AMBER OFFICIALS AT THE MUGHAL COURT

Considering the fact that the Raja had to attend his watan and tankhwān jagāirs as also the far flung subedāris and faujdāris, it is deemed essential to understand the instrumentality of the officials who amicably dealt the affairs at the Imperial Court on behalf of the Raja. Notable among these officials were wakīl and diwān. The multiplicity of their functions made their presence felt both at the state and centre.

WAKĪL

Under the Mughals, mansabdārs, jagirdārs, nobles and princes who were stationed at the provinces for one or the other purpose and there upon could not be in regular attendance at the Imperial Court, used to appoint certain persons as their wakīl.¹

---

¹ Ram Chand was the wakīl of Najabat Khan in the reign of Aurangzeb, Mirāt-ul Haqāiq, Itimad Ali Khan, M.S. Fraser 124, India Office Library, M.F. No.127 History Department, A.M.U. Sikandar Muin also had a wakīl in the imperial Court in the reign of Shahjahan, Surat Singh, Tazkira-i-Pir Hassu Taili f.122(b) M.S. History Department, A.M.U., Amin Abdus Salam Mashhadi was the wakīl of prince Khurram at the Imperial court in the 17th RY of Jahangir, Khwaja Kamgar Hussain, Maqṣir-i-Jahāngīrī, ed. A.Alavi, Bombay, 1978. For wakīls of Ajit Singh; Budh Singh, Rana, See WR Baisākh Sudi 1, 1722/7 May 1715 etc. For our region see G.D. Sharma: Vakil Reports Maharajgan 1693-1712, 1987. Also see Sumbul Halim Khan: Correspondence of Raja of Amber with Mughal Court - a calendar of wakil's letters to the rulers 1681-1715 (unpublished dissertation).
The appointment of wakil at the court is said to have begun from the time of Mansigh, while the office continued till at least the time of Sawai Jai Singh.

The wakil had to be conversant with both Persian and Hindawi. His command over these languages is evident from the wakil's report. Generally speaking the Persian reports tend to be verbose, while those in hindawi are more concise. It may be added that till the reign of Aurangzeb, the impact of persian on hindawi was tremendous, often the latter being transcript of Persian into hindawi. The wakil report of the later period in striking contrast was a mixture of Rajasthani dialect.

1. Panchauli Jagjiwan Das complains here of his monetary condition by comparing himself with the wakils of Man Singh's period WR Phalgun Sudija 12, 1767/23 March 1710, which reveals the presence of wakil in the time of Man Singh.

2. The information relates to the year 1739 when the wakil Kirpa Ram was representing his master at the imperial army. Iqbalnama, p.68.
Hereditary nature of the Office

The office of wākil tended to run in a particular family. In 1715, the wākil informed Maḥārāja (Jaisingh - Sawai) while pleading his case that the office of wākil of Bundi has been in his family from four or five generation.

The succession to the office was considerably spontaneous. Hence Parikshat Rai succeeded his father Kesho Rai at a very tender age, Kesho Rai as will be seen in the subsequent discussion did not have a very sound career. We even find close relatives like sons-in-law and brothers obtaining the offices of the current incumbent.

The same person could be the wākil of more than one master. This may be seen from a wākil's report of 1715, in which the wākil reminds the Maḥārāja that "when he (the Maḥārāja) and Ajit Singh had camped at Pohkar the Maharaja...".

---

1. WR Phālgun Sudi, 12, 1767/23 March 1710
2. WR Śawan Sudi 11, 1772/13 Aug.1715.
3. WR Phālgun Vadi, 7, 1761/7 March 1705, also see supra for the case of Kesho Rai.
4. Panchauli Jagjiwandas whose brother Meghraj was serving the Mahārāja as wākil seemed the wakālat see WR. Śawan Vadi 5, 1762/20 Aug 1705. Similarly, Jagjiwandas pleaded to the Maharaja to appoint his son in law Ghan Ram who was already serving the Prince of Amber. WR Baisākh Vadi, 13, 1768/21 April 1711.
had asked him (wakil) that "you have already got my (Maharaja's) and Ajit Singh's wakilat, why do you not take the wakilat of the Rana also. Then at one side will be your Maharaja and on the other Ajit Singh, in the middle there will be Rana. Accordingly I got the latter's wakilat. now that matters of Bundi have settled,"¹ I am hopeful to become the wakil of Bundi as well.² The succeeding chapter will reveal that these Rajas were not always on good terms it would have therefore been remarkable on the part of the wakil to keep all the masters satisfied without inviting suspicion.

The wakils could be recalled to serve in other bureaucratic positions under the Maharaja at the watan or any other pargana in jagir, from the arhsattas of pargana Chatsu, it is evident that Megh Raj a wakil of Amber stationed at the imperial court served from 1711 to 1715 as 'amil and in 1715 as amin of Chatsu. During this period he is naturally not found despatching any reports to the Maharaja from the Imperial court.

-------------
1. Budh Singh was reinstated at his watan jagir Bundi, WR dated Bhadva Sudi 12, 1772/13 Sept. 1715.
2. WR dtd Baisakh Sudi, 1, 1772/7th May 1715
Caste:

The wakils of Amber known to us are Mirza Anwar, Raghunath (1639) Kesho Das (1641), Roopchand (1675), Kanwal Nain (1681), Udai Rai (1685) Kesho Rai (1689), Megh Raj (1692) Sad Ram (1696), Parikshit Rai (1705), Jagjiwan Das (1711), Jag Ram, Kirpa Ram Maya Ram and Keshav Das (1717). Among these except for Mirza Anwar, all belonged to Kaiyastha caste. The family of Jagjiwan Das, which dominated the wakalat for several generations was that of Panchauli Sept, of the Kayasthas.

The duration for which the above mentioned wakils officiated is difficult to demarcate since at least two of these officiated simultaneously, often the arzdahs bear the name of both the wakils.

1. See Waki1s Reports for different years.
3. WR Asoj Vadi 11, 1698/20 Sept. 1641. The arzdah is written by both Raghunath and Kesho Das also Magh Vadi 15, 1698/22 Nov.1641 etc. The exact months of their tenure, however, is not mentioned.
Remuneration:

The wākīl of Amber received a salary of Rs. 2000/- annually\(^1\) besides the provision of Rs. 6000/- for monthly expenditure at the Imperial court.\(^2\) For the latter amount he was expected to send full details of disbursement.\(^3\)

Status:

The wākīl had a high enough status to keep, almost that of a noble.\(^4\) The wākīls demanded favours like the title of Rai, elephants, tāmba pattar (copper plate grant) village, havelī (house) and orchard in Amber.\(^5\) Besides this, they were allowed to use palangins by the Emperor.\(^6\)

---

1. WR dated Mītī Phālguṇ Sūdī 12, 1767/23 March 1710. In the descriptive list of wākīl reports published from Bikaner in 1967 no.630/1014 Persian wākīl's report of Megh Raj is listed in which he thanks the Maharaja for increasing his salary to Rs.4000/- per month. The last seems to be an error for per annum we have evidence indicating wākīl Gulab Chand's salary amounting to Rs.6000/- annually Arzdasht Sāwan vadi 3, 1768/22 June 1711. This pay scale is not found repeated subsequently.

2. WR 25 Shawa'al 1118/19 Jan 1707

3. WR 21 Shabān 1103/26 April 1692 also WR 17 Zīalgād 1116/7 Feb 1707.

4. WR dtd Phālguṇ Sūdī 12, 1767/23 March 1710 also WR dtd Phālguṇ Sūdī 2, 1767/13 March 1710.

5. WR dtd Māgh Vadi 4, 1770/23 Dec 1713.

6. WR dtd Baisākh Sūdī 1, 1772/7 May 1715
Their status can also be determined from the expenditure incurred in marriages. The wakils married their children with great pomp as may be discerned from following description, Previously Raja Udot Singh had arranged for the marriage of my daughter in Kheina and had given her Rs. 50,000. For the second daughter, Pratap Singh the brother of Raja (Udot Singh) gave 20,000.

It is noteworthy that such an important official had occasions to complain again delayed payment by the Maharaja. A report of 1710 says that "the wakil from Man Singh time till this date had lived like nobles. It is only I, who is left in such a monetary strain."

-----------------------
1. WR dtd Paush Sudi 6, 1769/24 Jan 1712
2. Again in 1715, "your majesty fourteen months back, I had sought Rs.8000/- from you. At the time of the marriage of my brother also, I did not receive anything from the state, so I borrowed the amount for the marriage. The Emperor has gone to Lahore and I do not have any means of getting the money. The expenses are enormous. The bohra is pressing me hard for repaying the money. I am waiting for the previous amount of salary to be paid to me.

If not then the revenue of a few villages in pargana Baswa and Chatsu may be granted to me out of your jãñirs" WR Phalgun Sudi 1767/23 March 1710.
Responsible to Emperor as well as the Maharaja:

The wakil was answerable for his actions to the Maharaja as well as the Emperor. The Emperor at times handed such cases as that of embezzlement by a wakil to the Maharaja,\(^1\) who in turn was not very lenient since Kesho Rai is reported to have attempted suicide for fear of a strict decision.\(^2\) In another instance, we find the Emperor dismissing the wakil without referring the matter to the Maharaja.\(^3\)

Nature of duty:

The wakils were expected to represent the interest of their employees at the court such as by exploring possibilities for securing mansab, izâfa, jâgîr, ijâra,\(^4\) inâm, sîbadâri or faujdâri. They were to safeguard their interest against their opponents plead for their masters in case of alleged irregularities committed by them and to justify their masters conduct in every fashion.

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

1. WR dtd Zíalgâd 27, 1103/31 July 1692
2. WR 117/540 undated
3. WR Phâlgun vâdi 7, 1761/7 March 1707
4. For details regarding the conscious efforts of the wakil in such matters see infra Chapter I.
Regarding the specific duties of a wakīl, Jagjiwan Das, writes in an arzdāt that the wakīl should be in the imperial court, and collect news from the nobles, who attend the court and also from the diwān of Kachehri, the wāqia navīs, and the khufia navīs and should attend every session of the darbār.¹

He was also expected to accompany the Imperial army.² Among other things, he was to urge the Imperial chancery to use all the titles assigned to his Mahārājā.³

To accomplish his duties, the wakīl had to maintain regular correspondence with this employer. The detailed correspondence can be classified as follows.

The wakīl dispatched akhbarat (news bulletin). These were copied out from the akhbār-i-darbār-i-mu‘allā, which included every request publicly made, every order issued by

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

1. WR dtd Baisākh Vadi 12, 1771/30 March 1714.

2. The WR are replete with references to either instructions of officials directing to accompany the Imperial army (WR Māngsir Vadi 1, 1769) 3 Nov 1712 or information of important events being despatched by the wakīl to the Rāja WR dtd Phālgun Sudi 1, 1768/23 Feb 1711, Phālgun Sudi 10, 1768/7 April 1712, Chaitra Vadi 9, 1769/16 April 1712 etc.

3. WR Baisākh 12, 1770/23 April 1713.
the Emperor and all enquiries made, such documents cover the period from 1676 to 1730.

The other category comprises the siyāhs and yaddāshāt, which bear the name of the wakil, one such siyāh reports the increase in Mansab and jagār of Bishan Singh.¹ Yaddāshāt too record the assignments along with the name of mahāl.²

Finally there are the wakil reports which are in themselves a mine of information considering the fact that they are consolidated information which has otherwise to be gleaned from Akhbarāt farnāns, parwānas, Yaddāshāt, iltimās, siyāhs Muchalka, mahzār, nishāns and haqbul hykum.

These reports contain much information of historical importance. Significant light is shed on the appointments of nobles to various posts and increase in their mansab. Apart from which serious reflections on the accumulation of arrears of nobles in the year 1714 is recorded.³ Similarly the lack of concern on the part of the Emperor towards the administration is comprehensively brought out in

1. Siyāh 5 Jamādi 1101/15 Feb 1690 R.S.A.
2. Yaddāshāt 1106-7/1695-6, R.S.A.
3. WR Chaitra sudi 2, 1771/17 March 1714
these day to day records. War of succession, hundis, are among some other subjects of interest in these reports.

Wakil's contacts

The wakil maintained contacts with nobles due to the complexity in the nature of their service we find him informing" I go to the prince daily to wish him and he thinking that I am your servant honours me ".

Mirza Sadruddin, Mohammad Khan, Bakhshiul Mulk have agreed to favour, whenever any request is made through them to the Emperor".

"At present Khwaja Mahram Khan, Hafiz Anwar and Masud are closer to the Emperor. I always attend them that is why they are happy and they have invited any request from you."

Prince Qaimbaksh conferred mansab of 300, I could not accept the offer because I would not have been able to serve you".

1. WR Baisakh vadi 13, 1768/21 April 1711
2. WR Phālgun vadi 7, 1761/21 Feb 1704
3. Ibid
Representation of Imperial viewpoint

Being at the court he tended to see many things from the point of view of the Imperial Court thus we find him insisting during the war of succession that Maharaja should come to the court and leave Ajit Singh alone\(^1\), or again cautioning the Maharaja against appropriation of revenue from the smaller jagir\(\ddot{d}\)ar and zamind\(\ddot{a}\)rg.\(^2\)

Role:

From the above discussion it may be discerned that wakil was an important official who acted as a communication channel between the Maharaja and the Emperor as well as the Maharaja and other nobles. It would not be out of place to cite instances revealing his instrumentality in gaining favours. Kanwal Nain in 1681, requested the Emperor through Umdat ul Mulk to grant the title of Maharaja to his master as well as for addition of Chatsu and Kehrauli to his jagir and the responsibility of guarding Khyber and Jamrud.\(^3\)

\(^{1}\) WR Phalgun Sudi 12, 1769/9 March 1712.

\(^{2}\) WR dtd As\(\ddot{a}\)rh Vadi 5, 1769/9 June 1713; WR dtd Pa\(\ddot{u}\)sh Vadi 12, 1771/6 Jan 1714; WR dtd As\(\ddot{a}\)rh Vadi 17, 1771/2nd July 1714; WR dtd As\(\ddot{a}\)j Sudi 10, 1771/21 Oct. 1714.

\(^{3}\) WR dtd Shawa\(\ddot{a}\)l 3, 1092/6 Oct. 1681
Bhagwandas in the same year tried to obtain a *jāgīr* in Tirhut worth 43,000 *dāms* for the Maharāja.\(^1\) In 1688 the *watan* of Amber and Bahatri amounting to 30,000,00/- *dāms* was sought in *jāgīr*; and this was granted by the Emperor.\(^2\) In 1694, Megh Raj applied for the *jāgīr* of Baswa instead of Malarna since the *jama* of latter was inflated. Parikṣhit Rāi obtained *jāgīr* in Dausa worth 4,15,530 *dāms*\(^3\) together with the exemption from branding of horses for the Maharāja.\(^4\)

The office of *wakil* gained all the more importance in the last years of Jai Singh Sawai’s time due to the prevalent political condition at the Imperial Court which could prove better possibilities to secure favours. The office remained in tact at least till the reign of Jai Singh Sawai\(^5\), subsequent to which our information is lacking.

Dīwān:

The dīwān was the official responsible for the finances of the Rāja and its remittance to the Imperial

1. WR dtd Zīlalhāj 22, 1092/23 Dec.1681
2. WR dtd Ramzān 20, 1099/9 July 1688
4. WR dtd Baisākh Sudi 10, 1764/16 May 1707.
5. WR Paush Sudi 1787/Dec 1730 also Iqbalnama op.cit.
treasury. For the purpose he had to be in regular attendance at the court. He accompanied the Imperial army too. Diwan Ram Chandra was killed on such a trip.

Duties:

The Diwan was disbursed the amount incurred at the imperial court and he handed over the amount required by the wakil and for the rest he was responsible. Among these expenditures were those incurred on nazr, payment of dawab etc. which he paid on behalf of the Raja.

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

1. Arzdasht of Bhikhari Das, Phalgun Vadi 5, 1768/16 Feb 1712.

2. Arzdasht Kartik Sudi 2, 1768/1 Nov 1711; Arzdasht Bhikhari Das Asoj Sudi 5, 1768/6 Oct. 1711.

3. Arzdasht Mangsir vadi 1, 1769/3 Nov.1712, Arzdasht Sawan vadi 3, 1768/22 June 1711, Asoj Sudi 5, 1768/3 Oct. 1711 etc. WR Phalgun Sudi, 16, 1768/11 March 1712.


5. Arzdasht of Bhikari Das Kartik Sudi, 2, 1768/1 Nov. 1711, Asoj Sudi 6, 1768/6 Oct.1711

6. Arzdasht Kartik Sudi 2, 1768/1 Nov.1711.

7. Arzdasht Kartik Sudi 2, 1768/1 Nov.1711; Arzdasht Asahr Sudi 5, 1768/10 June 1711; Arzdasht Phalgun vadi 12 1767/3 Feb 1711 etc.
He also pleaded the Raja's case in the presence of the nobles.¹ He gave earnest suggestions to the Raja.²

The diwan maintained regular correspondence with the Raja³ and intimated every detail of the court including the attitude and manipulations of the nobles,⁴ and the attempts of wakil and himself in expediting such matters.⁵ His arzdashts are often a duplication of the wakil reports.⁶

At least two diwans officiated simultaneously.⁷ Though their jurisdiction were not demarcated they worked in full

1. Ibid; Arzdasht Bhadva Sudi 3, 1768/6 Aug 1711; Ibid, Sawan Vadi 13, 1768/2 July 1711.
2. Ibid Phalgun vadi 12, 1767/3 Feb 1711 etc.
3. See arzdashts of the diwans addressed to Jai Singh, R.S.A. Bikaner.
4. Arzdasht Bhadva Sudi, 14, 1768/14 Sept. 1711; Asoj Sudi 6, 1768/6 Oct. 1711; Magh Sudi 1, 1768/27 Jan 1712.
6. Arzdasht Phalgun Sudi 2, 1768/27 Feb 1712; WR dtd Phalgun Sudi 10, 1768/5 March 1712; numerous such examples can be cited from a perusal of wakil's report and the arzdashts of the diwan.
7. See arzdashts of the diwans op. cit.
cooperation. Both maintained correspondence with the Rāja and received separate parwānas. The diwanship of Ajit Singh was held at the same time. The position of diwan in such a condition could be vulnerable. The wakīl complained once that diwan Bhandari Das was being partial towards Ajit Singh and was receiving enhancement in mansab of Ajit Singh and his son along with such important post as the Subandari of Gujarat. The Raja gave serious consideration to this problem, fortunately enough the other wakīl had nothing to say against diwan Bhandari Das.

Our information lacks on the salary of the diwan though we have evidence to the fact that he was subassigned jāgīr from Raja's own jāgīr.

The diwan enjoyed a fairly respectable position at the Imperial Court and due weightage was given to his pleadings.

1. Arzdāşht, Phālgun Vadi 5, 1768/1769/16 Feb 1712; Mānsūr Vadi 11, 1769/1768/13 Nov.1712 etc.
2. Arzdāşht, Bhādva Sudī, 3, 1768/1768/6 Aug 1711; Aśōji Sudī 15, 1768/1768/15 Oct. 1711 etc.
3. Arzdāşht, Bhādva Sudī, 3, 1768/1768/6 Aug 1711; Aśōji Sudī 15, 1768/1768/15 Oct. 1711 etc.
4. WR dtd Mānsūr Vadi 9, 1769/1768/11 Nov. 1712.
5. Arzdāşht Mānsūr Vadi, 11, 1769/1769/13 Nov. 1712.
He was bestowed favours too from the Imperial Court. Diwan Bhandari received sculpture of tiger and diwan Bhikhari Das was given dhukdhuki.¹

1. Arzdāsht Māngsir Vadi 5, 1769/7 Nov. 1712.