CHAPTER-2
The history of Kachhwahas is less authentic prior to Bharamal. Abul Fazl in an interesting passage states that "he (Bharmal) left the circle of zamīndārs and became one of the select of the Mughal Court."¹ It is evident from the statement that the Mughal Chancellory designated him as zamīndār. These zamīndārs close to the Emperor were bestowed special favours.² In conformity with this policy the Amber rulers too were assigned high mansabs at the Imperial Court, against which revenue assignments were made to them. It is, however, notable that the ruler of Amber fared better in comparison with the other Kachhwaha nobles, from the very outset Bharamal's position was treated to be of crucial significance³ due to the fact that even the Shekhawats and

---

1. Akbarnama, II, Bib Ind. 1897/1921, p.63.
2. At the time of the expeditions of Durgarpur, Akbar had clearly instructed the Kunwar (Man Singh) that the Rama (probably of Udaipur) and other zamīndārs of the neighbourhood were to be bestowed princely favours and those who opposed should be ruthlessly crushed. Akbar-nāma III p.40.
3. At the time of expedition against the rebellion of Daud Khan, Akbar took him with his trusted generals. Abul Fazl numbered the total of such nobles as being nineteen among them Raja Bhagwan Das and Kunwar Man Singh are at first and second place. Akbarnama III p.93.
Narukas who ruled their estates independently joined Bharamal at the time of external danger. Bharamal on the other hand was influenced by the prevalent political condition. Mirza Sharfuddin, the governor of Mewat and Nagaur (and also later of Ajmer) while supporting Suja's claim to the throne of Amber had caused anxiety for him and had fixed the amount of tribute. After his submission to Imperial court, he was raised to the rank of 5000. This alliance enriched the Amber ruler's prestige.

Territories recognised as that of the chief by hereditary right were regarded as their watan jāgīr.

1. Maasirul Umara, I, 410-11?
2. Suja was the son of Puran Mai, the elder brother of Bharamal.
4. S. Nurul Hasan, Zamindars under the Mughals', Land control and social structure in Indian History ed. R.E. Frykenberg London, 1969, pp.17-31, for variant view see V.S. Bhatnagar Life and Times of Sawai Jai Singh 1688/1743 Delhi, 1974, p.271. On the contrary S.P. Gupta had conclusively asserted on the basis of archival records that even before the submission to the Mughals, the position of the rulers of Amber could merely be termed as zamindar or chief. Cf. Agrarian System of Eastern Rajasthan (Chapter I and II).
though the term is not found in Akbar's time. Nurul Hasan while analysing the position of the zamindārs calls such zamindārs as the Amber ruler as autonomous chieftains. The watan jāgīr was assigned at a notional revenue figure (jama) which according to him was appropriated towards meeting the salary of the chief and pay claims of the contingent kept by him for imperial use.

Tod states that "At the accession of Jai Singh, the rāja of Amber consisted of three parganas Deosah, and Bussaw, the western tracts had been sequestrated and added to the royal dominion attached to Ajmer. The Sheikhwat confederation was superior to, and independent of the parent state, whose boundaries were as follows. The royal thāna (garrison) of Chatsoo to the south those of Sambhar to the west and Hastera to the north west; while the east, Deosah and Bussaw formed its portion.

---------------
(1650-1750). Theoretically and practically, mughals asserted paramountcy at several occasion as is borne out by a large number of wakīl reports.

1. Zamindars under the Mughals, op.cit.
2. Ibid.
The domains of the Kachhwaha had been divided before Akbar between the Rajāwats and Sheikhāwats. A perusal of wakils reports reveals that the Sheikhāwats in earlier times were dominant over the Rajāwats of Amber. The Rajāwats were pressed hard by these neighbours, therefore they had control over their watan Amber alone.

Amber had the jama' worth 1,22,56,297 dams in 1595. The area for which this jama' was allocated constituted the watan of the Raja and therefore could not be assigned to any other noble.

-----------
1. See C.U. Wills, Appendix G.
2. It has been argued by Inayat Ali Zai in his unpublished Ph.D. thesis entitled Mughal and the Rajputs 1605-1659 A.D., 1982, A.M.U. that in 1597 part of the revenue of pargana Amber was controlled by the Central Government. Sanganer a mahāl in pargana Amber was given as Jagir to Ram Udawat. Apart from the fact that Ram Udawat is Ram Das and his jagir is three kuroh away, from Sanganer mauza lamba. See Maásir-i-Umra, Vol.I, p.804. This Ram Das then tallies with Ram Das Kachhwaha. See Tabagāt-i-Akbari, Vol.II, p.354. Note may also be taken of the fact that how the presence of a Kachhwaha noble holding the rank of only 500 zāt. (See Apparatus of the Mughal Empire, p.18) would alter the position of the bigger jagirdar. In fact it was customary for the Raja to put forth and promote the claims of his clansmen at the Imperial Court by obtaining for them mansab and jagir in close proximity to his watan and tankhwāh jagir. See Yāddāśht Oct. 1708.

Pargana                      Phagwi
Sultan Singh                Banda-i-dargāh
11,60,000 dams               23,53,514 dams

Hopeful the arrears of payment amounting to
Interestingly enough, Amber remains the original watan even in our period. Testimony to which is borne out from wakil's report of 1694. "Only Amber is the watan of the Raja whoever wishes for assignment in other territories may be

1,15,33,386 dams will be adjusted from pargana Dausa against the following.

Hakim Singh S.o Bahadur Singh  
Kachhwaha Nabarpota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th>Actual mansab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300/250</td>
<td>700/750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shyam Singh S/o Murdal Singh  
Kachhwaha Khangarot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th>Actual mansab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200/200</td>
<td>200/100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amar Singh S/o Hari Singh  
Kachhwaha Khangarot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th>Actual mansab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 Sawar</td>
<td>500/300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prithvi Singh S/o Kanchan Singh  
Kachhwaha Khangarot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th>Actual mansab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>750/100</td>
<td>250/100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also wajib ul arz dtd. 9 Ziaiabad 1123/1711

"Lal Singh and other young Rajputs have complained against Marathas, Afghans etc. I have brought them with me and hope that as per the recommendation (Tajviz) they may be conferred mansab."
assigned it except for Amber.¹

The concept of watan gradually began encompassing such territories as were held hereditarily or where their zamindāri rights prevailed. Thus parganas like Ajabgarh were referred to as mahāl-i-watan². Niwai is another such pargana.³

It is worthwhile noting here that despite the clear distinction between mahāl-i-watan and zamindāri both were opted in close proximity, becoming therefore complimentary to each other. Preference for the parganas indexed in the same dastūr circle were greater. Possibilities of obtaining such parganas in continuity were constantly explored. Parganas Jhak, Mauzabad and Phagwi formed a dastūr circle alongwith Amber,⁴ therefore assignments of these were taken

---

¹. WR dtd Asār vadi 8, 1750/16 June 1693. Also see Chithi dtd. 1756. Another WR is equally noteworthy wherein the wakil of Amber was asked to justify Rājas claim over pargana Chatsu which was 30 kūs away from Amber. He represented that the Rāja's clansmen (yūs) were settled in the village of pargana Chatsu, no additional recruitment would be necessary. It may therefore be inferred that Chatsu did not from even the jāgir in the above year.

². Wajib ul arz 1123/1711.

³. Parwana addressed to wakīl dtd 14 Safar 1117/7 June 1706.

as tankhwâh jâgîr later on Phagwi remained in the tankhwâh jâgîr, while Jhak and Mauzabad were taken on ijâra similarly Chatsu being a contiguous pargana was very important, it formed the tankhwâh jâgîr even in 1638, and was considered in 1714 to be one of the parganas held since long in jâgîr. It is interesting to note that both Jai Singh and Vijay Singh held jâgîrs in Chatsu.

Pargana Malarna too was in the tankhwâh jâgîr of the Râja in the year 1690, 1711-19, 1723-32, 1736-50 and on ijâra in the year 1714. List of such parganas held in continuity can be exhaustive.

1. Yaddâsht I Rabi I 1048/ 13 July 1639.
2. WR dtd Mâgh Vadi 7, 1771/23 Jan 1714
5. WR dtd Mâgh Vadi 7, 1771/23 Jan 1714
6. Arhsattas pargana Malarna for different years. Notable among these pargana are Toda Bhim, Harsana, Malpur, Bhusawar, Dausa, Deoti Sanchari etc. See WR dtd 12 Zilhaj 1100/17 Sept 1689; 14 Ramzân 1103/31 May 1692; 27 Rajab 1105/24 March 1694; Mâgh Vadi 4, 1770/20 Jan 1714 etc.
At a time when the request for an assignment of jāgīr
could not materialize, the Raja opted for ijāra.¹ In this
context the prevalent condition is best reflected in a
wakīl’s report of 1712.

“The jāgīrs of Khan-i Jahan Bahadur extend from
Akbarabad to Mewat, therefore he should not be antagonized.
The holders of other smaller jāgīrs near the watan will
readily agree to give them to us on ijāra once Khan-i-
Jahan’s jāgīr’s are obtained on lease.

Those who are in imperial service they are acquiring
whichever jāgīr they can get in ijāra. If you want to serve
the Emperor then take Jaitarangna on ijāra so that it
remains in control (tassaruf) for three years. The
acquisition of areas contiguous to the watan should be given
first priority otherwise some other noble might avail the
opportunity to obtain them on ijāra.”²

It would thus emerge that parganas contiguous to watan
are deliberately being acquired even if leased on short term

1. WR dtd Asōj Vadi 4, 1769/6 Oct 1712 “pargana Mojpur
sarkar Akbarabad with three lakh fifty five thousand
dāms has been taken for three months since there is no
possibility of getting the same in jāgīr”.

2. WR Bhādva vadi 13, 1769/15 Sept 1712
basis. A notable example of this is pargana Khohri which reveals the operating tactics. While in Jan 1714 Jai Singh was assigned Khohri from Azim ush Shah's jagir for three years, on 23 Jan 1714 Jai Singh had been assigned tankhwan jagir in the pargana. Finally in July 1714 Churaman Jat's ambition to obtain the zamindari of this pargana were challenged by the Raja's wakil on the claim that khohri belonged to the watan of the Raja.

A large number of chitthis and arzdashte would also indicate that the raja did not hesitate to use force against Pratap Singh Naruka of village Soda in pargana Malpura. The latter resisted the claims of Amber rulers over their zamindaris. Amber rulers were always interested in extending their zamindari rights and weakening the rights and privileges of the bhomias in order, ultimately to confiscate their zamindari rights entirely. Such as, the Solankis of Tonk and others, who rebelled, were supported by all their fellow-caste bhomias from Mewat to Tonk and Malpura against the Raja and his allies, to defend their

1. WR Maagh Sudi 14, 1769/29 Jan 1713
2. Parwana Sakti garar Miti Asadh 1 Sudi 3 V.S., 1787/1730; Chitthi Qarar Miti Sudi 2 V.S., 1801/1744. Also see R.P. Rana Agrarian Revolts in Northern India during the late 17th and early 18th century, IESHR, XVIII (3&4), pp.291-326.
zamīndāris and even to create new ones.¹ Sometimes the cases were referred by the bhomias to the Mughal court and necessary parwānas were acquired to confirm their rights.² Thus one is led to the conclusion, that as soon as the Mughal administration began to disintegrate Sawai Jai Singh did not hesitate to enlarge his zamīndāri rights at the cost of the local zamīndārs. This is also true in case of certain independent thikānas like panchpana Singhana. It comprised three old Mughal parganas of Jhunjhunu, Narhar and Singhana. These parganas were taken over by Sawai Jai Singh from the Mughal state between 1730 and 1744 and is held by a branch of the Shekhawat sept, known as sadānis. They were independent chiefs. The Oaimkhanis had been there for a nearly 200 years and held their territorial chief (zamīndārs). Sawai Jai Singh made Shekhawat as tributary chiefs by granting them ijāras after getting these territories in ijāra from the Mughal government or directly from the ijāradārs. This had lead Mr. Wills to hold that this ijāra system ultimately established Sawai Jai Singh as the sovereign

¹ Cf. S.P. Gupta, Agrarian System, pp.137-38
² Chitti Miti Sāwan Sudī V.S. 1723/1666.
power asserting his paramountcy.¹ So was the fate of Khetri, Umara, Fatehpur, and Sikar, the thikānas of eminence.

Our study thus suggests that though the extent of the original watan was small but the presence of many zamīndāri mahāls and acquisition of these tracts in jāgīr too, were not only mutually complimentary but also assisted the Rāja to claim such mahāls as mahāl-i-watan.²

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

1. Report of Inquiry Committee 1933-35. Also see the C.U. Wills: The Land Tenures and Special Powers of certain Thikhanedars of Jaipur State, 1933; Also Jr.Jackson: A Reply to the Report on Wills found Tenures..”.

2. WR Asārh Vadi 7, 1771/24 May 1714.