SHAHJAHAN’S RELATIONS WITH NON-SUFI SAINTS

Shahjahan, son of Jahangir, was born to a Rajput princess Jagat Gosain daughter of Mota Raja Udai Singh of Marwar in 1592.\(^1\) From his childhood, he was very close to his grand father Akbar\(^2\) and inherited his broad and liberal outlook. The Mughal court during Shahjahan’s reign was the meeting place of the adherents of different religions and cultures. There were a large number of Hindi poets present at the Mughal court, who were patronized by Shahjahan. One of the prominent Hindi scholar and poet was ‘Jagannath Pandit. He was patronized by both Jahangir and Shahjahan and was a close friend of Asaf Khan and Dara Shikoh. He was honoured with the title of Mahakavirai by Shahjahan. Once Shahjahan pleased by his rhetoric poem, ordered that he be weighed against with silver.\(^3\) He eulogized Shahjahan in the following verses.

\[
\text{दिल्ली राजस् वा जगदीशराजस् वा मनो स्थान}
\]
\[
\text{पूर्णितम् समर्थः।}
\]
\[
\text{अन्यौर्ध्वते परिदीपमान: शाकायवा}
\]
\[
\text{स्मालवरणाय वा स्यात्॥}
\]
(i.e either the Lord of Delhi or the Lord of the Universe is alone capable of fulfilling desires. What is given by other kings may suffice only for buying pots, herbs or salt).

Jagannath also translated Arabic work Almagist, on astronomy, into Sanskrit, with the title, ‘Siddhantasara Kauslubha,’ during Shajahan’s

---

One of the poets was Kavindra charya Saraswati, a learned scholar of Sanskrit who was a respectable person at the Court. He wrote so many books in Sanskrit for Dara Shikoh. Shahjahan conferred upon him the title of ‘Sarvavidhyandhana’ and also granted for him a pension. This Kavindracharya led a delegation of the Pandits of Benaras, to Shahjahan’s court in order to seek the abolition of pilgrimage tax on Hindus visiting their scared places of worship. He addressed the emperor in a very flattering language, that ultimately softened the heart of the emperor, and he ordered the abolition of pilgrimage tax on Hindus. Another Hindi poet patronized by Shahjahan was Sundar Das Brahman of Gawalior. He was also given the title of Kavi Rai by Shahjahan. Another Hindi poet Chnitamani was associated with Shahjahan’s court.

Dara Shikoh was the most liberal figure of the time. He was himself a profound scholar of Persian and Sanskrit and patronized many Sanskrit scholars as well. Dara translated ‘Bhangwad Gita’ into Persian. He also translated fifty two ‘Upanishads’ into Persian with the title of ‘Sirr-i-Akbar’ (The Great Secret) in 1657 A.D.

Dara also attempted to bring the followers of Islam and Hinduism by writing an important treatise entitled ‘Majma-ul-Bharain’ (intermingling of two seas), around 1656. Many Sanskrit works were also translated under Dara’s patronage. His Munshi Banwali Das, translated, the famous philosophical drama, ‘Prabodh Chandrodaya’ into Persian

---

5 D.N. Marshal, Mughals in India, op.cit. p.247.  
with the title ‘Gulzar-i-Hal’. Har Karan translated the ‘Ramayan’ into Persian. Joga Vashishta was also rendered into Persian with the title of Tarjuma-i-Joga Vashishta in 1656 A.D, and Dara Shikoh himself wrote its introduction. Dara used to wear a ring with the word ‘Prabhu’ in Hindi, inscribed on it. He had good relations with the non-sufi-saints and Hindu ascetics of the time.

Shahjahan’s court Historians Abdul Hamid Lahori in Badshahnama and Inayat Khan in Shahjahannama in laudatory tone describes that there were 70 or 76 temples which were demolishes at Benaras by the command of the emperor, but such reports were based on exaggeration and were to impress the orthodox section of the Muslim. If these allegations of temple desecration against Shahjahan are analysed minutely, it appears from the contemporary documents pertaining to the grants of Shahjahan to the temples and their priests, that Shahjahan displayed full-hearted tolerance towards his non-Muslim subjects.

Shahjahan’s sons also displayed utmost religious tolerance. The priest of Mahakaleshwara temple at Ujjain, Deva Narain petitioned to the imperial court to provide ‘ghee’ or butter for burning Nandandeep at the said temple. Prince Murad Bakhsh by his ‘nishan’ of 5 Shawwal 1061 A.H/21 September 1655 A.D ordered that provides four ‘Akbari seer’ of ‘ghee’ should be provided daily for the lighting Nandandeep.

---

of the said temple. Similarly, Prince Dara Shikoh presented a stone railway to the temple of Keshav Rai at Mathura.

It was reported to the court during 1648 A.D, Prince Aurangzeb occupied a temple that belonged to Shanti Das Jawhari and it got converted it into a Masjid by constructing a Mihrab, when he was in Gujarat. Mulla Abdul Hakim represented to the emperor that a building by reason of its being the property of another person, could not be considered as a mosque according to Islamic law. Ultimately a ‘Nishan’ was issued by Dara Shikoh dated, 21 Jumada II 1058 A.H/13 July, 1648 A.D, purporting the imperial orders.

It stated that the building belonged to Shanti Das and that because of its being Mehrabi, no obstruction should be caused to the above mentioned person (Shanti Das) and that the Mihrab should be removed and the said building be restored to him (Shanti Das). The royal orders were issued to the effect that the Mihrab, which the Prince (above referred) had constructed, may be retained and a wall be built close to the mihrab between the temple and mihrab to serve as a screen. The Nishan ordered that since the emperor has granted the said temple to Shanti Das, he should be left in possession of it as usual and he may worship there according to his creed in any way he likes and no one should cause any obstruction or hindrance to him in this regard. It bears the tughra of Shahjahan in addition to the tughra and seal of Prince Dara Shikoh.

---

There is also ‘nishan’ of Dara Shikoh dated Jamadi II 1069/February 1659 A.D granting the whole Pushkar village as madad-i-māash to the Brahmans of Pushkar for their maintenance.\footnote{Asnad us Sanadid op.cit. p.203-204.}

### 3.1 Shahjahan’s Relations with the Saints of Pushti Marga

Vithalrai, one of the most celebrated saint of Pushtimarga, who received so many land grants by Akbar was died in 1585 A.D. His successors maintained relations with the Mughal emperors and received so many land grants. Shahjahan after accession to the throne, continued the land grants and concession given by Akbar to the house of Vithalrai. During Shahjahan’s time Vithalrai had already died, but the farman were issued in his name with the phrase, ‘generation to generation.’ This indicates that though the farman of Shahjahan were issued in the name of Vithalrai, after his death they were valid for his descendents also.\footnote{Din Dayal Gupta, Ashtchhap Aur Vallabh Sampradaya, Hindi Saitya Samaylan, Prayag, 1970, p.78.}

#### Shahjahan’s farman to the successors of Vithal Rai

During the year 1633 A.D, a petition was made to Shahjahan, that Goswami Vithalrai Tikayat of Govardhan Nath resident of Gokul purchased lands from Zamindars in Mowzah Jatipura alias Gopalpur for the construction of buildings, cowsheds, workshops and gardens for the God Govardhan Nath.

So, a farman was issued by Shahjahan, dated 17\textsuperscript{th} day of 6\textsuperscript{th} regnal year, 29\textsuperscript{th} September 1633 A.D/A.H-1043/V.S. 1690; granting land in Mowzah Jatipura Gopalpur for Goswami Vithalrai Tikayat and
for the expenses of Thakurdwar (temple) free from all taxes and also exempted from payment of dues, from descendent to descendent. It was ordered to the governors and revenue collectors and jagirdars, present and future that they should allow the land in his possession from descendents to descendents and should not demand any kind of tax, and should not ask for renewed farman and parwancha every year. There are four seals on the farman one of Bhagwandas, second of Badan Das, third of Musawi Khan and fourth of Afzal Khan.  

Shahjahan issued another farman immediately after ten days of the issue of the first farman. This farman was issued on the date of 18 October 1633 A.D/A.H 1043/V.S 1690. This farman states that the Mowzah of Gokul in parganah Mahaban has been granted, free of tax from ancient times to the children (grandsons) of Vithalrai Goswami for the expenses of Thakurdawar (temple). It was ordered to all the civil officers and jagirdars present and future, to allow that Mowzah in their possession and also consider it (land) free from the payment of all type of taxes and not to demand a new order; so that the said Goswami (who from ancient times was prayer offerer for the good fortune of the eternal kingdom, may remain engaged himself in praying for the good of the perpetuity of the United Kingdom. There are four seals of imperial officers namely Bhagwandas, Badan Das, Musawi Khan and Afzal Khan and Sayyid Tahawwar Ali.

Shahjahan issued another farman in his 17th regnal year, corresponding to 1643 A.D/A.H. 1053 with the seal of Dara Shikoh. This farman was issued to protect the rights and property of Vithalrai.

---

18 K.M. Jhaveri, Imperial Farmans, op.cit. Farman No. VI.
19 Ibid – Farman No. VII.
The farman states that Vithalrai, son of Dikshit Damodar was one of the prayer offerer of the eternity allied kingdom, resident of Gokul and had his property and cattle there. It was ordered (to the officials) that no one should molest or disturb him, so that he (Vithalrai) may engage himself in offering of prayers for the perpetuity of the eternity allied kingdom. It was further ordered, that the mischief makers of these places, should not molest him in respect of his property. 20

**Shahjahan’s Farman to Girdhar, son of Vithalrai**

After the death of Goswami Vithalnath (Vithalrai) his third son ‘Girdharji’ became the head acharya (pontiff) of the sect of Vallabha Sampradaya, though his fourth son Gokulnath, who was a very learned person in religious scriptures, was the chief propounder of the message of *Pushtimarga*, after Vithalnath. 21

This farman of Shahjahan with the seal of Dara Shikoh was in the name of Girdharji. The farman dated 27th of Rajab 1068 A.H, 20th April 1658 A.D, V.S.1714. The farman states that the Mowzah of Gokul, in the pargana of Mahaban, has been wholly granted by way of *madad-i-māash* to Girdhar son of Vithalrai, sevak (worshipper) of the Takurdwar (idol temple) of Gokulnath, and after his death (the grant continued) in possession and occupation of his descendents and other heirs. The officers ordered that he was not to be troubled and molested with the demand of Various prohibited taxes. 22

---

20 Ibid – Farman No. VIII
21 Din Dayal Gupta, Ashtchhap Aur Vallabh Samprodaya, op.cit, part-I, p.80..
Shahjahan’s farman to the temple of Govardhan Nath

It was represented to Shahjahan that the cows of Govardhan temple, situated in the village Gopalpur went for grazing on the lands in the village of Bachha Gam. Consequently a farman was issued protecting the grazing rights of the cows belonging to the temple of Govardhan Nath. The farman dated 8 Jamadi II\textsuperscript{nd} 1068 A.H/32\textsuperscript{nd} of regnal year corresponding to 3\textsuperscript{rd} of March 1658 A.D. The farman contain seal of Dara Shikoh along with Shahjahan. It was ordered in the farman to the civil officers, ‘present and future’ of the place, that the cows belonging to the temple of Govardhan Nath in village Gopalpur go for grazing in the villages Bachha Gam and Bachha. So, whatever the number of cows belonging to that temple, that go for grazing, should not be molested or prohibited and there should be no demand of grazing fees.\textsuperscript{23}

Parwana of Ishaq Azam Khan

During Shahjahan’s period the economic interests of Goswami Vithalrai and his followers were protected. In this regard a parwana was issued by Ishaq Azam Khan, officer of Shahjahan to the effect that the right of collection of the taxes (or receipt of perquisites of weighers) from the Mandvi (market place) of Gokul of parganah Mahaban, were confirmed for the workers (men) of Goswami Vithalrai, as per the practice of olden times. The farman is dated 10\textsuperscript{th} Shabanul Muazzam, A.H. 1056, corresponding to Friday 11\textsuperscript{th} of September A.D. 1646, V.S 1703.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid - Farman No. XII.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid – Farman No. IX.
Parwana of Mukramat Khan in the name of Girdharlal the eldest son of Vithalrtai

This parwana is also of the same nature as the previous one issued by Azam Khan. It was dated 10th of Safar 1057 A.H, 20th Elahi year of the accession corresponding to 7th of March 1647 A.D, V.S. 1704. According to this parwana, it was ordered to the civil officers and revenue collectors, that the grain market (mandi) of Mowzah Gokul in pargana Mahabn has been granted to Girdharlal. So, it was allowed, to remain in his possession and they should not molest or trouble him in any way.  

3.2 Shahjahan’s relations with the Goswamis of Jangambari Math of Benaras

After his accession to the throne Shahjahan maintained relationship with the Goswamis of Shaivite Math of Banaras and retained all the previous land grants made to this sect by his father Jahangir and grandfather Akbar.

Shahjahan’s farmans to Malik Arjun Jangam, the head priest of the Math-

In his second regnal year Shahjahan issued a farman in the name of Janjams confirming the previous grant of Sultan Parwez. The farman having the seal of Shahjahan dated 1138 A.H corresponding to 16 January 1629 A.D to 5 January 1630 A.D. The farman states that 178 bighas of land in pargana Banaras has been allotted as madad-i-māash to the Jangams, according to the nishan of Sultan Parwez. It is ordered to the present hakims,

25 Ibid – Farman, No. X.
ummal jagirdars and karoris, leave the aforesaid land in their possession and not demand the cesses and should not trouble them in any way. On the reverse side of the farman there is a certificate Shar-us-sundur Mooswi Khan confirming the grant.  

Another farman of Shahjahan having the same contents and the same date. It is stated in the farman, that according to the farman of (late) Majesty (Arsah-Ashyani Akbar) and the nishan of Sultan Parwez, about 178 bighas of land from the parganah of Banaras, has been granted in the madad-i-māash for the brotherhood of Jangams. So, according to this farman dated 9th Amardad-i-Ilahi, of the 2nd regnal year 16 January 1629 to 5th January 1630 A.D the above mentioned land from earlier times, is being left in the possession and occupation of them (Jangams). No alteration is permitted in this respect (in the farman), so they (Jangams) use its income as their livelihood and continued to be the perpetual prayer offerers of the grand domnious. This farman has on the top the title of Shahjahan, ‘Sahib-i-Qiran-i-Sani’ and have the seal of Afzal Khan. 

During Shahjahan’s period the property rights of different religious communities were protected. There is an order of Shahjahan’s officer Shukrullah, entitled Afzal Khan, ordering the officials Jagirdars and karoris of the parganah, Hawaeli Benaras. A person named Lala Naik, petitioned that Malik Arjun Jangam and others residents of the city are the prayer offerers for the exalted kingdom, so they should not be oppressed, tyrannised and should not

---

be caused any type of injury. If any body caused harm to them, he would face dire consequences. This order written in the 5th regnal year of Shahjahan dated, 5th December 1631 A.D to 3rd December 1632 A.D, having the seal of Shukrullah entitled Afzal Khan. ²⁸

Shahjahan’s officers also were keenly interested in giving confirmation and concessions to different religious divines and organizations. His officer Shujaat Khan confirmed the grants of the emperor. An order of Shujaat Khan having his seal, with the invocation Allahu-Akbar and Shahjahan’s title Sahib-i-Qirani Sani on the top dated Zulqadah 1043 A.H/Friday 28 June 1633 to Monday, 16 June 1634 A.D. informed the officers of pargana Hawali sarkar Chunadah, that 100 bighas of land in accordance with the (previous) exalted farman have been given in the madad-i-māash to the Jangams from the said pargana. So, the above mentioned land should be left in their possession. The officers, should not demand any kind of tax, so they may engaged themselves in praying for the perpetuity of the everlasting kingdom. ²⁹

Another farman of Shahjahan, stating that, according to the exalted farman of Hazarat Sahib-i-Qiran-i-Sani (Shahjahan), dated 9th Amardad-i-Ilahi 2nd regnal year (or four), about 178 bighas of land, measured in Illahigaz, has been granted in the madad-i- māash of the brotherhood of the Jangams from the parganah haweli Banaras situated in the sarkar of the same name, Subah of Allahabad. As they showed their ‘sanads’, order was issued that for charity of his majesty

the above mentioned land be confirmed. The officials of the parganah should leave it (the land) in their (Jangam’s) possession, so that they may engage themselves in praying for the perpetuity of the everlasting dominions. The date of writing of the farman is given, 15th Jamadi 1st 1044 A.H. Two dates are given by M.A. Ansari in his Persian copy of the farman and in English translation. The first one is 16 January 1629 A.D to 5th February 1630 A.D and the second one is 15 Jamadi 1st 1044 A.H corresponding 27 October 1634 A.D. 30

Another farman of Shahjahan issued in the 7th regnal year, dated 25 Rabi 1st 1044 A.H. This farman also contain two dates – 23rd November 1633 A.D to 11 November 1634 A.D. and 1044 A.H/ 17 June 1634 A.D- 6th June 1635 A.D. This farman was issued for the confirmation of Shahjahan’s grant of 178 bighas of land as madad-i-maāsh, bestowed on Jangams in his 2nd regnal year. By the present farman the officials of jagirdars, karoris and mutasaddis of pargnah Haweli Benaras, were informed that the above mentioned land be left in their possession.

It is also mentioned in the farman that the Jangams came and produced reliable evidence that the same persons are still alive and in possession of the land. It is also instructed to the officers that they should not be given any trouble, so that they should continue in praying for the perpetuity of the everlasting dominion. 31

3.3 Shahjahan’s relations with the Goswamis of Chaitanya sect of Vrindavan and Mathura

As we have seen that Akbar and Jahangir granted land and financial support to the religious divines and priests of the temples of Mathura and Vrindavan. Shahjahan carried on this policy of his father and grand father and continued to maintain relationship, and confirmed the grants and concession to the Goswamis of Mathura and Vrindavan and also protected their rights and privileges of management of the temples. The farman of Shahjahan and parwana’s of his officials to the temples, priests and devotees of Vrindavan and Mathura, depict that, to what extent the Mughal administration reached in granting its support and protecting their right to worship, in their own fashion, and to manage the temple affairs themselves.

Shahjahan’s Farman to Gosain Das, Sevak (servant) of Madan Mohan Temple

It was Shahjahan’s first farman, in the 5th regnal year, of his in the name of a person related to the temple of Vrindavan. By this farman Shahjahan confirmed, Jahangir’s grant (previously it was Todarmal’s grant) to the temple. Shahjahan permitted this grant to pass in entirety from the previous Sevak Srichand, (now dead) to his successor, Gosaindas.32

So, this farman of Shahjahan, dated 5 Azur 5th regnal year corresponding to 26 November 1632 A.D. The farman states, the grant of 89 bighas and 9 biswas of land in village Rajpur of pargana

Mathura, in the name of Gosaindas the successor of Srichand, (now dead), Sevak of Madan Mohan temple, exempted from tax. \(^{33}\)

**Shahjahan’s Farman to the temple of Gobind Rai**

This *farman* is dated 1\(^{st}\) Amurdad of 6\(^{th}\) regnal year corresponding to 24\(^{th}\) July 1633 A.D. The *farman* states the transfer of tax exempted grant of 135 bighas of land to temples of Gobind Rai and others. The grant was originally made by Akbar’s *farman* of 4\(^{th}\) Shahriwar of 43 Ilahi year to Raja Jai Singh as ‘inam’ on the same terms as the original grant 95 bighas of land in village Dosaich and 40 bighas in village of Dholera, because, as the emperor observed, that “it is not the rule (hukm) to (make the grants) in the name of temples.”\(^{34}\)

**Shahjahan’s farman to the temple of Madan Mohan, allowing the sounding of time gong**

This *farman* of Shahjahan issued on the 4\(^{th}\) Azur month of 7\(^{th}\) regnal year of 29 November 1634 A.D, with the invocation of Allahu Akbar and his square seal and tughra of the top. The *farman* thus, states, “It has been represented to his sacred Majesty that in the temple (devala) of Madan Mohan, situated in village Brindaban, pargana Mathura, Suba Akbarabad (Agra), a large body of God-worshipping Hindu mendicants are engaged in divine worship according to their own religion and custom.” For the practising of the rites of divine worship in the said temple, a time-gong (*gharial*) was

---


\(^{34}\) Irfan Habib & T.Mukherji. op.cit. Calender No-17, p.295.
in use for the purpose of knowing the passage of hours and the time of
night and day.

For some time as a result of the interference and prohibition of
officials, this (sounding of gong) has been in abeyance. As a result,
the proper timings of the acts of devotion and divine worship, owing
to lack of sounding of hours of night and day cannot be maintained.
(The devotees) are hopeful that the time-gong be permitted in
accordance with past practice. Therefore the world-subduing, sun-
illuminating, sky-reaching order has been issued to the effect that no
one should obstruct the sounding of the time gong in the said temple.
Officials, present and future, should strive for the continuance and
fulfillment of this order, ensure that the time-gong is in use in the said
temple, and not obstruct it for any reason. They are not to practice
delay in carrying out what has been ordered. 35 This farman of
Shahjahan is a fuller testimony of his utmost tolerance and granting
freedom of worship to his non-Muslim subjects.

Shahjahan’s Farman to Kishandas devotee; entrusting
management of Madan Mohan and Govinda Dev Temple

This is Shahjahan’s farman (not extant) issued in 1644 A.D. in
the 8th regnal year. The farman, states that, since Akbar had entrusted
the adhikara of Madan Mohan and Govinda Dev temple (devala) at
Vrindavan to Jiv Gosain, and he in his lifetime had given it to his
murid (disciple) Kishan Das, it is ordered that the latter should fulfill
the same office, and none, should interfere in it. 36 This farman is

36 A Documentary History, op.cit, p.148.
referred to in Islam Khan’s parwana of 14th Ramzan, of 14th November 1644, of 18th regnal year. This parwana states that Kishan Das, devotee (Mutaqid) of Jiv Gowain, should have the management (adhikar) of the temples (devala) of Bindraban. 37

So, this farman of Shahjahan and parwana of Islam Khan clearly indicates that the Mughal emperor and his officials were keenly interested in affairs of management of the temples of Vrindavan and were always ready in giving them full assistance and protection.

Whenever any dispute arose between the devotees of the temples, Mughal administration took keen interest to settle the affairs. There is a statement of settlement of dispute under the Qazi’s seal, of Mathura, dated 11 Jumada IInd 1064 A.H/29th April 1654 A.D. A person named Gauranga Bengali (in Vrindavan) lodged a complaint with the faujdar, Shaikh Abdun Nabi that Damodardas Radhaballabhi had seized tress belonging to the seat of “Kishan Chaitan (chaitanya) who was our Guru”. Consequently two mediators being appointed and a division of trees was made between the two parties. Settlement was agreed to by both. 38

Parwana of Dara Shikoh’s officer for the exemption of cattle tax

As all the grants made to the Goswamis of Chaitanya sect of Vrindavan were exempted from the payment of tax, the tax on grazing of cattle of the temples was also remitted. There is a parwana of Dara Shikoh’s official Daud Khan of the same nature, when Mathura was in the jagir of Dara Shikoh. The parwana of Daud Khan dated 9 Rabi IInd

38 Ibid – Calender. No. 239, p.298.
of 31\textsuperscript{st} regnal year of 14\textsuperscript{th} January 1658 A.D. It was addressed to the officials of pargana Mahaban. The pujaris (priests) of Gobind Dev temple had represented to prince Dara Shikoh that under the previous jagirdars they were exempted from the cattle tax (gau-shumari), but in the preceding year the Prince’s officials in Mahabnan exacted the tax as well as subjected the gardeners of the gardens or orchards of the said temples, to begar (forced labour). Since the complainants deserve concession, the ‘gau-shumari’ is remitted and the gardeners were not to be subjected to begar.\textsuperscript{39}

3.4 Shahjahan and the Jogis of Jakhbar

The jogis of Jakbar were in constant touch with the Mughal government. Than Nath and Bhau Nath, the head jogis of Jakhbar gaddi, presented themselves at the Mughal court, the jogis appears to be harassed in some way by the agents of jagirdars, so they approached the emperor to plead their case.\textsuperscript{40} So, Musawi Khan the Sadr sent strict orders to his officers in this regard.

Parwana of Musawi Khan to the Jogis of Jakhbar

Musawi Khan was appointed ‘Sadr’ in 1636-37 A.D.\textsuperscript{41} He issued a parwanah in 5\textsuperscript{th} regnal year, which also referred to the Shahjahan’s farman issued in the 12\textsuperscript{th} regnal year. It Granted 200 bighas of land to the jogis. The parwana had the invocation of Allahu Akbar on the top and the seal of Musawi Khan with a verse from the Holy Quran. The parwana was addressed to the present and future jagirdars and karoris

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid – Calender, No. 44, p.298.
\textsuperscript{41} Abdul Hamid Lahori, Badshahnama, op.cit. vol-I, part (b) p.267 & M.Athar Ali, the Apparatus of Empire, Oxford University Press, 1985, No. 51362, p.138.
of the pargana Pathan. It states, that, “Whereas in accordance with the exalted and auspicious farman of the emperor (Shahjahan) issued on the 12th day of Farwardin Ilahi of the 12th regnal year, 200 bighas of land in the village Narot, within the administrative jurisdiction of the above mentioned parganah, had been in conferment by way of madad-i-māash upon the jogis, Than Nath, Bhau Nath and others. Now they presented themselves before. His Majesty (the emperor) and the truth of their just claims has become manifest. On that account, the abovementioned land in the old mahal remains verily in conferment upon them by way of madad-i-māash, and in their possession, according to the former practice. It is therefore being ordered that having handed over the abovementioned land to them (the jogis), and any thing should not be demanded from them, so, that they may remain occupied with praying for the permanence of the everlasting dominion. Taking every care in this matter, (the officials) should do nothing contrary to the commands. Written on the auspicious 15th regnal year, of Rabi-ul-awwal 1052 A.H, corresponding to 1642 A.D.  

3.5 Shahjahan’s Relation with Sikh Gurus

Shahjahan and Guru Hargobind

The author of Dabistan-i-Mazahib, was a close friend of Guru Hargobind he narrates that, Guru Hargobin had seven hundred horses in his stables and 300 experienced horsemen and 60 musketeers were always in his service and among them a group of persons occupied

---

themselves in trade, service and work on his behalf. So, Hargobind collected a standing army and under his the Guruship transformed into one, spiritual as well as temporal leadership.

According to ‘Dabistan-i-Mazahib,’ after the death of Jahangir in 1627 A.D. Guru Hargobind remained in attendance on his majesty Shahjahan and for some he was in the service of Yar Khan the Eunuch, the faujdar of Punjab.

Once Shahjahan went on hunting from Lahore. The hunting party was in the direction of Amritsar, Guru Hargobind at the same time engaged in hunting at the same place. Both the hunting parties inadvertently approached each other, but without meeting. The emperor had a white hawk which was sent to him as a gift by the king of Persia. As the emperor was returning to Lahore, he let flow his hawk in the pursuit of a duck, and also sent his huntsmen and some troops to follow the hawk. The emperors hawk flew in the direction of the Guru’s party and they caught it. When the emperor’s huntsmen reached there and demanded the hawk, the Sikhs refused to give it back. The imperial huntsmen complained the conduct of the Sikhs to the emperor. As a result, Shahjahan ordered one of his commander Mukhlis Khan to lead an army against the Sikhs. A battle was fought between the Mughal army and the Sikhs, in which Mukhlis Khan was killed. According to Dabistan-i-Mazahib. He (Guru Hargobind) had a battle with the imperial forces sent against him by his Majesty
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Shahjahan. The guru’s baggage and goods were plundered, and he left Ramdasapur and went to Kartarpur.⁴⁸

A disciple of Guru Hargobind, named ‘Sadh,’ brought three horses and camels from Iraq to present them to the Guru, during 1643-44 A.D. (1053 A.H). When he reached ‘Gorband’ a place of Kabul province, the horses and camels were seized by an officer in charge Khalil Beg. ⁴⁹ But in the account of Macauliff, it is narrated that two ‘masands’ Bakhtmal and Tarachand, brought two horses from Kabul for the Guru. But the horses were forcibly seized by the emperors officials and presented to him. ⁵⁰ The Guru’s servant Biddhichand stolen the horses.⁵¹ Upon this the emperor sent an army under the command of Lala Beg and a battle was fought which lasted for 18 hours.⁵²

Another battle was fought at Kartarpur between the Guru and imperial forces, in which, Payinda Khan was killed.⁵³

So, it is clear from the above analysis, that the relations between Shahjahan and Guru Hargobind were not harmonious, and it was a prelude of the hostility between the Mughals and the Sikhs.

3.6 Dara Shikoh and Guru Har Rai

Guru Hargobind in his life time nominated his grandson, Har Rai as his successor. After becoming the Guru Har Rai stayed at

Kiratpur for one year during 1056 A.H/1645-46 A.D. After his defeat at Samugarh in 1658 A.D, during the war of succession, Dara Shikoh wandered from place to place. In that critical situation, he decided to visit Guru Har Rai for spiritual assistance. So he sent a letter to the Guru for his favour. The Prince went to Kiratpur but at that time the Guru was at Khadur. Ultimately he had an interview on the bank of the Bias river. On this occasion, Dara made large offerings to the Guru. They had a long discourse on different aspects of spirituality. Dara requested the Guru to pray for his success. It is also that Guru Har Rai supported Dara with a large force. But on the pretext of collecting more troops he left Dara.

3.7 Dara Shikoh and Baba Lal

Saint Babalal, the founder of Baba Lalis sect, was born, according to his followers at Kushpur or Qasur near Lahore in 1590 A.D. But according to Wilson, and Grierson, he was a Khatttri by caste, was born in Malwa and had finally settled at Lahore. He had become a disciple of Chetan Swami. Like Kabir and Dadu, Baba Lal found a monotheistic religion based on Sufism and Bhakti movement. The doctrine of incarnation was not accepted by him, but his teachings were based on eternal love for Almighty God.
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According to Dara Shikoh, Baba Lal was a *mundiya* (a shaven headed monk) and belonged to the order of Kabir panthis. As Dara Shikoh was a person of mystic bent of mind, he was always eager to meet the religious divines of Sufi and Bhakti order. It was during 1653 A.D, when Dara Shikoh was returning from his unsuccessful expedition of Qandahar. He halted at Lahore, and came into contact with Baba Lal. The meeting between Dara and Baba Lal took place at the house of Dara’s Munshi Rai Chandrabhan Brahman. There discussion on different aspects of religion and mysticism took place between them, and the discourse continued for a few days. The discussion between the two was mainly on characteristics of ascetic life, different aspects of Hindu mythology and nature of the human soul, on burial and cremation and on idol worship. The whole discussion and the events of the meeting was recorded into Persian by Rai Chandrabhan Brahmin in a book entitled as ‘Nadirul Nukat.’
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