Chapter 6

THE ZAMİNDÂRS

Literally zamîndâr (also known as bhûmia) means holder of land. The word zamîndâr does not literally mean 'owner' of land, but rather one who controlled it. However, in actual use it was often held to be synonymous with mâlik (owner) with the difference that his "right extended over land occupied by a number of persons". It was in other words, a species of superior right.

The nature and jurisdiction of zamîndârs has been made by Irfan Habib. Here, I have attempted to highlight only certain features of zamîndâri rights for which evidence is forthcoming from the sūba of Delhi.

There seems to have been some distinction between zamîndâri and ra'iyati villages. An administrative manual written in Delhi mentions separate cultivated land of the zamîndârs (khud-kâshta-i-zamîndârân) and ra'iyatî.

The zamîndârs held hereditary rights in the Mugbal Empire. After the death of a zamîndâr his sons inherited

2. Ibid, 136 passim.
4. Durr-ul-Ulûm, 43a-b.
equal shares in the zamīndāri. In pargana Mandawar, sarkār Sambhal Būlchand and Sukhānand (cousins, descended from the same grand-father) shared the zamīndāri of their grand-father. Sometimes, the share-holders were recognised but the land was not physically divided and the heirs held the zamīndāri in common. It, sometimes, caused contention among the heirs. Būlchand, one of the co-sharer in the zamīndāri of pargana Mandawar, complaint to the Emperor against his cousin Sukhānand that he had usurped Muḥammadpūr etc., 19 mauzaś (including his house (havelī) and garden) from his zamīndāri jurisdiction.

Besides being hereditary, the zamīndāri right was salable as well.

Apart from their fixed share (nānkār, mālikāna), the zamīndāras sometimes extorted prohibited cesses.

Residents of village Kilayat, pargana Kaithal, sarkār Sirhind, Sri Chand, Hirdai Rām, Dayāl Dās and Durgā Dās

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
5. Nānkār : an allowance paid to the zamīndār in lieu of his service in the collection of revenue. It was 1/10th of the revenue demand (Cf. Agrarian System, 174-5). Mālikāna : "when the authorities convert the zamīndār's land into sir (i.e. impose in it direct assessment and collection of revenue from the peasantry, they give him on account of being the mālik something out of every hundred bighas or every hundred mans of grain" - called mālikāna (Khwāja Yāsin, 'Glossary of revenue and administrative terms, Br. Mues. Add. 6603, f.79a quoted in Agrarian System,146).
etc. preferred a complaint against the Ranghar zamindārs (Bulāqī, etc.) of village Kilayat. They informed the Emperor that the said zamindārs levied prohibited cesses upon them, such as Rs. 4 against dastar-shumārī (counting of turbans, a poll-tax), Rs. 2 on marriages (of sons and daughters) and births.¹

In the account of the twelve sūbas Abūl Fazl provides us with numbers of the zamindārs' retainers in the columns headed horseman, foot-retainer, and elephant. On the basis of their military strength it may be possible to work out where the zamindārs were more powerful and perhaps extracted a greater shares in the surplus. A viable method for doing this has been suggested by S. Moosvi, who has suggested that we should estimate the probable expense on retainers and elephants and then calculating the total for each mabal based on the numbers given, divide the total by the jamā'.²

The result of these calculations is that the zamindārs of the distant and outlying parganas and sarkārs are seen to possess larger shares in the surplus. The zamindārs of the sarkār of Delhi, and of sarkār Saharanpur obtained only 4 and 7% of the jamā' respectively, while in the outlying sarkārs, the zamindārs' minimum share

1. Balkrishan Brahman, 52 a-b.

2. Shireen Moosvi, 'The Zamindārs' Share in the Peasant Surplus in the Mughal Empire - Evidence of the Ain-i-Akbarī Statistics', IESHR, Vol. XV, No.3, 1978, pp.363-64'. The minimum expenditures on each horseman, foot-retainer and elephant have been accepted as 1000, 100 and 300 dāms respectively.
ranged from 10 to 20%; but in the sarkār of Hissār Fīrūza it exceeded 20%. With a few exceptions the pargana-wise study, too, reveals the same trend (see Map 6:1).

Abūl Faḍl also provides us with a detailed list of the zamīndār castes entered against each pargana in the column headed būmi or zamīndār. This account helps us to study the pattern of the distribution of zamīndār castes in different parts of the sūba in 1595. The regional distribution can be compared with the position of the various land-holding castes around 1900.

The series of U.P. District Gazetteers edited by Nevill provide us with information about the prominent land-holding castes in each pargana.¹ For the rest of the sūba, (portions of the Punjab and Haryana and a small part of Rajasthān), we have to rely on the District Gazetteers of the Punjab and Rājpūtānā.² Though these Gazetteers are not as complete as those of U.P., we nevertheless do get a tahsil-wise account of different land-holding castes.

---


Of the castes recorded by Abūl Fazl a considerable number continued as zamīndār castes till recent times. But a few castes recorded by Abūl Fazl remain to be identified.

During the reign of Akbar the Rājpūts were prominent in all the sarkārs of gūba Delhi. The Chauhāns were numerous in the sarkārs of Sirhind, Nārnual and Delhi. They also held one pargana each in the sarkārs of Badaūn and Sambhal. Besides the Chauhāns, the Pundīrs were to be found in the sarkārs of Saharanpur and Sirhind. Few scattered zamīndāris of Bargūjars were in the sarkārs of Sambhal, Delhi and Saharanpur. The Tonwārs held three pargana each in the sarkārs of Hissār Pirūza and Nārnual and one pargana each in the sarkārs of Delhi, Badaūn and Sambhal. The Ghorewāha were listed zamīndārs in the sarkār of Sirhind in six parganas; while Barāh held 3 pargana in sarkār Sirhind. The Bais held one pargana each in the sarkārs of Sambhal and Sirhind; Khokhars in Badaūn and Sambhal; Ghelot and Sānd in Delhi; and Bhattīs in Sirhind and Delhi. The Jātū, Rāthors, Sālār and Bakkāl were prominent in the sarkār of Hissār Pirūza; the former also held a pargana in sarkār Nārnual and Gauṣ in the sarkār of Sambhal. The Bachhāls held zamīndāri in a single mahāl in the sarkār of Badaūn. The Parihār and Kachhwāhā Rājpūts held 2 and 1 pargana respectively in sarkār Nārnual.
By 1900, the Rājpūts seem to have improved their position considerably. In the sarkārs of Hissār Firūza and Rewari they were still the dominant groups, and in the sarkārs of Delhi, Saharanpur and Sambhal they seem to have extended the area of their control. In other areas, however, their position seems to have weakened. In the sarkār of Sirhind their holdings declined to 10 parganas against 17 (excluding Ranghars) in the Āīn. In the pargana of Garh-muktesar they fell from the first to the fourth position.¹ In the parganas of Saharanpur, Jaurasi, Sarawa, Rurki, Muzaffarābād and Malhaipur they seem to have lost to the Baniās and Mahājans.²

As far the prominence of different clans, the Chauhāns have greatly increased their holdings in the sarkārs of Sambhal and Sirhind; in sarkār Delhi they were still prominent in four parganas, though in pargana Sentha they have lost their position to the Jāts.³ The Pundīrs held prominent land-holding rights in Hapri and Pundri (sarkār Sirhind).⁴ However, we do not have details regarding the two Pundīr zamindārī areas of Fathpūr and

Mansurpur. But the Pundírs later increased their position in sarkár Delhi from none to one. The Bârgûjars increased their holdings in the sarkár of Delhi and Rewari, though in the sarkár of Sambhal their position seems to have declined slightly (from 3 to 2 paraganas). The Bhattīs still hold prominent position in Bhatinda. The Rāthors and the Jātūs still (c.1900) held prominent position in the sarkár of Hissār Pîrûza. The Katehariās possessed c.1900 a few scattered holdings in the sarkārs of Sambhal and Badāūn. Mandhars slightly increased their position in sarkár Sirhind and Delhi and Taonis and Dogars in sarkár of Sirhind. The Gaurs seem to have lost all of their holdings in the sarkár of Sambhal, though they improved their position in the sarkár of Badāūn (from none to three) and marginally in the sarkár of Delhi (from none to one). The Tonwars lost their holdings in Sirsawa (sarkár Sambhal). ¹ The Thākurs, Jangharās, Chandels and Gautams held few scattered paraganas in the sarkár of Badāūn.

The Ranghars (now a converted Muslim Community of Rājpūts) are recorded in the sarkár of Sirhind (12 out of 33) and Delhi (5 out of 48); while in the sarkár of Saharanpur they held only two paraganas. By 1900, the Ranghars seem to have greatly increased their holdings in

the sarkār of Hissār Firlūza (from none to eleven) and slightly in the sarkār of Rewāri (from none to two). In the sarkārs of Delhi, Sirhind and Saharanpur their position seems to have declined. In the sarkār of Delhi they have lost their holdings in Karnal and Meerut.¹ On the other hand, in Kharkheuda and Rohtak, where earlier no Ranghar zamīndārs were reported they now held considerable holdings here.² In sarkār Sirhind their possessions fell from 12 to 5. However, they gained considerably in Maler and Machhiwara.³ In sarkār Saharanpur they have lost to Mahājans in pargana Muẓaffarābād.⁴

The Jāts, too, generally increased their possessions since the time of the Āin. Going by the information in the Āin, the Jāts were prominent in the sarkārs of Hissār Firlūza (19 out of 27 parganas), Sirhind (15 out of 33), Rewāri (4 out of 12) and in the western portion of the sarkār Delhi (17 out of 48). They also held zamīndāris in some parganas of sarkārs of Saharanpur (7 out of 36 parganas) and Sambhal (6 out of 47). The Sheorāns, Sangwāns and Puniyas had their holdings in the sarkār of Hissār Firlūza, while Āwāns held on pargana each in the

1. Ibid, vol. IV (Meerut), 283-84.
sarkārs of Sirhind and Saharanpur. By 1900, not only had they succeeded in retaining their position (with the sole exception of pargana Baghra (in sarkār Saharanpur), where the Jāts have lost to the Rājpūts,\(^1\), but also greatly increased their holdings in the sarkārs of Saharanpur (from 7 to 20 mahals), Delhi (17 to 37), Sirhind (8 to 13)\(^2\) and slightly in sarkār Badāūn (from none to one). In the sarkār of Rewari (except Sohna)\(^3\) and Hissār Pīrūza they have retained their position.

The Brahmans held some zamīndāri rights in the sarkārs of Saharanpur, Sirhind, Sambhal, Delhi and Badāūn. By 1900, they seem to have improved their position in the sarkārs of Delhi (7 to 26 including sub-castes), Badāūn (2 to 9), Sambhal (11 to 21), Rewari (from none to 4) and Hissār Pīrūza (from none to 8). In sarkār Sirhind they lost their possessions in Shahabad.\(^4\) In the sarkār of Saharanpur they have also lost greatly (18 to 10).

In 1595, the Tagās (mod. Tyāgīs) were fairly prominent in the sarkārs of Saharanpur (16 out of 36

---

1. Ibid, vol. III (Muzaffarnagar), 211.
2. In the Āīn Jāt zamīndārs are entered in 15 parganas. But we do not have details of all these parganas. We have a list of zamīndār castes for only 18 parganas in the sarkār. Out of this only 8 return Jāt zamīndārī in the Āīn, while by 1900, the Jāts occupied land-holding rights in as many as 13 parganas.
parganas) and found also in Sambhal (11 out of 47) and in the eastern parts of the sarkār of Delhi (5 out of 48). In the sarkār of Badāūn they held only two parganas. By 1900 the Tagās (Tyāgīs) seem to have lost their position greatly in the area of the sarkār of Saharanpur (from 16 to 10). Thus in pargana Khodi, they still held the second position, but the Banīās had outdistanced them by now.¹ In the sarkār of Saharanpur they lost mainly to the Banīās and Mahājans. In Badāūn they were no longer recorded. On the other hand, in the area of the sarkār of Sambhal their holdings appear to have slightly increased from 11 to 13 (except in Azampur and Mughalpur where they lost to Jāṭs and Banīās respectively).² In Delhi too they greatly increased their holdings, being now found in 17 instead of only five parganas.³ In the sarkārs of Rewari and Sirhind they have increased slightly (from none to one).

The Gujars are recorded in the Ain as zamīndārs in several parganas of the sarkārs of Delhi, Saharanpur and Hissār Fīrūza. By 1900, they seem to have increased their holdings in the sarkārs of Delhi from 9 to 18 (except Jewar), Saharanpur (from 3 to 15) Sambhal (from

3. Ibid, vol. V (Bulandshahr), 310. In Siyana, where they were no longer found, they seem to have lost to Jāṭs and Banīās.
4. Ibid, 247.
none to 2) and Sirhind (from none to 9); whereas they lost their holdings in some of the parganas of Saharanpur (Ambihta, Rāmpūr, Sarsawa, Kairana and Manglaur) to Baniās and Mahājans;¹ in the pargana Palwal (sarkār Delhi) they lost their possessions seemingly because of the confiscations after Mutiny.²

The Thathars (converted Gujars) are recorded in the Āīn as zamīndārs in the sarkār of Rewari (6 out of 12); but by 1900, they seem entirely to have lost their position.

The Ahīrs, in 1595, do not seem to have enjoyed much prominence as zamīndārs in any sarkār. They had few zamīndāris in the sarkārs of Delhi (2 out of 48), Sambhal (2 out of 47) and Saharanpur (1 out of 36). By 1900, they appear to have lost all of their holdings in the sarkārs of Sambhal and Saharanpur. However, they considerably improved their position in the sarkār of Delhi (being now holding zamīndāris in 12 instead of 2 parganas) and in sarkār Rewari (3 parganas instead of one). The Āīn refers to the Ahīr zamīndārs in the pargana of Sardhana (sarkār Saharanpur), but by 1900, not a single Ahīr holder was important enough to be noticed.³

². Punjab District Gazetteers, vol. IV A (Gurgaon District), pp. 22-25, 63-64.
The Kāyastha held zamīndārīs in a few scattered parganas of sarkār Badaūn and Sambhal. By 1900, they increased their possessions in both the sarkārs (though they lost their position in parganas Kundarkhi and Badaūn). 1 In the sarkār of Delhi they have also improved their position from none to two.

A major change since the Ain's time seems to be the emergence of Baniās and Mahājans as large land-holding castes. In 1595 the Baniās were entered as zamīndārs only in the parganas of Barwala and Hānsī (Bakkāl and Multānī) in the sarkār of Hissār Fīrūza and in no other sarkār; but by 1900, they held considerable estates in the sarkārs of Saharanpur, Sambhal, Delhi and Badaūn (east of Yamuna) and also had a few scattered holdings in the remaining sarkārs (except Rewari). In sarkār Hissār Fīrūza they lost their original strong-holds but were found as proprietors in the parganas of Punyan, Seoran and Sidhmukh.

The Afghāns are recorded in the Ain as zamīndārs in 6 parganas in the sarkār of Delhi, all west of Yamuna, with a few scattered holdings in the sarkārs of Sirhind (where they are recorded as zamīndārs in 3 parganas), Hissār Fīrūza (in 2 parganas) and Rewari (3 out of the total 12). In the Doāb only the sarkār of Saharanpur

1. Ibid, vol. XV (Badaūn), 195-96; vol. XVI (Moradabad), 228.
returned Afghāns as zamīndārs and that too in only 4 out of a total 36 mahals. No Afghan zamīndārs are recorded in the Āin in the sarkārs of Sambhal and Bādāūn, which comprised the larger part of modern Rohilkhand. It was during the reign of Shāhjāhn that we have our first evidence of Afghān settlements in pargana Kant, where Shāhjahānpūr was founded by the well-known Afghān noble Bahādur Khān.¹ Dīler Khān himself founded Shāhābād in an adjoining locality within sarkār Khairābād of the suba of Awadh; portions of it (pargana Mihrābād) were later transferred to sarkār Bādāūn, probably to keep the new Afghān settlements within one political jurisdiction.²

By the late 18th century the Afghāns (Rohillas) succeeded in establishing their power in the wholeKatehr tract, which was now renamed Rohilkhand.³ The Rohilla war of 1774, the Maḥalwārī System and the Mutiny of 1857 resulted in large reductions in their zamīndāris.⁴ Still by 1900,

1. Elliot, Memoirs, II, 142.
2. Kāgghāzāt-i-Mutafarriga, 86b.
3. Rōhilla is a generic term used for all the Afghān tribes. These Rōhillas were the inhabitants of Rōh (Hills) and so known as Rōhilla (Rōhillas), (Cf. Safarnāma, 70).
4. Nevill, District Gazetteers, vol. XV (Bādāūn), 149-152; Brennan who discusses the position of Afghān zamīndārs in Rohilkhand in the first half of the 19th century says that the "sales of land for arrears of revenue and debt deprived some of them of the position they held at cession". ('Social Change in Rohilkhand 1801-33', JESHR, vol. VII, No.4, 1970, p.444.
they held considerable areas within the limits of the old sarkārs of Badāūn (in 3 mahals against nil in the Āin), Sambhal (6 parganas against nil in the Āin) and Saharanpur (9 against 4, but losing in pargana Saharanpur, in the Āin).

In the Haryana region certain definable shifts seem to have occurred. Afghān zamīndāris are recorded in the parganas of Dhatrat and Tohana in the Āin. We do not have details of these two parganas but by 1900 Afghāns held proprietary rights in the parganas of Maham and Gohana in the sarkār of Sirhind their holdings declined; they were now found in one (Chhat) against 3 parganas (Banur, Chhat and Sirhind) in the Āin. In the sarkār of Delhi Afghans at the time of the Āin held zamīndāris in the parganas of Jhajhar, Dadri Taha, Kharkhauḍa, Sonepat, Tanda Bhawan and Panipat. About 1900, though they retained their position in the parganas of Jhajhar and Sonepat they are not mentioned as important land-holders in the other four parganas. However, they held proprietary rights in the parganas of Mandauthi and Beri Dobaldhan. In the Doāb region of sarkār Delhi the Āin does not mention a single Afghān zamīndāri, but by 1900 they are entered as land-holders in as many as five parganas (Puth, Siyana, Jhinjhna, Garh-muktesar and Dankaur).

Among Indian Muslims the Saiyidshad scattered holdings in the sarkārs of Sambhal, Saharanpur, Delhi
and Hissar Fīrūza during the region of Akbar. An important clan of the Saiyids was that of the Saiyids of Barha. They held a single *pargana* of Behat Kanjawar in *sarkār* Saharanpur at the time of the *Āin* Jahāngīr, while referring to the Bārha Saiyids says that they were so-called because they belonged to a group of twelve villages (*bārah*). In the Doāb, he says, there were twelve villages 'near each other' which 'are the native country of these Saiyids' who came to be known as the Saiyids of Bārha. Elliot and Blochmann trace their descent from Abūl Parāh and divide them into four branches Tihanpurī, Chhataraurī, Kundaliwals and Jagnerī. At first they settled in the Punjab with their headquarters at Tihanpur, Chhatbanur, Kundli and Jagner, which gave the names to their branches. Thereafter, they are said to have migrated to the Doāb establishing their headquarters at Jansath (*Pargana* Jaulī), Sambhalhera, Majhera (*pargana* Sambhalhera) and Bidaulī. The *Āin* records Saiyids (without the further specification of 'Bārha') as *zamīndārs* in the three adjacent *parganas* of Jaulī, Sambhalera and Bhukarheri. Obviously the Bārha Saiyids are intended.

1. Tuzuk, 366.
2. Ibid.
The Bārha Saiyids enjoyed prominent positions from the days of Akbar. Abūl Faţl mentions 9 Bārha Saiyids in his list of high mansabdārs, but they reached their highest position of power in the time of Farrukhsiyār. The political importance of the Bārha Saiyids declined during the reign of Muḥammad Shāh (1719-1748). During the early years of this century the Bārha Saiyids still held about 17% land in Muzaffarnagar district, the great bulk of their possessions were in the parganas of Sikri Bhukarheri, Sambhalera and Jauli, their traditional strongholds.

Another important clan of the Saiyids was that of the Saiyids of Amroha. The Ain refers to Saiyids as zamīndārs in the pargana of Amroha. From the time of Akbar till the end of the reign of Aurangzeb they continued to enjoy a certain amount of prominence as mansab holders. Subsequently, owing to the intervention of the Rōhilla power, their power declined. The Saiyids of Amroha still

2. Elliot, Memoirs, I, 12.
5. Ibid, 222-23, 226, 259.
held about 27.26% of the whole Amroha tahsil in the early decades of this century, but it was said that they had lost much of their property and were in great poverty.  

By 1900, the Saiyids, in general, had increased their position considerably in the sarkārs of Saharanpur (11 parganas against 5 in the Ain but losing in Bidauli) and Sambhal (11 against 2 parganas in the Ain). They also improved their position in the sarkārs of Hissār Firūza (3 against one pargana in the Ain) and Delhi 5 against one in the Ain). In the sarkār of Sirhind they lost their holdings in pargana Sirhind.

Other Indian Muslims or Shaikhzádas did not enjoy a prominent position during the reign of Akbar and had few scattered holdings in the sarkārs of Delhi, Badāūn and Sambhal (holding one pargana in each sarkār). By 1900, they seem to have increased their position in the sarkārs of Delhi (from 1 to 6 but losing in Barnawa), Badāūn (1 to 4), Sambhal (1 to 18), Saharanpur (none to 11) and Sirhind (from none to one).

The Meos and Khānzdás are recorded in the Ain as prominent zamīndārs in the Mewat tract which mainly

comprised the **sarkārs** of Tijāra and Alwar. During the period of the Āin, in sarkār Tijāra 14 **parganas** out of 18 were held by Meo zamīndārs. However, in sarkār Alwar Meo zamīndārs were relegated to second place, the first-being held by the Khānzāds. Meo zamīndārs controlled 12 **parganas** out of 43 in sarkār Alwar.

Till modern times, Meos dominated over all other clans in Mewat. The Meos claim Rājpūt descent.

Abūl Fazl also mentions Mewātis as Mewras. He describes them as excellent runners. Akbar employed 1000 Mewras in the imperial service in this capacity.

The Meos were probably converted to Islām during Fīrūz Shāh's reign. Now all Meos are Muslims but till recently they still performed several Hindu customs. They observed Holi; the Brahmans used to write **pīli Chitthi** in their marriages. However, marriage was performed by the

---

1. **Sarkār Alwar** had never been the part of Delhi **gūba**. But to trace the nature of zamīndār castes in the whole Mewat tract I have studied the position in sarkār Alwar as well. It formed a part of **gūba** Agra under the Mughals.


4. Āin, I, 188-89.

5. Cunningham, 24-25.
Qāzīā. They also retained Hindū names like Singh etc; Their women used to work in the fields; They were quite ignorant about their religion as, even they hardly knew the kalīma.¹

It is difficult to analyse the position of Meo zamīndārs in 1900 since I could not get Powlett's Gazetteer of Ulwur. However, the Urdu work Arzang-i-Tijāra and Gurgaon District Gazetteer give us some information about the position of Meo zamīndārs in certain areas.

By 1900, in pargana Ujhina (sarkār Tijāra) where, at the time of the Āin, the Khānzāds and Thathar were entered zamīndārs, the Meos were now the zamīndārs.² Meos also retained their position in Tijāra, Bisru and Nagina parganas (sarkār Tijāra).³ In pargana Tijāra out of 107 villages Meos held 61 under their zamīndārī-jurisdiction.⁴ Meos were also entered as zamīndārs in tahsil Alwar in modern times.⁵

The Khānzādas were another important caste of the Mewat tract. In sarkār Tijāra during the Āin shows four out of 18 parganas being held by the Khānzādas. But, in sarkār Alwar the Khānzādas enjoyed great influence and

¹. Powlett, Cf. Punjab Castes, 180; Cunningham, 22-23.
⁵. Ibid, 115 - 142.
and held 18 out of 43 mabals in their zamindari.

The Khānzādas claim their descent from Jādon1 Rāja Tahan pāl whose descendants Prince Sāmbhar pāl and Sopar pāl were reputedly converted to Islām during Firūz Shāh’s reign. Firūz Shāh gave them the title of Bahādur Nāhar and Chhajjū Khān respectively. Khānzādas declared themselves to be the direct descendants of Bahādur Nāhar and Chhajjū Khān.2

However, Shaikh Muḥammad Makhdūm in his Arzang-i-Tijāra says that they were in fact the ‘slaves’ of Firūz Shāh and thus can not claim royal descent.3 Yet Bābur, writing about Ḥasan Khān Mewātī, says that Ḥasan Khān Mewātī received Mewat from his ancestors who ruled there for “nearly 200 years”.4 Aḥmad Yādgār also refers to Ḥasan Khān as a man of ‘royal descent’.5 Ab ūl Fażł mentions them as Rājpūt convertees of Januhāh clan.6

1. Abūl Fażl (Ain, II, 57) says that they were the convertees from Januhā clan of the Rājpūts.
3. Arzang-i-Tijāra, 5-10. In reply Munshi Ahmad Khān Khānzādah wrote Tārikh-i-Arzang-i-Tijāra in Persian immediately after the publication of Arzang-i-Tijāra. Besides, Sharfuddin Ahmad in Nim Tārikh-i-Khānzādah Rājpūt (or Muragga-i-Mewāt) pp.117 passim attacked Muḥammad Makhdūm in severe terms.
6. Ain, II, 57.
Though, like the Meos Khânzâdas were Muslims they were held to be superior to them in rank. Khânzâdas belonged to the ruling class while Meos came from the lower orders. In the words of Powlett they are "better Musalmans".¹ Unlike the Meos they performed no Hindu festivals. However, Brahmins took part in their marriage-ceremonies. Meos allowed their women to work in the fields but Khânzâda women never went out to work in the fields.² Channing says, that ordinarily the Khânzâdas do not intermarry with Meos but the "inhabitants of five villages in the Fîrûzpur tahsil profess to have been formerly Khânzâda and said to have become Meos by intermarriage"³. To define the Meo-Khânzâda relationship we can aptly quote an observation that "the Khânzâda are to the Meos what the Râjpûts are to the Jâts".⁴

From Fîrûz Shâh's reign onwards Khânzâdas retained their position as ruling race in Mewat.⁵ Bâbur succeeded in crushing the power of Hasan Khân Mewâtî who sided with Rânâ Sângâ in the battle of Khânwa.⁶ Later Akbar occupied
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Mewat and formed two sarkārs Tijāra and Alwar in gūba Agra. Since then the Khāṇzādās lost their power, as rulers. However, they continued to enjoy high positions locally. From Akbar's reign Khāṇzādās Amīr Khān, Natthe Khān and later, during Aurangzeb's reign Lashkar Khān enjoyed chaudhāīi rights in Mewat. Chaudhrī Zabardast Khān Khāṇzādā held the gardens of Malikpur and Barhoji and nāṅkar rights in pergana Indore. Aurangzeb, in 1689, confirmed his rusūm and nāṅkar rights in that pergana. Besides, Aurangzeb also granted him 1/4th income of mauza' Jhuwana. In 1709, Shāh 'Ālam conferred Chaudhāīi rights upon Buland Khān Khāṇzādā in gasba Mubārakpūr. Besides, Shāh 'Ālam also granted him Rs.210 for nāṅkar and a madad-i-meāsh grant of 105 bīghas to Buland Khān. In 1710, when chaudhrī Muḥammad Khān, son of Nīsām Khān, Khāṇzādā of pergana Indore died, Shāh 'Ālam conferred the chaudhāī and zamindārī rights on his son Bahādur Khān.

During Aurangzeb's reign Khāṇzādās of Mewat also held some inām grants. In 1657, Aurangzeb conferred an inām grant of 7750 (?) bīghas to 'Itibār Khān son of Lāt Khān
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Khānzādah. Out of this half was granted to ‘Itibār Khān and the rest was divided among his brothers.¹

In 1708, Shāh ‘Aalam granted to chaudhri Bahādur Khān, son of Ahmad (?) Khān, 500 bīghas as īnām in gāsba Indore, sarkār Tijāra. Bahādur Khān seems to have enjoyed a fairly prominent position during Shāh ‘Aalam’s reign. Shāh ‘Aalam also granted Rs.1100 for naākar and Rs.100 for batā from pargana Siri Deha and other parganas. He also got the right to collect 8 ānnās per hundred rupees on salt from the gāsba; one rupee daily was also given to him as madad-i-māsh. He was given exemptions from land-revenue.²

Some of the female members of Khānzādah’s family also enjoyed madad-i-māsh grants. In 1708, Bībī Bānō etc. held a madad-i-māsh grant of 500 bīghas in pargana Tijāra.³

Though Khānzādas held strong position in Mewat they always remained turbulent throughout the Sultanat and Mughal periods.⁴ During Aurangzeb’s reign the Khānzādas rebelled in 1661.⁵
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finally killed Akram Khanzadah, described as the leader of rebelling Mewatis.¹

By 1900, Khanzadas seems to have lost their position greatly. They held only few villages in Nuh, north of Firuzpur and Sohna (Gurgaon District).² In pargana Ujinah, sarkar Tijara they lost to the Meos and the Rajputs.³ In pargana Bisru, too, their possessions had declined.⁴ However, in pargana Tijara their position seems to have improved. Out of 107 villages in pargana Tijara the maximum number were held by the Meos, but the Khanzadas, yet held 19 villages here. (In the Ain they were not entered as zamindars in Tijara).⁵

Abul Faiz does not enter Kambohs as zamindars in any pargana under any sarkar. But they are known to have been a prominent community and Akbar's famous noble Shahbaz Khan Kamboh was one of them. Shaikh Farid Bukhari says that this was a prosperous community and Shahbaz Khan's ancestors had been learned men and mystics.⁶
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ascribes to Khān Jahān Lodi the view that the Kāmbohs made good revenue-collectors, but were not well known as soldiers.\(^1\) It is, therefore, surprising that they are not specifically recorded as zamīndārs in the Ain, though they might, of course, be covered under the more general category of Shaikhzādas (Indian Muslims).

Crooke describes the Kāmbohs as "an influential cultivating and land-owning class found in the Meerut (and Agra) divisions".\(^2\)

The Kāmbohs in recent times had various settlements within the limits of the Mughal sūba of Delhi: Bijnor, Meerut, Saharanpur, Muzaffarnagar, Maler-Kotla, Patiala, and Nabha.\(^3\) The Zakhirat-ul-Khawānīn also refers to the Kāmbohs of Meerut.\(^4\) Khair Andesh Khān, who belonged to this branch, was a noble of Aurangzeb. He is said to have been the faujdār of Etawa and Irīj.\(^5\)

By 1900, the Kāmbohs held many villages (in the sarkār of Delhi) in Meerut and Ghaziabad tahsils. In the
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sarkār of Saharanpur they held villages in pargana Muṣaffar-ābād. But, here, their holdings came to even less than 2.5% in the pargana. It seems that, though they held several villages in the Meerut and Saharanpur districts, even they do not come among the first five prominent proprietary castes in any single pargana of the districts. But in the sarkār of Sirhind, in the parganas of Maler-kotla, Sunam Shāhābād and Banur they are listed among the first five castes of the parganas.

The Āin lists the following castes among zamīndārs, which can not, however, be identified: Dewak, Bahā, Kāhor and Ṭok (in sarkār Badāūn), Dewar and Marmān (in the sarkār of Delhi), Mundiar (in the sarkār of Saharanpur), Dasiā (in the sarkār of Sirhind) and Ghāndār and Makar in the sarkār of Narnaul.

On the other hand a number of small clans or castes holding estates around 1900 are not recorded as zamīndārs in any pargana in the Āin. These are: the Kurmis and Khattris (in the sarkār of Sambhal), Raiens (in the sarkār of Sambhal and Sirhind), the Arains, Dogars the Sainis and Mālīs (in the sarkār of Sirhind) and Bohras (Muslim money-lenders) in the sarkār of Saharanpur.