CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION

Fernand Braudel has attempted to discuss and interpret history in terms of a 'total history'. In fact, he conceives an all encompassing world economy that constitutes a dominant city centre with a hierarchy. The entirety is considered to be reflected in the aggregate of individual economies that are linked to the centre \(^1\). The present study is an analysis of the mechanism and the extent of the metamorphosis of the socio-economic structure of the sixteenth century Goa through the multiple innovative techniques introduced by the Portuguese. It also aims to discern the changing trends on a wider perspective. It is possible to undertake such explorations since, as M.N. Pearson postulates, common uniform themes and limits can be ascertained among all the ports in the Indian ocean. He opines that, if observed on a generalized scale and a wide spectrum, trade provided port cities like Goa, Malacca, Colombo, Surat and Calicut with a common economic role. These towns, over a period of time, served dual purposes - for entry and as transshipment centres \(^2\). One can therefore surmise that cities of a particular period would experience an uniform pattern of direction in terms of commerce and economy.

Goa is thus taken up as a case study in a period when economies were in transition during an era of discovery of sea routes and subsequent evolution of merchant capital preceded by the phase of so called feudalism. A comprehension of the development of feudalism in Europe will enable the exploration of the possibility to which an identical process could have emerged even in India. It will contribute in evolving a parameter to situate India in a parallel network of transitional trends the former affecting Europe as the
fundamental issue is to establish on a level comparable to the then existing equivalent patterns in the latter.

In this context, a cognizance of medieval India becomes significant as it forms the basic background which witnessed the sudden intervention of the European commercial companies; it is referred to as a conceptual bridge linking the feudal to the capitalist stage. It is also known in historiography as a transitional phase. Concepts like proto-industrialization and feudalism attain relevance in terms of this period as they enable us to visualize the later development of commercial capitalism in the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries. The phase is one of evanescence of historical forces and Franklin Mendel has in fact defined proto-industrialization to be the 'first and necessary phase of a transition to industrial capital'. Pertinent factors that have generated discussion are

1. The issue and eventual possible existence of feudalism and its nature in the context of India. If so, was it in conjunction with that prevalent in Europe in a similar period in history? If not, in what way was it different?

2. Did feudalism occur on an uniform scale throughout India? Or, were there clear cut distinctions in its basic inherent structure? And, can the same methodology be applicable to South India as well?

3. Did feudalism lay as the foundation for the development of capitalism in the long run and how can terms like 'precolonial' and 'proto-Industrial' be understood? These concepts are of extreme relevance as they focus on the interim phase between feudalism and capitalism. Moreover, is the 'feudal' phase in anyway responsible for the evolution of the later day
The concept of the advancement and stratification of European feudalism has been interpreted and defined by many historians. In a general context, it denotes a social system of rights and duties founded on land tenure and personal relationships, in which land, (and, to a lesser degree, other sources of income) was held in 'fief' (that is property in land) by vassals from lords. The former owed individual services and were bound by personal loyalty to the latter. In its singular meaning, it is considered to be a 'political order based upon the distribution of coercive authority among a large number of agencies each enjoying a relatively high degree of private local jurisdiction' [6]. In other words, a highly stratified and power conscious social order depending land, came to exist.

Marc Bloch, one of the main proponents of feudalism, defines it as consisting of 'a subject peasantry, widespread use of the serviced warriors, ties of obedience and protection binding man to man' [7]. A definite form of hierarchy can therefore be visualized. In social terms, it refers to 'local networks of social relations, the law and order of spatial mobility for individuals or families, and, the absence of effective centres which could link rural networks into larger patterns of organization' [8]. Harbans Mukhia traces the origin and further augments the concept of feudalism by classifying it as 'evolving and transitional socio-economic system having its base in Western Europe'. It is considered to be the link between a slave based society to one constituting free peasantry and capitalism. A consequent by-product was the promotion and revival of towns constituting artisan classes, farmers and landless agricultural workers [9].

In plain economic terms, in a nutshell, it is known to be a mode of
distribution of the means of production and appropriation of the surplus. Feudalism is considered to have originated in Western Europe where it denoted a process in which the producer was neither separated from his means of production nor was he an ‘economic being’. The identification of land as the primary source of wealth and income forms the fundamental crux of medieval feudalism.

Feudalism as such began with the decline of the Roman empire and the subsequent attacks by the various tribes. These incursions diminished the hold of the powerful king who in addition to being militarily weak, was also unable to generate income on his own to meet necessitating economic demands. He was therefore obliged to grant tracts of lands as ‘fiefs’ to his nobles. The latter in turn distributed both the lands and the accompanying rights to their own subordinates, the vassals. In a period of extreme political fluctuations and the trepidation of incoming invasions, the people were forced to accept the overlordship of the feudal lords who at least guaranteed their existence.

These lords slowly gained power and a social structure consequently came up; side by side, the power of the king was constantly declining.

A generalized three tiered pyramidal social structure with the peasants at the base level followed by the knights, barons, dukes, earls and the king at the apex came into existence. The dukes and earls were direct vassals of the king. The feudal lords of different categories possessed lands at as vassals of their respective overlords.

At first, the lords not only controlled the lands but carried out military obligations as well. Over a period of time, the land became hereditary
property. Even their military duties were inherited by their descendants [13].
In other words, the structure evolved in such a peculiar manner that the feudal system began to define the disintegration of public authority by its agents who, due to possession of lands, had become autonomous. The authority invested in them was considered a part of their patrimony [14].

The peasantry which formed the lowest and largest proportion of the population was also divided into a three layered strata. These included the freeholders who received lands from the lords. They could utilize and managed the same as their own through payment of taxes. They paid tax to their lords. The other category was of villeins who not only gave a portion of the produce of their own lands but also worked on the lord's fields for a minimum stipulated wage. Serfs on the other hand, had to cultivate the lords' lands.

A society where the nobles exercised an exclusive monopoly of law and private rights of justice within a political framework of fragmented sovereignty and subordinate fiscal capacity materialized [15]. The peasant while retaining his independence, to part with his surplus produce in the form of taxes either to the State or the officials representing it [16]. The extension of cultivation and innovations in agrarian techniques enabled him to exchange a portion of his cultivated produce for non agricultural commodities imitating a barter form of exchange. These trends slowly encouraged the growth of crafts, then guilds and expansion in trade. These features in turn led to the emergence of towns.

Tracing the exact origin of feudalism, Marc Bloch places the process of rigid and extensive stratification of social classes to have occurred substantially between 1250 and 1400 [17]. On a wider scale, the boom in the population from the eleventh century onwards could have prompted and necessitated the
establishment and maintenance of law and order [18].

These were the general trends prevalent in Europe at that juncture of political turmoil when economic pressures compelled even the ruler to depend overwhelmingly on a semi autonomous loyal nobility for his very survival.

A definite and similar form of social hierarchy existed even in Portugal, the country which colonized Goa in the sixteenth century. In the fourteenth century, the nobility occupied the second highest position in society. The knights were next in hierarchy. A state of complex power struggle between the centralized tendencies of the monarchy and the combined resistance offered by the church, military orders and nobility prevailed at the political level [19].

The economy was encountering a slump due to many factors. These included the extensive exodus of peasants from the countryside to the towns, an interrelated paucity in production and subsequent non-availability of food supplies; paucity of ready cash and a collapse of the Royal revenue. The local peasant in the villages continued to produce under duress. He contributed 70 per cent of his earnings towards tax at the end of the fourteenth century. A vocational hierarchy of non agrarian occupations in the form of guilds also came into being. It was maintained with the goldsmiths at the apex. The cobblers formed the lowest rung [20].

The early decades of the fifteenth century witnessed social crisis a and fall in the population level due to the rampant epidemic in the form of Black Death [21]. Administrative regulations were also rigidly enforced. Unlike the other European countries of this period, there was a strict and uniform regulation which insisted all healthy and able bodied artisans and peasants
had to participate in military service in times of external invasions.

The situation however underwent a transformation towards the middle of the fifteenth century when the Portuguese in an endeavor to enhance their prosperity and acquire spices directly, diverted their attention towards trade and exploration of sea routes. They were the first European power to do so as Portugal was endowed with the natural advantage of possessing a coastline that was thrice its area in proportion. Its strategic location combined with its limited natural agrarian resources created the attitude and subsequent action in this direction. Another positive feature at this juncture was its stable political structure in the form of powerful kings who were inclined towards discovery of alternative routes for improving commercial prospects. In fact, Immanuel Wallerstein contends that on a comparative level, Portugal was initially more successful in its attempts as it was urbanized with a high degree of monetization [22].

The process was assisted further with the entry of a foreign mercantile class into Portugal as a result of the newly formed Atlantic network [23]. The Portuguese empire of this period developed primarily as a result of the piracy and slave trade undertaken by the knights who were successful in garnering extensive support from the crown, the nobles as well as the church. They were motivated mainly by the acquisition of easy wealth through trade for indulging in activities. The kings also supported these activities as the Crown was in dire need of finances [24]. Medieval Europe thus witnessed the emergence and rise of autonomous and self sufficient economic units under feudalism.

A similar situation had developed in India as well [25]. In this context, the issue leading to its formation, is not in terms of exclusive rights of either
the landlord or the peasant \[26\]. Though land the primary means of production continued to be the deciding factor, the emphasis was on the varying degrees of control over it. It had become an exigency of that period. The enhanced number of village communities necessitated the creation of a class that could concentrate sufficient surplus in its grip so as to assure the trader of continuous flow of supplies \[27\]. It is a clear indication of the evolution of commerce on a large scale.

Suitable models to review and understand medieval Indian economy and society have been proposed both by Indian and foreign historians in the past few decades. There has however been an accelerated interest and subsequent further research with in-depth studies only in the recent years. The conceptual framework as suggested by Karl Marx has evoked great response from Indian historians who have subjected it to a highly critical examination. As the stress is on Goa, the trends and pertinent models proposed by some historians that will assist in a better understanding of the port town are elaborated in the study. The arguments and theories of R.S.Sharma, Irfan Habib, D.D.Kosambi, Harbans Mukhia and Frank Perlin are consulted for a broad comprehension of the term 'feudalism' and its prevalence particularly in the context of North India. Medieval South India society has been surveyed through the works of T.V.Mahalingam, Burton Stein, Noburu Karashima and Kenneth Hall.

There are diverse opinions regarding the origin of feudalism in India. R.S.Sharma dates its provenance to the fourth century. It is considered to have attained a high level in the eleventh and twelfth centuries \[28\]. Irfan Habib has however historically placed it to be bordering between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. On the other hand, D.D.Kosambi considers it to be around the second century \[29\]. Whatever the date of commencement, the phenomenon is rated to have attained its peak around the thirteenth to
fifteenth centuries for many regions in India.

The issue of land grants forms the basic crux of the entire debate dealing with feudalism. R.S. Sharma founds his argument on epigraphic sources to substantiate that serfdom which began in the peripheral areas had slowly percolated to the centre of Northern India by approximately the middle of the eighth century [30].

Aspects of distinctive political and administrative developments leading to the crystallization of this system partially began to consolidate only from the post Mauryan period and, especially that of the Guptas [31]. In fact, the latter is considered the first dynasty to exhibit extensive trends in terms of the dimensions of land or territory which were possessed and enjoyed [32]. The process of feudalism was however gradual and took place at two distinct levels. On the one hand, the village headmen appointed by the king became semi feudal officers over a period [33]. On the other, the king’s favorites who became close intermediaries, evolved into a significant concomitant in the development of feudalism [34]. The perpetuation of this stage was beneficial to them in every possible way.

While an analysis to develop contemporaneous stages in the evolution of feudalism both in India and Europe has been essayed, a comparison of the manner as it existed in India with that in Europe follows. These differences persisted due to some inherent characteristics peculiar of both the regions.

Firstly, in India, the majority of the power structures within the State were neither accountable to nor did they pay taxes. Secondly, while the Western European feudal lords granted lands to their serfs mainly for cultivation. The local kings only, bestowed lands to receive the taxes that is the (surplus)
collected. The landed intermediaries existing at various levels in the social hierarchy had the responsibility of extracting surplus produce through control. Their numbers being somewhat limited, serfdom was therefore more contained. Thirdly, India had no sharply defined classes of feudal barons organized in councils and assemblies. The origin of decentralization of power and authority also dates to this period.

In India, it was caused by the granting of lands to priests and temples. Grants to temples of cash income from the sales tax and tills on various counts may be compared to the money which the fiefs were endowed with in medieval Europe. Foreign invasions were a major cause for the development of feudalism in the latter where manors existed as a form of economic or financial security in terms of rent for the lord. R.S. Sharma considers their absence had led to the subsequent prevalence of small scale peasant production. Moreover, the process of subinfeudation was also not of such magnitude as in Europe.

R.S. Sharma has thus postulated facts regarding the origin and spread of feudalism in India. Markedly visible differences between the Indian and European feudalism have also been explored.

Another historian, D.D. Kosambi considers the processes of the dissemination of religion and private trade to have induced the concept of private property in land. These in turn facilitated the emergence of a class structure even in tribal areas. According to him, in India, the European manorial system came to exist concretely only towards the end of the feudal period. He visualizes the concept of feudalism to be of two types; that from above and from below. He differentiates between the two states on the basis of the enhancement in the number of village communities and the exigency to create
a class capable of concentrating sufficient quantity of surplus in their hands [43]. The first stage postulates a phase where the prevalence of the State depends on the payment of tributes which the all powerful king had acquired from autonomous subordinates. Feudalism from below refers to the intermediate class of landowners between the State and peasantry within the confines of the village. These people wielded power over the local peasantry, assumed direct contact with the State and people and were subject to military service [44]. He describes the Vijayanagar empire as having experienced feudalism from below.

On the other hand, a South Indian historian T.V. Mahalingam conceives Indian of feudalism to date only from the period of the Vijayanagar empire. At this juncture in history, the kings deliberately created a mode of decentralization by introducing the nayakas into the politico economic system. Nayakas like the feudal tenants of medieval Europe, were appointed by the king and commanded his lands in lieu of an established annual financial contribution and the maintenance of a standing army contingent. In times of emergency, these people had to supply arms. In addition to the nayakas, minor tenants were also bestowed lands. He opines that in spite of their emergence, the gradual expansion of subinfeudation did not attain a high a degree of perfection as in Europe [45]. The sole reason for the lack of development was that the tenure of the nayakas was founded primarily on military needs with the king receiving a fixed financial contribution [46]. The ruler had approved of these officials chiefly for their better running of the administration. The absence of an economic exigency retarded the progress and furtherance of this stage.

Burton Stein also dates the formal emergence of a destructive warrior class to the Vijayanagar period. The rise of the nayakas in this empire reflected
a period of hitherto unprecedented level of subordinated authority and power in South India. They owed their existence and success to new and improved warfare techniques. He also contends that while the class possessed a number of prerogatives, it was however not organized as a system of hierarchic power like in the case of Japan or Europe \(^{47}\). Noburu Karashima is in conjunction with the opinion that the emergence of nayakas can date only from the beginning of the sixteenth century. Though he concedes to the development of a social formation, he does not define the society as such since he visualizes the deficiency of a cohesive general statement for classifying the concept in its totality in the case of India. The State control over the nayakas is also considered to be different \(^{48}\). Thus, the above mentioned historians have attempted to draw parallels between Indian rulers and their European counterparts; the former did not in any situation, whatsoever, develop formidably or maintain such a rigid pyramidal social hierarchy.

While they have endeavored to locate and interpret feudalism in terms of Indian history, Harbans Mukhia questions the very possibility of the existence of Indian feudalism. He actually contends that the term ‘feudalism’ itself is not conducive for implementation in the context of any period in Indian history. The main reason given is that since the post Mauryan period, the Indian economy is considered to be ‘characteristically a free peasant economy’ \(^{49}\). The social conflicts were also limited and those that occurred were confined solely to the redistribution of the agrarian surplus \(^{50}\). He stresses on the high soil fertility and low subsistence requirements relative to Europe \(^{51}\). Moreover, he opines that unlike in Europe where peasant resistance could have been more individualistic in nature except on common pastoral land, the Indian economy necessitated only collective pressure \(^{52}\). There was no other cause whatsoever. Harbans Mukhia while drawing a parallel between both the forms of feudalism states that both Sharma and Yadava have
overlooked the fact that the European feudalism based on slavery and transformation was initiated by the increasingly stratified Germanic tribes. According to them, since no such phenomenon prevailed in India, the very concept is not applicable.

After an analysis of the term ‘feudalism’, its development in the context of both Europe and India, we will now take up models presenting medieval South Indian history as they have greater proximity to our field. Works analyzed are those of Burton Stein, Noburu Karashima and Kenneth Hall. The stress is on Burton Stein as he initiated a new model for evolving a framework for the understanding of Medieval South Indian society. He has also contributed numerous articles and works to substantiate his hypothesis.

Burton Stein broke away from the then prevalent general trend as he introduced a new hypothetical model from the discipline of social anthropology. The basis for his theory is Alan Southall who in 'Alur Society' proposed a type of segmentary state to serve as a precedent for the understanding of African politics. A segmentary state is visualized by anthropologists as a 'transitory and unstable form moving towards the normative unitary condition'. These states can be defined as 'decentralized polities with ill defined territorial boundaries - a pyramidal power where distribution of the authority of the primary ruler is duplicated by political subordinates, with central power weakest at the State periphery'. It is surmised that other states with common political organizations can utilize the same paradigm.

Burton Stein postulated the archetype as he perceived similarities between the political order of South India and Africa. In segmentary states, sovereignty encompasses both actual political and ritual hegemony. The latter is also referred to as ritual sovereignty. The prevalence of this concept is corroborated
with evidence derived from the Chola inscriptions [56]. Burton Stein contends that though the Cholas were an imperial power possessing a vast kingdom, numerous centres of power or segments developed within the kingdom itself. In other words, theoretically the Chola king owned rajadharma over the entire area. The kshetra was however confined to the core area in the immediate vicinity of the capital [57].

The other areas within the confines of his direct control were the small semi autonomous units which, while operating independently, constituted an integral part of his empire. The Chola segmentary state is therefore seen as an amalgamation of territorial units each individually constituting a central focus of actual power and possessing an approximate measure of ritual sovereignty [58].

The fundamental notion prevalent under the segmentary system is of cohesion among the diverse peasant localities as formalized in ritual linkages between kings and chiefs [59]. The participating social strata included brahmanas, the dominant peasant, the lower peasant, the dependents, the artisans, the traders and the landless laborers. The segmentary state beginning under the Pallavas, continued under the Cholas and even the Vijayanagar Empire. This form did not become totally extinct and, in fact, it persisted in a more diluted form till the nineteenth century i.e. the coming of the British to India. It thus appears to have a long lineage.

The first phase is dated between the seventh to the tenth centuries when peasant production and ownership of property were dominant features. Over the period however, the central area had geographically shifted from the Kaveri basin to the Krishna Tungabhadra doab [60].
Under the Cholas themselves, trends can be discerned. Towards the latter part of their reign, inscriptions record a transition in the process of transfer of ritualism of the Brahmadeva to the bhakti oriented temples. These temples while accumulating power, became centres of culture, religion and learning and paved the way for the creation of towns. ‘Nadu’ contributed in the participation and the sharing of temple responsibility. Outside the main area, the segments were more or less contained as units of government; these administrative areas defined as nadus were the prime units of local administration and a territorial assembly. The sabhas were mainly assemblies.

The evolution and development of temples as prominent centres of religion and learning can be traced to this period of Medieval South India. These were locations that provided a base for the brahmins and other learned religious persons supported by a lay clientele. With an augmentation in power and prestige, these temple areas also expanded in the form of towns. Commerce flourished and with the involvement and participation of people in various occupational activities, cities developed as an inevitable corollary.

The temples were usually supported through grants. Village lands were usually granted to the temple to meet its regular needs. These were not owned by anyone; people could only derive a share of income for participation in the cultivation. In other words, temples received grants and money to maintain ritual performances of religious institutions in perpetuity. By being involved in the cultivation of lands donated to them, the temples were participating in schemes of agricultural development to produce a stable income flow so very necessary for their existence. They also provided a source of livelihood for those dependent on the same. Under the Vijayanagar rule, there was a shift in terms of dominance between agrarian and non agrarian commodity production. The temple being the titular
head, received the greater share of the products. The cultivator received a minor portion for his involvement.

Burton Stein’s model has encountered a lot of criticism. Historians like D.N.Jha and M.G.S.Narayanan among others question his basic presumption of laying emphasis on the ritual and moral forces in the construction and unification of early medieval Indian society. These scholars give greater significance to the Bhakti movement which, disseminated in the middle of the sixteenth century along with the growth of a feudal order. Beginning as a widespread socio-religious movement, it is considered to have finally culminated in the setting up of temples. It flourished primarily due to the Royal patronage extended to it.

Noburu Karashima has provided us with another model for understanding the society of this period. He has employed techniques of statistical analysis for the data available at the macro level to comprehend the relationship of the peasant to the State or that between the individual and the land. A comparative study of records relating to the brahmadeya and the non-brahmadeya villages of the Chola period has been made. The evidence is substantiated by an analysis of the forty donative inscriptions and those inscribed on the walls of the Nageswaraswami temple in the brahmadeya village of Tirukkudamukki.

Karashima discusses the theories suggested by R.S.Sharma, Burton Stein and Kathleen Gough. He considers Burton Stein’s theory too speculative. According to him, Stein’s presumption of the ‘nadu’ as the only significant socio-political reality and the total absence of any level of bureaucracy weakens his argument. He accepts the theory of Kathleen Gough and dates the Chola period to originate from the ‘time of the formation of a centralized state attaining a certain degree of completion’. He therefore infers that
feudalism in India would have probably come into existence only after the 
Chola rule \[67\]. In other words, the origin of Indian feudalism according to 
him, is to be dated only from the past Chola period \[68\]. The slow maturing 
of feudal economic forces within the society could have possibly rendered 
the centralized state totally nonviable by the thirteenth century \[69\].

Karashima concludes that on the whole, communal holdings were predominant 
in non-brahmin villages as compared to individual holdings in brahmin villages. 
This classification is considered to have a parallel in the land holdings pattern 
in mirasdari villages during the British period \[70\]. It is further substantiated 
by Baden Powell's statement that the mirasdari could have had one of its 
origins in the villages where land grants were made by the Chola and Pandya 
rulers to brahmins and the officials \[71\].

On the other hand, in his book, Kenneth Hall aims to exhibit the links, 
relevance and influence of trade on polity. He considers the evolution of the 
Chola relationship with the merchants to be a simultaneous process. Commerce 
was totally connected to the development and the subsequent decline of 
Chola statecraft of this period from the ninth to thirteenth centuries.

After an explanation and discussion about feudalism in medieval South India, 
we move to the main object of this study. The above mentioned facts have 
been discussed basically to understand and analyse the economy and society 
of Goa in the sixteenth century. This study becomes imperative as it was 
one of the earliest regions on the coastline of the Indian subcontinent to be 
colonised by one of the first European powers, the Portuguese in a period 
subsequent to the discovery of a sea route to India \[72\]. Moreover, direct 
European control and the establishment of authority for a period of nearly 
four centuries and a half had a comparatively greater degree of influence on
Goa than on other Portuguese colonies in India. It grew in importance and
its official designation as the headquarters of the Portuguese empire by the
1530’s substantially contributed to, and, enhanced its stature. The port town
can in fact be seen as an exemplar of the whole Portuguese presence as it
served the country in many ways [73].

All these factors directly or indirectly augmented Goa’s uniqueness. A real
grasp of the social milieu of the port can be ascertained only through an
in depth analysis of its economy and society both during the pre-Portuguese
period and in the first century of Portuguese rule, that is the sixteenth
century.

Studies that have been undertaken for a comprehensive analysis and understanding
of Goan history are listed below. The earlier available works that are
cognizant to this period are restricted mainly to narrative accounts of the
religious, political and military aspects. The political conquest by Afonso de
Albuquerque has been generally covered in works concerning the period of
the Portuguese expansion [74]. Its impact on the ancient village communities
and the extent of their transformation has been investigated through the Foral
of 1526 of Afonso Mexia [75].

The revenues of the Estado da India have been deduced for some specific
years [76]. Sixteenth century coastal trade has been reviewed in articles by
M.N.Pearson, K.S.Mathew and T.R.deSouza. The Inquisition initiated in Goa
in the mid sixteenth century to counteract the activities of the new christians
and its consequent repercussions on these people have been discussed [77].
While some aspects of the Goan economy and trade have been scrutinized,
an in-depth exploration of the socio economic aspects under investigation to
yet to be attempted [78].
The proposed enquiry therefore attempts to present a cohesive study of aspects pertaining to the sixteenth century Goa. It intends to fill up the existing lacunae. It also aims at contributing towards the evolution of a proper link in the cognizance of Goan history over the centuries.

Relevant information was procured through traveller’s accounts, especially those of Jan Hughyen van Linschotten, Duarte Barbosa and Tomé Pires. A number of published documents and secondary sources were also easily accessible. Primary documents pertaining specifically to the sixteenth century commerce and non agrarian production were available in the libraries and the various Archives based at Lisbon, Portugal. Regarding other works, João de Barros and Diogo de Conto have presented a very vivid picture of the then existing Portuguese colonies.

The following chapter focuses on pre-Portuguese Goa. The state of the polity, society, economy and commerce prior to the Portuguese occupation are examined. The village communities, the fundamental basis of the agrarian structure, is discussed in detail.

The third chapter concerns Goa under the Portuguese rule. It incorporates details regarding the political conquest, geographical location, changes in the agrarian structure, the consequent transformation of land ownership, the collection of revenue - both from land and the passes, and the mechanism involved in the same.

The fourth chapter discusses the non agrarian sector of the Goan economy. The various secondary occupations practised, the master craftsmen and the highly specialized form of guilds, the master craftsmen and the transformation through monetization are discussed.
The fifth chapter examines the evolution and emergence of a new social order. It occurred due to major factors like changes in land ownership and the influx of population from the adjoining areas as well as conversion.

The sixth chapter highlights trade. As Goa was a port its strategic location could have further added to its stature. The local, intra-Asian and international aspects of commerce are examined. The second section of this chapter concentrates on the classes benefiting from participating in it.

Conclusion forms the final section of this study. Answers to relevant questions include:

1. The extent to which all the above factors contributed to the urban growth of Goa, whether the development was a concurrence primarily through trade.

2. If Goa was able to achieve some degree of self sufficiency through the direct link with European market.

3. If all the above discussed facts assisted in the integration of Goa into the world trade and economy. And the possible repercussions in commerce on the city's economy and prosperity.
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