CHAPTER 7
MAINTENANCE OF ARMY FOR MUGHAL SERVICE

The maintenance of army for imperial service was an important pre requisite, every mansabdār had to render. The contingent to be maintained as per practice was indicated by the sawār rank. Accordingly, the payment obtained against the sawār rank was also mentioned. As has been discussed earlier the scale of mansab recorded the jama' of parganas from which the salary (in lieu of mansab) had to be maintained from the mentioned parganas.

The Amber Rājas are known to have held high rank from the time of Bharamal who had the mansab of 5000/5000 Mansingh 5000/5000 and later 7000/7000 Mirza Rāja Jai Singh 5000/5000 out of which 5000 was duaspa sihaspa Bishan Singh 2000/2000 and Jai Singh Sawai 7000/7000.

It would thus be evident that the strength of the sawārs the Rāja maintained was considerable.

To check evasion from maintenance all jāgīrdārs had to present their contingent for branding after every six

1. Yaddāsht, 1 Rabi'I 1048/13 July 1639 5000 (Nafar) including Khāṣa sanctioned monthly pay 52,00,000 dāms deducting (zāt pay) Khāṣa 5000 = Rs.30,000 (x 40) i.e. 12,00,00 dāms.
months. A perusal of *siyāh tasīha* reveals that name, father's name were entered along with salary 'dōl (Men)' absent dōl if any, horses, absent horses if any, quality, colour of horses apart from the date and place of branding. In one such extant siyah except for two men all others were present at the time of branding. It is also interesting to find a large variety of horses such as Turki Kūmēt, Turki Neela baui, Tāzi Kūmēt, Tāzi Surang, Tāzi Neela Kubud, Tazi baui maqsi, Tazi Surakh, Yābu Neela Kubud, Yābu Suran etc. An important series of chēhra documents dating from 1781 to 1831 reveal how descriptive rolls were maintained in our region. These documents provide the details of the genealogy domicile, complexion, description of forehead, eyebrow, eyes, nose, ears, age etc. The documents pertaining to nagdi troopers detail the quality, colour, marks etc. of the horse too. (See Appendix).

2. *Siyāh Tasīha*, Lahore, 1676
3. *Chēhra docs*, 1781-1831, R.S.A.
Amber was fortunate enough to earn notoriety for maintaining the requisite quota of troops. We thus find Bishan Singh being informed that the Emperor is pleased to see the muster roll of his army and has conferred ear rings on him.

How was this quota formed? The percentage of the various martial clans in the army of the raja and their effective control over clan based army requires a detailed discussion.

Despite the heterogeneous composition of the Naruka clans in our sample parganas, it is also notable that some clans had insignificant strength. It would thus appear that though a large number of clannish people were recruited, the thrust of confidence was enjoyed by the privileged Rajawat and Naruka clan as would appear from the numerical strength. The fact remains that Rajawats and Narukas even though had higher salary (as per subassigned area) better horse (Turki)

1. *Nuskha-i-Dilkusha*, p.140-141a, also *Arzdāsht* dated *Asōj Sudi* 15, 1768/29 Sept. 1696 addressed to Bishan Singh informing that the Emperor is pleased to see the muster roll of his army and has conferred ear rings on him.

2. See *Arzdāsht* dtd. *Asōj Sudi* 15, 1768/29 Sept 1696.


4. Among these castes were brāhmans, banya, Gahlōt, Mina, Sodha, Jādam, Chandēl and Kāyasth.
and were also entrusted with the responsibly of *jamiyatdār*, such favours were also bestowed by the rulers to Sheikhwat, Gaur, Pathāns of Peshawar as also Solankhis.¹

So far as the mode of remuneration was concerned it varied considerably. The more enormous amount were paid through subassignments of areas within the *jāgīr* of the Rāja.² However small amounts were paid in cash.³

The subassignees were the local magnates including bhūmias belonging to varied martial clans.

From the arhsattas, it is borne out that the *jama* while being sub assigned came to be known as *tan* for the purpose of sub assignment. The *tan* of each village was calculated on the basis of the area of a *pargana* keeping aside the uncultivable waste and *punya udik*, *inām* etc. The entire *tan* of a village or a portion of it would be assigned to a sub assignee. Simultaneously, there could be more than one assignee sharing the *tan* depending upon terms and conditions of their service and the amount to be paid to them against their service. The assignee could also be

1. See *Siyāh Tasiḥa*.
2. For details see *awarija mutaliba*, 1676
3. *Arhsatta jamiat kharč*, *pargana* Akbarabad 1735 A.D. also *Chēhra Nagdi* V.S. 1788/1731.
assigned tan in more than one village.¹

It appears that like Mughal jagirs the above subassignment were also on a temporary and short term basis, though one finds that in most cases they were renewed from year to year.²

The subassignments were calculated on an annual basis. Then the tenure of a jagirdar was reduced to the months he had to serve, viz. ten months, (dah māha) eight months (ath māha) or six months (cha māha) this was then divided by twelve (months) the monthly payment thus achieved was multiplied by the numbers of months for which the assignment was made.³ It is interesting to note that in pargana Chatsu all Rajput and non Rajput clans are assigned twelve monthly jagirs except for Brāhmanas, Kayasthas and Mahājan who were assigned jagirs only for eight months. In pargana Malarna surprisingly all the sub assignees are on eight monthly

1. Arhsatta Pargana Chatsu 1730 Annual Salary of Ram Chand Rājāwat - Rs.3000.
   Mauza Kirtipur   Barsipur   Anandpura
   550           666.8.03    783.09.00

2. Chithi garār miti mānsir 5, V.S. 1801/30 Nov 1744.

3. Arhsatta Pargana Chatsu 1730, etc. op.cit.
The reason seems hard to ascribe, for pargana Chatsu we can argue that the abovementioned caste were being treated inferior though same obligations were being extorted as from twelve monthly subassignees. However it is for pargana Malarna that the problem becomes unconvincing.

Some of these subassignees were jamiatdārs who had under them several unit of sawārs, bargandāz etc. Thus Bhairav Das received Rs. 10,000 for 18 horse and 18 sawārs.²

On an average the monthly rate per unit of sawār rank gleaned from our documents³ appears to be of much relevance when compared to those of 1595⁴ and 1570.⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate Per Unit of Sawār</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>Rs. 20/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td>Rs. 46/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Rs. 48/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amount varied according to the quality of horse.

1. Ibid also Arhsatta Pargana Malarna 1730.
2. Siyah Tasiha, 1675 op.cit.
3. Ibid.
4. Ain, p.175-177 also Shireen Moosvi The Economy of the Mughal Empire, 1595: p.216.
So far as the break up of per unit of sawār rank is concerned Shireen Moosvi has worked it out for Mughal India basing on information contained in Ḍīn. For our region such details are lacking S.P. Gupta has, however, attempted to calculate the average payment per horse by dividing the total annual salary of tabinān by the total number of horses and then by converting the amount into monthly payment he arrives at a figure of Rs. 47.83/-.

---


2. The Economy of Mughal Empire, p.216.

payment per horse cannot be worked out by dividing the total number of horse with the salary in isolation with the number of sawārs. From his list of Tabinān when we take only yak aspa sawārs, we get the average annual payment per unit of sawār, converting it into monthly payment we get 48.8. From this amount when we subtract the average payment per horse calculated by S.P. Gupta, we leave only Rs.1.8 for the personal salary of the sawār which appears unreasonable.

What is worth considering in this respect is the actual expenditure incurred on the maintenance of a Turki horse in 1735 at pargana Akbarbad available to us in arhsatta.¹ Turki Kumet is paid Rs.23 (per month).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TURKI (KUMET)</th>
<th>Rs.23 (PER MONTH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nagad</td>
<td>Rs.12/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charāi (of grain)</td>
<td>Rs.3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charbādār</td>
<td>Rs.3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukhtani</td>
<td>Rs.1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nālbandi</td>
<td>Rs.0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeen (harness)</td>
<td>Rs.2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc (Rassa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
¹ Arhsatta Jamiat Kharch, op.cit.
Jurhēra

Dhāno and

Masāla (spices) Rs. 0.21

considering the pay of *vak aspa* (Turki) in 1675 which was Rs.46\(^1\) if we subtract Rs.23 fixed for the maintenance of horse. Then it appears that there is 1:1 ratio between personal salary of sawār and the maintenance cost of horse.

This may also be substantiated by a *Wakīl* report\(^2\) wherein it is stated that forty lakh ḍāms were deduced from the salary due to the transfer of 500 sawārs. The amount thus assigned per head comes to 8000 per annum. The increase in the amount may be justified perhaps by the salary allowed to jamiatdārs or subassignees.

The maintenance cost of the rest of the qualities of horses is not provided in our set of documents.

Fortunately, enough, we have the personal salary of sawārs maintaining Tāzi, Yābu and Jangla horses for the year 1731, which are Rs. 22, Rs. 15 and Rs. 12 respectively. If

---

1. Ibid
2. WR dtd 14 Ramzān 1103/31 May 1692
we subtract personal pay of Tāzi sawār (i.e. Rs. 22) from the pay of yak (Tāzil) aspa (i.e. Rs. 44) we get again 1: 1 ratio.

The payment made to a bargandāz in 1595 ranged from Rs. 2 3/4 to Rs. 6 1/4.¹ In 1731, the payment was almost similar i.e. Rs. 3 to 6.²

Bandūgchī (Matchlock bearers) of common category are divided into five classes like the bargandāzes³ the payment of these too ranged between Rs. 6 1/4 and Rs. 2 3/4.⁴ In 1667 and 1668 the variance in the salary of bandūgchī ranged from Rs. 1.8 to Rs. 5. We also come across instances of enhancement in the number of bandūg as well as the salary of bandūgchī.⁵

The salary of harkārgs (mace-bearers) for the year 1681 remains surprisingly static at Rs. 3/-.⁶ And the mulāzims

-------------

1. Šīršāi, I, p.40.
2. Chēhra Nagdi, 1731, R.S.A.
5. Yaddāsht Fēhrist Mina 1667, 1668, R.S.A., Bikaner
6. Ibid 1681, 1781.
received Rs. 1.12 to 2.04 per month.\textsuperscript{1}

The artillery was another important department of the army it can be divided into heavy and light artillery. In the 17th century the cumbersome application of heavy artillery began to be felt. It is therefore interesting that the nature of our information details light artillery pieces.\textsuperscript{2} What is more striking is the fact that the number of muskets is the largest when compared to other pieces of artillery though these were being wielded by infantry.

The types of artillery pieces listed include i) nāli ii) hathnāli iii) ṭōbra (iv) Ghurhnāli v) Shuturnāli vi) zambūr vii) raheru viii) dhamāka ix) rāmchangī and x) Bandūg.\textsuperscript{3}

All of these categories have been grouped under light artillery\textsuperscript{4}, or styled tōpkhana jinsī (moveable artillery), which was attached to Emperor's person.\textsuperscript{5}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid 1667-73
\item Taujih jama kharch tōpkhana, Kārtik Vādi 1, V.S. 1783 to Chaitra Vādi 11, 1783.
\item Ibid
\item Irvine, p.133.
\item Travels in the Mogul Empire, A.D. 1656-1668, p.218.
\end{enumerate}
Nāli as the term itself suggests was a gun barrel. Three categories of nāli are known to us i) Small nāli ii) Bachādar and iii) Bachkāni (small) nakāra (ineffective).

Shuturnāli was a gun fired from camel’s back. It was a small field piece of the size of double musket.\(^1\) The maintenance cost incurred upon this ranged from 30 ḍāms to 10 ḍāms showing the difference in the variety of these shuturnāls.\(^2\)

Ghurhnāli similarly was fired from horses back.\(^3\) The maintenance cost of this was invariably 30 ḍāms.\(^4\)

Hathnāli meant a gun barrel used from an elephant. This would appear synonymous to the Gajnāl referred to in Ain.\(^5\) One of these measured 15 ft\(^6\) maintenance cost again was 30 ḍāms.\(^7\)

\(^1\) Ibid, p.217.
\(^2\) Jama‘Inarch Topkbana.
\(^3\) Platts, p.33 also Iqbalnāma, p.49.
\(^4\) Jama‘KharCh Topkhāna
\(^5\) Ibid
\(^6\) Jama‘KharCh Topkhāna
\(^7\) Ibid
Tobra has been variously defined as nose bag\(^2\) or as a mantlet.\(^3\) From the kind of information that we have it is clear that the width of the *tobra a āhni* (Kerchief) is 9.11 in almost all the cases while the weight of *tīr* (arrow/balls) is 3 seers. The amount incurred on these 3 seers *tīr* varied from Rs.125.8 to 685.8 and Rs.484.12. This description reveals that the bag was used to keep arrows.\(^4\)

Zambūr was the short for *zambūrak* (camel swivel). In our documents both the swivels measure two *hath* and forty six *līva* and the weight of the *top rēz* was 51181. The maintenance rates differed from 11 *dāms* to 73.\(^5\)

\(^{1}\) Ain, 36.

\(^{2}\) Muntakhab Ut Tawārīkh Bib. Ind. I, p.334.

\(^{3}\) Irvine, pp.142-4.

\(^{4}\) Jama`Kharch.

\(^{5}\) Ibid

\(^6\) Wilson, 609.
Rahēru was a light cart the division between Raheru asatghāti and Ainee is provided, it is however difficult to identify these divisions.

Dhamāka was a cannon carried on elephant. The maintenance rate varied from 35 to 9 dams.

Rāmchangi was a light field piece. Two varieties of these have been mentioned, duzarba and nākāra (inefficient) the maintenance cost ranged from 30 to 10 dāms.

Bandūg was a matchlock. Up to the 18th century it was looked with less favour than bow and arrow. It was left chiefly to the infantry who occupied a much inferior position to that of cavalry. Among the other varieties of bandūg were included laychar and nākāra. The rates vary from Rs.6.8 as to 60.8.

From the number of these weapons it is evident that bandūg was the most commonly used arm followed by Rāmchangi and Zambūr previous to this use of bow and arrows was more

1. Jama'i Kharch
2. Platts p.546 also Iqbalnāmā p.49.
4. Jama'i Kharch op.cit.
5. Ibid.
in vogue the bandugs mostly were wielded by infantry the largest wing of the army.

Apart from cannons and arms the carriages to draw it formed an important section of the army. The types referred to in our documents are i) Takht Chaubīn nālika. This was an open pāliki used by a person of rank.1 Bahāl Ikhtra Ki Chaubīn was a finely built carriage meant for bedding and baggage.2 Another type was dhagha chaubīn the carriage which was thatch roofed. Gārhā chaubīn was a gun carriage.3

The other department was the arms etc used by the animals. These included i) Pakhāl aghōri which was an iron armour for the defence of a horse4 and the ii) Pairha wāhni oonta kī the iron track for camel5 and the jōt aghori the straps of a carriage.6

4. Pakhār means armour Ain I, 139 aghōri is used for horses
5. Platts
6. Ibid
We also get the details of the objects used (Kalash Peetal, Katōri, Dolak, Bamboo, Mashak, rope (of i) cotton and II) jute, howda etc) cloth (tukrhi, took, mūmjāma cheent) and metal etc iron wire, wax, copper, seesa, cotton, sulphur, saltpetre etc).

It is noteworthy that both horses etc. and artillery were provided by the state since the expenditure stated includes only the maintenance cost of these objects. Shyamal Das in a stray statement says that while returning from Deccan horses worth Rs.1,000 was taken to the watan for breeding purpose.¹

It is needful it seems here to peruse the application and usage of the army contingent and the weaponry by the Rāja for the Imperial Court.

Jai Singh Sawai could easily muster above fifty thousand troopers as he did when he opposed the Sayyids in 1719 or when he proceeded against Jodhpur in 1740. A notable success was achieved at Sambhar in Oct. 1708, when Saiyid Husain Khan was defeated with extensive use of matchlock.²

--------------------
As would appear from the preceding discussion allusions are to the fact that decline in the maintenance of army for Imperial service did not take place, despite the fact one way presume this to be the case at the disintegration of the Mughal Empire. In fact we find an increasing vigour in maintenance and the involvement of Amber Raja at the Imperial court. The result being the effective usage of the Amber army at the Imperial Court.

The interest of Sawai Jai Singh was not to shake the yoke of the centre instead to gain his interest within the shadow of the Mughal court. As early as Aurangzeb's period Bhimsen says that jagirdars except for Durgadas, Jai Singh and Ajit Singh did not maintain the requisite contingent. The result is that the jagirdars were unable to maintain army as effectively as Jai Singh.

Jai Singh Sawai was aware that such a contingent would not be able to check Maratha disturbances. The answer appears perhaps in the nature of the army maintenance while Marathas were known for Swift mobility with muskets on cavalry our Raja's army as we have seen had more infantry than cavalry. The infantry was moreover equipped with muskets. Therefore inspite of larger strength of Raja's army small Maratha contingent could wipe the Rajputs in the battle.
After Sawai Jai Singh, internal dissensions crept into the army too which divided the Rajput chieftains to acquire more influence at the cost of Jaipur State.