CHAPTER-5
It has hitherto been stated that the Mughal Emperor was the paramount power so far as his relations with the chiefs were concerned. It would appear that they were dependent solely upon the goodwill of the Emperor and not on their inherent rights. In our study of the relations of the Amber Raja with the Emperor, a perusal is made of the spheres, in which paramountcy was exercised the extent to which it stretched. Whether or not the passage of time could alter its intensity.

Since the time of Akbar, Mughals asserted right on their nobles to present themselves in the court wherever their services were required. In no case, this condition was relaxed. We know one of the factors regarding the failure of the negotiations with Maharana Pratap was that the latter requested exemption to personal homage at the Mughal Court which was not acceptable to Akbar. This practice continued till our period as we find in a wakil report by Jagjiwan Das addressed to Maharaja Jai Singh.

requesting the Mahārāja to reach the court as desired by the Emperor and to leave Ajit Singh in case he delays because the latter ancestors acted in a similar manner unlike Mahārāja's ancestors who were always present in Emperors service.1

Another instance is reflected in wākīl report wherein it is stated that the wākīl submitted to the Nawab that except for the physical presence of the Mahārāja all the conditions are accepted and that sūbēdāri of Malwa and Gujarat be granted to Jai Singh and Ajit Singh respectively without attending the court as it was done by Emperor Aurangzeb in case of Jaswant Singh.2 The plea was however turned down.

The Amber chiefs in the earlier phase were not important from the point of view of their territorial resources. But they were important keeping in view their clan (ulus) based organization with a chain of local potentates. The Kachhawahas being the territorial chief and the head of their clan had exercised 'sovereign rights' therefore occupied considerable importance in the Mughal polity. Though the Amber house developed its economic

1. WR dtd miti Phāgun Sudī 12 V.S. 1767/2 March 1710.
2. WR dtd Kārtik Vadi 4, 1769/7 Oct. 1712.
resources only after the submission to the Mughals; their clan affiliation were always valued by the Mughal Emperors. With the passage of time they were not treated by the Mughal court as ordinary zamindars. It would also not be out of context here to recall that Kachhawahas were one of the largest beneficiaries so far as mansabds and jagirs are concerned. In return, these chiefs, who had a clan following and could muster a larger army proved their worth and sincerity to the Mughal Emperors. The Emperor was at times so pleased with them, that, they were entrusted with important administrative assignments and they served at Akbarabad (Agra), Jahanabad (Delhi), Sri Muttra Ji (Mathura) and so on in different capacities.

The term zamindars was used in all official papers, it has, however, been noted in the case of Amber that the correspondence between the chiefs invariably refers to their states as desh or rāj nor does the term zamindar ever occur in their records in reference to one another. Thus it is felt the usage of such terms as watan and zamindar does not reflect the true position of the Amber rulers.¹ Though the above mentioned correspondence, namely, Khutoot Ahalkalan

do not refer to watan and zamīndār, but, all petitions and memorandum addressed to the Emperor have references to the above terms. The two kind of correspondence, therefore, should not be treated in isolation.

The Emperor is said to have played an essential role in the succession (tīka) of the chiefs to the throne. While, we are on the one hand acquainted with the assertion of this imperial prerogative as early as Jahangir's reign in the case of Bikaner and Maha Singh of Amber; on the other hand, there are scholars who tend to believe that the Emperor's right was of confirmatory rather than discretionary nature.

In the above perspective, the period which followed the battle of Jajau, whereby, the watan of Amber was confiscated to khālisā and later conferred on Vijay Singh seems to be of much relevance. Herein the intention of the Emperor to exercise greater control in Amber is gleaned. As the events proved, the Rāja wielded considerable power to

1. See Arzdashts, Yaddāshts etc. R.S.A.
resist the Emperor's authority. A reflection of which was found in the killing of Saiyid Hussain Khan and the subsequent plunder. The Raja could mobilize a sizeable section of the nobility in a favourable disposition. Restoration of watan and grant of an audience with the Emperor followed.

It was also the imperial privilege to assign jagirs, wherever, the Emperor intended to. Territories as close to Amber as Chatsu and Manoharpur were in imperial khālis. It has also been convincingly argued that the territories assigned were not in entirety. In fact, other nobles were assigned the same parnana while a portion was retained in khālisa. The ijāras were similarly given on short term

1. Jai Singh in fact tried to display his military strength to the Emperor while he intended to visit Amber. Instructions were issued to subassignees to collect impressive troops of Rajawat, Shekhawat, Naruka etc. for the purpose. See Parwāna, Māngair Vadi 2, V.Ś. 1764/31 Oct.


3. See supra Chapter VI also Vir Vinod, pp. 781-84.


5. Arzdāsht addressed to Bishan Singh V.Ś, 1750/1693.

6. For tabulation of these assignments see Agrarian System of Eastern Rajasthan, pp. 8-9.
leases. All this was due, in the main, to curtail the control of the Raja over a larger principality.

Notwithstanding the above attempts as we have seen in an earlier chapter, the Raja resorted to other measures to achieve greater control.¹

The posts of sūbedāri, faujdāri etc. depended solely on the will of the Emperor. The faujdāri of jat mahāls along with jagārdāri was imposed upon the Raja at a time when he had least the intention of availing it.² The Raja subsequently parcelled out the pargana to the village headmen who were the local potentates.³

At a time, when the Raja was desirous for the sūbedāri of Malwa, the petition was delayed due to the fact that Ajit Singh coveted sūbedāri of Gujarat and the two Rajput Rajas in a close neighbourhood could be a source of anxiety for the Emperor. As late as 1713, the Rājas were appointed to the said sūbedāris.⁴ In the later years, the Raja could

1. See infra Ch. II.
2. WR dtd 7 Jamādi II 1105/24 Jan. 1694.
3. Jamābandi record 1101-2/1694 also 'Revenue farmers and zamindārs in pargana Kol 1694'.
avail even more such posts.\textsuperscript{1}

It is noteworthy that Emperor could mediate in the administration of the Rājas watan or tankhwa jāgīr. Testimony to which is found in the regulations and reprimands against levying of pēshkash, nazrāna and farmāish,\textsuperscript{2} also against the consumption of Sambhar salt.\textsuperscript{3} How far these effected the Rāja unfortunately, is not found in our evidence.

The hierarchy of officials such as the Khufia navis, wāqīa navis and the like penetrated the administrative set up of the Rāja and provided every detail at the court. These officials too were bribed by the Rāja so much so that trivial matters were inflated to desirable extent.\textsuperscript{4}

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] Farman dtd. 3 Rabi I 1124/10 April 1712, also Kapat dwara Documents.
\item[2.] Parwāna 19 Jamādi 'Il 1133/6 April 1721.
\item[3.] Farman 5 Shawaāl 1053/7 Dec. 1643; letter of Amirul Umara to the Raja dtd 28 Zjalgad 1114/15 April 1703.
\item[4.] WR undated from Jagjiwan Das to Jai Singh reporting "It is the tradition of the court that whenever one does even a trivial job it should be well presented so that it may be rewarded. If the information of the siege of Rajgarh would have reached the Imperial court through the wāqīa navis, Khufia navis, harkarās and their petitions of diwan and bakhshi of the sūba followed by your own azzdāsht the importance of the event would have increased".
\end{itemize}
Reimposition of jaziya was yet another interesting instance which reflected the alterations in the Imperial attitude. Jaziya yielded a handsome amount of four crore rupees. It has been noted that while Farrukh Siyar wrote to Jai Singh that "Inayatullah Khan had placed a letter from the Sherrif of Mecca that the collection of jaziya is obligatory according to shara. in a matter of faith, I am helpless" while in actual fact through Inayatullah Khan orthodox element was mobilized. Irrespective of the margin of exaggeration to Shiv Das, Jai Singh played an extremely important role to plead for the abolition of jaziya. It was subsequently abolished by Muhammad Shah.

1. Nishān to Mahārāṇa Jai Singh, 1690; Yaddāghīl (Vir Vinod III, p. 150). Even the Maharana of Udaipur was not exempted from jizāiah. A fixed amount of Rs. 100000/- was fixed upon the Maharana. In lieu of which parganas Badnor, Mandalgarh and Pur were assigned to him. For details see Vir Vinod pp. 670, 750. Also see Fārmān of Aurangzeb, where it is refused that the Maharana had rupees one lac as jizāiah every year and for that he will have to produce the surety (māl-i-żāmin). However, he could pay it in four instalment and deposit it in the treasury at Ajmer.


From a perusal of the above details, it would appear that the Emperor tried to implement the theoretical control he exercised over the Amber Raja. Nevertheless, it is also essential to study how such attempts were received not only by the concerned Raja but an influential part of the nobility as well, the latter being perused in a subsequent chapter. The need it seems was being felt for accommodation and expediency on the part of the Emperor where such important noble as the Raja of Amber was concerned. Also, in the perspective of the fluid condition of Imperial court, support of Amber Raja could not be conveniently dispensed with. So far as the attitudes of the Amber Raja was concerned, he was well aware of the privileged position he enjoyed. He, too, it is notable, inspite of his status, wanted to adapt into the situation which was contrary to the intention of shaking the yoke of the Empire.

II

The significance of peshkash lies in the fact that it was offered by a subordinate to a superior as a mark of submission. This was paid in cash or kind\(^2\) though cash

1. See WR dtd 26 Jamādi II 1104/4 March 1692
2. The peshkash offered in kind included the products manufactured from the Raja's karkhānas. See Karkhāna papers, R.S.A.
offerings were also at times termed *nazr* which was of a nominal nature and offered at 1) the accession of the Raja 2) festive occasions at the court, birth anniversary, naurroz, accession of the Emperor, Idd etc. 3) whenever, a messenger or representative or the Raja presented himself at the imperial court 4) before or after gaining victory in some battle, the Raja had participated. Sometimes we get similarities in the nature of *nazr* and *peshkash*.

The amount of *peshkash* was determined by the imperial court, against a particular *pargana* assigned in a *janīr* and the amount of *peshkash* was not a matter of choice on the Raja's part.

In extraordinary circumstances the *peshkash* due to the

1. WR dtd Baisākh Sudi 4, 1771/18 April 1714
2. WR dtd Chaitra Vadi 9, 1769/16 April 1712. also WR Phālgun Sūdi 2, 1769/16 March 1713.
3. For the distinction between *peshkash* and *Nazr*. See M. Athar Ali, 'The Mughal Nobility Under Aurangzeb', p.144. Also see WR dtd Kārtik Sūdi 6, 1768/2 Nov. 1711 wherein it is stated that Shah Qudratullah informed (diwan) Bhandari that one lakh rupees each should be sent from both the Rajas (Jai Singh and Ajit Singh) as *nazr*, out of which sixty thousand rupees each will be accepted as the *peshkash* of the Emperor and remaining forty thousand rupees as *nazr* to Prince (Saheb-i 'Alam).
4. Farman dtd.
Rāja against a particular pargana was remitted as in the case of pargana Mauzabad in 1717. Mention may be made to a likhtang which states, if famine occurs and a remission is made by the Emperor, a proportionate reduction will be made (from the ijāra amount).²

It would thus seem inferable that the Raja collected peshkash from the jāgīrdārs (sub-assignees) as well as the ijārādārs which was recorded for the convenience of the state and in turn submitted to the Imperial court.

How the amount of peshkash was determined by the imperial court is not clear from our evidence? It had some relationship with the resources at the disposal of the Raja. Despite the fact that jama‘figures were extant to the Mughals, they did not fix a regular percentage of peshkash. The reason probably lies in the fluctuating resources of the chief.

Taking our internal evidence, as the index to determine the relationship between jama‘and hasil referred to in our documents as tan and hasil, it can be deduced that the hasil in proportion to tan did not exceed to one fourth.

1. Ibid.
2. Likhtang dtd Kārtik Sudi 3, V.S. 1789, by Sardul Singh Shekhawat.
It is, therefore, probably apparent that tan also includes the amount of peshkash.

Peshkash was offered for the grant of faujidāri, sūbedāri etc. It is interesting to find that the peshkash of these varied from region to region. Thus a wakīl's report reads 'I have conveyed your demands to Amirul Umara. He has demanded money. Write to me the demand, you wish to present... If the mansab of 7000/7000 is conferred then only we can pay whatever he wishes, whereas for the faujidāri of Mathura send any amount you wish. Though the assignment of parganas Tonk, Deoti Sanchari, Malpura or Khohri would be preferrable. You therefore kindly keep these points in view and reply'.¹

The nature of information contained in arhsatta reveals that the amount of muqarara jama' and hālsal are divided in a number of cesses and perquisites which includes peshkash too.² We also find references to peshkash being collected from the sub-assignees and sub-leasees of the Rāja. The awarija documents shed light on the amount of

¹ WR dtd Jyestha Vadi 1 VS. 1768/18 May, 1711; Also see WR dtd Baisākh Vadi 13, 1768/21 April, 1711.
² See Arhsattas for the list of peshkash payees which includes Patwāri, Patēl etc.
pēshkash fixed against a person belonging to the given clan along with the proportion of pēshkash submitted.1 The proportion of the amount of pēshkash which remained with the Raja and the Emperor, however, can only be conjectured upon.

A few illustration would be relevant to show that the demand of pēshkash was invariably made directly or indirectly at the time of assignment of jāgīr. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the value of pēshkash was a strong determining factor for the desired assignment.

We come across a reference of 1704, wherein the Maharāja informs the Shahzada that he would pay Rs.20,000 to him as pēshkash on receipt of sanad for the grant of nakkārah and the parganas of Dausa, Chatsu and Mauzabad in jāgīr.2 We then substantiate this information with wakīl report of 1714, where the previous jama' of parganas Dausa and Chatsu is mentioned as 61,57,000 and 68,43,000 dams respectively.3 Converting these into rupees we get the amount of Rs.32,50,000. To this, we shall add the jama' figure of pargana Mauzabad available to us from another

1. Awārija Mutāliba pargana Bahatri.
2. Miscellaneous pargana papers dtd 1116/1704.
3. WR dtd Maṅgh Vadi 7, V.S. 1770/23 Jan 1779
wakil report of 1695, which amounts to Rs.1,60,000. From the above total, if we take out the percentage of peshkash, we arrive at 4%.

Another example of Udaï Singh Shekhawat who has to pay a sum of Rs.50,000 as peshkash in 1712, if a mangab of 1500/1000 and parganas of Khandela and Rewasa are granted in jagir. Similarly, we have on other illustration from a farman regarding the grant of Bundi and 5000 mangab (with 5000/2500) on the condition of paying peshkash of Rs.5,00,000 to Budh Singh. It is also mentioned that one lakh is to be paid in cash and the rest in instalments but the absence of extant of jama figures of the above parganas hinders us to calculate the percentage of peshkash in the above instances.

The fact, that the Emperor had the knowledge of the collection of peshkash and other cesses and it had not only imperial sanction, but also accountable to the Imperial court is illustrated by the following document "since the Maharaja has been appointed subedār of Malwa by the Emperor.

1. WR dtd 19 Ramzan 1106/3 May, 1695.
2. WR dtd Chaitra Sudi 11, 1769/6 April 1712.
it has been settled ... pēshkāsh and other revenue realised from the suba shall be divided between diwān (of Raja Ayamal) and the Maharaja as one share will go to the diwān and two to the Maharaja. The income from the villages taken on lease shall also be divided accordingly.... If the Deccanis do not settle peace with the Emperor the expenditure on encounter with them shall be met from the joint income and the rest shall be divided in the above ratio". ¹

The payment of pēshkāsh in advance was much in vogue and that too in lump sum. The annual payment of pēshkāsh could pose certain problems in the event of frequency in transfer of jāgīrs.

On the pattern of Mughals the Rāja fixed lump sum amount at the time of appointing pātel, pātwarī, amin and āmil. But the amount of pēshkāsh in such case was irrespective of the jama‘ figures, entirely depended upon the wishes of the Rāja.

______________

1. Naqal Kāgad hindawi Rāja Ayamal under orders to Sawai Jai Singh to Nagaroj Dhoubhai Asoj Vadi 13, 1789/6 Sept 1732, Kapat dwara, op.cit.