CHAPTER I: THE HADA PRINCIPALITY

Emergence of the Hadas

A 15th century inscription about Kumbha's conquest described the area around Bundi as Hadavatim\(^1\), which afterwards came to be known as Hadauti. Suffixes like *wada* or *vati* with clan name had come in vogue with the emergence and spread of Rajput polity in Rajasthan. Such suffixes conveyed the distinct relationship of a clan or people with an area. *Wada* was used as a suffix to denote numerous settlements of a clan in an area, like Aheerwada Merwada Khinchi wada\(^2\) etc. whereas, *vati* conveyed the area deemed to be a clan's share in a larger political entity. Such a share became acceptable on the basis of that clan having established its Rajput status and hold upon that area prior to its incorporation in the larger political entity. Thus, Hadavati was the share of the Hada Rajputs within the Guhil principality in 15th century\(^3\).

Abul Fazl described Hadauti as one of the three main constituents of *suba* Ajmer, the other two being Mewar and Marwar\(^4\). According to him out of the seven *sarkars* in the *suba*, *sarkar* Ranthambhor was inhabited by the Hada Rajputs. Since his task was to describe and enlist the *suba*, the *sarkars* and the *parganas* as conceived at the official level, he overlooked the fact that in several *parganas* of *sarkar* Ranthambhor, Hadas had not even been able to register their presence. The area actually dominated by the Hadas in 16th century was much smaller than the *sarkar* of Ranthambhor. His silence about the history of Hadas is also conspicuous. His notion of Hadauti appears to be rooted in the empire building motive for which the Hadas could prove to be a useful ally in *sarkar* Ranthambhor. It reflected the possibilities rather than the actual position of Hadas in that *sarkar*. Till the middle of 17th century the only
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3. *Kumbalgarh Inscription, op cit*
Hada principality was Bundi and the area under effective Hada domination was limited. It was only after emergence of Kota as a second and larger Hada principality that almost whole of sarkar Gagron of suba Malwa came to be dominated by the Hadas besides some more parganas of sarkar Ranthambhor.

Nainsi’s perception of Hadauti appears to be different from Abul Fazl. He differentiated between the parganas enjoyed in jagir by the Bundi chief and his sardars and the parganas which were the original ‘watan’ of the Hadas. He used a very peculiar method to reconcile this dichotomy between the traditional and official perception of Hadauti by enlisting the jagirs of Rao Bhao Singh separately from ‘Bundi-ri-pakhti Hadauti-re-pargana’\textsuperscript{5}. It appears from his description that pargana. Bundi, Khatkar and Patan, which were in the jagir of Bhao Singh and Kota, which was in the jagir of Mukund Singh, were the core areas of Hadauti. Certain other parganas like Awa were also in the ‘watan’ of Hadas though not in the jagir of Hadas, Pargana of Palaita, Sangod and Khairawad were peripheral areas, which were neither the ‘watan’ of Hadas nor, in their jagir. All the other parganas like Lakheri, Mau, Gagron, Ghati, Gugor, Khatakheri, Chacharni, Chachardo, Behu were considered to be in Hadauti and some were even in the jagir of Bhao Singh and Bhagwant Singh but were not their ‘watan’. So Nainsi included all those parganas in Hadauti which had come to be dominated by the Hadas by the 17\textsuperscript{th} century but carefully pointed out that there were several pockets within Hadauti which were not the ‘watan’ of Hadas. He also mentions the name other clans who were dominant in these parganas prior to the entry of Hadas. Therefore, for him neither the entire sarkar of Ranthambhor was Hadauti nor the entire territory dominated by the Hadas the ‘watan’ of Hadas.

In 19th century the territory possessed by the two Hada principalities of Bundi and Kota had become synonymous with Hadauti. It was stated that the

\textsuperscript{5} Khyat, I pp. 101-105
'country of Hadas' or in other words territories of Bundi and Kota was 'Haraoti'\textsuperscript{6}. So the British perspective was to describe the territories of Bundi and Kota as Hadauti, which, indirectly negated all other claims situated within the territory of the two Hada principalities. Thereafter, the three modern districts of Kota, Bundi and Jhalawar came to be identified as Hadauti.

The Hadas had succeeded in projecting themselves as one of the twenty-four sakhas of Chahmans. Although, the Chahmans are one of the major Rajput clans mentioned in the epigraphic sources of early medieval Rajasthan, the Hadas had emerged on the political scene in 14th century. The two major branches of Chahmans known till 12th century were Chahmans of Sakambhari and Chahmans of Nadiol, the later getting sub-divided into many sub-clans ruling at Jalor, Siwana, Sanchor and Abu\textsuperscript{7}. Very little historical evidence is available to throw light on emergence of Hadas as a sub-clan of Chahmans. In the Rajput genealogies formation of a sub-clan has often been linked to the name of one of its ancestors, real or imaginary. Thus, Deva, the founder of Hada principality of Bundi was described as a grandson of a person named Hada, a descendant of Rao Lakhan, the dhani of Nadiol\textsuperscript{8}. In the genealogy given by Suryamal Mishran, a rather sanskritised version of the name, is found as Asthipal\textsuperscript{9}. This genealogy has been rejected as a fancy of Bhattas, since the names given there in do not tally with the major Chahman inscriptions, copper plates and literary works\textsuperscript{10}. More recently, attempts to rationalize the genealogies found in the epigraphs themselves have been criticized, as suffering from a tendency to dynasticise\textsuperscript{11}. At the same time, the need to study the origin of Rajputs and segmentation of various clans as a historical process with reference to the factors known to be in operation cannot be ignored. However, an explanation for segmentation of Chahmans
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"simply in terms of movement to new areas" cannot he sustained as the process of formation of a subclan to a certain extent was also the result of absorption of local elements when such elements came into contact of an already established clan. However, the evidence about the operation of this element of localism is hazy in the case of Hadas.

The presence of Chahmans in eastern Mewar is established by several inscriptions of early medieval period, although, their political status vis-a-vis the Guhils of Mewar remains uncertain. In a 10th century inscription the title of Maharajadhira had been used for the the Guhil king Bharatpatta II as against simply Mahasamanta for the Chahman ruler of Pratapgarh, a feudatory of the Pratihar ruler of Kannauj. The Uparmal area of eastern Mewar was dominated by Chahmams of Sahakambhari line who were associated with construction of many Shaiv temples in Menal and Binjholi (Bijolia) and had conferred land grants on Shaiv as well as Jain temples situated in the area. Bijolia inscription gives the genealogy of the Chahman rulers and mentions the religious places, which received patronage from them in Uparmal. Chahman inscriptions have also been found at Lohari (Jahazpur), Dhod, Menal and Visalpur, which confirm the Chahman presence in the area.

The first reference to Hadas is found in Menal inscription of S. 1446 cited by Tod which stated "Bhaorndhun who in the field of strife attained the desire of victory" as the one of whose race was the tribe of Hara and his son Koolun was of illustrious and pure descent in both the races (Chahmans and Hada). So according to this inscription the Hada sub clan had emerged from Koolun and not from Asthipal or Hada. The emphasis on his being of pure descent was perhaps meant to cover up rather than to reveal his real origin. In the genealogy given in Vamsh Bhaskar, Koolun is mentioned as one of Deva's
ancestors. He had inherited Binjholipur, said to have been founded by one Raja Rukmangad’s wife Bindhyavalli but was in ruins at the time of Koolun inheriting it from his father. Koolun is said to have rehabilitated the township and built satadhisth sahasra (1100) temples of Sive in and around Bhinjolipur for which he came to be known as Binjholiraj and Hunraj for the charities he conferred on Yachakas and died fighting against the Turks17. His devotion to Shaivism which was by then a popular sect in the region was found noteworthy which was intended perhaps to boost Hada claim to rule by extending patronage to an established cult in the region. “His fame was as fair as rays of moon” and his son Jaypal obtained “the garb of royalty” and his son Devraj (Deva) was “lord of the land”18. Nainsi gives the name of Deva’s father as Banga while the Menal inscription gives the name as Vijay Pat19. According to Vamsh Bhaskar, Bang Dev had wrested Mandil, Panagarh, Sandagarh, Hinglaj, and Khairoli, Bhainsrodgarh and twenty-four other places from ruler of Mewar and chiefs of Dasor (Mandsor) and Jeeran20. This claim about Banga is in sharp contrast to what Nainsi had to say about Deva as “living in distress at Bhainsrodgarh (his vasi), before capturing Bundi”. The Menal inscription mentioned Deva Hada’s father as a ruler while Nainsi talked of his distress. Since, this inscription was put up only after the Hadas had succeeded in gaining Bundi and Bambavaada in mid 14th century, so the use of expression “garb of royalty” for Deva’s father could have been a pretension which a near contemporary like Nainsi was perhaps not willing to accept. Banki das, noted the name of Deva’s father as Bagha and he was the one who had captured Bundi from the Meenas21. In Surjan Charitra, the Hadas are shown to be descendants of the Chamans of Ranthambhor22. Thus the various geneologies of Hadas are full of contradictions and appear be an attempt to relate the Hadas to Chamans in order to establish their claim to Rajput status.
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Rise of Hadas can be traced with far more certainty after Deva managed to seize Bundi from the Meena tribe in V.S. 1398/c. 1342. Meenas, an aboriginal tribe of Rajasthan was also known as Mer or Meh. The name seem to have been derived from their original habitat, the Arvali hills, since a hill is also known as Mer. Nainsi has mentioned Meena settlements starting from Deolia in south of Mewar upto Mandor in west and Amer in northeastern Rajasthan. The description strengthens the view that Meenas had started spreading out from their hill abode to nearby plains to settle as cultivators much before the emergence of Rajput polity in Rajasthan. In the process of migration many sub-division had emerged amongst the Meenas. Subjugating the Meenas had been an essential stage in emergence of Rajput polity in various parts of Rajasthan. One of the earliest encounters was at Mandor in 12th century where Prithviraj had to fight against Mers in order to capture it.

In connection of Mewar, Nainsi observed that at some places they lived as 'raitl' white at other places as 'mewasi', implying that not every where they accepted the norms laid down by Rajput polity and continued to create trouble in various ways. Rulers of Mewar Jagat Singh and Raj Singh had to chastise them even in the 17th century to pave the way for Rajput settlements.

Bundi valley prior to Hada conquest was known as Bundo-nal, inhabited by the Meenas of Osara clan, considered being asli or of unmixed stock. Availability of alluvium plains in south east of the valley had transformed the Meenas into agriculturists. Agricultural development was facilitated by construction of Jait Sagar, by the Meena chief at that time. It continued to be known by the same name even upto 19th century, though it had been
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renovated and given a new name by the Hadas\textsuperscript{29}. The growth of this Meena settlement was facilitated by the high mountains in the north and west protecting it against encroachments from Chauhans and Guhils and by the River Chambal and thick forests (inhabited by Bheels) in the south east from Parmars who had made their presence felt at least upto Shergarh\textsuperscript{30}. The Meena chief had closed the valley with barriers of masonary and gates though a regular city had not emerged till then\textsuperscript{31}. According to \textit{Vamsh Bhaskar} the Meena chiefs held a \textit{gras} of twelve villages in this valley\textsuperscript{32}. Although, such an assignment was a set unit of land distribution and political control from the early days of Rajput polity known as \textit{trankupaka} and \textit{rahradvadasa}\textsuperscript{33}, but in case of Meenas of Bundi, it is not possible to establish this grant. It can only be conjectured that Parmars of Malwa might have given such a grant to Meena chiefs and weakening of Parmars paved the way for its growth as an independent principality, The statement that " Jaita was trying to emulate the \textit{chatradharis}"\textsuperscript{34} perhaps refers to this process.

It seems that the Meena principality had became a cause of concern for Dodiyas and Hadas who claimed to be the offshoots of Parmars and Chahmans respectively\textsuperscript{35}. The Hadas had been active in the southwest and Dodiyas in southeast of Bundi. Harraj Dod (Parmar) regularly terrorized the Meenas to realize \textit{nalbandi} (a tax). Taking advantage of the troubled situation, Deva was able to neutralize Dod Parmars and over power the Meenas with the help of Rana Ari Singh of Mewar, and the Solankis of Toda. Deva managed to subjugate the Meenas by resorting to treachery and deceit by inviting the Meena chief with his kinsmen on the pretext of marrying either a Brahamin's or his own beautiful daughter to a Meena boy. In another version of the story, Deva had invited the Meenas to marry the two daughters of a
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Golwal Chahman Jas raj, the pradhan of Meenas to Vigrah raj and Indra Duman the two sons of Jaita Meena. When the Meenas gathered for marriage they were slain and their camp was set on fire at night. Thus, the Meena bhumiyas were almost annihilated and the Hadas were able to establish their superior claim.

The use of term 'bhumiyas' for Meenas even upto 17th century was rooted in the autochthonous claim of Meenas in the Bundi valley. Establishment of Hada polity through exceptionally violent means is hi-lighted in the expression bhumiya sara kut maria and dharti ras pad36. It suggests that Hadas were able to capture the fertile land of the valley from the Meenas and establish their claim to its produce37. The use of brutal force combined with treachery in the process of establishment of Hada claim is found in all versions of the myth. In one of the myths, the factor of superior military skills of the Rajputs in establishment of Hada principality is also brought out very prominently. The use of a horse by Har raj Doas well as Deva Hada mentioned in this context is significant. Har raj Dod was portrayed as 'ekal aswar' (a single horseman) yet ravaging their land. The failure of all efforts to check him depicted the power which a mounted cavalier could exercise against a whole group of people unfamiliar with the use of horse as a war machine. So the Meenas had engaged Deva Hada because he possessed a horse, which he had refused to part with even when it was requisitioned by the 'patshah' of Malwa, probably because he considered it to be the source of his strength. The encounter between Har Raj and Deva is also described almost as an encounter between the two horses. The success, which Deva attained in combating Har Raj, was also related to his capability as a mounted warrior38. Thus the success of Hadas was a result of their superior military skills used ruthlessly against the
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Meenas. Hadas had received direct support from Guhils and latent support from Dodiyas and Solankis to wipe out the Meenas. This collaboration amongst the Guhils and the offshoots of three major Rajput clans against the Meenas, gradually led to their marginalisation in the region.

To strengthen his hold on the areas dominated by the Meenas Deva called his kinsmen to settle down around Bundi and posted his Jamiyat at various places. The horizontal spread of Hadas in the Bundi valley resulted in multiplication of Hada Khamps. There were three main Khamps (subdivisions) of Hadas in the region known as Navbrahma (sons of Lalla), Lohatiwala (sons of Lohat) and Miyanre-Gudhe re Hada (sons of Jabdu). The Khamps continued to multiply and came to refered as Hallu pote, Arjun pote, Narhad pote, Hathaut, Jaitawat, Naurang pote, Sthir Raj pote, Khajuri, Thurad, Sawat and Ramke Hadas etc. The horizontal spread of the Hadas was made possible by encountering small principalities of other Rajput clans around Bundi and across river Chambal.

In the track north east of Bundi, which stretched upto river Chambal, Patan was a Mohil principality. Mohils, a subclan of Chahan of Sri Morpur, were the dhanis of Chapar, Dronpur popularly known a Mohilawati. Nainwa and Karwar were in the hands of Dahiyas, who were powerful around Parabatsar near Ajmer. Khatpur, Gainoli and Lakheri were gaud principalities. Gaud Rajput were initially powerful around Ajmer but with the rise of Chahmans started moving away and got dispersed to far off places. All these Rajput principalities around bundi were chastised by Deva to establish the hegemony of Hadas. However, a decisive success could have been gained only after a while as campaigns against Dahiyas and Gauds continued even during the period of Napa, the grandson of Deva. Eventually Hadas did succeed in subduing them and establish their dominance. The grant of some of these
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parganas in patta to Surjan by Rana Udai singh at the time of giving tika of Bundi in 16\textsuperscript{th} century was in fact, a confirmation of position enjoyed by the Hadas in these areas\textsuperscript{42}. The Dahiyas later on were to be found even in the service of Hadas\textsuperscript{43}. For a while river Chambal remained the eastern boundary of the newly founded Hada principality.

The obstacle posed by the river was over come in the period of Deva's son Samar Singh when his son Jaitra Singh attacked a Bheel settlement on the eastern bank of Chambal near Kanswa which was an ancient sight dating back to Naga and Mauryan period. An inscription of V.S. 795 mentions Dhavllap Maurya as overlord of Shivganga\textsuperscript{44}. According to the popular legend the area was inhabited by Kotea Bheels who were considered to be of Ujla (unmixed /pure) descent. The Bheel chief, was slain and an elephant was erected at the place where he fell, which stands a place that came to be called Char Jhopra near the chief portal of the castle of Kota\textsuperscript{45}. Jaitra Singh's son Surjan gave the name of Kota to this abode of Bheels and built a wall around it. His son Dheer Deo excavated twelve lakes and dammed up the east of the town which Ws known by his name but later on as Kishor Sagar\textsuperscript{46}.

The other important gain of Hadas in the southeast was Khairavad and Ranthambhor in the north. The keys of fort Ranthambhor had been entrusted by rana Udai Singh to Rao Surjan\textsuperscript{47}. In the days of Afghan supermacy this fort had been entrusted by Salim Khan to his salve Jajhar Khan who with the collapse of Sur dynasty sold this fort to Rao Surjan, a powerful chief in the neighborhood of Ranthambhor, was a servant of Rana Udai Singh. Surjan built some houses in the fort and also seized the villages around
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Ranthambhor was associated with the fort of Ranthambhor even earlier when Rana Sanga had granted the fort to his two sons from Hadi Karmeti, Vikramaditya and Udai Singh and Suraj Mall Hada had been appointed as their guardian. Therefore, when Rao Surjan manipulated to get Ranthambhor from Afghans, Udai Singh in recognition of services rendered to him when he was a minor, conferred it on Hadas. Ranthambhor being a prestigious and strategically located fort strengthened the position of Hadas in the northern part of the region.

This encouraged the Hadas to challenge the Khinchi Rajputs in the south. The Khinchi principality had been established by Dharu when the Dod Parmars had been weakened. Khinchis dominated the area on eastern and western bank of river Kali Sindh known as Khinchiwada which was commanded by twelve forts. They had suffered a blow when the seat of Khinchi power the fort of Gagraun was captured from Achal Das Khinchi by Sultan of Malwa in V.S. 1483/Ad 1426. Gagraun had passed into hands of Mughals during the conquest of Malwa by Akbar. Man Singh defeated the Khinchi chief Raisal and the fort was placed in the charge of Rai Prithviraj of Bikaner. Finally the Hadas got the opportunity during the period of Jahangir, when Rao Ratan of bundi, was granted the pargana of Mau in inam and was asked to seize it from the Khinchis. Rao Ratan established his thanas and posted two thousand sawars in Khinchi domain. Khinchis resisted Rao Ratan’s men many a times but when Raja Salwahan Khinchi was killed and their hold started dwindling, Rao Gopal of Mau Maidana accepted the imperial service. Khinchis of Chacharni continued to resist the Hada Mughal combine lead by a Sindhal Rajput princess who was the mother of Khinchi Bagha. However after her death chacharni was also capured by Nauser Khan. Mau, Gugor, Chacharni,
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Behu, Ghati, Ghatoli Chardo all became of Hada principality. Later on, Shahjahan granted the fort of Gagraun also to Rao Mukund Singh of Kota in jagir\(^{53}\). The Khinchis remained zortalab throughout the Mughal period. So the Mughals had to adopt the policy of using Hadas against Khinchis which came as blessing in disguise for Hadas. Even after the decline of Mughal power, Khinchi-Hadas conflict went on till 18th century. Durjan Sal had attempted to capture fort of Gugor but was compelled to retreat by the Khinchis in c.\(^{54}\).

Stepping into Khinchiwada had brought the Hadas into fresh conflict with the Bheels. Bheels had recovered much of their ancient inheritance in the intricate tract on the southern frontiers of Hadauti. Bhagirath Bheel had joined the Mughal service during Shahjahan’s period\(^{55}\). The chief place of the Bheels was now Khatakheri (Manoharthana) where the king of Bheels, Chakrasen resided, whose person was attended by five hundred horses and eight hundred bowmen, and to whom all the various tribes of Bheels from Mewar to extremity of the plateau, owed obedience\(^{56}\). Bhagwat Singh younger brother of Rao Bhao Singh of Bundi, captured it in c.1661\(^{57}\).

After Aurangzeb’s death Bheem Singh of Kota with the help of Saiyyid brothers got the grant of Mau Maidana, Shergurh, Baran, Mangrole and Barod and entrusted the task of subjugation of Bheels to the chief of Narsinghgurh and Rajgarh\(^{58}\). Thus by the beginning of 18th century Hadas had gained a dominant position in all the three present districts of Bundi, Kota and Jhalawar.

Political rise of Hadas began at a time when the Ghuils had been weakened considerably by the Turkish onslaught. Muhammed Tuglaq had entrusted the fort of Chittor to Maldeo Sonigara of Jalor to keep the Guhil resistance in
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check. After the Guhils recaptured chittor in middle of 14th century, Maldeo sonigara’s son Banveer had allowed to occupy Bhainsrodgarh since he had accepted the overlordship of the Guhils of Mewar. Thus the Guhils for a while were keen to maintain cordial relations with the neighboring Rajput principalities and clans to set their own house in order. The help which they had extended to the Hadas in capturing Bundi, had made Deva agree for chakri and to go for mujra (to salute) on Dussera to the court of Rana of Mewar. The Guhils gradually recovered their lost grounds but in the meantime the Hadas had succeeded in consolidating their position in the area around Bundi. The relationship between Mewar and Bundi reached a point of confrontation, as Maharana Hammir Singh and his successors were keen to maintain the Guhil supremacy while the Hadas feeling confident of their position resisted the Guhil raids on their territory. Later Kumbha succeeded in conquering many forts of Hadauti perhaps even Bundi and exacting tribute.

By the time of Rana Sanga, Hadas had accepted the overlordship of Mewar. They were paying tribute and attending the court the Mewar as well as rendering chakri (service) to the rulers of Mewar. Mundu Monialties between the two had also developed. Narayandas Hada had imprisoned the ruler of Mandu on behalf of Rana Sanga, and Suraj Mall had been appointed the guardian of Rana Sanga’s minor sons from Rani Karmati Hadi. The relationship of Hadas with Mewar had got strained after Sanga’s death when for a while Ratan Singh and Suraj Mall encountered and killed each other. It normalized once Udai Singh succeeded to the throne of Mewar and was during this period that the fort of Ranthambhor and seven other parganas; (Patan, Kota, Khatkar, Lakheri, Nainwa, Anterda and Khairavad) were granted in patta to Rao Surjan, as chief of Bundi after removing Rao Surtan.
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Thus Hadas had established their hegemony over a large area by 16th century, initially by taking advantage of the weakened position of Guhils and afterwards, by confronting and resisting the Guhil claim of supremacy. They were ultimately sandwiched between powerful sultans of Malwa and Ranas of Mewar and had little option but to accept the sovereignty of Mewar, in order to save the position which they had gained around Bundi.

II

Hadas under the Mughals

Hadauti's integration with Mughal Empire began with Rao Surjan handing over the fort of Ranthambhor to Akbar in 1569. He had been convinced to take the decision through the mediation of Bhagwan Das Kachwaha and had little option after the fall of Chittor in the preceding year. As early as 1567 Surjan had to relinquish some of his ancestral domain to the advancing imperial armies. Sivi Super had been conferred on Nazr Bahadur and Kota on Shah Muhammad Qandhari by Akbar because even before the H. M's arrival the servants of Surjan the governor of the fort of Ranthambhor had become so terrified and had gone off together with the peasantry. Close association between the Mughal military operations against the rebel nobles and the Hada chief of Ranthambhor gives an impression that initial subjugation of the hadas was a by-product of the court politics.

After joining the Mughal service he was able reach the mansab of 2000, and was holding the parganas of Bundi and Khatkar as his watan. His watan was deemed to be just Bundi and Khatkar is confirmed even by his own proposal.

63 A.N., II, pp. 495-96
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to give Bundi to Duda and Khatkar to Bhoj. Bundi and Khatkar had been the earliest Hada possessions in the region. In Khajuria inscription Suraj Mall who died in 1531 was described as ruler of Bundi and Khatkar. This was only a fraction of the territory, which Hadas held in the Guhil polity. They held Bundi, Khatkar, Kota, Patan, Lakheri, Nainwa, Antarda, and Khairavad apart from the fort of Ranthambhor. However, assignment of Gadha and later on of four parganas of Chunar and seven parganas towards Varanasi in jagir compensated Surjan. Although, the Persian sources are silent but Nainsi has mentioned an agreement (kaul) which Surjan made with Akbar before handing over the keys of the fort of Ranthambhor. According to this agreement Surjan would continue to hold Rana of Mewar in reverence and was not to be sent against him. Inspite of such an unusual agreement discontentment against the alliance with the Mughals was apparent. One of the Rajputs who had accompanied Surjan’s sons to Akbar’s court at Ranthambhor, took out his sword attacked one of Bhagwan Das’s men and ran towards the Dault Khana—but, Surjan was not held responsible for it.

Similarly, the conduct of Duda, the elder son of surjan was also not particularly conducive for forging the alliance. He had gone and joined the court of Rana Udai Singh of Mewar who had provided him with a rozina (daily allowance) for substance. He repeatedly went up to Agra and picked up serious quarrels with his younger brother Bhoj who had joined the Mughal service and had been granted a mansab of 900 and even attempted to kill him while he was coming out of the court. He even tried to forcibly collect revenue from Bundi and created trouble. Abul Fazl also noted the departure of Duda from the royal court without leave in 1576 and that “he opened a hand of oppression at Bundi”.
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67 Khyaq, II, p. 266
68 Khajuria Inscription, s. 1563, cited Oja Udaipur Rajya ka Itihas op.cit p. 241.
69 A.N. III, p. 223, Khyaq, I., pp. 98-99
70 Khyaq, I, pp. 98-99.
71 A.N. II, pp. 494-95.
72 Khyaq, I, p. 100; III p. 268
73 Ibid.
This attitude and conduct of Duda towards Bhoj has been explained differently by historians over a period of time. Nainsi writing in 17th century noted the humiliation Rao Surjan had to suffer at the Mughal court after the surrender of Ranthambhor in contrast to the applause given to Jaimal and patta and their heroic defense of Chittor. On the basis of this testimony Shyamaldas has concluded that, this humiliation of Surjan had generated anti Muslim feeling in Duda's mind. It strained his relationship with Bhoj who remained in Mughal service. Ojha has linked the whole issue to Pratap's resistance against Akbar and concluded that Duda was fighting in the army of Pratap until Shahbaz Khan took him to Mughal court in 1578.

It would be rather knaive to describe Duda's attitude as simply anti-Muslim or anti- Mughal and to trace it to the personal humiliation of Surjan. The two brothers, Duda and Bhpj had been at loggerheads even before the acceptance of Mughal sovereignty. Rao Surjan's proposal to divide his ancestral domain between the two sons to give Bundi to Duda and Khatkhar to Bhoj, was rooted in these differences between the two. On this issue the sardars of Bundi were also divided and played up the contradictions between the two brothers. Dahiyas lead by Hammir of Karwar prompted Bhoj to seek the favor of Emperor Akbar against Duda. Gauds lead by Banno and Dhanno Gaud were the pradhans of Duda and sided with him not only to settle scores with Bhoj but even with Dahiyas for helping Bhoj.

Therefore, the decision of Duda to go to Udai Singh was to strengthen his claim against that of Bhoj. Later on Duda also went to the Mughal court and stayed there till 1576, after Udai Singh's death. He fled from the Mughal court again in order to take advantage of the troubled situation in Rajasthan created by Pratap's resistance to Mughals from 1576 onwards, but soon after

74 A.N, III, p. 258.
75 Khyar, I.p. 100.
76 Veer. Vinod., II/1, p. 115.
77 Ojha, op.cit
78 Khyar, II, pp. 266-272, links the differences between the brothers to their maternal families.
Khumbhalmer being captured by Mughals he became “repentant and submissive” and decided to come back with Shahbaz Khan to Agra. However, by this time Akbar had made up his mind in favor of Bhoj, by placing him incharge of Bundi	extsuperscript{79}. In sheer desperation he fled from mughal court once again and died in 1581 in Malwa on his way to Bijapur where he was going to seek help from the Bahamani ruler for his cause	extsuperscript{80}.

Inspite of these initial troubles the alliance of Hadas with the Mughals remained intact until the disintegration of the Mughal Empire. Alliance with the Mughals provided Hadas with a leverage against the Khinchis as well as necessary protection against Ranas of Mewar, which enabled them to wipeout the remaining pockets of Bheels in Hadauti and the Khinchi strong holds and extent their area up to Gagraun. Thus Mughal intervention in Hadauti strengthened the position of Hada chief as an intermediary between the rulers of Delhi vis-à-vis the other local groups.

Rao Ratan (1607-1631) rose up to the mansab of 5000/5000 and was granted the title of sarbuland Rai by Jahangir	extsuperscript{81}. After his death his son Madho Singh was given the jagir of Kota and Palaita while his grand son Chatrasal (son of Gopi Nath, who was the eldest son of Rao Ratan and died in his life time) was accepted as his successor and was given Bundi, Khatkar and other parganas of his watan in jagir with a mansab of 3000/2000	extsuperscript{82}. Madho Singh who had been in the Mughal service with a mansab of 1000/600 was also promoted to the mansab of 2500/1500 by Shahjahan	extsuperscript{83}. There after the Hukumat of Kota continued to be conferred on successors of Madho Singh. This lead to emergence of Hada principality of Kota, in due course, independent from Bundi. The Mughal policy was to give not only higher mansab but also the title of Rao to the Hada chief of Bundi, alone. The
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	extsuperscript{79} A.N. III, pp. 121-286, 355-56
	extsuperscript{80} Veer. Vinod. II/1, p. 111.
	extsuperscript{81} Tuzuk, tr. Rogers (revised and edited by Beveridge) , Vol 1, reprint Delhi, 1968, p.140
	extsuperscript{82} Badshahnama, Maasiir-ul-umra, cited in Veer Vinod, II/2, pp. 1407-9
	extsuperscript{83} Ibid.
mansabs granted to Kota chiefs were always lower than the chiefs of Bundi till Bheem Singh. The mansab granted to Hada chiefs of Bundi, Chatrasal, Bhao Singh and Anirudh Singh were higher than the mansab given to Madho Singh, Mukund Singh, Jagat Singh, Kishor Singh and Ram Singh of Kota in the period of two Mughal Emperors Shahjahan and Aurangzeb. Thus inspite of creation of a separate principality for Madho Singh and his successors, the primeval position or Bundi line of Hada chiefs was maintained within Hadauti and at Mughal court for quite some time.

It was during Aurangzeb's period, that Kota chiefs managed to have a better deal. Aurangzeb gave 'sardari-l-watan' to Jagat Singh of Kota84, But his successor Kishor Singh and later on Ram Singh were simply given hukumat-i-Kota85. However, Ram Singh who enjoyed the patronage of Zulfiqar Khan managed to secure the zamindari of Mau Maidana, after being taken away from Budh Singh of Bundi in A.D. 170486. After Ramsingh's death his son Bheem Singh received 'sardar-l-watan. In the period of Farrukhysiyar Hussain Ali Khan made an agreement with Bheem Singh of Kota to grant him the title of Maharaja and honours higher than any other Rajput except Ajit Singh of Jodhpur. This agreement could not be implemented due to Bheem Singh's death in 172087. The clear reversal of the policy towards Bundi, in the period of Ram Singh and Bheem Singh, created internal rivalries, which came to surface when Budh Singh of Bundi, obtained the farman from Bhadurshah to occupy Kota, which was resisted by Bheem Singh successfully. At first on his own and later on with the permission of Farukhysiyar and with the help of Saiyyad brothers, Bheem Singh even tried to avenge this act by occupying Bundi88. Thus Bheem Singh was able to use the factionalism at Mughal court to consolidate his position. His successor Durjan Sal's period witnessed the first invasion of Marathas lead by Baji Rao towards north. As the weaknesses

85 *Maasir*, op. cit II/2, p. 1411.
86 *Maasir*, op. cit. II/2, p. 1413
87 *Maasir*, op. cit. II/2 p. 1411
of Mughal Empire became apparent it compelled the Hadas to find ways and means to cope with the changing political scene in 18th century.

The Mughal Rajput alliance was projected in different perspectives by the two sides. The Hadas regarded themselves to be the sword arm of the Empire. The effort of bardic tradition of Hadauti was to highlight the role of Hadas in saving the Mughal Empire which got epitomised in the popular duha "jata garh Jahangir ka rakha Rao Ratan" (it was Rao Ratan who saved the fort of Jahangir). While the Mughal attitude towards Hadas found an expression in Jahangir’s description of Rao Ratan as "brave Rajput servant who fed from the royal table". Another contemporary perspective on Hada-Mughal alliance is found in Nainsi who mentioned that Rao Surjan was portrayed as a kukan (dog) while Jaimal and Patta were shown mounted on elephant on the walls of the gate of Agra fort. He was perhaps referring to the Hathiya pol on which ‘fabulous animals’ were depicted on the panels above the second storey of the gate, while on both the sides two life size stone statues of elephants were placed. Nainsi was perhaps reflecting the lighter side of Mughal Rajput relations, but the two sides clung to each other for more serious reasons as long as they could and tried to work out ways and means to co-exist.

Impact of political alliance with the Mughals upon the Rajput principalities of Rajasthan has been assessed and analyzed at length. It has been pointed out that establishment of Mughal paramountcy modified the Rajput polity, as well as "protected and enriched" the Rajput rulers. The rise of lesser Rajput clans like Kachwahas and Hadas as a result of their entry in the imperial service has also been noted. The position and prestige which the Kachwahas, Rathors
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89 Tuzuk, II, tr; op.cit p. 278
90 Khyat, I, op.cit. pp. 99-100
91 See, R. Nath, "Depiction of Fabulous Animals at the Delhi gate of Agra Fort" Medieval India- A Miscellany, II, Delhi, 1972, pp. 45-52
and Hadas were able to gain for themselves was considerable. The alliance had put an end to the 'internecine warfare' and opened 'the wider political arena' for them. Thus ramifications of the alliance were the same for the principalities of Amer, Marwar, Bundi, Kota etc. In fact, establishment of Kota as another Hada principality, independent of Bundi itself was a manifestation of Hada Mughal alliances.

The Kota chief used the alliance to further strengthen their position by expanding the area under their effective control and for sidelining the other Rajput clans present in the area such as Gauds, Solanki, and Khinchis and for subjugating the Bheels. Although, the watan of Kota chiefs was deemed to be paraganas of Kota and Palaitha, but they held a much larger area in jagir and ijara in paraganas of Baran, Mangrol, Sangod, Barod, Ghatoli, Mau etc. They also enjoyed faujdari rights in some of these paraganas. Consequently the Hada chiefs had become mediators in an intricate system of redistribution of these areas to their kinsmen and other Rajput sardars by way of jagir and ijara.

18th century witnessed receding imperial control and entry of the Marathas on the political scene of Rajasthan. It was a new political climate for the Rajput principalities of Rajasthan. Constant warfare between Kota and Bundi after Aurangzeb's death and growing factionalism at the Mughal court compelled Bheem Singh to align with one of the leading factions at court in order to defend his claim on his ancestral domain. The success of Bheem Singh against Bundi and the patronage of Saiyid brothers ensured a prominent
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93 S. Chandra, "Aurangzeb ka Punamulyamkan", in Madhya Kahan Bharat Mein Itihas Lekhan, Dharma, Aur Rajya Ka Swarup, I Hindi edition. New Delhi, 1999, p. 120
95 See, R.S Mathur, Relations of Hadas with Mughal Emperors, Delhi, 1986, pp. 104-108
96 Madha Singh had been granted Kota and Palaitha in jagir as his watan in c. 1631, Abdul Hamid Lahori, Badshah Nama, ed. By M.Kabiraddin and Abdul Rahim, Biblotheea Indica series, 1867-68, Vol I. P. 401
97 See, S. Chandra, The 18th Century in India: Its Economy and the Role of the Marathas the Jats the Sikhs and the Afghans, Calcutta, 1991
position to the Kota chiefs in the interstate politics of Rajasthan. However, the encounters between Bundela, Afghan and Maratha powers in Malwa in c. 1726-28 had become a cause of great concern to the Kota chiefs. They could feel the political pressure created by the Maratha onslaught in Malwa in various ways. Increased military activity in Malwa and Bundelkhand created disturbances in the southeastern part of the Kota principality. Therefore, the problem faced by the Kota chiefs was to maintain their claim on their ancestral domain as well as to save it from the impending threat of Maratha incursions. The political pressures on the Kota chiefs started much earlier than many other Rajput principalities of Rajasthan due to their territory being adjacent to Malwa. It was in this changed political climate that the Kota chiefs began to consolidate and assert their power and position in their ancestral domain afresh and tried to redefine their relationship with the Hada sardars. The new title of Maharao used by Bheem Singh as well as his successors adequately reflects their new pretensions. Durjan Sal had realised seerbandhi ki birad from his sardars at the time of accession in c. 1723. The birad had been fixed by on the basis of village held by them in jagir, the upi (realisation) from these villages, the nature of chakri and their proximity to the chief in terms of kinship ties. This birad was a contribution by the sardars to pay the peshkash to the Emperor. Those sardars who held imperial mansabs were exempted from the birad and were to pay the peshkash directly. The parganas around Kota were described as kajila of Nandgaon and Barsana or even as taluka of Maharao although the faujdari claims of Kota chief were confined pargana
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98 See, S. Chandra, Parties and Politics at the Mughal Court, 1707-1740, pp. 121-22-140, for the position enjoyed by Bheem Singh at the Mughal Court.
99 The title of Maharao was granted to Bheem Singh by Farukhsiyar on 18th September, 1713 at the time of raising his mansab to 2500 zat and 3500 sawar, Akhbarat, September, 1713; the jagir pattas granted by Bheem Singh in c. 1719 use this title, patta granted for mauza Sanjo, Asoj sudi 14, s. 1776, K.B. 1/85
100 Jama Seerbandhi ki birad, s. 1780, K.B. 1/108
101 Durjan Sal to hawalgin of pargana Mangrol, Aghan sudi 2, s. 1784, and undated papers attached to it refer to the peshkash to be given to the 'nawab ji', K.B. 1/118
102 Jama seerbandhi op.cit
103 Sirista pargana Nandgaon, s. 1776, K.B. 1/84; Mansabdaran ka dam Sri Maha Rao ji ka taluka pargana mein, s. 1784 K.B. 1/119
Baran\textsuperscript{104} and imperial orders about transfer of villages from \textit{jagir} to \textit{paibaqi} were being followed as usual\textsuperscript{105}. Kota chief participated in the imperial campaigns against Marathas in c. 1734-35 and c. 1737\textsuperscript{106}. It was only after Nizam-ul-mulk agreeing to cede the territory between Narmada and Chambal to the Marathas in c. 1739\textsuperscript{107} that the links with the imperial system were formally severed and the Kota chiefs had to agree to pay \textit{chauth} to the Marathas. As long as the imperial system was intact, claim of the Mughal \textit{mansabdars} to realise revenue from their \textit{jagirs}, remained acceptable in practice. However, the Kota Chiefs held most of it in \textit{ijara}. Reference to cash installments of \textit{ijara} amount being sent to Mughal \textit{mansabdars} can be found till c. 1739\textsuperscript{108}.

The growing political uncertainties also had an impact upon the attitude of the Rajput \textit{jagirdars} towards the Kota chief. Many of them had failed to turn up even after being called by the Kota chief, while some had deserted him when he was on his way to Rampura. Many of the \textit{jagirdars} frond to be \textit{ghairhazir}, were the \textit{bhai bhatijas} though, some other Rajputs also refrained from turning up\textsuperscript{109}. This attitude of the \textit{jagirdars} was unprecedented in the recent years. As a result, orders were issued to confiscate their \textit{jagirs} and put them in chief's \textit{khalsa}\textsuperscript{110}. The changed attitude of the \textit{sardars} was perhaps related to the need of keeping the \textit{raiyat} in their \textit{jagir} village assured, to prevent them from fleeing. Thus the changing political reality was compelling the \textit{sardars} to act independently. At the same time, the chief needed the clan support more than ever before, to guard against any encroachment on his domain. After 1740 it became increasingly necessary to make military arrangements at the local

\textsuperscript{104} Mansabdaran ka dam pargana Baran, Barod Sangod vagar mein, s. 1794, K.B. 1/135
\textsuperscript{105} Durjan Sai to hawlghir of pargana Baran, Posh sudi 7, s. 1784, mentions suluk of paibaqi
\textsuperscript{106} K.B. 1/119
\textsuperscript{107} S.Chandra,\textit{Parties and Politics at the Mughal Court}, op.cit, pp. 220 and 234
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid p. 235
\textsuperscript{109} Mansabdaran ke dam pargana Baran Barod Sangod etc. op.cit
\textsuperscript{109} The \textit{jagirdars} who were \textit{ghairhazir} were \textit{Bhai} Ratan Singh, Madho Singh, Jalam Singh, Mukund Singh Rathore, Ratan Singh Rathor, \textit{Bhai} Nawal Singh, Karamat Singh Hada, Kharat Singh Rahtor, Chain Singh \textit{Toji}, s. 1785, K.B. 1/123
\textsuperscript{110} Ibid
level. During this period not only the Marathas had to be appeased with regular payment of huge sums but the recurring loot of Nagas and Pindaris also posed a serious threat to agriculture. In c.1783 the Nagas had taken away the standing crops of sugarcane, grain stocks, more than rupees 1800 and gutted the tapras (huts) compelling the people to run away from the 25 villages of pargana Suket 111. After barely five years the Pindaris looted the same pargana. As a result at least seven villages were completely ruined and several others suffered partial damage112. Such loots broke the back of small peasant agriculture. This troubled situation made the jagirdars more powerful in their jagirs as well as in the court. It also enhanced the role and say of those sections who had at their command the resources to help the agrarian economy survive the political crisis. The changing political scene compelled the Kota chief to introduce many changes in the Hada polity. The system of sub-assignment known as ghoda bant jagirs was gradually replaced by patta jagirs. More and more jagirs were now assigned for chakri-desh. It also led to recruitment of many new groups as jagirdars to meet the new military needs. The system of revenue farming acquired a new dimension and utility. These developments had a profound impact upon the Hada polity. It is proposed to discuss some of the changes in detail in the following pages in a separate section.

III

Changes in the Hada Polity

Parwanas issued by Jagat Singh in 17th century contain references to a system of subassignment termed as ghoda-bant jagir. It appears that the Kota chiefs assigned such jagirs, primarily, to their kinsmen for recruiting them in their contingents in order to fulfill their obligations as Mughal mansabdars. However, some non-Hada Rajputs and Muslims were also included amongst the assignees. These assignments were made on the basis of number of

111 Araj Pargana Suket ki, attached with Zalim Singh's order of remissions, Asadh sudi 12, s. 1840, K.B.. 3/1
112 Zalim Singh to Kusal Singh etc. Phagun vadi 5, s. 1845, K.B. 3/3.
horsemen who could be sustained on the revenue of a village. A village could be assigned *dar-o-bast* (fully) or in *shariqat* (to be shared) on the basis of the estimated income of the village. For instance Sagat Singh was assigned only four horse *bant* (share) out of total six horse *bant* of mauza Borkheda, paragana Barod in c. 1681 and out of the two remaining *bants* one was assigned to Devkaran while the other was to be in Kota chief's *khalsa*.

One horse share in the case of Hiday Ram Hada in c.1701 was calculated to be rupees 300, when it was taken in *mukata* by the *jagirdar* who had the other five shares in that village. The claim of a *jagirdar* in a village was limited to the *hasil* from the area already under cultivation and *beeds* (virgin land) was to be in *khalsa*. The zabta of such a *jagirdar* consisted of *deel* (Persian *daul*) and *hazri-ra-aswar*. The zabta to be maintained could vary in *kharif* and *rabi*. Deep chand was maintaining eight horses (horsemen) in *kharif* and just four in *rabi*. Sagat Singh was maintaining three horses in *kharif* and just one in *rabi*. The emoluments for a *deel* depended upon three or two or one horse he was maintaining. The rate of payment for maintaining *hazri-ra-aswar* was lower than for the *deel*. There was not explicit reference to *jamaor rekh* of the village assigned in *jagir* or to the total pay claim of a *jagirdar* in cash. For instance, mauza Borkheda of pargana Barod was estimated to sustain six horses (*az gaon ek ghoda che*) or the *mal* (land revenue) of chak beegha 743 in mauza Arlo to sustain six horses for the purpose of assignment. The estimate for the two crops of *kharif* and *rabi* could be different. Mauza Borkheda of pargana Barod was estimated to sustain ten horses in *kharif* and five in *rabi*. This difference in the estimates for different villages shows that, although, there was no reference to the *jama or rekh* but it was used as the
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113 *Parwana* of Jagat Singh, s. 1738-40, K.B. 1/4
114 *Parwana*, Asadh vadi 14, s .1739, op.cit
115 *Parwana*, Asadh vadi 2, s. 1740, op.cit
116 *Parwana*, Asadh vadi Amavasya, s. 1739, op.cit
117 *Parwana* issued in favour of Miyan Rahim Khan Pathan states, "*deel 1 ghoda 4*" and "*hazri ra asab 12*", Asadh vadi 2, s. 1740, op.cit
118 *Parwana*, Asadh vadi 14, s. 1739, op.cit
119 *Parwana*, Asadh vadi Amavasya, s. 1739, op.cit
120 *Parwana* of Jagat Singh, op.cit
122 *Parwana*,Sawan vadi 1 s. 1740, op.cit
criterion for assignment. At times, a jagirdar was made naqdi or had to wait for a few months before getting the amal (control) of the village assigned in jagir. The payment for this duration was to be made in cash\textsuperscript{123}. So the reason for neither stating the jama / rekh of a village nor the actual pay claim of the jagirdar were certainly other than the absence of such estimates. One of the reasons was the risk in fluctuation of the hasil. In case of Pathan Hiyati Khan, who was given mauza Dhangaro in his ghoda-bant jagir because of fluctuation in the hasil, ultimately, his pay claim was fixed at rupees one thousand. It was decided that if the hasil of his jagir village fell short the remaining amount would be payable to him and if it exceeded, the excess amount would be deposited in khalsa\textsuperscript{124}. Hiyati Khan's case was an exception and most of the other ghoda-bant jagirdars had to share this fluctuation of hasil with the chief. They had to be content with whatever hasil they received from the village in jagir. Whether these assignees passed on the problem created by the difference between hasil and jama to the peasants remains ambiguous. Since, most of them had local roots, it would not have been difficult for them to extract the amount required for fulfilling the service obligations. Another reason for resorting to ghoda-bant jagirs instead of stating the exact pay claim against the jama of the villages assigned could be that many of the villages were still under summary assessment. Although disapproved by the higher authorities it continued to exist at the village level even till the 18 century\textsuperscript{125}.

These jagirs were also subject to transfers. Many a times when a jagir was transferred, the jagirdar was paid according to his hazri from the naqad chautra, before getting the amal of the next jagir village\textsuperscript{126}. At times, an assignee also took some grains as advance, which were adjusted against his

\textsuperscript{123} Parwana, Asadh vadi 14, s. 1739, op.cit
\textsuperscript{124} Parwana, Bhanon vadi, 1,s. 1740, op.cit.
\textsuperscript{125} N.A Sidiqqi, Land Revenue Adminstration under the Mughals, Bombay, 1970, pp. 53-54
\textsuperscript{126} Sagat Singh Hada was made a naqdi, but soon received a jagir, Parwana Asadh vadi Amavasya, s .1740, op.cit
total pay claim. A jagirdar could be placed, either in hazuri hazri or in desh. In the period of Ram Singh, the later category came to be termed as chakri desh ki. In one of the parwanas issued by Jagat Singh, the term chakar was used for a Pathan. The military obligation of Rup Singh Rajawat a non-Hada Rajput who was assigned a jagir in Hadauti, was termed as qarar and not chakri. In 18th century even huzuri hazri was replaced by huzuri chakri. Thus, the notion of chakri was incorporated explicitly in both the categories by 18th century. Significantly, the term chakri was initially used in the context of chakri of desh and only later on, in context of chakri of huzuri. The shift from hazri to chakri reflected the changed perception of the Kota chiefs towards their kinsmen. It symbolized the actual political power they had acquired by this time and the gradual decline in the position enjoyed by the sardars within the clan polity.

Some of the jagirs were assigned as khawai-ki-jagir carrying no military obligations. These jagirs were given to the kith and kin of the chief. Bhai Prem Singh, maiji Bhankrot and bai Uda held such jagirs in pargana Mangrol during the period of Jagat Singh in c. 1681. Such jagirs were also transferred according to the change in the jagir of Kota chief. These jagirs were assigned for the purpose of subsistence and were few.

In 18th century a new system of assignment in the form of patta jagirs marked the beginning of a new stage in Hada polity. These jagirs were assigned by issuing a patta which mentioned, the patta rekh i.e. the amount to which a jagirdar was entitled, the names of the villages assigned in jagir, the zabta to
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127 Parwana, Bhadun vadi, 1, s.1740, op.cit
128 Ajab Singh who hada zabta of 14 horses was to keep 12 in huzuri hazri and 2 in desh
129 Talikparcha, Sawan vadi ii, s. 1740, K.B. 1/4
130 Desh ki chakri ke patte, s. 1752, Toji. Taqsim, K.B. 6/1
131 Parwana of Asadh vadi 2, s. 1740, op.cit; states, "Rahim Khan Pathan Sardar mein chakar rakha che".
132 Order of Ramsingh for quarar of Rup Singh Rajawat, Chait sudi, 5, s. 1752, K.B. 6/1
133 Talik Parcha, Sawan vadi 11, s. 1740, op.cit
134 Ibid
be maintained by the jagirdar, and the nature chakri \(^{134}\) which could be huzuri or desh. The zabta specified in the patta consisted of deel and tabindar (troopers). In deel the number of personal horse and emoluments of the jagirdar were specified while the number of sawars, varkandaz (musketeers) and paidal (foot men) to be maintained by the jagirdar and the rate of payment for them was specified in tabindar category. The patta rekh equal to the sum total of the payment for the both the categories deel and tabindar\(^ {135}\). The emoluments fixed for the deel depended on the nature of chakri as well as the number of tabindars in command. The huzuri chakars received better payment for deel as well as tabindars. A deel with one to ten tabindars at his command could get anywhere between Rs. 300 to 700 per year in huzuri chakri\(^ {136}\). A deel with two personal horses and 150 tabindars was getting Rs. 6000 per annum\(^ {137}\). However, it seem that emoluments for deel were fixed at the discretion of the Kota chief while the rate per horseman in the tabindar category was uniform. In huzuri chakri a sawar with one turki tazi horse was paid Rs. 300 while in chakri desh the rate for a sawar was Rs. 200 per year\(^ {138}\). Normally a sawar was required to maintain turki-tazi horses. The hawalgir of every pargana was instructed to check the zabta being maintained and to deduct the amount for ghair-hazri.

These jagirdars were to render either chakri huzuri, or chakri desh, or at times the term used was chakri sarkar \(^ {139}\). Although, villages assigned in patta jagir were subject to transfer but some of the assignees were allowed to choose the village to be assigned in jagir\(^ {140}\). Patta jagirs most of the time were for a person's lifetime and were to be renewed at the time of accession of a

---

\(^{134}\) See the jagir Pattas of s. 1775, K.B. 1/80; Khata jagirdar Hada, s. 1780, K.B. 6/61; Bahi Talik s. 1823, K.B. 3/1

\(^{135}\) Ibid

\(^{136}\) Ibid

\(^{137}\) Joint patta given to Sam singh and Sahib Singh Naruka for 2 deel/ 4 horses and 300 tabindars with a patta rekh of rupees 1,02,000, dated Sawan vadi 1, s. 1791, Khate Jagirdar Hada, op.cit

\(^{138}\) Patta given to Deep Singh Hada, Aghan sudi 4, s. 1780, and to Salwahan Hada, Asadh vadi 14, s. 1780, Khate jagirdar Hada, op.cit

\(^{139}\) Ibid, patta given to Sam Singh Sahib Singh Naruka was for chakri sarkar ki

\(^{140}\) Bheem Singh to hawalgir of pargana Khatakheri, Posh vadi 10, s. 1760, K.B. 1/37
new chief. Some pattas were granted on a hereditary basis also. A jagir could be, either, in tankhwah, or in malkula. If the jagir was in tankhwah and the hasil fell short of the patta rekh, the remaining amount was to be paid to him. In malkula no such claim could be made by the jagirdar. The normal practice was to assign jagirs in malkula and not in tankhwah. However, in both the types, if the hasil exceeded the patta-rekh juwadi, (Persian az-jumal-vadi) the amount to be deducted was fixed. It was to be paid by the jagirdar in two or three installments in a year. The decision to make a jagir tankhwah or malkula was not taken arbitrarily. If the village to be assigned had a hasil, which broadly corresponded to the rekh, jagir was assigned in malkula, but if the hasil had lot of fluctuation, it was assigned in tankhwah. In the former minor or occasional variations were to be borne by the jagirdar. However, if the difference between rekh and hasil was more than occasional it was given in tankhwah so that the loss could be compensated. A village assigned in tankhwah was continuously reviewed on the basis of chak (beegha) and upat details and whenever the state was satisfied, converted in to malkula. In case of a jagir being converted from tankhwah to malkula necessary adjustment were made in the zabta as well. Some times, Instead of fixing the patta rekh an assignment known as patta keemati was also made. These pattas were issued to the Pathans and in such pattas though the pay claim was fixed according to the specifications of the zabta, no village was assigned. The payment was to be made by the hawala which was to be ¾ in jinsi (grains), and the remaining in cash. It was a paradox that the ghoda bant jagir, which was, a mode of payment against specified service obligations was termed as

---

141 See Parwana bahali issued by Bheem Singh for Daulat Singh Hada to the hawalgir of pargana Khatakheri, Asoj vadi 10, s. 1760, K.B. 1/61
142 Bheem Singh to hawalgir of Khatakheri, Asadh sudi 14, s. 1772, K.B. 1/72 and Arjan Singh order for Kushal Singh Mewawat, Baisakh sudi 10, s. 1779, K.B. 1/96
143 Heeru Singh Dahiya's jagir was changed from tankhwah to malkula, Arjan Singh's order, Sawan vadi 10, s. 1779, K.B. 1/96
144 For instance, Jait Singh Sagtawat had to pay the amount for juwadi in three installments of rupees 150 in Katik, rupees 173 in Magh and 175 in Baisakh from the hasil his jagir in mauza Patheda, pargana, Baran, K.B. 1/118
145 Arjan Singh's order, Asadh sudi 14, s. 1778, K.B. 1/96
146 Durjan Sal to Dhai Bhai Dev Karan etc. about five parwanas, s. 1779, K.B. 1/96
147 Durjan Sal's order for Sikandar Khan Pathan, Aghan vadi 14, s. 1782, K.B. 1/115
'chakri' only towards the end of 17th century. Where as the patta jagir which was basically an acceptance of the claims based upon kinship ties by the chief described the military obligations in terms of chakri right from the beginning. While the ghoda bant jagir was basically an arrangement to recruit kinsmen for fulfilling military obligations as Mughal mansabdars the patta jagir was reinforcement of the claim of kinsmen within Hada polity. Although both carried specified military obligation and reinforced the kinship ties, but the emphasis had been reversed in the changed context. A patta jagir could be granted even before fixing the military obligation. Similarly, a patta jagir could be made ‘sadamadri’ (permanent) to be retained by the successors. Thus the patta jagir was the embodiment of the permanent claims of sardars within the Hada polity. The spirit of patta jagir lay in the claim to a patta, rather than in the zabta to be maintained according to the patta.

Even after adoption of patta jagir some assignments continued to be ghoda bant ki jagir. Amar Singh was given 1000 beegha reserved for khalsa in mauza Dungariya of pargana Mangrol against a zabta of four horses. Fateh Singh Hada was given chak beegha 1100 against a zabta of one horse in c. 1726 and he was to retain the dastur. So it appears that the practice of ghoda bant continued as long as the Hada rulers remained associated with the Mughal rulers leading to redistribution of the parganas and villages received by them in jagir. However, the upcoming trend was to give patta jagirs even to small assignees. Megh Singh Hada Barawat was given a patta jagir with a rekha rupees 700, against a zabta of one deal with one horse and one tabindar.

In 18th century a number of jagirs had to be given in chakri-desh-ki, to garrison various hawalas, because of the intensification of rivalry with the

148 Bheem Singh order, Jeth vadi 5, s. 1764, K.B. 1/59; similar references can be found in the later period also
149 Durjan Sai’s order, Bhadva vadi 6, s. 1783, K.B. 1/118
150 Durjan Sai’s order Phagum vadi 11, s. 1783, K.B. 1/118
neighbouring Hada principality of Bundi. In c. 1723 more than 4/5 of the Hada jagirdars were in chakri desh\textsuperscript{157}. The need to provide security at local points was so strong and urgent that a large number of small jagirs were conferred on Bheel, Meena, Gujar and Ahedi communities in pargana Kota and pargana Baran for chakri desh. There were 78 jagirdars from these communities as against just 11 Rajputs posted in the different Kota (fortresses) of bardi area\textsuperscript{152}. Their contingents consisted of mainly paidal soldiers who were paid very small amount for subsistence\textsuperscript{153}. These communities were the original inhabitants of this area and many of them considered themselves to be the bhomias. They considered it obligatory to render this type of limited military service to the Rajput chief in special situations namely to defend the land that once belonged to their ancestors\textsuperscript{154}. These assignments were only for the time being and could be revoked afterwards. Towards the end of 18th century the numbers of such jagirdars was considerably reduced\textsuperscript{155}.

The fiscal obligation of the jagirdars kept on increasing through out 18th century for various reasons. At the end of 17th century the jagirdars were paying khai bhom at the rate of rupees 7.50 per horse of their zabta\textsuperscript{156}. They also paid rupee one per bullock and rupee one per buffalo\textsuperscript{157}. This was realised in lieu of allowing the jagirdar to appropriate the hasil bhomi and the cess known as bhainsa which were realised over and above the jama of the village. Mohrana was charged at the rate of rupees 7.50 per horse in the zabta\textsuperscript{158}. It was realised at the time of the first jagir assignment to be paid from the first hasil of jagir. Mohrana was not charged in case of transfer or renewal of jagir\textsuperscript{159}. In 18th century, at the time of accession of a new ruler these jagirdars were made to contribute for the peshkash to be paid by the

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Year} & 
\textbf{Amount (rupees)} \\
\hline
1723 & 7.50 \\
1724 & 7.50 \\
1725 & 7.50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Jagirdar Contributions}
\end{table}
chief to the Mughal emperor. It was known as seerbandhi and was charged at the rate of rupees 100 per horse from huzuri chakars and rupees 40 per horse from desh chakars, at the time of accession of Durjan Sal in c. 1723. These jagirdars who held imperial mansabs were subjected to peshkash directly\textsuperscript{160}. At times, to raise money, ghoda birad was also realised at the rate of rupees 40 per horse in the zabta from both huzuri and desh chakars\textsuperscript{161}. The practice of levying birad on the jagirdars on various occasions to meet the financial needs of the state became frequent in 18th century. At times the jagirdars found these fiscal burdens too heavy to bear and complained. In case of natwani (poverty) of the jagirdar or kumi-hasil (poor collection) the state had to extend remissions\textsuperscript{162}. At time not, only a remission were granted but even the additional amounts realised from that village such as bighori, jamdari and patwari birad had to be granted to the jagirdar\textsuperscript{163}. However, The situation remained quite dismal. Bhai Prem Singh of Pipalda, to contribute for the peshkash to be given to Nawab Asad Ali, had to surender his patta to the darbar to realise tha hasil of his jagir against the outstanding amount\textsuperscript{164}. The darbar in its own turn was hard pressed for money and was helpless in view of the growing pressures.

By its very nature the nobility of Hadauti was predominantly Hada, although, Dahiya and Gaud Rajputs were present from the very beginning. In early 17\textsuperscript{th} century Rathors had also entered as a result of Rao Ratan's policy to subjugate the Khinchis. The different Hada khamps (branches) were fifty eight percent of jagirdars in huzuri ki chakri in c. 1723\textsuperscript{165}, inspite of a large number of jagirs having been recently conferred on the Kachwahas because of the growing rivalry with Bundi, perhaps in a bid to secure support against Sawai

\textsuperscript{160} Jame seerbandhi ki birad, s. 1780, K.B. 1/108

\textsuperscript{161} Durjan Sal's order Phagun vadi 11, and Baisakh vadi 10, s. 1780, K.B, 1/109

\textsuperscript{162} Orders of Durjan Sal about such remissions, Phagun sudi 3, Phagun vadi 11, Baisakh vadi 10, s. 1780, K.B. 1/109

\textsuperscript{163} Ibid, Umed Singh's order, Magh vadi 5, s. 1835, K.B. 6/8

\textsuperscript{164} Parwana, Aghan sudi 1 and Aghan sudi 2, and likhant of Bhai Prem Singh, Aghan sudi 1, s. 1784, K.B. 1/118

\textsuperscript{165} Goshwara Huzuri ki tan ke jagirdaron ka, s .1780, K.B. 1/108
Jai Singh\textsuperscript{166}. Though the entry of Kachwahas can be traced to 17\textsuperscript{th} century when Ram Singh had given jagirs in lieu of service to several powerful Kachwahas like Rup Singh and Sur Singh Rajawat along with their kinsmen\textsuperscript{167}, but their position began to improve after 1720. Sam Singh and Sahib Singh Naruka enjoyed a patta of rupees 1,02,000 in twenty eight villages of pargana Palaitha, Barsana and Barod, in the period of Durjan Sal\textsuperscript{168}.

By 1723 Kachwahas constituted the second largest group, but began to loose their position after Sawai Jai Singh’s death and by the end of 18th century were reduced to a nominal strength. The other Rajput clans who suffered a loss of strength were Solanki, Dahiya, Gaud and Rathors. Their number declined steadily in 18\textsuperscript{th} century.

The four major khamps of Hada who held jagirs were Sawant, Arjun Pote, Narhad Pote, Ram ka Hada and bhais (brothers) of the chief, which included the cousins of the Kota chief on paternal side for two or three generations\textsuperscript{169}. The fortune of different khamps kept changing. For instance Sawat Hadas lost their position enjoyed till the period of Bheem Singh. In c. 1723 their number in chakri huzuri was sixty which was reduced to just two in c. 1797\textsuperscript{170}. The turning point in the position enjoyed by Sawat Hadas was the succession dispute between Durjan Sal and Sam Singh, the two brothers who encountered each other in the battle of Udaipur in c. 1723\textsuperscript{171}. We have references to the Sawat Hadas fleeing from their villages and the hasil of their halas being taken in khalsa\textsuperscript{172}. Some of the jagirs of the Sawant Hada whose jagirs were made Khalsa had returned later on\textsuperscript{173}. Many of the jagirs of

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{166} Ibid
\item \textsuperscript{167} Ram Singh’s order. Chait sudi 15, s. 1752, K.B. \textit{6/1}
\item \textsuperscript{168} Durjan Sal’s order, Sawan vadi 1, s. 1781, K.B. \textit{1/61}
\item \textsuperscript{169} Jama seerbandhi ki birad, op.cit
\item \textsuperscript{170} Khata Desh ke jagirdaron ke naam, s. 1854, K.B. \textit{7/43}
\item \textsuperscript{171} A A R, op.cit, p.
\item \textsuperscript{172} Durjan Sal’s order, Baisakh vadi 7, s. 1780, K.B. \textit{1/109}
\item \textsuperscript{173} Durjan Sal’s order, Jeth vadi 12, s. 1780, K.B. \textit{6/61}
\end{footnotes}
Sawant, which were in tankhwah, were changed to malkula. The succession dispute had divided the khamps of Hadas and the success of Durjan Sal had lead to a decline in the position of those Hada khamps who had sided with Sam Singh. While the Sawant Hadas lost their position some new khamps managed to secure more jagirs like Hada Hammir, Ramlot, Baranwat and Mewawat. So the position lost by one khamp was transferred in terms of new jagir assignment to the other khamps, having a smaller share till then.

Although, the nobility of Kota was predominantly Hada but because of political pressures, many new groups entered the polity in 18th century. The new groups who entered the ranks of jagirdars were Dakhini Pandits, Pindaris and Arabs. The state officials known as khawas also became powerful. The khawas were from Brahuman, Kayasth and mahajan communities and held important position in administration. The Dakhini Pandits had gained jagirs as a result of entry of Marathas in Hadauti in c. 1739.

Recruitment of the Pathans, Pindaris and Arabs was to meet the new military needs. Many of them were in the chakri of topkhana. Topkhana had to be developed at the local level as an important branch of the war machine because after the decline of Mughal power the Hadas had to fend for themselves. Thus the composition of nobility changed considerably after c. 1740 and by the end of 18th century, non-Hada and non-Rajput groups had improved their position considerably. This change was primarily due to the problems, which cropped up in a clan-based polity after the decline of Mughal Empire. The tendency of jagirdars was to establish complete and permanent hold on the jagir village even in 17th century. They had succeeded in doing so

---

174 Durjan Sal to Dev Karan, etc, undated, s. 1779, K.B. 1/108
175 Goshwara Huzuri ki tan ke jagirdaron ka, s. 1780, K.B. 1/108
176 Khata Desh ke jagirdaron ke nam, s. 1754, op.cit
177 Ibid
178 Dalel Khan who was a Pathan was the incharge of taluka topkhana in the period of Zalim Singh; for jagirs of Pindaris, Pathans and Dadu Panthis in s. 1840-46, k.b. 3/3
179 See Appendix II
through an intricate system of *ijara* and exchange mediated by the Kota chief. The *patta jagirs* fulfilled this urge to a great extent. A significant change was that *patta* which was a document of assignment began to be interpreted as a document of right. The *patta jagir* while on the one hand vindicated the position of the chief vis-à-vis the *sardars*, as the authority investing a *patta*. On the other hand by its very nature a *patta jagir* provided permanence to the claims of the *sardars* leading to retrogradation of the system of assignments and wily revival of the principle of *bhai-bant*. The *patta jagir* thus became a streamlined version of *bhai-bant*.

The *patta jagirs* entrenched a *jagirdar* in his *jagir* village and he acquired a definite say in the process of assessment and collection. Decline in the number of *huzuri chakars* who were needed by the chief, primarily, to render military service to the Mughals and increase in the number of *desh chakars* the *jagirdars* could be physically present in their *jagir* for a much longer period. In many cases the *jagirdar* used to be personally present during the *lata*.

The number of complaints by the *jagirdars* about poor *hasil* and levies imposed by the state also went up. The presence of the *jagirdar* in the village intensified the contradictions within the village society. It became increasingly difficult to transfer the *patta jagirs* and in many cases the *jagirdars* refused to vacate the village placed in *khalsa*. Quarrels amongst

---

180 Umed Singh to Rathor Bhawahi Singh, Isari Singh, Jeth sudi 15, s. 1845, K.B. 3/3
181 Some of the *jagirdars* went to the extent of denying even the claim of the *dohli* land holders in their *jagir* village, Bheem Singh's order to Karam Chand Hada, *Jagirdar* of Rani ka Kheda, Jeth sudi 3, s. 1766, K.B. 1/61; In later half if 16th century *jagirdars* of *pargana* Baran and Palaitha were refusing to allow the *dastur* of *chaudhary* and *kanungo*, Umed Singh's order, Katik sudi 4, s. 1845, K.B. 3/3
182 For decline in the number of *huzuri chakars*, see Appendix I-B
183 *Likhnat* of patel and *karsa* of *mauza* Neeloda refers to the presence of *jagirdars* at the time of *lata*, Sawan sudi 1, s. 1784 K.B. 1/119
184 *Kabuliyat* of the *tahalwa* of Raja Kirat Singh, Sawan vadi 1, s. 1807, K.B. 1/135
185 Orders of Durjan Sal about the complaints of the *jagirdars*, s. 1780, K.B. 1/109
186 Umed Singh to Dalel Singh Sagatwot warned him against disobeying the *parwana* sent earlier to vaccate *mauza* Alod, Posh sudi 4, s. 1841, K.B. 3/3
jagirdars of neighboring principalities could not be checked inspite of repeated warnings by the concerned chiefs\textsuperscript{187}.

Towards the end of 17\textsuperscript{th} century, many a times, the remaining villages of those parganas which were in jagir of the Kota chief were secured in ijara from the other Mughal jagirdars, khalsa or paibaqi. For instance pargana Mangrol in which Ram Singh held a jagir of 24,20,000 dams, in c. 1697, dar-o-bast dams were secured by way of ijara along with the faujdari of the pargana out of which 18,01,551 dams were redistributed\textsuperscript{188}. A similar, redistribution was made against ‘chakri-desh’ in pargana Itawa and pargana Barod in c. 1695\textsuperscript{189}. Jagirs were assigned not only to Hadas but also to Kachwaha, Rathor, Gaud and Solanki Rajputs, through a systematic redistribution \textsuperscript{190}. The system of redistribution strengthened the position of the chief vis-à-vis his kinsmen as the could now assign, transfer and take away a certain position on which they had no inherent claim. Redistribution made in favor of the non-Hada Rajputs helped in reducing the chief’s dependence upon him kinsmen. However, it did not lead to rolling back of the policy of bhai-bant in essence, as bulk of the redistribution was in favor of bhai-bhatijas and other Hada thakurs,\textsuperscript{191} but it marked a new stage in the development of Hada polity.

A large numbers of parganas held by the Kota chiefs in ijara/mukata and faujdari reflect the dependence of the Mughal ruling class upon the locally powerful groups for revenue collection\textsuperscript{192}. Much of it was a result of the

\textsuperscript{187} Umed Singh to Kushal Singh Ranawat for quarreling, forcibly realising grains and snatchino from the villages in Mewar principality. Posh vadi 4, s. 1841, K.B. 3/3

\textsuperscript{188} Parcha Zat dovarki, s. 1754, K.B 1/35

\textsuperscript{189} Desh ki chakri ke patte, s. 1752, op.cit

\textsuperscript{190} Ibid

\textsuperscript{191} In P.Mangrol, out of 1801551 dams, 1166325 were assigned in jagir to the Hadas while the rest were given to other Rajputs, order dated Asadh sudi 9, s. 1775, K.B. 1/80

\textsuperscript{192} In Hadauti the practice of revenue farming has more often than not been noted by the term Mukata, although, the term ijara had also been in use. The term was perhaps derived from persion muqta or bi-l-muqta, which has been explained as fixed demand of revenue year after year and in which revision was only a special measure and not the rule, The Cambridge Economic History of India. Ed. T.Roychoudhary and Irfan Habib, Delhi, 1984, vol. 1, p. 238 and A. Ali, Mughal Nobility Under Aurangzeb, Bombay, 1970, p. 85. In mukata revenue was farmed at a slashed rate of jama.
practical problem associated with revenue collection in a large Empire because of the great distance between the area of posting and the area assigned in jagir. This seems to be particularly true for the Dakhini mansabdars, who had to depend upon the local chiefs for their jagirs situated in ‘Hindustan’. However the dependence of the Mughal ruling class also had a political dimension in Hadauti. The on going struggle against the Khinchis, Gauds and Bheels in the region left little option with the Mughal ruling class, but to depend upon the strength of the Hada chiefs to maintain the process of surplus extraction. The events like the uprising of Chakrasen Bheel in 1661, and conduct of the Khinchis through out the 17th century, reflect the tensions, which prevailed in Hadauti and Khinchiwada. Even in Hadauti, problems created by Raja Uttam Ram Gaud in 1682-83, by Durjan Sal Hada of Bundi in 1687, by Bishan Singh and Harnath Singh Hada of Kota, at the time of Ram Singh’s accession, all demonstrate the local political pressures on the Mughal imperial system. It was in this situation that Hada chiefs of Kota emerged as reliable political allies in the region. These ijaras and faujdari brought a large area under direct control of the Kota chiefs and gave them an opportunity to redistribute the villages of this area in jagir or mukata according to their own political calculations.

The ijara/mukata taken by the Kota chiefs were of various types. Some of these were in the well-known category of rasad-afzud-ijara. Apparently, such an arrangement was made when the jama had decreased due to natural calamities. These mukatas were fixed at a sum lower than the jama but with a gradual increase reached up to the level of the jama but with a a gradual increase reached up to the level of the original jama. The ijara of pargana

192 C.A Bayly, Rulers, Townsmen and Bazars, New Delhi, 1998, p. 164
194 Toji Parchazat, s. 1748-51, K.B. 1/19, Pertaining to he ijara of Manikunji, Subhan j threw and Sankuji’s jagirs uses this term
195 Nainsi, Khyaf, 1, p.101-4
196 For a general discussion on these see, R.S Mathur, Relations of Hadas with Mughal emperors, op.cit, pp.158-162, 170-71; Raja Uttam Ram Gaud has also been referred to in the context of redistribution of P.Mangrol’s dams, s. 1754, op.cit; He also had a jagir in P.Aton which was in ijara of Ramsingh, K.B. 1/35
197 See, N.A Siddiqi, op.cit, for an explanation of the term rasad afzud ijara. p. 92
Urmal can be placed in this category\textsuperscript{198}. The \textit{taqsim} of \textit{pargana} Urmal for c. 1697 shows that at least 1/3 of the villages in the \textit{pargana} were \textit{ujad}\textsuperscript{199} (deserted). The \textit{dar-o-bast dam} of the \textit{pargana} were in \textit{jagir} of two Mughal \textit{mansabdars}. They had given it in \textit{mukata/ijara} in c. 1697, initially, for three years to the ruler of Kota, at a four-month scale of \textit{jama} but with an annual increase to reach up to six-month scale of \textit{jama} in the fourth year\textsuperscript{200}. The \textit{mukatas} in \textit{pargana} Ghatoli were also fixed at an extremely low month scale of \textit{jama} between c. 1690-1696\textsuperscript{201}. The \textit{khalsa patshahi}, \textit{paibaqi} and \textit{jagir dams} were taken in \textit{mukatas} from time to time at two-month scale of \textit{jama}\textsuperscript{202}. It seems that \textit{pargana} Ghatoli was sparsely populated. In c. 1664 it was stated to be having just thirty-one villages\textsuperscript{203} while from the \textit{taqsim} of c. 1711 it appears that the number of villages had gone down from thirty-one to twenty six. Over a period of forty-seven years only two villages had been repopulated while some of the populated villages seem to have disappeared\textsuperscript{204}.

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Az pargana dam} & 6,00,000 \\
\hline
\textbf{Mauza} & 26 \\
\hline
\textbf{Asli} & 24 \\
\hline
\textbf{Dakhili} & 02 \\
\hline
\textbf{Biran wa ujad} & 03 \\
\hline
\textbf{Baqi} & 23 \\
\hline
\textbf{Asli} & 21 \\
\hline
\textbf{Dakhili} & 02 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{198} Urmal had suffered a crop failure is s. 1755/c.1698 refered to in the \textit{mukata} for that year, K.B. 1/29
\textsuperscript{199} Taqsim of P.Urmal, s. 1754, K.B. 6/1
\textsuperscript{200} Mukata of P.Urmal, s. 1755, K.B. 1/29
\textsuperscript{201} Mukata of P.Ghatoli, s. 1755, K.B. 1/29
\textsuperscript{202} Ibid
\textsuperscript{203} Khyat 1, p102.
\textsuperscript{204} Taqsim P Ghatoli, s.1768, K.B.6/1.
\end{flushright}
The two villages, which were dakhili, had been created by the rulers of Kota by allotting land to the chakars of state. However, the jama of the pargana was 6,00,000 dams in c. 1690 and remained the same even in c. 1711\textsuperscript{205}. So the purpose of mukata in this case, was to improve the number of inhabited villages and cultivated area in the pargana. To achieve this, jagirs were granted to some Kachwahas in order to counter the Khinchis, but not much improvement could be made\textsuperscript{206}. However, the realization against jama had improved considerably by c. 1709\textsuperscript{207}.

After c.1709 many of the ijaras were in the zortalab areas, such as pargana Chacharni and Gugo\textsuperscript{208}. Some of these ijaras had been obtained from the Dakhini mansabdars for whom it would have been difficult to collect revenue even in the raiyati areas because of the distance. However, in these parganas even the khalsa and paibaqi was given in mukata to the Kota chief. Thus the difficulty in revenue collection was not related to distance alone, as the Khinchis continued to resist the Mughals. Therefore, most of these ijaras were fixed for very small amounts corresponding to hardly one or two and even a half-month scale of jama. At times the necessary kharch incurred to finalise these mukatas with amin, kirori and other officials was more than the asli (real) jama of the mukata\textsuperscript{209}. The mukata of the jagir of a Dakhini mansabdar in pargana Gugor was again without any reference to month scale of jama\textsuperscript{210}. The asli amount for mukata tended to remain the same for as many as four years in sequence and the increase was to take place in the fifth year. Where as when it was in jagir of one of the Hada sardars, the mukata was fixed at six month scale of jama but when it was reverted back to paibaqi, the mukata was fixed at a three month scale of jama\textsuperscript{211}. Thus the Hada chiefs were clearly using to their advantage, the problems which Mughals administration

\textsuperscript{205} Ibid
\textsuperscript{206} Ibid
\textsuperscript{207} Ibid
\textsuperscript{208} Mukata of P.Chachami and Gugor, s. 1749, and s. 1758, K.B. 1/19 and 38
\textsuperscript{209} Ibid
\textsuperscript{210} Mukata of P.Gugor, op.cit
\textsuperscript{211} Mukata of P.Chachami, op.cit
had to face in Khinchiwada. The success of Kota chiefs in this area was reflected in the transfer of zamindari of Mau Maidana to Ram Singh towards the end of Aurangzeb's reign.

The mode of realisation adopted by the Kota ruler in this area was to give a sub lease in *pargana* Chacharni to Inder Singh Hada Raimalot at a slightly higher rate\(^{212}\), and in *pargana* Gugor, which was an even more difficult area, a sub lease to some of the Khinchi *thakurs*. While Inder Singh Hada was successful in improving revenue realisation year after year. The Khinchi *thakurs* did not make any payment what so ever, even after three years\(^{213}\). As a result, a *parwana* had to be issued from Kota to attach half of the *jagat* of *pargana* Gugor, which was thrown to wind by the Khinchi *thakurs*. The *potdar* found himself helpless in view of the *vasis* and *nauhrs* of Khinchis spread all over the area. With great difficulty and mediation of local persons involved in the *mukata* finally, only a part of the outstanding amount could be realised\(^{214}\). Thus, the redistribution pattern of the land acquired in *mukata* was determined by the nature of problem existing in that area.

In case of zortalb areas, where the locally powerful groups were not willing to cooperate with an outsider, it was sub leased to a locally powerful person. The sub lease could be given at a higher rate. The *mukata* of *jagir* of Surtan singh Rahtore in *Kasba* Chechat in s. 1760/AD 1703 was taken at a four month scale of the *jama* and subleased at seven month scale of *jama*\(^{215}\). The person taking the sub lease furnished an undertaking signed by two local merchants. It contained conditions such as not to interfere with revenue collection of *paibaqi* in the *pargana*; to accept the authority of *amin*, *kirori*, *faujdar* and the Kota *darbar*. It was also stated that the *mukata* was to be renewed only in case of the *jagir* being *bahal* as per order but in case of *jagir*...
being transferred or withdrawn the mukata was not to be renewed and to vacate the area without any objection. In these sub-leases, the Kota darbar was only a mediator between the jagirdar and the locally powerful person capable of realising the revenue. In case of default, responsibility to arrange for the payment was borne by the Kota darbar. When Devi Singh Chundavat, who had given the ijara of his jagir in pargana Ghati and Ghatoli, did not receive the payment, the officers posted at pargana Madhukargarh hawala, were instructed to pay his from the hasil of zabti and agotri from other villages. Whatever margin was left for the Kota darbar, by way of this mediation was because of shouldering this responsibility of payment. However, this responsibility to ensure regular collection and payment was shouldered not for the sake of this margin, but primarily, to protect their own political interest, to find allies amongst the strong local groups in these areas, which were not fully under Hada domination, yet. The method of giving a sublease enhanced the revenue collection by improving the machinery of surplus extraction as a result of involvement of locally powerful groups.

The mukatas of parganas dominated by the Hadas were of a different nature. The Hadas of Kota had been in a dominant position in the parganas of Kota, Palaitha, Mangrol, Etawa, Baran, Barod, Aton and Sangod. The mukatas obtained in these parganas helped the rulers of Kota to maintain their hold. Such ijaras were obtained, primarily, from the Dakhini mansabdars, Muslim and Rajput mansabdars, and also from paibaqi and Khalsa. Although, the mukatas were taken invariably with reference to the month-scale of jama, but the rate for jagir and paibaqi areas varied, even withing the same pargana. The mukatas for jagirs were generally fixed at a higher rate than for the paibaqi. Since, the jagirs obtained in mukata belonged to a cross section of mansabdars, therefore, the month-scale of jama at which the mukatas were obtained, did not reflect so much the proportion of hasil against jama, as the
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215 Mukata of Surtan Singh Rathor's jagir in P.Chachat,s .1758, K.B. 1/38
216 Ibid
217 Bheem Singh to hawalgir of P.Madhu kargarh, Asadh vadi, 7. s. 1765, K.B. 1/37
bargaining position of the individual *jagirdar* with the Kota ruler. For instance, the *jagirs*, of a Dakhini were obtained in *mukata* at three month scale of *jama* till c. 1691 and at the four month scale from c. 1692\(^{218}\) but the *jagirs* of a Rajput *mansabdar* were taken in the same *pargana* at five month scale\(^{219}\). In *pargana* Aton the *jagirs* of a Muslim *mansabdar* were taken at two and a half-month scale while the *jagirs* of a Rajput Raja were taken at four-month scale\(^{220}\). This difference can be explained only in terms of bargaining position of the individual *jagirdars*. The *paibaqi* was taken at one and half month and two month scale in three of these *parganas*, in c. 1697\(^{221}\). The *mukata* of *paibaqi* in a period of *jagridari* crisis could not have been obtained, without serious political considerations. It seems that the *paibaqi* of Itawa, Sangod and Godvada was given in *mukata*, either, because of a natural calamity, or, devastation and ruin for man made reasons\(^{222}\). Thus *mukata* in these *parganas*, although, fixed on the basis of actual agrarian conditions prevailing there involved some bargaining as well\(^{223}\). The bargaining position of both the parties was determined by the political conditions prevailing in the region.

The Hada rulers were often very keen to obtain the *jagirs* of other Rajputas in *mukata*. They were prepared to take such *mukatas* even at a higher month scale of *jama*, as compared to the *jagirs* of other *mansabdars* and *khalsa* and *paibaqi* land\(^{224}\). It implied that, they were keen to strengthen their hold and wanted to restrict all such claims, which were independent of their authority. Since, some of these *parganas* were also in the *faujdari* of Kota cheifs, the non- Hadas had to suffer a deduction for *faujdari dams*\(^{225}\). Those who wanted to escape from this deduction, either, gave their *jagirs* in *ijara* to the Kota chief

\(^{218}\) *Mukata of jagiri dams* of Dakhinin, s. 1751 1 ,K.B. 1/19

\(^{219}\) *Ijara of Parsa Ram Tanwar’s jagir*, P.Barod, s. 1754. K.B. 1/38

\(^{220}\) *Mukata of Ajmeri Khan and Utam Ram Gaud’s Jagir in P.Aton*, s.1757, K.B. 1/40

\(^{221}\) *Mukata of Paibaqi dams*, s. 1754, K.B. 1/35

\(^{222}\) Ibid

\(^{223}\) Ibid

\(^{224}\) *Mukata of Surtan Singh’s jagir*, op.cit and of Santi Singh Rahor in P.Bar, s. 1764, K.B. 1/59 and *Mukata of Paibaqi of P.Baran,Barod and Sangod*, s. 1755, K.B. 1/59

\(^{225}\) *Faujdari of Mangrol was with Ram Singh, P.Mangrol ke dam*, op.cit., of Bara with Bheem Singh, *Jamadami of P.Bar* s. 1771, K.B. 1/276, (Kota Depository)
or accepted his mediation, by taking a *jagir* assigned by him in exchange of their original *jagir*, in another *pargana*. For instance, *pargana* Mangrol was under *faujdari* of Ram Singh. Therefore, Gopal Singh Rathor gave his *jagir* in *ijara* to him while Kirat Sing Gaud accepted to exchange his *jagir* with two villages of *pargana* Sangod. Those who wanted to retain their *jagirs* had to suffer a deduction for *faujdari* dams\(^{226}\). Thus, the Kota chief used *ijara* and *faujdari* to assert their power in the Hada dominated *parganas*.

Many of the villages in the *parganas* acquired in this manner were redistributed to the local Rajputs including the Hadas in *mukata*. Kunwar Goman singh Hada had the *mukata* of *mauza* Bango in *pargana* Baran\(^{227}\). The Gauds and Solankis who were powerful in the east the north of Kota respectively had many villages in *mukata* in *pargana* Baran and Barod\(^{228}\). These *mukatas* were given for *mal-o-jihat* i.e. inclusive of cases in *tisala patta* (three-year lease). In some cases *hasil* of rahadari was to remain in Kota chief's *khalsa* but *hasil* of local *melas* was to be appropriated by the *mukati*\(^{229}\).

It was specified that ‘*amal*’ would be as ‘*sadamadi*’ and the amount for *mukata* would be paid according to the ‘*sarah*’ of the *pargana*\(^{230}\). The local Rajputs were obtaining these *mukatas* to maintain their *thakurai* in the villages where they had their *vasis*. Sadaram Bhankrot gave *mauza* Rawtha that he held in his *jagir* to the Kota chief and took in exchange *mauza* Rasulpur in *mukata* because his *vasi* was situated there\(^{231}\). The *hasil* of *mauza* Rawtha was to be adjusted against the amount payable for the *mukata* of *mauza* Rasulpur\(^{232}\). The reason for sub leasing these villages was to ensure the participation and support of the local *thakurs* in the process of surplus extraction. Any attempt to change this pattern could lead to a sudden decline in the *hasil*. For instance, in *mauza* Jhatoli of *paragana* Barod for which

\(^{226}\) *Pargana Mangrol ke dam*, s. 1754, op.cit

\(^{227}\) *Mukata of P.Bar*, s. 1755, K.b. 1/37

\(^{228}\) Ibid; *mukata of P.Barod*, s. 1755, K.B. 1/37

\(^{229}\) *Patta of mukata of M.Cheepardo*, P.Barod to Hindu Singh Gaud, Jeth sudi 6, s. 1754, K.B. 1/37

\(^{230}\) Ibid

\(^{231}\) *Mukata of M.Rasulpura and Lekha of Sadaram Bhankrot*, s. 1766, K.B. 1/60
detailed information is available, it can be seen that unless it was in *jagir* or *mukata* of Sarup Singh, who was a Sawat Hada, the *upti* (expected yield) of rupees 1720 could not reach, even up to rupees 1000\textsuperscript{233}. Thus in a situation where the Kota chiefs could assign *jagirs* of only a limited value and only on transferable basis, *mukata* provided a tool for maintaining the *thakurai*. In this arrangement the clan chief as well as the local *thakur* could share the benefits within the imperial framework.

In 18\textsuperscript{th} century the numbers of *parganas* held in *faujdari* kept increasing. Bheem Singh had acquired *faujdari* of *pargana* Baran. The Mughal *mansabdars* who had *jagirs* in this *pargana* were subjected to a deduction of 1/10 of the *jamadami* as *faujdari dams*\textsuperscript{234}. Those who gave *ijara* of their *jagirs* to Bheem Singh in this *pargana* also had to suffer this deduction as the amount for *ijara* was fixed only after deducting the *faujdari dams* from the *jamadami*\textsuperscript{235}. In c. 1739 *faujdari dams* were being deducted not only in *pargana* Baran but also in *parganas* Barod and Sangod. Now, even the rate of deduction varied according to the month scale of *jama* at which the *mukata* was fixed. It was 1/10 for two and a half month scale but 1/12 for three month scale and 1/60 for four month scale\textsuperscript{236}. So the *jagirs* with higher month scale of *jama*, suffered a relatively smaller deduction for *faujdari*. The *jagirdar* had to suffer a further loss because of the rate for converting the *dams* into rupees. Out of the total *dams* 3,43,68,543, *dams* 36,00,000 were converted at two different rates\textsuperscript{237}. Thus the *faujdari* of Kota chiefs strengthened their position against the non-Hada Rajputs Rajputs. The *kharch* of fixing the *mukata* had now been formally passed on to the *jagirdar* and was stated as *muqarrah*\textsuperscript{238}.

The *mukata* documents enclose as *kharch* the details of payment made to different officials such as *amin*, *kirori*, *qanungo*, *bakshi* etc. to finalise *mukata*

\textsuperscript{232} Ibid
\textsuperscript{233} *Mukata* M.Jhatoli, P.Barod, s. 1791, K.B. 1/134
\textsuperscript{234} Durjan Sal to hawalgir P.Bar, Asoj vadi 3, s. 1784, K.B 1/119
\textsuperscript{235} Ibid, *Jamadami* of P.Bar, s. 1771, op.cit
\textsuperscript{236} *Mansabdaran ke dam*, s. 1794, K.B. 1/135
\textsuperscript{237} Ibid, 10 lakh *dams* were converted at the rate of 185 *dams* per rupee and 26 lakh *dams* at the rate of 236 *dams* per rupee
transaction. The *kharch* included not only the amount spent in sending *hundis* to the concerned *jagirdar* or *suba* office but also the amount paid to the different imperial officers in connection with the deal. Initially, the *kharch* was to be borne by the party giving the *mukata*. In all the *mukatas* taken from Dakhini *mansabdars* *kharch* had been borne by them. For instance, rupees 15,000 fixed for the *mukata* of their *jagirs* in *pargana* Barod. However, they were sent a *hundi* of rupees 7,559 only and the balance was taken as credited to their account, because it had been sent to Ajmer for *tehsil* and *darbar* *kharch* but the *hundyawana* was borne by the Kota chief. 239 Thus it is clear that the *kharch* was borne by the party giving the *mukata*. What ever was actually spent was adjusted against the amount to be paid to the *jagirdar*. 240

The practice of *kharch* being borne by the party taking the *mukata* and fixing it formally started with the *mukatas* of *paibaqi* land. It was fixed at three weeks to one-month scale of *jama*. In 1690 the *paibaqi* of *pargana* Ghatoli was taken in *mukata* at a two-month scale of *jama* and the *kharch* was fixed at one-month scale of the *jama*. 241 Thus, the *kharch* was quite huge considering that the area had been given in *mukata*, to improve the agrarian conditions. Obviously, the party taking the *mukata* wouldn't have borne it as an additional burden. Therefore, the *kharch* involved would have tended to decrease the month scale of *asli mukata*. Gradually, the *kharch* come to be fixed formally, even for the *jagir mukatas*. In 1692 *mukatas* of some of the *jagirs* were fixed at the rate of three-month scale of *jama* and the *kharch* was fixed at ¾ month scale of the *jama*. 242 Thus, at least formally, the amount had to be borne by the party taking the *mukata* both in *khalsa*, *paibaqi* and in *jagir* areas. Since, it reduced the month scale of *asli mukata*, it was actually a loss to the party giving the *mukata*. In the later years, the *kharch* was fixed formally but was once again to be borne by the party giving the *mukata*. The *mukata* emerging

238 Ibid
239 Vasil enclosed with *mukata* of Dakhini’s *Dams*, s. 1749-51, op.cit
240 Ibid
241 *Mukata* of P.Ghatoli, s. 1755, K.b. 1/29
242 *Mukata* of P.Chachami s. 1749-58 K.B. 1/19
as a regular practice both the parties, the one giving and the other taking the mukata, as well as, the concerned imperial officials, developed fixed rates for the kharch. It began to be noted down in the documents, in terms of month scale of the jama i.e, 15 days, pon maha, one month, two month along with the month scale of jama for asli mukata\textsuperscript{243}. The kharch not only became a recognised component of the mukata jama it also became a point of bargain between the two, just as the month scale of jama of asli mukata\textsuperscript{244}. It was no longer confined to small customary sums paid as bhent-milni but came to be described by rather formal expression like, darbar kharch, fard-I-patta, peshdasta, amin and kiroi kharch. Also, it was not confined to lower level of administration. Not only amin and kiroi but even bakshi and diwan were taking huge amounts\textsuperscript{245}. In some cases the kharch even exceeded the amount of asli mukata. The proportion of kharch to asli mukata, was higher in khalsa and paibaqi land than jagir land\textsuperscript{246}. It shows the connivance of the revenue officials in fixing the asli mukata at a lower rate in order to leave a margin for themselves as kharch, and there by causing a loss either, to the treasury or to the jagirdars for their personal gains.

The different reasons for giving and taking mukata did not undermine mukata as a source of profit, because the month scale of asli mukata was based not only on the month scale of the jama at which a jagir had been assigned, but primarily on the local estimate prepared for the purpose.\textsuperscript{247} It took into account the kharch involved which had become a regular feature, as well as the possibility of improving the revenue collection. Thus the amount actually collected could be higher than the amount at which the mukata had been

\textsuperscript{243} Mukata of jagiri Dakhinis, op.cit
\textsuperscript{244} For instance in P.Chachami often negotiations not only the kharch but also the asli mukata was reduced in s. 1750, op.cit, : in the mukata dams of paibaqi of P.Bara, Sangad and Barod, the patta kharch was finalised after radbadal (change) at one month scale of jama and the diwan was to be given Rs. 3000, s.1765, K.B. 1/59
\textsuperscript{245} Ibid
\textsuperscript{246} Ibid
\textsuperscript{247} See, Tairiz of jama of the mukata villages in P.Barod, the total amount realised was Rs. 21662 from the eight villages which were in mukata for Rs. 15000 in s. 1750, Mukata of jagir Dams of Dakhinis, op.cit
fixed. The *jagir dams* of 4,30,000 had been taken in *mukata* at four-month scale of *jama*, which was equal to rupees 3,583 but the actual amount realised from the *mukata* villages was rupees 5,248 in c. 1701\textsuperscript{248}. It left a substantial margin, for the *mukatadar*. As the *kharch* required for fixing a *mukata* tended to decrease or increase the amount for *asli mukata*, and fell either directly or indirectly on the party giving the *mukata*, so even that did not affect the margin of the *mukatadar*.

The practice of *mukata* continued to flourish and increase in 18\textsuperscript{th} century. By c. 1727 Kota rulers had 3,26,11,903 *dams* in his *taluk parganas* belonging to different *mansabdars* spread over fourteen *parganas* as can be seen in the table given below\textsuperscript{249}.

### Dams of Mansabdars in Maharao's Taluk in c.1727

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pargana</th>
<th>Dams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awa</td>
<td>1062200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aton</td>
<td>299800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itawa</td>
<td>2400000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urmal</td>
<td>700000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chacharni</td>
<td>260000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagron</td>
<td>525000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chechat</td>
<td>1045000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaitpur</td>
<td>850000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaitha</td>
<td>273335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barod</td>
<td>4180150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baran</td>
<td>19000458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{248} *Mukata* of Surtan Singh's *jagir* in P.Chechat s. 1758, K.B. 1/38  
\textsuperscript{249} K.B. 1/119
In c.1739 they held in *ijara* 34368543 dams in *parganas* of Baran, Barod and Sangod etc.\(^{250}\).

*Ijara*, irrespective of its utility was injurious to the interests of the imperial *mansabdars*. Therefore, Sadiq Khan’s lamentations abut *ijara* as a cause of ruin of peasantry in large parts of Empire, in a way reflect the resentment of the Mughal ruling class towards *ijara*\(^{251}\). The imperial administration on the other hand was fully aware of the usefulness of *ijara* as a device for surplus extraction. In the process of Empire building a wide variety of political interests had to be accommodated and assimilated. The request of Hadi Rani of Jaswant Singh to obtain the *pargana* of Jodhpur in *ijara* if not in *jagir* clearly illustrates the political utility of *ijara*\(^{252}\). Therefore, *ijara* continued to prevail in various parts of the Empire, testified by the very survival of such a large number of documents pertaining to *ijara* even in 17\(^{th}\) century. In fact the imperial administration even in its hey days tried only to regulate it, by issuing instructions from time to time\(^{253}\). This legitimised *ijara* to such an extent that the local political interest began using it as an instrument of not only retaining political power at the local level but for expanding the area under their political domination. The use of *ijara* by Sawai Jai Singh in 18\(^{th}\) century to create the state of Jaipur is well known\(^{254}\).

The Kota chiefs used *ijara* as a political instrument even in 17\(^{th}\) century. Its skilful use enabled them to expand the Hada principality of Kota within the

\(^{250}\) K.B. 1/135.
\(^{251}\) M.Sadiq Khan, *Shahjahan Nama*, pp. 10 a-b, cited by A.Ali, op.cit, p. 84
\(^{252}\) *Waqa-i-Suba Ajmer*, p.95, cited by N.A Siddiqi, op.cit, p. 96
\(^{253}\) Order "about prohibiting *ijara*", in *Nigar Nama-I-Munshi*, p. 189, cited by N.A Siddiqi, op.cit, pp. 94-95
\(^{254}\) S.P Gupta, *“Ijara System in Eastern Rajasthan*”, *Medieval India-A Miscellany*, Bombay,1972, vol II
imperial frame. As a result the Hada dominated a much larger area in early 18th century than they did in 16th century, prior to the Hada Mughal alliance.

Another major fallout of the political turmoil after 1720 was the need to rehabilitate the villages, which had been devastated and disserted. Parganas with developed agriculture like Baran, Barod, Mangrol and Sangod seem to have suffered serious devastation during this period. The inhabitants of pargana Baran looked at this struggle for supremacy in Malwa as 'par kathan ka dangar'. Therefore, the population of pargana Baran had fled away with their cattle. In the same year law and order broke down completely at Rampura. It was described as 'Rampura ka Ra ula' and the Kota chief had to march in person to restore peace and order in that area. The villages affected by this turmoil could be brought back to normalcy only with great difficulty. To bring back normalcy, state needed additional resources to provide support to agricultural activity. These resources were mobilised with the help of local sahas and chaudharies and even the dohli landholders, by giving mukatas in these parganas at slashed rate of jama. The jama mukata was to be raised every year until it reached up to the normal level. These mukatas were different in nature from the mukatas given before c. 1720. Which were given primarily to the Rajputs in order to facilitate them to retain their customary pockets or to improve revenue realisation in the zortalab areas. Many of the local Brahmans, sahas and chaudharies came forward to take the mukatas after 1720's and held more than one village in two or three different parganas. Saha Jandu Ram Haldiya had mukatas in pargana Sangod as well as pargana Palaitha. The role of such mukatis or the mukata holder was to provide resources for the jameet of these villages

255 Jameet of pargana Baran's khalsa villages, s. 1784, K.B. 1/121-133 contains this expression
256 Likhant Bhai Nawal Singh, Baisakh vadi4, s. 1784, K.B. 1/123
257 Jameet of pargana Baran's Khalsa villages, s. 1784, op.cit
258 Mukatas given in pargana Baran, Palaitha, Sangod, s. 1783, K.B. 1/118
259 See, Chapter I, for ijaras of zortalab areas.
260 See Appendix III
261 Mukata of mauza Beeipur, Dhanhedo, pargana Sangod and of some villages of pargana Palaitha, Jeth midi 4-6 s.1783
and to assure the peasants to cultivate. As a result they had acquired a final say in carrying out the *jameet* for the crop season. The *patel* and *patwari* were to follow the instruction of the *mukati* for the *jameet* and accept the *patta* of *ramreet* as decided by the *mukati*. The local *bhomia* was also to accept the 'chauthan ki dharti' against his customary claims on the village irrespective of its quality as sanctioned by the *mukati*. The *chaudhary*, *kanungo*, *patel* and *patwari* were also ordered to pay the revenue on land under their halas according to the *jama mukata* or else it was to be assessed at *karsada*. Thus the *mukati* was not only an agent to collect revenue but also responsible for improving the agrarian conditions. These villages could be given in *jagir* only on the condition of the *jagirdar* accepting to be satisfied with the amount fixed for *mukata*.

The installments for *mukata* amount were payable in Kartik, Magh and Baisakh. The first two were related to *kharif* while the third to the *rabi* crop. The break up of returns from *kharif* crop in two installments, and the second being larger of the two, provided the *mukati* ample time to sell the crops in the market to pay the state in cash. Thus the *mukatis*, of whom many were merchants found an inbuilt advantage in *mukata*. It provided them with grain and cash crop stock to be sold at profit because of the time gap between the payment of the state share and payment of *mukata* installment. The difference of two months was sufficient to send the stock to any nearby local market, to fetch a higher price. The political uncertainties increased the prospects of profit. Since, the *mukatis* were assured of concessions in case of *paimali*, *asaini* and trouble due to *fauj-phata*, the risk of investing in agricultural activity

---

262 Durjan Sal to Misar Narain Das, *mukata mauza* Kishanpura, Asadh side 11, s.1783, K.B.1/118
263 Umed Singh to *patel* and *patwari* of *mauza* Nimoda and Barada, *pargana* Jaitpur, Chait vadi 2, s. 1841, *Khate*, K.B.3/1
264 Umed Singh to *bhomia* of *mauza* Sarang Kheri, Baisakh vadi 2, s.1843, *Khate*, K.B.3/2
265 Umed Singh to *chaudhary Kanungo* *patel* *patwari* of *pargana* Baran, Bhadva sudi 2 s.1841, *Khate* K.B.3/1
266 *Likhant* of Sukh Ram Solanki at the time of of taking in *ijara* of *mauza* Damahu, which was in *tsala mukata*, Sawan sudi 13, s.1784, K.B.1/119
267 *Mukatas* op.cit
had been reduced. The rate of revenue realization was also fixed as sadamadi,\textsuperscript{268} therefore the mukati was under no compulsion to give such concessions to the peasants which were not actually required. The yearly increase in mukata amount could be met by increasing the area under cultivation. This change in the nature of mukata and the position of the mukati had made mukata a source of profit. Gradually the inbuilt advantages in mukata, created a lobby of revenue farmers who vied with each other to obtain mukatas and managed to secure even normal villages in mukata\textsuperscript{269}.

Purohit Bhikaji in order to procure mukata of mauza Kotri, offered to pay rupees 150 more than saha Hemraj\textsuperscript{270}. He used his contacts within the state bureaucracy to procure this mukata. Another brahmin who was recipient of kharch as the mewa for Srinath ji from the revenue of a village, held the same village in mukata, and paid the mukata amount to the state after deducing the kharch for the mewa\textsuperscript{271}. It gave new opportunities, role and position to the merchants in agrarian economy. The beneficiaries of the revenue system in 17\textsuperscript{th} century were the jagirdars, chaudharies, the local sahas and bohras and the dohli holders. They were the himayatis with defined role and position in the village society. They aquired a new role and position in 18\textsuperscript{th} century which altered the balance of power more and more in their favour against the karsa and the artisans and menials. It would be rather simplistic to conclude on the basis of a theory of areas of collapse, stability and growth that the Rajput principalities were heading towards “stability” within a loosened decentralised imperial structure”. In fact the struggle for power at the central level had its ramifications even at the village level and called for a realignment of force in order to maintain the system of production and surplus extraction.

\textsuperscript{268} Mukata of mauza Dhanheda, op.cit. Likhant of mauza Nanyaheda’s patel and patwari, Asadh vadi 10, s.1784 K.B.1/121
\textsuperscript{269} Mukata of mauza Beejpur to Jaduram Haldiya, s.1784, op.cit, abadan (habited), therefore mukata has been fixed on the normal jama.
\textsuperscript{270} Purohit Bhikaji to chaudhary Sri Sukhram ji, Asadh vadi Amavasya, s.1767, K.B.1/64
\textsuperscript{271} Order of Durjan Sal for mukata of mauza Malyaheda, and Likhant of Bhandari Nar Singh, Bhadva Sudi 9, s. 1783, K.B. 1/118
Appendix I A

*Tanka-Jagirdar in c. 1723*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>No. of Jagirdars</th>
<th>No. of villages in Jagir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hada</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>234.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachawah</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathod</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisodia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solanki</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaud</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahiya</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanwar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panwar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhar</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>227</strong></td>
<td><strong>364.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The term *tan ka jagirdar* implies those *jagirdars* who enjoyed *jagir* conferred by the Kota chiefs.
Appendix I B

Hada Jagirdars in Chakri Huzuri and Desh in C.1723

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hada Kham</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Huzuri</th>
<th>Desh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhai</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanwat</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjanpota</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narbadpota</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramka</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baranwat</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>172</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The difference in the number of Hada jagirdars in Appendix 1A and 1B is because the later includes even those Hada jagirdars who held an imperial mansab, while the former mentions only those who held jagirs through redistribution of the villages in the jagir of the Hada chief against the imperial mansab.
Appendix II

*Desh ke jagirdars in c. 1797*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Jagirdars</th>
<th>Villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hada Rajputs</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhai</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanwat Hada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mewawat Hada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamir Hada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raimalot Hada</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjan Pota Hada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narvad Pota Hada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non Hada Rajputs</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khinchi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauhan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhadaudiya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagatawat Sisodia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathod</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachawah</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhala</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaud Shaktawat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balnot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solanki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BadGujar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Rajputs</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakhini Pandit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahamin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pindari</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulami</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahukar Khuwas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jethi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jadudhabai</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banwari</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahari Mehta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meena</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aheri Meena Gujar</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talukadar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III

Composition of *Mukata* Holders in early 18th century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Castes</th>
<th>No. of <em>mukata</em> villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rajput</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmains</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahas/Bohras</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Officials</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patel/ Chaudhary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Total number of villages in *mukata*: 94  
Total number of *mukatadars*: 100