct employment of the noble would be paid through sub-assignments.³ Taking clue from the evidence that survives regarding the contingents of Rāthore chiefs of Jodhpur one may conjecture that towards

-
1. Mirzā Rāja Jaī Singh appointed Manucci as the commander of the artillery in his contingent in 1664, on the payment of Rupees 10 per day. See, Storiano-Mogor, III, p.113.

Bhainru Narookā was the faujdār of elephant stables in Mān Singh's contingent. See, Muhtā Nainsī-re-Khyāt, I, p.313, Bānkē Dās-re-Khyāt, p.124.

On occasions, the chiefs would entrust the command of expeditions to their officers. In 1650, Mirzā Rāja Jaī Singh, on being asked by Shāh Jahān to curb the rebels of Kāmā Pahārī, directed his subordinate, Rāo Kalyān Singh Narookā, to perform this task. See, Muhtā Nainsī-re-Khyāt, I, p.318, Vīr Vinod, II, p.1375.

2. Vīr Vinod, II, p.1375.
3. Shēr Khān Sodhā, who was in the service of a Kachawāhā chief, was given Morādā in pattā. M.K., I, p.356.

Similarly, Rāja Ajeēt Singh (1681-1724) of Jāhpur also sub-assigned a number of villages of Sāncher pargana to his retainers. See, Māwar-re-Pargana-re-Vīgat, II, pp.408-10. See also Waqāi-Sarkār-i Ranthambhore-wa Ajmer (Ms., p.359) wherein it is reported that Mān Singh, the jagir-dār of pargana Arain, sub-assigned the villages of the pargana in Tankwah to his retainers.

Aurangzib's reign ordinarily an horseman's salary under Kachawahās would be equal to the revenue proceeds of 400 bīghas of land in Ambēr and the surrounding parganas. The gentlemen-troopers would be paid for the maintenance of fixed number of horsemen attached to them according to the same rate though it goes without saying that there would be considerable variations in the number of horsemen allotted to individual gentleman trooper which would in turn go to determine his salary as well as place in the hierarchy.¹

It has already been established that under the great Mughals, the nobles would pay more to the retainers of Tūrānī and Īrānī origin than those belonging to Hindūstān itself. Under Akber,² the foreigners were paid Rs.5 per month more than their Indian counterparts.³ It seems this discrimination against the Hindūstānīs persisted down to Aurangzib's time.⁴ It would be of interest to find out as to what attitude the Kachawahā nobles would have in this respect. There does not exist any evidence suggesting any such discrimination practised by them. But one cannot be very sure regarding this point as all the evidence

-
1. From Mārwar-rē-Pargana-rē-Vīgat (II, pp.408-10) it is known that under the Rathore chiefs of Jodhpur, troopers were paid according to the same rate. Probably, a similar situation would be prevailing in the contingents of the Kachawahā chiefs.

From the same source, it is known that the gentleman trooper employed in contingents of the Rāthore chiefs would have 2 to 4 horsemen under him. One may conjecture that the situation in the Kachawahā contingents will not be basically different from/obtaining in those of the Rāthores

/that

2. See, Supra.
3. While the Tūrānī and Īrānī troopers were paid Rs.25 per month, the Hindūstānīs were given Rs.20 per month. See Ayīn-i Akbarī, I, p.175.
4. Tahawwur Khān, the governor of Ajmēr in 1680-81, paid to the Tūrānī troopers more than the Hindūstānīs. See, Waqāi-i Sarkār-i Ranthambhor-wā-Ajmer, p.355

that survive relate to Indian nobles, mainly the Rājputs, having their sub-assignments in or around pargana Ambēr. However, from a closer scrutiny of the same evidence, one feature clearly emerges, namely, most of the Muslim retainers, foreigners as well as Hindūstānis, of the Kachawāhā nobles were, apparently given sub-assignments in their ja-girs located outside Ambēr territory. This is borne out by the absence of any mention of a sub-assignment or pattā held by Muslim retainers in or around pargana Ambēr.

From a passage in Mamucci's account, one gets the impression that besides the troops hired through payment in the form of sub-assignments, there was yet another category of retainers consisting purely of the Rājputs, who were apparently peasant proprietors or petty zamindārs rendering service to the Rāja in return for traditional obligations.¹ Apparently, this category of retainers would be supplied by the peasant communities annually in a fixed number. When one batch would complete its period of service, they would ^{be} return to their land and would ^{be} replaced by other men from the same community.²

7
shermias?

-
1. Storia-do-Mogor, II, p.411. Mamucci's pointed reference to the fact that the land 'given' by the Rāja to this category of people was for 'cultivation' and that they themselves tilled the land goes to show that this arrangement was different from the system of revenue assignments (pattādāri).
 2. Storia-do-Mogor, II, p.411. "The greater number of these rajahs dwell in the plains, where their lands bring them in many sorts of supplies. The land is cultivated by their vassals or subjects, who are called Rajputs - that is, 'rajah's son'. They have no other occupation, knowing nothing but how to till the soil or take a part in warfare. For this reason the rajahs pay them only in land, which is given for them to cultivate as a means of subsistence, on condition that they keep horses and be ready to go out to fight when they are called upon. When they have assembled, the rajah joins them; then, at the end of a twelve month, fresh men arrive from their home country, and the first levy returns home, They all conduct themselves in one manner".

Manucci has not indicated as to whether this rotation of levies was regulated by the chiefs or by the communities supplying them. Neither, is it possible to say with any degree of definiteness as to what would be the allowances payable to them during the period, they would be campaigning with the chiefs. But most probably the procurement of arms and maintenance of horses would be their/^{own}responsibility or the responsibility of their communities. This evidence provided by Manucci cannot be brushed aside as mis-representation of the pattā-dārī situation, simply because it tends to give a slightly different picture of the relationship of the Rajput chiefs with their followers from the one painted by other sources including travellers' accounts like Bernier's Travels in the Mughal Empire.¹ Manucci had joined Jaī Singh's service in 1664 as the commander of his artillery² and appears to have remained in that position for quite some time. His observations regarding the organisation of the contingents of the Rājput nobles would be based on his personal observation of the situation under Jaī Singh.

Hence in the light of the above, it would appear that within the contingents of the Kachawāhā nobles, besides other categories, two basic categories in which all their retainers could be divided, would be those of the pattādārs

-
1. Bernier clearly states, "These horsemen are called Ragipous (Rājput̄s) or sons of Rājas. Their military occupation, as I have stated elsewhere, descends from father to son, and every man received a grant of land on condition that he be always prepared to mount his horse and follow the Rāja, whither he shall command". Travels in the Mughal Empire, pp.39, 208.
 2. Storia-do-Mogor, II, p.113.

or sub-assignment holders on the one hand and the Bhumiās and peasant cultivators on the other, although it is difficult to say as to what ratio would be maintained between them. The later category, in any case, it appears from Manucci's statement, would entirely consist of the Rājput̄s, probably of the Kachawāhā clan.

T A B L E 'A'

Rājputs in the service of Zamāna Bēg, entitled Mahābat Khān (d. 1634 A.D.)

S.No.	N a m e	Clan and Sub-clan	Sub-assignment of Pattā	R e f e r e n c e s	Remarks
1.	Bihārī Dās Nāthāwat	Kachawāhā (Rājāwat)	-	<u>M.K.</u> , I, p.310.	
2.	Bihari Das's son Ajab Singh	Kachawāhā (Rājāwat)	-	<u>Ibid.</u>	
3.	Himmat Singh	Kachawāhā (Rājāwat)	Ladānā	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.311.	In 1627, Mahābat Khān held certain parganas of Ajmēr suba as jā-gīr, see, <u>Tuzuk</u> , pp.412, 426; <u>Lahorī</u> , I, p.82
4.	Kēsho Dās s/o Kānha	Kachawāhā (Narookā)	Lālsot	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.314.	
5.	Kēsho Dās's son Ugar Sēn	Kachawāhā (Narookā)	Lālsot	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.314.	
6.	Rāj Singh s/o Rāgho Dās	Kachawāhā (Narookā)	-	<u>Ibid.</u>	
7.	Rāj Singh's brother Rup Singh	Kachawāhā (Narookā)	Vanhatō	<u>Ibid.</u>	
8.	Khīnve Karan	Kachawāhā (Shāikhāwat)	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.325.	

9.	Sādul Songar ^o of Sancher	Chauhān (Songar)	-	<u>M.K.</u> , ^{I,} /p.234, <u>B.K.</u> , p.162
10.	Sādul's brother Gopāl Dās	Chauhān (Songar)	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , I, p.234.
11.	Sādul's another brother Achal Dās	Chauhān (Songar)	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , I, p.234.
12.	In 1631, Mādho Dās s/o Kēsho Dās Songar	Chauhān (Songar)	-	<u>B.K.</u> , p.153.
13.	Songar	Chauhān (Songar)	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.152.
14.	Nārāin Dās	Chauhān (Songar)	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.152.
15.	Jaīta Songar	Chauhān (Songar)	-	<u>M.K.</u> , I, p.243.
16.	In 1616, Jaswant s/o Rānā Udai Singh	Sīsodīā	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.25.
17.	Karān Sēn s/o Ugar Sēn Rāthore	Rāthore	-	<u>B.K.</u> , p.55.
18.	Mahēsh Dās Rāthore s/o Dalpat and the grandson of Rāja Sur Singh of Jodhpur	Rāthore	-	<u>Lahori</u> , I, p.II, p.68, <u>M.U.</u> , III, p.445. <u>M.K.</u> , II, p.234.
19.	Rāghu Nāth Bhātī of Pugal	Bhātī	-	<u>M.K.</u> , II, p.119.
20.	Rāghu Nāth's brother Jagannāth	Bhātī	Chāndrakh	<u>Ibid.</u> ,
21.	Rāghu Nath's son Har Nāth	Bhātī	Chandrakh	<u>Ibid.</u>

After Mahābat Khān's death (1634), he joined the imperial service in 1635.

Rājput in the service of Āsaf Khān

1. Shāhib Khān s/o Vaini Das Kachawāhā - M.K., I, p.330

Rājputs in the service of Rāja Bīthal Dās

1. Kalyān Singh Khangarot Kachawāhā
 (Rājāwat) - M.K., I, p.306.
2. Sujān Singh Kachawāhā
 (Rājāwat) - Ibid., p.304.

Rājput in the service of Anurudh Gaur s/o Rāja Bīthal Dās

1. Kishan Singh s/o
 Shāhib Khān Kachawāhā - M.K., I, p.330.

T A B L E 'B'

Non-Rathore Rājputs in the service of the Rathore Chiefs of Jodhpur (1572-1700)

<u>S.No.</u>	<u>N a m e</u>	<u>Clan and Sub-clan</u>	<u>Sub-assignment or pattās</u>	<u>References</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
1.	Hirdāy Nārāin	Kachawāhā (Rajāwāt)	Village Gangarā (गंगारा) of <u>pargana</u> Mairāta along with four other villages.	<u>M.K.</u> , I, p.304.	
2.	Bhākharsī s/o Khangar	„	Bhowal of <u>pargana</u> Mairāta	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.306.	
3.	Mādho Singh	„	-	<u>Ibid.</u>	
4.	Ajab Singh	„	-	<u>Ibid.</u>	
5.	Sur Singh	„	-	<u>Ibid.</u>	
6.	Himmat Singh	„	He held <u>pattā</u> worth Rs.15,000	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.311.	
7.	Lār Khān	„	-	<u>Ibid.</u>	
8.	Balbhadr	„	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.308.	
9.	Gaj Singh	„	He held <u>pattā</u> worth Rs.17,000	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.311.	
10.	Ugar Sen	Kachawāhā (Narookā)	Riyān and Rāipur	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.314.	
11.	In 1611, Chander Bhān joined the service of Sur Singh	„	Rāhin	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.315.	

12.	Mohan Dās	Kachawāhā (Narookā)	-	<u>M.K.</u> , I, p.316.
13.	Govind Dās	,,	Some villages of <u>pargana</u> Rēwārī.	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.317.
14.	Jaswant	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u>
15.	Jaswant's son Har Rām	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u>
16.	Peērag Dās	Kachawāhā (Shaikhāwat)	Village Dholā of <u>pargana</u> Mairta.	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.323.
17.	Rām Singh	,,	He received some villages of <u>pargana</u> Rēwārī worth Rs.25,000	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.319.
18.	Mehkaran	,,	Village Piplāī of <u>pargana</u> Udaī <u>Pattā</u> worth Rs.12,000	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.320.
19.	Roop Singh	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.320.
20.	Amar Singh	,,	He held <u>pattā</u> worth Rs.3,000	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.322.
21.	Parshotam	,,	Kho village of <u>pargana</u> Rēwārī.	<u>Ibid.</u> , pp.322-23.
22.	Udaī Bhān	,,	Some villages of <u>pargana</u> Rēwārī.	<u>Ibid.</u>
23.	Mādho Dās	,,	Jāgarwās	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.328.
24.	In 1622, Sabal Singh Sīsodīā s/o Rana Sagar	Sīsodīā	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.25.

25.	Karam Sēn belonging to the same family	Sīsodīā	Chandāwal	<u>M.K., I, p.26.</u>
26.	In 1612, Chatarghuj s/o Shaikho and the grandson of Rānā Pratāp	,,	Village Karmavas of <u>pargana</u> Sīwānā.	<u>Ibid., p.28.</u>
27.	In 1607, Puran Mal s/o Rānā Pratāp	,,	Village Dāho of <u>pargana</u> Mairta	<u>Ibid.</u>
28.	Sur s/o Surtān Dēverā of Sirohī	Deverā	Villages 25 of <u>pargana</u> Bhādrājun	<u>Ibid., p.158.</u>
29.	In 1589, Rāo Kallā Dēverā belonging to the same family	,,	Bhādrājun	<u>Ibid.</u>
30.	Rāo Kallā's son Āskaran	,,	Nāsesāro	<u>Ibid.</u>
31.	Āskaran's son Hari Dās	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u>
32.	In 1623, Dwārkā Dās belonging to the same family	,,	Nāsesāro	<u>Ibid., p.160.</u>
33.	Jaswant belonging to the same family	,,	Kulkānā	<u>Ibid., p.163.</u>
34.	Jaswant's grandson Kān	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u>
35.	Surtan belonging to the same family	,,	Samujo	<u>Ibid., p.164.</u>
36.	In 1601, Rāwat belonging to the same family	,,	Village Dēvaliyā of <u>pargana</u> Sīwānā	<u>Ibid.</u>

37.	Rāwat's son Panchayan	Dēverā	Khadālo	<u>M.K.</u> , I, p.165.
38.	Rāwat's another son Achal Dās	,,	Navesāro worth Rs.1,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
39.	Achal Dās's son Jagannāth	,,	Navesāro	<u>Ibid.</u>
40.	Sāngā belonging to the same family	,,	Karmāvās	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.166.
41.	Māno belonging to the same family	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.200.
42.	In 1584, Nārāin Dās Songar belonging to Jājore joined the service	Chauhān (Songar)	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.210.
43.	Nārāin Dās's son Sātal	,,	21 villages of <u>pargana</u> Bhādrājun	<u>Ibid.</u>
44.	In 1643, Mādho Dās belonging to the same family	,,	Guntruch	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.211.
45.	Suraj Mal belonging to the same family	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u>
46.	Sakat Singh belonging to the same family	,,	Half of the <u>pargana</u> Pālī	<u>Ibid.</u>
47.	Sakat Singh's son	,,	Village Dāman of <u>pargana</u> <u>Jājore</u>	<u>Ibid.</u>
48.	In 1598, Vā'gh Bhātī belonging to Jāisalmēr joined the service	Bhātī	Village Aādvo of <u>pargana</u> Sojat	<u>Ibid.</u> , II, p.89.

49.	Vā'gh's son Kēsho Dās	Bhātī	-	<u>M.K.</u> , II, p.90
50.	In 1647, Kīrat Singh belonging to the same family	,,	Villages Odvāro and Jogar of <u>pargana</u> Jālore	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.91.
51.	Jogī Dās belonging to the same family	,,	Vizvāriā	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.119.
52.	Jogī Dās's brother Surtān	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u>
53.	Kisno Bhātī of Pugal	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.124.
54.	In 1602, Khangar belonging to the same family joined the service	,,	Bīthnok	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.125.
55.	Khangar's brother Kānha	,,	Village Mīthario of <u>pargana</u> Mairta	<u>Ibid.</u>
56.	In 1615, Bhagwant belonging to the same family joined the service	,,	Chāmu and Saverij	<u>Ibid.</u>
57.	Bhagwant Dās's son Mādho Singh	,,	Chāmu	<u>Ibid.</u>
58.	Bhagwant Dās's brother Vīram Dēva	,,	Kalano and 14 other villages	<u>Ibid.</u>
59.	Māno Nimbāvat belonging to the same family	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.154.
60.	Māno's son Govind Dās	,,	and <u>Vāsni/Māngla</u> of <u>pargana</u> Siwāna	<u>Ibid.</u>

61.	Māno's son Surtān	Bhātī	-	<u>M.K.</u> , II, p.154.
62.	Govīnd Dās's son Mohan Dās	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.155
63.	Govīnd Dās's another son Narhar Dās	,,	(Danver)	<u>Ibid.</u>
64.	Suraj Mal belonging to the same family	,,	Khaitasar	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.156.
65.	Suraj Mal's brother Nāhar Khān	,,	Village Dhāvo of <u>pargana</u> Jodhpur	<u>Ibid.</u>
66.	Govīnd Dās's son Rām Singh	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u>
67.	Govīnd Dās's son Vainī Dās	,,	Rarod of <u>pargana</u> Asop	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.157.
68.	Vainī Dās's son Rāj Singh	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.159.
69.	Rām Chander's son Karan	,,	Vimlakho	<u>Ibid.</u>
70.	Sunder Dās belonging to the same family	,,	Māvero of <u>pargana</u> Jodhpur	<u>Ibid.</u>
71.	Rugh Nāth belonging to the same family	,,	Māvero	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.160.
72.	Rugh Nāth's son Bhīnve	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u>
73.	Sādul belonging to the same family	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u>
74.	Kishno belonging to the same family	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.161.

75.	Jaimal belonging to the same family	Bhāti	- -	<u>M.K.</u> , II, p.162.	
76.	Mādhō Dās s/o Kēshō Dās belonging to the same family	,,	Rundiya	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.163.	He died in 1657 A.D.
77.	Mādhō Dās's brother, Bīthal Dās	,,	Rundiya	<u>Ibid.</u>	
78.	In 1583, Kān joined the service	,,	Kuri, Valārvo and four other villages	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.165.	
79.	Kan's son Har Dās	,,	Valārvo including seven other villages	<u>Ibid.</u>	
80.	Har Dās's son Bīthal Dās	,,	Mokhēri	<u>Ibid.</u>	
81.	Karan belonging to the same family	,,	Hirādēsar and Rāmāvat	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.166.	
82.	Karan's brother Lakhmi Dās	,,	Hirādēsar and Rāmāvat	<u>Ibid.</u>	
83.	Lakhmī Das's son Nātho	,,	Nadiya	<u>Ibid.</u>	
84.	Suraj Mal belonging to the same family	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u>	
85.	Suraj Mal's brother Govīnd Dās	,,	In 1583, Dhīkai In 1589, Bhāgot Vāsni In 1600, Aanavas	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.167.	
86.	Govīnd Dās's grandson Kumbho	,,	In 1631, A'navās	<u>Ibid.</u>	

87.	Kumbho's son (name is not mentioned)	Bhātī	Nadiya	<u>M.K.</u> , II, p.167.
88.	Gāngo belonging to the same family	,,	A'anāvās	<u>Ibid.</u>
89.	Kēsho Dās belonging to the same family	,,	Chopro	<u>Ibid.</u>
90.	Kēsho Dās's son Vainī Dās	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.168.
91.	Kesho Das's another son Amro	,,	Sihar of <u>pargana</u> Mairta	<u>Ibid.</u>
92.	Bhākharsī belonging to the same family	,,	Chairāī In 1620, Bairu	<u>Ibid.</u>
93.	Bhākharsī's son Jagannāth	,,	In 1638, Golahsnī & Thāharī	<u>Ibid.</u>
94.	Sānwal Dās belonging to the same family	,,	In 1604, Thirgāthī In 1609, Birmāvasī In 1610, Sāvant Kuvo	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.169.
95.	Sānwal Dās's son Vā'gh	,,	In 1613, Thirgāthī	<u>Ibid.</u>
96.	Sānwal Dās's brother Narhar Dās	,,	In 1606, Bhānro In 1616, Chabaryakh of <u>pargana</u> Sojat In 1624, Judh	<u>Ibid.</u> , pp.171, 182.
97.	Narhar Dās's son Rāmchand	,,	Judh	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.171.
98.	Hingal Dās belonging to the same family	,,	In 1594, Gāgarvās In 1601, Varlā & Achīnā	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.172.

He died in 1627 and his son Rām Chand succeeded him.

99.	In 1589, Khaṭsi joined the service	Bhātī	Jativās	<u>N.K.</u> , II, p.173.
100.	Khaṭsi's son Viko	,,	Jativās	<u>Ibid.</u>
101.	Viko's son Dhan Rāj	,,	Jativās	<u>Ibid.</u>
102.	Hamir belonging to the same family	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , pp.176, 180.
103.	Hamir's son Megh Rāj	,,	Khaṭtāsar	<u>Ibid.</u>
104.	Hamir's son Kēso Dās	,,	Khaṭtāsar	<u>Ibid.</u>
105.	Gopāl Dās belonging to the same family	,,	Butelave of <u>pargana</u> Sojat	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.177.
106.	Gopāl's son Rāgho Dās	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u>
107.	Isar Dās belonging to the same family	,,	Manevi of <u>pargana</u> Jodhpur	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.179.
108.	Isar Dās's son Kumbho	,,	Sāverao and Kaliyathra	<u>Ibid.</u>
109.	Kumbha's son Rām	,,	Sāverao including two other villages	<u>Ibid.</u>
110.	Amaro belonging to the same family	,,	Rāmravās of <u>pargana</u> Jodhpur	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.186.
111.	Amaro's son Tej Mal	,,	1621, Sārvant Kuvo 1632, Bhāro 1633, Khāri of Lawerā	<u>Ibid.</u>

112.	Sādul belonging to the same family	Bhātī	Varlo	<u>M.K.</u> , II, p.194.
113.	Chatarbhuḡ belonging to the same family	,,	Bhagatvāsni	<u>Ibid.</u>
114.	Manohar Dās of Rūnichā served under Gaj Singh	Sānkhilā	-	<u>M.K.</u> , I, p.342.
115.	Sikh belonging to Sāncher served under Mota Rājā	Chauhān	Khējālar including three other villages	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.233.
116.	Sikh's brother Dēvī Dās	,,	Samāvetī	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.233.
117.	Dēvī Dās's son Kachro	,,	Tantuvās	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.233.
118.	Kachro's brother Kēsave Dās	,,	Dahīporā	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.238.
119.	Pīrag Chauhān belonging to the same family	,,	Gāderī	<u>Ibid.</u>
120.	Pīrag's son Kachro	,,	Gāderī	<u>Ibid.</u>
121.	Pīrag's another son Narhar Dās	,,	Naraval of <u>pargana</u> Jodhpur	<u>Ibid.</u>
122.	Pīrag's son Sakto	,,	Gopārī of <u>pargana</u> Siwāna	<u>Ibid.</u>
123.	Narhar Dās's Manohar Dās	,,	Naraval	<u>Ibid.</u>
124.	Pīrag Dās's son Bhagwān Dās	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u>
125.	Pīrag's son Achal Dās	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.239.

126.	Gopal Dās belonging to the same family	Chauhan	-	<u>M.K., I, p.239.</u>
127.	Gopāl's nephew Kumbo	,,	-	<u>Ibid.</u>
128.	Kumbho's son Bhīnve	,,	In 1618, Korno of <u>pargana</u> Bhādrājun In 1621, Sajaro of Jodhpur In 1629, Polvās of <u>pargana</u> Mairta	<u>Ibid., p.240.</u>
129.	Tej Mal belonging to the same family	,,	Chinrī of <u>pargana</u> Āsṭop	<u>Ibid.</u>
130.	Megho belonging to the same family	,,	-	<u>Ibid., p.241.</u>
131.	Jīvo belonging to the same family	,,	Dantanio, Manaklāo	<u>Ibid.</u>
132.	Jīvo's son Bhoj Rāj	,,	Manklāo	<u>Ibid.</u>
133.	Rāo Viram Dēve	,,	Chitalvāno of <u>pargana</u> Sānchor worth Rs.14,000	<u>M.P. re-Vigat, II, p.408.</u>
134.	Kēsri Singh	,,	Kīrol of Sānchor worth Rs.4,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
135.	Budh Singh	,,	Hoti Gāon worth Rs.4,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
136.	Prithvī Rāj son of Surtān	,,	Worth Rs.4,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
137.	Jait Singh	,,	Dambhāl worth Rs.2,000	<u>Ibid., p.409.</u>

138.	Prithvī Rāj s/o Kēsri Singh	Chauhān	Sive worth Rs.2,000	<u>M.P.-re-Vigat, II, p.409.</u>
139.	Zālim Singh	,,	Pur worth Rs.2,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
140.	Isar Dās	,,	Dāval	<u>Ibid.</u>
141.	Bannē Singh	,,	Makh worth Rs.1,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
142.	Kusal Singh	,,	Rētari worth Rs.4,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
143.	Rai Singh	,,	Valano	<u>Ibid.</u>
144.	Mahā Singh	,,	Karaveri, Dantiya worth Rs.2,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
145.	Mādhō Singh	,,	Dhāsani worth Rs.1,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
146.	Thān Singh	,,	Haryālī, Bharkavo worth Rs.1,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
147.	Kāni Rām	,,	Bhādro worth Rs.1,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
148.	Sive Singh	,,	Arnāvo worth Rs.4,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
149.	Preṅ Singh	,,	Basan, Kamālpur	<u>Ibid.</u>
150.	Sagh Dān	,,	Galīfo worth Rs.4,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
151.	Ānad Singh	,,	Titrol worth Rs.1,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
152.	Rai Singh	,,	Chārnive worth Rs.1,000	<u>Ibid.</u>

153.	Bhoj Rāj *	Chauhān	Dādosom, Dadlo worth Rs.2,000	<u>M.P.-re-Vigat</u> , II, p.409.
154.	Mān Singh	,,	Sāgarvo worth Rs.1,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
155.	Gājio	,,	Bānverlo worth Rs.1,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
156.	Umo s/o Bhākharsī	,,	Prāvī worth Rs.1,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
157.	Prēm Singh	,,	Mulī	<u>Ibid.</u>
158.	Umo s/o Lālo	,,	Jotro	<u>Ibid.</u>
159.	Nārāyān Dās	,,	Virol	<u>Ibid.</u> , p.410.
160.	Kāno	,,	Kir	<u>Ibid.</u>
161.	Rām Singh s/o Chatur Singh	,,	Javedhrā	<u>Ibid.</u>
162.	Rām Singh s/o Anoop Singh	,,	Kario	<u>Ibid.</u>
163.	Rahmat Khān	Muslim	Hasan worth Rs.1,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
164.	Badar Khān	,,	Lāchri worth Rs.1,000	<u>Ibid.</u>
165.	Jīvo	Chāran	Kochelo Sambhāran	<u>Ibid.</u>

CHAPTER IV

THE PATTERN OF MATRIMONIAL TIES BETWEEN THE
KACHAWĀHĀ CLAN AND THE MUGHUL RULING FAMILY
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO JAHĀNGĪR'S REIGN.

One important aspect of the relationships between the Timurid rulers and the Rājput nobles was a tendency on the part of the Mughul rulers and princes to take into marriage the daughters and nieces of the Rājput chiefs in their service. These so called matrimonial alliances came into vogue simultaneously with the entry of the Rājput chiefs into the Mughul service in considerable strength under Akbar. As it is well known, the first to enter the Mughul service and offer his daughter in marriage to Akbar was the Kachawāhā chief, Bhār Mal.¹ The other chiefs of Rājputānā, who followed in his foot-steps, were the Rāthore chiefs of Jodhpur,² Bikanēr,³ Maīrta,⁴ the Bhātī chief of Jaīsalmēr⁵ and the Ghelot chief of Dungepur.⁶ But they

-
1. Tārīkh-i Alfī, Ms. f.145, Akbar Nāma, II, pp.157-58; Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh, p.50; Tabaqāt-i Akbarī, p.256, Zubdāt-ut Tawārīkh, Ms. f.148a; Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, 7, Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, f.155. Tārīkh-i Dilkushā, Ms.f.539b; Khulāsāt-ut Tawārīkh, f.374; Muntakhāb-ul Lubāb, pp.158-59; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, I, pp.111-12; Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. 'B'.; Tod, p. 376. Mullā 'Abdul Bāqī, the author of Ma'āsir-i Rahīmī (Vol. I, p.694) says that Akbar married the daughter of Bhagwān Dās which is incorrect.
 2. Bankē Dās-rē Khyāt, p.20; Tod, II, p.22; Vīr Vīnod, II, p.174.
 3. Akbar Nāma, II, p.358; Dalpat Vilās, 14-15; Tārīkh-i Ma'ādan-i Akhbār-i Ahmadī, Ms. f.251b; Vīr Vīnod, pp.174, 485. According to the above sources, Kalyān Mal gave his niece in marriage to Akbar. But the authors of Tārīkh-i Alfī, f.223, Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh, II, p. 133, Zubdāt-ut Tawārīkh, Ms. f.172a, and Muntakhāb-ul Lubāb, I, p.175, incorrectly say that Kalyān Mal gave his own daughter in marriage to Akbar.
 4. Mārwar-re Pargana-rē Vīgat, II, pp.69-70.
 5. Akbar Nāma, II, p.358, Vīr Vīnod, II, p.174.
 6. Akbar Nāma, III, pp.196, 210.

See now Nān & many
others.

joined Akbar's service and established matrimonial ties with him only after he had displayed his mailed-fist against the defiant Sīsodīās.¹ Apparently, it was on account of the ready cooperation that the Mughuls received from the ruling family of the Kachawāhās in their drive to take the Rājput chiefs into their service that these came to be treated by the former as most favoured among their Rājput nobles. The Kachawāhās and to a lesser degree the Rāthores of Mārwar,² also were singled out for the marriages of the princes of royal blood with their daughters and nieces throughout the sixteenth, seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries.³ Apparently, in the cases of other chiefs such marriages were contracted only at the time of their entry into the royal service.

While assessing the position of the Kachawāhās in Jahāngīr's service, it would, therefore, be appropriate to examine the nature and working of these so called matrimonial alliances between the Kachawāhā clan and the ruling family in some depth. This would help in further clarifying the circumstances leading to vicissitudes in the fortunes of the Kachawāhā clan during Jahāngīr's reign.

One may examine this problem in the following manner: First of all one should assess the available evidence regarding the various factors that were

-
1. Iqtidar Alam Khan, 'The Nobility under Akbar, and the Development of His Religious Policy 1560-80', Journal of Royal Asiatic Society, 1968, pp.32-33.
 2. Another Rājput clan who remained exceptionally, devoted to the Mughul cause once they had joined the service down to 21 R.Y. of Aurangzāb's reign.
 3. See Appendix 'C'.

responsible for Akbar's policy of establishing matrimonial ties with the Rājput clans in his service. Secondly, one may compare total number of marriages contracted with the Rājput princesses by Akbar, Jahāngīr, Shāhjahān and Aurangzīb 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. From the lists of such marriages one would also like to ascertain as to how far the position of the Kachawāhās as the most favoured Rājput clan for the purpose of matrimonial ties was maintained under Jahāngīr and his successors.

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 Tīmurids of securing the loyalties of the chiefs by marrying into their families. There are numerous instances to illustrate this tendency. Yūsuf Mīrak, the author of Mazhar-i Shāh Jahānī, a local history of Sindh, compiled during Shāh Jahān's reign, says that Arghuns and Turkhāns (who also belonged to Tīmurid tradition) used to marry the daughters of the chiefs of Samējā Unrā, a local tribe of Sindh.¹ Bābar and Hūmāyun also married the daughters of the local chiefs to secure their loyalties. For example, on 28 January 1519, Babar married Mubārak Bēgam,

1. Mazhar-i Shāh Jahānī, p.90.

a daughter of Malik Shāh Mansoor, the chief of Yūsufzāis, with a view to conciliate 'the Yūsufzāi horde'.¹ Similarly, in 1555, Hūmāyun married the daughter of Jamāl Khān Mēwātī 'to soothe the mind of the zamīndārs.'²

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 Bhumiā families of their regions without making any distinction on the basis of caste. The Kachawāhā chiefs, for instance, used to marry into the families of the Mēena chiefs.³ The Mēenas appear to have been displaced by the Kachawāhās as the leading zamīndārs of Amber region sometime before 1560. They still constituted a considerable section of the local landed class down to the end of 17th century.⁴ In establishing matrimonial ties with them, the Kachawāhās must have been motivated by a desire to conciliate the Mēena chiefs.

It was also a tradition among the Rajputs that they would give their daughters in marriage to the non-Rajput superior chiefs and rulers. From appendix 'B', it is evident that this tradition dated back to the middle of

1. Babur Nama, Tr. A.S. Beveridge, p.375.

2. Akbar Nama, II, p.48.

3. Muhta Nainsi-re Khyat, I, pp.312, 324. Bhar Mal's brother Rupsi and Raisal Darbari had wives belonging to the Meena and Jat communities.

4. Between 1557 and 1560, Bhar Mal ousted the Meena chief from Lawan. See, Jaipur-ki Vansaveli, Ms. pages are unmarked, Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, II, pp.282-83, Vir Vinod, II, p.1276, Jaipur-ka Itihas by H. Sharma, p.70.

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 the circumstances. For example, in 1445, Rāja Bhān of Idar, after he was defeated by Mahmūd Shāh of Gujrat, married his daughter to the latter.¹ Rāo Jodhā (1415-1488), gave his daughter in marriage to Shams Khān Qāyām Khānī, the chief of Jhunju, to save himself from the threat of the Qiyām Khānīs.² Similarly, a daughter of Rāo Loon Karan of Bikānēr (1470-1526 A.D.) was married to Nāhār Khān Qiyām Khānī to end a long standing enmity between the two families.³ Māldēo, (1511-1562 A.D.), the ruler of Jodhpur, also established matrimonial ties with his three non-Rājput neighbours. He gave his daughters in marriage to Islām Shāh Sur⁴ and the latter's commander, Hājī Khān,⁵ the hakim of North-Eastern Rājputānā. Another of his daughters and a grand-daughter were married to Sultān Mahmūd Baīgrā of Gujarāt⁶ and

1. Mifāt-i Sikandari, p.49; Vīr Vinod, II, p.995.

2. Qiyām Khān Rāsō, pp.36-37, Shams Khān Qiyām Khānī belonged to the Chauhān Rājput family of Darēra. His forefathers were converted to Islām during Sultān Fīroz Shāh's reign. (Qiyām Khān Rāsō, pp. 13-14, Muhtā Nainsi-rē Khyāt, III, pp.373-75). Shams Khān had matrimonial alliance with Sultān Bahlol Lodi (Qiyām Khān Rāsō, p.37). Fadan Khān, one of the descendants of Shams Khān, joined the service of Humāyūn. After Humāyūn's death, Fadan Khān gave his daughter in marriage to Akbar. From Āyīn-i Akbarī (Ms.f.248a) it is come to know that the Qiyām Khānīs had zamīndārī rights in Fatehpur and Jhunju of Shaikhwātī. Jhāngīr gave Fatehpur as Altangā Jā-gīr. (आलम नौरु रे खे) to Alaf Khān (Qiyām Khān Rāsō, p.59). On 26th November 1620, Alaf Khān was given the charge of Kāngrā fort and his mansab was fixed at 1500/1000. (Tuzuk-i Jahangiri, p.320). During Aurangzib's reign, a sardār of Qiyām Khānīs, titular, Alaf Khān held a mansab of 1500/700 (Alangir Nama, p.290) M. Athar Ali (The Mughal Nobility Under Aurangzeb, p.201) holds that Alaf Khān Qiyām Khānī was an Afghān which is, obviously, a slip. He was not Afghān but he was a Shaikhzādā.

3. Qiyām Khān Rāsō, p.49.

4. Bānkē Dās-rē Khyāt, p.20.

5. Afsāna-i Shāhan, Ms. f.178b., Mārwar-rē Pargana-rē Vigat, I, p.52, Bānkē Dās-rē Khyāt, p.20.

6. Mārwar-rē Pargana-rē Vigat, I, p.52; Bānkē Dās-rē Khyāt, p.20.

Daulat Khān, the chief of Nāgore¹ respectively. It would appear that having established these ties with his three powerful neighbours, Māldēo had become very influential and he expanded his territory at the cost of small chieftains.² Māldēo came to be regarded as "the most potent chieftain of Hindūstān" by the Persian chronicles of the sixteenth century.³ Further, Bhār Mal who gained the throne of Ambēr after ousting Āskaran, offered his daughter in marriage to Hājī Khān⁴ to wean away the later from his rival Āskaran and secure Hājī Khān's support for his claim to the gaddī of Ambēr. Similarly, Vīram Dēve Rāthore of Mairta, after being ousted from Mairta by Māldēo, gave his daughter in marriage to the chief of Jālore, a Muslim, in the hope of re-occupying Mairta with his help.⁵ Sometimes such marriages would be made in the hope of receiving rewards. For instance, Karamsī Rāthore of Mairta, who gave his sister in marriage to Daulat Khān Nāgorī, received Khīnvesar village of Ās op pargana.⁶

-
1. Waqīāt-i Mushtāqī, Ms. f.56b; Tārīkh-i Dāudī, p.156; Bānkē Dās-rē Khyāt, p.22; Vir Vinod, II, p.808.
 2. In 1531, when Māldēo became the Rāja, he had Jodhpur, Sojat and Jaitaran under his sway. Later on, he conquered a number of parganas neighbouring to his territory. He extended his possessions by subjugating Bhādrājun, Jālore, Sīwāna, Sānchor, Phalodī, Mairta, Bīkāner, Ajmēr, Chātsu, Tonk, Todā, Malpurā and Sāmbhar. See, Mārwar-rē Pargana-rē Vigat, I, pp.43-45.
 3. Akbar Nāma, II, pp.160, 197; Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh, I, p.439; Tabaqāt-i Akbarī, p.205; Tūzuk-i Jahāngirī, p.277; Tārīkh-i Shāhi, p.163.
 4. Jaipur-ki Vanshāveli, Ms, pages are unmarked.
 5. Mārwar-rē Pargana-rē Vigat, II, pp.52-54.
 6. Bānkē Dās-rē Khyāt, p.67. Āsop pargana was in the sarkār of Jodhpur. See, Āyīn-i Akbarī, II, p.276.

for some areas only

It appears that the Rājput chiefs regarded their daughters a heavy burden and a source of dishonour. This led to the wide spread practice of infanticide in certain parts of Rājputānā which survived down to the British period.¹ Even an orthodox Muslim like Badāūnī who hailed from Todā was influenced by this prejudice; he expresses indirect approval of the practice of putting to death of female children by quoting a flimsy hadīs.² One might suggest that this prejudice would have been partly an outcome of the imbalance of the sexes in the population. It is possible that owing to the high rate of male casualties in battles the female population would outstrip the males. Owing to prevailing prejudice against the female sex and non-availability of suitable Rājput grooms for their daughters, the Rājput chiefs became prone to establishing matrimonial ties outside their groups. This may be regarded as one of the important factors facilitating the establishment of matrimonial ties between the Mughul rulers and the Rājput chieftains.

III.

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

-
1. Tod, I, pp.141, 505. This practice was prevailing in other parts of the Mughul Empire also during the period. Jahāngir says that the people of Rājaur of Kashmīr strangled their daughters at the time of their birth. Tūzuk-i Jahāngirī, p.317.
 2. For the hadīs quoted by Badāūnī cf. M. Athar Ali, "Religion and Medieval Indian Politics" paper presented at a Seminar on Historical Models in the Study of Tradition and Change in India, IIAS, Simla, 1969.

First, it would appear that in most cases the establishment of matrimonial ties accompanied the entry of the chief concerned in the royal service. For instance, in January 1562, Bhār Mal joined the Mughul service as well as gave his daughter in marriage to Akbar.¹ Similarly, in 1570, Rāi Kalyān Mal of Bikānēr gave his two nieces in marriage to the Emperor and joined the Mughul service.² About the same time, Rāwal Har Rāi of Jaīsalmer married his daughter to Akbar³ and Rao Chander Sēn of Jodhpur married his sister to the Emperor and took up the royal service.⁴ In 1573, while entering into an agreement with Rāja Jai Chand of Nagarkot, it was put as a condition that the Rāja would give his daughter in marriage to Akbar.⁵ In March 1577, at the time of joining the Mughul service, Rāwal Āskaran of Dungepur gave his daughter in marriage to Akbar.⁶ In 1581, Kēsho Dās Rāthore of Mairta married his daughter to the Emperor and entered into the royal service.⁷ In May 1597, Rāja Lachmī Nārāin of Cooch Bihar's entry in the Mughul service was accompanied by the establishment of matrimonial tie.⁸

-
1. Akbar Nāma, II, pp.157-58, III, p.35, Muntakhāb-ut Tawārikh, II, p.151, Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngiri, p.252.
 2. Akbar Nāma, II, p.358, Dalpat Vilas, pp.14-15, Āyīn-i Akbarī, p.182.
 3. Akbar Nāma, II, p.358, Āyīn-i Akbarī, p.184.
 4. Bānkē Dās-rē Khyāt, p.20, Vīr Vīnod, II, p.174, Āyīn-i Akbarī, p.182.
 5. Akbar Nāma, III, 36.
 6. Ibid., pp.196, 210.
 7. Mārwar-rē Pargana-rē Vigat, II, pp.69-70.
 8. Jaipur-ki Vanshāvalī, Ms. cf. also Akbar Nāma, Tr. H. Beveridge, p. 1068, N. 2.

It is quite understandable that the chiefs, entering the royal service should be called upon 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 Rājput clans joined the imperial service. During the reigns of Jahāngīr, Shah/^{Jahan}and Aurangzīb the number of such marriages seems to have declined. As the appendix on marriages evinces, during the reigns of Akbar, Jahāngīr, Shāh Jahān and Aurangzīb respectively 33, 7, 4, 8 marriages were contracted with the girls belonging to leading families of the local chiefs.¹

However, the two leading families of the Rājput chiefs, namely, Kachawāhās of Ambēr and Rathore chiefs of Mārwar, were singled out for a special treatment in this respect. As already observed, the Mughul rulers continued to take brides from these two houses down to Bahādur Shāh's reign.² It would appear that, in this respect, the Rājawat sub-clan of the Kachawāhās was the most favoured family till the end of Akbar's reign.³ But apparently after Jahāngīr's accession, a sort of parity was maintained between the Kachawāhās and the Rāthores. In all, down to Bahādur Shāh's time, there took

1. See, appendix 'C'.

2. In March 1714, Ajeēt Singh Rāthore of Jodhpur gave his daughter in marriage to Farrukh Siyar. See, Muntakhāb-ul Lubāb, p.738; Ma'asir-ul Umarā, III, p.757.

3. Cf. Badāūnī, Muntakhāb-ut Tawārikh, Vol. II, p.341. It can be clearly deduced from the manner in which Salīm's marriage with Bhagwant Dās's daughter is reported that it was his first wedding. The fact that a girl from the Kachawāhā 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 Rājput chieftains in the royal service.

place 7 marriages with the girls belonging to the house of Jodhpur while 5 brides were taken from the Kachawāhā chiefs of Ambēr.¹ The details of marriages in Kachawāhā family after Akbar are as follows:

Jahāngīr's first Kachawāhā wife, daughter of Bhagwant Dās, committed suicide on 6th May 1605.² Three years later in 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 Kachawāhā clan.³ Although Jahāngīr was not happy with the Rājā on account of his collaboration with Khusrāu on the issue of succession, he preferred to maintain the matrimonial ties with the Kachawāhā ruling family. But Shāh Jahān, who was born of a Rāthore princess⁴ and was married to a Rāthore princess during Jahāngīr's life time⁵ did not have a Kachawāhā wife. During Aurangzīb's reign, the number of the marriages between the members of the royal family and women belonging the Kachawāhā clan rose again.⁶

1. See, appendix 'C'.

2. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.26; Tārīkh-i Dilkushā, Ms. f.577a.

3. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.68, 69; Ma'āsir-i Jahāngīrī, Ms. f.57a, Muntakhāb-ul Lubāb, I, p.259; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, pp.141-42, cf. Athar 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.

4. Akbar Nāma, III, 603, Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.8.

5. Mārwar-rē Pargana-rē Vigat, I, p.III, S.R. Sharma (The Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors, p.79) says that Shāh Jahān did not marry with a Hindū princess but from Mārwar-rē Pargana-rē Vigat, a late 17th century Rajasthan source, it appears that Shāh Jahān married the daughter of Rao Sakat Singh, son of Mota Rājā.

6. See, appendix, 'C'.

IV.

When Jahāngīr married Jagat Singh's daughter her maternal grandfather Bhoj Hārā of Bundī who was also in the royal service expressed his resentment over it. Jahāngīr was greatly displeased with the Hara chief on account of this attitude.¹ As a matter of fact such a prejudice on the part of the Hārās and their disapproval of the marriages between the daughters and nieces of Rājput chiefs with the Mughul Emperors dated back to Akbar's reign. In 1569, Surjan Hārā of Ranthambhore submitted to the Mughuls 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.² Apart from the Hārās 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 Rāthore chiefs of Mārwar were also opposed to the idea of establishing matrimonial ties with imperial family but this section was overruled by the reigning chief. For instance, in 1585, Kallā, a nephew of Mota Rāja, strongly objected to the marriage of the Rāja's daughter with Prince Salīm but his objection was overruled by the Rāja and he was eliminated a year later with the help of the Mughuls.³

It would, however, appear that these objections or reservations of certain Rājput groups were the result of a caste bias rather than religious prejudice.

1. Ma'asir-ul Umarā, I, pp.141-42.

2. Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, II, p.383, Vir Vinod, II, pp.84, 85.

3. Vir Vinod, II, p.182.

As already noticed, there was a discernable tendency among the Rājput̄s to establish matrimonial ties with the non-Rājput̄ groups. It is also not recorded anywhere that the marriages of the Rājput̄ chiefs with the daughters of the chiefs belonging to such diverse caste groups as Mēenas and Jāts were ever opposed by any section but at the same time there is available sufficient evidence to show that the Rājput̄ chiefs looked with disapproval upon any inter-caste marriage amongst the chiefs subordinate to them as well as amongst the common people. According to Muhtā Nainsī, when a Mēena Bhumiā of Bundī wished to marry a daughter of a Brāhman, the latter resisted and sought protection of the Hārā chief.¹ Similarly, Shyamāl Dās informs us that when a certain Dunger Bhēel tried to marry the daughter of a Mahājan by force, Rāwal Bīr Singh of Dungerpur intervened in the matter and punished the Bhēels.²

One may assume that these objections raised by certain Rājput̄ groups to the matrimonial ties with the royal family were a further projection of the prejudice that already prevailed amongst the Rājput̄s against inter-caste marriages, though as goes without saying at a certain level a tendency operating in the opposite direction was also discernable from a very early time. It is particularly note worthy that none of the contemporary Rājput̄ sources give an impression that these objections or reservations of a section

1. Muhtā Nainsī-rē Khyāt, I, p.97.

2. Vir Vinod, II, p.1005.

of the Rājput chiefs were a result of religious (or 'National') bias. It would appear that in this respect the statements and sentiments attributed by Tod to the Sīsodiā chief, Rānā Pratāp, reflect the state of mind of the Rājput chiefs of his own time.¹

There is no basis for the assumption that the Rājput chiefs who established matrimonial ties with the Mughul Emperors were treated as out castes. Such assumption, often reflected in the writings of modern historians,² 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 Mughul 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 Sīsodiās and Harās of Bundī did not give their daughters in marriage to those very Rājput chiefs who had matrimonial ties

the Mughul Emperors
but they married their
daughters to

-
1. Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, I, p. 390.
 2. H. Goetz, 'The Policy of the Grand Mughals Vis-a-vis Rajput States' Indian Culture, XIV, p. 94; 1948, Calcutta; Raghuvēer Singh, Purve Adhunik Rajasthan, p. 42; M. Mujeeb, The Indian Muslims, pp. 258, 359.

with the Mughul Emperors.¹

1. There took place a number of marriages among the Sīsodīās, Hārās, Bhātīs and the Rāthores which go to show that the Sīsodīās and the Hārās had no hesitation in establishing matrimonial ties with the Rāthore and the Bhātī chiefs who liked the Kachawāhā chiefs, were already related the Muslim superior chiefs through matrimonial ties.
 - (a) Rānā Sāngā (24th March 1481-April 1527) of Mēwār married Dhan Bāī, the daughter of Vā'agh, the son of Rāo Suja Rāthore (M.K., I, p.102).
 - (b) Rajkanverī, the daughter of Māldēo Rāthore (4 Dec. 1511 - 9 Nov. 1562) was married to Surtān, the son of Surjan Hārā. (M.P. -rē-Vīgat, I, p.53; B.K., p.20).
 - (c) Rāīmal, the son of Māldēo Rāthore, married Ratan Kanverī, the daughter of Surjan Hārā (1554-1585) of Bundī. (B.K., p.19).
 - (d) Rānā Udaī Singh (4 Aug. 1522 - 28 Feb. 1572) of Mēwār married Karmavati, the daughter of Rāo Chandra Sēh of Jodhpur. (B.K., p.22).
 - (e) Rāī Rāy Singh Rāthore (1541-1611) of Bīkānēr married Jaswantdē, the daughter of Rānā Udaī Singh Sīsodīā of Mēwār. (D.V., pp.12-13).
 - (f) In 1637, Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur married Rām Kanverī, the daughter of Chatarsal Hārā of Bundī. (Waqāi 'Ajmer, p.241; M.U., I, pp.405-06; M.P. -rē-Vīgat, II, p.462; M.L., II, p.43).
 - (g) In 1655, Jaswant Singh Rāthore of Jodhpur married the daughter of Bīram Dēve Sīsodīā. (Wāris, p.298; M.U., II, p.881).
 - (h) Jaswant Singh (1627-1678) of Jodhpur married a Sīsodīā princess of Mēwār. (Bernier, p.37).
 - (i) Jaswant Singh married the daughter of Sorāb Sīsodīā (M.U., I, p.754).
 - (j) Mahā Rānā Amar Singh (26 March 1560- 30 Oct. 1620) of Udaipur married a daughter of Rāwal Amar Singh Bhātī of Jaisalmēr. (V.V., II, p.1764).
 - (k) In 1622, Amar Singh, the son of Gaj Singh Rāthore of Jodhpur married a princess of Udaipur. (M.P. -rē-Vīgat, I, p.107).
 - (l) Karamsī Rāthore of Mairta married the sister of Rānā Jagat Singh of Udaipur. (Badshāh Nāma, Lāhorī, II, p.198).
 - (m) Bhān, son of Sakat Singh Sīsodīā and the grandson of Rānā Udaī Singh, married Rāj Kanver, the daughter of Mota Rāja of Jodhpur (M.K., I, 26).
 - (n) Rānā Sāngā's son Bhoj Rāj married the daughter of Vīram Dēve Rāthore of Mairta. (Vīr Vīnod, p.362).
 - (o) Rānā Rāj Singh (1652-1680) married Chārumatī, the daughter of Rāja Roop Singh Rāthore of Kishangarh. (Vīr Vīnod, p.476).
 - (p) Rānā Rāj Singh married the daughter of Sabal Singh Bhātī of Jaisalmēr. (Vīr Vīnod, p.476).
 - (q) In 1652, Anoop Singh of Bīkānēr married Rānā Rāj Singh's sister (Ibid., p.401).

The Kachawāhās of Ambēr who were one of the first Rājput clans to establish matrimonial ties with the Muslim rulers at an early date continued to enjoy a high status in the Rājput society. Precisely, during the period they established matrimonial ties first with Afghān chief, Hājī Khān, and later on with the Mughul rulers, they were having similar ties with the other Rājput clans on an extensive scale. The table given below would show that throughout the second half of the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries the Kachawāhās of Ambēr were having matrimonial ties with almost all the important Rājput clans.

T A B L E 'A'¹

Number of the brides taken by Kachawāhā chiefs
from different Rājput clans during 1547 - 1667:

Rāthores :	36
Chauhāns (Hārās) :	12
Parihārs :	7
Gaurs :	5
Bargujars :	4
Sīsodias :	3
Bhātīs :	3
Panwārs :	3
Yādeves :	1
Ghelots :	1
Nirbhāns :	1
Meēnas :	1
Jāts	1
Unspecified :	17
T o t a l =	95

1. The figures of this table are derived from appendix 'D'.

If any thing, it would appear, with their rising affluence and prosperity in the royal service the status of the Kachawāhās became higher among the Rājput chiefs, most of whom would consider it a special honour to have matrimonial ties with them. Even the ruling families of Bundī and Udaipur who were otherwise so opposed to giving their own daughters to the Mughuls, did not feel any compunctions of conscience in giving their daughters to Bhār Mal's descendants. For instance, Jagat Singh married Kishan Kanverī, the grand-daughter of Bhoj Hārā of Bundī.¹ Mahā Singh married Mahlanvas, the daughter of Bhoj Rāja.² Mahā Singh married Kān Kanverī, the daughter of Rāo Vāgh Sīsodīā.³ Another wife of Mahā Singh was Roop Kanverī, the daughter of Bhagwant Dās, son of Rānā Udaī Singh Sīsodīā.⁴ Moreover, the Kachawāhās were having matrimonial ties with the Rājput ruling families scattered all over Northern India. These belonged to Rājputānā, Bihar, Bengāl and Orīssa. For example, in March 1590, Puran Mal, the Rāja of Gidhur married his daughter to Chander Bhān, brother of Mān Singh.⁵ In January 1597, Rāja Lachmī Nārāin of Cooch Bihar gave his sister in marriage

1. Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, pp. 41-42, Jaipur-ki Vansāveli, Ms.

2. Jaipur-ki Vansāveli, Ms.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Akbar Nāma, III, p.576.

to Mān Singh.¹ Similarly, Mān Singh married Achurengdē, the daughter of Rāja Rām Chander of Orīssa.²

The break down of these marriages is as follows: Out of 95 marriages Rāthores 36, Chauhāns 12, Parihārs 7, Gaurs 5, Bargujars 4, Bhātīs, Sīsodiās and Panwārs 3 each and Yādeve, Ghelot, Nirbhān, Meēna and Jāt one each. These figures reveal that the Kachawāhā chiefs took the largest number of brides from the Rāthore clan. It is interesting to note that these two clans with such extensive matrimonial ties with each other were closest to the Mughul ruling family and throughout this period, were establishing matrimonial ties with them. But at the same time it may also be kept in mind that the tradition of inter-marriages between the Rāthores and Kachawāhās dated back to the pre-1562 period. As a matter of fact, a perusal of Appendix 'D' shows that while almost all the wives of Bhār Mal and Āskaran were from the Rāthore clan, Mān Singh had wives from a much wider cross-section of the Rājput groups including Rāthores, Gaurs, Chauhāns, Baghēlās, Yadeves, Parihārs, Bargujars and Bhātīs.³ This is a clear indication that after their entry into the royal service, far from being excluded

1. Ibid., pp.716-17, Bahāristān-i Ghāybi, Tr. by Borah, p.7. Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.166, H. Blochmann says that Lachmī Nārāin gave his own daughter in marriage to Mān Singh which is obviously a slip. See, "Koch Bihar, Koch Hajo and Assam, in the 16th and 17th centuries", Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal, p.53, 1872.

2. Jaipur-ki Vansāveli, Ms. J.N. Sarkar, The History of Bengal, p.210.

3. See, Appendix 'D'.

from the caste, the Kachawāhās had become acceptable to a much larger section of the Rājput aristocracy.

On the other hand from table 'B', one gathers that the Kachawāhās after entering the Mughul service, had become extremely choosy, regarding the marriages of their own daughters. While no doubt the largest number of Kachawāhā girls, during the period, were given to the Rāthores of Jodhpur and Bīkānēr, a few other marriages that are recorded, were made with persons belonging to the families already in the Mughul service, such as the Bhātīs of Jaisalmer, Rāja Bikramājeēt of Bāndhu Garh, the Hārās of Bundī.¹ In this respect the only exceptions were two marriages with rather obscure persons, one of them belonging to Bargujar clan.

In Table 'B', given below, the information regarding the marriages of the Kachawāhā brides, during the period 1547-1667, is arranged to indicate the number of brides given to different families:

Table 'B'²

Number of Kachawāhā Brides Given to
Different Families during 1547-1667:

Rāthores of Jodhpur	=	17
Rāthores of Bīkānēr	=	3
Rāthores of Maīrta	=	2
Chauhāns (Hārās)	=	1
Bargujars	=	1
Bhātīs	=	1
Mughuls	=	5
Unspecified	=	1
Total	=	<u>31</u>

-
1. Here, of course, we are not taking into account the marriages with the members of the Mughul ruling family.
 2. The figures of this table are derived from Appendix 'E'.

From this table one may see that out of a total of 31 such marriages, 22 were made with the members of Rāthore clan, 17 belonging to the ruling family of Jodhpur, 3 of Bīkānēr and 2 of Maīrta. While 5 brides were given to the royal family, one each was given to the members of the ruling families of Bundī, Jaīśalmēr and Bāndhugarh all of whom were in the Mughul service. It is pretty certain that these marriages took place at a time when the above chiefs had already entered the Mughul service. Regarding the remaining two marriages, it may be noted that although not much is known about the persons concerned. Yet one cannot completely rule out the possibility of their being in the imperial service.

V.

From the present study it emerges that the establishment of matrimonial ties between the Mughul ruling family and the Rājput clans was the direct out come of the recruitment of the Rājput chieftains into the imperial service in considerable strength. According to the established custom of the Tīmurīds and the Rājputs, 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 binding upon the Rājput chiefs at least in regard to such marriages. Even prior to these matrimonial ties with the Mughul ruling family, the Rājput chiefs were having similar ties with certain Muslim chieftains of Northern Rājputānā and Gujarāt.

In most cases, the marriage of a Mughul ruler in the family of a Rājput chief would take place only once, that is, when the chief of that particular clan entered the 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 Rājawat chief of Kachawāhā clan and the Rāthore chiefs of Jodhpur. These two families were singled out by the Mughul rulers for taking brides, down to the end of the seventeenth century greater preference was, however, shown to the Rājawat chiefs till Jahāngīr's time; but from Shāh Jahān's time onwards, it seems, the Rāthore chiefs began to find precedence over the Rājawats in matters of matrimony.

There is no basis for the view that the Kachawāhā chiefs were regarded by other Rājput clans as outcastes on account of their matrimonial ties with the royal family. The available evidence, on the other hand goes to suggest that even the Sīsodīās and the Hārās of Bundī who were so averse to give their daughters to the Mughul ruling family continued to have matrimonial ties with the Kachawāhās throughout the seventeenth century. If any thing, with the rise in the power and prestige of the chiefs of Amber after their joining the Mughul service, they became acceptable to a still larger cross-section of the Rājput families. However, with the passage of time, the Kachawāhās tended to become choosy regarding the marriages of their daughters. Ordinarily, they would marry their daughters either to the members of the ruling family or to persons holding mansabs in the Mughul service. During the 17th century, they would rarely give their daughters to a Rājput chief not holding an important position in the service of the Emperor.

A P P E N D I X 'A'

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

D a t e	TĪmurĪd Rulers	Racial Charac- teristic of Local Chiefs	Sources & Remarks.
28th Jan. 1519	Bābar married Mubārak Bēgum, the daughter of Malik Shāh Manṣoor, the chief of Yūsuf Zāis.	Yūsuf Zai (Kābul)	<u>Bābar Nāma,</u> Tr. A.S. Beveri p.375.
Date is not mentioned	Humāyūn married the daughter of Jamāl, the brother of Hasan Khān Mewatī.	Shaikhzāda (Mewāt)	<u>A.N., II, p.48.</u>

A P P E N D I X 'B'

LIST OF THE MARRIAGES BETWEEN THE DAUGHTERS OF IMPORTANT
CHIEFS OF RĀJPUTĀNĀ AND THE NON-RĀJPUT RULERS, MUSLIMS
AS WELL AS NON-MUSLIMS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER TILL
1562

Sl.No.	D a t e	The Rājput chiefs who gave their daughters in marriage to Non-Rājput chiefs.	Racial characteristic of Non-Rājput chiefs	Sources & Remarks
1.	1445 A.D.	Bhān of Idar gave his daughter in marriage to Mahmūd Shāh of Gujarāt.	Gujarāt	<u>Mīrat-i Sikandarī</u> p.49, Tr. p.23; <u>Vīr Vīnod</u> , II, 995.
2.	1415-1488	Rāo Jodhā, the chief of Mārwar, gave his daughter in marriage to Shams Khān Qīyām Khānī, the chief of Jhunjm and Fatehpur.	Qīyām Khānī (Jhunjm & Fatehpur).	<u>Qīyām Khān Rāsō</u> , pp. 36-37.
3.	13 Jan. 1470 - 29th June 1526	Rāo Loon Karan's daughter was married to Nāhar Khān	-do-	<u>Qīyām Khān Rāsō</u> , p. 49.
4.	4 Dec. 1511-9th Nov. 1562	Ratnāvati, the daughter of Māldēo was married to Hājī Khān, a commander of Salīm Shāh Sur.	Afghān	<u>Afsānā-i Shāhan</u> , Ms. f.178b; <u>M.P.-re Vīgat</u> , I, p.52; <u>B.K.</u> , p.20.
5.	-do-	Kankāvati, the daughter of Māldēo was married to Mahmūd Baīgrā of Gujarāt	-- --	<u>M.P.-re Vīgat</u> , I p.52; <u>B.K.</u> , p.20.
6.	-do-	Lāl Bai, the daughter of Māldēo Bāthore of Jodhpur was married to Sur Pādshāh (perhaps Islām Shāh Sur)	Afghān	<u>B.K.</u> , p.20.
7.	13 Jan. 1538-23rd July 1595.	One of the daughters of Motā Rāja of Jodhpur was married to Chiram Khān of Nāgore.	(Nāgore)	<u>M.P.-re Vīgat</u> , I, p.89. Chiram Khān is not identified.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|---|--------------------|--|
| 8. | 31 July
1541-1581 | Dhan Bai, the daughter of
Rao Chander Sen, the son
of Maldeo was married to
Daulat Khan of Nagore. | (Nagore) | <u>Waqiat-i Mushtaqi</u> ,
Ms. f.56b; <u>Tarikh-i</u>
<u>Daudi</u> , p.156; <u>B.K.</u> ,
p.22; <u>V.V.</u> , II,
p.808. |
| 9. | 1547 -
Jan. 1574 | Bhar Mal married one of
his daughters to Haji Khan | Afghan | <u>Jaipur-ki Vansha-</u>
<u>veli</u> , Ms. pages
are unmarked. |
| 10. | Date is not
mentioned | Rawal Patā of Rarodhra
married his widow daughter
to Gajni Khan, the chief
of Jalore. | Afghan
(Jalore) | <u>M.K.</u> , II, p.97. |
| 11. | -do- | Viram Deve Rathore (1477-
1543) of Mairta gave his
daughter in marriage to
a chief of Jalore. | (Jalore) | <u>M.P.-re Vigat</u> , II,
pp. 52-54. |
| 12. | -do- | Karamsi Rathore of Mairta
gave his sister Bhaga Bai
in marriage to Daulat
Khan Nagori. | (Nagore) | <u>B.K.</u> , p. 67. |

A P P E N D I X 'C'A K B A R

MARRIAGES CONTRACTED BY THE MUGHUL RULERS WITH THE
GIRLS TAKEN FROM THE FAMILIES OF THE LOCAL CHIEFS
IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER FROM 1562 TO 1707.

Sl.No.	D a t e	Marriages	Racial character- istics and place	References and other Remarks.
1.	Jan. 1562	Akbar married the daughter of Rāja Bhār Mal.	Kachawāhā (Ambēr)	<u>T. Alfī</u> , Ms. f.145; <u>A.N.</u> , II, 157-58; <u>M.T.</u> , 50; <u>Z.T.</u> , Ms. f.148a; <u>T.J.</u> , Tr. p.7.
2.	Jan. 1563	Akbar married the daughter-in-law of Shaikh Bādāh of Āgrā	(Āgrā)	<u>M.R.</u> , I, 694-5; <u>T.D.</u> , Ms., f.539b; <u>K.T.</u> , 374; <u>M.L.</u> , I, p.159; <u>M.U.</u> , I, pp.111-12; <u>M.T.</u> , II, 61.
3.	9th Aug. 1564	Akbar married the daughter of Miān Mubārak Shāh of Khāndēsh.	(Deccani) (Khāndēsh)	<u>A.N.</u> , II, 230-31; <u>T. Alfī</u> , f.615.
4.	15th Nov. 1570	Rāi Kalyān Mal gave his niece in marriage to Akbar.	Rāthore (Bikānēr)	<u>A.N.</u> , II, 358; <u>D.V.</u> , 14-15; <u>M.T.</u> , 133; <u>V.V.</u> , II, 174, 485.
5.	-do-	Rāi Kalyān Mal gave another niece in marriage to Akbar. She was daughter of Bhinve Rāj, a brother of Kalyān Mal.	-do-	<u>D.V.</u> , 14-5.
6.	-do-	Akbar married the daughter of Rāwal Har Rāi of Jaisalmēr.	(Bhātī) (Jaisalmēr)	<u>A.N.</u> , II, 358; <u>V.V.</u> , II, 174.
7.	Nov. 1570.	Rukmāvati, the daughter of Māldēo was married to Akbar.	Rāthore (Jodhpur)	<u>B.K.</u> , p.20; <u>Tod.</u> , II, 22; <u>V.V.</u> , II, 174.

- | | | | | |
|-------|------------------|---|--------------------|---|
| 8. | 1573 | Akbar married the daughter of Rājā Jai Chand of Nagarkot. | (Nagarkot) | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 36. |
| 9. | March 1577 | Akbar married the daughter of Rāwal Āskaran of Dungarpur. | Gehlot (Dungarpur) | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 196, 210. |
| 10. | 1581 | Kesho Dās married one of his daughters to Akbar. | Rāthore (Mairta) | <u>M.P. Vigat</u> , II, 69-70. |
| 11. | 16th Feb. 1584 | Prince Salīm married the daughter of Bhagwant Dās. | Kachawāhā (Ambēr) | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 451; <u>M.T.</u> , II, 341; <u>T.J.</u> , p.7; <u>Lāhorī</u> , II, 603-4; <u>T.D. Ms.</u> f.577a; <u>Z.K.</u> , I, 105; <u>M.L.</u> , I, p.189, 245-46; <u>M.U.</u> , I, 189; <u>K.T.</u> , 375. |
| 12. | 26th June 1586 | Akbar married the daughter of Saīd Khān Gakhar. | Gakhar | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 494. |
| 13. | -do- | Prince Salīm married the daughter of Rāē Rāī Singh of Bikāner | Rāthore (Bikāner) | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 494; <u>M.T.</u> , II, 353; <u>Tod</u> , II, 145; <u>V.V.</u> , II, 168-69. |
| 14. | 1587 | Prince Salīm married the daughter of Motā Rāja of Jodhpur. | Rāthore (Jodhpur) | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 603; <u>T.J.</u> , Tr., p.19; <u>M.J.</u> , f.10a; <u>M.L.</u> , I, pp.245-46; <u>M.U.</u> , II, 180-81; <u>T.U.</u> , f.155; <u>Tod</u> , I, 267; <u>V.V.</u> , II, 182, 815 |
| 15. | 1st Jan. 1592 | Akbar married the daughter of 'Alī Rāī, the ruler of Tibet | (Tibet) | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 603; <u>M.T.</u> , 376. |
| 16. | October 1592 | Akbar married the daughter of Shams Cak of Kashmīr. | Cak (Kashmīr) | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 626. |
| • 17. | -do- | Prince Salīm married the daughter of Mubārak Khān, the son of Hasan Cak of Kashmīr. | Cak (Kashmīr) | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 626. |
| 18. | 20th April 1593. | Prince Salīm married the daughter of Rāja 'Alī Khān of Khāndēsh. | Deccani (Khāndēsh) | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 639. |

- | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|
| 19. | 2nd Oct.
1595. | Dāniēl married the daughter of Rāē Mal, the son of Rāi Māldēo. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 696. |
| 20. | May 1597. | Akbar married the daughter of Rāja Lachmī Nārāin of Cooch Bihār. | (Cooch
Bihār) | <u>Jaipur kī Vanshāvalī</u> , pages are unmarked; cf. also <u>A.N.</u> , Tr. H. Beveridge p.1068, Foot-Note No.2. |
| 21. | March 1604 | Prince Dāniēl married the daughter of Adil Khan of Bījāpur. | Deccanī
(Bījāpur) | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 827; <u>T.D.</u> , Ms. f.576b; <u>M.L.</u> , I, p.216. |
| 22. | Date is not mentioned | Akbar married the daughter of Fadan Khān Qiyām Khānī. | Shaikhzāda
(Fatehpur & Jhunjnu) | <u>Qiyām Khān Rāsō</u> , p.54. |
| 23. | -do- | One of the daughters of Rāō Chander Sēn Rāthore of Jodhpur was sent in <u>Dolā</u> to Akbar. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>B.K.</u> , p.22. |
| 24. | -do- | Prince Murād married the daughter of Bahādur Khān s/o Rāja 'Alī Khān of Khāndēsh. | Deccani
(<u>Khāndēsh</u>) | <u>M.R.</u> , II, 481. |
| 25. | -do- | Prince Sultān Salīm married the daughter of Rāwal Bhīm of Jāisalmēr. | Bhātī
(Jāisalmēr) | <u>T.J.</u> , Tr. 326. |
| 26. | -do- | Akbar married into the family of Tunwar chiefs. | Tunwar
(Gwālior) | <u>Z.K.</u> , I, 104. (From <u>Āyin</u> , II, Tr. Jarrett. 198, it appears that Tunwar <u>zamīndāris</u> were concentrated around Gwālior). |
| 27. | -do- | Akbar married into the family of Baghēlā chiefs. | Baghēlā
(Bhattā) | <u>Z.K.</u> , I, 104. |
| 28. | -do- | Prince Salīm married the daughter of Kesho Dās Rāthore. | Rāthore
(Mairta) | <u>T.J.</u> , I, 19; <u>Wāris</u> , 238. |
| 29. | -do- | Daniel married the daughter of Dalpat Ujjainīyā, the Rāja of Bhojpur. | Bhojpur | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 826; Bhojpur is in <u>Rohtās sarkār</u> of <u>sūba</u> Bihār, <u>Āyin</u> , II, Tr. 168. |

30. -do- Akbar married Gohar-un Nīsa Bēgum, the sister of Shaikh Jamāl Bakhtiyār (Chandāwar and Jalēsar) M.U., II, 564, 566; He was the son of Mohd. Bakhtiyār and resided in Chandāwar and Jalēsar.
31. -do- Prince Salīm married the daughter of Daryā Malbhās -- A.N., III, 572, the bride's father's name was Daryā Komm and was a powerful Rāja at the foot of the Lāhore Mountains. See, Price's Jahāngīr, p.34.
32. -do- Prince Salīm married the sister of Abiyā Kashmīrī, the son of 'Abdul Cak. Cak (Kashmīr) A.N., III, 609.
33. -do- Prince Dāniāl married the daughter of 'Abdullāh Bīluc. Bīluc A.N., III, p.662.

J A H A N G I R

1. 28th May 1608 Jahāngīr married the daughter of Rāja Jagat Singh s/o Mān Singh. Kachawāhā (Ambēr) T.J., 68, 69; M.J., f.57a; M.L., I, 259; M.U., II, 141-2.
2. 1st Feb. 1609 Jahāngīr married the daughter of Rām Chander Bundēlāh. Bundēlāh (Orchā) T.J., p.77.
3. 22nd Nov. 1614 Jahāngīr married the daughter of Rāja Lachmī Nārāin of Cooch Bihār. (Cooch Bihār) T.J., p.131.
4. -do- Jahāngīr married another daughter of Lachmī Nārāin of Cooch Bihār. -do- -do-
5. April 1624 Prince Parwēz married Manbhāvati, the sister of Rāja Gaj Singh. Rāthore (Jodhpur) T.J., p.380; M.P. Vigat, I 108; In return Prince Parwēz sub-assigned the pargana Mairta to Rāja Sur Singh.
6. 1625 Dāwar Bakhsh, son of Prince Khusrāu married Rāja Jai Singh's sister. Kachawāhā (Ambēr) Akhbarāt, 20th R.Y., J.N. Sarkar's collection, Calcutta, pp.2-4.
7. -- Prince Khurram married the daughter of Rāo Sakar Singh, son of Mota Rāja. Rāthore (Jodhpur) M.P. Vigat, I, 111.

S H Ā H J A H Ā N

- | | | | | | |
|----------|----|---------|--|-----------------------|--|
| | 1. | 1654 | Prince Sulaimān Shīkoh married the daughter of Amar Singh Rāthore of Nāgore. | Rāthore
(Nāgore) | <u>V.V.</u> , II, pp.342-43. |
| /_grand- | 2. | 1654-55 | Prince Sulaimān Shīkoh married the daughter of Rāja Gaj Singh. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>M.L.</u> , II, 730. |
| | 3. | 1655-56 | Prince Sultān Muḥammad married the daughter of 'Abdullāh Qutub Shāh of Golcundā. | Deccanī
(Golcundā) | <u>M.U.</u> , III, 620-21. |
| | 4. | -- | Prince Shūjā married the daughter of Rāja Gaur Sēn of Kishtāwar. | (Kishtāwar) | Lāhorī, II, 434-35;
Kanbu, II, p.445. |

A U R A N G Z Ī B

- | | | | | | |
|--|----|--------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | 1. | 17th Nov.
1661 | Prince Mohd. Mu'azzam married the daughter of Rāj Singh Rāthore, Rāja of Kishangarh. | Rāthore
(Kishangarh) | <u>M.A.</u> , 3-4, 181-82;
<u>'Ālamgīr Nāma</u> , 639-41, 874;
<u>V.V.</u> , II, 529. She was converted to Islām. |
| | 2. | 3rd May
1669 | Prince Āzam married Raḥmat Bāno, the daughter of the King of Āssām. | (Āssām) | <u>M.A.</u> , 73. |
| | 3. | 2nd Jan.
1676 | Prince Muḥammad Sultān married the daughter of Rāja of Kishtāwar. | (Kishtāwar) | <u>M.A.</u> , 148. |
| | 4. | 1st Sept.
1676. | Prince Mohd. Akbar married the daughter of Allāh Qulī Gakhar, the son of Murād Qulī Gakhar. | (Gakhar) | <u>M.A.</u> , 155. |
| | 5. | 5th July
1678 | Prince Mohd. Āzam married the daughter of Kirat Singh s/o Mirzā Rāja Jai Singh. | (Kachawāhā)
(Amber) | <u>M.A.</u> , 167. |

6. 26th July 1681 Prince Azam married Shahar Bāno, the daughter of Adil Shāh of Bījāpur. Deccanī (Bījāpur) M.A., 210.
7. 30th July 1681 Kām Baksh married Kalyān Kanwar, the daughter of Amar Chand, a brother of Jagat Singh of Manoharpur. Shaikhāwat (Manoharpur) M.A., 210-11; M.L., II, 510. Shaikhāwat is a sub-branch of the Kachawāhā clan.
8. Prince Muḥammad married the daughter of Qutb-ul Mulk. Deccanī M.U., II, 190-91.

A P P E N D I X 'D'

MARRIAGES OF THE KACHAWĀHĀ CHIEFS WITH THE WOMEN
BELONGING TO THE RĀJPUT FAMILIES:
1547-1667 A.D.

BHĀRMAL: 1547- Jan. 1574

Sl.No.	Family	Clan & Place	Sources
1.	Married Badāndē, the daughter of Mohajal Rāja.	Rāthore	<u>J.V.</u> , Ms. pages are unmarked.
2.	Married Padmāvati, the daughter of Vanvēer Chauhān	Chauhān	-do-
3.	Married Naīndē, the daughter of Khaītsī Rāthore.	Rāthore	-do-
4.	Married Kishnāvati, the daughter of Rāmsingh Rāthore	Rāthore (Jodhpur)	-do-
5.	Married Champāvati, another daughter of Rām Singh Rāthore	-do-	-do-
6.	Married Kalyān Kanverī, the daughter of Bā'aj.	- -	-do-
7.	Married Phool Kanverī, the daughter of Jagmāl Rāthore.	Rāthore (Mairta)	-do-
8.	Married Champāvati Solankī, daughter of Rāo Rānā.	Solankī	-do-
9.	Married Solkanverī, the daughter of Lākhā Rāo Chandrā.	- -	-do-
10.	Married Kishan Kanverī, the daughter of R. Jagat Singh Sīsodiā.	Sīsodiā (Mewār)	-do-

Ā S K A R A N

1547 - 1605

1. Married Indervatī, the daughter of Rāo Māldēo of Jodhpur. Rāthore (Jodhpur) M.K., I, 303; B.K., 20, 23.

M Ā N S I N G H

27th November 1550 - 6th July 1614.

1. Married a sister of Rāja Lachmī Nārāin of Cooch Bihār. Gaur (Cooch-Bihār) May 1597 A.N., III, 716-17; M.U., II, 166.
2. Married Sarangdē, daughter of Ratan Singh of Jaitāran. Rāthore (Jaitāran) M.K., I, 297; B.K., 125.
3. Married Jānvatī Chauhān, the daughter of Ratan Singh. Chauhān. J.V., Ms.
4. Married Rām Kanverī, the daughter of Hamēer Sēn Khichī. Khichī (Chauhān)-Khilchīpur J.V., Ms; Khichī is a sub-branch of Chauhān Rājputs (B.K., 141-2).
5. Married Manbhāvatī, the daughter of Kishan Rāo Baghēlā. Baghēlā - J.V., Ms.
6. Married Lichmāvatī, the daughter of Bijay Singh Rāthore. Rāthore. -do-
7. Married Chānd Kanverī, the daughter of Jalāl Solankī. Solankī -do-
8. Married Mahānkanverī Kotāchī, the daughter of Birdhī Chand Kotāchī. -- -do-
9. Married Āa'ash Kanverī, the daughter of Chander Sēn Rāthore. Rāthore (Jodhpur) M.K., I, 297; B.K., 124.
10. Married Achu Rang Dēvī, the daughter of Rām Chand of Orissa. -- (Orissa) J.V., Ms.

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|--|
| 11. | Married Sāhodrā Devī or Bhānu Matī, the daughter of Rāī Sāl Gaur of Cooch Bihār. | Gaur
(Cooch-Bihār) | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
| 12. | Married Sat Bhaī, the daughter of Rāe Mal Rāthore, the son of Māldeo. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>B.K.</u> , 124. |
| 13. | Married Ratnāvati, the daughter of Kapoor Chand Khichī. | Khichī
— | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
| 14. | Married Kooram Devī or Tīlok Devī, the daughter of Chander Sēn Yādave. | Yādave
— | -do- |
| 15. | Married Varansi Devī, the daughter of Santosh Mal Parihār | Parihār
— | -do- |
| 16. | Married Pratāp Devī, the daughter of Bansī Dās Bhadūriyā | Chauhān
(Bhadūriyā)
— | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. Bhadūriyā is a sub-branch of Chauhān Rājput. (<u>B.K.</u> , 141). |
| 17. | Married Sumitrā Devī, the daughter of Mahārāj Singh Rāthore. | Rāthore
— | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
| 18. | Married Ahjan Kunwar, the daughter of Rāe Rāī Singh of Bīkāner. | Rāthore
(Bīkāner) | <u>B.K.</u> , 124;
<u>V.V.</u> , II, 1285. |
| 19. | Married Madnāvati, the daughter of Sikhar Bhīm Rāj. | | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
| 20. | Married Lichmāvati, the daughter of Rāj Nārāin Dās of Bengāl | Gaur
(Bengāl) | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
| 21. | Married Dulhan Devī, the daughter of Banē Singh Gaur. | Gaur
— | -do- |
| 22. | Married Hammīr Devī, the daughter of Bāghjī Bādgujar. | Bādgujar
— | -do- |
| 23. | Married a daughter of Rāo Loonkaran of Jaisalmēr. | Bhāti
(Jaisalmēr) | <u>V.V.</u> , II, 220. |
| 24. | Married Brij Kanver, the daughter of Kanvar Pāl. | | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
| 25. | Married Sumitrā, the daughter of Isar Dās Rāthore. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | -do- |

- | | | | |
|-----|--|----------------|-------------------|
| 26. | Married Prabhāvati, the daughter of Bhanvar Pāl of Orīssa. | --
(Orīssa) | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
| 27. | Married Shyām Kanver, the daughter of Chander Sēn Chauhān. | Chauhān
-- | -do- |

BHAGWANT DĀS KACHAWĀHĀ

1561 - Nov. 1589

- | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. | Married Bhagvatī, the daughter of Pinchon Panwār and grand daughter of Karam Chand. | Panwār
(Ābu) | <u>B.K.</u> , 124, 138. |
| 2. | Atrange, the daughter of Ashok Mal, was married to Bhagwant Dās Kachawāhā. | | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
| 3. | Married Krishan Kanver, the daughter of Surjan Hārā of Bundī. | Hārā
(Bundī) | -do- |
| 4. | Married Isardē, the daughter of Jādon Bhārath Chand. | | -do- |
| 5. | Married Bhāmādē Rāthore, the daughter of Tārā Chand. | Rāthore
-- | -do- |
| 6. | Married Gang Kanverī, the daughter of Saduljī Solankī. | Solankī
(Bundī) | -do- |
| 7. | Married Imratdē, the daughter of Achaldat Rāthore. | Rāthore
-- | -do- |
| 8. | Married Lāl Kanverī, the daughter of Sahas Mal Chauhān. | Chauhān
-- | -do- |
| 9. | Married Sumitā, the daughter of Biryā Rāo | | -do- |

- | | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| 10. | Married Rāī Kanverī,
another daughter of
Biryā Rāo. | | <u>J.V.</u> , ms. |
| 11. | Married Champāvati, the
daughter of Rāīsāl. | | -do- |
| 12. | Married Bhāvē Kanverī,
the daughter of Arjun
Baghēlā. | Baghēlā
(Bhāttā) | -do- |
| 13. | Married Satmābhā, the
daughter of Rāe Mal
Rāthore. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | -do- |

J A Ī M A L : 1562-1583

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------|--|
| 1. | Married Dāmētī Bai, the
daughter of Udai Singh
(Motā Rāja) of Jodhpur. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 402;
<u>M.U.</u> , II, III;
<u>M.K.</u> , I, 312. |
| 2. | Married a daughter of
Sānkhilā Chief. | Sānkhilā
-- | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 312. |

LOONKARAN SHAIKHAWAT

1562 - 1583

- | | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|--|
| 1. | Married Hansbāī, the
daughter of Māldēo. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 319;
<u>M.P. Vigat</u> , I, 52;
<u>B.K.</u> , 20. |
|----|---|----------------------|--|

RAĪSĀL DARBĀRĪ

1562-1609

- | | | | |
|----|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Married a daughter of
Bithal Dās, the son of
Jaīmal Rāthore. | Rāthore
(Maīrta) | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 321. |
|----|--|---------------------|-----------------------|

- | | | | |
|----|---|---------------|-----------------------|
| 2. | Rāisāl married a Gaur Princess. Her family is not identified. | Gaur
— | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 324. |
| 3. | Rāisāl married a Songrā Princess. Her family is not identified. | Songar
— | -do- |
| 4. | Married Bargujar Princess. Her family is not identified. | Bargujar
— | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 323. |
| 5. | Rāisāl married a Nirbān Princess. | Nirbān
— | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 324. |

RĀJ SINGH S/O ĀSKARAN

1562-1615

- | | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Married Rāi Kanverī, the daughter of Motā Rāja. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 303. |
|----|---|----------------------|-----------------------|

JAGAT SINGH RĀJĀWAT

1568- 15th Oct. 1599

- | | | | |
|----|--|---------------------|--|
| 1. | Married Sarupdē, the daughter of Rāja Puraṅ Mal. | | |
| 2. | Married Kukundē, the grand-daughter of Bhoj Surjan Hārā. | Hārā
(Bundī) | <u>M.U.</u> , I, pp.141-42;
<u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
| 3. | Rām Kanverī Rāthore, the daughter of Isar Singh Rāthore of Mairta, was married to him. | Rāthore
(Mairta) | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
| 4. | Married Lāchandē, the daughter of Bhoj Mahalārvās. | | -do- |

- | | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| 5. | Married Bhanvetī, the
daughter of Mādho Dās s/o
Jaimal Rāthore. | Rāthore
(Mairta) | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
| 6. | Married Santbhāmā, the
daughter of Mahēsh Jī Rāthore. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | -do- |
| 7. | Married Kusumdē, the
daughter of Hans Lāl. | --
-- | -do- |
| 8. | Married Kēsardē, the
daughter of Rāo Sultān. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | -do- |
| 9. | Married Man Bhāvetī, the
daughter of Karan Rāthore. | Rāthore
-- | -do- |

M Ā D H O S I N G H

1573 - 1605

- | | | | |
|----|--|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1. | Married the daughter of
Rāo Dungarsī of Bīkampur. | Bhātī
(Bīkampur) | <u>M.K.</u> , II, 133. |
|----|--|---------------------|------------------------|

B H Ā O S I N G H

Sept. 1576-Oct. 1621

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Married Āskanverī Bai, the
daughter of Suraj
Singh of Jodhpur. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 299. |
| 2. | Married Āshī Kanverī, the
daughter of Chatrangdē
Panwar. | Panwar
-- | <u>B.K.</u> , 27. |

M A H Ā S I N G H

1585 - 1617

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------|-------------------|
| 1. | Married Ruknavatī Bai, the
daughter of Kān Singh. | --
-- | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
|----|--|----------|-------------------|

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 2. | Married Mahalanvās, the daughter of Bhoj Rāja. | Hārā
(Bundi) | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
| 3. | Married Manmādē, the daughter of Sakat Singh. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | -do- |
| 4. | Roop Kanverī, the daughter of Bhagwān Singh Chauhān of Rāmpurā was married to him. | Chauhān
(Rāmpurā) | -do- |
| 5. | Married Krishnāvati Solankī, the daughter of Bhagwān Dās. | Solankī | -do- |
| 6. | Married Rāj Kanverī Badgujar, the daughter of Ajeēt Singh. | Badgujar | -do- |
| 7. | Married Rānī Rukmāvati, the daughter of Motā Rāja. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 297. |
| 8. | Married Shyām Kanver, the daughter of Rāja Puraṅ Mal Bargujar. | Bargujar | <u>J.V.</u> , Ms. |
| 9. | Married Rukmāvati, who belonged to Chandrāwat family. | Chandrāwat
(Sīsodīā) | -do- |
| 10. | Married Kān Kanverī, the daughter of Rāo Vā'gh Sīsodīā. | Sīsodīā
(Mewār) | -do- |
| 11. | Married one of the daughters of Āskaran Pugaliā. | Bhātī
(Pugal) | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 133. |
| 12. | Married Rup Kanverī, the daughter of Bhagwant Dās s/o Udaī Singh. | Sīsodīā
(Mewār) | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 287. |

GIRDHAR SHAIKHAWAT

1602 - 1623

- | | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Married the daughter of Kānāh s/o Raisāl Rāthore. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 322. |
|----|---|----------------------|-----------------------|

JAI SINGH

29th May 1611 - 28th Aug. 1667.

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Married Mirgāvati Bai, the daughter of Rāja Suraj Singh Rāthore. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur)
1622 AD. | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 297;
<u>B.K.</u> , 27, 125. |
|----|--|----------------------------------|---|

SUR SINGH S/O BHAGWANT DĀS

Died in 1581

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Married Jasodā Bai, the daughter of Motā Rāja. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 300. |
|----|--|----------------------|-----------------------|

GOVERDHAN RĀJĀWAT S/O RĀJA ĀSKARAN

Died in 1591

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. | Married Kankāvati, the daughter of Rāo Chander Sēn of Jodhpur. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 303-4. |
|----|--|----------------------|-------------------------|

BHAGWANT DĀS

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Married Durgāvati, the daughter of Rāo Māldeo. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 297. |
|----|--|----------------------|-----------------------|

CHANDER BHĀN brother of MĀN SINGH

- | | | | |
|----|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. | He married the daughter of Puran Mal of Gidhaur. | —
(Gidhaur)
March 1590 | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 576. |
|----|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|

RĀM DĀS S/O RĀJ SINGH

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Rām Dās married a daughter of Motā Rāja. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 303. |
|----|--|----------------------|-----------------------|

SABAL SINGH S/O MĀN SINGH

- | | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Married Rai Kanveri, the daughter of Rai Chander Sēn Rāthore. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | <u>M.K.</u> , I, 298. |
|----|---|----------------------|-----------------------|

TH-5350

T I L O K S I

1. Married Kishnāvati Bāī,
the daughter of Motā
Rāja. Rāthore
(Jodhpur) M.K., I, 312;
B.K., 25.

APPENDIX 'E'

LIST OF THE MARRIAGES OF THE KACHAWĀHĀ
GIRLS (1547-1667 A.D.) WITH
THE RAJPUT CHIEFS OF
DIFFERENT CLANS.

Ā S K A R A N

1547 - 1603

Sl.No.	<u>Family</u>	Clan & Place	Date	Sources
1.	One of Āskaran's daughters was married to Motā Rāja.	Rāthore, Jodhpur	--	<u>M.P. Vigat</u> , I, 92; <u>M.K.</u> , I, 303; III, 214; <u>B.K.</u> , 23.
2.	Another daughter of Āskaran was married to Rām Singh Rāthore	-do-	--	<u>B.K.</u> , 22.
3.	One of Āskaran's daughters was married to Kisan Singh s/o Motā Rāja.	-do-	--	<u>M.K.</u> , III, 214.

M Ā N S I N G H

27th November 1550 - 6th July 1614

1.	Rup Kanverī was married to Hari Nārāin Hārā.	Chauhān (Hārā), (Bundi)	--	<u>B.K.</u> , 145; <u>G. Table</u> Pages are unmarked.
2.	One of the daughters of Mān Singh was married to Rāja Bikramājī of Bāndhugarh.	-- (Bāndhugarh)	--	<u>M.K.</u> , I, 133.
3.	Badan Kanverī was married to Mairtyā Rāthore.	Rāthore, (Mairta)	--	<u>G. Table.</u>
4.	Rāja Sur Singh of Bīkāner married Sarupdējī, the daughter of Mān Singh.	Rāthore (Bīkāner)	--	<u>Gajnama</u> , Ms. f.5.

- | | | | | |
|----|--|---------------------|----|------------------|
| 5. | Madnāvatī was married to Bāghā Bādgujar. | Bādgujar
(—) | -- | <u>G. Table.</u> |
| 6. | Moklāvatī was married to Karam Sen Rāthore. | Rāthore
(Mairta) | -- | <u>G. Table.</u> |

J A G A N N Ā T H

9th November 1552 - 1609

- | | | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|----------|------------------------|
| 1. | Gaj Singh of Jodhpur married the daughter of Jagannāth. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | 1606 AD. | <u>M.K.</u> , II, 155. |
|----|---|----------------------|----------|------------------------|

J A G M Ā L

1562-1573

- | | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------|---|-------------------|
| 1. | Rāo Jaitsī of Bīkāner married Dadamvatī, the daughter of Jagmāl (Dadamnāthjī) | Rāthore
(Bīkāner) | — | <u>D.K.</u> , 59. |
|----|--|----------------------|---|-------------------|

RĀM SINGH UDĀWAT

1573 - 24th Oct. 1613.

- | | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------|-----------|-------------------------|
| 1. | His daughter was married to Shyām Singh. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | Dec. 1601 | <u>A.N.</u> , III, 799. |
|----|--|----------------------|-----------|-------------------------|

BHĀO SINGH

Sept. 1576 - Oct. 1621.

- | | | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|----------|---|
| 1. | Rāja Gaj Singh married Surajdē, the daughter of Bhāo Singh. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | 1619 AD. | <u>M.P. Vigat</u> , I, III;
<u>M.K.</u> , I, 299;
<u>B.K.</u> , 28, 34. |
|----|---|----------------------|----------|---|

MAHĀ SINGH

1585-1617

- | | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------|----|-----------------------|
| 1. | Dēep Kanverī was married to Amar Singh s/o Gaj Singh Rāthore. | Rāthore
(Jodhpur) | -- | <u>Wāris</u> , p.259. |
|----|--|----------------------|----|-----------------------|

JAI SINGH

29th May 1611 - 28th Aug. 1667

1. Māldeo Bhātī of Bhātī -- V.V., II, 1764.
 Jaīsalmer married the (Jaīsalmer)
 daughter of Mirzā
 Rāja Jaī Singh.

HIMMAT SINGH KACHAWAHĀ

Died in March 1597

1. Rāja Sur Singh of Rāthore -- M.K., III, 31.
 Bīkāner married the (Bīkāner)
 daughter of Himmat
 Singh Kachawāhā.

J A G R U P

Died in 1599 A.D.

1. Kalyāndē Jī was married Rāthore 1605 AD. M.K., I, 301; B.K., 28.
 to Rāja Gaj Singh of (Jodhpur)
 Jodhpur

CHANDER BHĀN NAROOKĀ

1. Kēsardē, the daughter Rāthore -- M.K., I, 315.
 of Chander Bhān Narookā, (Jodhpur)
 was married to Rāja
 Gaj Singh Rāthore.

DURJAN SHAIKHĀWAT

1. Gaj Singh married Rāthore 1587 M.P. Vigat, II, 435;
 Sobhāgdē, the daughter (Jodhpur) M.K., I, 325; B.K., 26.
 of Durjan Shaikhāwat.

RAI SINGH

1. Rāja Sur Singh of Jodhpur Rāthore -- M.K., III, 32.
 married the daughter of (Jodhpur)
 Rāi Singh

RĀM SINGH S/O TEJSĪ SHAIKHĀWAT

1. One of the daughters of Rām Singh was married to Motā Rāja. Rāthore (Jodhpur) -- M.K., I, 326.

RATANŚĪ SHAIKHĀWAT

1. Māldeo married Lāchalde, the daughter of Ratan Śī Shaikhawat. Rāthore (Jodhpur) -- M.P. Vigat, I, 55.

RUMĪ KHĀN S/O KARANSĪ

1. Suraj Singh married Kēsardē, the daughter of Rumi Khān. Rāthore (Jodhpur) -- M.K., III, 214.

TIRMAL RĀĒ

1. A daughter of Tirmal Rāē s/o Rāī Sāl was married to Rāja Suraj Singh of Jodhpur. Rāthore (Jodhpur) 1611 AD. M.K., I, 323.

VEER SINGH SHAIKHĀWAT

1. Jaswant Singh married Atirangde, the daughter of Vēer Singh Shaikhawat. Rāthore (Jodhpur) -- B.K., 35.
2. Maharaja Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur married a Narooki Princess. Rāthore (Jodhpur) -- Futuhāt-i Ālangiri, Ms. f.139; V.V., II, 828.

CHAPTER V

THE ASPECT OF CULTURAL SYNTHESIS

An eminent sociologist Professor J. Goody says that the marriage policy is the most important factor in the change of cultural features.¹ It would be, therefore, natural to assume that the marriages contracted between the women of the leading Rājput clans and the members of the Mughul 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 the two cultures. To begin with one would like to study the nature of various ceremonies performed at these occasions and also the treatment of the Rājput princesses in the Royal harem with special reference to the Kachawāhā 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 Rājput chiefs and particularly those of the Kachawāhā chiefs. Further, it will be examined, as to how far did the Kachawāhā nobles cooperate with the Mughul Emperors with respect to some of their measures

1. Jack Goody, 'Marriage Policy and incorporation in Northern Ghana', Comparative Studies in Kinship, p.154.

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 Mughuls and the Rājputs were observed.¹ This implies that the daughters of the Rājput chiefs taken into marriages by Akbar were not converted to Islām. This practice appears to have continued during Jahāngīr's reign as well.² In the accounts of Jahāngīr's marriages with the Rājput princesses there is no reference to the conversion of the brides. But as it is well-known, this policy was reversed by Aurangzīb. It is known that when in 1661, Prince Mu'azzam married the daughter of Roop Singh Rāthore, the bride was converted perhaps, with the concurrence of her father, to Islām.³

On the occasion of Prince Salīm's marriage with the daughter of Bhagwant Dās in 1584, the marriage rites of both the Hindūs and the Mughuls were observed. While the proposal for this match came from the parents of the bride which was in conformity with the Rājput practice,⁴ the marriage proper

1. Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh, II, p.341.

2. In the account of Jahāngīr's marriages with the Rājput princesses, there is no reference to the conversion of the brides. Cf. Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.68, 69, 77, 131, 380.

3. Ma'asir-i Ālangīrī, pp.3-4, Ālangīr Nāma, pp.639-41.

4. At another occasion (1608), the initiative came from the side of the royal family. Observing the Mughul custom, a sum of Rs.80,000 was sent to the bride's family as sachāq (marriage present). Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī, pp.67-68.

was solemnised first through aqd presided by a qāzī, fixing the mahr of the bride at two crore tankās, and later through the Hindū 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. Rāja Bhagwant Dās gave in dowry several strings of horses, one hundred elephants, large number of slave boys and girls of Abyssinian, Indian and Circassian origin, golden and silver vessels with jewels. The Raja also presented Persian, Turkish and Arabian horses with golden saddles to the nobles, present at the marriage ceremony.¹ In this connection, it is significant that Badāūnī, who particularly noticed these details, has not criticised Akbar for allowing the marriage of his son to be solemnised in addition to aqd through Hindū rituals repugnant to the basic spirit of Islām. This would suggest that by the time, Badāūnī 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 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 Jahāngīr's second marriage into the Kachawāhā family in 1608, the same procedure must have been followed. The only difference in the procedure, which is noted by Jahāngīr was that the initiative for the match this time came from the side of the Mughul ruler.²

Further, it seems that the Rājput princesses in the Mughul harem

1. Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh, II, p.341; Tabaqāt-i Akbarī, III, p.346; Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, pp.103-4; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.130.

2. Tūzūk-i Jahāngīrī, p.68.

had full freedom to practise their religion. They also appear to have been instrumental in bringing about a notable 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 the festivals of the Hindūs. Badāūnī for instance attributes Akbar's tolerant attitude towards the Hindūs and a tendency on the latter's part to participate in Hindū festivals and rituals to the growing influence of his Rājput wives.¹ Badāūnī further holds that Akbar being influenced by his Hindū wives prohibited the eating of beef, onions and garlics. It would appear that the tendency to accept Hindū cultural practices manifested itself at an early stage in Akbar's life when he was still under the influence of the 'Ulemā. From a passage in Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh, one gathers that as early as mid seventies, Akbar used to put on yellow garments, made of a silken cloth, a Rajput practice considered repugnant to the rules of shariāt by the orthodox people.² Naturally, a taste for such garments would be acquired by Akbar in the company of his Rājput wives. Towards the close of his reign, Akbar had started observing some of the typical Hindū rituals in clear violation of shariāt. It is known on the authority of Abū'l Fazl that after Hamīdā Bāno Bēgum's death in 1604, Akbar had his head and

1. Badāūnī holds that Akbar celebrated the hom festival of the Hindūs in compliment to his Hindū 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, everyone had to rise up respectfully. Akbar also celebrated the rākhi festival which was followed by his chiefs and nobles. Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh, II, pp.261-62.

2. Ibid., pp.210-11, 306.

moustaches shaved after the Rājput custom.¹ Further, it seems that the innate respect of the Mughul 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 shariāt. For instance, in June 1595, when Rāi Rāi Singh of Bīkānēr was ill, Akbar asked the Rāi to go on tīrath (pilgrimage to sacred places of worship).² In August 1639, Shāh Jahān granted 200 bighās of land in pargana Baīkunthpur for the maintenance of chatrī of the deceased mother of Rāja Mān Singh.³

From Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, it appears that the Hindū practices established by Akbar, continued to be observed during Jahāngīr's time. The practice that, on the occasion of rākhi festival, the Hindū nobles would bind on the King's wrist costly 'strings of rubies and royal pearls and flowers jewelled with jems of great value' was discarded for sometime by Jahāngīr on account of the nobles to indulge in extravagance. Henceforth, only the Brāhmins would be allowed to tie pieces of silk on the King's wrist according to their own custom. But in 1613, Jahāngīr revived the abandoned practice and allowed the Hindū nobles to bind rākhis on his wrist.⁴ There is also available evidence in Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, suggesting that the festival of Dīwālī was celebrated by Jahāngīr in

1. Akbar Nāma, III, pp. 830-31; Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p. 468.

2. Akbar's farmān to Rāja Rāi Singh of Bīkānēr. See, A Descriptive List of farmāns, manshurs and Nishāns, p. 5.

3. Shāh Jahān's farmān to Mirzā Rāja Jaī Singh. See, A Descriptive List of farmāns, nishāns and Manshurs, p. 6.

4. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p. 120.

an elaborate manner. In 1614, Dīwālī was celebrated at Jahāngīr's court by having gambling bouts for three consecutive nights.¹ In the same year Dashehra festival was celebrated with the usual decoration of elephants and horses.²

A close scrutiny of the surviving evidence also suggests that from around 1577, Akbar's Rājput wives started taking an interest in matters of state policy and their influence was exercised against the measures recommended by the orthodox elements tending to discriminate against the Hindūs. According to Badāūnī, in 1577, the Rājput ladies pleaded with Akbar for the release of a Brāhman from Mathurā, accused of using abusive language against the Prophet. After the man was executed by 'Abd-un Nabī without proper trial, they protested to the King against this arbitrary attitude of the Sadr-us Sudur and instigated him to take steps against 'Abd-un Nabī.³ If one is to believe Badāūnī, this episode was one of the prime factors contributing to the latter's fall in the estimate of the King.

Similar instances of the Rājput wives of the King taking part in high politics and trying to influence the course of events according to their own judgement or inclinations can be cited from Jahāngīr's reign. It is known that Jahāngīr's first Kachawāhā wife, intervened over the issue of succession after Akbar's death. She disagreed with her relatives who were sponsoring the

1. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.131.

2. Ibid., p.123.

3. Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh, III, pp.80-82.

Khusrau's candidature and tried to dissuade her son from claiming the throne against his father. According to Jahāngīr, "she constantly wrote to Khusrau and urged him to be sincere and affectionate to him". Being frustrated in these efforts, she committed suicide.¹ Similarly, in 1613, on the occasion of the festival of Dashehra, Jahāngīr's wives pleaded for Khusrau's release from prison and succeeded in securing a pardon for the Prince.²

On the other hand, ladies belonging to the imperial harem Rājput princesses as well as others occasionally entered into correspondence with the Rājput chieftains seeking to influence them politically. In 1627, Shāh Jahān's Rāthore wife went to Jodhpur and stayed there for eight days canvassing support among her relatives for her husband's claim to the throne against other contenders.³ There is also available evidence indicating that Shāh Jahān's favourite daughter Jahān Ārā Bēgam (entitled Bēgam Şahiba) maintained occasional correspondence with Mirzā/Jaī Singh regarding political and administrative matters. In 1640, she sent a letter to Jaī Singh for the verification of Hēm Singh's claim of being a real son of Rāja Chatr Sāl.⁴ Apparently, she sought this

1. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.26; W. Finch, Purchas his pilgrimage, IV, p.68; Tārīkh-i Dilkushā, Ms. f.577a.

2. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.123.

3. Mārwar-rē Pargana-rē Vīgat, I, p.111.

4. Jahān Ārā's nishān to Mirzā Rāja Jaī Singh, N.184, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner. Jahan Ara Begam was entitled as Begam Sahiba. Bernier, Early Travels in the Mogul Empire, p.5. Kāmān and Pahārī were the two mahālls of sarkār Sahar of the suba of Āgrā (Āyīn-i Akbarī, Tr. II, p.206 Kāmān and Pahārī are situated in 27°38'N, 77°16'E. and 27°43'N, 77°05' E. respectively.

verification from Jaī Singh as she was approached by Hēm Singh for a recommendation for the grant of a manṣab to him. There is available yet another letter addressed to Jaī Singh dated September 1651, commending his service in suppressing the Mēwātī rebels in parganas Kāmān and Pahārī and asking him/come to the court so that he may be sent to lead an expedition against Qandhār.¹ During war of succession, in 1658, Nadīrā Bāno Bēgum, wife of Dārā Shīkoh, urging upon Jaī Singh to devote himself fully to the operations against Shujā.²

As a matter of fact the blood ties created by the matrimonial alliances between the Mughul ruling family and the Rājput clans were attached great importance by both the sides. Sometimes, the members of the royal family would not feel averse to seeking help from their Rājput 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 Jaī Singh addressing him as Khālu wherein he had asked the Rāja to help him against his father.³ There exists ample evidences showing that the ties between the Mughul ruling family and the Rājput clans tended to raise the latter almost to the position of the member of the ruling family which distinguished them even from ordinary Rājput nobles. It is known on the authority of

-
1. Jahān Arā's nishān to Mirzā Rāja Jaī Singh, N.201. See, A Descriptive List of Farmāns, Nishāns and Manshurs, pp.32, 43.
 2. Nadīrā Bāno's nishān to Mirzā Rāja Jaī Singh, N.231. Preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner. cf. KR Qamungo, Dara Shukoh, p.167.
 3. Khurram's letter to Jaī Singh, No.169. Preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner.

Bānkē Dās that after Hamīdā Bāno Bēgam's death in 1604, all the Rājput nobles except Rāo Bhoj Hārā and Rāo Durga Chandrāvāt who were not related to ruling family, had their heads shaved,¹ which is the customary Hindū practice of condoling the death of an elderly relative.

From all indications, it is evident that the Rājput wives and their relatives used to have considerable influence over the Mughul Emperors. The Rājput ladies related to the royal family in different capacities were treated with exceptional honour and much confidence was reposed in them. Jahāngīr was particularly attached to his Kachawāhā wife, daughter of Dhagwant Dās, referred to above. She, on her part, had such a great affection for Jahāngīr'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 Jahāngīr, it was on account of her great love over the misconduct of her brother Mādho Singh that she committed suicide in 1605. Jahāngīr, it is reported in the Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, did not take food and water for four days after her death.² 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,³ was given into the care of Akbar's Kachawāhā mother-in-law,

1. Bānkē Dās-rē Khyāt, p.145.

2. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.26.

3. Ibid., 15.

Bhār Mal's wife.¹

It would be wrong to suppose that after a Rājput princesses were taken into marriages by the Mughul Emperors, all contacts were stopped between them and their parents.² As a matter of fact, these marriages promoted more frequent and closer social inter-course between the Mughul ruling family and their Rājput-in-laws. There are ample evidence to show that the Rājput wives of

1. Akbar Nāma, II, p.373. Sujān Rāī Bhandārī (Khulāṣāt-ut Tawārīkh, p.374) informs us that Jahāngīr was born of Bhār Mal's daughter. But this appears rather improbable on three accounts. First, the statement is not corroborated by the contemporary and near contemporary authorities. Secondly, the manner in which Jahāngīr's up bringing is recorded in Tūzūk-i Jahāngīrī (pp.40-41), suggests that soon after he was born, he was given in the care of Shaikh Salīm Chishtī's daughter. If the mother of the baby had been a Kachawāhā lady, as suggested by Sujān Rāī, 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 Kachawāhā 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 Jahāngīr's mother had been a Kachawāhā lady, the Jesuits of Jahāngīr's reign would not have been highlighted only the fact of Khusrāu having been born of a Hindū woman. See, Jahāngīr and Jesuits, Tr. C.H. Poynce, p.111.

2. M.L. Roy Chaudhury 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 abut after marrying their daughters to the Muslims. The Dīr-i Ilahī, p.143.

the Mughul rulers would occasionally visit their parents and relatives, it is recorded in Akbar Nāma that in 1573, Akbar's Kachawāhā wife visited Ambēr to condole with her parents over the death of their son, Bhupat, killed during Gujarāt campaign.¹ According to a Rājput chronicle, in 1627, Shāh Jahān sent his Rāthore wife to Jodhpur to influence her relatives to support him against other contenders for the throne.²

At times the Mughul Emperors would personally visit their Rājput-in-laws on the occasion of deaths and marriages. In 1594, Prince Salīm went to Ambēr to condole with his brother-in-law, Mān Singh, on the demise of Bhagwant Dās, who had died in 1589.³ In August 1601, when Rām Dās's son Din Min Dās died, Akbar went to the house of Rām Dās to condole with him.⁴ The Mughul Emperors also used to visit their Rājput-in-laws on the occasions of marriages and such other ceremonies in the family. In 1569, after fall of Ranthambhore, Akbar visited Bhagwant 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 and presented to the couple five lakh dāms.⁶ According to Muhtā Nāinsī, Akbar had taken personal interest in arranging the match of Durjan Singh Shaikhāwat's daughter with Sur Singh Rāthore of Jodhpur.⁷

1. Akbar Nāma, III, pp.15, 34.

2. Mārwār-re Pargana-rē Vigat, I, p.111.

3. Akbar Nāma, III, pp.648-49.

4. Ibid., pp.788-89; Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, p.415; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, p.157.

5. Akbar Nama, III, p.339.

6. Ibid., p.799.

7. Muhtā Nāinsī-rē Khyāt, I, p.325.

It would appear that this climate of cordiality and close social bonds between the Mughul rulers and their Rājput-in-laws, particularly the Kachawāhās and the Rāthores, was not disturbed in any significant manner down to Shāh Jahān's reign. It is known that when Jaswant Singh married Bīram Dēve Sīsodiā's daughter in 1655, Shāh Jahān made a present of ten thousand rupees to the couple.¹ One may thus conclude that during Jahāngīr's reign, this kind of social contacts between the ruling family and the Kachawāhā and the Rāthore 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 accession these contacts were temporarily interrupted owing to his estranged relation with Mān Singh resulting from the latter's support of Khusrāu's candidature on the issue of succession. However, it is known on good authority that the Kachawāhā chiefs were rehabilitated in Jahāngīr's favour after 1608 and close social contact between the royal family and the family of Kachawāhā 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 Mughul 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 Mughul service. This process manifested itself mainly in the form of growing interest particularly among the Kachawāhās in the Persian

1. Wāris, Bādshāh Nāma, p.298.

language and their involvement in the literary and cultural tradition handed down through the medium of Persian language. Among the Kachawāhās in Jahāngīr's service, Rāo Manohar Shaikhāwat (pen name Tausānī) was regarded as a distinguished Persian poet.¹ Badāūnī while praising Tausānī's 'intellectual power' remarks, "Since a Hindū had so much poetic genius and ecstatic feeling, I have recorded these verses".² Even Jahāngīr who had a rather dim view of the intellectual prowess of the members of the Kachawāhā clan acknowledges Rāo Manohar's proficiency in Persian language and goes on to remark that he was not 'without intelligence'.³

It seems the impact of Islāmic tradition on Rāo Manohar's family was quite considerable⁴ which must have been the partly the consequence of their acquaintance with the Persian literature. As a youth Rāo Manohar was called Muḥammad Manohar by his family members.⁵ Later on after he came under Akbar's influence, he seems to have dropped 'Muḥammad' from his name and came to be addressed as Mirzā Manohar.⁶

1. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.8.

2. Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh, III, pp.201-202.

3. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, p.8.

4. It is said that during the 14th century Mokal, the ancestor of Rāo Manohar had no issue. He became a father through the blessings of Shaikh Burhān. Thus he named his son as Shaikhjī. Therefore, he became the patriarch of the Shaikhāwat branch. According to the Shaikh's preaching, the Shaikhāwats do not eat pork and all meat in which blood remains. Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, Ms. f.110 ; Bānkē Dās-rē Khyāt, p.130; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, pp.170-72.

5. Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh, III, pp.201-2. Badāūnī says that Akbar prohibited to name by the names of Prophet such as Muḥammad, Ahmad and Mustafa in 1582, Ibid., II, p.314.

6. Ibid., III, pp.201-2.

Mirzā Manohar's surviving Persian verses shed interesting light on the cultural outlook of the sections of the Kachawāhā nobility that have already been exposed to one or the other degree to the influence of Islāmic tradition in 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.¹ This kind of non-dogmatic and sympathetic attitude towards Islām religion and its followers was also the hall-mark of the attitude of many other Kachawāhā nobles serving under Jahāngīr. For instance, Mān Singh, who had refused to be enrolled as Akbar's murīd so bluntly² is credited with building the jāma masjid of Lāhore.³ Mān Singh is also known to have given a madad-i ma'āsh grant of 14 bighās of land in pargana Hājipur from his jaḡīr for the maintenance of the tomb of a Muslim saint.⁴ Further, it is known from

1. The following are the verses of Manohar:

شیخ مستغنی بدین و برهن مغرور زلف
 بی عشق تو در درج لبالب نارا است
 مست حسن دوست را با لظرو ایمان کار نیست
 بی درد تو در سرم سر اسرار است
 بنامان و کعبه میرد و نردم کفر است
 ما را به یگانگی اینزد کار است
 یگانه بودن و یکتا شدن ز چشم آموز
 که هر دو جدا جدا نمی گزیند
 را اید لعل پرستی و ما دوست پرست
 تو یابین عقل مسلمان و ما بر همینیم
 چه لفر و چه اسلام در لعلی دو + هر دو نه رو آورم سوی او نیست
 اگر ایمان یحیی لعل پرست است
 بر سناران بن راطعه از چیست
 هر دو در نه رو آورم سوی او نیست

For references see, Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh, III, pp.201-2; Ma'āsir-i Rahīmī, I, pp.255-56; Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, p.220; Dabistān-i Mazāhib, p.152; Ma'āsir-ul-Umarā, II, p.117.

2. Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh, II, pp.315, 364.

3. Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, pp.107-8. Bains Prasad, the annotator of Ma'āsir-ul-Umarā (I, p.405, F.N.3) incorrectly says that the mosque was built by Aurangzib.

4. Madad-i ma'āsh grant. For text, see, R.N. Prasad, Raja Man Singh of Amber, p.172.

Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn that Mān Singh provided liberal facilities to his Muslim retainers for observing their religious duties.¹ But this did not mean that Mān Singh and his fellow Kachawāhā 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 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.²

The Kachawāhā nobles had close friendly relations with the high nobles of Tūrānī as well as Irānī origin. For instance, Mān Singh was particularly close to 'Abdur Raḥīm Khān-i Khānān, an Irānī by origin. According to Farīd Bhakkari, sons of 'Abdur Raḥīm Khān-i Khānān used to address Mān Singh as dādājī. While the latter on his part used to pay regularly some kind of pocket-money allowances to them.³ Similarly, Mān Singh was very close to 'Azīz Kokā, 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 Khusrāu on the throne after Akbar. After Jahāngīr's accession, when Mān Singh was planning to withdraw to Bengāl, 'Azīz Kokā

1. Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, p.107.

2. Ibid., pp.108-9; Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, II, pp.69-70.

3. Zakhīrāt-ul Khawānīn, I, pp.107-10.

had sent his family members to the Rājā's residence at Āgrā so that they might accompany him.¹

1. Darbār-i Akbarī, Hindi edition, p. 124.

B _ I _ B _ L _ I _ O _ G _ R _ A _ P _ H _ Y

Contemporary, Near Contemporary and Later Contemporary Sources:

1. Futuh-us Salātīn, Isāmī, Ed. by A.S. Usha, Madras, 1948.
2. Bābur Nāma (Memoirs of Bābur), tr. A.S. Beveridge.
3. Waqi'at-i Mushtāqī, by Rizqullah Mushtāqī, 1572, Add. 11, 633, Or. 1929.
4. Nafā'is-ul Ma'āsir by Alā-ud Daūlah Qazwīnī, 1574-75. Ms. Brit. Mus. Add. 22, 831 (Rieu, i, 404), and also Aligarh Ms., Subhamullah Collection, 920/45.
5. Bihār o Bengāl Mēn Rāja Todar Mal kī Kār-guzārīān by Safdar 'Alī, mīr munshī of Todar Mal, 1580-81. Urdu translation by Ikraam Ali, 1874: Transcript from Bankipore Ms. in Research Library, Department of History, Aligarh. The original version has not been discovered so far.
6. Tārīkh-i Akbarī by Hājī 'Arif Qandahārī, 1584. Edited by Muimuddin Nadwi, Azhar Ali & Latiaz Ali Arshi, Rampur, 1962.
7. Tārīkh-i Humāyūn wā Akbar by Bayāzīd Bayāt, 1587, edited by Hidayat Husain, Bib. Ind. Series, Asiatic Society of Bengal.
8. Tārīkh-i Alfī by Ahmad Thattāvī and others, compiled in 1588-9, Ms: Br. Mus. Or. 465.
9. Akbar Nāma by Abū'l Faḥl, 1594. Edited by Agha Ahmad 'Alī, Asiatic Society of Bengal. Takmil-i Akbar Nama. The authorship of Takmil-i Akbar Nama is a matter of controversy. It was compiled either by 'Inayāt Ullāh, Muḥibb 'Alī or Muḥammad Ṣalih.
10. Āyīn-i Akbarī by Abū'l Faḥl, 1594. Text edited by Saiyid Ahmad Khan, Delhi, 1856. English translation, Vol. I, by Blochmann, Calcutta, 1927 (2nd ed.) Blochmann also edited the text, Calcutta, and Vol. II, by Jarrett (2nd ed.) Calcutta, 1949.
11. Tabaqāt-i Akbarī by Nizāmuddīn Ahmad, 1594. Edited by B. De, Bib. Ind. Series.
12. Muntakhāb-ut Tawārīkh by 'Abdul Qādir Badāūnī, 1596. Edited by Ahmad Ali, Kabir-al-din Ahmad and W.M. Lees, Bib. Ind. Series.

13. Akbar Nāma by Ilahādād Faizī Sirhindī, 1601. Ms. Br. Mus. Or. 169 (Rieu, i, 253)
14. Zubdat-ut Tawārikh by Shaikh Nūr-ul Haq Dehlvi, 1605, Ms. Br. Mus. Add. 10,580 (Rieu, i, 224b).
15. Risāla-i Tārīkh-i Aṣad Bēg Qazwīnī, Ms. Br. M. Rieu, 1227, Add. 6572.
16. Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī Edited by Saiyid Ahmad Khān, Ghazipur and Aligarh, 1863-4.
17. Tārīkh-i Firishta by Muḥammad Qāsim Hindū Shāh ('Firishta'), 1606-7. Text published by Nawal Kishore.
18. Tārīkh-i Khān Jahānī by Ni'matullāh, 1612. Edited by Imam Al' Din, Dacca, 1960.
19. Mirāt-i Sikandri by Sikandar-bin Muḥammad, 1613.
20. Tārīkh-i Shāhī by Ahmad Yādgār, 1614. Edited by Hidayat Husain, Bib. Ind. Series.
21. Tārīkh-i Ma'ādan-i Akhbār-i Ahmadi, by Ahmad-bin Bahbāl. Date of compilation 1614. I.O. 121, i/46.
22. Ma'āsir-i Rahimī by 'Abdul Bāqī Nahāvandī, 1616. Edited by Hidayat Husain, Bib. Ind. Series.
23. Iqbāl Nāma-i Jahāngīrī, by Mutamad Khān, 1619-20. Text published by Nawal Kishore.
24. Waqā'at-ul Zamān or Fateh Nāma-i Nūr Jahān, by Kāmī Shirāzī, 1625-26, Ms. Paris, Blochet, iii, 1874
25. Anfā'al- Akhbār by M. Amīn bin Daūlat M., compiled in 1626-27. Rotograph (N.141) available in Centre of Advanced Study, Department of History, Aligarh.
26. Ma'āsir-i Jahāngīrī by Khwāja Kāngar Husāin, 1630-31, BM Ms. catalogue 21 B.C. 1-219.
27. Pādshāh Nāma by Amīn Qazwīnī, Ms. Br. M. Or. 173; Add. 20, 734.
28. Pādshāh Nāma by 'Abdul Ḥamīd Lāhorī, ed. Maulvi Kabiruddin and Maulvi Abdur Rahim, Bib. Ind. Calcutta, 1867-68.
29. Pādshāh Nāma by Muḥammad Wāris (continuation of 'Abdul Ḥamīd Lāhorī's Pādshāh Nāma) Br. M. Add. 6556, Or. 1675. Transcript in the Department of History, Aligarh. (This Ms. is defective at the end, lacking the list of mansabdars).

30. Mazhar-i Shāh Jahānī by Yusuf Mirak, 1634. Edited by Pir Husamuddin Rashidi. Published by Sindi Adbi Board, Karachi.
31. Maktubāt-i Khān-i Jahān Muẓaffar Khān-wa- Gwālior Nāma, Jalāl Hisāri, Date of compilation 1639 A.D., Ms. Br. M. (Rieu. iii, 837) Add. 16859.
32. Gwālior Nāma, Hirāman bin Girdhar Dās Munshi, Date of compilation 1669. (Ms. Rieu i/406 Add 24039). The early part of this work, down to the reign of Shah Jahan, is borrowed, without acknowledgement, from a Gwālior Nāma written in 1639 by Jalal Hisari.
33. Tārīkh-i Dilkushā by Ināyatullah Kambo Lahori, compiled between 1652 and 1671. Ms. Cambridge, King's, 71.
34. Dabistān-i Mazāhib by Mohsin Fānī, 1655, Nawal Kishore, Kanpur.
35. ʿAmal-i Ṣālih by Muḥammad Ṣālih Kambo, ed. G. Yazdani, Bib. Ind. Calcutta, 1923-46.
36. ʿĀlamgir Nāma by Muḥammad Kāzim, Bib. Ind., Calcutta, 1865-73.
37. Tārīkh-i Aurangzāb by Abūl Faẓl Māmūrī, Ms. Br. M. Or 1671. Continuation of Sadiq Khan's Shah Jahan Nama.
38. Khulāsāt-ut Tawārīkh, by Sujān Rāi Bhandārī, ed. Zafar Hasan, Delhi, 1918.
39. Nuskha-i Dilkushā by Bhīm Sēn, Ms. Br. M. Or. 23.
40. Maʿāsiri ʿĀlamgiri, by Sāqī Mustaʿid Khān, Bib. Ind., Calcutta, 1871.
41. Waqāʾi Ranthambore wa Ajmēr, A.D. 1678-80. Asafiya Library, Hyderabad, Transcript in the Department of History, Aligarh.
42. Khulāsāt-us Siyāq, 1703 A.D., Ms. Sir Sulaiman Collection 410/143, Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh.
43. Ādab-i ʿĀlamgiri, Ms. Abdus Salām Collection 326/96, Azad Library, Aligarh.
44. Muntakhab-ul Lubāb by Khāfī Khān, 1732. Edited by Maulvi Kabir-al-din, Asiatic Society of Bengal.
45. Mirāt-i Ahmadi by ʿAlī Muḥammad Khān, 1748 A.D. Edited by Syed Nawab Ali, Baroda, 1927-28.
46. Riāz-us Ṣalātīn by Ghulām Husain Salīm, 1787-88. Edited by Maulvi Abdus Salam. Bib. Ind. Series, 1890.
47. Tārīkh-i Daudi by Abd ʿAbdullāh, ed. by shaiikh Abdur Rashid, Aligarh, 1954.
48. Aḥsānā-i Shāhān, Rieu i 243 b, Add. 24, 409.

Records and Documents :

1. Jaipur documents, preserved in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner. The collection consists of farmāns, nishāns and manshurs belonging to Akbar, Jahangir, Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb's reign.
2. Wakil Report and News letters sent by the agent of Raja of Amber.
3. A Descriptive list of Farmāns, Manshurs and Nishāns addressed by the Imperial Mughals to the Princes of Rajasthan. Published by Directorate of Archives, Govt. of Rajasthan, Bikaner, 1962.
4. Descriptive list of ^{The} Wakil Reports Addressed to the Rulers of Jaipur, 2 Vols. Published by Rajasthan State Archives, Govt. of Rajasthan, Bikaner. March 1972.

Biographical Works

1. Zakhirāt-ul Khawānīn, Shaikh Farid Bhakkari. Date of compilation, around 1650, Ms. Sulaiman Collection, Aligarh. Text edited by Moimul Haq, Pakistan Historical Society, Karachi, 1961.
2. Ma'āsir-ul Umarā, Shāh Nawāz Khān, compiled 1742-47, ed. Maulvi Ashraf Ali, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, 1890.
3. Tazkarāt-ul Umarā, Ms. Br. M. Add. 16, 703, microfilm available in the Research Library, History Department, Aligarh.
4. Umarā-i Hunood (Urdu), Saiyid Ahmad. Published Aurangabad, 1932.

European Sources :

1. Early Travels in India (1583-1619), Ed. W. Foster, London, 1927.
2. Akbar and the Jesuits, Tr. C.H. Payne, London, 1926.
3. The Empire of the Great Mogol, Joannes Delaet, Tr. J.S. Hayland and annotated by S.N. Banerjee, Bombay, 1928.
4. Jahangir and the Jesuits, Tr. C.H. Payne, London, 1930.

5. Purchas his pilgrimage, Vol. III, and IV, James Maclobose and Sons, Glasgow, 1905.
6. A Contemporary Dutch Chronicle of Mughal India, Tr. and Ed. by Brij Narain and Sri Ram Sharma, Calcutta, 1957.
7. The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe (1615-19), Sir Thomas Roe, ed. W. Foster, Oxford, 1906-27.
8. Travels in India, Jean Baptiste Tavernier, 1640-67, Tr. V. Ball, London, 1889, 2nd edition revised by W. Crooke, London, 1925.
9. The Travels of Peter Mundy, Peter Mundy. Published Hakluyt Society, Cambridge, 1907.
10. Travels in the Mogol Empire, Francois Bernier, 1656-68, Tr. A. Constance, ed. Smith, London, 1916.
11. Jahangir's India, Francois Pelsaert, Tr. Geyl and Moreland, Cambridge, 1925.
12. Storia-Do-Mogor, Nicolao Manucci, 1656-1712, Tr. W. Irvine, Indian Text Series, Govt. of India, London, 1907-8.
13. Bishop Heber in Northern India, ed. by Laird, M.A. Pub. Cambridge University Press, London, 1971.

Rajasthani and Hindi Works :

1. Chāndron Jītasen Vīthu Sujorro Kīyo, Date of compilation 1534, Ed. Tessitori, Asiatic Society of Bengal.
2. Dalpat Vilās author anonymous, 1595, Ed. Rawat Saraswat. Pub. Sadul Research Institute, Bikaner, 1960.
3. Qāim Khān Rāsa, Jān Kavī, written during Shāh Jahān's reign. ed. Puratatva Chariya, Jin Vijay Muni, Pub. Rajasthan Puratatva Mandir, Jaipur, 1953.
4. Muhtā Nānsī-rē Khyāt, 3 Vols., Muhtā Nānsī, compiled during the 17th century. Ed. Badri Prasad Sakaria, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Jodhpur, 1960.
5. Mārwar-re-Pargana-rē Vīgat, 2 Vols., Muhtā Nānsī, compiled during the 18th century, Ed. Fateh Singh, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Jodhpur, 1968.
6. Bānkē Dās-rē Khyāt, Bānkē Dās, written during the 18th century, Ed. Puratatva Jin Vijay Muni, Pub. Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Jaipur, 1956.

7. Dayāl Dās-rē- Khyāt, compiled during the 18th century, Ed. Prof. Dashrath Sharma and Prof. Jaswant Singh Khichi. Pub. Anoop Sanskrit Library, Bikaner.
8. Jaipur-rē-Vanshavelī, compiled during the 19th century, Ms. preserved in Maharaja's Library, Jaipur.
9. Shikhar Vansotpatī, Kaviya Gopāl, written during the 19th century, Pub. Nagri Pracharni Sabha, Kashi.
10. Gaj Nāna, Ms, compiled during the 19th century. Preserved in Abhay Jain Granthaliya, Nahto-ka chowk, Bikaner.
11. Jaipur-kā Sankchipt Itihās, Ms. written during the 19th century. Preserved in a Jain Mandir of Jaipur.
12. Vīr Vīnod, 4 Vols, Hindi (based on Persian and Rajasthani Sources), 1886.

M o d e r n W o r k s :

1. Irfan Habib, The Agrarian System of Mughal India (1556-1707), Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1963.
2. Athar Ali, The Mughal Nobility under Aurangzeb, second ed., Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1970.
3. Beni Prasad, History of Jahangir, second ed. Allahabad, 1930.
4. Qanungo, K.R., Sher Shah and his Times, Orient Longman, Bombay, 1965.
5. Qanungo, K.R., Dara Shukoh, Pub. S.C. Sarkar & Sons, Ltd. Calcutta, 1952.
6. Saran, P., The Provincial Government of the Mughals (1526-1658), Allahabad, 1932.
7. Satish Chandra, Parties and Politics at the Mughal Court (1707-40), Aligarh 1959.
8. Saksena, B.P., History of Shah Jahan of Delhi, Allahabad, 1958.
9. Sharma, S.R., The Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors, Second ed. Bombay, 1962.
10. Alam Khan, Iqtidar, The Political Biography of a Mughal Noble - Munim Khan Khan-i Khanan, (1497-1575), Orient Longman, Ranchi, 1973.

11. Sharma, H., Jaipur-ka Itihas, Hindi Edition, Jaipur.
12. Singh, Raghuvir, Purve Adhunik Rajasthan, Pub, Rajasthan Vidhya Peeth, Udaipur, 1951.
13. Tod. James, Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, 2 Vols., Second edition, New Delhi, 1971.
14. Mujeeb, M., The Indian Muslims, Pub. Allen and Unwin, London, 1967.
15. Sarkar, J.N., The History of Bengal, Pub. University of Dacca, Dacca 1948
16. Tripathi, R.P., Rise and Fall of the Mughal Empire, Pub. Central Book Depot, Allahabad, 1956.
17. Prasad, R.N., Raja Man Singh of Amber, Pub. The World Press Private Ltd. Calcutta, 1966.
18. Ray, H.C., The Dynastic History of Northern India. Pub. Munshi Ram Manohar Lal, Delhi, 1973.
19. Sharma, M.L., History of the Jaipur State. Pub. The Rajasthan Institute of Historical Research, Jaipur, 1969.
20. Desai, Z.U., (Compiler), Published Muslim Inscriptions of Rajasthan, Pub. The Directorate of Archaeology and Museums, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur, 1971.
21. Siddiqi, Iqtidar Husain, Some Aspects of Afghan Despotism in India, Pub. Three Man Publishing House, Aligarh, 1969.
22. Moreland, W.H., The Agrarian System of Moslem India. Pub. Allahabad Central Book Depot., 1929.
23. Azad, Maulana M. Husain, Darbar-i Akbari (Akbari Darbar, Hindi edition) Nagari Pracharini Sabha, 1967.
24. Goody Jack, Comparative Studies in Kinship, Pub. Routledge And Kygan Paul, London, 1969.
25. Roy, M.L., The Dir-i Ilahi, Pub. University of Calcutta, 1941.
26. Malik, Zahiruddin, A Mughal Statesman of the Eighteenth Century Khan-i Dauran (1719-1739), Pub. Centre of Advanced Study, Department of History, Aligarh (Asia Publishing House) Bombay, 1973.
27. Irvin, W, The Army of the Indian Mughals, Pub. Eurasia Publishing House, New Delhi, 1962.

28. Sharma, G.N., Marwar and the Mughal Emperors. Pub. Shive Lal Agarwal & Co. Agra, 1962.
29. Erskine, K.G., Rajputana Gazetteer, Pub. in 1879.

Periodical Literature :

1. Alam Khan, Iqtidar, 'The Nobility under Akbar, And the Development of His Religious Policy, 1560-80' Journal of Royal Asiatic Society, 1968.
2. Ali M. Athar, 'Religion And Medieval Indian Politics', Paper presented at a Seminar on Historical Models in the Study of Tradition And Change in India, IIAS, Simla, 1969.
3. Goetz, H., 'The Policy of the Grand Mughals Vis-a-vis Rajput States' Indian Culture, XIV, Calcutta, 1948.
4. Blochmann, 'Kooch Bihar, Koch Hajo and Assam in the 16th and 17th centuries' Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1872.
5. Husain, Afzal, 'The Family of Shaikh Salim Chishti', Medieval India - A Miscellany, Vol. II, Pub. Asia Publishing House, New Delhi, 1972.
6. Habib, Irfan, 'The Family of Nur Jahan during Jahangir's Reign' Medieval India - A Miscellany, Vol. I, Asia Publishing House, New Delhi, 1969.
7. Khan, Refaat Ali, 'A Note on Jahangir And the Rajputs, 1605-12' Proceedings of Indian History Congress, 1960.
8. Gupta, S.P., 'The Expansion of the Kachawaha Territory in Mughal Times', Proceedings of Indian History Congress, 1965.
9. Alam Khan, Iqtidar, 'Note on the Chronology of Early Moves of Humayun', Proceedings of Indian History Congress, 1972.
10. Singh, M.P., 'Akbar's Resumption of Jagir, 1575 - A Re-examination', Proceedings of Indian History Congress, 1966.
11. Alavi, R.A., 'New Light on Mughal Cavalry', Medieval India - A Miscellany, Vol. II, Asia Publishing House, New Delhi, 1972.