

THE MUGHAL NOBILITY UNDER
AURANGZEB

Revised Edition

M. ATHAR ALI

DELHI
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
CALCUTTA CHENNAI MUMBAI
1997

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

EVOLUTION OF THE MANSAB SYSTEM

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

Long before the period of the Indian Mughals, the organisation of the cavalry in large Turkish armies was modelled on the decimal system. Under the Delhi Sultans, the ideal system laid down was that ten horsemen (*sawars*) should be put under one *sar-i khail*; ten *sar-i khails* under one *sipah-salar*; ten *sipah-salars* under one *amir*; ten *amirs* under one *malik*; 10 *maliks* under one *khan*; and at least ten *khans* under the King. Thus a *sar-i khail* would command ten men, a *sipah-salar* 100, an *amir*, 1,000, a *malik*, 10,000, a *khan*, 100,000.¹ This, of course, is a supposititious calculation only, and there is also an error in Barani's account. An Arab account of the 14th century tells us that in the Indian army "the *khan* has under him 10,000 riders, the *malik* 1,000, the *amir* 100, the *sipah-salar* less than that," so that the size of contingents of the officers of the three highest ranks is reduced to one-tenth.² In the army of the Chengizi Mongols, from whom the Indian Mughals claimed descent, the smallest unit was that of ten horsemen, ten officers of such units being under a commander of 100; ten commanders of 100 being under a commander of 1,000 and ten commanders of 1,000 under one commander of 10,000.³ A unit of 10,000 was generally called a *thuman*. The basic principle in this system seems to be that the lower officers are direct subordinates of the higher and their contingents form part of the latter's. Thus, if the *khan* in the Delhi Sultanate was supposed to have 10,000

¹ Barani, *Tārīkh-i Firuz Shāhī*, ed. Prof. S. A. Rashid, I, p. 167 (Bib. Ind. Ed., p. 45). Advice of Bughra Khan to Kai-Qubad. Bughra Khan wanted 10 *khans* in the empire, but according to Barani's calculation this would mean an army of one million—a preposterous figure.

² Shahabuddin al-Umari, *Masālik-al-Aḥsār fī Mamlakāt-al-Amsar*, tr. Spies, Rashid and Haq, p. 28; also al-Qalqashandī, *Subḥ-al-Aḥḥā*, extracts translated by Dr Otto Spies as *An Arab Account of the 14th Century*, p. 67.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

³ Moreland, *JRAS*, 1936 p. 647; Abdul Aziz, *The Mansabdārī System and the Mughal Army*, p. 98.

⁴ Barani, *op. cit.*

⁵ Barani, *Tārīkh-i Firuz Shāhī*, ed. Prof. S. A. Rashid, I, p. 40.

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

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

ZAT AND SAWAR RANKS

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

¹ Rank (*mansab*) in the Mughal State Service¹, JKAAS, 1936, pp. 641-65. For the introduction of the *mansab* under Akbar, see A. J. Qaisar, *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.* Delhi session 1961, pp. 155-56.

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

This principle for sub-classification of each *zat* rank is also given in the *Kinshastur Spang* f. 483; and *Mir'at-i-Ishtih*, 15a-15b.

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

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

⁴ See Appendix 'A' at the end of the chapter.

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

CONDITIONAL RANK ('MASHRUT')

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

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

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

³ Thus in the *Raqaim-i-Karaim* Aurangzeb regrets that efficient persons were not available, f. 6a; *Dilkusha*, f. 139a; *Kahani-i-Tajzabat*, f. 21a, 33a, 97b, 135b; *Waga-i-Aymer*, p. 645.

⁴ *Mir'at-i-Ishtih*, f. 14b. Muza'ffer, son of Sher Babu, was given a conditional rank of 400/400 for the duration of his appointment to the *faujdari* of Pargana Kari etc. (*Mir'at-i-Ahmadi* Vol. I, pp. 289-90). Conditional *mansab* of Rad Andaz Khan was cancelled when he was

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

THE DU-ASPA SIH-ASPA RANK

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

	Total	Holders of <i>du-aspā sih-aspā</i> ranks
10th year of the Reign ³	191	12
20th year of the Reign ⁴	219	23
30th year of the Reign ⁵	293	25

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

transferred from the *faujdarī* of Lonar etc. (*Akhbarat*, 28rd Sakat, 36th R. Y. of Aurangzeb). Conditional *mansab* of Shaikh Anwar was cancelled when he was transferred from the *gal'adarī* and *faujdarī* of Ram Nagar (2nd Shaban, 37 R. Y.). Conditional promotion of Shuja 'at Khan was cancelled. (*Mir'at-i-Imnazi*, Vol. I, p. 317). Conditional promotion of Muhammad Beg was cancelled (*Akhbarat*, 8th Zilhij, 43 R. Y.). Conditional promotion of Aurang Khan was cancelled when he was transferred from the *faujdarī* of Dhawar (18th Rajab, 46 R. Y.). Conditional *mansab* of Wali Dad Khan was cancelled when he was transferred from the *gal'adari* of Dew Durk (13th Rabi, II, 38 R. Y.).

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

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

³ Lahori, *Badshah Nama*, vol. I, pp. 292-312.

⁴ Lahori, *Badshah Nama*, Vol. II, pp. 717-37.

⁵ Warris, *Badshah Nama*, Cr. 1675, ff. 200a-214a.

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

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

PAY FOR THE RANKS

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

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

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

³ Cf. *Mir'at-i-Fatihah*, f. 15b.

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

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

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

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

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

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

from the finance department. "And if through great endeavour, winning a patron and employing an ardent and capable agent (*vakil*) and after running about for seven or eight months and spending a large amount" Mannuri tells us, "an officer succeeded in proving his claim (*talab*), he would only be able to get a fourth of the money from the treasury after the greatest effort. In the end, gradually, all order disappeared."¹¹

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

MILITARY OBLIGATION OF MANSABDARS

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

¹ Mannuri, f. 182b; Khasi Khan, II, 396-7; *Dastur-ul Amal Agha*, f. 53; *Raqam-i Avval*, f. 8b. See also *Waga-i Niamat Khan Ali*, p. 16.

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

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

¹ Fraser, 86, f. 13a-13b; *Zawabit-i Alamgiri*, 40a.

² Lahori, *Badshah Nama*, II, 507.

³ *Akbarad*, 6th Ramadan, 49 R.Y.; 18th Ziqada, 38th R.Y.

⁴ *English Factoris*, 1655-60, p. 67.

⁵ *Amaci-Salih*, III, 248.

⁶ *Alamgir Nama*, p. 1083.

⁷ Cf. *Dihshita*, f. 139a, where the complaint is made that *jagirs* are resumed on account of *mutaliba*, *masa'idat*, *jurmama*, etc.

⁸ *English Factoris*, 1655-60, pp. 66-67.

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

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

horse with a '2' when it was mustered the second time and so on, but now as each class of soldiers had a particular mark, the mark is only repeated at the subsequent musters. In case of *adakh*, the former custom was retained; some *bishkis*, and near servants of His Majesty who have no leisure to look after *jagirs*, receive their monthly salaries in cash and muster their horses every eighteen months. Grandees, whose *jagirs* are very remote, do not bring their horses to the muster before twelve years have elapsed, but when six years have elapsed since the last muster, one-tenth of their income is retrenched. And if a *mansabdar* has been promoted to a higher *mansab* and three years have elapsed since he last presented his horses at a muster, he receives a *zat* (personal) increase of salary but draws the allowances for the increased number of his men (only) after the first muster. His old and new men then get their assignments. If at the renewal of the mark at subsequent musters, any soldier brings a superior horse in exchange of his old one, he is taken before his Majesty, who inspects and accepts it."⁵

¹ *Ain-i Akbari*. Vol. I, pp. 123-24.

² Evidence of a sort in favour of our suggestion comes from a letter of Abul Fazl, preserved in a collection of a doubtful genuineness. This letter, shows that a *mansabdar* of 100 *sawar* had to bring at the maximum 50 horsemen.

³ For a discussion, see Morriani, *JRAS*, 1936, pp. 141-65.

⁴ Lahori, *Badshah Nama*, II, pp. 303-7.

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

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

Lahori specifies the actual numbers of men and horses—that is, the number of *sih-aspas*, *du-aspas* and *yak-aspas* or three-horse, two-horse and one-horse troopers—which had to be mustered under the Rule of One-fifth on each month-scale against a *mansab* of 5,000 *sawar*. His statements are reproduced below in a tabular form for the sake of convenience.

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

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

¹ *Mirat-i Ahmadi*, I, 228 (Shahjahan's *farman*, 27th R.X.). But see *Waga-i Ahnir*, where a

Rajput officer serving in Kabul was required to muster men under the rule of 1/4th. In the 25th R.X. of Shahjahan, Jai Singh was summoned to court to be sent with prince Aurangzeb on the Qandahar expedition. Jai Singh was asked to bring his contingent according to the 1/4th rule, and if that was not feasible, then according to 1/5th rule (*Tarikh Darulaman* No. 79 p. 145).

² *Ain-i Ahmadi*, Vol. I, p. 228.

³ *Khulasat-us Siyag*, I, 54.

⁴ Lahori, *Badshah Nama*, II, pp. 546-7.

⁵ Ibid.