

“A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE UNDER THE MUGHAL REGIME”

*** DR. MUHAMMAD KHURSHID**

Civilization and cultural values of a nation or community, living in particular region or area, give birth to a social structure. The social conditions of a region played a decisive role in the economic and political development of the people living there. For a detailed discussion on the Indian social structure it is necessary to define the words civilization and culture. The term civilization designates a condition of human society characterized by a high level of culture and technological achievement and correspondingly complex social and political development. In its literal sense civilization implies a social government of an organized state. It has come to imply all that progress in arts, government, social equipment, social cooperation, and culture which separates man as a member of the higher societies from a condition of barbarism. Culture is a term used by social scientists and humanistic scholars which means the cultivation of human mind to a pattern of life. Culture is an extremely complex phenomenon which can be defined as the sum-total of the ways of living built up by a group of human beings, transmitted from one generation to another. It has reference to innumerable relations which exist between individuals, groups, associations and the social whole. It includes their manners, customs, and institutions as well as thoughts, sentiments and aspirations, expressed or unexpressed, held consciously or unconsciously, embodied in their system of philosophy and religion, or uttered through their art, poetry and music. It also embraces all material structures, all products of social or economic activity, all articles which satisfy human want¹. In short according to Ruth Benedict culture is “a pattern of thinking and doing that runs through the activities of a people and distinguishes them from all other people. In later years, culture became a term used to describe the distinctive human mode of adapting to the environment (molding nature to conform a man’s desires and goals. However, all anthropologists agree that culture consists of the learned ways of behaving and adapting, as contrasted to inherited behaviour, patterns or instincts²”. The cultural standard is never stationary, and it is not uniform in all the strata of a society. It is composed of differing and sometimes contradictory strands and thus the immense complexity of the task becomes even more palpable. It is important to point out that “a society’s traditions by and large embody and perpetuate what that society has found to be good and valuable for itself³”. No society can remain static for any length of time. Evidently, every new generation brings the old moulds of society into new temperaments, attitudes and em-

* Associate Professor, Department of History & Pak. Studies, Islamia University, Bahawalpur (Pakistan)

phasis, which sometimes gradually and sometimes rapidly alter the character of that civilization. Social developments often take place in the inner working of a society as a result of changing moods of the individuals, modifications in the disposition of groups and variations in environment. The nature of the change is sometime violent and revolutionary, resulting in the overthrow of the old and the appearance of an altogether different society and culture.

In India, there were many communities and each formed its own entity which possessed some faint consciousness of unity. There were many linguistic regions where existed religious groups and communities corresponding to similar groups and communities in other regions. Through the multiplicity of these societies, groups, and communities, and the spectrum of languages, religions, arts and customs was suffused with a uniqueness which distinguished the cultures of India from other cultures of the world. In many ways religion is the preserver of cultural or social values of the Indian people. The followers of different religions had their own traditions. They tried to conform to the injunctions of their sacred scriptures to observe what was commanded and to abstain from what was forbidden. They followed in their conduct the law as laid down by the law-givers (*shariat and dharma*). For Muslims and Hindus the laws comprehended not only the personal life of the individual but his entire public life in social, economic and political spheres. There were many sects and sub-divisions among them, but whatever their differences were, they agreed upon emphasis regarding their established doctrine and ritual. The people of India were the descendants of many races who mixed up with the passage of time. The diversity of races had left a deep impact on Indian culture. Nevertheless, the Indian culture has been greatly enriched by the customs and traditions of various races. According to Herbert Risley before the advent of Islam there were seven types of ethnological groups in India named as the Dravidian, Indo-Aryan, Turko Iranian, Scythio-Dravidian, Aryo-Dravidian, Mongoloid and Mongol Dravidian⁴. The most extensive influence was exercised by the Dravadians who had evolved a very high standard of culture and civilization. Their contribution to the Hindu religion is particularly significant. Certain social customs with which present society is familiar also owe their origin to the Dravadians. For example, during the wedding ceremony the use of turmeric and vermilion in the wedding ritual was borrowed from the Dravadians. The Aryans unconsciously adopted a large number of religious and social practices of the Dravadians.

The social life of the people is commonly organized with a view to help each other in the struggle for their betterment. The vedic literature, Dharma literature as well as the Epics and Puranas shows that the people in ancient India had enjoyed a highly developed culture, customs, usages and rituals long before the arrivals of the Muslims. The ancient Indian society was completely “based upon *Varna* and *ashrams*, a four-fold classification of the entire people into *Varnas* and four-fold division of the life of each individual into *ashrams*

(stage)⁵”. The post vedic social system continued to preserve the division of society into four castes viz, Brahman, Kshatriya, Vaishya and shudra. Brahmans always worked as the priests and religious leaders. The Indian Muslims also, with the passage of time recognized the *Qazis* and *Moulvis* as their religious leaders. It did not disturb the social harmony since it adjusted within the Hindu social system of tolerating different believers under the same roof. As professor K.S. Lal says “there was perfect freedom of worship in the Hindu philosophy⁶” because Hinduism itself was a blend of many religious branches. So it was possible only in Indian environment that believers of different sects could live together. Consequently, it helped to sustain the power of assimilation of different religions in India and maintained continuity in the society. Prasanto Kumar Sen stated that “in manners and customs and in the daily routine of religious duties, the bulk of the Muslims in the villages followed pretty much the same lines as Hindus with only this difference that certain other customary religious duties – were supposed to justify their existence as followers of the prophet⁷”.

From religious point of view, during Muslim rule, Indian society was divided broadly into two categories Viz; Hindu society and Muslim society. During the early Mughal rule the relations between these two communities were normal and mutual; jealousy and rivalry were more personal or political than religious. The upper strata of the society, which was closely associated with the throne, never identified itself with the interests of the state and the common people. Though the Muslim community of India “presented itself to superficial view as *prima facie* a solid homogenous block held together by the cement of Islam, it was in reality a composite community having within its fold representatives of races from all over the Muslim world and Hindu converts from all grades of society⁸”. In India all the Muslim groups, those who migrated from different Islamic states and the converts from Hinduism, fell under the influence of caste system. Thus we find that the Arabs, Turks, Persians, Mughals, Pathans and Sayeds, who formed a nation distinct from Indian nationality, acquired the characteristics of caste. Each component, ethnic or racial group, was betraying too much pride and self-consciousness to be moulded into a compact homogenous whole⁹. The converted Indian Muslims (Rajputs, Jats, Gujars, etc., retained their ancestral social exclusiveness and customs of marriage, inheritance and status which they possessed before conversion. Like the Hindus, the Muslims too were divided into two social orders (the higher casts known as Ashraf¹⁰ and the lower casts known as Ajlaf¹¹. These two divisions of Muslim society were marked in particular by two different ways of life. The Ajlaf were deeply rooted in the Indian culture from which they sprang and followed indigenous patterns of life. They spoke local languages and their occupations indicated their low status as mostly they were cultivators or labourers. Among them only the Rajputs followed the noble profession of fighting. Among the Ashrafs the Saiyeds followed the profession of

learning, the Mughals and the pathans were warriors and the Shaikhs were devoted to gentle avocations and most of them were converts from higher Hindu castes¹². This two-fold division of the Muslim society involved differences in culture – religious attitudes and activities, education, manners, customs and laws. The Ashrafs tried to follow the injunctions of the scriptures – the Quran and Hadith but the lower order(Ajlaf) remained steeped in ignorance and superstition. Most of the Ajlaf continued to follow the ways of their ancestors of pre-Muslim days. In fact, caste was more social than a religious institution, and therefore, conversion from one religion to the other had no effect upon the social standing and caste of the convert. Consequently, on the eve of the Mughal rule, the Muslim society like Hindus was divided into castes and sub-castes and also suffered from the double caste system – the religious caste system, sectarianism and the social caste system. Like Brahmins the Ulama, who largely belonged to the Saiyed caste in Islamic society, exercised much influence both on people and the government. But this influence waxed and waned according to changes in inclinations, opinions and policies of the rulers.

According to the *vedic* literature India had developed high culture, customs, usages and rituals long before the arrival of the Aryans. After the fall of Mauryas, the Indian sub-continent never saw political stability before the sultans of Delhi who succeeded to maintain peace and order. Finally, Jalal-ud-din Akbar established law and order in far and wide areas of the country in the sixteenth century. There were many phases during the intervening period which can be described as ‘dark period.’ But it does not mean that there was no social structure during this period. It was simply due to this fact that Indian social life was not dependent much on the political stability because it was not the creation of the rulers. Actually, it was the culmination of the socio-political integration which had been going on since vedic age. Earlier this integration had been brought about by almost constant flow of immigration from the land approaches in the north-west. Their settlement left imprints on the existing society, and in return, they were affected by the latter. This constant migration and assimilation of different people gave birth to a unique Indo-Muslim culture. It was that Indo-Muslim culture which sustained the destabilisation and survived the long innings of political instability. Obviously, it attained a higher stage during the time of peace. But it suffered set-backs, specially in the urban life, whenever the society was confronted with political instability. However, the growth of culture continued unabated in the rural areas which showed the element of continuity in the social life.

The Indian social life had two distinct divisions: urban life and rural life. The historians of the medieval times were mostly dependent on the patronage of the native rulers. They lived in courts and their narrations were more about the urban life. In order to understand the social life of the Indian people who were known for their rural bias, it is necessary to study the rural structure. Nizamuddin Ahmad a historian and an experienced administra-

tor wrote: "At the present time, namely A-H.1002/1595 A.D., Hindustan contains 3200 towns and 500,000 villages¹³". The rural society, had a sort of republic system. Feudalism was the backbone of the rural structure as the right to administer their people had gone into the hands of the landlords. By them the policing of vast rural areas was left "to the local *chowkidars* who were supposed to be the servants of the village community¹⁴". The rulers "did not interfere in the village life as long as the revenue was paid and so long as there was no violent crime or defiance of royal authority in the locality¹⁵". The right to rule the people was decided by the battles between the rulers. The villages were always exposed to the loot of the invading armies and fell prey to the conquerors. As there was little security for village people, which preserved the joint family system and community feelings within a village. As the inhabitants of respective villages were loyal to their village system, their local loyalties hampered the evolution of national loyalty among different communities. However, it gave birth to social harmony while creating unity within the Indianized social system. Most of the writers are of the opinion that there were political reasons which exploited religion and generated disharmony in the rural society.

According to the nature of their work the rural society was divided into two groups – Martial races and the labour class. It gave birth to a multitude of castes and presented the most horrible disunity in the society because each profession carried a caste. They produced goods or provided services needed by their respective villages and got a fixed share of annual produce of each farmer. Simply, it was a payment for their services through the barter system. In this way, the villagers were self-reliant which helped them to preserve their autonomy in spite of the political instability at national level. It was a common phenomenon of the Indian rural society of the eighteenth century which has its roots in rural insecurity even today. Moreover, religion played a very important role in the Indian society. It was not only the base of the Hindu society even after advent of the Muslim rule for more than seven hundred years, but it is still a regulation of the Indian social structure. Though the Muslims political dominance in India brought about conversion from other religions to Islam, the majority of the people still adhered to their respective religions. The Muslim rulers took very little interest in the Islamization of the sub-continent because such fanaticism was bound to create disharmony and political unrest among the different religious communities. Further, the majority of the Muslim rulers were well-aware of this fact that it would bring doom to their ruling authority. They also knew that "the day when the government attempts to interfere with any of the more important religious and civil usages of the Hindus, will be the last of its existence as a political power¹⁶". So the majority of the Muslim rulers refrained from any interference in non-Muslims' personal affairs. Consequently, the success of Mughal emperors – Jalal-ud-din Akbar, Nur-ud-din Jahangir and Shah Jahan was largely due to their liberal and enlightened policies. Even Zahir-ud-Din

Babur before his death advised his son Naseer-ud-Din Humayun not to distinguish between a Muslim and a Hindu. Aurangzeb Alamgir sought to turn back the hands of the clock but he ultimately realized the futility and undesirability of mixing religion with politics¹⁷

In the sixteenth century the Muslims from outside India were predominantly Turks, Afghans and Persians with a sprinkling of Abyssinians and Arabs. Majority of them were warriors and learned men than artisans and technicians. They surrounded the person of the sovereign and formed the galaxy of the royal paraphernalia. They were divided into two main groups – Turani and Irani¹⁸. The Afghans who formed only a chapter in the dazzling pages of the history of the long line of Timur, had their own worth. Their original home was the valley of the Sulaiman Range. They established themselves all over India and due to their constant association with the rest of the population of north India had undergone a change and were more rapidly Indianized than other. The cultural links between India and Iran had been renewed with the advent of Islam. The Afghans were the muscle; whereas the Persians who were Shias by creed, supplied the brain of the Muslim ruling aristocracy of India. With the rise of Chengiz Khan a large number of Persian Muslims were driven towards India to seek a safe home. No doubt, the Persians were fortune-hunters as they had accompanied the ranks of Babur and his successors¹⁹ in large number. Their success at the Mughal court had induced many others to follow in their foot-steps²⁰. Due to their ability and fidelity they were appointed to the highest posts of trust and importance. Although they were lesser in number than Turanis yet were in possession of the most important offices and exercised the largest share of influence at the court of the great Mughals²¹. There were Physicians, poets, lawyers, soldiers and other professional classes in their ranks. They served the Mughal empire with great skill and faithfulness. At the same time they entertained “a Vain and overweening desire to exalt their nation²²”. But they owed allegiance to their national king, the shah of Persia²³. Anyhow, in India the social and cultural hegemony of the Persians was most significant. Even Aurangzeb who was distrustful of this race, recommended that “no other nation is better than the Persians for acting as clerks²⁴”, and all the *Mir Bakhshis* of his reign were of Persian origin, who enjoyed very high reputation due to their ability, polished manners and their aptitude for office management²⁵. They formed the cream of the Muslim community. In short, they hailed from a country which was the seat of culture, learning, fashion and polished manners and were respected as the masters of social decorum in Asia. The Turanis who belonged to the ancestral home of the reigning dynasty, claimed a superiority over the others. They were Turko-Mongol by race, Sunni by creed and were “more to be commended for their valour than beauty; a square stout, strong people, having platter faces and flat noses²⁶. They were very strong and sturdy people and formed the most dominant part of the population having great ability in military as well as civil administration and proved to be very influential class in state affairs. The Mughal emperors

always conferred favours on this race because “on many occasions these men can do the necessary services, whom no other race can²⁷”. The Afghans who were mostly sunnis²⁸, formed a glorious chapter in the dazzling pages of the Indian History, got their own worth vindicated by sheer hardwork. Even the menials and water-carriers coming from this stock were high-spirited and war-like. The relations between Mughals and Afghans were not friendly because Afghans had a deep-seated hatred for the Mughals, and it was only the Yoke of subjection which had reconciled them to the domination of the latter, and with the passage of time had partly healed their wounds. The Afghans were more known for their general rusticity, illiteracy, bragging and ill-temper rather than for culture, learning, taste and decency²⁹. They mainly inhabited the part of the country in the vicinity of the Ganges in Bihar and Bengal³⁰. The pathans were obstinate soldiers and it is often said about them that “they never draw their swords, but blood must flow³¹”. Though some of them had shown an aptitude for the civil administration yet as rulers they were too rough for civil life. The most peculiar trait of their character was their boastfulness and vanity and “each on thinking himself greater than the rest and decline to concede to others any superiority³²”.

As earlier mentioned there were two types of Muslims in India: one, whose ancestors had, as a result of the steady flow of foreign immigration, made it their new home; and the second, Hindu converts to Islam who were called neo-Muslims. It is notable that the artisan class was first to be converted to Islam. Later on the migrated Muslims inter-married with the Indian people and had become Hindustanis in the real sense and they always took the Indian side in most affairs of life and administration. The Neo-Muslims, who were tempted out from the stock of Hindu society or forcibly converted³³, did not materially alter their outlook and social position and were more akin to their past social and religious order. They participated in their common sufferings and joined Hindu festivals like Holi, Diwali and Dosehra and Hindus celebrated Muslim festivals³⁴. Many Muslim converts of Rajput descent took care to append the designation of their original clan to their personal³⁵ names though all the converts to the fold of Islam were usually styled with the honorific title of shaikh³⁶. The Indian Muslims were quite different in habits, customs and manners from other Muslim groups³⁷. Most of them were sunnis³⁸. They were rustic sort of people and not so ingenious and crafty as Afghans or Mughals³⁹. For example the Saiyeds of Barha regarded themselves as Indians and had become such in every sense of the term. They had no foreign sympathies and looked askance at fresh arrivals from Iran and Turan, Whom they regarded as foreigners. Their predecessors had entered this country simultaneously with the conquest of Islam and had become naturalized citizens of India⁴⁰. In 17th century the Saiyeds formed a powerful clique and played a decisive role in the politics of the country⁴¹. In 18th century they became virtual rulers and ‘de facto’ sovereigns when they became the king-makers. The Saiyeds of Barha were famous for their obstinate valour and love of fighting

and to them belonged as their birth-right, the privilege to lead the vanguard of the imperial forces on the battlefield. Moreover, a religious fervour and a heroic demeanour were the distinguishing features of this tribe. Many of them for their services to the state were awarded the coveted title of “Khan” which in course of time often obliterated all traces of their being Saiyeds. The tribal differences and self interest gave birth to jealousy and rivalry between the different groups of the Muslim community. Iran and Turan signified not only two regions but also two type of people differing in race and creed. The rivalry between these two regions was of a long standing nature which brought with it the feelings of hatred and animosity. It reached the climax when the reigning sovereigns played one against the other, in order to ensure the stability of the empire and not to allow either of them to grow so powerful as to become a menace to the throne itself or they might play only a tool in their hands⁴². Anyhow, envy and a passion for individual distinction, as opposed to comradeship and devotion to a common cause, were undoubtedly the driving forces in every department of life⁴³. Apart from tribal animosity, the sectarian division, among the Muslims as Shia and sunni, was another painful feature⁴⁴ which had given birth to bitter relations and pervaded all the ranks of the Muslim society alike⁴⁵.

The descendants of foreign Muslim conquerors, even after a domicile of centuries in Hindustan retained the extra-Indian direction of their hearts and they formed a distinct nation separate from the rest of the Indian population. During Mughal’s period a dispassionate study of the Muslim community reveals that the Muslims became Indianized, though an allowance might be made for their sentimental learning towards Arabicism. Their socio-political attitude shows that the Indian Muslims were different from their co-religionists in the other parts of the world outside India⁴⁶. The Muslims regarded Hindustan as their homeland (*watan*) and were unwilling to cross the Hindu Kush Range or the Helmand river, beyond which lay Turan and Iran. The first dawn of patriotism on the part of Indian Muslim is found in Amir Khusrau, who was proud of being an Indian and bore the title of ‘*Tuti-i-Hind.*’ Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq wanted to make India the home of Muslims. He extended his cooperation and provided all facilities to foreign Muslim settlers and discouraged their return to their native land. When he heard that some Muslim immigrants wanted to go back, he ordered their execution⁴⁷. Later on even the Afghans had as much repugnance to cross the Indus like the Hindus. In the reign of king Akbar an expedition to Kabul was abandoned mainly because the soldiers’ ‘love for India’ acted as a barrier in entering into the Trans-Indus regions⁴⁸. When prince Khusrau was advised by Husain Beg to go to Kabul to secure help against his father Jahangir, the Afghans and Indians deserted him on the bank of the Chenab and ran back. Further we see that after having been defeated at Samugarh, Dara Shukoh fled away through Multan and Sind and reached a place from where begin the road to Persia Via Qandahar. But he dropped the idea to enter into Iran

because his Indian born wives and retainers were reluctant to trust themselves to the power of the Persians⁴⁹. On the other hand the Persians often laughed at the attempt of Indian-born Muslims to dabble in Persian poetry but Shaida as a Persian poet bitterly resented this superiority complex of the Iranians and upheld the claim of India as the most blessed place⁵⁰. It shows that behind the rampart of social exclusiveness, the forces of adjustment and amalgamation were at work and the fusion of the Hindus and Muslims both in the realm of thought and that of action had been slowly gaining ground. Ibn Batuta, notices the peculiarities of the Indian Muslims' life with amusing disapproval. The Brahmans used to teach the students both Hindus and Muslims, who flocked to them from great distance. Firuz Tughlaq might flay alive a Brahman under whose influences Hindu idols were worshipped by some Muslims. The official ban could no longer hold back the natural flow of the process of assimilation when the people of different creeds and communities inhabit the same land⁵¹.

Little evidence exists to draw a true picture of the social structure during the Mughal regime because of the absence of statistical data, prejudice or ignorance has made the resultant picture essentially fragmentary and inadequate. Moreover, conditions differed in different areas and among different classes of people with a sharp contrast between the levels of wealth and life styles. Hence, in general terms, it becomes difficult to describe the standard of life of the people of India. Contemporary writers tell us nothing about the common people and their mode of living and confine their record to a chronicle of kings, courts and conquest rather than that of national and social evolution⁵². According to Baburnama the Indian society on the eve of the Mughal conquest was at the low ebb of civilization due to the disintegration of Delhi sultanate and the rise of centrifugal forces fighting a fierce battle among themselves. In his Tuzuk, Babur wrote that the inhabitants were not well favoured, they had no idea of the pleasures of society, no genius for power of generalization, neither amiability, sympathetic feeling, nor that urbanity of manner which sometimes stands in place of good qualities or conceals their absence. He also pointed to a universal lack of mechanical invention and grandeur of architectural conception. He further observed that there was not only want of institutions like colleges and public baths, but such small aids to study and civilization as are afforded by lamps and candles⁵³. Actually, the year 1526, was the scene of political instability and the next four years were consumed by Babur in battles with the Rajputs and the Lodhis. His description, therefore, relates more to the headless political authority rather than the poverty of the people. Anyhow, during this period the urban life had been completely disturbed and the rumour of Mongol invasions used to scare the people in rural areas. According to Bernier, there was no middle class in Delhi, a man must either be of the highest rank or live miserably. However, it is not a correct assessment because medieval Indian society presented the picture of a pyramid and its apex

was formed by the emperor. Its upper slopes covered the grand imperial court and a small wealthy, luxurious and extravagant aristocracy, the autonomous *Chiefs, Rajas, Mansabdars, Jagirdars* and *Zamindars*, attached with the Mughal administration, lived in the cities. Infact the general character of the daily life of the masses could have changed but little since the days when Megasthenes visited the court of the Mauryan emperor, Chandragupta.

At the base of the social life there were lower classes, the masses or the common people having two tiers, the peasants, as well as workers or artisans, and the agrestic serfs at the bottom. In between these two classes there were many trading, professional and service groups which formed the middle stratum of society. It included the rich traders and merchants, bankers, *sarrafs, mahajans*, thrifty shopkeepers, and various professional classes like accountants and writers or clerks, teachers and other high officials and physicians. It is to be noted that the small middle class, constituting the urban intelligentsia, was never powerful⁵⁴. The traditional structure which had divided the Hindu society in four major castes firmly existed even at the eve of Mughal invasion. The gulf between the upper and the lower classes existing under Akbar increased during the successive reigns. The observers like Thomas Roe, Bernier and Tavernier have all referred to the Yawning gulf between aristocracy and the poor commonality. There was a great contrast between the luxury and extravagance of the upper classes and the dismal poverty and helpless misery of the masses. This cleavage between the aristocracy and the common people may be illustrated as, the farmer robs the peasant, the gentleman robs the farmer, the great robs the lesser. There were many servants and attendants free as well as slaves in the houses of the upper class. An outstanding phenomenon of the Mughal life was the show of luxury and display of personal services by servants and slaves. The servants were free and also hired on low wages. They were allowed only a bare subsistence. Considering the prevailing cheapness of articles it can be said that the rates were not very low as they were paid Rs. 3 to 4 per month. Moreover, they had a lucrative income from tips from the visitors of their masters. In any case their standard of living was better than the poor artisans⁵⁵. Slavery was recognized both in Hindu and Muslim law. Islam in fact enjoins that the slave was not to be persecuted but be well-treated in the household. So in the Indian society slavery existed from the early times and it was differentiated between urban and rural servitude. In towns and cities the slaves were engaged as domestics and in the villages as agricultural labourers and were virtually agrestic serfs. They were hereditary and their ranks swelled through involuntary and voluntary sources of recruitment, as well as imports. Besides indigeneous slaves, there were also imported slaves from Abyssinia, Mozambique and other places in Africa and Persia . The Portuguese, Dutch, English and the Arab merchants shared this trade which continued down to the 19th century⁵⁶. Though the slavery was abolished in India by the proclamation in 1789, but domestic slavery continued in houses of landlords or Muslim nobles even in the

early 19th century. Besides urban slavery there was predial slavery or agricultural bondage in rural areas. The agricultural labourers were practically serfs who in return got by way of subsistence and allowance grain (about 15 mds) and a piece of coarse cloth. This practice is still continued in south Punjab and Sind.

The family was the basic unit of social organization in India. Usually, there was a joint family system in which parents, brothers, cousins, nephews and others lived under one roof as one group and were closely linked with each other. They even owned immovable property in-common. In addition to the blood relations the Indian family also included adopted children, servants, domestic serfs etc. The family of Brahman included a number of students too⁵⁷. According to S.C. Raychoudhary: in ancient times “the rite of *saraddha* played an important part in binding the members with the common ancestors. At the time of the performance of this rite the sons, grandsons and great grandsons of the deceased were present, which naturally bound them together and proved to be a potent force in keeping the family united⁵⁸. Usually the eldest male member was the head of the family who administered family affairs including property. However, in old times, “in Kerala the headship rested with the eldest female member⁵⁹”. The head of the family enjoyed very extensive powers and often behaved in an arbitrary manner. There are many legends stating that the father enjoyed the power of life and death over his sons and even sacrificed them. No doubt great respect and devotion was shown to parents and the sons were their mainstay in their old age. The children were brought up with great care and affection by the parents. Mandelslo wrote: “The children of the Muslims have a particular tenderness to those that brought them into the world; nay, that it is sometimes so great, that they would rather starve themselves, than suffer those from whom they derive their life should want anything requisite for the preservation of their own⁶⁰”.

In Hindu society the position of the woman was not identical because mostly she could not lead a free life and lived under the tutelage of her parents, husband or sons. The Hindu law books treated the woman as equivalent to the Sudra. The high esteem in which wife was held during the vedic age is evident from the fact that she was considered the half that completed the husband. In Islam the position of the woman was not much different though she was given much in the form of legal rights. As regards legal status the prophet assessed woman at half the worth of a man as a witness before the Qazi, two women being held equivalent to one male⁶¹. On the other hand it is a fundamental truth that if a father was to be implicitly obeyed and honoured as the *Kaba* and *Qibla* of both the worlds the mother was to be worshiped in Muslim household; because, the Prophet of God said, ‘paradise lies beneath thine mother’s feet’. It shows that the influence of women whether in the royal *harem* or in the common households was very great in Muslim society. In India, during the Mughal period, the woman lost the proud position of free Arab women⁶², and occupied

definitely a subordinate position having been subjected to the will of their polygamous master⁶³. Nevertheless, the women were treated as the honour of the family. She assisted her husband not only in his general duties but also in household matters. The husband and wife together were always supposed to keep the household fire burning and to look after all the duties of their family. Anyhow, the woman was the honour and *Izzat* of the Indian society. The Muslim woman of upper class observed *Pardah* and disliked to come out in public except clothed in *Burqa*⁶⁴. Rich family women were usually carried in covered coaches, specially in *Palkis* and the poor women went on foot. The Muslim jealousy about their wives and sisters was proverbial and even near relations were not allowed to have a look on the fair damsels of the family⁶⁵. In Hindu culture it was not necessary to observe *pardah* and the women were encouraged to learn singing, dancing and other arts like painting and garland-making. Dancing was not merely the profession of the low-caste women and prostitutes but ladies from respectable Hindu families also took interest in it. The Rigveda tells us that young men and unmarried girls mixed freely and there was no instance of unnecessary restrictions on the married women. However, the women were too much dependent on men for protection and were not supposed to take any initiative. The Hindu women were expected to follow the path adopted by her husband, even if it meant the path of death. After the death of her husband a widow did not remarry and led a very pure and chaste life. The *sati* system was probably also in vogue but there were many incidents of widows burning themselves alive along with the pyre of her husband. The Muslim women unlike the Hindu ladies were more religious minded and well proportioned, though of low stature. Moreover, the morality of the Muslim women was thrice stronger than those of their male counterparts. Majority of the Muslim women of towns learnt Quran by heart and were generally taught religious books. Nevertheless, the upper strata of the Muslim society produced some women literature and Muslim poetesses were not unknown .

Polygamy was common among the Indian nobles and no Muslim ruler except Sultan Nasiruddin was content with one wife in the right spirit of Islam. Though at a time four wives are permissible in Islam but Akbar was the first Muslim ruler who thought of making marital reforms in India. He preached the desirability of marrying one wife though according to Mohammad Yasin "he himself married three hundred wives without divorcing anyone⁶⁶". However, Abul Fazl defended Akbar's inconsistency between preaching and personal practice on the ground of political expediency and charity of heart. When the question of the legal number of wives brought in the *Ibadat-Khana*, Akbar openly accused that Shaikh Abdunnabi had told him before that a man could lawfully marry eighteen wives⁶⁷. It is further mentioned in the *Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh* that one learned Maulvi married eight wives, because he read the verse "two plus three plus four", i.e., nine in all, keeping room for one more perhaps in future⁶⁸ The Muslim community of India suffered

more from the evils of polygamy. It was a luxury of the rich and a liability thoughtlessly incurred even by men of poorer means. A *harem* was a perpetual source of anxiety both for the rich and the poor because domestic harmony and peace could not be expected in a polygamous household. In rural areas a Muslim cultivator whose wives observed *Pardah* was at a decisive disadvantage as compared with the Hindus because his wives could not work in the field, and he must run home to fetch water from the well for the family leaving, ploughing and sowing⁶⁹. Usually, in a polygamous Muslim household the first wife was the most honoured one and she had the precedence in all matters where dignity was to be preserved. She had a control over the management of the household affairs and took charge of other wives of her husband⁷⁰.

The Muslim community of India remained firmly anchored to their great heritage of Islamic culture, the Shari'at and the Quran, like a mighty vessel in stormy water. The Muslims were always proud of their religion and believed that the salvation lay only in following the path of Islam. Generally the Muslims accepted and ate food and other things like sweets prepared by the Hindus. But the rigid Muslims like Brahmans had developed an un-Islamic prejudice of not taking anything cooked by the hands of a non-Muslim, though the Prophet of God permitted the ghazis to take food brought by infidels to them by sanctifying it with *Bismillah*⁷¹. In manners and etiquette the Muslim society was far ahead than other Indian communities. It scrupulously followed the subtle and delightful rules of etiquette towards friends and strangers. The visitors were received warmly while greeting each other, coupled with an inclination of the body. The inferiors would salute by raising their right hand to the head accompanied with a bow. The lower strata of Muslim society, while living with the Hindus, used to say "*Biradar-i-man Ram Ram*". This shows the liberal attitude of the average Muslim to meet the Hindu halfway in social courtesy. Though the moral tone of the Muslim community was not very high but they tried to earn their living by honest means. The Muslims believed in preparing themselves in advance to meet the mortal's inevitable end though a wave of unworldliness had come upon kings and nobles. The pious persons liked to pass their life in most unceremonious and unpretentious manner, taking the most ordinary food for their bare sustenance, and sharing their own with others in need⁷².

The customs and ceremonies were neither uniform nor obligatory with all the sections of the population. It varied according to localities and the notions of a particular family, their religious susceptibilities and social status. An outstanding feature of the social life in India was the observance of a large number of personal ceremonies in the life of the individual. These ceremonies started long before the birth of the child and continued till his death. In Hindu society, at the time of the birth *jatakarma* ceremony was performed which included the whispering, the mantras in the baby's ear, giving him a mixture of honey and *ghee*. Muslims' *Azan* was sounded in the ears of newly born⁷³. The birth of a child was an

event of great pleasure and if it be a male one, the joys were unbound⁷⁴. In rich families the feasting and banqueting were prolonged, with much music and sounding of instruments, and the relations assembled to present congratulations to the new-born child⁷⁵. The final feast was celebrated six day after the birth, called *Chhatti*, which lasted all the night with great illuminations, music, dancing and fireworks⁷⁶. After the period of ceremonial impurity (*Sotak*) was over, the rite of *Aqiqah* was performed. The Hindus in the sixth month performed the *annaprasana* ceremony and “the child was given meat, fish or rice mixed with curds, honey and *ghee* along with the recitation of the vedic verses⁷⁷”. Among the Indians another important ceremony was the rite of initiation to learning “*Bismillah khwani*, pronouncing the name of God, (also called maktab ceremony or the ceremony of commencing the education of a child), was performed amidst the showers of acclamation and good wishes when the infant attained the age of four years, four months and four days⁷⁸”. Among the Muslims “the circumcision (*Khatna, Sunnat*) was usually performed between the age of seven and twelve or fourteen, but it is lawful to do it seven days after birth. Sometimes the boys were circumcised before the *Bismillah Khwani* ceremony as was the case with Mughal princes⁷⁹”. Fryer wrote, “they circumcise the foreskin of the male organ, which is performed by a barber, at eight years of age; with feasting, and carrying the boy about in pomp, with music and great expressions of joy⁸⁰”. Marriage was the next eventful item which was considered to be a sacred bond of union between a male and a female. The marriage was primarily a family affair, arranged by the parents, and the marrying couple had no say into the matter. Among the Hindus the marriage was arranged in consultation with the Brahman taking into account the various omens, horoscopes and auspicious physical characteristics. Usually marriages were held within one’s own caste or tribe⁸¹. The details of marriage ceremonies were so diverse and complicated that a fuller treatment is not possible. Usually *pan*, or betel leaves were distributed as a token of acceptance of the proposal by the members of bride’s family⁸². The wedding ceremony was started with *hena-bandi*, the bride and the bridegroom’s hands and feet were dyed red with the *hena* by ladies concealed behind the curtains⁸³. On the day of marriage the bridegroom came to the house of the bride on horseback “accompanied by his kindred and friends having on each side two pages carrying umbrellas of painted paper⁸⁴”. With fireworks and music playing before him. Thus the procession passing through the main streets of the locality, reached the house of the bride. Their the *nikah* was performed by a Qazi or Mulla and the marriage was registered in Qazi’s register⁸⁵. It is essentially a contract between the wedding parties, a dower debt was agreed upon which was payable to the bride on demand or in case of divorce. After feasts guests were entertained by singers and dancers. Many customs were observed when the bride was first introduced to the bridegroom after the *nikah*. The ancient Hindu custom of carrying away the bride, by real or pretended capture (Rakshasa form of marriage), was also prevalent as early as the days of Ibn Bututa, who witnessed such a ceremony during the marriage

of Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq's sister with a Bedouin Saiyed⁸⁶. Unlike birth and marriage, the death of a Muslim, like that of a social being everywhere and in all ages, was certainly a mournful occasion. No food was cooked in the house of the deceased person for three days. Among the posthumous ceremonies much importance was attached to soyyam which was also called the *ziarat* ceremony, that is, visiting the grave on the third day after burial. On this day Quran was read, sweet-drink, betel-leaves and food was distributed in the name of the deceased⁸⁷ and on the fortieth (*chehallum*), the same ceremony was repeated⁸⁸. Some people observed the half-yearly and annual feasts to provide blessing to the soul of the dead.

Conclusion

Before the advent of Muslim rule it was the Brahman culture which was predominant in the sub-continent. The assimilative spirit of the Hindu culture brought within its fold all new comers: Iranians, Romans, Scythians, Kushans and others and submerged them within itself in such a way that they lost their separate identity and no distinguishing feature of their culture could be easily discerned. But Islamic culture was an exception, which fought against all assimilative forces and retained its distinctive features. However, long and close association of the Hindus and the Muslims did bring about a new blend of the two cultures called Indo-Muslim culture which was the outcome of mutual give and take. This aspect of mutual relationship can be summarized as under:-

1. Muslim conquest of India produced deep and lasting effects on the Indian culture. The net result of this fusion was the birth of new culture and a new civilization, the logical conclusion of this concourse. Despite the spirit of mutual accommodation between the two races, the Muslims maintained their separate identity and a separate outlook on life.
2. In spite of this artificial social and cultural affinity, the two races remained at war against each other, each acting as Challenge to the other. Nevertheless, the Muslims were inclined towards some of the Hindu rituals and traditions and accepted them as part of their social and cultural life. They attached too much sanctity to the shrines and tombs of the saints and religious figures and sought spiritual relief and solace from them. Their celebrations on the birth of a child and the marriage of sons and daughters were also akin to those of the Hindus. Similarly, they mourned the death in the same spirit holding *Soyyam* and *Chehallum*, an equivalent of Hindu *Tija* and *Tairain*. They also participated in the Hindu festivals of Holi, Diwali and Dosehra.
3. Although there was no caste system in Islam, the Muslims developed social taboos among themselves. Basically they were divided into two racial segments. Particu-

larly there was a sharp division among the ruling elites – the Iranians and the Turanians. It was from these two racial segments that the ruling class was recruited and each segment vied with the other for the attainment of political influence and political superiority. There was also a tussle for obtaining political peaks and privileges. There was another class of Indian Muslims who were ignored. There were converts from Hinduism. They enjoyed a comparatively inferior status in society and in the administrative set-up. The gulf between the ruling elite and the Indian Muslims, therefore, widened creating so many social and economic problems and a resultant social imbalance.

4. During the Mughal regime the ruling class consisted of *Jagirdars* and big *zamindars* or the military elites known as *mansabdars*. They controlled the entire socio-economic system, while the peasants, artisans, labourers and the domestic servants who formed a class of their own were ignored and were forced to lead the life of serfs and social inferiors with no chance of improvement in their lot and emancipation from the clutches of the superior class.
5. In spite of the absence of caste system in Islam, the Muslim society was classified into so many divisions and sub-divisions. The division was ethnic, regional and tribal. They were also divided on linguistic, professional and sectarian basis. These divisions hindered the growth of social and national unity and the development of a national outlook.
6. In spite of their conversion to Islam the Neo-Muslims retained their social taboos, their customs and traditions. Hence, on the basis of their social and cultural affinity the Neo-Muslim some times preferred a Hindu neighbour over his Muslim co-religionist. Consequently, there was no deep-rooted feeling of Muslim brotherhood or Muslim solidarity. The regional and parochial feeling gave birth to regional affiliations like Punjabi, Bengali, Sindhi and others.
7. These ethnic and tribal differences among the Muslims ultimately led to the emergence of Muslim revivalist movements under Hazrat Mujaddid Alfsani, Hazrat Shah Waliullah and Haji Shariatullah and others. They created in them religio-political awareness leading to country-wide movements for Muslim welfare and solidarity.
8. On the whole, the Mughal rule was secular and free from anti-Hindu feelings. Hence, barring few exceptions there were no religious riots and no feuds on the basis of religion. The Muslims and Hindus lived amicably sharing each other's worries and woes. It was perhaps in response to the Challenge of Hindu revivalism and Hindu militant movements that the Muslims united themselves politically and formed a separate political platform of their own.

Notes and References

1. Tara Chand, *Society and state in the Mughal Period*, Lahore, 1979, p. 23. For further details see Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, *The Cultural Side of Islam*, Lahore, 1984, pp. 1-22.
2. The Encyclopedia of Americana, (International Edition), Donbury, 1979, pp. 314-315.
3. Ronald Charles Benge, *Cultural Crisis and Libraries in the Third World*, London, 1979, p. 241.
4. S.C. Raychoudhary, *Social, Cultural And Economic History of India (Ancient Times)*, Delhi, 1989, pp. 19-20.
5. S.C. Raychoudhary, *op. cit.*, p. 159.
6. S.C. Raychoudhary, *Social, Cultural And Economic History of India (Modern Times)*, Delhi, 1987, p. 33.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
8. Mohammad Yasin, *A Social History of Islamic India: 1605-1748*, Lahore, 1958, p. 3.
9. "All the Mohammedans (Muslims) of these parts (i.e. of Hindustan) may be said to profess the same religion, but they have among them certain superstitions, and particular manner of life, whereby they are distinguished into several sects, though it may be also alleged, that they are to be accounted rather so many nations (than) different sects". J. Albert de Mandelslo, *The voyages and Travels of J. Albert de Mandelslo – into the East-Indies*, (trans), John Davies, 2nd. ed., London, 1932, p. 65
10. "The Ashraf, the honourable people, consisted of men who were descended or claimed descent from those who had come to India as conquerors and rulers from other parts of the Islamic world. Among them were included Arabs, Persians, Turks, Mughals and Afghans who were identified in India as Saiyeds, Shaikhs, Mughals and Pathans. Muhammad Saleem Ahmad, *The All India Muslim League*, Bahawalpur, 1988, pp. 1-2.
11. "The Ajlaf were of Local origin – they belonged to the lower strata of heir Islamic society in India and that they did not command the same respect and position as did most members of the Ashraf group". *Ibid.*, p. 2.
12. Tara Chand, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-30.

13. Quoted from S.C. Raychoudhry, *op. cit.*, (Modern Times), p. 29. For further details see Khwaja Nizamuddin Ahmad, *Tabaqat-i-Akbari*, (English translation), M.A.B.De, vol. III, Calcutta, 1927-1939.
14. Jadunath Sarkar, *Mughal Administration*, 3rd. ed., Calcutta, 1935, p. 16. Also see R.P. Tripathi, *Some Aspects of Muslim Administration*, Allahabad, 1956.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 24
16. Dubois, *J.A. Hindu Customs and Manners*, n.p., n.d., pp. 57-58.
17. Tara Chand, *op. cit.*, p. 60
18. From Turan or Trans-oxiana, the country lying between Khwarizm on the west and the oxus on the south from Badakhshan to the frontiers of Khwarizm.
19. During his stay in Persia Humayun came somewhat under the Shia influence. On his return from Persia, the Persians followed in his train in large number. This was resented by the orthodox section of his followers. Abdul Qadir Badauni, *Muntakhab-ul-Tawarikh*, (Bid-Ind.), (English Translations, S.A. Ranking, vol. I, Calcutta, 1898, W.H. Lowe, 2nd. ed., vol. II, Calcutta, 1924, Wolseley Haig, vol. III, Calcutta, 1925), vol. I, p. 468.
20. Thomas Roe, and John Fryer, *Travels in India in the Seventeenth century*, London, 1873, p. 179.
21. Jean Baptiste Tavernier, *Travels in India*, (trans.), V. Ball, Vol . II, London , 1889, p. 177.
22. Francois Bernier, *Travels in the Mogul Empire (1656-1668)*, (i) Trans, and ed., Irving Brock, (ii) Revised ed., Archibald constable, London, 1981. Further revised ed., V.A. Smity, London, 1914, 1916, p. 146.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 146-153.
24. Jadunath Sarkar, *History of Aurangzeb*, vol. V, Calcutta, n.d., p. 265.
25. *Ibid.*, vol. III, p. 70.
26. Edward Terry, *A voyage to East-India*, London, 17737 p. 122.
27. Jadunath Sarkar, *op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 266.
28. Niccolao Manucci, *Storia Do Mogor (1653-1708)*, (trans. William Irvine, vols. IV), vol. II, London, 1907-1908, p. 454.

29. A.S. Beveridge, *Baburnama*, (English trans., vols. II), n.p., 1921, p. 156.
30. Francois Bernier, *op. cit.*, p. 206.
31. Thomas Roe and John Fryer, *op. cit.*, p. 285.
32. Niccolao Manucci, *op. cit.*, p. 453.
33. There were three types of conversions to Islam in India. First, voluntary; and it was the result of *tabligh* of the Muslim missionaries in which Muslim saints played a conspicuous part. Secondly, when Hindus embraced Islam in the hope of worldly gains. Third, forcible; it should be noted that these forcibly converted Hindus returned to Hinduism whenever they got a chance. Muhammad Qasim Hindu Shah Firishta, *Tarikh-i-Firishta*, (English trans.), John Briggs, vol. IV, London, 1829, p. 487.
34. A.S. Beveridge, *op. cit.*, vol. III, pp. 958, 1245.
35. For example, Hasan Khan Bachgoti see Badauni, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 25.
36. Shaikh is an Arabic word, meaning an elder or chief, and probably corresponds very closely to the tribes of Arabia with *chaudhuri* among those of the Punjab. Thomas Roe and John Fryer, *op. cit.*, p. 279.
37. J. Albert de Mandelslo, *op. cit.*, p. 65.
38. The king Akbar once ordered that the Sunnis should stand separately from the Shia, the Indian Muslims without exception went to the Sunni side and the Persians to the Shia side. Abdul Qadir Badauni, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 337.
39. J. Albert de Mandelslo, *op. cit.*, p. 65.
40. The true Saiyeds are the descendants of Hazrat Ali, and strictly speaking, the word includes only those descendants who were born of Hazrat Bibi Fatima. But there are Alavi saiyeds, who are said to be descendants through other wives. The origin of the Barha saiyeds was assigned to the saiyed Abul Farah Wasiti, son of Saiyed Daud or Saiyed Husain, who came to Ghazni in 389 A.H. For further details see H.A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province*, vol. III, Lahore, 1911-1919, pp. 390-394.
41. A.S. Beveridge, *op. cit.*, vol. III, pp. 225, 244.
42. For instance, Aurangzib to counter-act the pre-eminence of Asad Khan and Zulfiqar Khan, the Irani nobles began to promote the nobles of the Turani party. Saqi Must'ad Khan, *Maasir-i-Alamgiri* (English trans.), Jadunath Sarkar, Calcutta, 1947, pp. 214-216.

43. The instances of jealousies and rivalries and the selfishness of the Muslim nobles are so numerous that they hardly need any particular mention.
44. Jean Baptiste Tavernier, *op. cit.*, p. 175.
45. Whole the Muslim community happened to be divided in belief, they could not withhold their tongue from cursing each other. For details see Ranking, *op. cit.* vol. III, pp. 404, 474.
46. Albert de Mandelslo, who had travelled extensively nearly all over the Muslim World, observes: "óówe shallóótreat of the manner of life of the Mahumetans of Indies, which is much different from that of the Turks and Persians." Mandelslo, *op. cit.*, p. 62.
47. Ibn Batuta, *Travels in Asia and Africa: 1325-1354*, (Urdu Translation.), vol. II, p. 157.
48. A.S. Beveridge, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 522.
49. K.R. Qanungo, *Dara Shukoh*, vol. I, Calcutta, 1953, p. 199.
50. Sher Khan, *Mirat-ul-Khiyal*, Calcutta, 1831, pp. 109-111.
51. Elliot and Dowson, *Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi*, (English translation.), vol. III, p. 365.
52. V.A. Smith, *Akbar the Great Mogul*, Oxford, 1917, p. 386.
53. For details see Tuzuk-i-Baburi (Babur's Memoirs), in original Turki.
54. Francois Bernier, *op. cit.*, p. 252.
55. Francisco Pelsaert, (1620-1626), *The Remonstrantie*, (English Translation), W.H. Moreland and P. Geyl, Cambridge, 1925, pp. 60-62.
56. For details see M. Martin, *The History, Antiquities, Topography and Statistics of Eastern India*, London, 1838, p. 496. For further details see Reuben Levy, *The Social Structure of Islam*, Cambridge, 1962, pp. 78-89.
57. S.C. Raychoudhary, *op. cit.*, (Ancient Times), p. 164.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 164.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 164.
60. Albert de Mandelslo, *op. cit.*, p. 62.
61. For Position of women in Islam and relevant traditions and extracts from the Quran bearing on the subject see T.P. Hughes, *A Dictionary of Islam*, London, 1935.

62. For example, khalifa Mahdi was a puppet in the hands of his wife. Harun's wife, Zubaida Khatun, proved ultimately more powerful than the all powerful Barmicides. Turkish women were equally aggressive. The influence of women in the caliphate reached its zenith in the hands of Khalifa Muqtadir's Turkish mother. For details see D.S. Margoliouth, *Umayyads and Abbasids*, London, 1907, pp. 229-231.
63. For further details see Sir Thomas Roe, and Jhon Fryer, *op. cit.*, p. 450.
64. The veil or covering used for the seclusion of women when walking outside. For a description of *Burq'a* see Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 95.
65. J. Ovington, *A Voyage to Suratt in the year 1689*, London, 1696, p.210.
66. Mohammad Yasin, *op. cit.*, p. 125.
67. Badauni, Text, vol. II. p .270.
68. *Ibid.*, p .270.
69. Muhammad Yasin, *op. cit.*, p. 126.
70. *Ibid.*, p. 127.
71. The Hindus had also the same scruple. See Tavernier, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 273.
72. Jadunath Sarkar, *Massir-i-Alamgiri*, p. 318.
73. Sikandar Gujrati, *Mirat-i-Sikandari*, (English Trans.), Fazlullah Lutfullah Faridi, Dharampur, n.d., p. 121.
74. Muhammad Yasin, *op. cit.*, p. 62.
75. Niccolao Manucci, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 150.
76. *Ibid.*, p. 150.
77. S.C.Raychoudhary, *op. cit.*, (Ancient Times), p. 163.
78. Khwaja Nizamuddin Ahmad, *Tabaqat-i-Akbari*, (English trans.),
79. Muhammad Yasin, *op.,cit.*, p.64.
80. Thomas Roe and Jhon Fryer, *op. cit.*, p. 281.
81. *Ibid.*, p.279. Also see Bernier, *op. cit.*, p. 259.
82. Muhammad Yasin, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

83. Abdul Hamid Lahori, *Badshahnama*, vol. I (Part II), (English trans.), Kabiruddin Ahmad and Abdur Rahim, Calcutta, 1867-1868, pp. 267-268. Also see vol. II, p. 305.
84. J. Albert de Mandelslo, *op. cit.*, p. 62.
85. Francisco Pelsaert, *op. cit.*, p. 83.
86. Niccolao Manucci, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p.1 51.
87. Saqi Must'ad Khan,(trans.), Jadunath Sarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 294.
88. Abdul Qadir Badauni (trans.), W.H .Lowe, vol. II, p. 50.