CHAPTER V

THE PRIMARY ZAMINDARS

(On the eve of the eighteenth century).

Like other parts of Mughal empire the Primary zamindars enjoyed an important position in socio-economic sphere of rural life in the Mughal province of Gujarat. The Primary zamindars formed a distinct and considerably influential though not an exclusive category of the class of zamindars. A study of the forms and modes of holding rights by them brings to light an interesting instance of variation, both regional and intra-regional. Holding the lowest ladder of the landed aristocracy the most numerous category of the Primary zamindars was subject to greater degree of administrative control, degree of which varied in terms of space and time.

Before examining the position and the role played by the Primary zamindars in society it may be worth while to

1. B R Grover (*Nature of Land Rights* pp 17-25), Irfan Habib (*Agrarian System*, pp 141-43, 147-49) and N A Siddiqi (*The Land Revenue Administration*, pp 147-52) have duly taken note of the inter-regional variation. But perhaps in view of the purpose and scope of their studies they have not paid sufficient attention to intra-regional variations.
identify and determine the sway of their rights. It may be attempted with the help of evidence contained in the pages of the contemporary chronicles, both imperial and regional and in the revenue documents.

To begin with, the contemporary sources use different terms to denote various holders of the superior rights in land. The terms, it seems, find definite usage with specifiable connotations particularly in the regional documents pertaining to the Subah Gujarat. The way the term 'zamindar' finds description in these sources has already been discussed at length. Besides the 'zamindar' and allied terms examined earlier, the available documents also mention girasia, chauthia, giras, bantha-giras, bantha-chauth-giras and the chauth. In these sources the holders (girasia, chauthia) of the rights (giras, chauth, bantha)\(^2\) formed an

\(^1\) The Mughal practice of using the same generic term for the holders of superior rights in land has sometimes misled even the modern scholars. W H Moreland, *Agrarian System* pp 122, 279; P. Saran, *Provincial Government* pp. 102-4 of Irfan Habib, "Zamindars in the Ain", *Proc. IHC*, 1958, pp 320-23; For further details of the usage and connotations of the term, Irfan Habib, *Agrarian System*, pp. 136-39; S. Nurul Hasan, "Zamindar under Mughals" p 18, Moreover, understanding of modern scholars of the terms used to denote the rights and their holders in Gujarat is partly defective and needs to be modified in the light of discussion in the following pages.

\(^2\) A section of the holders of bantha belonged to the category of the Superior zamindars [(Chapter 1 (1) (2)) and the other may be identified as the Primary zamindars. Please see the discussion below.
identifiable section of the landed aristocracy. Not only the possessors and their possessions were thus named differently from the ones of a (Superior) 'zamindar' but also the offering (salam) made to the state was given a different nomenclature to distinguish it from the peshkash-i zamindaran. In the following pages an attempt is made to discuss broad feature of the giras, bantha and chauth, determine the role, position and nature of relationship subsisting between the girasias and chauthia i.e. Primary zamindars and the empire during the heyday of Mughal rule and ascertain the pattern of change, if any, by the onset of the eighteenth century.

Before the above mentioned terms and their import are examined it is worthwhile to point out that though the girasia and chauthia (i.e. Primary zamindars) enjoyed identical rights they could possess a position which might be at variance from one another. The way the terms giras, bantha and chauth are used in the documents perhaps suggests the identity and simultaneously the persisting shade of distinction. The terms as will be seen below, have been used collectively and alternately for one and the same possession as also separately to denote the same right but held in a somewhat different form.

GIRAS :

The giras and its holder girasias are frequently men-
tioned in the sources, right from the *Ain* down to the British works. Also, some modern scholars have examined these terms but have not satisfactorily succeeded in the appreciation of the *giras* as an established claim of its legitimate holders, the *girasla*.\(^1\) Besides, these scholars view *bantha* almost as the only form of possession of a (Primary) zamindar in Mughal Gujarat and have not examined *giras* as a legitimate claim existing, side by side with, and on a wider scale, and perhaps since times earlier than the *bantha*. In view of persisting views which do not stand the test of evidence and for a proper appreciation of these terms an indepth study of the same is warranted.

In Mughal sources of information the earliest available reference to the *girasia* is made in the *Ain*. But the *Ain*

\(^1\) Irfan Habib does not go beyond his appreciation of *giras* as "an exaction" which right was derived "from the threat or actual use of force" as different from *bantha* which was "derived from an earlier, legally recognized right". *Agrarian System*, pp 147-48 as also *bid*, pp 142-43, 149. A R Khan first identifies and specifies *giras* among the chieftaincies and then, following Irfan Habib, regards it as an exaction, adding that *giraslas* were the ones who "lived upon the exaction, *giras*." A R Khan, *op cit*, pp 95-6 and n, 116. Neither of the scholars identifies the *girasia* with *bantha*. It may be mentioned that *giras* could take form of an *exaction* also. But as will be seen below it was not its only form. Also the chief could also hold the *giras* but by virtue of merely being in possession of *giras* one could not acquire the status of a chief. The *giras* was Primary zamindar's right which could be enjoyed by the chiefs also (references follow). Though Irfan Habib feels somekind of 'shade of distinction between a zamindar and the *girasia* but he leaves the difference unspecified. *Agrarian System*, p 148 & a.
which reflects them in the caste column of the zamindars, seems to have mistaken girasia for a caste. But then, the work also specifies 'girasia-mehtar' (lit leading girasia) and Rajput girasia in the same column. As such it implies a difference between the caste (Rajput) and the girasia. But the fact that girasias find description along the zamindars and, then, have not been included in the general description of leading zamindars (i.e. chiefs) suggests that the two could carry general similarity and shade of distinction at the same time.

Making no distinction between giras and the girasia, Nizamuddin Ahmed who had himself been in the subah refers to them as a group of people beside the zamindars. The Mirat mentions giras as a possession distinguishing it from the zamindari of a Superior zamindar. Thus during the days of Sultan Muzaffar Gujarati the Jam, Chief of Navanagar "had four hundred (entire villages as) giras" and "one fourth

1. *Ain*, II, p. 120
3. Thus sultan Muzaffar fought the Mughals "with the support of the Kolis and the giras (girasia) and other zamindars," and imperial army marched with the intention of "eradicating the disturbances created by the giras" (i.e. girasias). For the same and similar references, *Tabqat-i Akbari*. II pp. 381, 390; *Ibid*, III, pp 138, 184-86.
share of zamindari in four thousand villages. Again, one Bagela-Jhala, (Superior zamindar), is shown as holding *entire giras* rights within his makan-i zamindari presumably in addition to his right as a Superior zamindar. The apparent shade of distinction between girasia and a (superior) zamindar is again noticeable in the Mirat’s reference to one Jagmal girasia in imperial service along with other ‘zamindars’ during Aurangzeb’s reign. In one of Aurangzeb’s farmans *girasias and zamindars* are, again mentioned together.

The document entitled Yad dasht: dehat pargana Kadi places it beyond doubt that the girasias were legitimate holders of superior rights in land and that they were other than and different from though not exclusive of the (Superior) ‘zamindars’. Furnishing details of villages and their holders the document first specifies the villages constituting the taalluqa (makan-i zamindari) of each (Superior) zamindar in the pargana. Then it specifies 116 villages as

2. *Ibid*, 1, p. 22 read with *Account*, ff 119a-20b, Also see please *Mirat-i Sikandari* (p. 46) when it refers to *zamindaran-i* Gujarat Tarangdas Raja Champaner and Satrasal (Chhatrasal) girasia Jhalawad.
4. *Ibid*, 1, p. 279
the villages of girasias and others. Of these, 20 villages were held by the 'zamindars' and the girasias collectively and the rest formed exclusive possession of the girasias.¹ These villages contained bantha-giras lands, evidently the girasias' lands.² As such the girasias were accepted holders of superior right in lands and not merely the ones who 'lived upon the exaction, giras'.³ On the contrary a girasia was regarded as a respectable member of society⁴ and could be treated as a person loyal and useful to the state.⁵

The purpose of citing evidence in some details is to remove the existing misconceptions about giras and girasia and to submit that the giras denoted for a girasia what the

¹. Yad-dasht dehat pargana Kadi, op. cit.
². Account, 308 b - 30a; The Mirat-i Sikandari quotes a Minister informing Sultan Muhhamad Gujarati, saying that ki rob-ee mamalik-i mahrusa-i shuma ke an ra... banta mi goyand Rajputan girasia-o koliyan motasarref and. Mirat-i Sikandari pp 363-64. Following it the Mirat-i Ahmedi also notes that rob-ee az mulk-i Guja­rat k' an ra... banta goyand Rajputan Girasia-o Koliyan motasarraf and. Mirat-i Ahmedi, 1, p. 83. It will be seen below that giras and the bantha could be different from each other in form only, in spirit the two were identical and similar to each other.
⁴. See, for instance, the inscription (1615) on a temple at Ghoga recording the names of respectable persons which among other, included the emperor, Qazi, desai, faujdar, Seth beside girasia, Rai-Singh, "Historical Sketch of the town of Ghoga", op. cit, pp. 283-5.
⁵. Thus, for example, please see subedar Shaista Khan transferring zamindari of a rebel zamindar to Jagmal girasia of pargana Dholqa Mirat-i Ahmedi, 1, pp 230, 232.
makan-i zamindari meant in relation to a zamindar.

The giras, it may be seen, is noticeable in almost all the kharaji sarkars of the subah. To begin with the Ain notices girasias in the parganas of Bheel, Nadiad, Sarnal and Kala (?) in the sarkar Ahmadabad.¹ The Mirat-i Ahmadi and other available pieces of documentary evidence suggest the existence of giras in other sarkars of the subah.² The giras and girasias were also there in the territories which were held by the autonomous (Superior) zamindars.³

So far the discussion has mainly been confined to suggest prevalence and continuity of giras as a superior right from the times of emperor Akbar (rather sultans of Gujarat) onward. Since the revenue department was required to maintain the statement of facts concerning the giras (haqiqat-i giras)⁴ some information is contained in the pages of the Account and in other revenue documents of the time. The available evidence casts some light on the mode of


3. Mirat-i Ahmadi; I, pp 22, 285; Mirat-i Sikandari; p. 46

4. Account f. 81a.
holding and meeting the giras claim which could be
realized in more than one way.

In the parts of the subah the lands of which were not
surveyed, the giras claim was met in the form of deduction
out of revenue taken as a share out of the produce of the
peasantry\(^1\), as far as we can tell. In these areas the lands
of the villages do not seem to have been divided on the
bantha-talpad lines\(^2\); it was therefore the revenues extorted
from the peasantry which were apportioned.

Within the villages and parganas the land of which had
been surveyed, the giras-rights could be held in two forms.
The girasias' possession was not apportioned in definite
area units and the area of the village was left undivided.
Thus the area statistics of the cultivable portion of land
of mawza itawra (pargana Kadi) may be cited to clarify the
point.\(^3\)

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

1. Yad-dasht dastur-ul amal...b' mohr Nawab Isa Tarkhan-
dehat pargana Idar, R.No.23. Pune. For the polaj land,
fasl-i kharif, it is recorded as under: az qarar-i
bilmanasfa seh hissa sarka-o yek hissa giras waz' mi
shavad. The dastur available for pargana Mhorasa and
Meghraj in the Account (f.353b) puts it as under:
hissa-i sarkar-o riaya Nisfa-nisf, az jumla sarkar
chauthai hissa girasia waz' mi shavad.

2. The bantha-talpad, during Mughal age was confined
to the areas lands of which were covered by survey. For
details please see discussion in the following pages.

3. Account, f.311b. For similar reference please see
discussion in the following pages under bantha.
mawza Itarwa

785 bigha laiq-i zira't mal giras.

In such cases when the lands were not duly apportioned into talpad and bantha the produce of the village might be divided in the manner referred to above. But then, in the second case, the giras could take the form of bantha: mawza Unada: 1-

raqba laiq-i zira't : 1175 bigha
raiyati : 1081 bigha
giras : 94 bigha

Evidently the lands were duly apportioned and the giras's giras (bantha) 2 was separately recorded in definite numbers of bighas. In this case the giras, as such, takes the form of bantha which (division), as will be seen below, denominated divisioning and could be termed bantha-giras, bantha-chauth-giras or merely bantha.

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

1. Ibid.f.311a; for more references please see discussion under bantha.

2. The available dastur-ul amal for pargana Kadi speaks of the talpad and bantha or the raiyati and bantha, then, records rates, separately for the villages lands of which were held jointly, and not apportioned. In the latter case the term used are giras or the girasias. Yad dasht dastur-ul amal-dehat paragana Kadi, 1093 fasli RNo.47, Pune; For identification of giras with and the difference from the bantha please see discussion in the following lines. It may however be mentioned here that bantha appears to have been one of the mode of holding giras rights which in substance did not differ much from the former.
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BANTHA-GIRAS:

According to the available information the bantha rights emerged during the reign of Sultan Ahmad Gujarati and were likewise retained under the Mughals.¹ According to available information the Sultan expelled the Rajputs and Kolis (who were in possession of the country of Gujarat) from their possessions which were taken entirely under direct control. Consequently they created situation which could not be managed by the Sultan. Finally both the parties compromised their position and effected a settlement. According to the settlement three fourths parts of land of every village were attached to the government. A fourth part of the lands was settled upon the Kolis and Rajputs. Thus divisioning (of their land) was settled (bantha qarar yafīt).² The part attached to the government was termed talpad and the one left with the original possessors was categorized as bantha.³ Besides, the possessions of a section of them were not likewise divided which, therefore, they continued to hold intact on account of personal favours or else as a political concession dictated by the circum-

------------------------
1. Account, f. 106 a.
2. Ibid.
stances. Thus there emerged two forms of zamindari villages, viz; the first which they held intact and the second which were divided into bantha and talpad.

The lands which were not divided into bantha and talpad and were held intact fall into two categories, viz; the lands termed makan-i zamindari and held by the Rajput etc. who were called 'zamindaran' and have already been discussed as Superior zamindars. The possessions of other section holding their lands in likewise manner were termed giras which were subject to the payment of salami by its holders who were called girasias.

In the same way the bantha possessions were common both to the (Superior) zamindars and the Primary zamindars. The bantha'daran in our sources are identified as the 'zamindaran' and also girasias which looks ambiguous and confusing. But, then the girasias' bantha was subject to the payment of state's claim which is described as bantha-sala


2. Beside the discussion in the preceding section please see references in the following pages also.

3. The aspect has been discussed in Chapter I (A) above. Also see please Account (F. 106a) where it state: see also Account ff. 207b-32a read with Ibid F. 307a and Yad-dasht dehat pargana kadi, op cit nos. 2a-6a.

mi and the zamindars' bantha was, likewise, subject to the payment but it is termed peshkash. Thus a line of demarcation may be drawn between the two categories of zamindars holding bantha land.

The bantha denoted the portion of the possession which its original possessors were allowed to hold after the divisioning was effected. In actual practice the divisioning which being confined to the area regarded as cultivable raqba laiq-i zira't did not cover entire area constituting the village. The cultivable area thus apportioned into two distinct parts has been named differently, viz; talpad and

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

1. Account f 101a, 106a. According to the source the salami of state on the bantha (bar zamin-i bantha salami sarkar-i wala) was settled during the period of Gujarati Sultan. See also Mirat-i Ahmadi I. p. 174; Ibid, Supplement, pp. 228-29 and the reference in the following discussion.

2. It has been discussed in the preceding Chapter I (1) and (2); see also, Account, f 106a.

3. The term bantha, wanta or banth is taken from vanta (division), a noun for the verb vantan (i.e. to divide) j, Baden powell, Land systems of British India, p 278; Bombay Gazetteer, II p129. The Account (f. 106a) also says that banthah qarar yaft, the divisioning was settled. It may be mentioned that the bantha is invariably applied to the land, or a village but in no case to the produce.

4. Account, ff. 175b - 81b; 219 a - 20a; 308-32a; for specific instance please see the discussion that follows.
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bantha¹; raiyati and giras²; raiyati and bantha-giras³ and lastly the raiyati and banth-chauth-giras.⁴ The similarity and the difference between various expressions used to denote the Primary zamindar's rights will be discussed a little later. It may however be pointed out that the giras and bantha in many instances have been used alternately as

-------------------
2. Account, f 175b : area statistics of mawza Antrali (pargana Bheel) are recorded thus :

(Entire area) : 2646 bigha
Habitations etc. (abadani waghaira) : 1965 bigha
cultivable area (raqba liaq-i zira't) : 681 bigha

giras  raiyati
185-5  495-15

For similar references, Account ff. 308b-29a.
3. Ibid. f. 176b : mawza Bardoli (pargana Bheel)

Cultivable area (raqba liaq-i zira't) 900 bigha
bantha raiyati
giras  645 bigha
225 bigha  645 bigha

For similar reference, Ibid, ff 219a-20a, 339b-40a.
4. Ibid, f. 176 a : mawza Basna Matar (pargana Bheel)

(entire area) 11,180 bigha

Habitations etc. (abadani waghaira) : 4290 bigha
Cultivable area (raqba laiq-i zira't) : 4890 bigha

bantha  raiyati
chauth-giras
1223 bigha  3667 bigha

For similar instances, Ibid, ff, 177a-81b
well as in conjunction with each other to denote one and the
same area of lands.\textsuperscript{1} Besides the talpad too has at times
been used inter-changeably with the raiyati.\textsuperscript{2}

The divisioning did not end with mere categorization of
land into two. It meant something more. First the available
dastur-ul amals suggest that the rates of assessment were
maintained separately for the talpad (or raiyati) and the
bantha-giras lands in the revenue department.\textsuperscript{3} Detailed
informations regarding the area actually cropped during the
kharif and rabi crop seasons were procured and specified
separately for the lands under two categories.\textsuperscript{4} Similarly
the details concerning kind and quality of land, viz; ban

\hspace{2cm}

\begin{enumerate}
  \item The Account uses the expressions bantha and talpad for
specifying (divided) lands of entire sarkar Ahmadabad
but the area-in parganas and villages is recorded under
the heads mentioned in the preceeding notes. The area
of villages in pargana Bheel is recorded under the
heads mentioned in the preceeding references but the
dasturs carry the expressions muzarian-i talpad and the
bantha only. Then, the dastur-ul amal for fasl-i kharif
is recorded for raiyati and the bantha but the same for
rabi are recorded under the expression 'raiyati' and
the bantha-giras. Account ff. 82a, 175b -81b, 182a,
333b, 339a-40a; Dastur-ul amal, PC Nos. 45-7
  \item But the two did not necessarily denote the same posi-
tion though at times could coincide with each other.
For details please see discussion in following pages.
  \item Account, ff.182a, 333b, 339a-40a; dastur-ul amals (from
Shah Jahan to Muhammad Shah). PC Nos. 22-47
  \item Docs entitled mazruat pargana haveli Ahmadabad. (for)
mawza (so and so) for the years 1090, 1093, 1094, 1096,
1100, 1105, 1117, 1118, 1125 fasli, for the villages of
Aslali, Aqilpur, Rasulpur, Sarkhej and other, R.Nos. 21
and 27 Pune.
\end{enumerate}
jar-laiq-i zirat (cultivable waste), polaj (under continuous cultivation) and barani (un-irrigated) and chahi (irrigated) comprising talpad and bantha were duly specified. Besides, separate threshing floor for heap ing and threshing the produce of the bandha and the talpad were invariably maintained as also a boundary between wanta(bantha) and government (talpad) land was drawn. The divisioning seems to have been carried a little farther. The Account sometimes speaks of the cultivators of talpad muzarian-i talpad implying as if there was a distinct group of cultivators that tilled the talpad alone. According to a work of later date kunbis tilled the government portion (i.e. talpad) alone. The documents which furnish plots and cultivator-wise details for bantha and the talpad lands for a number of villages further strengthen the possibility of divisioning existing among the cultivators. A closer scrutiny of the

1. Dastur-ul amal, PC Nos. 20-51; Account.f.25b.
3. Account ff. 182a, 336b.
5. Documents Khasra mazurat for the years 1090, 1093, 1094, 1096, 1099, 1100, 1105, 1109, 1113, 1117, 1118, 1119, 1126 fasli, R.Nos. 21, 27, and PC Nos.110-14, 116-21, 121-30,1 53-57.
plots which were duly named and identified in both the
categories of lands; and of the cultivators who are named
and further identified with their holdings reveals that
neither the plot nor the cultivator was common to both the
categories of lands i.e. the plots as well as the cultiva-
tors in one category were exclusive of the other.¹ Whether
similar divisioning among the cultivators existed every
where in the subah is difficult to say for the available
contemporary evidence for the period under review relates
mainly to sarkar Ahmadabad.

The practice of dividing the cultivable area into two
portions appear to be a common though not the only mode of
putting aside the bantha possessions. In some cases entire
village could be categorized as the bantha. One Sur Singh
girasia held the village of Maile and Khoral (pargana Khan-
bayat) entirely in bantha.² Similarly Khodasi girasia held
mawza Banjral (paragana Dholaqa) entirely as bantha.³ In
brief nine entire villages in all, in the entire sarkar
Ahmadabad are specified as the exclusive bantha possessions

¹. See also, Selection from the Records of Baroda Govern-
ment (Giras), No II vol.II, pp 1127-28 where it records
that even the houses in the villages were likewise
divided.

². Account.f.249a.

³. Ibid, f. 298b.
of *giriasias*. As such the practice of setting aside entire villages in *bantha* appears to be an exceptional phenomenon, the common mode being the divisioning of cultivable area of villages rather than the villages themselves. The state, as such, would prefer, if possible, not to allow the *girasias* to preserve and maintain clusters of villages held entirely by them.

The *Mirat* and the *Account* suggest that the *bantha* constituted a fourth portion of the area of villages. There is evidence to show that *bantha* could constitute a fourth of the cultivable area but it was not invariably the case. There were 270 such villages in *pargana* Kadi lands of which were divided into two categories. Amongst these the proportion of the *bantha* in 158 villages was exactly a fourth of


2. Even if a *girasia* held rights in many villages he was generally allowed *bantha* in every village in the form of a portion thereof. Thus, according to the *Rasmala* a Rajput chief was allowed *bantha* lands in 84 villages as distinct from one-fourth number of the villages themselves. *Rasmala* p 261. One Lekhraj *girasia* held *bantha* lands in seven villages of *pargana* Bheel. The area of the *bantha* thus spread over the seven villages, if put together, comes to 7797 bigha and 16 biswa. Area of any village containing his *bantha* was not less than 7797 bigha. As such the *girasia* could be allowed any of the entire village in *bantha*. Doc. *Girasiaha mawaziat pargana* Bheel, RN0 43, Pune, read with *Account* ff.175b-80b.

3. *Account*, f.106b; *Mirat-i Ahmadi*, i, pp 173-4

4. *Account*, ff.308b-32a
the cultivable area which had been divided. But in the remaining villages, 112 in number, the bantha constituted either less or more than a fourth, the proportion ranging from 1/8th to 2/5th of the cultivable area. In none of the fourteen villages comprising pargana Piplod the bantha represented a fourth; it stood between 1/5 and 1/3 of the cultivable lands.¹ Similarly no exact proportion is noticeable between the bantha and the talpad portions of lands which were actually cropped.²

Some idea of the cultivators cultivating the bantha lands besides the grasias may be had from the documents reflecting cultivator wise details of the area actually cropped. In its association with the cultivators the bantha land may be classified into two. In the first place may be mentioned the cropped area which is reflected, exclusively, against the grasia himself, with no other person specified.³ Such lands may be identified as the khudkhasta lands of the

1. Ibid. ff. 218a-20b
3. Of 157 bighas of cultivated lands, 19 bighas is shown against the grasia himself in mazruat Rakhyal buzarg, fals-i kharif, 1127 falsi, PC Nos. 122-28 a ; also see mazruat mawza Mahej, fals-i kharif, 1149 falsi PC Nos 95-102 ; Amal-i dastur PC No 23.
grasia. Another document, though of a little later date (1140 fasli/1732-33) describes a portion of the bantha lands as bantha-sir-i girasia. The sir lands were the zamindari lands wherein direct assessment was imposed and the authorities collected revenues from the peasantry directly without any intermediary. The sir lands which fall in the second category are, in the document, shown as being cultivated by specified persons other than the girasia. There are then other documents which specify a portion of bantha lands which were cultivated by the cultivators. The documents reflecting 19 bighas of the cropped area of bantha against the girasia (identified as khud kashta) also specifies 138 bighas against persons, other than the girasia. No further information having been furnished it is difficult to precisely define their position. However it seems they were in direct communication with the state that is why they find descrip-

1. The works of later date also mention that the girasia carried cultivation with the assistance of 'assamis', halls or meors. Bombay Gazetteer, II, pp. 67, 204-5, 385; Ibid, (Kaira), p. 288; Rasmalai, p 565. Locally the self cultivating wants lands were called ghr kher'. Selections from the Records of Baroda Government, Jamabandi of the villages of kodram, Indrana, and Varsude, No. II vol. II p. 1128.


5. Mazruat mawza Rakhyal buzurg, 1127 fasli, op. cit.
tion in the records which were utilized for the fixation of the state demand.

Some indications of differentiation are noticeable among the peasantry cultivating bantha lands. The persons (other than the girasia) reflected in the mazruat documents fall in three categories. In the first place may be mentioned those who are merely named against their specified holdings with no other identity provided. In the second group may be mentioned the holders who have been designated muzare'. Thirdly there were the sub-ordinate cultivators, also called muzare', but cultivated lands which did not belong to them.

It may thus be seen that there were the peasants holding lands in the bantha and exercising some rights of un-

1. They appear to have been the most numerous, finding description in each of the mazruat papers specifying bantha lands. In this section may also be mentioned (the non-girasia) desais, muqaddams and kotwals who also held, perhaps as peasant-proprietors, lands in the bantha. Mazruat mawza Mahej, 1149 fasli, op. cit; Mazruat Rakhyal buzurg 1126 fasli for rabi and 1127 fasli for kharif PC Nos 110-4, 116-21.

2. Khasra Mazruat mawza Deori, PC No 92 and Mazruat mawza Mahej, 1114 fasli; R No. 44, Pune. According to S. Nurul Hassan the term 'muzara' included not merely the peasant proprietor but also the tenant-cultivator. Thoughts on Agrarian Relations, p 20.

3. Khasra mazruat mawza Deori, op cit. The document puts them as under: Pirthiraj muzara-i Udai Singh; Parorkar muzara-i Kalla Gohel or Kalyan, muzara-i Pusaita-i muqaddaman i.e. so and so muzara of such and such person.
specified description coexisting with those of the girasias in their capacity as the Primary zamindars over entire bantha.

The bantha and, correspondingly the talpad lands were earmarked and demarcated. Besides, the talpad was attached to the government (talpad mal-i padshahi qarar yaft) and its revenues were to be expropriated by the state, its assignees or the grantees.¹ But it is yet to be seen whether the holder of bantha had any relationship with the peasantry of the talpad.

The holders of bantha do not find any reference in the documents pertaining to assessment and collection of revenues from the talpad which appears to be the concern of muqaddams and desais.² Therefore it seems that the banthadar was neither allowed a share in the revenues of talpad nor to have been associated with its revenue administration.³ But his dissociation from the talpad may not be pressed too far, for there were the villages which contained bantha lands but

1. Account, f. 106b; Mirat-i Ahmadi, I p 174; Irfan Habib. Agrarian Systems, pp 142-3. Also see discussion in the following pages.

2. For details and references, Chapters I (2), and III above.

3. Jama-o Kharif mal-i-jihat-o-Sair jihat dehat pargana haveli Ahmabad, mahal nazim-i subah falsi-i kharif 1127 falsi and 1130 falsi; Jama-o kharj mal-o jihat-w sair jihat, pargana haveli Ahmabad, falsi-i kharif 1124 falsi P.C.
had no *Muqaddam*.¹

But, then, the *talpad* lands also were not held by the peasants enjoying equal status with no signs of differentiation. There were some identifiable holders of *talpad* lands enjoying a privileged socio-economic position. Thus Rajputs, Kolis and Muslims holdings *zamin-i sarkar* (i.e. *talpad*) enjoyed exemption from paying a cess, called *mankna* which was levied from other peasants during both the crop seasons.² The Kolis and Muslims, likewise enjoyed exemption from paying another cess, termed *karaya* (? rent) which was levied from the peasants in *pargana* Sarnal.³ Besides, the possessions of Kolis and Muslims in *pargana* Thamna and those of Brahmans in *pargana* Prantij were assessed at concessional rates.⁴ As such the Rajputs, Kolis, Brahmans being given a preferential treatment must have enjoyed a superior status among the holders of the *talpad* lands.⁵

¹ Chapter III above. Whether the *girasia* performed the duty of *muqaddam* in such villages is not known.
² *Account*, ff. 220b, 349b, 359b. The rates varied from crop to crop and ranged between two annas to two and a half mehmudi per bigha.
³ *Account*, f. 302b.
⁴ *Ibid*, ff. 202a, 222a; The Brahmans were allowed to retain two-third and Kolis and Muslims enjoyed three fifth part of the produce; common peasantry paid half of the produce.
Whether the superior and preferential treatment thus meted out to Rajputs, Kolis, Muslims and Brahmans was designed (or kept up) to detach them from the girasias is a matter of speculation. There is, however, circumstantial evidence to show the State's endeavours to deny the bantha-dar probable chances of attracting talpad - peasantry for undertaking cultivation on the bantha which, almost invariably, contained cultivable waste also.

In the sphere of assessment of state's claim entire village comprising talpad and bantha was treated as a unit. The assessment records—crop season-wise details of the actually cropped area by individual cultivators—were prepared by the village patwari with the co-operation of mugaddams and under the supervision of the desai for the bantha the same way as for talpad lands. Then the state assessed individual holdings of each plot-holder in both the categories of lands without making difference and thus entered into direct communication with the cultivators. ¹

Secondly, the state maintained dastur-ul amals for both the lands and enforced them through the agency of desais and muqaddams who were required to ensure that the assessment was carried in accordance with the rules laid down for the

¹. This is borne out by the mazruat papers which are cited above as also in the discussion that follows.
bantha as well as talpad.¹

Thirdly a comparative study of the rates of assessment laid down for the talpad and the bantha lands as cited above, reveals that the peasantry whether holding bantha or the talpad had to pay revenue at the same rate. These dasturs take into consideration the chahi and barani, banjar and polaj lands for both the crop seasons including the additional cesses levied.²

Fourthly, any fall in the production of the talpad lands would directly hurt the interests of the desais and the mugaddams who were allowed a share in the revenue collected from the talpad and not from the bantha salami offered by the bantha-holder, the girasia.³ Obviously the muqaddam and desai would act, under normal circumstances as the watchdog of imperial interests which were thus identified with their own.

1. The dasturs are available from the time of Shah Jahan to the opening years of Muhammad Shah's reign. Dastur-ul amal, pargana haveli Ahmadabad; Amal-i dastur dehat pargana haveli Ahmadabad; Yad-dasht dastur-ul amal for 1091AH, and for the period of Mahabat Khan, Isa Tar Khan, Ghairat Khan, 1053 AH and 1079 AH PC Nos.20-6,28-61 Account, ff. 182a-2b, 202a, 302b-3a;338b-40b,349a-51a, 363b-65a, 408a-10b; Baroda, 87.

2. In addition to the dasturs cited in the preceding note please also see discussion in the following pages.

3. Docs. jama-o Kharj mal-i jihat-w sair jihat dehat pargana haveli Ahmadabad, op., cit, See also Chapter III above.
Lastly, the *muqaddami* and *desaigiris* seem to have only exceptionally coincided with the position of the *bantha*-holders, the three positions were generally, (though not essentially ) held by different persons.¹ The checks thus applied would have helped in the smooth working of the *bantha-talpad* system under the over all superintendence of the state.

But, as pointed out earlier, the *bantha talpad* system was not enforced to cover the entire Subah. The sway of the system as will be seen below, was confined to the surveyed parts of the mainland Gujarat.

Our sources do not precisely specify the limits of the area of the *bantha talpad* system. Also the modern scholars have not viewed the possibility of the zamindars holding their lands in the non-*bantha* form.²

The *Mirat* and the *Account* very clearly speak of the limitations of the state in the enforcement of the system to cover entire lands of all the zamindars.³ We have already discussed that the zamindars of the *peshkashi sarkars*, the

1. For details please see discussion in the preceding Chapter III.


ismis, a section of the zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin and a section of the girasias also held their lands which were not divided into bantha and talpad. But the territorial limits of the system are yet to be ascertained. ¹ On a closer view of the village-wise description of 28 parganas comprising sarkar Ahmadabad and the dastur-ul amals; which are available for the same and other parts of the subah it would appear that:

The references to the bantha lands (i.e. bantha-giras or bantha-chauth-giras) are exclusively confined to the villages, parganas and sarkars lands of which had been surveyed.² Even when the land had been surveyed but the area was not divided into two portions, the girasia's claim is termed giras and not bantha.³

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

1. See above Chapter I (1) & (2); It has been discussed in the preceding section of the present Chapter that in certain parts of the subah giras denoted divisioning of produce as distinct from the bantha-giras which stood for physical divisioning of the lands. Please also see discussion under chauth in the following pages.

2. Account. ff.163a, 172b 175b - 81b 219a - 20a, 309 - 32a (for the references to the bantha and actual divisioning); Ibid, ff.182a - 82b, 302b, 339a-40b, 349a - 51a, 358b - 60a, 409a for the dasturs specifying assessment rates for the bantha and the talpad lands; see also the dastur-ul amals cited above.

3. To cite two examples representing the two forms (Account, ff. 176a, 314a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mawza Badosma</th>
<th>mawza Pusnota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(entire area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 bigha</td>
<td>5985 bigha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the areas lands of which were not surveyed (dar paimaish nayamde) the bantha does not find any reference. Instead the share of the giras is reflected in terms of a share in the produce as distinct from the one in delineated portion of lands.¹

It may thus be submitted that the bantha denoted a portion of cultivable area (and sometime, though only exceptionally, an entire village) which was duly demarcated. The bantha lands were confined to areas which had been covered by the land survey i.e. the central parts of the subah which felt the greatest thrust of the administrative pressure.²

---Continued---

habitations etc. 300 bigha 309 bigha
cultivable area inclusive 2892 bigha
of giras raiyati - banthagiras
(laiq-i zira't mai giras)
700 bigha.
169 bigha 723 bigha.

1. *Ibid* ff. 212b-13a, 214b, 227b, 353b, For specific instance please see discussion in the following pages. It may also be added that the documents like tamassuks, qabuliyat, muchaika etc. which are available for the ghair paimoods areas do not likewise, make any reference to the bantha. Similarly the documents reflecting actual revenue - returns mention for such area the salami or giras salami as distinct from bantha-salami which is specified in the paimooda parts only.

2. See also S C Misra, *Rise of Muslim Power in Gujarat*. p. 205
The *chauth* is another expression which is also used to describe the Primary zamindar's right in certain parts of the *subah*. Though by and large associated with the Marathas, the *chauth* seems to have been in vogue in Gujarat prior to their appearance on the political scene of the province.\(^1\) The term which is left undescribed in the available sources, seems to have carried more than one connotations, viz; the possession (i.e. land) the share of a Primary zamindar in the produce and finally the state's share.

To begin with, in its statistical account of lands and village of *pargana* Bheel (*sarkar* Ahmadabad) the *Account* uses the expression *chauth* in conjunction with the *bantha giras*.\(^2\) Of 72 villages carrying area statistics of the apportioned lands the *Account* specifies one part of the divided lands.

---

1. *Yad-dasht-dastur-ul amal, pargana haveli Ahmadabad, fasli-i Kharif-o rabi 1053 fasli* (1645AD), *pesh-az julus-i padshah Alamgir, PC No. 50* (f.18b). Its holder when he happened to be a *zamindar* was called *chauthia*. *Tarikh-i Soreth* (Junagadh MS) f.13.

2. To cite a representative example (*Account*, f.178a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mawza Dhamaliya</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire area</td>
<td>2904 bigha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitations etc.</td>
<td>213 bigha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivable area</td>
<td>2691 bighas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bantha</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>chauth-giras</em></td>
<td>raiyati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672 bigha</td>
<td>2018 bigha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 biswa</td>
<td>5 biswa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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lands under rayiat and the other under bantha giras (or
simply giras and bantha). Divided the same way but the
apportioned lands in the remaining 58 villages have been
placed under the expression raiyati and the bantha - chauth
giras. Thus, the chauth has been added to the bantha-
giras, features of which have been discussed above. At this
stage any inference would be far from satisfactory. However
in the light of evidence cited below the chauth would appear
to be identical to the bantha in spirit but in form the two
could also differ from each other.

When used in conjunction with bantha or bantha-giras
the chauth seems to have denoted what otherwise the bantha
stood for. The available dastur-ul amal for the same
pargana (Bheel) and contained in the pages of the same work
specifies rates for the bantha (and raiyati) having no
reference to chauth in anyway, thus equating bantha with
the rest of expressions used to denote the same portion of
lands.

Another set of evidence equates chauth with the imperi-
al claim on the bantha (of giras). The lands of the vil-
lages of pargana Kadi were categorised as giras and

1. Ibid, ff. 174a-81b.
2. Ibid, ff. 182a-82b.
raiyyat. The dastur-ul amal available for the pargana specifies rates for bantha, the expression not used to describe the relevant portion of land in any of the villages of the pargana. And then, the offering made by holders of the giras (i.e. bantha) lands in 14 of the villages of the same pargana is termed chauth bantha. As such the chauth might be equated with the bantha, i.e. giriasas' possession and then with the state's claim on the possession. But the evidence does not help us to differentiate chauth from the bantha as and when the lands were apportioned and tenured.

------------------
1. Ibid ff. 309b-32a.
3. Yad dasht dehat pargana Kadi; PC No.3b. The document places the specified villages as held by Malik Musalmans Kameja- Muslims, Rajputs, zannardaran (Brahmans), badfaroshan (Bhats), Muslims, Kolis and Charans under the following expression: Musalmanan waghaira mutasarraf and -o chauth-i bantha b'jagirdaran midehand. Another document specifies Rs. 1014/6 annas during Kharif and Rs. 907/- during rabi crop season under the expression: chauth-i bantha-i Musalmanan mawza Mahej. Doc. jam-o Kharif pargana Dholqa, fasli-i Kharif .. 1128 fasli. PC No.9-10.
4. Please also see Selection from the Records of Baroda Government NO. II Vol II, p 1121 where it states that "Wanta lands were also known as chauth-wanta. Does it mean that chauth rights could be set aside by way of bantha (the division) ?
bantha and the bantha-chauth-giras.\(^1\)

But then chauth rights are also noticeable in those areas which were not covered by land survey and bantha talpad system. Pargana Birpur neither was covered by land survey nor were its lands divided into bantha-talpad.\(^2\) It is however described as chauthia pargana in which the (Superior) zamindar of Lunawara enjoyed chauth claims.\(^3\) Diwan Ranchhod ji of Junagadh also mentions the chauthias later in Nawabi territory of (sarkar) Junagadh.\(^4\)

The dastur-ul amal available for the pargana haveli Ahamdabad (1643 AD) lands of which had been surveyed and accordingly apportioned places it beyond doubt that the chauth beside denoting bantha, represented the share of the state and the giras as well. According to the dastur the produce of bantha-giras was divided into four equal parts.

\(^1\) Chauth literally means a fourth. The bantha as pointed out above, also stood for a fourth. But in actual practice the bantha could be less or more than a fourth, though it could be exactly equivalent to a fourth. The bantha-chauth-giras in the specified villages of pargana Bheel as a matter of fact, represented exactly a fourth. But then every fourth part of the apportioned lands is not termed chautha-bantha.

\(^2\) Account, f.215a.

\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) Tarikh-I Soreth (Junagadh MS) f 13. In a parwana dated 1172 AH /1758 AD reference is also made to chauthia-mugaddams but no other relevant information is furnished therein. SH Desai's private collection, No 24/1172 AH.
Out of it two parts were left with the raiyat. Out of the remaining two parts each of which represented a fourth of the entire produce of the bantha-giras, one part was to be taken by the state (chauth hissa-i sarkar). The remaining fourth part was marked as the girasias' share but a portion of it was also taken by the state.¹

It would therefore appear that the chauth denoted state's claim, share of Primary zamindar in the produce and, as also the apportioned part of land (bantha-chauth). It seems to have represented a fourth share whether in land or its produce, of the state and or that of the girasia or chauthia.

In the light of the preceding discussion it may be maintained that the Primary zamindar's was a superior right which was other than and stood above and co existed with other rights and claims.² Described as giras, bantha and chauth, the claim was legally recognised and customarily

1. Yad-dasht dastur-ul amal pargana haveli Ahmadabad, 1153 fasli op cit. It puts the rate as under: bantha giras--- az dastur raiyati nisf. chauth hissa sarkar = aza jumla chauth juzvi b'girasia dade, juzvi dar sarkar kharch namude. It may also be mentioned that the deduction out of the girasia's share of fourth was made for a short period. For details please see discussion in following pages.

well established\(^1\) Though the available evidence is not conclusive however it seems that the *giras* denoted the claim\(^2\), *bantha* (division) connoted the arrangement, a way to meet out the claim and the *chauth* stood for proportion of the claim. The *chauth* and *bantha* seem to have, in due course of time, come to denote the claim itself.

But all the rights designated as *giras* did not meet the state's approval. A European traveller, F.Martin (1681-2) noticed that "all the inhabitants round Baroda are robbers... Further north in the neighbourhood of Ahmadabad there existed a tribe of robbers called *gratias*." Unchecked by the Mughal police the 'gratias' became so bold that they

\-----------

2. The *Account* and the *Mirat* speak of the Rajputs and the Kolis in possession of lands prior to their forcible eviction and then of the settlement allowing them to hold a portion of their original possessions by way of *bantha* under the *bantha-talpad* system which for the first time, was effected by sultan Muzaffar Gujarati. In the bardic traditions the original possessions held prior to the emergence of *bantha* lands are identified as *giras*. *Rasmala* pp 255-6, 260-4, 299, 569. Besides, the *giras* existed even within the domains of the autonomous zamindars who granted it as subsistence to junior members (*bhayads*) of their respective families following rule of primogeniture in the matter of succession. *Rasmala*, pp 186, 586; also see for its presence in the self administered domains *Ain* II, p 120 (Idar); *Mirat-i Sikandri*. pp 363-4. *Giras* papers are available in the palaces of Bhuj, Bhaonagar and Jamnagar; *Selections From the Records of Baroda Government*, NO II, Vol. II p 853; H.W. Wilbeforce, *Bell*, *op cit*, pp 230-31. It may therefore be contented that *giras* claims existed prior to the *bantha* and in the areas where the latter did not exist at all.
ventured to attack villages where they levied contributions from the villagers and hold their headman to ransom if they refused to pay.\textsuperscript{1} The \textit{Mirat} also speaks of the exaction levied as \textit{giras} by the Rajputs and Kolis sometime after the \textit{bantha-talpad} system, was effected.\textsuperscript{2} Thus the present illegal form of \textit{giras} also emerged but it was different from the \textit{giras} which carried legal sanctity as discussed above. It may however be seen that the prevalence of \textit{giras}, the exaction, speaks of limitations of the Mughal security system in the countryside.

\textit{SHARE:}

It has been discussed above that the Primary zamindar's share in the produce was met out, administratively, in two ways, viz; by effecting a physical division of land and putting aside a fourth part of it by way of \textit{bantha} and, secondly, by allowing them a share directly in the revenues of the village.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} \textit{Memoires de F Martin}, II, pp 315-7, 351-3 cited in the "Piracy in the western seas in the Reign of Aurangzeb", \textit{Journal of University of Bombay} Vol V pt IV No 10 January 1939 p 5. The \textit{girasias} levied exaction (\textit{giras}) from the travellers also. SN Sen (ed.) \textit{Indian Travels of Thevenot And Caveri}, Indian Records Series, N.Delhi, 949, p.20. The two travellers call the \textit{girasias} as robbers whom they paid 'tole' between Cambay and Baroda.
\item \textsuperscript{2} \textit{Mirat-i Ahmadi}, l.p.174 During the post-1700 period the \textit{giras} acquired unmanageable dimensions for details, Chapter VI below.
\end{itemize}
The bantha has been identified as (Primary) zamindar's share, an equivalent of malikan of Northern India. From the farman of emperor Akbar it would, likewise, appear that no mehsul was to be demanded from the one fourth land of Kolis and others set aside as ordered. But another set of evidence strongly suggests that the state demanded a share, called bantha-salami out of revenue of the bantha lands.

According to the Account the girasias had 'accepted (to offer) salami on the bantha land to the sarkar-i wala' (bar zamin-i bantha salami-i sarkar-i wala qabul namudand) at the time the divisioning was effected during the period of the Gujarati sultan. The Mirat also suggests that it was paid even under the Mughals. But what portion of the bantha revenues was demanded by the state under the denomination of bantha salami has to be examined for ascertaining the share of Primary zamindars.

The girasias were required to surrender, by and large, a half of the bantha revenues in favour of the state by way of bantha salami. According to the earliest available das-tur-ul amal (c.1642-44) the bantha peasantry was required to

1. Irfan Habib, Agrarian System, pp 149-50.
3. Account, f.106b.
surrender a half of its produce of polaj lands during the 
Rabi' and Kharif seasons in pargana haveli Ahmadabad. The 
girasia was to retain a half of the portion thus extorted 
from the peasantry whereas the other 
was to be paid as bantha salami to the state.¹ Likewise two 
third of the produce of newly reclaimed banjar lands formed 
peasantry's share and the remaining one third was shared by 
the girasias with state on equal basis.² The dastur-ul amal 
which were in force during Auranzeb's reign and were not 
officially amended during later years for the bantha lands 
of girasias located in the parganas of haveli Ahmadabad, 
Bheel, Arharmatar, Petlad, Piplôd, Khanbat Dholqa and Nadiad 
specify the same share i.e. bantha revenues were shared 
equally between the state and the girasia.³ Instances show-
ing variation from what appears to be the common pattern 
mentioned above are also noticeable in the dasturs which, 
likewise, were not amended. In some of the villages of 
pargana Munda the salami on bantha was assessed on lump sum

----------------- 
1. Dastur-ul amal ... b'mohr Isa Tarkhan, PC Nos. 41-2 
2. Ibid, PC Nos. 45-7. 
3. Account, ff 182 ab, 409a; Dastur-ul amal PC Nos. 22, 
25, 31; Yad-dasht-dastur-ul amal, (dt.1060 fasli and 
1070 fasli) (Kharif). R.No. 56. Pune.
(bilmuqta) basis. The girasias holding bantha lands in mauza Tanbul (pargana Mehmudabad) enjoyed exemption from paying salami as per ancient custom. In some of the villages of the same pargana the girasias paid naqdi salami, rates of which are not specified.

Some changes in the rate of bantha salami seem to have been attempted during the course of the seventeenth century. The Account which specifies rates as were in force during, if not earlier than the reign of Aurangzeb and stood unamended for the rest of the period, does not speak of any change in direct terms. But sometimes it does not specify the rates and, instead states that the salami was assessed as per the ancient customs implying that changes might have been effected elsewhere. During the period of his subedar (1645-46) Prince Aurangzeb attempted upward revision of the rate of the state's claim on the bantha demanding an unspecified portion of the fourth of produce which the holder was

1. Account, f.339a. In rest of the pargana the rate of salami was the same as in pargana haveli Ahmadabad.

2. Ibid f.350a; for this village the work records the rate as under: mauza Tabul - qanun-i qadim, salami nadarad-mua’f. In the remaining villages it was assessed on the usual rates.

3. Thus for a pargana (sarkar) Ahmadabad it records the rate as under: bantha salami---qanun qadim ast. Ibid f 302b.
allowed to retain under Isā Tar Khan's dasturs.¹ But the prince's attempt appears to have been resented strongly² that is why, it seems the administration restored the status quo ante during the period of administration of Prince Dara's naib Ghairat Khan (1648-50).³

Sufficient information regarding the girasias' share in the villages lands of which were not divided into bantha and talpad is not available. But some idea of it may still be formed. According to the Account the produce of the raiyat in parganas of Mhorasa and Meghej (lands of which were not divided) was divided into two parts (Nisfa nisf), called hissa-i sarkar and hissa-i raiya. A fourth of the hissa-i sarkar was deducted as girasias' claim.⁴

Whether the girasias of the pargana were required to part with a portion of their share is not known specifically for these parganas. But the Account mentions girasias as being under the obligation of paying giras-salami.⁵ Another

2. For other similar actions taken by the Prince and thier impact please see discussion under Revenue Grantees of the present Chapter.
3. Naqi tumar ganwat... Ghairat Khan, PC Nos 46b-47a.
4. Account f. 353b.
5. Ibid f. 126a.
Dastur-ul amal (1050 fasli/1642-3AD.) however suggests that the salami on giras was nothing but an equivalent of bantha salami. Thus the peasantry in sarkar Pattan was required to surrender half of its produce of Polaj lands during Kharif season. Out of the state's share (az jumla sarkar) which thus amounted a half of the produce, a fourth was deducted as giras. Out of the giras (az jumla giras) the state demanded a share called salami amounting to a half of giras in some places and two fifth in other. Thus the girasia was left with a half or three fifth part of the fourth portion of the revenues. It comes to 6.25 and 7.25 percent of the produce excluding talpad. It may thus be seen that the girasia's share baring few exceptions mentioned earlier whether holding bantha-giras or giras ranged between 6.25 to 7.25 per cent of the produce (or 12.50 and 14.50 percent of the bantha, inclusive of talpad.

The bantha revenue being not entirely retained by the girasia who had to share it with the state, generally on

1. Dastur-ul amal fasli-i Kharif, 1150 fasli Nawab Radhanpur's unindexed private collection, Radhanpur. To reproduce the operative part of the dasturs:
   Sarkar Pattan -- amal-i batai.

2. Cf. Irfan Habib, Agrarian System, pp 142-3,147,149-50
equal basis, bantha may hardly be equated with the malikana which was an exclusive privilege of zamindar.\(^1\) The bantha in the present context, bears closer identity to the zamindari which had been curtailed rather than the zamindar's share. The salami or bantha-salami\(^2\) was collected regularly and it could be levied both in cash and kind.\(^3\)

The sway of Primary zamindar did not cover the entire countryside of Gujarat.\(^4\) The Mirat refers to the raiyati\(^5\)

1. Cf. ibid. Irfan Habib has not taken into account the salami as a regular imperial claim.

2. N.A. Siddiqi (op cit p 23n 12 ) holds that the salami came to be known as peshkash during the Mughal age. The author has not been able to distinguish peshkash on bantha as paid by "zamindaran" and salami on the same by the girasias.

3. Yad-dasht haqiqal-i paidaish mawza Rupar, pargana haveli Ahmadabad 1002 fasli R No 37, Pune, and for the years 1023, 1024 fasli for the same village ibid. See also PC Nos. 14-5, Account ff 182b, 202b, 212b-13a, 220b-22b. 303a,339b; for the jagirdars collecting the share and selling it in the market, Corpus Inscriptio-num Bhaonagri, Antiquarian Deptt. Bhaonagar state, New Delhi: 1971 pp 47-8 ; Tamassuk, dt. 1097 fasli-i kharif. RNO.37, Pune.

4. For a general view of their sway Irfan Habib, Agrarian System, p 141; BR Grover "Narture of dehat-i talluqa" p 166 But the intermediary zamindars would enjoy right even within the raiyati tracts.

5. The term is also used to denote the revenue paying villages as apposed to villages which refused to pay taxes and were, therefore, known as zortalab, mehwas or mawas in Gujarat. Account ff 311a,314a, 316b. In view of its submissiveness a zamindari village could be, as it was, called raiyati ibid ff.225a-6b.
villages as distinct from the villages of Primary and the
directly administered territories. The available evidence casts sufficient light
on the existence of the raiyati lands within the villages, otherwise known as zamindari ('girasias') villages, necessi-
ating modification in the present understanding of the term
raiyati vis a vis talpad in their association with the
bantha possessions.

The parts of land originally termed talpad were, by
and large, called raiyati in contradistinction to zamindari
(girasia) lands (bantha-giras) under the Mughals. Thus the
talpad portion of lands in each of the 92 (out of 84 vil-
lages comprising the pargana Bheel) villages lands of which
were divided, is termed raiyati. To cite a representative
example:

1. Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp 215-17. Account ff 176b,181b. According to the Account (ff 81b-82a) the
diwani subah had to maintain detailed information regarding the makan-i zamindari, haqiqat-i giras, raiyati and mehwas and bantha and raiyati.

2. Account, ff. 175a-81b.

3. Ibid. f.178a
**mawza** Dhamaliya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire area</td>
<td>2904 bigha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitations etc.</td>
<td>213 bigha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivable area</td>
<td>2691 bigha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

: **bantha**

- **raiyati**

- **chauth-giras**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>672 bigha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 bigha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 biswa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 biswa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidently the *talpad* portion of land is described as the *raiyati*.¹

Secondly, the *talpad*, for that matter *raiyati* lands constituted part of this village otherwise called *talluqa-i girasia* (or *talluqa-i zamindar*).²

The detailed break up of area figures of 116 villages described as *talluqa-i mutafarriqa-i girasia* (in contradistinction to *talluqa-i zamindar*) in a document is recorded the following way.³

---

1. For other instances, *Account*, ff. 279a-90b; 309a-32a

2. As noted earlier, *Account* and the *Mirat* state in very definite words that the lands of 'watans' (awtan) and 'villages' of the Rajput and Kolis (i.e. zamindars and the girasias) were divided into the *bantha* and *talpad* i.e. both the portion of land were thus there within one and the same village or villages.

3. *Yad-dasht dehat-i pargana* Kadi, *PC* Nos. 3b-4a, 6b-7b; *Account*, ff. 309a, 316a, 318b-9b, 320b-21b, 324a-25a, 327b, 330b.
Mawza Nadri\(^1\) 
Mawza Firozpur\(^2\) 
(pargana Kadi) 
(whole area) = 725 bigha = 750 bigha 

(area under) habitations etc. 
= 150 bigha 140 bigha 
Cultivable area = 575 bigha 610 bigha 
raiyati = 431 bigha 460 bigha 
giras = 144 bigha 150 bigha 

It goes to establish it beyond doubt that the raiyat\(\text{t}\) lands did exist within the talluqa villages. As such, the sway of the zamindar (giras\(\text{i}\)) did not cover the entire area even of the villages which were identified as taalluqa\(-i\) girasia, taalluqa\(-i\) chauthia or else as the taalluqa\(-i\) (Superior) zamindar\(^3\) which we have discussed in Chapter 1(2).

1. *Dehat\(-i\) pargana Kadi*, op.cit., *PC* No. 4a identifies the villages as held by a Bhat, a chauthia; read with *Account*, f. 331b.

2. *Dehat\(-i\) pargana Kadi*, op.cit *PC* No. 6a includes it in the villages of girasia talluqa; read with, *Account*, f. 352 a.

It would therefore appear that the taluqa did not necessarily connote the exclusive zamindari possession, at least in the context of Gujarat.

Another set of evidence which furnishes details of cropped area under various titles (i.e. rights) goes to establish that the talpad could be identical to as well as different from the raiyati lands. Thus details of area statistics of mawza Aslali pargana (haveli Ahmadabad) may be reproduced to establish the point of identity between the two --

(Total cropped area) = 1206 bigha

1. **Raiyati**

   A - Kameja kashta = 272 bigha

   B - Paikashta = 729 bigha

2. **Bantha-giras**

   = 205 bigha

The entire cropped area of the village (1206) consisted of raiyati (1001 bigha) which may be identified as talpad, and the bantha-giras (205 bigha). In the present case the

talpad may be identified as and equated with raiyati. Similar details available for mawza Rakhyal buzurg \(^1\) (1714-15) may be cited to differentiate one from the other Raqba (i.e. total cropped area) = 647-10

1. **Talpad**

   (A) **Raiyati**

   (i). Kameja = 107-10

   (ii). paikashta = 317-0

   (B) **Napa-pusaita**

   = 66-00

2. **Bantha-giras**

   = 157-00

It would thus appear that the entire cropped area of the village (647 bigha, 10 biswa) comprised talpad (490/10) and the bantha-giras (157/0). Secondly the area of talpad (490/10) is more by 66 bigha, than that of the raiyati (424/10) i.e. the talpad comprised the raiyati and the Napa-pusaita \(^2\) which being 66 bigha speaks of the difference. Besides, the raiyati lands were constituted by the area held

---

1. *Mazruat pargana haveli Ahmadabad, fasli-i kharif, 1122 fasli, mawza Rakhyal buzurg, PC Nos. 116-21; Ibid, 1126 and 1130 fasli, PC Nos. 110-14, 129-30; Similar documents for mawza Shaistabad (1125 fasli), Sorpur (1128 fasli). Shelikpur (1131 fasli) and Gopalpur (1131 fasli) for kharif, R.No. 31, Pune.

2. The *napa-pusaita* lands were held by the revenue grantees. For details please see following sections of the present Chapter.
by kameja (resident-cultivators, peasant proprietors) and the paikasht, non-resident cultivators.¹

It would, therefore, appear that the talpad and the raiyati alike denoted lands which did not constitute possessions of (Superior and) Primary zamindars. But the raiyati stood exclusive of the lands which had been set aside by way of revenue grants whether conditional upon or free of service.² Besides, the raiyati like talpad could be found in the villages which otherwise were identified as zamindari villages, at least within the ones lands of which were divided into bantha and talpad.³

It is thus evident that the sway of zamindari did not cover the entire countryside. Even within the taluqa village Primary zamindars' economic claims could as such, be confined to the bantha portion alone still their association with the entire village was maintained, for the bantha-dars


2. For the lands marked as wazifa (i.e. madad-*i* ma'ash) beside pusaita being excluded of raiyati but included in the talpad, mazruat pargana haveli Ahmadabad, fasli-i kharif, 1127 fasli, mawza Palri Kakej, R.No. 21, Pune.

3. But raiyati could also be there where talpad lands were non-existant.
were to keep watch and ward and police the villages of their respective possessions. 

To ensure that the Rajput and Kolis performed the required duty and that they did not create disturbance they were obliged to furnish reliable securities which were procured by thanedars and faujdars, and sometime by the Nazim.

Some information about the castes of the Primary zamindars is also available. A scrutiny of the evidence would suggest that though the bantha and giras lands were also held by the Jats, Ahirs, Bhats, Charans, Brahmans, Maliks and other Muslims but the Rajputs and Kolis were the dominant zamindari castes. It is important to note that the clansman of the Superior zamindars and their brotherhood (brathri) and brethren (brathran) were amongst the holders of giras claims. They are moreover described the same way brathran or brathri in available documents. It is worth submitting that the recalcitrance is generally associated

2. The Nazim had to ensure procurement of the securities from leading recalcitrants. Mirat-i Ahmadi, I. pp. 173-4, 210, 303; Account, f. 106a, Tamassuk, Baroda, 99.
3. Ain, II, pp 120-4; Account, ff, 105b-6a, 175a-75b, 309a, 405a; Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, pp 173-74, Ibid, Supplement, pp 190, 211-8, 225, 228-29; Mirat-i Sikandri, pp. 363-64. Dehat pargana Kadi; Op.cit.
4. Dehat pargana Kadi; op cit.
and the rebellious elements are described in terms of castes.

The state seems to have been quite conscious of the recalitrance in its association with caste. Beside taking immediate steps of punitive nature against the rebels it seems to have made preventive arrangement for controlling and containing the recalitrants. Rebellious character of a caste seems to have gone a long way in determining the territorial extent of an administrative unit meant to enforce, among other, the law and order. Then the rebellious girasias and their possessions could be placed under a separate administrative unit by dividing the existing one, presumably for exerting greater pressure and maintaining

1. Thus 'malevolent' Kollis and Kathis, zxortallab Jhala Rajput, 'distracted' Kolis, 'misguided' Kolis etc. are the most common expressions used by Ali Muhammad Khan, the last diwan-i subah, Mirat-i Ahmadi; I. pp 174, 178, 211. Also rebels from Akbar to Aurangzeb are described the same way Ibid I.pp 173, 210-16, 220, 253-54, 292, 324-26, 330-343, and Ibid I.pp. 304, 331, 336-37, 345. It was presumably on account of close identity between caste and recalitrance that is why caste, mawas and giras are used interchangeably as if no shade of distinction existed between them. Tabqat-i Akbari, ll. pp 381 390; Ibid, ill pp. 138, 184, 186; Mirat-i Ahmadi, I. p. 213 read with Amal-i Saleh, ll, pp 339-40


3. Account f.405a The Ain too also specifies the parganas which were associated with a single zamindari-caste; please also see Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp.203, 211-18.
strong vigil through the added strength of troops.\textsuperscript{1} Sometime additional troops were also posted to keep the Kolis and other within bounds.\textsuperscript{2} The state also assessed the Rajputs and Kolis' personal (non-zamindari) lands at concessional rates and granted them revenue free land.\textsuperscript{3} Whether these favors were granted with a view to woo them is a matter of speculation. In spite of all these steps, the state does not seem to have succeeded much in managing the rebellious element, much less in changing their rebellious nature.\textsuperscript{4} If therefore seems that the zortalbi had come to stay and was treated as fait-accompli. Since a drastic change in the caste composition of zamindars of the subah could not be

\begin{enumerate}
\item Thus in all 700 sawars were maintained to manage the Kolis of Azamabad, a small sized pargana. \textit{Mirat-i Ahmadi Supplement}, p. 190; for the girasias holding these village called mehwasi, \textit{Account}, ff.175a-75b. Similarly pargana Jhalawar was broken into two (Virang-aon and Halwad) to contain zortalab Jhala Rajputs during Aurangzeb's reign. \textit{Account} f 22a; \textit{Mirat-i Ahmadi; Supplement}, pp.192, 219 cf \textit{Ain} ii, p, 249.

\item \textit{Account}, f309a; \textit{Mitatt-i Ahmad, Supplement}, pp.190, 192-3, 197.

\item \textit{Account}, ff.202a-2b, 220b, 222a, 349b, 359b; Isa Tar Khan's \textit{dastur, op.cit}; For the revenue grants please see discussion under Revenue Grantees in the following pages.

\item The villages and parganas wherein the state had reportedly applied coercive methods or granted concessions are continuously described as zortalab and generally with no revenue returns (hasil nadarad). \textit{Account} ff.172a-72b, 224a-26b, 312b, 315a, 316b, 318a, 319a, 321a, 324a, 330a,. Besides the Kolis and Rajputs are continuously described the same way.
\end{enumerate}
effected quite continuity in the caste-based recalcitrance is quite understandable. Under Aurangzeb incidents of recalcitrance seem to have increased further.¹

Instead of taking a drastic step to effect change in caste composition of zamindars, Aurangzeb desperately resorted to inflicting the most severe punishment — "girasias and zamindars who are mischief mongers, rebellious and confirmed offenders should be killed".²

It may also be pointed out that there were also multi-caste zamindari holdings. Thus bantha-giras lands in village Kalba (pargana haveli Ahmedabad) were held by Ranji Koli, Saiyed Akram, Saiyed Inam, Malik Muhammad, Bhawan Farmar, Sangram Gohel and Jai Singh Jadav.³ Similarly Charans, Bhats

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


2. Mirat-i Ahmadi, I p,279. It was also provided that "they could be killed on evidence against them." But the qazi released a number of girasias who had been imprisoned at the chabutra-i kotwali. Presumably the faujdars failed to bring evidence against them before the qazi. The emperor then ordered that "after this confirmed (?) rebels should be confined to jail and not released" by the qazi (Ibid.p 304) They were to be detained without substantiative evidence It seems none from the villagers would take the risk of speaking against the girasias.

Brahmans, Maliks and other Muslims held bantha-chauth lands in the villages of pargana Kadi. But references to non-Rajput-Kolis appear only far and few between and negligible number of zamindars belonging to other castes would obviously not have affected the position of the dominant castes.

As regard the mode of possessing zamindari lands by the members of the same family, it could be held in two ways. In the first place the entire lands could be held collectively without affecting physical division of land. The share of each girasia in such cases was expressed in terms of annas. But in some cases physical division of lands could be effected and each share, in such cases, recorded in terms of definite area unit. Or else pattis (strips) of each girasia could be demarcated and marked.

In the light of the preceding discussion it may be observed that the position of Primary zamindars in the subah is marked by inter-regional and intra-regional variations. As compared to the Superior zamindars, this category enjoyed a wider social base and commanded influence at grass roots.

1. Yad-dasht dehat pargana Kadi, op.cit
2. Bombay Gazetteer, (Kaira), pp.82,89.
3. Yad-dasht muqaddaman waghaira, op.cit; Yad-dasht bantha-daran mawza Mehmudabad, PC No. 218
4. Hamilton Walter, op.cit I pp.640-1; Treaties, VI, p.267, Bombay Gazetteer, II p.211
level. Still it was exposed to bear the maximum of administrative burden, degree of which varied from place to place and time to time.

The Mughals attempted to reach the peasantry directly and thus contain the zamindars by reducing the area and degree of their control. The administration sought to manage them by exerting continual administrative pressure and maintaining a system of checks and balances. It also attempted to reduce their share. But it could not make effective inroads into the bastions of their power.

Though relatively docile, still the Primary zamindars were restive under the imperial hold. They tried to cash upon a favourable situation. Increasing recalcitrance could not be tackled by adopting harsh measures, much less bring about a qualitative change. Imperial attempts to exert pressure in greater degree met with appreciable success in the central part of the subah. But in terms of comprehensiveness over all imperial control seems to have been declining.

**REVENUE GRANTEES**

Like its predecessors the Mughal ruling class granted its rights in land or its usufruct to select individuals and establishments. The alienated rights were known as
There were *inam*, *inam-i altamgha* and *awkaf* grants which were different in name but were, in fact, very similar. Still other grants were described as *pusaita*, *rawania*, *ranwatia* and *devasthan* which were indigenous in origin but had been retained by the Mughals who kept up the practice of making fresh grants under regional nomenclature.

1. IMPERIAL GRANTS

A. *Madad-i Ma'sh*:

For a detailed view of the terms Irfan Habib, *Agrarian System*, p 298 & n. According to the Ain (I, p. 278) subsistence allowance paid in cash were called *wazifa*, lands conferred were called *milk* or *madad-i-ma'sh*. 'The two types of grants were covered by general term *suyurghal*'. N.A. Siddiqi, *op,cit* p 213.

Later on, it seems, the suyurghal came to be replaced by *wazifa* which covered all grants, both in cash and kind. Thus the Account records the granted revenues and lands as under:

_**Wazifa (pargana Bheel)**_

(a) *dams*: 203630 - (i) *madad-i ma'sh* 1,22,341  
   (ii) *ina'm* 61,289  
   (iii) *iwz-i rozina* 20,000

(b) *arazi*: 4386 bigha, 6 biswa and 10 *biswansis*.  
   Account, f 241a, see also *Ibid*, ff. 164a, 174bb, 183b, 203b, 218b.


3. The grants under regional nomenclature may broadly be categorized into (i) the *pusaita* lands held by intermediary zamindars and discussed in the preceding Chapter, (ii) the lands held by servants and artificers of village community and (iii) the ones held by persons who were regarded socially useful and influential.

In the present discussion these grants are referred to as indigenous grants.
In view of the observation that the class of grantees 'contributed in its own way towards the acceptance of Mughal authority by a considerable number of people'1 a study of the recipients of imperial grants and their credentials appears to be imperative.

The madad-i ma'sh grants were not an exclusive monopoly, either in theory or in practice, of any caste and community. However these were more commonly held by Muslims and even among them by the Sheikhs and Saiyeds.2 In Gujarat too the same people appear to have formed the dominant group throughout the seventeenth century. Emperor Akbar allowed the noted Shaikhs and Saiyeds to continue in their possessions granted earlier by Gujarati Sultans and also made fresh one.3 Emperor Jahangir is perceived to have 'moderated Akbar's stern policy a little'.4 The information contained in the Tuzuk and available documentary evidence goes to suggest that the Emperor showed his particular inclination towards the Sheikhs and Saiyeds of Gujarat and favoured

2. The Mughals and The Jogis of Jakhbar pp 21-3; Irfan Habib, Agrarian System; pp 307 & n 39; 309n 47.
4. Irfan Habib, Agrarian System p 311.
them with madad-i ma'\'sh the lands size of which ranged from
six bighas to an entire village.\textsuperscript{1} But their fortunes seem
to have touched a high water mark under Shah Jahan.

Under Shah Jahan the Sheikhs and Saiyed got madad-i
ma'\'sh grants which were larger in size and also appear to be
relatively numerous. The family of one Sheikh Muhammad Buk-
habi was recipient of villages, nine in number during his
reign.\textsuperscript{2} The Emperor also granted the same number of villages
to Sheikh Fatto, khadim-i rawza (of?) beside 700 bighas of
land under cultivation in 1629 and 1644.\textsuperscript{3} One Saiyed Faizul-
lah and Saiyed Azam were likewise granted five and two
village respectively.\textsuperscript{4} Similarly Saiyed Chand, Saiyed Idris
and Saiyed Abdar Razaque were granted one village each by

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Tuzuk, I, pp, 419, 425-26, 439-40; Junagadh SC No 411
Ext. 1 and 2 (mahal Una); Ibid, SC No 625 Exs. 5/4 and
5/6 (mahal Kutiyana) Ibid SC No 894 Exs 12 and 14
(mahal Kutiyana); Ibid, SC no. 1162 Ex. 1 (mahal Una);
Ibid SC No 1192 (mahal Una); Haqiqat madad-i ma'\'sh,
pargana haveli Ahmadabad, 1080 AH; f 9b, R No 22.
\item \textsuperscript{2} Junagadh SC No 2 Ex. 1, SC Nos 413, 420, 1137, 1162,
1192 (mahal Una).
\item \textsuperscript{3} Ibid, SC Nos 426, Exs 1 to 1d; 912, Ex Nos. 3, 5 and 7.
\item \textsuperscript{4} Ibid SC No 425 (mahal Una).
\end{itemize}
the same emperor.\textsuperscript{1} Besides, the emperor also granted lands
the area of which ranged from 20 to 750 bighas to other
Sheikhs and Saiyeds in large numbers.\textsuperscript{2}

Under Aurangzeb too the Sheikhs and Saiyeds seem to
have formed a dominant group but the area of land per indi-
vidual-grantee appears to be less than the one under Shah
Jahan. As per the available evidence the size of grant given
as madad-i ma’sh generally ranged between 20 and 100 bigh-
as, but in few instances it happened to be more than that.\textsuperscript{3}
Though Aurangzeb also granted entire village but the number

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
No. of grants & Size of grants (in bighas) \\
\hline
3 & 150 to 200 \\
7 & 100 to 145 \\
20 & 60 to 95 \\
75 & 5 to 50 \\
5 & each comprising an entire village. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textbf{Junagadh, SC No. 429 (mahal Una); Ibid, SC No 1123, Ex
10; Ibid, SC No 1190, Ex 9/3, 9/4 (mahal Kutiyana); Ibid SC Nos 853, 893 (mahal Mangrole); Sanad, parwanas, R Nos. 21,23, 27; Haqiqat-i madad-i ma’sh, 1080 AH, op
cit; Saiyed Sardar Halder's (Bharoch), Private Collection, un-indexed; PC No. 286/41/G. Please also see following notes.}

\footnotesize{1. Ibid, SC No 105, Exs 21 and 27; Ibid SC No 483, Exs.
22/3 to 22/7 (mahal Pattan Deo); Ibid, SC No 554, Exs,
E-1, 1/2, 1/3, 2/1, 2/5 (mahal Una).

2. Haqiqat-i madad-i ma’sh, op.cit, ff 2a to 21b; parwa-
nas, chakhamas and parwanchas, R Nos 21, 29 and 39,
Pune; PC No 284/41/G/Bharoch.

3. Area-wise break up of little more than 110 traceable
grants made in favour of Sheikhs and Saiyeds of Gujarat
by Aurangzeb may be summarised as under:
No. of grants & Size of grants (in bighas)
\hline
3 & 150 to 200 \\
7 & 100 to 145 \\
20 & 60 to 95 \\
75 & 5 to 50 \\
5 & each comprising an entire village. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\footnotesize{1. Ibid, SC No 105, Exs 21 and 27; Ibid SC No 483, Exs.
22/3 to 22/7 (mahal Pattan Deo); Ibid, SC No 554, Exs,
E-1, 1/2, 1/3, 2/1, 2/5 (mahal Una).

2. Haqiqat-i madad-i ma’sh, op.cit, ff 2a to 21b; parwa-
nas, chakhamas and parwanchas, R Nos 21, 29 and 39,
Pune; PC No 284/41/G/Bharoch.

3. Area-wise break up of little more than 110 traceable
grants made in favour of Sheikhs and Saiyeds of Gujarat
by Aurangzeb may be summarised as under:
No. of grants & Size of grants (in bighas)
\hline
3 & 150 to 200 \\
7 & 100 to 145 \\
20 & 60 to 95 \\
75 & 5 to 50 \\
5 & each comprising an entire village. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\footnotesize{1. Ibid, SC No 105, Exs 21 and 27; Ibid SC No 483, Exs.
22/3 to 22/7 (mahal Pattan Deo); Ibid, SC No 554, Exs,
E-1, 1/2, 1/3, 2/1, 2/5 (mahal Una).

2. Haqiqat-i madad-i ma’sh, op.cit, ff 2a to 21b; parwa-
nas, chakhamas and parwanchas, R Nos 21, 29 and 39,
Pune; PC No 284/41/G/Bharoch.

3. Area-wise break up of little more than 110 traceable
grants made in favour of Sheikhs and Saiyeds of Gujarat
by Aurangzeb may be summarised as under:
No. of grants & Size of grants (in bighas)
\hline
3 & 150 to 200 \\
7 & 100 to 145 \\
20 & 60 to 95 \\
75 & 5 to 50 \\
5 & each comprising an entire village.
of such grants comes to five\(^1\) which as compared to Shah Jahan’s reign is apparently less.

The above mentioned Sheikhs and Saiyeds were by and large, associated with the mausoleums (rozah) of sufi-saints where urs were organized and the Prophet’s birth day was celebrated\(^2\), the places and occasions of public attraction. Still other Sheikhs and Saiyeds received madad-i ma’sh grants because of their association with the madarsahs, the places of higher learning where Non-Muslims also could acquire education.\(^3\)

Besides there were other Muslims who were likewise favoured with madad-i-ma’sh grants on the grounds of poverty, large family establishment (Kasrat-ul ayal), orphanage, unemployment and some unspecified reasons. They were continuously favoured from emperor Jahangir to emperor Aurangzeb with grants, the size of which generally ranged between 18

\[\text{--------}\]

1. Aurangzeb’s farman, dt 17 Shawwal, 18 RY, Sajjada Nashin, dargah Edroosia, Surat; Mirat-i Ahmadi; Supplement, pp 37-8,


and 60 bighas and in a few instances it could be as more as 100,140 and 1300 bighas.¹ Then Muslim women were likewise favoured with the madad-i ma'sh grants as direct recipients as well as under the decrees and rules governing inheritance.²

Non-Muslims were also favoured with the grant of madad-i ma'sh lands from the time of conquest down to the onset of the eighteenth century.

Emperor Akbar granted Kailubad, a Parsi, 300 bighas of land together with palm and date trees in pargana Navsari (Sarkar Surat) by way of madad-i ma'sh.³ He also favoured one Somji Bhat (bad farosh) with a madad-i ma'sh grant comprising 30 bighas of land, an orchard and mawza Ahmadpur entirely (dar-o bast).⁴ Emperor Jahangir also granted two

1. Junagadh, SC No 554/1 (mahal Junagadh); Ibid, SC No 553 Ex. 5/3; Ibid, SC No 554 (mahal Una); Ibid, SC No 894, Ex 16 (mahal Kutiyan); Ibid, SC No 893 (mahal Mangrole); Haqiqat madad-i ma'sh, op cit, 10b; Haqiqat-i aima ma'sh, pargana haveli Ahmedabad R No 21 to cite few representative examples.

2. Baroda, 57, 70-73, 75-6, 79-82, 84; Haqiqat-i ma'sh, ff 1b, 7a, 12a-14b; SH Desal's private collections No 16/14-2.


4. Junagadh, SC No 1201 Ex. 4/3 (mahal Junagadh); His descendants were confirmed in the grant by Emperor Aurangzeb, in 1097 AH/1684 Ibid, SC No 263 (mahal Junagadh).
villages entirely to Shankar Bhat along with descendent in pargana Mangrolie (sarkar Soreth); 10 bighas of land to Chandu Sanghvi, a Jain in mawza Akbarpur (pargana Chawasli); 100 bighas of land to two Parsi priests, Mulla Jamasp and Mulla Hoshang of Navsari (sarkar Surat) and 15 bighas of land to Sukhdev Purohit for laying down a garden in the vicinity of Ahmadabad. 1

Tradition was kept up under Shahjahan and Aurangzeb. Shah Jahan granted one Naraindas Bhat 15 bighas of land (1634) by way of madad-1 ma'sh in pargana Una (sarkar Soreth). 2 Aurangzeb added 45 bighas of land (1670) together with a well to his possession in the same pargana. 3 Bhan Singh, another Bhat, was granted mawza Tari (pargana Kuti- yana alias Muzaffarabad, sarkar Soreth) entirely and 3350 bighas of land in another village sometime during Shah Jahan's reign. Qutubuddin Khan Khweshgi, faujdar of Soreth, during the opening years of Aurangzeb's reign, resumed the grant. When the matter was brought to his notice, Emperor

1. Ibid, SC No 995 Exs 11/1, 11/2; Bhanu Chand Charitra, pp 86-8; Muni Vidya Vijaya, Surishwar and Samrat, pp 368-89; "A farman of emperor Jahangir in favor of two Parsees of the Dordi family of Naosari" J.B.B.R A S; (1919-20), pp 419-20; Naql chaknamah, PC No 245. The Jain was granted land for the purpose of building a temple, laying a garden and a memorial in honour of the deceased Jain Acharya Vijaya Sena Suri.

2. Junagadh, SC No 40 Ex 6/5 (mahal Una).

Aurangzeb ordered its restoration. Bhaval and Raghunath, the Bhatas acquired two villages and two mahals of orchard from Shah Jahan and confirmatory farman of Aurangzeb after they had been disturbed in their possession by the local faujdar. Aurangzeb bestowed upon Narottamdas and other Bhatas the villages of Sardari and Baori and 15 bighas of land in 1697 by way of madad-i ma'sh grants. One Vasudev, a Brahman, was likewise granted 15 bighas of land by the same emperor.

The bulk of the madad-i ma'sh grants were conferred without imposing any condition in return. But some grants were conditional which though called madad-i ma'sh were,
however, different from the ordinary grants. Significant among these grants was the one held by a physician. The grant consisting of 100 bighas of land was conditional 'mashroot' upon his service of treating the patients (Khid-mat-i mualja-i marizan). Then Emperor Aurangzeb also granted village and hills of Palitana to Satidas jeweller, a Jain, in his capacity as a leading member of the sawak (Jain) community with the provision that the grass and timber etc. which was found on the hills would 'belong to the sawak community and that 'whosoever' would 'guard the hills and the temple (devasthan) should be entitled to the income of Palitana'.

B-INA'M

The ina'm grants appear to have been less numerous than the madad-i ma'sh and unlike the latter were generally held

1. The qazis, muftis and the muhtasibs were ex-officio holders of these grants. But these lands were not counted as part of madad-i ma'sh, ina'm etc. which were granted free of obligation. Account ff. 174b read with 96a; Ibid, ff 213a, 214a 338a read with, ff 96a, 97b. The official positions tended to be hereditary and therefore the lands too came to be held likewise. Ibid, ff96a-100a.

2. Ibid, f 97b; The physician could also be granted madad-i ma'sh lands free of condition in recognition of their service of treating "the poor and indigents". Hodivala, Studies in Farsi History, pp 167, 188; Likewise Khan Muhammad who was engaged in teaching in haveli Pattan was granted madad-i ma'sh lands. Account f 97b.

3. MS Commissariat, Imperial Mughal farmans in Gujarat. plate No XX.
by Non-muslims.¹ Emperor Shah Jahan granted (1634) a piece of chahi land measuring 15 bigha in the vicinity of Deiwara (pargana Una, sarkar Soreth) to Naraindas, a Bhat.² The Emperor also confirmed Bhavanidas and Narottamdas (1638) in the ina'm possession of mawza Sarhari and Baorl and 150 bigha of land (pargana Mangrole) which their deceased father had held on the basis of sanads issued earlier.³ Likewise the Emperor confirmed Shantidas, Ratanji and Lakshmi Chand in the ina’m possession after the death of Vardhman and Panju who held it along with their sons since 1628.⁴ Similar-

1. Of the known recipients of ina’m lands only five belonged to Muslim community. Junagadh, SC No 105, Exs 21, 27 (mahal Sutrapara); ibid SC No 481 (mahal Una); ibid, SC No 853 (mahal Kutiyana); Baroda, 65; Hakim Ruhulla Bharochi was given villages of Than, Sarvadi (pargana Okiesar) and Kukrawada (pargana Bharoch) by way of madad-i ma’sh after the physician had correctly diagnosed emperor Jahangir’s cause of illness and treated the empress Nur Jahan. The Empress granted these villages by a hukm, dt 22nd julus/1627 AD, of her own. Village of Chawaj was given as ina’m by the emperor vide his farman dt. 24 Rabī, 1, 1032 AH/1623AD. After the physician’s death in 1649-50 his sons were granted the three madad-i ma’sh villages by way of ina’m vide Prince Murad’s hasb-ul hukm. These documents are available with Sardar Saiyed Haider, inamdar of Bharoch. Copies of the same are there in Bharoch commission’s Report of 25 Aug 1805, District Record office, Bharoch.


ly another Bhat-family held mawza Bhadora (pargana Kutiyana) by way of ina'm from sometime before 1654. The same emperor had also granted mawza Ramlori (pargana Patla) to Barsa and Jatlan, Charans on condition of keeping vigil etc (b'shart-i muhafat-w khabardari-i rah-w daf'mutamarid). 2

Emperor Aurangzeb had ordered (1672-73) the "resumption of all grants held by Hindus" 3, and thus, it is observed, 'completely reversed Akbar's policy'. 4 Following the order the above mentioned mawza Ramlori granted by Shah Jahan was resumed. 5 But on the Charans' representation the grantee was allowed to retain the same. 6 But the same emperor granted mawza Rakhyal khurd (pargana haveli Ahmadabad) by way of ina'm to Naraindas. 7 Likewise Bikhudas and Jagjiwandas were granted mawza Asja (pargana Mangrole) sometime during Shujat Khan's period of subedari (d.1701) confirmed in their possession in 1703 and are noticed in possession in 1729. 8

3. Ibid.
4. Irfan Habib, Agrarian System p 311 and n 55.
6. Ibid.
In 1704 the same emperor granted 200 bighas of chahi and barani land by way of ina’m to Mohanji and Raghunath. Also the Kolis of Chunwai, Amar Singh Bhat of mawza Ropra (pargana Idar) and Kanhaji Brahman of Mogdi (pargana Idar) are noticed in their ina’m possession from Aurangzeb’s times to the reign of Muhammad Shah. Non-Muslims who had been granted lands from Akbar to Aurangzeb in sarkar Soreth under whatever nomenclature and referred to in the present discussion, continued to hold the same as late as, if not later than, 1880-90. Aurangzeb’s above quoted order may, therefore, be regarded as a statement of policy which was hardly followed even by himself.

There were other grants which, though not given any name, were however identical to the ones mentioned above. Emperor Akbar granted (1592) hills of Sidhanchal, Girnar, Taranga, Abu etc (subah Gujarat) to Hirvijya Suri, Acharya

1. Ibid SC No 668 Ex 8/4.
2. Yad-dasht dehat tappa Chunwai, amla pargana Jhalawar PC No R-1; Account, ff 170b, 171b.
3. All the Junagadh Settled case files and documents stand testimony to this fact.
4. Irfan Habib, Agrarian System, p 311 & n 55. The only available instance of resumption of grant held by a Non-muslim is the one already mentioned.
of Jain Swetamber community. The Emperor also granted (1595) 30 bighas of land and an orchard to Somji, a Bhat in pargana haveli Junagadh (sarkar Soreth). Emperor Jahangir granted 15 bighas of land to the sons of Sukhmal Purohit. Emperor Shah Jahan granted 39 bigha and 15 biswas (1651) of land under cultivation to Raizada Gopaladas (pargana haveli Ahmadabad). The Emperor also bestowed 39 bighas of land and a well upon Bhakar and Mordas.

The nature of rights enjoyed by the grantees seems to have been qualified by the composition of the lands so granted. The grantee was not invested with any rights not claimed previously by the state. The state merely transferred its rights over the revenues of the area thus alienated.

---

1. For the fascimile of the farman see Memorial of the firm of Sheth Anandji-Kalyanji as the Representative of the Jain community in India in reference to their grievances about certain rights Re the Shatranjya Hills. The Times of India Press, Bombay, n.d. pp. 25-6.

2. Junagadh SC No 263 (mahal Junagadh); Ibid. SC No 1201, Ex 4/3.

3. Chakhamah, dt 22 safar, 1061 AH/1650, PC No 245. Since part of the grant originally demarcated had been covered in habitations, the grantee was given the land at another place under Shah Jahan's orders.

4. PC Nos 86.

5. Ibid, No 273; for similar grant by Aurangzeb Junagadh, SC No 893 Ex 1 (mahal Kutiyana); Ibid, SC Nos 838, 847, Ex 2 (mahal Kutiyana).

ated in grants'. The grants generally consisted of the
cultivable waste and the lands already under cultivation.

The state was 'the proprietor of all the jungles, unre-
claimed and unappropriated waste land' whereas the appropri-
ated land 'was owned by certain categories of the riaya'.

The grantee enjoyed the right to develop the waste land
on their own, or get it cultivated with the help of hired
labour or the tenants. Such tenants would not be evicted so
long as they paid the stipulated share regularly to the
grantee. But the land developed by him would be retained by
the grantee even after the grant was resumed. In the lands
already under cultivation the rights of the grantee for the
revenues and the 'land ownership rights' of the self-cult-
----------------------


2. Emperor Akbar had provided to give half of the area
already cultivated and the other half in cultivable
waste, called *ufita-dab, banjar-Laiq-i zira't*. (Ain, I p
179). But the rule was not strictly adhered to. The
general trend appears to have been to alienate the
minimum of revenue-paying (mazrua) lands. Junagadh, SC
Nos. 79, 89, 842, 894 (mahal Una); PC No. 284 /Bha/ 41g;
Junagadh, SC No. 849, 894 Ex 3/3 (mahal Kutiyana); PC No
273.


4. Tamassuk dt. 1082 fasli, Sardar Saiyed Haider's private
collection. Unindexed; BR Grover. 'Elements of continu-
ity...." p 16.

5. Mazruat wasifa mawza Khatwara. PC No 152; Tamassukh
1082 fasli, op. cit; Khasra mazruat taraf Rajpur, 1149
fasli PC No 163, see also PC No 93b; BR Grover "Ele-
ments of Continuity," p 16.
vating riaya co-existed.1

Secondly, the grantee's claim over the revenues vis a vis the state was also qualified by the nature of abalienated area. In the first place, the cultivable waste (banjar-liaq-i zirat or uftadah-laiq-i zirat) is described as kharif az jama i.e excluded from the jama (not assessed for paying revenues) at the time of making grants. From the available evidence it appears further that the uftadah lands even after they had been reclaimed but continued to be held in grant, were not assessed for fixing the jama.2 On the other the mazrura portion of granted land stood already assessed.

The individual-grant and grantee-wise jama was ascertained

1. Khatabandi Pakri Kochrab, pargana haveli Ahmadabad. PC NO 77; BR Grover "Elements of Continuity." pp 15-6; see also PC Nos 163 and 93b, op cit.

2. The Ain specifies the 'jama alienated under suyurghal', obviously the revenue otherwise demanded by the state from the lands already under cultivation.

The Mirat specifies (a) jama in dams (b) area of land (not covered by the jama and (c) the amount given in cash. (Mirat-i Ahmadi i pp 25-6). The area with no jama obviously is of the uftadah lands which remained unassessed. It goes without saying that the grantees did bring the uftadah lands under cultivation after the grant had been made.

One Saiyed Tahir was granted 45 bighas - 15 bighas already under cultivation and 30 bighas out of uftadah lands - as madad-i-ma'sh sometime during Shah Jahan's reign. The position in regard to jama in 1081 fasl/1673 is stated as under:

30 bigha - dam nadarad
15 bigha - 3150 dam
Haqiqat madad-i-ma'sh, ff 9a and 7b. RNo 22, Pune.
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after the chak had been demarcated. The same was recorded alongside the area of land, assessed revenue and the hasil (baqaid-i jama-o hasil).¹ Since the state is understood to have alienated its 'rights over the revenues', the question whether the state granted a specified jama or else the grant stood independent of the (revisable) amount of jama, may be answered with the information contained in the document entitled haqiqat-i madad-i ma'sh.

The grantee's claim over the grant seems to have been qualified by the amount of jama and the hasil of the granted land. Thus one Saiyed Saeed was granted 125 bighas and 14 biswas of mazrua land sometime before 1071 AH/1660 AD. Its jama was worked out and it stood at 50,000 dams. Consequent upon the upward revision (1081 fasli/1673 AD) the jama of the same land was fixed at 53027. The grantee paid Rs 56/- against the difference (3027-dams) of the amounts of jama.²

To cite another representative example, a grantee was given mazrua lands which initially carried a jama of 71500 dams. Later the jama was revised and fixed at 1,60,000 dams some-

¹ The Revenue Department maintained details of the alienated jama for the grantee, village, pargana, sarkar and then for the entire subah. Account, f 100a; The document which carried grantee and village-wise details for each pargana was called haqiqat-i madad-i ma'sh. Ibid; One such document is available in the Pune collection. op cit.

² Haqiqat-i madad-i ma'sh op cit f 223a.
time before 1673 AD. The grantee was allowed exemption (izzāfa muṣaf shud) from paying the revenues against the enhanced jama.¹ The state did not necessarily realize the revenues against the difference. Instead the area of land corresponding to the difference (arażi bazyaf)² in jama was realized.

In some cases the difference in the amounts of hasil originally granted and the increased one at later stage could likewise be realized.³

But, then, all the grantees do not appear to have enjoyed rights which were qualified by specified jama and/or hasil. Such grants were therefore described and held as bila-qaid-i dami-o hasil. The principle of resumption (baz yaft) was not applicable to them and the grantees not required to pay any amount of revenues to the state.⁴ Besides, the grantees who held villages 'entirely' (dar-o bast) were

1. Ibid f 219 a see also Ibid ff 167a-69b.
2. Ibid f 211a see also Ibid ff 115a-23b
3. Thus a person was granted a piece of cultivated land the hasil of which stood at Rs 394/4 annas. By the year 1673 the hasil figure rose to Rs 642/10 annas. The difference which being Rs 293/6 annas was realized by the state. Ibid f 56a see also Ibid ff 88a-92b
4. Ibid, f 97a see also Ibid ff 86a-89b. It may however be pointed out that part of the possession could be resumed at the time of confirmation in the inherited possessions. All the available instances pertaining to the ina'm lands record the grant under the expressions, bila qaid jama-o hasil. Ibid f 15.
required to surrender a portion of revenues and therefore not allowed to enjoy the whole of revenues taken from the peasantry.¹

The state maintained detailed account of the cropped area for both the crop seasons of the alienated lands presumably to effect detailed assessment through its own revenue machinery.² Also the sadarat maintained its mutasaddis to ensure that the mutasaddis of diwani would not levy taxes exemption from which had been granted.³ Sometime the fauj-dars and the subedars resumed the grants which had to be restored after imperial intervention.⁴ The grantees, by the closing years of Aurangzeb's reign, had grown bold enough as they are reported to have defied the diwan's orders and did not "produce their sanads for inspection".⁵

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

1. Ibid. ff 23a-9b ; please also see yad-dasht-haqiqat-i paidalsh pargana Dholqa sarkar Ahmadabad fasl-i kharif., 1130 fasl (PC Nos 14-17) which separately specifies 'jama b mae bazyafte aimma' (Ibid, 14b), collection from the dehat-i aimmadaran (Ibid 15b) under mal-o jihat and then bazyafte iaimma waghaira under sair jihat (Ibid, 16a).

2. The mazruat documents cited in the preceding discussion stand testimony.

3. Account ff.100 a & b

4. Junagadh, SCNo 1009 (mahal Kutiyana); Ibid SC No 995 Exs. 11/1 to 11/4, 15/1 (mahal Kutiyana)

5. Mirat-i Ahmadi; p 335. The diwan therefore approached the emperor who issued a farman asking the grantees to produce their sanads. Ibid.
In the year 1690 Emperor Aurangzeb issued a farman declaring that thereafter "the lands of the grantees would be retained completely and fully, without loss or reduction by the heirs of the deceased grantee generation after generation".¹ Still the state maintained rules governing succession. As per these rules the grantees' descendants were not necessarily allowed to inherit the possessions entirely though it was not invariably the case.² Whether these rules which stood unamended were actually enforced is not known. Aurangzeb's order had however placed the grantees on equal footings with the Primary zamindars.

**INDIGENOUS GRANTS**

Contemporary and near contemporary sources also refer to other revenue-grants which were known as pusaita, shasun, nakru, rawania, ranwatia, haria, halia, dharamdeva and devasthan.³

¹. Emperor Aurangzeb's farman cited in Irfan Habib, Agrarian System, p.306 & n36
². Account, ff, 100b-101a
³. The terms stand for the grants which the Britisher categorised as 'personal' (jat inam) and the 'institutions'. Among the former were the haria (given to the family of a person who died fighting for the village); ranwatia (given to the 'warriors' family who died in an attack on the enemy), and halia (tombstone field) given for support of a tomb in memory of some Charan, Bhat or Brahman who had killed himself in the interest of the village. The other category comprised the grants which were meant for the maintenance of temples (devasthan,
Granted by the native chiefs and the village communities 'according' to the ancient customs to patronise families and persons of various description regarded 'useful to the community.' These custom-based grants were honoured by the Mughal administration also. However these grantees were generally meted out a differential treatment and their grants were not equated with the imperial grants discussed above.

The pusaita lands were found almost in every part of the Subah. On the basis of their holders the contemporary documents categorise the pusaita into pusaita apa and the pusaita na'pa. The two forms were meted out different treatments.

---Continued...

*dharamdeva* or *dharamdan*, mosques and tombs, The pusaita which were more common and identical to zamindari lands, will be discussed below. It may be pointed out here that in Kaira region pusaita was known as nakru and in Idar it could be called shasun. In other parts haria, yachuk and nakru could be applied to the pusaita itself. Bombay Govt. Rev. Sel. XXXIX, New Series, p. 23; The East India papers, III, p. 708; Tarikh-i Soreth, ff. 205-6; Baden powell, Land System of British India; III, pp. 300-2.

---


2. These grants were neither recorded with nor counted as part of *madad-i ma'sh* etc. Also there were separate *dastur-ul amals*, as will be seen below, for the pusaita etc.

The *napa-pusaita* lands were held by the *ahl-i khidmat*\(^1\) (the service rendering people) and the ones other than the serving people (*siwai ahl-i khidmat*).\(^2\) Beside the artificers the other holders of the *napa-pusaita* are identified as the Jogis, Brahmans, B hats, Charans, Kolis and the persons attached to the mosques and tombs of saints.\(^3\)

There were then the *pusaita* lands which, on the basis of its holders' caste, bore caste-appellations. Thus we come across *pusaita-i Koliyan*, *pusaita-i zinnardaran* and *pusaita-i badfaroshan*.\(^4\) Later on the British found the Gosains, Bairagis, Brahman s Bhats, Saiyeds, descendents of 'noble' 

1. Among the *ahl-i khidmat* are mentioned the *pagi* (the tracker), *qasid* (the village messenger), *halaikhor* (scavenger), *hajjam* (the barber), *bhagalia* (?), and *dehdan* (?). *Dastur-ul amal* (Prince Aurangzeb), PC No. 49; also the references cited in the preceding note. These serving people seem to have held these lands conditional upon service and may not be regarded as revenue grantees. Later on the British also regarded them as "the inferior class of village servants" who were regarded as part and parcel of the village community. *Bombay Govt. Rev. Sel.* III, p. 649. The Account (ff.302) describe them as *lazim-i abadan-i deh*.

2. Among the artificers are mentioned tailor (*Khabbat*), carpenter (*darudgar*), iron-mith (*ahangar*), potter (*Kazar*), shoemaker (*mochi*), *rebari* (?), and *Kalal* (?). Account ff 339a,340a; *Mazruat* Docs, PC Nos. 99,114, 120, 125-126, 128, 146, 149, 164. The present section held the lands obviously for the professional indispensable services rendered by them to the village community.


4. *Mazruat* Docs. P.C.Nos 94,98,9,146,159; *Account* ff. 339a,340a
Hindu and Muslim families in possession of the pusaita lands from earlier times.\(^1\) As such these lands were held, among others, by the members belonging to high caste, the ones associated with the high caste people and the Kolis—the caste which was particularly singled out for its refractory attitude.\(^2\)

The apa pusaita lands were held by the Kolis, Upadhyai, Mehta, Brahmans, Bhattas, Muslims and others.\(^3\) The basis of holding these lands is however not known.

The devasthan lands were similarly spread over the villages. From the detailed statistical account of the lands of villages of pargana Kadi (sarkar Ahmadabad) it would appear that 105 out of 282 villages had the devasthan lands area of which ranged between 1 and 25 bighas.\(^4\)

2. For the references about Kolis please see the discussion in the preceding pages. According to the Rasmala the influence of the Bhattas and Charans was very powerful. (p 572.) They were closely connected with the Rajputs (ibid, p.558); They were in some places cultivators, in other bankers, but their more legitimate occupations are those of acting as securities and recording the genealogies of their Rajpoot clients*. Person of Bhat and Charan was held "sacred“. Ibid.
3. PC Nos 146.
The *pusaita* grants were made by the Mughals also. One Mahadji was granted 45 bighas of land (mawza Pastwara, paragna Somnath Pattan) by way of *pusaita* in 1629 AD to put a well into use for irrigation purposes. He was also granted exemption from paying irrigation cess (*mehsul-1 chah*) under the same grant.¹ Two Charans, Lekha and Rana were granted (1668) 20 plots (qita's) of land from mawza Batwa (paragna Batwa) and 16 plots of land in mawza Badola (paragna Mangrole) by way of *pusaita* out of Khalsa lands on condition of performing watch and ward (*b-shart-i khidmat chowki-o pehra dehat*).² Similarly a son of the desai who had been murdered by a patel was granted 85 bigha of chahi and barani lands and a well by way of *pusaita* by emperor Aurangzeb.³

The holders of *pusaita* rights were not necessarily the cultivators themselves. Like the *madad-i ma'sh* lands the *pusaita* could be *khudkasht* as well as the one held and cultivated by the peasants.⁴

The *pusaita* lands could be subject to payment of a portion of revenues to the state and therefore the grantee did not enjoy full exemption. During Isa Tār Khan's period of

¹. SH Desais private collection NO 14/(1)2.
². *Junagadh*, ScNo 224 (*mahal* Mangrole)
³. SH Desais private collection, Nos. 14/1 (5) and 14/1 (6).
⁴. *FC* Nos. 164b, 210-11.
subedari holders of the naps pusaita enjoyed complete exemption from paying revenue to the state. But prince Aurangzeb demanded two third of revenues and eight annas per bigha on the napa pusaita of Brahmans and Bhattas; entire revenue from the pusaita of village artisans and half of the revenues from the ones of village-servants. Ghairat Khan, prince Dara's nalb granted full exemption to the ahl-i khidmat, demanded only two third of revenues from the artisans and the Bhattas and Brahmans but they were allowed exemption from paying 8 annas per bigha as demanded under Aurangzeb. The prince also demanded two third of revenues from the rest of the holders of napa pusaita. Ghairat Khan fixed the state demand @ Rs. 1/4 annas per bigha.

The holders of apa-pusaita were to pay a third of the revenues of the reclaimed banjar and two third of the same of lands already under cultivation during both the crop seasons under Isa Tarkhan. But prince Aurangzeb demanded

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

1. PC Nos. 42a; The same position continued during the reign of Aurangzeb and later on in pargana Arharmatar and Kadi Account ff 182a, 302a-b.
2. PC No. 51.
3. Ibid, No. 47b.
4. Ibid. Nos. 47b, 51.
5. Ibid Nos. 41b, 45b, 46a.
entire revenues during the *rabi* crop season. Ghairat Khan restored the status-quo ante. The rates as enforced by Ghairat Khan seem to have remained unchanged.

In brief it may be seen that the Mughals not only continued the grants, extended due patronage to the regional customs by keeping up the old grants and making new grants in the local fashion. Regardless of their usefulness for the Mughal state, the grantees appear to be the persons having social roots which, apparently, forced the Mughals to renew the old grants and make fresh one. The Mughals however did not allow the grantees to acquire administrative hold over their possessions which continued to remain under direct hold of the state. Still the grantees grew bold enough to defy the state that had granted them the rights in the first place and had stood as protector thereof.

---


2. *Ibid* Nos. 47a-7b. In some *parganas* the grantees were to pay 8 annas per *bigha*, one *mehmudi* per *bigha*, something on *bilmugte* basis or one to two mehmudis per *bigha*. Account ffs. 162a, 302a, 339b-40a, 350a.