The process of production and the major tenurial forces discussed in the previous chapters, provide the background for the study of the evolution of socio-economic relations in Vēṇād and its impact on the shaping of political authority in the region. In the chapter, it is proposed to examine the growth of agrarian relations in Vēṇād from the end of the formative period discussed in Chapter I and bring the discussion up to the middle of 18th century, when large scale land reforms were carried out under Martanda Varma.

The first five sections in this chapter deal with the growth of agrarian relations during 14th and 15th centuries; evidence from early decades of 16th century also being used for the discussion. The first section delineates the general trends in the evolution of land relations. Land management under the Padmanabha temple is described in the second section, while the 3rd section extends the discussion on the land management to other parts of Vēṇād. Section IV deals with the rights of the royal family and the nature of the rent collected by them along with the process of collection of royal dues.
Section V, based on the discussion in the previous sections, attempts an analysis of the broad relations that were developing between landlords and the producers.

The later sections of the chapter concentrate on the latter half of the period under examination, from the 16th to 18th centuries. Section VI and VII study the transaction in land and cash in the temples, the latter section discussing the evidence from the Padmanabha temple. Section VIII examines the rights over land that were developing during these centuries, primarily based on the evidence from the Padmanabha temple. Section IX studies the management of temple lands during the period under discussion. Section X studies the growth of private landholders as an intermediary class and the means utilised by them to acquire lands and bring the peasantry into submission. Section XI discusses the position of the royal family of Venad in the emerging land relations. The final section, sums up the major arguments given in the chapter and attempts to provide the general perspective on the growth of agrarian relations.

I

By the 14th century the Venād royal family had established its authority over the region from Quilon to Nanjinadu, in which the chain of royal temples set up
during the earlier period played a crucial role. Land grants to temples continued during the 14th and 15th centuries; however, the available evidence indicates that most of the land grants to temples and brāhmanas were limited to the Kanyakumari region. The grants by Vira Ramavarman (646 K.E.) Bhutala Vira Ravi Varma (712 K.E.) to the Suchindram temple and the grant by Udayamartanda Varma to the Kanyakumari temple of cultivable lands were made for conducting Sandhya offering in the memory of a Chenpagaraman and Udayamartandan respectively.1 Again a grant to Sivagiri temple in Raṇasingaballūr, instead of lands, specifies the dues that were being transferred to the temple.2 A grant by Vira Ravi Varman to Kilārmangalam temple also specifies the dues and this time, the dues included those on traders, craftsmen and commercial groups.3 Very few records clearly mention grants of lands as Devadānas or similar traditional grants. There is evidence of new temples being built in the region as in the case of Nagar-koil temple, set up by the Jaina monks for which a large number of lands were granted by Bhutalavarma Martanda Varma.5 Among the grants to the brahmanas the most important was the establishment of a brahmana Agrahāraṇam at Agasthees-waram, called Udaya Martanda Chaturvedi Mangalam in 1436-9 A.D.6

The grants by Kël þ rur prince and then Klayādathu
Sorūpam for the Endalaiappan shrine at Tiruvēlunannūr near Kottarakkarai, in Quilon District, are on record. In 550 K.E. a Vēṇād prince Iravi Adichcha Varma transferred lands in Kuṣavarkal Kurunganūr of sowing capacity of 12 kalam. Grants were made by not only Vēṇād rulers but also by a Pāndya ruler Perumāl Sri Kulasekharadeva, who granted lands from Karuvēlakulam in Pāṇḍināḍu to the Trivandrum temple. Transfers to the Trivandrum temple took a different form also. During 502 K.E. a Vēṇād prince transferred lands as ōtti in Munchirai and Peruvilai. A major ōtti transaction was made by Iravi Adhichchavarma to Trivandrum temple when the transferred the Marudattur Udupuli Desams belonging to him, including the lands earlier granted as Devadāna to the Mahadeva temple and Chaṇḍaiyappa shrine in Tiruvīdaikkōḍu for a sum of 124692 Tiramam. The gold equivalent for this huge amount was taken from the gold pawned by a brahmāna.

Apart from royal landgrants and deeds, private individuals also continued to transfer land and money to the temples. A number of moneygrants were made during 13th and 14th centuries for conducting the regular expenses in Sātangulankarai temple. The grant of lampstead and 400 Kaliyugaraman pānam to Kāḷārmangalam temple by a brahmāna...
describes how the money grant was utilised. The money grant realised an interest of 4 panam per month and this was treated as equivalent of the 'Ayappanam' from paḷḷam, Māṇakkudi and Orāppokiparru lands in Nāṉjinādu. Money grants were made by brāhmaṇas to the Tiruvidaiṅkōḍu and Puravassēri temples with instructions regarding the offerings to/conducted from the grants.

Land grants by private persons also came predominantly from the Kanyakumari District. The private donors include a dancing girl, granting lands to Tiruvidaiṅkōḍu temple and a brāhmaṇa to Kāryamāṇickapuram temple. An undated record refers to a brāhmaṇa granting a garden land for the expenses of the Tiruvattār and Taḷīyal temple. Some land-grants e.g. those made to Kāryamāṇickapuram temple and the Parakkai temple were exempted from taxes by Venad rulers. Private landgrants from Trivandrum and Quilon Districts are relatively scarce, one being the grant by two persons from Chiravūrkal to Tiruvēlunannūr temple.

Transactions between temples and private persons also became a little complicated with the growth of the practice of commuting cash into land and vice versa. An example is the redemption of three purayidams by the authorities of Rāmāswaram temple at Quilon. It appears that the temple got the lands exempted from taxes, and after receiving an unspecified sum of money from Kayalil Sāttan Marudapillai agreed to make on his behalf certain offerings to the temple.
The requirements of the temple were met not only by grants in cash and kind, but also by acquiring lands and provisions by mortgage and sale. In a record from Kūlithurai (attributed to 15th century A.D.) a certain individual held two lands from another person as Otti and provided for the feeding of 12 brahmanas in cash. Two fragmented documents from Pullālankōdu show the Dēvarkarmigal of the temple, executing Otti deeds. Temples also purchased lands from private persons.

The above examination of the land grants to the temple show the following tendencies:

First, land grants made by the members of the ruling families were decreasing in the entire Venād region, with the possible exception of Nānjinaḍu;

Second, grants by private persons continued, the donors being both brahmanas and non-brahmanas.

Third, the practice of commutation of rent into cash was on the increase and temple authorities sought increase in the income of the temple by executing Otti deeds, with other landowners and by purchasing lands.

Normally, the money and land grants were to be managed and expenses conducted by the Sabhai or the temple managers (Dēvarkarmigal). By the 14th and 15th centuries, grants were directly transferred to individuals within the
managing body. The grant to Sivagiri temple in Ranasinganallur was to be managed and provisions made hereditarily by a certain variyam of Sattanur. The grant to Suchindram temple by Ramavarman was to come under the management of a person who was described as the Potuval of Suchindram. The expenses prescribed by a grant/Kariamanickapuram temple were being conducted by a SriVaishnava of the temple. A document from Parakkai records an undertaking by a private person to the Devarkarmigal of the temple where the former offered to meet the prescribed expenses with the money (probably) handed over to him. The money was to be given for interest per crop and the expenses conducted from the interests.

The tendency of assigning the conduct of offerings to individuals increased during 14th and 15th centuries. The deed given by the authorities of Suchindram to a kaikkola of Kumari temple giving thim Manakudi and Tamarakkuam parru to conduct the Chempagaraman Sandhyapuja shows how far this procedure had come into acceptance. In another instance of the daily service/Cempagaraman Sandi was assigned to a dancing girl.

The donor was the King Bhutalaviraramayvarma who himself appears to have looked after the SriKaryam of the temple. Another grant by the same prince to the Padmanabha temple, was entrusted to a certain Vattuppati Kandan Kandan. At times, land grants were allotted on lease as in the case of grants for a lamp to Navaykkulam temple which were to be enjoyed by those in charge of the lamp as pattam.
The occasional references to landholders appearing as donors or recipients of grants show the basic tendencies of the times. The Vāriyan of Sattanūr, who received the grant to Sivagiri temple is said to have constructed the Chattanūr Mahadeva temple. This would mean that his position had already become powerful by the 14th century, and the hereditary assignment during the beginning of 15th century was indirectly a recognition of his status. Similarly, Kayalil Sattan Marudapillai, mentioned earlier, is referred to in another record from Quilon as contributing to the Tiruppani (renovation) of the Rāmeśwaram Temple.

Two brāhmanas belonging to the Mangalacheri family were involved in land transactions. Ariṣil family, a member of the yōgam of the Suchindram temple appears to be involved in land transaction independently. Two members of the Māmpilli family were similarly involved in the transaction with the temples. Māmpilli family, apart from their independent transactions also occupied the position of Adhikārapadārtham in the Trivandrum temple.

Two basic features of the land relations and temple management are indicated by the evidence. Many landholders granting lands to the temples seem to have acquired such lands by means of Otti transactions and at times by outright sale. Expenses of the temple were increasingly conducted by individuals who were attached to the temple or occupied positions in the managing body. Members of the temple management bodies were also indulging in land
transactions independent of the temple which they managed and some of these 'managers' like the Vārivan of Sāttanūr, had become so powerful as to build their own temples. A class of intermediary landholders was emerging who, in the actual practice of land management and the conduct of temple expenses, replaced earlier institutions like the Sabhai and controlled managing bodies like the Yogam.

We have evidence of similar landowners from other sources also. In a document from Manaltittai describing the regulation regarding the collection of rent from Nānjināḍu, there is a reference to 'Tērūr Aḷagiya Nambi Dēṣam' as coming under the assessment. We have no further information on this person. Whoever he was, the Nambi claimed equal status with the temples and similar landlords in Nānjināḍu. In the Otti transaction, between Iravi Adichcha Varma and the Trivandrum temple the only part of the Dēṣam excluded from the transaction was a previous allotment as Iravili (tax free) to one Chellar Mudali whose position as an independent landholder was thus recognised. In the document referring to the transfer of Navāykulam temple and its properties to Akkaiyūr Dēvan Dēvan, the grantee was also given the right to collect all the dues for the ruler, which meant that Akkaiyūr Dēvan Dēvan was recognised as the overlord over those area. Apart from the recognition of independent overlordship the transfer of Navāykulam temple indicates the culmination of another trend also. It appears that at least until 15th century most of the landlords were brāhmaṇas, and they were generally associated with one temple
or another. But they were not acting as members of a corporate body as in the early medieval period (see chapter I) but had begun to exercise their landholding rights independently, and also controlled temple exclusively as their property, as in the case of Akkaiyur Devan Devan. Similarly, the practice of appointing a single Uraj for managing the temple lands which was not adopted in the early medieval period, now became acceptable.

Merchants also appear to have begun to hold lands in Nanjinadu area. Their entry into land transactions may have been facilitated by the increase in Otti transactions and the practice of commutation of rent into cash. The Nagaram of Kottar, a merchant body, gave lands under Irail Otti to a certain merchant from Tyirukkurungudi. The Nagaram also assigned lands to Guvavan Vadugan alias Rajendra Chola Vaisravanam. The same merchant held lands as Otti from Cholapuram temple. A royal order of 655 K.E. assigned to another merchant family all the privileges (Sthānamānams) of Elaraikkara Nāḍu including all dues from 20 Kottai Viraippādu (sowing capacity) lands and Varam from two karais. The activities of the merchants were limited to Nanjinadu where the Otti transactions based on cash were probably more numerous than other parts of Vēṇāḍ.

To sum up, the major features of the land relations from 14th-16 centuries were the following:

1) the period witnessed the growth of intermediary landholders who granted lands to the temples, controlling temple lands and provided for temple expenses. In most of the areas this did not result in a change in the nature of
obligations by the cultivators to the temple, or other overlords like the prāhmanas and rulers; Increasingly the cultivators found that their relations with the temple were mediated by land holders or temple servants who received rent from them and provided for the expenses or obligations to the overlord.

ii) Transactions among the landholders at times involving merchants were on the increase; mortgages and sales became more common. The intermediaries often paid the rent in cash. However, commutation of rent into cash did not alter the structure of the obligations of the cultivators to the overlords.

iii) The authority of Sabhai and the Yōgam as corporate bodies in the management of the temple lands was giving way to the growth of managers and landed proprietors who maintained and controlled the temple expenses. This change was particularly visible in smaller temples.

iv) The increase in cash transactions resulted in the growth of mortgage tenures and some of the lease holders appear to have converted themselves into Ītti holders though, definite evidence in this regard is lacking. In the case of ordinary cultivators the growth of intermediaries and the Koluvāram demanded by them apparently became an additional burden. However, we have no means to compute the amount of rent collected by the intermediaries.

II

The general observations made in the previous section, will be examined here in greater detail on the basis of the Padmanabha swāmi temple records. From the documents beginning from early 14th century we are able to obtain a full picture of the nature of land management in the Padmanabha temple, and
some indication regarding the management of other temples. Ever since the Padmanabha temple came under the management of the yogam the actual managers were the Vāriyam, and two of the yogakkar became the Vāriyam by annual rotation. The yogam along with its body of accountants and temple servants was in charge of the general administration of the temple. The land management began to take its final forms only during 15th century. The organisation of land management under Vēnād rulers was directly linked to the evolution of the land management under the Padmanabha Temple because of the status that it acquired as the principal royal temple in Vēnād.

The evidence from the 15th century shows that the temple lands were distributed in a large number of Desams. The temple lands were generally divided into categories:
(a) For daily expenses or Nityanadaichelavu and (b) for the expenses of Sripandāram temple treasury. They were classified as two estates called Cherikkals. The Sripandārachelavu Cherikkal included the Desams of Māttūr, Marudattūr, Chirayinkīl, Kuṭṭamangalam and Punnattalai. The Nityanadai Chelavu Cherikkal Desams were to the south of Trivandrum, including Vīranārāyaṇassēri normally mentioned together with Parāntakanallūr and Rājākamangalam Desams located in Kalkulam and Agastheeswaram Taluks. During the 16th century, there were also Desams set apart for special expenses
as Karuvēlamkulam (in 'Pāndinādu' to the east of Western ghats/ pūja instituted by a Pāndya ruler Kulasekhara. There were other special regions like the Uduppūli Deśams mortgaged by the Vēnād ruler, and another area called Kurumattūr, providing for a Kurumattūr pūja. Another special area was Karuman Deśam providing for an offering called Karuman Tirudvādasī.

Since the lands were distributed all over Vēnād and some were in the Pāndya Kingdom, the management had to be decentralised. The system of assigning each chērikkal and the special region to a pair of 'tenants' (Teerpu and pāttam holders) arose from such a need. Two persons presumably brāhmaṇa were appointed as Teerpu and pāttam holders over a Chērikkal or a special region. Their pāttam was to last for a year and they had to pay 'customary' Avarōdhakkānam. Their allotments were divided into two shares (bhāgam or Kūru). Apart from these two, a few other officials were also deputed to the different lands, including Talaichelavu and temple servants named Manushyam. The Teerpu and pāttam holders, Talaichelavu and Manushyam were allotted their remuneration (Udamai). They were to collect all the dues that were to be realised by the temple from the respective Deśams and to keep account of the arrears (Kudissikai).

It is difficult to ascertain the exact form of keeping accounts of the Padmanabha temple during this period. The 'Head Accountant' of the temple was the Sṛikaranam and for a long period during the second half of 15th century this position was occupied by Māmpūla Ayyappan Vikraman. The
documents show that the payment of rent to the temple
from Karuvēlankulam Déṣams fell in arrears during the period
from 570 K.E. to 661 K.E. and finally, the Melkangaṇīkanakku
including the rent estimates and expenditure from the Déṣam
calculated by Māmpūla Ayyappan Vikraman was made the basis
on which the Tandi (or the dues) from the Déṣams, was reali-
sed. Another arrangement immediately following this was made
for the Sripandārachērikkal Déṣams, where all the arrears
of rent from 570 K.E. to 661 K.E. along with all customary
dues were to be given by the Teerpu and Pāttam holders
as fixed by the Manushyam Melkangāṇi Kanakku of Māmpūla
Ayyappan Vikraman. A Tarichelavu (or, more probably Talai-
chelavu) was appointed for the Déṣams, who was in charge
of the accounts and supervised the rent collection in the
Déṣam.

Collection of rent in the Déṣam was organised probably
through similar accountants. Different terms are used to
denote the accountants in the Déṣams, but the exact differ-
ences in the nature of their occupation are not clear.
Mattūr Déṣam had a Vāriyan and a Karanattā. There are
references to the Melkangaṇīkanakku for Kuṭṭamangalam and
Punnathalai Déṣams and the Idamudachil Kanakku for the
Karuvēlakulam Déṣams. When Virakosaladeva Martanda Varma
transferred Adaichāṇi Déṣam in 'Pandināḍa' for Vikramar-
tandan pūja, a brāhmaṇa was appointed Talaichelavu to keep
the accounts of the Déṣam and collect the arrears. There
is reference to 'Oulkunnam' which was apparently the rent
demand fixed on the Desams so that prescribed expenses were met. Olukunnam was made for Karumaṇparru, for conducting the Tirudvādaśi offering in 711 K.E. The pāttam, holders of Nityanādaideśams and their accountants were instructed to realise the Olukunnam for conducting the Karuvelamkulam pūja. The Olukunnam from an unspecified Desam for a period of five years (from 712 K.E. to 717 K.E.) was realised in cash.

It appears that by the 16th century almost all the Desams had a network of accountants and rent collectors. The accounts for Nityanāda Chelavuchērikkal were written under the direction of the temple management in 680 K.E. The temple management was called Sabhai but apparently the reference was not to the traditional brāhmaṇa corporate body, but to the brāhmaṇas who formed the yōgam. A separate accounts office (Kanakkupurai) was set up and the accounts prepared by the Karanakanakku, (the accountants in charge of lands) Acharakanakku (in charge of rituals) Karuvukaranakku (in charge of money, ornament, previous articles) and another accountant. The amount collected from the Desams were entered into the account and Desavalithāirattu (estimate per Desam) was prepared. This shows the general method of keeping accounts. It appears that Karanakanakku and Acharakanakku were to keep the accounts for the actual expenditure out of the income from the Desams.

Temporary assignments to pāttams holders and the practice of fixing the rent demand according to Melkangāni
Kanakkku by the Śrikarana, the head accountant, appear to have ensured the dependence of its servants and reduced the chances of fragmentation. However, this form of assigning lands also implied that if the pāṭṭam holders fell short of the target for some reason, then the remainder would have to be found from other sources. For example, when the Nityanādaichērikkal lands could not provide for the expenses in 666 K.E. the yōgam decided to advance 300 Kalam (15 Narakkal) of paddy which was realised from the Teerūpu and pāṭṭam holders of Śripandaracherikhikkal. Similarly, when the demand for Karuvēlāmkulam pūja could not be met from the land allotted to them, it was decided that the temple would meet one third of the pūja expenses which was to be realised from the Nityanādaichērikkal lands.

In 658 K.E. Kurumattūr expenses and Karumāṭ Tirudvādaśī were combined under the same Teerūpu and pāṭṭam holders. Such arrangements were also intended to ensure the sustenance of all temple functions, though it often meant additional burden on some regions, when others failed to provide any.

Apart from the pattam holders, the talaichelavu, and Manushyam were also brāhmaṇas. At times, they were related to one another also. It appears that most of the appointments were made from migrant brāhmaṇas called Dēsigal. The accountants, including the one occupying the important post of Śrikarana, were non-brāhmaṇas working under the
and pāttam holders. This essentially meant that the system ensured brāhmanical control over the temple lands during the 15th century. The Management of Padmanabha Temple lands is a pointer to the general trends discussed in the Section I. During/14th and 15th centuries, the temple acquired lands in different parts of Vēṇād region. As the temple holdings expanded, the organisation of collection of rent from the lands became important, as shown by the arrears accumulating in various Dēsams in the course of the 15th century. The result was a reorganisation in which Śrīkaranam Māmpūla Ayyappan Vikraman may have played an important role, which brought the temple lands under a network of managers, accountants, and rent collectors. This meant that the actual land management was being taken away from the responsibilities of the temple Yōgam and was being handed over to a new set of intermediaries. However, the control of the Yōgam was maintained through regular switching of the managers of Dēsams, who were brāhmanas, and payment of salary instead of hereditary allotments. We have already seen in Section I that the intermediaries in other temples had elevated themselves to a position of near-permanent control. This position could not enjoyed by the intermediaries of the Padmanabha Temple, probably because the temple Yōgam patronised by the ruler was powerful enough to prevent total fragmentation of management of temple lands for the time being.
Growth of organisation and management of temple lands in other parts of Vênad, including Nânjinâdu did not take after the system in the Padmanabha temple. The following cases reveal more clearly the tendencies mentioned in the first section. For smaller temples in the Vênad region, the elaborate arrangements of the Padmanabha temple were not needed. The managers of the temple were variously called Devarkarmigal, Sripandârakâryam cheyvâr and Tânattar. In rare cases we have references to Padamulattavar, Tânattar and Padamulattavar functioned as corporate bodies similar to Yogakkâr and managed temples directly. However, Sripandârakâryam Cheyvâr and Devarkarmigal were to in practice close to the intermediaries discussed in the case of Padmanabha temple and may have included non-brahmanas.

Larger temples like the Suchindram temple were managed by managing bodies such as the Yogakkâr. The lands held by Suchindram temple were distributed in Nânjinâdu (the Nayanâr Dêsams and the Perumâl dêsams) and in Tamil country to the south of Vaippâru including the Kanyakumari region (the so-called Patineţtu nâdu.) It is possible that some of the Perumâl dêsams were controlled by the Trivandrum temple.

The general management of temple lands held by Suchindram was in the lands of a Potuvâl who has been referred to in
the records of the 13th and 15th centuries. During the 15th century, 23 Ālkantayōga parādesīga were appointed as the Anaival of the Suchindram temple, who probably assisted the Potuvāl in land management. In the Dēsams and Pidāgais, there were two officers Kalvi and Āchinen who were in charge of the actual collection of dues and probably had judicial functions. As in the case of Trivandrum temple we have srikāryam and a group of accountants in Suchindram also.

But information regarding the organisation and method of accounting is meagre. One major difference in the system of accounting from that of the Padmanabha temple can be seen, which was the practice of hereditary assignments of important positions in the temples. It appears that the practice of assigning the responsibility of writing accounts permanently to one person became common during the 16th century. Thus Iswaran Nambi Samantan was made the Urkanakkū of a Nāyīnār Desam which was a permanent assignment. Dikkellampukalam perumāl of Vīṣāngudi was made the Sripandārakanakkū at about the same period. As in the case of Trivandrum temple they were provided with Udamai from the temple in cash and kind. Iswaran Nambi Samantan was also given land and a share of the rent from lands as his dues.

This form of appointing accountants was not limited to
the Suchindram temple alone. Two documents of the same year (708 K.E.) from Vadasseri and Talakkudi show that the same person was appointed as Srīpandārakanakku in both the temples. The practice of appointing hereditary accountants in temples was followed in the Tamil country also, as shown by a record from Valliyur (702 K.E.) in the Tirunelveli District.

Appointment of 23 Anaivāls in the Suchindram temple underlines the role of Parādēsibrahmanas in temple management. The Saivite Srīmāhāswaras were also appointed as land managers (Kankāni Cheyyār). Lands assigned to a Śrīvaishnava for provisions to the temple has already been mentioned. Some of the brahmanas referred to as providing for temple offerings may have been Parādēsīs.

However, during the 15th century, such assignments had not become the dominant form of distribution of the share of the produce coming to the temple. Normally, a land grant was made the joint responsibility of the temple authorities and the Urār of the village from which the lands were assigned. Taxes on the areas held by the Suchindram temple in the Tamil country were remitted by Vēṇād ruler Aditya Varma on the request of the temple authorities. Similarly, the Vēṇād ruler removed the obstructions on Suchindram temple lands also on the request of the temple authorities. In both cases, the temple was recognised as the manager of lands and not an individual. Hence, it is possible that
the corporate control of the temple lands continued to be recognised in the case of larger temples.

The changes in the temple administration in other parts of Venād were marked by a shift in the actual control of temple lands from the hands of the brāhmanical corporate body (Jūrālār) to a network of accountants, rent collectors and other temple servants. In the case of smaller temples individuals who were land holders had to come control the lands of the temple also either by undertaking to provide for prescribed temple expenses or by controlling the entire temple affairs. The corporate brahmanical body remained in overall control of the management in larger temples but the functions of rent collection and management were carried out by intermediaries who at least in Nānjināḍu, enjoyed their offices on a hereditary basis. The practices of farming out the conduct of temple expenses to individuals was also developing in Nānjināḍu, on the whole, it could be said that the corporate control of temple administration was giving way to management by intermediaries, both temple servants and private landlords. Thus, the traditional power structure in temples was being altered considerably. Although, corporate bodies remained in control, although management was becoming decentralised.

IV

The impact of the changing forms of land management on the political structure of Venād may be examined now. The Venād royal family as shown in Chapter I was extending its authority by means of an alliance with the brāhmanical form of
land organisation. The rulers were also evolving their network for the collection of dues and expansion of land control. Documents from the 14th century onwards give a general picture of the form of control wielded by the ruler. For Venād ruler, the dues were collected by the adhikārīgal and Turakkārār. There are several references to Turakkārār in Nānjinādu. However, we have no evidence to ascertain whether these officials functioned throughout Venād region. From the beginning of the 16th century, the accountant Karuvakarakanakku began to appear, and he apparently acted as the head accountant of the Desams, in charge of the royal treasury. We have also reference to an official the called "Chandiram" from this period who later looked after the expenditure of the royal household and became a powerful figure. It appears that the king also had a head accountant or Pandārakanakku who realised the royal dues with the help of the chief of the Desam and the accountant.

By the 15th century, the term Kömuraippādu to denote the customary dues to the king was in use and the range of customary dues varied from place to place. A land transfer of Kāriyamāṇicampuram refers to Silvari, Peruvāri and a few other dues as Kömuraippādu that were transferred. Another record from Nānjinādu mentions Kadāmāi, Upādī, Vinīyogam and Kanakkilakkai as being transferred as Kömuraippādu. In the Trivandrum district the list of dues collected as Kömuraippādu was totally different and contained very few items related to agriculture.
There was no substantial difference in the forms of dues collected by the temple and the Kōmuraippādu realised by the ruler. This happened because when the lands were transferred the customary dues from lands were also included, as in the case of the list of dues, previously held as Kōmuraippādu going to Trivandrum temple from Karuvēlankulam Desam. The dues going to the temple from Kuṭṭamangalam Desam accounted by the Mēlkankāni Kanakkum included dues on land i.e. special dues like Ēnam Chelavu, Karkatakachelavu, Chenkompu, Ānamurai, Pulai irai, Meni irai, etc. which were collected by the rulers also. When Navāykulam temple was transferred to Akkaiyūr Dēvan Dēvan the dues collected by the ruler like Chemgimpu, Talaivilai, Mupparamunnāli, Anqam, Chungam, Taraqu etc. were also transferred along with the temple. Similarly dues from merchants including Valiyayam (tolls) from pallam Maṇakkudipararu were transferred by the king to the temple. The same temple received dues including Taraqu, Tarikkadama, Idaŋqai, Vālangai, Ulavukatchi, etc. that were among the dues realised by rulers also. Even during the 15th century the rent collected by the temple was called Tandal the term used by the ruler for his dues in early medieval documents.

The information on the organisation of rent collection by the rulers suggests that the royal control over land was also showing important changes compared to the formative period.
focussed in Chapter I. The practice of maintaining a royal representatives or Adhikāri and tax collectors or Turakkārār was being continued. A group of accountants including Karuvukaranakku and Pandarakanakku appeared who took charge of maintaining accounts regarding the royal dues (referred to as Rājakaram in some records). Since these accountants had to keep accounts for the customary dues Komuralippādu coming from the entire Vēnād region, their functions might have overlapped with the accountants of larger temples, like the Padmanabha temple. These officials formed the new group of royal servants called 'Pandarakāryam Cheyvār; an intermediary class that held similar positions in the organisation of land control as the temple intermediaries.

It is possible that intermediaries acquired their positions in their capacity as private landlords. Some of the intermediaries might have developed into private landlords also. However, general conclusions regarding land management by private landlords including brahmanas cannot be made at the present stage. Some private landlords were conferred the title 'Mādampi' by the local rulers. Thus, Mādampis were of Vanjipula and Makilanjeri families who were brahmanas, were ferred to from early medieval period. Vanjipula Mādampi was the traditional overlords of the highlands in the present Pathanamthitta District and parts of Quilon District. There is one reference to a Manai (House-
site) given as Chittotti to a member of Vanjipula family from Kadigai pattinam, which might signify the spread of the activity of this Madampi to Nanjindu. For the present, it may not be inaccurate to assume that their form of land control was not different from the methods used by the temples or rulers. However, this assumption would have to be tested with the help of information coming up from subsequent periods.

V

In the previous three sections an attempt was made to provide a general outline of the changes in land management and collection of rent in Venad during 14th and 15th centuries. Land relations in this period became more complex than during the formative period with the growth of mortgage relations, commutation of rent into cash, and the growth of an intermediary including brahmanas and non-brahmanas who collected rent and provided for the expenses of the traditional overlords, including temples. The general features of this period are summed up in this section which would provide the basis for an examination of the evolution of land relations in the subsequent centuries.

The land management by the larger temples continued to be based on the corporate form of organisation. The temples realised their dues on the basis of various offerings instituted by rulers or private donors and the regular festivals
and ceremonies conducted in honour of the rulers or a private person. Fulfilment of the rent demand every year was an important factor in conducting these ceremonies. The network of rent collectors and leaseholders in the Trivandrum temple lands was meant to serve this need. However, the yōgakkar of Trivandrum temple had to make arrangement from time to time to conduct various expenses that were stopped because the rent collection from certain lands was falling into arrears. This shows that the system of rent collection was not functioning as efficiently as it was visualised. Similar problems were faced by temples in Nanjįṇāḍu also, as shown by the requisition to the Vēnād ruler made by the authorities of the Suchindram temple in 716 K.E. as mentioned earlier. The appointment of rent collectors and accountants for different regions by temples meant that the cultivators of temple lands were not only required to make their traditional payments for the prescribed expenses but also provide for the upkeep of these temple servants also. As temples increased their ideological and economic influence, the number of persons attached to the temples also increased, who were to be provided from the lands. For example, the temples of Nanjįṇāḍu provided a number of dancing girls (who were settled as kudis) and they were provided with the income from temple lands. They had also to maintain temple servants like flute players, drummers, garland makers etc. 88 A substantial part of the temple
expenses went for the feeding of migrant brahmanas, all of which had to be paid by the cultivators. The cultivators of the Chêrkkals and Dèsams held by Trivandrum temple had to pay for the maintenance of the Manushyam or temple servants who acted as protectors of the temple lands also. In the case of Trivandrum, the Manushyam were paid directly from temple funds, but the Manushyam in each Dèsam were paid from collections from that particular Dèsam. During the sixteenth century hereditary assignments of lands or land produce, either in the form of an offering, or as regard for functions in temple administration also appeared. Such allotments meant that cultivators in temple lands had to bear the burden of maintaining a growing number of intermediaries as well as providing the traditional dues to the temple.

Assignments of various services in the temple on a hereditary basis provided a departure from the earlier form of grants as Viruttis or Jivitas. During the period under discussion we have very few references to these two forms in Vênâd region. Virutti and Jivita were mainly used for remuneration to servants of a lower grade in Padmanabha temple. Intermediaries of a higher rank in Padmanabha temple, were the Teeryan and pattam holders mentioned earlier, but their rewards were specifically limited to the period for which they held the post. These applied to servants named Manushyam who assisted in the protection and control of temple lands. Hereditary assignments prevalent in Nânjinaḍu meant that the temple servants gained a certain autonomy in handling their
services, their relations to the temple being determined by customary obligations. Even after hereditary assignments were made, the temple administration could remove the assignee from his post, as happened to Dikkellāmpukalum-perumāl, who was made the hereditary accountant of the Suchindram temple and was removed from his post soon afterwards.91

The dues paid by the peasants to the rulers were customary and apart from Mēlvāram from cultivated fields, which varied from one-fifth to half (Mēlpāthī) of the produce, we have no information regarding the actual amount collected from each region. The long list of additional cesses, that followed the normal dues, like Kadamaí, Mēlvāram, Antarāvam, etc. appear to have been imposed arbitrarily. Despite the variations in the modes of payment, it appears that the ruling family exercised complete control over certain areas which were a permanent course of income as in the case of Tiruviṭaiṅkōḍu, Marudattūr, Māṇalikkarai (all areas lying near Kalkuḷam) and a part of Kadigaiyattinam to the south of Trivandrum and their traditional area to the north of Trivandrum. The authority wielded and the dues realised by the rulers from these areas were hardly different from the control exercised by the temple or any other private landlord in their areas. The mortgage of Royal lands to Trivandrum temple during the 14th century was similar to the transaction between two landlords. Apart from these landholdings, at the end of 15th century, the Vēṇūd ruler collected revenue from Nānjināḍu and the Tamil region,
the latter apparently depending on military control. Thus for the ruler the customary payments seems to have been supplemented by military raids.

Variations in the customary obligations were due to the absence of a standardised procedure for collection of revenue and also because of the regional variations in the process of production. The Kōmuraippādu in Nānjinādu were predominantly agricultured products, whereas the Kōmuraippādu from Trivandrum region included, dues from commercial crops, poll taxes on communities and dues on foodcrops. These variations apparently made the use of a standardised procedure difficult.

The absence of a standardised procedure of rent collection would have affected a large temple like the Padmanabha temple, which depended on a regular collection of rent to conduct its offerings and ceremonies. Difference in the nature of rent and the amount collected from their lands, which were distributed all over Vēnād, affected the regular conduct of temple affairs and called for some form of standardisation. This was attempted at the end of 15th century by the temple authorities, when they asked the accountants of Karuvelamkulam Dēsams, and Sripandarachērikkal Dēsams to collect rent according to the Melkangānikanakku of Māmpula Ayyappan Vikraman. Arrears of rent between 570 K.E. and 661 K.E. to be collected by the intermediaries might indicate the period for which accounts of rent collections from Dēsams were available, which
were used by Māmpūla Ayyappan Vikāraman for preparing his Melkangānīkanakku, involving a systematisation of a temple accounts. Instructions to the Pāttam holders of Śrī Panḍāra Chērikkal and Karuvēlamkulam Deśams implied that the regularisation of rent collection and the collection of Olukunnam were such regular demands. Regulations on the collection of rent in Nānjināḍu in 722 K.C. according to the Manaltittai record appear to have followed the standardisation of rent collection by Māmpūla Ayyappan Vikraman and were presumably made by the authorities of Padmanabha temple. Similar procedures were followed in the organisation of rent collection by other major temples also.

An examination of the nature and forms of collection of rent on land by the overlords including the rulers and temples show the following major features. First, due to the expansion of the lands controlled by the overlords, the forms of rent collected and the nature of collection became varied and more complex: The Vēṇād royal family and temple appointed intermediaries to streamline the collection of rent. The appointment of intermediaries by the overlords was based on the convenience of the overlords and the status of the intermediaries, hereditary or otherwise, depended on whether the overlords considered the innovation beneficial to them. Second, the growth of intermediaries apart from the traditional overlords may have imposed additional burden
on the cultivators. By this time, almost the entire cultivable land available in the region had already been put into use, and the available evidence do not show any effort by the overlords to improve the cultivation in the region. All the innovations were in the organisations of the collection of rent, a feature which was shared by the temples and Vēnād ruling family. Land relations that were developing during the early decades of 16th century followed the general pattern discussed above.

VI

The sections that follow deal with the period that could be loosely referred to as later medieval, i.e., from 16th century to the formation of Modern Travancore state under Martanda Varma, during the 18th century. The changes in land relations during this period are complex and have a direct bearing on the changes in land management and the formation of State power during the 18th century. In order to examine the complex relationships in a systematic manner, the major types of landholdings that developed during this period will be described and the evolution of each type will be taken up separately.

The landholdings in the Vēnād region during 16th and 17th centuries were basically of the following types:

1. Temple lands, called Śripandāravaga lands in the Malayālam region and Devadanam or Sanketaparru in Nāñjinādu.
2. Lands paying customary shares of the produce to the king. They were later termed Pandaravaga, but were variously called Kandulavu, Udupalli, or Chandrachelavu Vaga during this period.

3. Edavaga lands, specific to Malayalam region, Chempalandi, Melepérur, and Kusavurkal Edavagas near Trivandrum were allotted to royal relatives, even though we do not get information regarding the persons they were allotted to.

4. Lands held as brahmaswams, enjoying a number of customary dues; The brāhmanas could be temple Utalar, or individuals like Māmpalli Pandarathil who held important positions with the Padmanabha temple.

All those lands paying Kōmuraippaṇu could be classified as Pandaravaga and fields held by the temples or brāhmanas that had not received tax remission could be technically under royal control. Hence, we have to be careful about classifying lands under the headings given above, as a single field could have obligations to several overlords at the same time. Also, in the above classification a group of lands named 'Mādampipāravaga' (or lands held by independent nobles) have not been mentioned the reasons for which would be given in the course of the discussion.

As noted in the previous chapter, there were very few land grants made by the rulers themselves to the temples of this region during the period from the middle of 16th to the middle of the 18th centuries. We have a grant to Suchindram by Bhutalavirarama Varman, and grants to
Kanyakumari temple by Nayaka rulers, Muttuvirappa and Chokkanatha. Land transfers were made by some Venad rulers to Trivandrum temple, e.g. one by Attingal Rani during 852 K.E. Similar grants were made during the same period by Venad Prince Ravi Varma also. However, a formal royal land grant with libation of water reappeared only during the time of Martanda Varma, when he transferred lands to the Mitrânandapuram shrine in 912 K.E.

Land and money grants to temples by private persons continued in Nānjinādu. Most of the grants though made according to the customary procedure, were not simple transactions. Many of them involved commutation of the overlord's share of the produce. A grant of 54 panam by a resident of Kadigaippatinam to the local temple set aside the interest on the amount for the expenses in rice and other condiments. Another land grant as 'Dharmam' commuted the rent coming from the grant as equivalent to a prescribed sum of money, to be treated as Ubhayam and utilised for the expenses. A grant of 200 panam was utilised by the temple authorities to redeem a land given as Otti. Five Kottai of paddy was realised from the land every year to conduct the grant. Two money grants of 550 panam and 450 panam made to Kilārmangalam temple for feeding one brähmana, were also to be realised in land produce. The Ubhayam on the money was to be equivalent to the required measure of paddy. Another type of grant was the money given by a certain individual to a brähmana so that the latter may provide for the expenses for lighting a lamp in the Suchindram temple.
The grants discussed above show the penetration of cash transaction in Nanjindru, where the temple authorities received grants mostly in cash and utilised the money to provide for temple expenses in kind, realising the amount from the temple lands.

The grants during these centuries also show a new tendency. In Nanjindru and elsewhere private persons set up shrines and Mathas and donated lands and other gifts to them. One such case is the grant by a merchant for the temple set up by an ancestor of the donor. A rest house (ambalam) was built at Putur by a dancing girl and her brother for which lands were granted. Lands were granted by accountant, Dikkellam pukalam perumal and a dancing girl to a stone matha set up by a private individual. Grants were also made by the same persons for an agrahara, set up near the Matham. A brāhmaṇa village was founded by Panaiyarai Sankaran Kōthai, a royal servant and lands were granted by him for the settlements.

By the end of 17th century this tendency reached its highest point. Marungūr village was granted to a disciple of Munchirai Swāmiyar by an army commander of Tirumala Nayaka. Another grant mentions the building of a koil (shrine) by the donors and one of them, was also the manager of the shrine. The grant by two members of the Cheruvalli house to a shrine near Neyyattinkarai might indicate the patronage of this shrine by the family, and probably, the shrine itself was constructed by them. A resident of Suchindram built a Vinayaka temple at Tālakudi and granted lands to the shrine.
Most of the donors were non-brāhmanas; some of them were merchants settled in Nanjindū, others worked as accountants as shown by the prefixes of their names, Kaṇakku Perumāl Tānuvan, Kaṇakku Dikkellāmpukalum Perumāl etc. Panayara Sankaran Kōthai, one of the donors, was specifically described as a royal servant (Fandarakāriyam Cheyvār) but as no ruler is mentioned/connected with the grant, which meant that he was making the grant on his own. The donors from northern Vēnad region include a Nāyar, CheraPillai and a brāhmana, Makilanjeri Mādampi. In this connection, one interesting grant made on the command of an unspecified ruler (826 K.E.) granting 10 temples to a brāhmana of Ālwar Tirunagari should also be mentioned.

Grants discussed above demonstrate two major features in the land transactions during this period. First, the tendency noted in Section I of private individuals controlling shrines, Matham, and amenities to brāhmanas including agrahāras increased. Second, greater number of non-brāhmanas including merchants, royal servants and temple servants were granting lands and providing for temple expenses. The growth of non-brāhmana donors illustrate the important position occupied by the intermediaries noted in the previous sections.

There were very few cases of actual remissions of dues by the ruler. In many grants the donor granted only
the share of the produce held by him, after deducting the share of the ruler (Rājakaram) which indicated that the grantee had to continue to pay those dues. At times, the actual overlord of the grants might be different from the lord who received Mēlvāram and the grantee should see that the former's share was also paid. There were some cases of transfer of the entire share of the overlord. Some of the donors went to the rulers of Vēnād or Dēsinganād and obtained a Tirumugam or royal order for a tax remission.¹¹²

The land grants were not confined to any specific region which meant that they might be held under different tenures, and might even be in different areas even. The details of the land grant made to Krishna temple at Iravipuram (887 K.E.) is cited as an example. The lands granted included:

1. The lands held by the ancestor of the donor for the expenses of the temple (to which the present grant was made) — Tax remission given by a Vēnād ruler to the ancestor i.e., the temple received Anjāli and Mēlvāram directly.

2. Lands from Kōthainallūr-parru in Malainādu. — Pāttam to be received by the temple after removing the Kadamai (going to the ruler).

3. Parakkōdu Perungulam lands — Kadamai will go to the temple.

4. Dānam held by Perumāl Anṅāvi of Kōttār — Pāttam after removing Anjāli Mēlvāram.
5. Purayidamns
   (a) Pëttalivilāgam from Kulachai
   (b) Anjāli Vilāgam from Neyyar

6. Manai, Vilai, and Thöppu from various places.

7. Seven kaḍais (markets) in Tiruvitānkōḍu.

8. Kāniyāṭṭai lands in Kādukkarai granted as earlier (in 870 K.E.)

It should be noted that Köthainallūr, Parakkōḍu and Tiruvitānkōḍu were in Kalkulam Taluk, Köttār was in Agastheeswaram, Kadigaipattinam and Kādukkarai in Töväalai Taluk, and Neyyar possibly in Neyyattinkarai taluk.

Similarly, the grant made by Cheruvalli family to a temple in Neyyattinkarai Taluk included lands in Neyyattinkarai, Trivandrum and one land held by Rāmēswarattu Mahadevar in Kollam, all of which were held as Kāranmai by the donors. One grant to Ārūvāymolī temple included Mēlvāra Otti land given to a brahmana. The interest on two lands given as Paḍukalam was also transferred. These transactions display overlapping of rights in land which was to characterise a number of landholdings during this period.

The lands granted by various persons were obtained by them from other landholders. The grant by a brahmana to Kāriyamānīckapuruṇam temple was obtained by the donor as Dānām from 'Kāniyāḷar' probably indicating the landed proprietors
of Nāṃjinādu.\textsuperscript{115} Two of the lands granted by a merchant to Viravanallūr temple were received by the donor as Upakshaya dānam from two brāhmaṇas and then granted to the temple.\textsuperscript{116} The land granted to Tāḷakkudi temple as Tirumālaiappuram (735 K.E.) included lands previously held as Ottī and the dues received by the temple included Mēlārām and Ubhayabhōgam.\textsuperscript{117} Grants to a rest house at Tiruviḍaikkōdu,\textsuperscript{118} and to the Suchindram temple\textsuperscript{119} included Chōra Ottī lands. The land granted to Suchindram temple, however, was transferred as Karāṇmaī; It could be seen that majority of the lands transferred were lands held under various types of Ottī.\textsuperscript{120} The donors who were often temple servants and accountants were acquiring lands under Ottī, which were then being transferred. The two Dānams mentioned before also show the increase in private holdings.

Another aspect of these transactions is illustrated by a document from Tāḷakkudi. Some lands were granted to the authorities of the Tāḷakkudi temple. These lands were given out as Ottī by the temple authorities in 740 K.E. In 744 K.E. the same lands were transferred to the temple as Nandāvanappuram\textsuperscript{121} and the dues from the land used for making garlands. Since no additional lands were involved, this was apparently an internal arrangement where the balance of rent from the mortgaged lands was set apart for specified temple expenses. We have seen that 'Dānams'
made to some shrines included lands already held by the same shrines. There was another form of 'Grant' which also was apparently an internal arrangement of a temple; Two persons probably attach to the temple collected money from several individuals, cast a Makarattöranavilakku at Nāgarkoil Krishna Temple and provided for the supply of oil. Their payment of 600 panam cancelled the arrears of 450 Kōttai or paddy due from them and the expenses were met from the interest on 600 panam. Here no additional 'grant' was made. The arrears in paddy was commuted in cash and with its yearly interest a new offering was instituted in the temple. Hence, the 'grant' was also a convenient arrangement between the donors and the temple. This form of commuting rent was calculated for an increase in the income of the temple with the newly instituted offering. The practice of treating arrears of rent as 'Padukalam' was discussed in Chapter II and the above case shows that a similar practice was adopted by temples also, which increased the burden on the tenants.

Apart from land and money grants to the temple there were also assignments of lands from the temple from service and supply of ritual requirements. In one case 5 ma of first rate (Mudaltaram) land was given to a Vāniyan (Cil presser) who was supposed to provide rent for the land as well as supply oil to the temple. In another record,
land was granted as *Virutti* to a Kannan Māpāratan, a Mahābhārata bhatta.\(^{124}\) Another form of land assignment was the allotment as *Silpavrittikārānmai* i.e. tenancy rights to the master sculptor of the temple.\(^{125}\)

A series of records termed *AdichChandōswarapramānas* found from the temples of Nānjinādu illustrate the character of these assignments. In one document a resident of Bhūtappāndi received 150 paṇam from the temple to provide 45 nali oil necessary for lighting a new lamp every year. It appears that this amount was used for redeeming the pledge of *Melvāram* (*Melvāra Otti*) on a piece of land. Four and a half Kottai was obtained from the land (as *Melvāram*) and the expense conducted.\(^{126}\) In another deed, an individual was advanced 100 paṇam, and from the Ubbayampalisa for this amount a monthly service of ghee and plantain fruits would be conducted.\(^{127}\) In yet another deed the temple gave 900 paṇam to a merchant and from the interest calculated in paddy (that could be commuted into money) certain temple expenses were conducted by him.\(^{128}\) A private individual gave 700 paṇam for which a land was given as *PidiṆadu* by the temple and the prescribed expenses were to be realised from the land by the donor.\(^{129}\) All these documents show a pattern where cash or land were allotted to different individuals, prescribing the temple offerings they were to meet from the allotted sum. The documents show that the assignments were mostly in cash, which were used for pledging
or redeeming lands which were to provide for the expenses. 

Otta transactions became the predominant form of landlord-tenant relations in temple lands, and the temple became dependent on the Otta of various kinds for conducting their offerings and ceremonies.

The extent of lands as Otta in Nanjinaḍu and the dependence of the temple on such lands could be seen in a request made by the authorities of the Bhūtapāṇḍi temple. Several persons were holding lands as Nila Otta and Nelvāra Otta for the temple (which probably meant that the share of the produce was assigned to the temple in the cases noted above).

It appears that the original landlords started troubling the Otta holders for redemption of the holdings. The temple authorities told the ruler that redemption of ottis would be harmful for the conduct of temple expenses. The king consulted his representatives in the area and decided that except those held as otta from royal lands, mortgages made by others need not be redeemed. The document also illustrates incidentally the control that the ruler exercised over the area. It appears that despite the fact that Otta was a time bound tenure, redemption of Ottis was not common, otherwise there would be no point in granting a temporary holding/a temple. The above example also indicates that cash had come to play a crucial role in the land relations, and commutation of rent solved the problems of procuring the articles needed for temple
expenses. Despite the prevalence of Ötti during this period, there were very few instances of actual sales, as noticed in the previous chapter. During the 18th century we find a few examples of 'grants' of house-sites on receiving a certain amount of money probably meant to be its value, which were not regarded as sale deeds.\textsuperscript{131}

Holding lands as Ötti, without converting them into actual sales proved to be convenient for traditional overlords like the temple to retain their control over the lands and to ensure that expenses of the temple are met. It also saved the temple from bothering about the actual process of production and rent collection, which would be handled by the intermediary landowners holding the mortgaged lands. Changes in the nature of land transactions were probably meant for alteration in the mode of collection of land rent. The earlier form of collection of dues as Mēlvāram, Upādi, and Viniyogam slowly declined. Sometime during the 16th century, we find the dues termed Anjāli being introduced as a cess realised by the ruler.\textsuperscript{132} During the 17th century a number of other dues were being introduced which were not mentioned in the documents from earlier centuries, like Kuttagai and Māttālpānam.\textsuperscript{133} The changes in the types of cesses indicate that the rent paid by the cultivator to his overlord got consolidated into a single cess, as Mēlvāram or Pāttam. Similarly the dues from cash crops, which were different for different types of cash crops, were also consolidated into a single form, Pāttam or KadamaI,\textsuperscript{134} paid in cash. Such cash payment substituted all different payments in kind.
Another important change occurred with reference to forms of control over the lands held by the temple. A grant for feeding 54 brāhmanas in a temple at Tiruvitaikkōdu was given as brahmaswam and was entrusted with the Īrār of Tiruvitaikkōdu and Kaṇīnjānkōdu. Grants when made to smaller shrines, were to be looked after by the village Īrār assembly, one example being the grant to Vinayaka shrine at Kaliyāngādu. The Grant to the shrines at Viravanallūr was made in the presence of Köyimal, Īr and Kaṇiyālar. Another grant was to be protected by Īrār and Köyimal of Viravanallūr, and it appears that authorities of another shrine in the same place are also named as protectors. This indicates that at least in the case of the smaller shrines that were set up, the lands granted were to be under the joint authority of the landholders of the area.

Such a practice was different from the organisation of temple lands during the period before the 16th century. Temple lands were classified as Sankētams, which were centres of autonomous authority. Sankētams were spheres of brāhmana influence, and all major temples set up during early medieval times had their Sankētams. In the case of shrines that are discussed above, exclusive brāhmanical authority over temple lands clearly did not exist. Temple lands were brought under the control of assemblies of landowners in the villages and there is no indication that
they were brahmanical assemblies. Thus, the rising non-brahmana classes were sharing the control of temple lands, along with the traditional brahmana overlords. Autonomy of the Sanketam lands was also being violated as shown by a 17th century record (536 K.E.) which listed at least three lands that were transferred from Sanketam holdings.

The discussion on the nature of relations that characterised temple lands reveals the following major features. a) Grants to the temple and assignments by the temple were characterised by the spread of monetary transactions. Otti or mortgage transactions became the dominant tenurial form, particularly in Naininadu and mortgages while aiding the development of a new group of land owners, ensured the continuation of the rights of the traditional overlords (b) The new class of intermediary land owners, majority of them non-brahmanas became main donors, and sometimes controllers of temples and temple lands. Merchants also became major land-owners and donors to temples (c) Exclusive brahmanical control over temples, in the form of Sanketam decreased with the growth of new landlords and their temples. The above features are particularly visible in the documents from the Kanyakumari district.

VII

In this section the main features of the management and relations that prevailed in the lands held by Padmanabha temple are being examined. The occurrence of the tendencies
described in the previous section has to be demonstrated in the case of Padmanabha temple, as the chief royal temple and the largest landowner in Vēnād.

Even though we find references to other temples, the landholdings and management of the Padmanabha temple were crucial and typical in the development of land relations in later medieval Vēnād, and hence the discussion on northern Vēnād would have to be depend largely on Padmanabha temple documents. It should be pointed out that the transactions by the temple and transactions made by the temple servants independently, are discussed together in the temple records, and hence they are dealt with together in the discussion that follows:

The rent collected by the Trivandrum temple for the festivals and ceremonies belonged to the broad categories of Pātṭam and Vāram. The mode of collections of rent continued to be based on the arrangement outlined in Section II. However, since the collection of rent was based on customary obligation and on the services to the temple or to the royal family, the set up did not prevent the growth of tendencies outlined in the previous section. The most obvious tendency was the growth of pledges of land. The simplest form of was Ulavupāttaṁ, a kind of mortgage-cum-lease. Example of Ulavupāttaṁ deeds have been mentioned in the previous chapter. Evidence shows that such pledges of land often involved the forfeiture of land when the interest on the pledge was not paid. In the records describing
transactions of the Padmanabha temple, we also find a number of large scale transactions as Otti. One document of 859 K.E. mentions lands received by a royal servant from another person, for 109 pañam. Four pieces of lands in Sittattinkarai near Trivandrum were taken as Otti for 1000 pañam. There is also reference to Otti artham of 2900 pañam on the lands and puraiyidams held by the Pāchallur family. An Ulayotti Ola mentions 13 Urūṇi of land as being given for 488 pañam. In another Otti deed, apart from the pañam, 900 pañam was provided additionally for reclaiming a forest tract. Probably, due to the latter provision, the assignment was termed Kodālikkānni. Vanjipula Madampi received as Otti 15 para Vithupādu of land for which he gave 201 adavurāsi panam as Vāyippa. Another Vanjipula chief bought land which he earlier held as Otti paying the price fixed by four persons. The lands transferred by the princes of Attingal to the temple included the Otti holdings of an individual in Tiruppatisāram, in Nānjinādu. These transactions were generally between big brāhmaṇa landholders, who held positions in Padmanabha temple and non-brāhmaṇa intermediaries. It should be noted that the only major landgrant by a member of the royal family to the temple during 17th century also involved Otti holdings.

Mortgages were not limited to large-scale transactions. 14 panam was paid as Otti artham to Kanchipurattu Madham for a strip of land (806 K.E.). The Trivandrum temple
accountants gave as Ṫtti a land of 2 Tuni Kuruni for 800 pānām.149 A land mentioned as Agāriviruttī (service holding of a carpenter) in Ālūr Dēsam went through several transactions, between 856 K.E. and 879 K.E.150 An accountant of KamaVarman Matham gave a land in Tenganādu Dēsam as Ulavotti for 41 Kaliyugarāman paṇam (895 K.E.).151 It should be noted that these Ṫtti deeds were also given by the temple and Matha authorities themselves, to private landholders. Thus, temple lands and those held by brahmans attached to the temple, were being mortgaged to a new group of intermediary landholders.

It is during the later medieval times that lands granted as Kulikkānām began to appear. We have reference to a puraiyidam, held by a woman as pāttam and kulikkānām from Kupakkarai Pōtti.152 Lands were also being held as Ṫtti and Kulikkānām and this form of holding became common by the beginning of the 18th century. Records of the settlements by Martanda Varma mention a number of lands allotted as Ṫtti and Kulikkānām and a close study of records shows that many of the lands were allotted under the same tenure during earlier years also. For example, the land allotted as Ṫtti and Kulikkānām by Rama Varman Maḍham attached to Padmanabha temple during 914 K.E. had earlier been allotted to another person.153

The incidences of Kulikkānām tenures during the 17th and 18th centuries along with Ṫtti and pāttam tenures (latter
(latter often assuming the character of a pledge) shows another important feature of the landholdings. Those who were holding lands under Otti were also trying to improve production in their holdings by expanding cultivation. The new group of landholders was trying to acquire actual control over their lands while fulfilling their traditional obligations to the overlords.

VIII

In the previous section, it was shown that mortgage-cum-lease transactions were becoming prevalent in the northern part of Venad also. However, the documents of the Padmanabha temple also demonstrate the increasing complexities in the hierarchy of land rights. This is revealed by a close examination of the details of the grant by Martanda Varma to Mitranandapuram temple during 912 K.E. Here, the lands were transferred to the temple from the holdings of a number of people, which were cultivated by others. Some examples are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landholder</th>
<th>Cultivator</th>
<th>Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Āngūr Ayyappan Ayyappan</td>
<td>Thandāṅkūṭtipillai of Thōttathuvedu Kuruvela.</td>
<td>15 para in Kīḻnamgal Vattam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landholder</td>
<td>Cultivator</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Periyamana Trivikrama Narayanan</td>
<td>Narayanachar of Konikkatteveedu.</td>
<td>34 para in Puttiyadattukonam Pangappara Desam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Islatti Matikutti Kali settled in Karai</td>
<td>13 para 8 in Puttiedattu Konam, Pangappara Desam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teyari Narayanan Raman of Cheruvakkal</td>
<td>Kochumatevan of Kadukkaraveedu.</td>
<td>7 para 5 in Parayur Vattam Cheruvakkal Desam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Periyannahattu Raman Marthandan</td>
<td>Kunchupillai of Karuvelyveedu, Peruntanni, Trivedrum Islatti Sakki</td>
<td>6 para in Chenkottuvattam Chempalandi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Perakkattu Kesavan Raman (held by the Princess of Attingal)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 para 5 nali in the Western side of Parakkattukonam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the examples given above, while the landholders were expected to pay the prescribed share of the produce to the temples, the cultivators (or tenants, as their position is unspecified in the document) would have to pay rent to the landholders. In other cases, along with those mentioned above, the lands were held by royal servants for their expenses. In one case, the tenant had to pay the share of produce to the Kalakkuttam temple which was treated as a landholder paying rent to the Trivandrum temple.

In another case, the amount transferred to the temple was held by a person who was probably a tenant of the junior princess of Attingal. The process indicated above, is similar to the process of subinfeudation. The same process was visible in the lands allotted to various temple servants, who were to receive the Mālpāthi from several lands and the persons who were allotted lands had to render the temple specific services.

The collection of rent shows similarities to the pattern already seen in Nanjīnādu, where the landholder paid shares of produce to several overlords. One example is found in the Mitranandapuram grant, where the lands belonging to Atrachēri Illam were held by the officers of Attingal junior princess. The cultivators mentioned in the record had to provide shares of produce to both the overlords besides the new allotment which was be paid by Atrachēri potti himself to the temple. In the 18th century records, we find lands classified as
as Pandāravaga Otți paying varam to a Matha.\textsuperscript{155} The share of the produce for various Mathas attached to the temples from Rājakamangalam, Kanyakumari District was calculated only after removing an amount Sripandārakadāma, probably going directly to the temple.\textsuperscript{156} Similarly accounts of rent from lands in Trivandrum show the same lands as paying rent to several temples or landlords at the same time.\textsuperscript{157} However, it may be argued that a hierarchy of rights over the share of the land produce was established during 16th and 17th centuries. This also indicates the rise of a number of landholders who paid their customary dues to the kings or to the temple but increased their strength by acquiring more land. The landholders mentioned in the grant to Mitranandapuram, incidentally included both brāhmanas and non-brāhmanas. In Nānji-nādu these landholders had become powerful enough to build their own temples and mathas. In Northern Vēnād the large scale Otți transactions show at least some of them becoming powerful.

To sum up, the rights over lands that were developing during 16th - 18th centuries show a hierarchy of landholders. Traditional landlords, like the temple enjoyed overall control over the lands and several layers of intermediaries were emerging and the growth of relations among the overlords, intermediaries and the cultivators show a process similar to sub-infeudation. However land relations were made more complex by the existence of overlapping rights of different overlords over the same land, each claiming their share of the
Trends in land management previously traced up to the turn of 16th century, should be now examined in more detail. Documents of the Trivandrum temple during the 16th and 17th centuries show that the temple authorities maintained the organisation for the collection of rent that was set up during 15th century. The organisation of rent collection as discussed earlier was to ensure the regular supply of produce and money to conduct temple expenses. In the temple documents of this period, there is evidence of frequent stoppages of daily offering and ceremonies due to lack of provisions. This may be an indication that regular collection of rent from temple lands ran into difficulties, forcing the authorities to suspend the prescribed offerings temporarily until fresh provisions were brought from temple lands.

Alternate arrangements were made by the temple authorities wherever the offerings were stopped temporarily. When the offerings were stopped continuously for 60 days during 721 K.\textsuperscript{a}, the ruler summoned the \textit{y\=ogam} and decided that the expenses for daily offerings were to be met from the \textit{sripand\=aram} (temple treasury).\textsuperscript{158} This was unusual as the regular expenses were met from the income of \textit{Nityanadai Desams} (see Section II). Again offerings in the Padmanabha temple had to be discontinued in 763 K.\textsuperscript{a}. But this time, the temple demanded compensation...
(Dendam and Parihāram) from the royal family for creating disturbances in its lands, preventing regular collection of rent. However, some of the offerings were conducted by money grants from temple servants. These instances show that the organisation for the collection of rent did not work smoothly during later centuries preventing the regular functioning of the temple.

Members of the yōgam were not only managing the temple, but they were also acquiring lands for themselves. The grant by Martanda Varma mentioned above included several lands held by Ponkaṇna Puli Anirudhan Aniruddhan, the Sri Kāryam and a member of the yōgam of the Padmanabha temple. A document of the period of Martandavarma refers to collection of arrears for 35 years from lands held by Kūpakkara Pōtti, another member of the temple yōgam. Grants to Samprati Ramayyan near Aruvikkara included lands held by Muttavilai Potti, another member of the yōgam. A land dispute brought up during the time of Martandavarma was between Athiyarai Potti and Mitranandapuram shrine where Melkollur and Kīkollur lands held by the former were wrongly claimed by the latter.

Another feature regarding the Padmanabha temple during this period was the growth of the Mathas. Mathas for the brahmanas were established at different times by different rulers. During the 16th century there were five Mathas, attached to the temple, to which another Matham was added by Ravivarma Kulasekharapperumal during 17th century. Mathas had lands
endowed for their expenses and they had also to perform specific services in the temple. Moreover, lands were held by several shrines near the Padmanabha temple. Sources refer to 5 Mukkalvattam (the normal Malayalam term for older temples) among whom Palkulangara (Thiruvambadi), Mitranandapuram and Srikanthswaram seem to have been the three major ones. They were not only landholders but had specific services to perform in the temple also. This would mean that the Trivandrum temple was managed by corporate bodies and individuals who were big landholders in their own right. Important meetings of the temple yogam would be attended by representatives from all these bodies. The relations that the Mathas and Mukkalvattams had with the Padmanabha temple were apparently of subservience where the overlordship of the temple over the lands held by these bodies was recognised; However, these institutions enjoyed relative autonomy over their sources of income and had a role in the management of Padmanabha temple. Thus the management of lands held by Padmanabha temple and the temples and the Mathas related to that temple was supervised by an extended corporate complex including the ruler, members of the Yogam, the hands, of the Mathas and the authorities of the smaller temples. The intermediaries, accountants, rent collectors etc. also may have increased in number the Mathas and the shrines requiring their own accountants.

Evidence from the Kanyakumari district provides us with further information regarding the management of lands by
temples. A certain assignment made by the authorities of Kumari temple to carry out the Kālaśāndi in the temple has among its signatories, the accountants of private persons, most of them non-brāhmanas. This may be an indication of the influence over the temple by non-brāhmanas. Similarly, appointment of accountants on a hereditary basis in the Nanjinādu temples, also show the growth of non-brāhmanas as important temple functiones. In one case, the position of accountant in a temple was given as Kaniyatci. The same person, Thampi Ādichthan Ādichthan held the position of the treasurer of Suchindram and Kilārmangalam temples at one time. Later, a Thampi Mārtandanan Mārtandanan is mentioned as Srikāryakanakku. However in 805 K. Ā. a relative of Iḷampel Pandārathil, a major landholder in Northern Vēnād was appointed as Sripandārakanakku. From these, it appears that landlords and merchants were assuming control of the treasury of the temples in Nanjinādu during the seventeenth century.

Management of temples in Vēnād thus became more complex during the 16th and 17th centuries. In Padmanabha temple, the authority of the yōgam continued but now became a part of an extended managerial complex. Accountants and rent collectors, carried out the functional part of land management on behalf of the yōgam. In Nanjinādu also, the accountants were wielding more power. They held their position permanently, and acquired lands independently. Non-brāhmanas acquired important positions in the temple management of Nanjinādu.
It was pointed out in the previous sections that land relations and management were considerably altered by the growth of an intermediary landowning class, including temple and royal servants. Apart from those who were directly managing the temple we have indications regarding the growth of large scale private landholders. We have already referred to the transactions between brāhmana and non-brāhmana landholders. In a document ascribed to the early medieval period the property of Kanguman Illam, the family that held the position of Tirumēnikōval in Trivandrum temple, was transferred to Veyilūr Matham. This Veyilūr Matham and its landed property were plundered by the Vēnād soldiers during the 16th century. During the 17th century when lands were allotted to the princes of the Perakattāyvali lands held by a certain Panapillai Adichapillai were transferred after his death. Among the records relating to the villages in Shenkotta we have reference to a village held by a Vēnād chief Ilambēl Pandārathil Independently. Another allotment to Perakattāyvali included lands held by a woman named Arumāni Nambirattiyar, presumably a royal relative. Apart from land holdings, it appears that the independent landholders had a share of the income from trade also. Idatharai Pōtti held a share of the tolls of pepper realised from Kulitturai. Ilambēl Pandārathil held 120 pānām from the tolls on Kōttāru. Two accountants had paddy allotments of 60 kālam and 120 kālam respectively, from Kalkulam
Udupulli lands. 177 Another interesting example of the growth
of landlords who set up their temples, was the establishment
of Ariyankavu temple in Kulon District (near Western Ghats)
by a certain Panayancheri Pillai. 178 It should be noted
that some of these landlords were brahmanas, and some were
non-brahmanas having the status of "accountants" but privileged
enough to get a share of the income from royal lands.
Mortgages and Padukalamuris (debt-bond) seem to have become the
major forms of landholdings in Venad during later medieval
period. When allotments were made from lands for soldiers
as Iravili aduthun (pension) a number of lands were held by
under Padukalam paying their rent as interest. 179 A document
of interest belonging to early decades of 18th century was
an avadhikadanmuri given by a certain Ramakrishnayyan to
Rajagopalabhattar Krishnayyan (father of Ramayyan Dalaway). 155
Kaliyugaran pañam was given as loan to the latter, some
lands were given as Octi, as a security for the money taken
and as a mode of payment of interest. If the loan was not
returned within the stipulated period then the lands would
be considered as sold (forfeit). 180 In one of the land
disputes cited in the Trivandrum temple records a royal servant,
was holding land as Padukalam, and it appears that he tried
to obstruct attempts at cultivation by the temple servants
in the surrounding fields also, which ended in a quarrel. 181
Another quarrel involved the Manushyam of a Matha and an
accountant of Makilanjeri Illam. The accountant claimed that he had occupied a certain land under Otti from a certain brahmana who had been receiving coconuts from the land as Melkâlcha. The temple Manushyam claimed the land as belonging to the Matha. It is possible that the Matha got its share of the produce and the brahmana received his Melkâlcha from the same lands, and the customary arrangement was upset by the new transaction with the accountant. The accountant, despite his connections with Makilanjeri Illam was acting here as an independent landholder. This could be treated as an example of how land mortgages upset the customary arrangement. The above examples demonstrate how Otti and Padukalam contracts between land holders or between temples and landholders were utilised by intermediaries to acquire lands. In the case of the royal servant an attempt was made/acquire land by forcibly grabbing the nearby fields, which was probably not unusual.

Another form of extortion can also be noticed during this period. The Manushyam of Viranârâyanasseri, held by the Trivandrum temple were transporting paddy via colachel. The Manushyam were forbidden to give Nelothi (a bag of paddy) to the adhikâri of colachel. Manushyam followed their instructions a quarrel started between them and the Adhikâri. Colachel might have been under the jurisdiction of this Adhikâri, but the practice of receiving Nelothi was not considered customary, at least by the temple servants. This
possible violation of customary practice makes the affair similar in nature to the demands made by royal representatives in Nanjinadu. One Kamukara Mutaliyar of Chirayankil Desam along with some others went to the Vepād prince and the princes of Attingal and obtained two orders for becoming an anaival' (officer). Then they went to a Sankētam land and started gathering coconuts, which resulted in another quarrel. This case is also similar to the previous one, as the attempt at collection of dues was made, using the position as a royal officer. In both cases, customary forms of collecting rent were violated by royal representatives. It is not clear whether they had the permission of the ruler to do so. Nonetheless, it appears that royal representatives found direct extortions of this kind by breaking custom as an effective method to enrich themselves.

One more example could be cited. Temple servants tried to cultivate the royal lands (Kandulavu) in Kottukal Desam, which was opposed by the 'Kulapatigal' of the Desam and the men of a certain Iravikkuttipillai. Kulapatigal were probably the local landholders, and Iravikkuttipillai, either a royal representative or big landholder. It is not clear which side was favoured by the existing regulations, but it is evident that the local landholders had the strength to prevent the temple representatives in the latter's effort to control the lands.
Land transactions of this period also show the use of militia in land relations, especially in the holdings of private landlords. In the example given above the temple servants were opposed by Iravikkuttipillai and his men, which appear to have formed a local militia. Veyilūr Matham, mentioned elsewhere was raided by a certain Kaman Iravi and his soldiers. Militia was used to extort dues from the cultivators of Nanjīnāḍu. The evidence from land transactions shows that militarisation served as an instrument for the acquisition of land and subjection of cultivators. Another feature connected with militarisation was that of forcible acquisition of lands by the landlords. The authorities of the Padmanabha temple complained about members of the royal family who seized the paddy allotted for temple expenses. In another case a princess of Attingal gave to Pāchakulattu Pōtti 14 para 5½ kandam as Dānam. Koduman Pillai forcibly acquired 5 para of land from the grant and Pāchakulattu Pōtti had not received anything from the land when the document was written.

There are number of cases where the temples and brāhmanas were disposed to assign lands in return for large sums of money or services. A kuri written by a resident of Ālamkulam shows the transfer of 730 para sowing capacity of land to be shared by two persons. The new holder had to pay a small rent after deducting the interest on the amount given.
as loan. This was not paid between 869 K.E. and 903 K.E. (for 35 years) and then paid as arrears. A similar deal was made between a brāhmaṇa and the Tiruvalla temple for 62½ para of land. The rent, after deducting the interest on the loan given by the brāhmaṇa was not paid between 857 K.E. to 905 K.E. but was later paid as arrears. These examples show the landlords transferring their lands for large sums of money, the transactions were similar to otti, but the rent were not being collected for a long period. This meant that, even though the original landlord held the right over the lands, it was not vigorously exercised and the 'tenant' utilised the lands for his own purposes. Thus this kind of transaction became a contract between the landlord and the actual proprietor of land.

Growth of private landholders is also shown by the activities of the peasant body, Nāttār, of Nānjinādu. Peasant bodies called Nāttār existed in Tamil country during Cola times, but the origins of the Nāttār of Nānjinādu that appeared during 16th and 17th centuries is obscure. Records from Nānjinādu before 16th century remain singularly silent about the existence of this peasant body. During 682 K.E. when the princes of Chiravay and Jayasimhanād gave tax exemptions to the Nattalvār of the country lying between Tovālai, river Parali and the hills of east and west. The regulations outlined in the Manalitittai record (722 K.E.) when the first concrete reference to them appears were to be applicable to
them. Further regulations were made by the ruler regarding the collection of Mālvāram from the area. It is clear from the documents that the Nāttār were paying their rent to the King, the temple or to land holders and their relationships to overlords was based on customary obligations. However, some regulations were introduced during the 17th century. Each landholder in the area was given a document giving details about the land (Muri or Karanam) and the amount to be collected as rent (Cheeti). There is also an oblique reference to a land survey document (Olugu) and a document was given to all cultivators showing their right to till their soil (Pativu). It appears that the collection of rent from Nanjinadu at least by the end of the 17th century was based on these documents. However, since Nanjinadu was the prime food crop region in the entire area, attempts were apparently made to increase the rent through various means, which have been mentioned in the documents as perāmpērū and Vaiyāvari.

Documents relating to the Nāttār of Nanjinadu outlines the methods used by tax collectors and landlords to increase their hold over the peasantry, which could be compared to the experience of other regions in Venād also. One method was the demand for excess taxes like Kottaippānām. If the dues were not paid then the lands of defaulting cultivators would
be ‘seized’ so that no cultivation was possible. Another method was that all arrears of rent (including peramperu) would be consolidated into a debt bond (Pachikalam) and the amount would be realised with an interest. If the debt was not cleared then the lands would be seized or confiscated. Alternatively the tax collector would receive pledges from the cultivator for their rent arrears. The tax collectors may well have used this opportunity to acquire lands for themselves. Another method, specific to Nanjinādu, was the manipulation of the regulations regarding water supply. Once the Turakkārar acquired lands on their own then they could allow themselves the freedom of having excess water to flow into their own fields, much to disadvantage of other cultivators. There is also evidence of loans (Kadanmuri) advanced to cultivators. The creditor (a Turakkāran or landlord) could again resort to two methods on- non-repayment of loans (a) prevention of cultivation or ‘seizure’ i.e. stoppage of the payment of aram on the field, (b) actual confiscation of property. All these methods were used to expropriate cultivators in both Sankētaparrur and Perumparrur, but instructions were given to prevent confiscation of the Matha lands.

The ways and means by which private landowners tried to expand their holdings were a major aspect of the growth of land relations during the period under discussion. The private landowner was burdened by a number of difficulties. There was very little possibility of expanding the cultivable area as most of the lands were already in the hands of
temples or held by brahmanas. The private landholder started his career as a small cultivator or tenant to the traditional landlord. During the period under discussion he could rise to become an accountant or a soldier, and if he was a brahmana could gain favour of the king easily. But establishing control over lands was more difficult. It appears that by the 16th century his task was made easier by the growth of mortgage-cum-lease contracts and complexities in the collection of rent as overlords share of the produce, which he exploited to his advantages.

The producer in Nanjinādu and Vēṇāḍ was increasingly becoming subject to customary obligations demanded by traditional overlords as well as the exactions from the new accountants and landlords. Some of the examples of extortions by the intermediaries discussed in the previous section may have had the backing of the royal family. Evidence of this kind is found from early 16th century itself when the Turakkār of the King tried to collect dues from a silk-weaver's street in Karuvelamkulam Dēsam, an action objected to by the temple servants.199 The attempt by royal representatives to impose a new Inavari (community tax) on the powerful Nādār community in Kanyakumari District and the intervention on their request by the Trivandrum temple was another example.200 The Nādār were customarily serving the temple alone, and this arrangement was disturbed by the King's men.
Correspondingly we do not find during this period substantial expansion of production. In Venād, the cultivable areas remained mostly the same, and we have little evidence for expansion of cultivation beyond Vempāykunram in the east. The region around Kottarakkara shows some extension of cultivation, on which the new branch of Kunnannēl Ālayidam arose. The landholdings of the Fādmanabha temple show that apart from the original areas (Nityanadai and Sripandārā-Chērikkals) the major extension took place in Nānjinādu, where lands were held by the Mathas attached to temples. There was extension of cultivation around Trivandrum as shown by the reference to Nellamaṇ Nilamai Sankētam, Uliyathura Desam etc. However, the lack of adequate growth in the technique of production also might have burdened the cultivators.

The growth of landholders holding lands independently and also acting as accountants, tax collectors, and ‘privileged’ tenants to traditional landlords was the major development of land relations during later medieval times. The modes of acquisition of land by these intermediaries have been discussed in this section. The relation between the traditional landlord and intermediaries acted as the most important propelling factor in the development of agrarian relations. However, it is not possible to analyse the ways and means by which the landholders and intermediaries brought the ordinary cultivators into subjection completely. It can only be surmised that the producer was saddled with a hierarchy of rights over the land and its produce, although some of the methods used by the intermediaries could be seen in the case of the Nāttār of Nānjinādu. Additional taxes may have been
realised from communities like the Şăńār and Nădār. We have no means to calculate the total yield or share taken away from the produce and hence, no concrete generalisation is possible at present. These transactions show that considerable amount of power was being wielded by the intermediary landholder, technically 'tenant' to the overlord. The intermediary was free to carry out his operations as long as he paid the customary dues to the overlord. Even that was defaulted by the intermediaries. This kind of arrangement enabled the intermediaries to enhance their economic position.

XI

It is against this background that the position of the Venad royal family who held the authority over the entire region should be studied. Their authority over the region was based on the collection of rent and tolls due to them on the basis of Kiliyakkam and Kilmariyādai (customary obligations). In the same way, they exercised overlordship or Kōyimai over the temples in the region, including the Padmanabha temple. It was pointed out in the first chapter in the 14th century, the Venad royal family had developed more than one political centre to exercise their authority e.g. Kilpērūr, Tripappūr to the north of Trivandrum and Tiruvitāmkōdu to the south. During the 16th and 17th centuries further branches had emerged. Some of them like 'Elayēdattu
Sorupam' (Kottarakkara) and Perakattayvali (Nedumangad) had become distant cousins whereas Desinganad and Trippappur maintained a closer relationship. The land allotments show tendencies of fragmentation even within the existing main branch i.e. Trippappur. Attingal, the 'mother's home' of the family had become a separate Edavagam, from where rent was collected for the Princess (even though she claimed rent from other areas also). Each major Koyikkal (palace held by a prince) had their separate allotments. For example, during the 17th century the landholdings of Manalikkarai Koyikkal included:

(a) Manalikkarai fort and Koyikkal; (b) Kothainallur adhikaram Udupulli lands; (c) Nattalam Vagai paddy and cash income; (d) Kothai Maveli vagai Kattirai Chittirai Raksabhogam; (e) Kadukkarai Venpala Vallan Kandulavu including 3 Kudis and (f) Kilinenlam in Vittinapuram.202

Similarly allotments were made to Ranasinganallur Koyikkal.203 Members of Perakattayvali were allotted lands first in 810 K. and again as Aduthun to a Vira Kerala Varma during late 17th century.204 These assignments meant that rent and tolls due to the ruler were being distributed among members or relatives of the royal family. A number of lands are referred to as directly held by rulers, like Muttakkadu Kandulavu, Manalikkarai Kandulavu, Kalkulam Udupulli and so on.205 Thus the royal family of Venad was a large land owning joint family holding normal landlords' rights over a number of areas apart from the customary obligations due to them as
as rulers.

The Vēnād royal family had 'officers' managing collection of rent and tolls, and also carrying out orders relating to land or trade, called Pandārakāryam Cheyvār. Adhikāris, Turakkār and accountants of Desams (Kapakku) could be classified among them. Panayarai Sankaran Kothai and Cheruvali Pillamar who were among the major landlords of the region, were also Pandārakāryam Cheyvār. We have already mentioned several persons with the prefix 'Kapakku' holding shares of tolls and shares of rent from royal lands. We have a Kochu Govindan Chempakārāman pillai holding share of the tolls from Colachel Vandattu Pillamar played an important role for both Trippappur and Desinganad families. However the main function of collecting rent was carried out by a group of accountant named Karuvukarattil Pillaimār. One document refers to Karuvukarattil Pillaimār collecting dues from different regions and the amount was first kept in the palace. Later a Karuvukarappura (a godown) was set up to store the collections. However, as we saw earlier, these accountants were also involved with the temple.

The presence of landlords, as tax collectors for the King or the temple was a reflection on the exalted nature of the power wielded by such positions. Even relatives of the royal family held such positions as in the case of the
the Ramasinganallur, Kovikkal, who held the rights of Srikaryakanakku over Alwar Koyil, Madhusudanavinangar Emperumân and Kathinamkulam temples. This meant that despite the customary authority of the Venâd ruling family, the actual land management on their behalf had to passed on to the Pillaimar, who were technically royal representatives and accountants as well as landlords. Given the nature of production in Venâd where income came from both food crops and cash crops, control of trade and commercial crops could well have been included in it, as shown by the shares held by several landlords on the tolls from Colachel and Kottâr.

However, changes in the land relations and the dominance of the intermediaries altered the nature of realisation of dues by the royal family. The Venâd rulers and their representatives tried to impose dues on lands from which temples also claimed their share, and it appears that the shares of produce collected were decided by customary arrangements. As we have seen above, most of the dues collected were similar. An additional imposition from the side of the ruler or by the royal servants upset the customary obligations but there was no clear way to check such subversions. Procedures adopted in Nanjinâdu to streamline the collection of rent were probably part of the effort to control the abuses in the collection of the share of the produce by the overlords. An attempt was made during the late 17th century in Trivandrum under royal
direction to survey the temple lands and assess the amount of rent collected from each Desam which was part of the effort to retain the authority that the Venad royal family exercised on the basis of customary privileges over the land owners of the region. The evidence discussed above suggests that the nature of obligations to traditional overlords and the means of realising them enabled men with money or other resources to obtain lands under Otti and convert them into permanent holdings or enforce the cultivators to forfeit their lands through debts bonds and pledges.

Accountants of big landlords and temples, royal representatives like Adhikaris and Turakkar were in a position to indulge in this because of the variation in the collection of rent and the lack of any basic procedure applicable to the entire region. The intermediaries used direct extortions of rent by breaking customary procedure, and also used militia for grabbing lands or share of the produce.

The brief account of the nature of control exercised by the Venad royal family brings out the following features:

(1) Political authority of Venad royal family expanded with the establishment of two more branches, Clayedattu Sorupam and Perakkattayvali. The rights held by the members of the royal family became further fragmented with the formation of Kovikkals (residence) a point which will be discussed in detail elsewhere.

(2) Collection of rent became organised with the help of a body of accountants called Karuvukarattil Pillamar and a general body of royal servants called Pandarakaryam Cheyvar.

(3) Rent collected was customary and
and economic control that could exercised by the ruler depended on the force of customary obligation. The royal family could not have done much to contain the growth of intermediaries, as they themselves were dependent on their accountants and servants to sustain their authority. The implications of these features would be taken up in the next chapter. In brief, members of the royal family were not different from the class of traditional overlords.

XII

The above discussion can now be summed up as follows:

(a) By the 13th century a number of temples and brahmans settlements had sprung up all over Vēnād. The 14th and 14th centuries saw the expansion of the land transactions of the temples, and the brahmans emerged as big landlords independently or in connection with the temples. Among the temples some like Suchindram, Tiruvattār and Padmana-bha temples outgrew the rest. For our purposes the growth of the Padmanabha temple is important as it was under the direct patronage of the Vēnād rulers. (b) The growth of these temples into big landlords meant that land management was becoming important, because the temple services and other expenditure depended on regular income from lands and other sources. The 15th and early 16th centuries witnessed the experiments at evolving an organisation for the collection of rent as in the case of the Padmanabha temple. Collection of rent was assigned to intermediaries
and accountants who were paid from the income received by the temple. Temples in Nanjinadu also evolved a similar system. Venad rulers also had their representatives to collect the Komuraiippadu due to them. The rent and tolls collected were based on customary obligations and tradition. However, there were some attempts at systematising the rent demand by the accountants. (c) The 16th and 17th centuries witnessed a continuation of the authority of the temples and the 'traditional landlords' i.e. kings and brahmanas but changes were taking place within land relations as such. The Nanjinadu region saw the growth of non-brahmana intermediaries including merchants and Pillaimar who came to control several temples and acquired lands, basically by means of land mortgages. The non-brahmana landholders of Nanjinadu paying rent to the king or to the temple became a powerful body. In Venad, a similar process was taking place with the accountants and intermediaries who apart from collecting the customary share of the rulers were receiving dues themselves such persons also managed to acquire lands permanently under lease or as pledge, from the traditional landlords i.e. temples or brahmanas. This process was not supplemented by any substantial change in the conditions of production in both these areas. The Venad royal family with its numerous branches and 'Koyikkal' had become big traditional landlords distributing the share of the produce received by the family. The local militia
must have played an important role in the dominance of landlords during this period. It is clear that by the end of the 17th century landholders came to be divided into two classes, the customary landlords who received their share of rent besides various other obligations and landholders who held lands belonging to the customary landlords but had become powerful enough to control the lands themselves. Here two forms of right over land can be discerned, (1) customary right based on hereditary territorial control or ideological authority exercised by traditional landlords, royal family and temples (2) Rights over land based on actual management of land. The effect of the two forms on the land relations as much should be examined based on the discussion on the landed property.

In general most of the historians of Kerala discuss mainly the evolution of the Janmi or the landlord, the Kanakkār and Verumpattakkār. In southern Travancore, the word ‘Kanam’ was not generally used, Otti was used instead to denote mortgage-cum-lease tenures. Jannam lands were supposed to be inalienable and mortgages and leases were taken for temporary tenures renewable at intervals. In southern Travancore, mortgages could be temporary or permanent (chora Otti). Technically the jannam land could be leased or mortgaged at will by the landlords, as mortgages could be redeemed and the pattakkār could be removed after the scheduled period. However, from the numerous examples given above, the landlords made no
effort to redeem the *Ottis* or other forms of mortgages and even the lease holders tended to hold their lands hereditarily.213 Confidence in the permanence of the deals were such that in Nanjinādū lands held under mortgage were transferred to temples as Dānam.

This situation arose because of the nature of the conception of proprietary rights existing in medieval period. Land was indeed considered wealth, but rights over land were based on the service that could be provided from the land. This concept would become clear from the way in which temples held their lands. Land allotments to temples were to serve specific expenses in the temples and the interest of the temple in protecting and even making necessary improvements depended on whether the income from the land would meet the temple expenses. Lands held as Brahmaswams also had a similar function. The traditional landlords, therefore, tried to retain their rights over the land, but were happy to leave the actual management of land to other people as long as they received their customary share i.e. that would meet all their expenses. Rulers were landlords in this sense, who would assign their landholdings to others so that they would receive their customary rent and service in various forms from landholders.214

Mortgage-cum-lease tenure might have developed from specific requirements faced by landlords, who pledged their lands when in need of cash or paddy. Such mortgage existed
from early medieval times. However, during the 16th and 17th centuries such tenures were acquiring the status of customary and permanent relation. They did not affect the overlordship of the original holders, but at the same time helped the large-scale tenants to acquire more lands. It was during this period that we find the growth of Kulikkānām tenure. The new possessors of land improved the production by extending cultivation of planting more trees, for which the landlord deducted one-third or one-fourth of the rent collected on the lands or trees newly cultivated. In spite of the reduction in rent for the cultivator, the landlord would not be materially affected. For planting more trees would mean an increase in the total produce i.e. increase in the amount of rent to be collected. Hence the dues for the landlord would be proportionately much the same. In both these forms the landlord was concerned with realising all the materials and services that could be obtained from the area under his control, and not the methods by which these dues were made available to him. It would be improper to call the Janmi system as signifying absolute proprietary rights over land as the British administrators did 215 nor would it be entirely correct to call the Īṭṭi holders and other landholders as 'the freeholders in the pure sense of the term'.216 As pointed out earlier, the land relations in southern Travancore show a hierarchy of rights, over land. Janmis including corporate overlords like temples and Venād royal family held lands 'customarily'
but the lands could actually be in the possession of Brahmans or non-Brahmana landlords who received rent from the cultivators. This form of hierarchy was extended to all forms of produce and even to poll taxes on different communities.

The hierarchy of rights exercised over the lands were shared among the customary overlords and intermediaries at various levels. For example, cultivator in a temple land paid rent to a certain landholder holding the land under pattam or Otti - who in turn provided for a prescribed expense in the temple. Sometimes a second layer of intermediary was inserted, the landholder may be paying rent to a matha, which in turn was obliged to perform a service to the temple. This form of relations existed throughout Vēṇād region, and the process of granting lands or providing for the services in a temple, marked the process of subinfeudation. The conditions of service that marked the relations between big land lords and the temple or the ruler also show similar features. Another example of the expansion of the hierarchy of rights and the subjection of the peasantry appears to in the case of Nanjinadu, the Nattār of Nānjinādu were not necessarily the actual cultivators, but landowners, but it they were subjected to the authority of the royal intermediaries, who collected rent from their lands.

Specific terms for allotments signifying this hierarchy have been found from Nānjinādu. We have the distinction between Melvāram and Kolvāram, the former going to the Janni
and the latter retained by the present land holders. If the Janmā and the present holder were the same then both would go to the same person. In the documents from the Padmanabha temple, distinction has been made between vāram, Kadamaī or pattam to the landholder and Janmivāram to the original landlord. Sometimes the Melvaram or Janmivaram might have been transferred to a local landholder, then it would be found that he performed a specific form of service form of service to the original landlord, which also formed a part of customary dues. The last form must have been prevalent among the temple or royal servants in relation to their overlords, as they held lands, or acquired them, for performing a service.

This would explain why a land ceased to be a Janmam once the landlord alienated it. Once a land was alienated e.g. given to a temple as an attipper grant, he relinquished all his rights over the land. Such transfers did not take place except to temples and brāhmanas. Since land alienation would affect the customary right, land was not generally sold by the landlord, even when he could get the actual value of land from a merchant or a royal servant. Mortgage-cum-lease tenures became half-way houses between a lease and actual sale. The customary right also enabled a landlord to allot the rent from a lease among different people e.g. the Trivandrum temple could allot the rent from its land to a temple servant, while retaining another share of the rent for a specific offering. This leads to the apparent sharing of rent among the overlords and their intermediaries. This form of rent sharing could be viewed as an exercise of customary thortiy.
Just as customary right did not prevent expansion of the interests of the landholders, it also did not prevent further transactions on the same land. Land taken under mortgage could be submortgaged to someone else (a form known as chittotti). In an incident from Nellamma Nilamai mentioned earlier, the right to Melkalcha on a Matha land was mortgaged. A land grant made by Cheruvalli Pillamar included lands held as Karanmai from Rameswara temple, Quilon and paying vāram to Kandalur sālai temple, Trivandrum. Land transfers could be made in another form also, as in the case of the transfer of Otti artham on several lands by King Martandavarma to Samprati Ramayyan. These transactions also seem to have helped the actual landholders to strengthen their position. Another effect of this form of landownership was that the circulation of money was regulated through the process of commutation of rent. The interest on the Otti artham received by the customary landlord was calculated either as paddy or in cash, according to the convenience and the actual requirements of both the parties. Landholders growing commercial crops found it convenient to pay rent in cash, but if the overlord was a temple, then it would require stipulated quantities in kind i.e. coconuts etc., and the rent would be commuted into those articles. This form of payment of rent called Ubhayam always indicated that rent would be calculated as the interest of a principal amount. Thus money could be advanced, instead of land to landholders or temple servants, so that they provided
provided for a specific expense as required. Again, money coming to landholders would be spent on mortgage-cum-lease agreement with other landlords, or would be used for giving loans on short term basis. Normally, land would be pledged for the loan, and if the loan was not repaid, the land would be forfeited to the creditor. There could also be real mortgages, where lands would be given as loan, on cash security but without the terms of agreement involved in the Otti tenure. Transactions called Nerpaliṣa and Padukalam developed in this way. The evolution of transactions involving Ubhayampaliṣa meant that despite the introduction of money, the forms of rent and their realisation never changed. Money, if accumulated by someone, was used for consumption or for various purposes.

All these developments resulted in the growth of the so-called 'Mādampirār Vaga' lands held by Chiefs who were conferred the title of Mādampi, the major example being the 'Ettuvettil Mādampi' famous in Kerala history. Mādampis were found from early medieval times, like Vanjipuḷa Mādampi but they could be classified among the traditional overlords. During the 16th and 17th centuries a number of new brahman and non-brahman Mādampis evolved. The nature of evolution of the Mādampis would be examined in the next chapter. It is only suggested here that conditions that prevailed in the land relations, due to the prevalence of the hierarchy of rights as outlined above, appear to have helped the growth of Mādampis.
There has been considerable debate or discussion on the characteristics of the land relations. Students of early medieval Kerala seem to agree on depicting the economy as feudal. The trends outlined above on the case of southern Travancore presented several features associated with feudalism, especially a hierarchy of rights over land, relations of production based on a subject peasantry, who parted with their surplus product or surplus labour as rent or services to their overlord. The subjection of the peasantry was enforced by extra-economic coercion, the customary obligation to their overlords and the ideological authority of the temple supplemented by the growth of a class of soldiers. However, comparison with classical feudalism should not be stretched too far. Management of Deśams and growth of Ādhikari and accountants cannot be compared to assignments of fields. Similarly, a janmam cannot be compared to 'Manor' as we have seen that the landlord sometimes had only customary right over his own land, actual management lay with someone else. Cheri-kkals of landlords and temples and the Kandulavu lands and Edavagas held by the royal family had some similarities to the demesne lands of early medieval Europe, but the distinction between customary right and actual management outlined above prevents us from forming any conclusion. Also, it should be pointed out that the king was another landlord, and did not have even customary right over all the lands in the area, the temple lands often being autonomous regions. There was no standard procedure for the collection of rent or on the type of obligation and services to the overlords, and
even the calculation of weights and measures varied. Only the temples who had lands distributed all over the region, tried to standardise their collection. Finally, one has also to deal with the persistence of the *adivār* class of bonded labourers not a characteristic feature of classical feudalism. Despite these specificities and differences from the classically accepted form, the mode of production in medieval southern Travancore, appears to be closer to feudalism than to any other pre-capitalist mode of production.

Frequent stoppage of services in Trivandrum temple and the complaints of the temple authorities of 'Desamudakkam' show that customary obligation and ideological authority did not ensure the smooth realisation of rent for them. The reasons for this could be found in the nature of land relations as well as the politico-economic conditions in the 17th century. An indication of the state of affairs in the late 17th century could be shown by the effort of the Venad ruling family, Attingal Rāni and her nephew to reopen the Padmanabha temple after it was closed down in 852 K.E.²²¹

They called together the accountants of the temple and instructed them to conduct a survey of all temple lands, make an assessment of the rent to be collected by the temple. This move was resented by two major landlords, Ilampēl Pandārathil and Idathara Pōtti, who tried to prevent the Pillaimār from assessing the rent from their holdings, and this resulted in
a fight between the temple servants and the landlords. This appears to be a case where customary obligations to the overlord were no longer recognised even by another landlord, which meant that the forces that held the land relations were breaking down.

Many historians of Travancore have already mentioned the rise of landlords named Ettuveetil Pillaimar (or Mādampis) and the threat they posed to the royal authority during the early decades of the 18th century. Their history is mixed with quite an amount of myth and legend, but it remains a fact that the expropriation of the Ettuveetil Mādampis by Martanda Varma was immediately followed by the first systematic land settlement conducted by Kaṇakku Mallan Sankaran during 913-4 K.E.223 Changes in the economic and political conditions in Southern Travancore during the 16th and 17th centuries should now be examined in order to understand the rise of Martandavarma and the logic of his actions. Since we have already characterised the production relations during this period as basically feudal, it is necessary to understand the interlinkages among political, economic and socio-cultural factors, as feudal formations have been sustained by them. Such an effort will be made in the succeeding chapters.
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139. SCR Document of 874 K.E.

140. C. 2293 0.46 859 K.E.
141. Ibid.,

142. C. 1458 0.37 830 K.R.

143. C. 1458 0.2 913 K.R.

144. Pattu Kalpanagal. Document of 860 K.R.

145. Ibid. Doc. No. 8, Undated record. Sale deed on lands held earlier as Otti.

146. C. 1668 0.73 852 K.R.

147. Among the names mentioned were Pullaman Potti, Pachallur Potti and Vanjipula Madampi who were brāhmaṇa and Panayarai Sundaram, Panayarai Sankaran Kothai, Panappan Matēvan and Mangalattu Tēvan, all non-brāhmaṇas.

148. K.N. Kesavapillai Treatment of Kudumbapporithi .... Doc. VII

149. Ibid., Doc. VII (g)

150. C. 2610 0.154


152. C. 1686 0.76 One of the earliest records mentioning Pottam and Kulikkannam.


154. In the records three lands are held 'Attingal' Ilamuravaga Pandara Kāryam Cheyyār 'cultivated by Pulavay (i) Kaman Matikutti of Chemkottupurayidam, Tevan Neelan of Kulivilaveedu and Chattukutti of Arupatamkottukonatty Veedu. All the lands paid overlords share to Atrachēri (Kumaran Irayimmar).

155. C. 2551 0.9 918 K.R. Olum for Pandaravaga Otti lands paying Varam to Pālsayasamatham.


157. Several Olugis from Vanchiyur Adhikāram mention this type of holding e.g. C. 1668 0.73-5.

158. C. 1727 0.157 727 K.R.

159. C. 1719 0.113 763 K.R. Also Mathilakam Granthavari No. IV.

160. Periyakilsanti Arumanai Narayanan Sankaran Contributed 10 panam for Stiratto Nirmālyam in the above case (763 K.R.)
C. 531 0.408 from 655 K.E. to 920 K.E.

162. SCR No. 273 Ramayyan Dalava Records No. 8

163. C. 1779 0. 1138.

164. C. 1727 0.157 Ref to '5 Mathanatis' as attending the yogam by 78115 K.E. the number of Mathans increased to six (C. 1719 0.34, 781 K.E.)

165. C. 1722. 0.1 674 K.E. refers to 3 Mukkālyattams, probably the shrines mentioned here. In the records mentioned in Note 167, the number of shrines increased to five.

166. TAS V pp. 195-8 TAR No. 41 of 1085 782 K.E.

167. TAS VI pp. 117-8 749 K.E.

168. Ibid., Also K.K. No. 163, 745 K.E.


170. K.K. No. 208/1968 805 K.E.

171. C. 43 0.1 Uncertain date. The property was taken over by the temple and Veyilur Vikraman Narayanan and Iravan were given Sthanam in Kanumman Illam.

172. C. 1719 0.31, 706 K.E., the incident was recorded in 718 K.E.


174. SCR No. 228 Shenkottah. Ayyanputuvur village in Ajikudi was held by 'Ilamana Pandaram' who could be Ilambel Pandaratil mentioned in Travancore documents.


176. Ibid. Doc. 1.

177. Ibid.

178. SCR No. 228. Section on the establishment of Ariyankëvu temple. Panayamchëri Pillai was a settler who purchased or acquired lands from a sheperdess (apparently he got himself adopted to the family of the sheperdess) and built the shrine.

179. C. 531 0.267 8 918 K.E.

180. SCR No. 273 Ramayyan Dalava Records 0.2 893 K.E.

181. C. 2601 0.87 Land was apparently given by the temple authorities to Ayyamperumal Pillai, but Mathukutti Pillai held rights over the land as pañukulam.

182. : 2546 0.238 undated.
183. C. 1719 0.2 744 K.E.
184. C. 1721 0.46 717 K.E.
185. C. 1727 0.243 768 K.E.
186. C. 1719 0.31 718 K.E.
187. C. 1656 0.121 Paddy was robbed by Desinganadu senior prince.
188. C. 2424 0.288.

189. SCR Document of 907 K.E.
190. SCR Document of 907 K.E.
191. TAR No. 115 of 1099, 682 K.E.
192. TAS No. V pp. 210-2, 212-5, 873 K.E.
193. Ibid. pp. 217-9 889 K.E.
194. P.M. Ms. K.S.P. II Series 7 Document 2 768 K.E.

195. TAS V pp. 210-2, 212-5, 873 K.E.
197. Ibid.
198. P.M. Ms. Document 5 830 K.E.
199. C. 2601 0.139 682 K.E.
200. C. 1722 0.17 663 K.E.
201. Records from Tiruvellamannur near Kottarakkara (TAS V 53-4. 663 K.E. pp. 61-2 711 K.E.) probably indicated the early phase of the expansion however, the areas of punallur and pattazhi, near this area might have been occupied from the later Chera times.
203. Ibid. Doc. 5 Kānasinganalur Kovalikkal was held by a certain prince Ramavarma during later 17th century.
204. Ibid; Doc. I allotment to Perakattayvazhi 810 K.E.
Doc. 4 Neetu given to Virakeral Varma.
206. R.C. 1719 0.31 Cheruvalli Pillai called Pandarākaryam Cheyvar.

208. C. 1719 0.37 747 K.C. C. 931 0.195 793 K.C.


211. Kshetra Karyam Curuna - Given as the appendix for T.K. Velu Pillai, Travancore State Manual Vol. II, efforts were made by the princess of Attungal and Ravi Varma, the importance of which will be discussed in another chapter.

212. A lively discussion the Janmam, Kathan and pattam tenure took place among british authorities and administrators Travancore during late 19th and early 20th century, after the Paudarapattam proclamation in Travancore in 1865 and before the conclusion of the revenue settlement in 1912. The discussion is summed up in Travancore Land Revenue Manual Vol. IV Chapter I (1916) Also see Logan, Malabar Special commission and 2 report, on Land tenures in Malabar (1881-2) (Madras 1896).

213. An early example of lease holder occupying the land hereditarily is found in C. 2546 p. 269.


215. The traditional view of the British administrators, that Janmi was the absolute proprietor of the land, was criticised by Logan (Report on Land Tenures, pp. 102-3) The crucial difference between Janman holding and the European landholding was expressed by Logan as follows: The European looks to the soil and nothing but the soil. The Malayali on the contrary looks chiefly to the people's located on the soil... And the surprising fact which has frequently been commented on that even the soil itself might drop away from the owner of a Janmam holding and yet leave him as completely as before the janmi of the whole of it, becomes under the above interpretation, a perfectly natural, may, a necessary, consequence (Logan, Malabar, Vol. I P. 609) The observation appears to apply to data under discussion.
216. In the previous chapter on land tenure, we referred to intermediary 'free holders' referring to a number of tenures like Thanathu, Vyāpyam, Anubhōgam etc. It is the content of Kerala, the freeholding could not have been absolute, unless they bought the land from the original landholders. In many cases, the lands were held as independent, holdings in effect through fulfilling customs any obligations to the original overlords. Hence, they cannot be compared with free holds in the European context. They did not possibly have the same rights as Kāniyāṭṭi tenure reported from Nanjinādu.

217. Janmivāram is separated listed in Thirattu of Vānchiyār Adhiκāram 921 K.E. (TIKM Vol. V)

218. TAS V pp. 128-34 cited above.

219. Show case Records, No. 273 Ramayyan Dalawa Records No. 3

