CHAPTER - I (1)

THE SUPERIOR ZAMINDARS

On the eve of the eighteenth Century

A significant feature of the Mughal subah of Gujarat was the large number of big and small, autonomous and semi-autonomous principalities spread all over. Like their predecessors, the Mughals effected a complete conquest of these principalities whenever and wherever it was possible but in many cases where subjugation was impracticable they contented themselves with either the exaction of tribute or military service, or both from them.

Before examining the position and the role played by the Superior zamindars in society it may be worthwhile trying to identify them and determine their territorial sway. This may be done with the help of evidence contained


2. Some initial explorations in this direction have already been made. For example, P.Saran in his The Provincial Government of the Mughals 1526-1658 (pp 117-24, 137-41) makes a selective study of the noted 'Chiefs. Irfan Habib's identification of the 'autonomous chiefs' though useful in a number of ways is, however, not wholly dependable. Not very exhaustive in detail, his observation that 'the entire sarkar of Soreth was held by the tributary Chiefs' apart from being incorrect is contradicted by his earlier statement that 'the villages of certain mahals of sarkar Soreth' being raiyati were situated outside the sway of zamindars; see Agrarian System of Mughal India, pp 142 and n.188. In his
Akbari, other works of the same period and the
Radi of Ali Muhammad Khan Bahadur, last Diwan of
The Mirat-i Ahmadi, the best work so far known on
rat, is particularly important for the first half
of the eighteenth century. Last but not least is the Diwan's
Account which is a compilation of documents that were avail-
able in the provincial office during the sixth decade of
the eighteenth century. The work furnishes almost an exhaus-
tive list of all the Superior Zamindars, and their watans
that existed as late as, if not later than, the first quar-
ter of the eighteenth century.

To begin with, the term 'zamindar' finds a definite
usage with specifiable connotations in the regional docu-
ments pertaining to the subah of Gujarat and in the Diwan's

--------Continued--------

...Continued...

descriptive study of the chieftains during Akbar's
reign A.R.Khan delineates the territories of 'Chiefs'
of Gujarat, (Chieftains in the Mughal Empire During the
Reign of Akbar, pp 77-96). His identification, however
suffers from two major defects: he has not been able to
identify all the chieftains, overlooking, for example,
the chief of Sunt, all those who are identified as
chiefs do not always fall in this category. Thus for
example giraslas and some of th lands like giras, which
were not the chieftaincies is have been included among
their possessions. For detailed references please see
the discussion in the following pages and Chapter V
below.
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Account. In these sources, the 'zamindars' (zamindaran) formed only a section of the landed aristocracy whose possessions were called 'makan-i zamindari', 'talluqa-i zamindar' and sometimes only 'zamindari'. A part or the whole of the offering made by them to the imperial government was termed 'peshkash'. Their possessions (makan-i zamindari) were grouped into zilas which, as will be seen later, were units other than parganas, mahals and sarkars. The 'zamindars' enjoyed a position distinctly superior to the one held by

1. In the chronicles, particularly written at the seat of imperial power, the term 'zamindar' has been used so loosely as to make it difficult to differentiate even between an autonomous chieftain holding vast tracts of land and a petty zamindar holding merely a fraction of a village in a directly administered territory --- a problem that has been commented upon by a large number of historians. See for example, Irfan Habib "The Zamindars in the Ain," Proceedings Indian History Congress-XXI session, 1958, pp. 320-3. B R Grover "Nature of dehat-i Taaluqa (zamindari village) and the evolution of taaluqdar system During the Mughal Age", pp 166-67; Irfan Habib, Agrarian System, pp 136-39, S. Nurul Hasan, "Zamindars under the Mughals" pp 17-8 N.A. Siddiqui, Land Revenue Administration under the Mughals (1700-1750), pp 21-3; 28-30.

2. It may be pointed out that the term 'makan' is not exclusively applied to the possession of zamindars. In the available sources it is applied to the area of jurisdiction (makan-i faujdari), territorial administrative unit (sarkars of the Subah) and the territorial unit(s) held by rebellious elements (makanat-i muftidan).
other members of the class. 1

Such evidence as is available throws light on the origin of two distinct sections of the superior landholders in Gujarat. During the reign of Sultan Muzaffar, and even later on, many 'zamindaran' who were duly accepted as being beyond the effective reach of administrative pressure retained their possessions (aksari zamindaran k' dast-i zor waqai b' anha n' raside) undivided in return for payment of annual tribute (peshkash-i harsala). 2 Likewise 'the big zamindars who held many (literally, most) parganas' were also permitted to retain their possessions undivided 'on condition of joining service and maintaining troops'. 3 They appropriated revenues of their watans in lieu of service and therefore were exempted from paying the peshkash. 4

The same Sultan also expelled a section of Rajputs and

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

1. The other section is termed girasia whose possessions are described as 'giras', 'bantha-giras', 'bantha-chauth-giras' and payments made to the government exacted from these holdings, are termed salami. This section though not exclusive of the 'zamindaran' under discussion, categorized as 'Primary Zamindar' is discussed in Chapters V and VI below.

2. Accounts f.106 b, Besides, a few zamindars who embraced Islam were given a preferential treatment. They were also allowed to retain their possession undivided on terms of offering peshkash-i harsala. ibid ff 106 b, 173 b; Mirat-i Ahmadī, Supplement, p 190.


4. Ibid, l. p 22; Account ff 9b, 10b-11a.
Kolis from their possession; they in turn rose in rebellion and forced the Sultan to come to a settlement. Accordingly, the Kolis and Rajputs were allowed to retain a fourth part of the land called bantha' of their native places (awtan) and villages. The remaining three parts of their possessions 'were attached to the government'. A particular section of the holders of bantha (banthadar) also came to be termed 'zamindaran' whose possessions (makan-i zamindari) were subject to the payment of peshkash from the time of the above named Sultan.

Emperor Akbar is said to have confirmed the above mentioned zamindars in their respective makans on the Sul-

1. Account, f. 106 b, Mirat-i Ahmadi, I. pp 173-4, Ibid, Supplement, pp 228-9. In actual practice it was the land of a village, and exceptionally the villages themselves, which were thus divided. The produce of the bantha land, or village, was also subject to divisioning between the state, the banthadar and the riaya. For detailed view, please see Chapters I, (2) and V below.

2. Account, f. 106 b. The statement is followed by a detailed list of zamindars along with their makans and watans in the subah and the amount of peshkash-i muqarr-rari-i nizamat (a fixed but revisable amount of tribute to be collected annually and assigned as the salary of nazim-i subah) shown against their makans. The other section which also held bantha lands was termed girasia and it was required to pay salami on its bantha. For details see Chapter V. The author of the Mirat-i Ahmadi. (Supplement pp 228-9) mentions only salami as a claim on the banth. The statement is, however, followed by details of peshkash exacted by nazims from specified makan-i zamindari which were subject to payment of peshkash. Other payments are also mentioned in the parganas that followed, exclusively, the banth-talpad system, as will be seen below.
Tan's patterns after he had conquered the region. ¹

The 'zamindaran' that we propose to designate 'Superior zamindars' were, during the Mughal Age, sub-categorised into three distinct sections, namely the zamindaran-i sarkarat-i peshkashi, zamindaran-i ismi, and the zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin, presumably in the order of precedence. ² In the following paragraphs an attempt is made to discuss broad features of the three sections, determine their role, positions and nature of relationship subsisting between them and empire during the heyday of the Mughal rule and ascertaining pattern of change, if any, by the onset of the eighteenth century.

A. ZAMINDARAN-I SARKARAT-I PESHKASHI: Six MakanS:

At the close of the seventeenth century, the province of Gujarat was divided into two categories of sarkars,

¹. Account f 105b; See also Mirat-i Ahmadi, l.p. 173.
². Account ff. 105a - 9 b, Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp 224-5, 228-9. The latter work specifies the first two sections whereas some details of the third section though without naming them, are also provided. In the regional dialect these zamindars were described as Rawat, Rana, Rao, Raja, Jam, Thakur, etc. For the appellations and gradation based on the appellations in the region, see, Alexander Kintoch, Hindu Annals of Western Gooverat, Rasmale (reprint) 1973, N. Delhi, pp. 568-9. pp 568-69.

The Account specifies 539 Makan-i zamindari existing around 1723-25. (ff 106b-219b).
namely, the **peshkashi** and the **kharaji sakars**. Of the sixteen **sarkars** of the **subah**, six—**Sirohi**, Dungarpur, Bans-balla (Banswara)2 Sunt, Ramnagar (Dharampur) and **Sulaiman-nagar** (Kutch-i buzurg) --- have been described as **sarkarat-i peshkashi** as also **mulk-i zamindarī** and **wilayat** belonging to zamindars (**Ta'alluq-i zamindaran**) who are also termed **umdah**.3 Each of the six **sarkars** formed one **makan-i zamindarī** administered by one **zamindar**.4

1. The term **peshkashi** indicates that no **mal-i wajib** was collected from the peasants by the imperial officials. The revenue paid by the zamindars of these **sarkars** was called **peshkash**. The **kharaji sakars**, on the whole were subject to the payment of **mal-i wajib** by and large determined on the basis of detailed assessment by the imperial officials. However, within these **sarkars** there were the lands of the zamindars who paid **peshkash**. N.A. Siddiqi. *op.cit* p 23, also see the discussion in the following lines.

2. The first three of the six **sarkars** are reckoned as **parganas** of **sarkar** Sirohi (Subah Ajmer) in the Abul Fazl's *Ain-i Akbarī* ( Asiatic Society, Calcutta, II, pp 132-3). Later on during emperor Aurangzeb's reign the three were raised to the position of **sarkars**. **Mirat-i Amhadi, Supplement,**, pp 224-5 N.A. Siddiqi. *op.cit* p 23. Ramnagar is now called Dharampur. The old capital Ramnagar, now known as Nagar, stands 24 miles South West of Dharampur, the new Capital. JN Sarkr, *Shivaji and His Times*, VI edn. Calcutta, 1961, p 186 n.

3. **Account ff. 105 b -6 b, 109b - 10b 126b-27b; Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, pp 25, 175; Ibid, Supplement, pp 24-8.** Before the year 1662 Navanagar was also counted as one of the **peshkashi-Sarkars**. In this year it was annexed and turned **Kharaji**. (**peshmashi bud... kharaji gashte**). In the present discussion references to Navanagar are made for the pre-1662 period. For references, please see the discussion below.

4. **Account ff. 105 b -6 a, 109 b-12a.** As will be seen below the territorial limits of all these zamindars did not invariably coincide with the boundaries of **sarkars** placed under each of them.
By virtue of their location the six makans enjoyed considerable significance. All the six sarkars being situated on the outskirts of the subah came almost to ring the kharaji sarkars on the land side and, thus, all the land routes to and from the subah passed through the territory of one or the other peshkashi sarkar. Situated far off the seat of provincial power the six sarkars also enjoyed a favourable geographical position. Besides each of them commanded strong forts which were further protected by the


2. The Kutch, according to the *Ain* (II, p.119), 'is largely a desert.' The region through which the route passes "is a saltish plain", says the *Mirati-i Ahamadi* (I, p.114), "sweet water is absolutely unobtainable... there is a kind of mud at most places... It is not possible for a few horsemens to go abreast of one another on the road". The region of Sunt and Ramnagar, observed Hamilton Walter, "is strong, difficult to penetrate, extremely troublesome to subdue, expensive to retain and wholly unproductive as to revenues; Himilton Walter, Geographical, Statistical and Historical Description of Hindoostan and its adjoining territories, J. Murry, 1820, I, p. 685. History of Dharampur state (prant Dharampur) 1262 to 1937, published by state Council (Author's name not mentioned), pp 13-5. Similarly, Dungarpur, Banswara and Sirsi were also situated in hilly region infested with forests and partly deserts. *Mirati-i Ahmadi, Supplement*, pp 246-49, Account, ff. 105 b, 109 b, 110 a, 111 b; James Tod, *Travels into Western India*, Delhi, (Indian reprint), 1971, pp 59, 61, 68.
surrounding jungles.  

The zamindars of peshkashi sarkars commanded considerable strength in men and equipment. The zamindars of Dungarpur and Banswara, each, commanded a force of 5000 cavalry and 10,000 infantry, that of Sirohi commanded 2000 cavalry and 5000 infantry and the zamindars of Bhuj and Navanagar 10000 cavalry 50,000 infantry and 7000 cavalry and 8000 infantry respectively at the end of the sixteenth century.  

The zamindar of Navanagar was capable of raising his strength of cavalry to 12000 at about the same time and the zamindar of Bhuj was in a position (1662) to dispatch 7000 mounted spearmen within a short period to help his clansmen outside his territory.  

From the account of the forces commanded by these zamindars it is, however, evident that

1. *Ain*, pp 119, 132-3, *Account f* f 110a, 111b, ; *Mirat-i Ahmadi Supplement* p, 227; *History of Dharampur*, p 317; *W* Webb, *Chronicles of the Hindu States of Rajasthan*, Delhi, 1972, p 29; *Hamilton Walter*, *op.cit*, I, p 685; it may be mentioned that there was a ban on the construction of new forts by the zamindars and the permission to construct a fort could be obtained from the imperial court only. *Account f*, 15a; *Mirat-i Ahmadi* II, p. 109. The Mughals seem to have allowed them to retain the forts which they possessed at the time of conquest.


the majority of their troops consisted of the infantry\textsuperscript{1}. But the evidence cited above also suggests that they commanded forces which might have possessed considerable striking capacity and were not means for fighting merely defensive battles.\textsuperscript{2}

Moreover, the zamindar of Bhuj is also reported to have maintained his own park of artillery (\textit{lawazma-i topkhana}) during the seventeenth and the following century.\textsuperscript{3} The zamindar of Navanagar is also noticed as commanding his own park of artillery which he had pressed into action against the invading imperial forces in 1662.\textsuperscript{4}

Besides, the caste and clanish ties of the zamindars seem to have formed the main sources of strength of some of them. In our sources, the zamindars of Bhuj and Navanagar who belonged to the Jadeja clan are described as \textit{marzaban},

\begin{enumerate}
\item For a detailed view, Irfan Habib, \textit{Agrarian System}, pp 163-4.
\item The zamindars of Bhuj and Navanagar had supported the cause of Sultan Muzaffar Gujarati against emperor Akbar. Though our sources do not specify the composition of the zamindars' forces fighting for the Sultan, the element of swiftness in their movement suggests that they were in command of a good cavalry; for details, AR Khan, \textit{op. cit}, pp 78-80; for the offensive moves taken by the zamindars of Bhuj, Khawaja Nizamuddin Ahmad, \textit{Tabqati-i Akbari} (hereafter \textit{Tabqat}), Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1935, II, pp 374, 386.
\item Account f. 111 b, \textit{Mirat-i Ahmad}, \textit{Supplement}, p 227. Under the existing rule to manufacture the cannons and guns by the zamindars was prohibited.
\item Kazim, \textit{op. cit}, p. 770.
\end{enumerate}
Sahib-\-i jamiat and qabiledars.\textsuperscript{1} There is evidence to show that the forces of Bhuj that raided imperial territory during Akbar's reign and later on (1662-71) rendered assistance to the zamindar of Navanagar consisted of (jadeja) Rajputs.\textsuperscript{2} Likewise Rai Singh and later on his son, Tamachi were equally supported by their Jadeja clansmen in their struggle for acquiring the gaddi of the zamindari of Navanagar.\textsuperscript{3}

The trouble that erupted between the members of the ruling family over succession to the gaddi of Navanagar highlights the fact that active support of the clansmen was not the less important than the imperial favor for the purpose of attaining and retaining the zamindari. Chhatrasal, the nominated successor of the ex-chief (died 1660), succeed his father in accordance with the royal mandate and usage of zamindari and became the leader of his community

\begin{enumerate}
\item Tabqat-\-i Akbari, II, 379-80; Kazim, \textit{op. cit}, p.296; Mirat-\-i Ahmadi, I, p. 194.
\item Kazim, \textit{op. cit}, pp 770-73.
\end{enumerate}
and raja of that land". 1 His uncle, Rai Singh, "persuaded" the Jadejas to 'desert his nephew' and 'won them over to his side'. He also reached an accord with the Jadeja chief of Bhuj2, strengthened his position with his help and later on (1662) fought the imperial forces with the help of his clansmen for retaining the gaddi which in the meantime he had occupied. 3 Evidently, Chhatrasal, the imperial nominee could not retain the gaddi for he failed to muster support of his own clansmen both within and without. Though Rai Singh was killed in action, his son continued to fight the imperial garrisons with the clansmen's support. He exerted so much pressure that the empire was forced to compromise with the Jadeja leader. 4

The zamindars of Ramnagar and Sunt though belonging to the Rajput caste were, however, assisted by the Kolis and the Bhils, in addition to their own caste brethren when

1. Ibid, p 768, Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, p. 254.
2. According to the Akbarnamah, the zamindar of Navanagar being ex junior member of the Jadeja ruling house of Bhuj acknowledged the overlordship of latter and sought his approval regarding the succession and in other matters. Abual Fazl, Akbarnamah, Bib, Ind., Calcutta, 1877, III, p. 472; Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, p. 194.
4. For further developments and references please see the discussion below.
they fought against the Mughals during emperor Shah Jahan's reign and later on against Shivaji.¹

Among the zamindars of the six sarkars Rajputs enjoyed a domineering position as members of one or another of their clans held these zamindars.² This apart, right from the time the zamindars submitted to the empire to the close of the period of the present study (1750), the zamindaris, with some interruption, as will be seen below, were retained by the same families.³


2. Ain, II pp 119-20, 132-3; Mirat-i Ahmadi, pp 284-5; Ibid. Supplement, pp 225-6; Account, ff.105b-6a, 109b-10b. There is contradictory information regarding the caste of the zamindar of Ramnagar. Relying on the unpublished English Factory Records, Sir. J.N. Sarkar notes that it was held by a Koli. Shiva Ji and His Times, 6th edn. Calcutta, 1961; p. 186. But the author of Hadiqat-u Hind states that from the pre-Sultanate period the state was held by Surajwanshi Rajputs and it remained in their possession even during the period under review. The author adds that Raja Ram of Ramnagar, a contemporary of Shah Jahan, was son in law of Bhariji, the zamindar of Baglana, a Rathor Rajput. (Hadiqat-ul Hind, f.4; Tarikh-i Mirat-ul Alam MS No. 2348, Old accession, Jama Masjid Bombay, ff. 279-80.

3. Ain, II, 119-20, 132-3; Akabarnamah III, pp 189, 196, 821; Account, ff. 105 b - 6 a, 109b-10a; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp-225-7; History of Dharampur, pp11-9; Lala Sita Ram, History of Sirohi Raj, Allahabad, 1920, pp 172-6, 188,193. Later on the British also found the same families holding these zamindars.
Though described as zamindars of the *peshkashi sarkars*,

the territorial extent of the zamindaris of some of them was

far from being identical with the boundaries of the *sarkars*

held by them. The zamindar of Kutch held a few *mahals* in the

*sarkar* of Pattan and subah Thatta in addition to his own

zamindari comprising the *sarkar*.¹ The Jam of Navanagar, on

the other hand enjoyed a share in the produce of two *mahals*

in *sarkar* Kutch.² Each of these zamindaris was regarded as

one *makan-i zamindari* and this included the possession

outside the *sarkars*.³ The other zamindaris consisting of one

entire *sarkar* each are likewise and separately reckoned as

one *makan-i zamindari*.⁴ Thus a *peshkashi sarkar* could form a

single *zamindari-makan* though this was not invariably the

case. The term 'peshkasi-sarkar' seems to have indicated not


2. *Account* ff. 111a, 112a. It is not known whether the amount of *peshkash* was paid, if at all, through the zamindar of Bhuj or directly by the Jam of Navanagar. Most probably, the Jam who was an ex-junior member of the ruling family of Bhuj continued to hold these lands in his capacity of *bhayad* of the senior branch of the house.

3. *Account*, ff. 109b-12 a, 118b, 122a, 126b-7a.

so much the territorial extent of the zamindar's possession
who held it as perhaps the boundaries of the administrative
unit placed under the zamindar.¹

In the absence of dependable information a comparative
study of the economic strength of the six zamindars may not
be possible.² However, from stray references available in
the sources, the zamindar of Navanagar emerges as the rich-
est among the six.³ Basically the economy of these zamindars
was essentially agrarian, as one would expect. However Bhuj
and Navanagar because of their geographical position were
more favourably exposed to trade and commerce, the two
zamindars commanded ports which were visited by ships of

1. The zamindars do not seem to have been placed under the
authority of imperial faujdars who were not appointed
in their lands. Instead, the zamindars virtually held
the position of faujdars and in this capacity they were
designated sarbarahan. Yad-dasht, peshkash-i Sarbarahan
R. No. 40 Pune.

2. The three known factors--extent of the area, jamadami
which is not known for all, and the amount of peshkash
may perhaps hardly be relied upon. The zamindari of
Kutch, the largest in size, was "largely barren and
sandy". (Ain, II, p 119). The amount of peshkash as
also the military contingents furnished for imperial
service, even if might have borne some relationship
with the zamindars' economy, were equally a denominator
of the degree of imperial control.

3. If we go by the aggregate mansabs, whether proposed or
actually awarded, the troops commanded and furnished,
the Jamadami, position of trade (ports and pearl fish-
ery) and Abul Fazl's remark that there are "many towns
and the agricultural area is extensive" in Navanagar,
the above impression would be reinforced. Ain, II,
p.119.
the surrounding areas. The most important trade for Bhuj, as well as Navanagar, was in Kutchi horses which were held 'equal to Arab horses'. Bhuj also exported cotton to Thatta and the zamindar of Navanagar probably had some connections with the trade in pearls which during the seventeenth century were taken out of sea under the supervision of the imperial officials.

It is thus evident from the preceding discussion that the strength, as also the sources of their power, varied considerably from each zamindar to another. Apart from the zamindars' capacity of resistance, the geographical position of the zamindaris on the imperial map, its productivity and manageability went a long way in determining the relationship of the Mughal empire with each zamindar. The possessions of all the six zamindars are invariably described as peshkasi. But it does not mean that the payment of peshkash, which will be discussed a little later, was the only obligation of these zamindars. They were also required
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to render military service with specified contingents under the Nazim-i Subah.

In continuation of the pre-Mughal practice b'dastur-i salatin-i Gujaratia the zamindars of the six sarkars were placed, from the time of the conquest of the subah, under the obligation of serving the Nazim with specified contingents which they were required to maintain in accordance with the army regulations mawajiq-i zabta-i fauj.¹ According to the arrangements made during Akbar's reign the zamindars of Ramnagar had to maintain 1000 horse-men and those of Dungarpur, Banswara and Sirohi 2000 each.² The zamindar of

---


2. Account, ff. 106 b, 109b, 126 b-27a; Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, pp 134,136, Ibid, Supplement, pp 226-8; Rasmala p.299; Sheikh Ghulam Mohammed, Mirat-i Mustafabad, Bombay, 1919, p.135. A.R. Khan's understanding of the text (op.cit. p. 217) "The Sarkar of Sirohi was assigned as jagir to the Nazim of Subah Gujarat on condition of maintaining two thousand sawars for imperial service" is incorrect. The text says: From Raja Todarmal the zamindar yek zanjir-i feel yaft w sarkar Sirohi b'shart-i khidmat ba jamia't du hazar sawar ba nazimani-i subah jagir muqarrar shud. Mirat-i-Ahmadi, Supplement, p. 226 The sarkar, thus, was assigned to the zamindar by way of jagir in return for service to be rendered with 2000 troops to the Governors of the Subah, the Mirat-i Ahmadi (i p.134) puts it more clearly: zamindar Sirohi... Raja ra deed... Raja khila't... b' zamindar dade; muqarrar farmud ke ba jamia't du hazar sawar hamrah subedar Gujarat nawkari namude bashad. Likewise the Account (f.110a) states that zamindar mazkur... mulazmat... namude... muqarrar farmudand ke b' jamia't du hazar sawar dar subah nawkri namayad. The zamindar, it may be pointed out, was not a mansabdar. So the sarkar was not granted to the zamindar as 'jagir' against the tankhwah in strict
Kutch was exempted from military service during Akbar's reign but in the subsequent years (1609-13) he is noticed to have served with 2500 horse-men under the Nazim's command. Details regarding the service obligations of the zamindar of Sunt are not specified; he is, however, mentioned among the six zamindars who were required to serve. Needless to say that it was not merely a theoretical obligation but on occasions they are reported to have actually... Continued...

technical sense of the term. Rather, the zamindar was to enjoy revenues of his zamindari as a mansabdardar-jagirdar would have done otherwise, on condition of maintaining the troops. To assign the revenue in jagir without granting a mansab seems to be a legacy of the pre-Mughal Gujarat; see Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, pp173-4; Ibid, Supplement, pp 224-5; Account ff. 106 b, 110, 126b, 127a.

1. Rao Khangar, the first ruler of Bhuj to submit, had obtained the pargana of Morbi at the time of his submission (Akbarnamah, III, p 530). Though the service obligation of the zamindar is not specified, the ruler being a du-hazar mansabdardar (Tabqat, II p, 443) must have been under the obligation of serving the empire. His son and successor, Rao Bharamal, was duly exempted from service obligation as a reward for getting the last of the Gujarati Sultan arrested at the time (1592-93) of his final submission. He also got pargana Morbi (sarkar Pattan) which in the meantime seems to have been confiscated. The text (Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, p. 226) says that the zamindar: darkhwast-i pargana Morbi w muafi-i nawkri kard... Khan-i Azam pazeeraft. The Account (f.110b) also states that: pargana Morbi b'jama deh lac mehmudi b'mujib farmedand... taklif-i nawkri muaf'i dashtand. Akbarnamah, III, pp 472,524,530,593, Mirat-i Ahmadi I p 180.

2. Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, p 180. The Bhuj contingent was led by the son of the zamindar.

3. Account, ff. 106 b, 110, 126b, 127 a; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp 224-5.
served the Mughal government during the seventeenth century whenever called upon to do so. Besides, troops of some of them were permanently stationed at the provincial capital where they remained till the close of the seventeenth century.  

Rendering military service to the state was not invariably conditional upon holding a mansab. There is evidence to show that these zamindars served even when they were not recipients of mansabs. Under emperor Akbar, no zamindar excepting that of Bhuj was actually granted a mansab, however, everyone of them was required to serve, a fact which has already been noted. None of these zamindars is, similarly, noted among the recipients of a mansab under Jahangir; they are, however, noted as serving the Mughals (1609-13) during his reign. Likewise the zamindar of

1. Mirat-i Ahmadi, i, p 189 (1609-13); Ibid, i, p 224 (1650); Ibid, i, p. 256 (1663-64); Account, ff. 76a, 79b,
2. Account ff. 76 a, 79b,
4. According to the Mirat-i Ahmadi, Raja Todarmal had proposed the award of mansab to the zamindars of Dungarpur and Banswara of 2500/2500 each, to the zamindar of Ramnagar of 1500/1000 and to the zamindar of Kutch 2000/2000 and to the zamindars of Navanagar of 4000/4000. Mirat-i Ahmadi, II pp-134,136 Amongst them the zamindar of Bhuj alone seems to have been awarded the mansab.
5. Mirat-i Ahmadi, i, p 189.
Dungarpur served the Mughals in the year 1663-64 though he lost the mansab in 1658 and could regain it after 1679-80 only.¹

The zamindars of the peshkashi sarkars endeavoured to abstain from serving the empire from the time of emperor Shah Jahan. The observation of the Mirat-i Ahmadi that these zamindars no longer rendered military assistance since the year of Aurangzeb's death² stands contradicted by the evidence available in the same and other works, pointing to a much earlier cessation of the tie. The zamindar of Sirohi, for the last time came to see the Nazim in the year 1648.³

Subsequently, (1657-58) prince Dara issued a number of nishans asking the zamindar to reach the imperial court and a few months later to serve under Raja Jaswant Singh. But the zamindar did not show up.⁴ From the year 1648 "no zamindar..."

1. Ibid, I, p. 256; for the award of mansab please see the discussion below.


4. Kaviraj Shyamaldas in his documented work, Vir Vinod (1888), reproduces the prince's nishans (Vol. III, pp 1105-11). M. Athar Ali (The Mughal Nobility under Aurangzeb) does not find the zamindar of the place among the participants in the war of succession. The author of History of Sirohi (pp 202-5) says that the zamindar sided with Dara and fought under Raja Jaswant Sing's command. He does not however substantiate his observation.
dar of Sirohi came to see any Nazim.\(^1\) much less to serve.
The zamindar of Ramnagar had ceased serving the empire from
1652-55 and perhaps even earlier and turned *peshkashi* for
good.\(^2\) The zamindar of Sunt likewise, turned *peshkashi*
sometime during Shah Jahan’s reign.\(^3\) The zamindar of Dungarpur
being a *mansabdar* (1000/1000 of which 800 were *du aspah
sih aspah*) and his troops having been posted at the provincial
capital continued to serve the empire till the close of
the seventeenth century.\(^4\) Though Tamachi, zamindar of Bhuj,
had evaded Prince Murad’s call to serve under him, he seems
to have served a little later (1659-61) in his capacity as
*mansabdar* for some time.\(^5\) Evidently, the *zamindaran-i sarkar-
rat-i peshkashi* who had all been rendering service showed an
inclination towards turning *peshkashi* and in their attempts


2. As early as 1637-38 Azam Khan the *subedar*, had to lead
an expedition for realizing *peshkash* from him. The
zamindar seems to have, then, ceased to serve. *Account*,
ff. 110b; *Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement*, p 234; for the
*peshkash* being finally fixed sometime in 1652-55,
Bakhtawar Khan *Tarikh-i Mirat-ul Alam*, MS No. 2401,
Jama Masjid Bombay collection, ff. 279-80; *Hadiqat-ul
Hind*, ff. 2-4.


4. *Ibid*, ff. 76a, 79b, 10ba 126b.

5. (Emperor) Murad’s *farman* (20 December, 1658), Sarad
Palace, Bhuj read with prince Dara’s *nishan* (17 Jan.
1659) of the same collection; *Account* ff. 110b-11a.
Later on the zamindar assisted the imperial rebels
instead. For reference, please see the discussion
below.
to do so they had met with success by the onset of the eighteenth century.

No evidence suggesting any actual attempt by the provincial authorities to enforce the military obligation on these zamindars is available in the pages of contemporary, near contemporary or later works. Instead, the provincial authorities resorted to the collection of peshkash.

It would appear from the foregoing discussion that there was a lack of uniformity in the relationship between the Mughal empire and the Chiefs. In the ultimate analysis, this relationship was determined by the respective strengths of the the two, although to be sure, this was done within the general framework of exaction of tribute and military service. It is also evident that the Mughal state was pragmatic enough to accept and continue the specific relationship with individual chiefs earlier established by provincial kingdom which was subsequently absorbed within the Mughal empire. ¹ The Mughals, it seems, had also endeavoured to exercise greater control as and when possible. In this, they met with considerable degree of success but gradually the zamindars succeeded in reversing the trend in their favour.

1. A.R. Khan, (op. cit) has taken particular note of this fact.
That the imperial government laid claim to a share in the revenue of the zamindaris, which, regardless of its mode of exaction, is an established fact. The zamindars of the peshkashi-sarkars, on the whole, were under the obligation of paying "peshkash-i harsala" (annual tribute) which consisted of the matalba-i sarkar-i wala (the claim of the Emperor) and peshkash-i nizamat (the tribute for the Governor). It was in addition to the offering made by them on special occasions as will be examined below.

The six sarkars were not, it seems, subject to the payment of mal-i wajib as pointed out above. In addition to being termed sarkarat-i peshkashi the six sarkars are also described as "peshkashi kharij az jama" i.e., not being subject to assessment and payment of mal-i wajib. The entire amount of revenues actually extorted from the six

1. Account. ff. 105 b. 106b, 107b-11b, Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, p 25. The zamindari of Navanagar which had undergone a change in its position clarifies this point further. Before its annexation in 1662 the sarkar was also peshkashi (peshkashi bud). With its annexation it turned kharaji (kharaji gashte) it was then subject to detailed assessment under the direct administration, revenue collected came to be termed mal-i wajib as distinct from peshkash of the pre-annexation period. Account. f. 105 b, Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, pp. 284-6; Ibid Supplement, pp 219-21, Yad-dasht pargana haveli Islamnagar Waghaira, in the possession of present researcher (hereafter P.C) No. P 3, P39-40 and ff. 55-6.
zamindars is invariably described as *peshkash.*

The *matalba-i sarkar-i wala* which was exacted from these sarkars by way of *peshkash* seems to have been calculated on the basis of the *jama.* While placed in the *khalsa,*

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

1. *Yad-dasht: Haqiqat-i hasil-o peshkash,* Farsi-daftar, Pune Archives, Pune, Roomal No. 70 (hereafter R.No. Only). Unindexed. The document shows (1658) both *mal-i wajib* and *peshkash* as having been collected from a number of parganas of kharaji-sarkars. But against the three of the specified *peshkashi-sarkars* only the term *peshkash* is entered; also see, nuskha-i *peshkashi* in the Account, ff. 105 b, 106 b, 109 b-11a.

2. The zamindar of Dungarpur with its entire *jama* (1,60,00,000) was held in jagir by a member of the house of Chitter during Aurangzeb's reign. The jagir reverted to the paibaghi for a brief period of roughly four months before it was assinged in the jagir of Rawal Jaswant Singh (zamindar of Dungarpur) and after the recall of the former jagirdar during the 22nd regnal year (R.Y.). Since the zamindar had not paid the *mehsul* for the intervening period, the emperor ordered the diwan-i subah to realise 'the amount of *mehsul* of the intervening period which came to Rs. 66,690 and 8 annas.' *Mirat-i Ahmadi,* I, p. 305. The recovery made in the 26th. R.Y. is recorded as 'peskahi-i sarkar-i wala' (the tribute for the emperor) in the document entitled 'Yad-dasht: Matalba-i sarkar-i wala, sarkar Dungarpur, dated (against the amount) 22nd R.Y. and 26th R.Y. (on the bottom), Pune, R.No. 70. Very clearly the amount was calculated against the *jama,* it is however, difficult to precisely asertain the relationship between the actual claim (*matalba*) and the *jama.* The recovery was made for a period of one-third of the year, the entire claim for the whole year comes to around Rs. two lakhs (66,690/8x3=200071/8). It is just about half the amount represented by the *jama* (1,60,00,000/40 = Rs. 400,000). Was the principality on six month ratio? Was it merely half of the amount of *jama* that was claimed as *peshkash?* Were the instalments of *peshkash* equally spread over the whole of year? The region, it may be mentioned, mainly yielded *kharif* crops.

Likewise the amount of *matalba* which the zamindar of Banswara had paid and the balance which stood in arrear is recorded just below the *jama* in the Account (ff. 109 b). Unfortunately, the work does not specify the exact period of claim.
or paibagi, the matalba (claim) was realised by the diwan-i subah and remitted to the imperial treasury. It could also be assigned in the tankhawah jagir. The peshkash-i nizamat (the tribute for the nazim) on the other hand, was to be appropriated by the nazims of the Subah who were responsible for its collection also. It was extorted in lieu of military service i.e. the zamindars either served the empire with specified contingents, or else they were required to offer peshkash-i nizamat. Besides, it seems to have stood independently of and over and above the jama.

1. Mirat-i Ahmadi, l, p 305; Account, f. 109 b.
2. Mirat-i Ahmadi, l, p 305; Account ff. 106a, 110ab, for further references please see the discussion in the following lines.
3. Account, ff. 14a, 20a, 74b; 106b; Mirat-i Ahmadi, l, p 25.
4. Thus, for example, matalba-i sarkar-i wala was collected from Banswara by the diwan of subah of Gujarat, whereas the zamindars was required to serve under nazims of the subah Malwa; since the zamindar of Dungarpur served the state with specified contingents during the course of the seventeenth century, he was exempt from paying it. During the year 1663-64 the zamindar served the state with 1000 contingents whereas the entire jama of the principality at this point of time was held in jagir by a member of the house of Chittoor; the zamindar of Ramnagar enjoyed exemption, as pointed out above, from paying peshkash-i nizamat in view of his rendering military service. But when he stopped serving the empire, he was required to pay 'peshkash-i nizamat'. For the same and similar references, Account, ff. 106 b, 109b., Ibid, f. 109 b, read with Mirat-i Ahmadi Supplement, p 225; also Account, ff. 118b, 126 b, read with Mirat-i Ahmadi, l, p. 305, Account with Mirat-i Ahmadi ff. 106, 127a, read with, Supplement, p 234; emperor Aurangzeb's farman repro-
Some idea of the assessment of 'matalba-i sarkar-i wala which was calculated against the jama may be had by examining the jamadami figures which are fortunately available for some of the sarkart-i peskhashi. The jama for the principality of Banswara and Sirohi stood at the same figures from the close of the sixteenth century to the close of our period of study.¹ However, the jama for Dungarpur had doubled sometime during the post-Jahangir and pre-1658 period.² Evidently, the element of reassessing the jama and co-ordinating it with the actual paying capacity of the zamindar seems to have been generally lacking.³

Likewise the peshkash-i nizamat due from the zamindars of the sarkarat-i peskhashi besides being an annual (har...

---Continued---

duced in the Vir Vinod 425-8 read with Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, pp 224-25, 305.

1. Ain, II, pp 132-3; farmans of Jahangir, Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb specifying the jama, Vir Vinod, pp 425-8, 1104; Account, ff. 106 a, 109b, Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, p 225. The jamadami of Sirohi stood at 1,20,00,000 dam during the Ain's period. (Ain, II p 132). Later on (1615) this is put at 100,00,000 dam (emperor Jahangir's farman, dated 1615, AD, reproduced in Vir Vinod, II, 239-49). The reduction (20,00,000 dam) may perhaps be attributed to the fact that twelve of the villages of Sirohi had been, in the meantime, included in sarkar Pattan, Account, f. 109b.

2. Ain, II, p 133; Jahangir's farman, (May, 1615) reproduced in Vir Vinod, II, pp. 239-49, Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, p. 305. During the post - 1615 period, the jama stood at the same figure.

3. Also see, Account, ff. 109a-10b.
claim was also subject to reassessment though not necessarily. Referring to peshkash offered by the zamindar of Sirohi (1585-86), the Tabqat says that he paid 'the total amount of peshkash (mubligh kulli peshkash kard). More particularly, the zamindar of Ramnagar paid different amounts Rs. 12000/- (1577-78), Rs. 9,000/- (1636) and Rs. 10,000 (1650-51) on three different occasions. Apparantly, the amount of peshkash was reassessed during the intervening period.

But the amount was not reassessed invariably. During the post-1652 period, the zamindar of Ramnagar was required to pay the same sum (Rs. 10,000), that he paid in that year. Likewise the amount paid by the zamindar of Navanagar seems to have remained fixed from 1577-78 to the closing years of the sixth decade of the seventeenth century.

---

1. Tabqat-i Akbari, II, p 382. See also Kazim, op.cit p 411, Account, (f. 106 b) describes it as peshkash: muqarrar-i harsala.


3. Also see Tarikh-i Mirat-ul Alam, ff. 279-80.

4. Ibid, f 80, the text runs as follows: muqarrar-i sakh-tand k' harsal deh hazar rupia b' tariq-i peshkash midade bashad) also see Account, f. 110a.

5. On the three different points of time --- 1577-78, 1636-42, and 1656-57, the zamindar is noted to have offered the same amount and the same number of Kutchi horses. Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, pp 213, 285, Yad-dasht: peshkash-i zamindaran, (dt. 1067 AH), Navanagar, Pune, R.No. 37.
As regard the obligation of paying peshkash-i nizamat and matalba-i sarkar-i wala position of the zamindars under review was at variance from each other. The zamindar of Bhuj enjoyed exemption from paying both the claims. The zamindars of Dungarpur and Banswara enjoyed exemption from paying the peshkash-i nizamat in view of their rendering military service but both of them were under the obligation of paying the matalba-i sarkar-i wala, as and when they were not receipient of mansabs. The zamindars of Banswara successfully evaded the payment of matalba-i sarkar-i wala during the reign of Aurangzeb. The zamindar of Ramnagar ceased to be service-rendering (1636), the exemption from paying the peshkash-i nazamat was withdrawn and he was instead forced to pay peshkash during the later period.

1. Excepting for a brief interval when he served under Jahangir as noted above, and during the period the zamindar enjoyed mansab under Akbar and Aurangzeb as mentioned above, the zamindars of the place do not seem to have served the empire, Account ff. 110 b-11a; the zamindar, however, was obliged to pay the peshkash in the year 1659 on account of his rebellious act of sheltering Dara during the war of succession. Ibid ff. 110 b-11a; 122a.


3. "Account f. 109b; it may be recalled that the Matalba-i sarkar-i wala was demanded if and when the jama stood unassigned in jagir.

Sirohi was exempt from paying the peshkash-i nizamat as late as 1650-51 in view of his rendering military service. Since that date he did not come to serve the nazims. In future he seems to have been required to pay the peshkash in lieu thereof.¹ The zamindar of Sunt was also required to pay 'matalba-i sarkar-i wala.²

The zamindars of the peshkash sarkars seem to have by and large remitted peshkash directly to the treasury or through the faujdars of the sarkar in the immediate vicinity of their respective possessions.³ It was perhaps under exceptional circumstances that the subedar himself was obliged to lead military expedition for exacting the tribute.⁴ Before the close of the seventeenth century, the zamindar of Ramanagar was placed under the authority of the mutasaddi of Surat, who, therefore extorted tribute.⁵

1. Account, ff. 110a, 119b, 126b, Mirat-i Ahmadi I. p 224.
3. Kazim, op. cit pp. 768-70, Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement pp 224-5 where he says that at the time the work was being written the nazim-i subah had to lead military expedition for the purpose, presumably it was not done in former days.
5. Account ff. 110b, 127a, Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp- 228, 234. The latter work does not specify the time.
Besides, these zamindars were also required to make occasional offerings. One among such, the occasion of doing homage, appears to be more important necessitating the presence of the zamindar. 1 Excepting the zamindar of Sunt all other zamindars under review are stated to have done homage to the Mughal emperor Akbar or to his envoy Raja Todarmal or to emperor Jahangir and Shahjan. 2 The zamindar of Bhuj did homage to emperor Jhangir for the first, and perhaps the last time, when he was forced to do so. 3 The zamindars of Sirohi, Dungarpur and Banswara did homage, perhaps for the last time in the years 1650 and 1700, re-

1. The Account (f. 85 b) specifies the birth and accession anniversaries of the emperor when the zamindars were required to congratulate the emperor and send peshkash. Besides, they had to offer peshkash along with the requests (ara'iz) made to the court. The zamindar of Bhuj had sent peshkash while requesting 'emperor' Murad to forgive his fault of sheltering an imperial rebel, 'Emperor Murad's farman dated 20th Dec., 1658 and prince Murad's Hasb-ul hukm dated May, 1657, private collection of Sarad palace, Bhuj Maharaolakhat of Bhuj also made a similar offering as late as 1756 to the imperial court when he sought to obtain the title of 'Mirza Raja' and the subedar of Thatta. Mirat-i Ahmadi, II, p 545.


3. Tuzuk, I, p 19, Emperor Jahangir's farman, dated 19th urde-Bahisht 12th llahi year Sarad palace, Bhuj. See also the Account, ff. 110a-11b, suggesting that no zamindar of Bhuj came to do homage. It is in spite of the fact that the zamindar enjoyed exemption even from offering peshkash.
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spectively. 1

On the occasions of doing homage each of the above mentioned zamindars made offerings which appear to be different from, though at times inclusive of 2 the regular claim of peshkash made on an annual basis. During Jahangir's visit to the subah, the zamindars of Navanagar had presented one hundred mahurs, one thousand rupees and fifty horses at the time of doing homage. 3 Elsewhere, it is noted that the zamindar was under the obligations of offering three lakhs mehmudis and one hundred horses as peshkash. 4 On the other hand, the zamindar of Bhuj offered precisely double of what the Jam of Nanavanagar had already offered. 5 Since the zamindar of Bhuj reportedly 6 enjoyed a special status supe-


2. For reference please see note on the preceeding page and A.R. Khan, op. cit. pp 211-12.


4. For reference see discussion in the preceeding pages.


6. Ain, II, p 119; Akbarnamah, III, p 472; Tuzuk, I, p. 443; Ibid, II, 19; Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, p 194; see also Jahangir's farman 'granting' permission to the ruler of Bhuj for kissing the imperial threshold, assuring him of a befitting imperial treatment vis a vis Navanagar. op. cit.
rior to that of Navanagar, the offerings made by these zamindars may, therefore, be regarded as a denominator of their respective social status, though it is difficult to be definitive about this.

As regards the position of these zamindars within their zamindaris, they appear to have been left alone to manage on their own. Their possessions on account of being *mulk-i zamindari* were exempt from survey, and, likewise, no imperial revenue officials were appointed in their territories.¹ Though the zamindars had accepted the circulation of imperial currency, the ones of Bhuj and Navanagar maintained their own mints and struck coins, called *kori, jami* and *mehmudi* there.² The zamindar of Navanagar was forced

1. *Account*, ff. 20 b, 24a-25b, 28a-30b, 105b, 106b, 109b-112b. The *Ain* also does not furnish area statistics. Since the *jama* for Bhuj, Ramnagar and Sunt is not recorded in any of the available works, it may therefore, be argued that even the *jama* was not necessarily calculated for all the zamindaris. In its exhaustive list of the *Makan-i faujdari* and *thanabandhi* of the entire subah for 1658 to 1725, the *Account* (ff. 393b-404b cf., *Ibid*, ff. 96a, 100a) does not mention one in these sarkars; also see, *Mirat-i Ahmadi*, *Supplement*, pp 224-8 which likewise does not mention the *makan* of faujdar in the possessions whereas in the *kharaji* sarkars the work specifies the same. Besides, the *Mirat* in its general description of the appointment of these officials from time to time, does not speak of such appointments in these territories. Therefore, it appears that *faujdars* were not maintained in their territories.

2. Even after the extinction of the sultanate, the zamindars of Bhuj retained their coins along with their own names written in Deonagari, the name of Muzaffar III of Gujarat, and the year 978(AH) both in Persian character, G.P. Taylor, *"Coins of the Gujarat Sultans* J.B.B.R.A.S., 1903, pp31-5; M.S Commissariat, *A History
(1640-41) to cease coining money, though minting appears to have been revived subsequently as is suggested by the stationing of an imperial official (1660) there.\(^1\)

But it does not mean that the imperial administration observed complete indifference towards all the internal affairs of these zamindars. The state maintained a \textit{waga'\textquotesingle i nigar} at Dungarpur, presumably to live in touch with the internal developments.\(^2\) Besides, the Jams of Navanagar were not free to work the pearl-fisheries which were placed under the control of imperial officials.\(^3\) Moreover, the emperor could also make land grants out of \textit{sarkar-i peshkashi}, one such grant in the \textit{sarkar} of Sirohi even survived the Mughal

\textit{Continued...}
rule in the Subah. ¹

In its concern for ensuring smooth flow of trade and commerce, the Mughal state, it seems, forced the zamindars to provide protection to travelers and traders through their lands.² Prince Murad (Oct. 1656), and a few months later emperor Shah Jahan ordered Rao Akheraj, the zamindar of Sirohi, to book the robbers who had plundered the goods of a traveller while passing through Danta, the zamindari territory which the Rao was granted with the express condition of preventing the occurrence of such events.³ From a hasb-ul hukm (May, 1657) it appears that consequent upon his plundering the Dutch traders one Akheraj (?) had been evicted out of his fort, and he took shelter in the territory of Bhuj with the suspected connivance of the zamindar of the place. The zamindar was, therefore, ordered to assist the imperial force chasing Akheraj, or else face similar conse-


². S. Nuurul Hasan 'Zamindars Under Mughals', p. 23.

³. See texts of the nishan and the farman, Vir Vilnod, III pp 1102-4, while refereing to the place (Danta) of occurrence the farman notes that ma badawlat zamindari anja ra b' oo barai een inayat farmude' eem k' een qism umoor dar anja waqi shawad.
quences, i.e. expulsion from his possession. 1

Sometime the eruption of dispute over the succession to the gaddi also invited imperial intervention.

The imperial authority asserted its right to recognize the successor of a zamindar of peshakshi sarkar, though normally it gave recognition to the zamindar's nominee to succeed him. 2 Only two instances of imperial intervention in the succession to these principalities are traceable in the available sources for the entire period of Mughal rule in Gujarat. In the first instance, emperor Akbar placed for a short period, the principality of Banswara under direct administration (1603-4) on account of the trouble which had arisen over the succession between Agar Sen and Man Singh. 3

The second incident which relates to Navanagar during Aurangzeb's reign deserves to be examined in some detail.

Chhatrasal, the duly nominated successor, succeeded


No clue to identify Akheraj of the hasb-ul-hukm is provided in the text. There were two zamindars of the same name during the period -- Akheraj of Sirohi and one of Sehore (Rasmala), pp. 352-3.


3. Akbaranamah, III, p 821. The chief of Banswara, Agrasen, was expelled and the principality was captured. Subsequently, Man Singh is noticed calling upon the emperor having, in the meantime been confirmed in the seat of power. A. R. Khan, op. cit, p 108.
his father in accordance with royal mandate and customary practice of zamindar. 1 His uncle, Rai Singh, who was actively supported by his Jadeja clansmen of Navanagar and backed by the zamindar of Bhuj belonging to the same clan, occupied the gaddi (1660-61), imprisoned Chhatrasal, and expelled the imperial officials from the mint and the pearl fisheries. 2 In his turn, Rai Singh was killed by the imperial forces that came to occupy the principality (1662) which was renamed Islamnagar and placed under the direct imperial administration. Chhatrasal was only nominally restored to the gaddi and allowed to retain only three parganas out of the whole sarkar which lost its former status of the peshkashi one and was declared kharaji. 3

Rai Singh’s eldest son, Tamachi escaped to Okha Mandal where he led the life of an outlaw (wahur wattia). 4 With the active support of the zamindar of Bhuj and the Jadejas of Navanagar, he attacked the villages of Halar (sarkar Navana-

1. Kazim, op. cit. pp 768-9, Mirat-i Ahmadi, I. p 254; Ranmal had remained "stead fast on the path of loyalty and submission", his request for nominating his, son, though a minor, was accepted. Kazim, op. cit.


Under the mounting pressure, Tamachi (of Navanagar) was offered a mansab which he seems to have refused.

Perhaps tired of the long time spent (1663-72) in outlawry, Tamachi approached Maharaja Jaswant Singh, then subedar of Gujarat (1670-72). Obviously on the subedar's recommendation and evidently because of the inability of imperial officials to deal with an influential caste leader, "the pen of forgiveness was crossed over the books of Tamachi's misdeeds" in 1672. Tamachi, his brother Phul, Lakha, his eldest son and Varamal, the younger son were ennobled with mansabs of 1000/700, 300/150, 200/60 and 200/60 respectively, and, as per his request, he with his sons and brother was exempted from dagh and muster. Besides, 25 villages of the region which were the native places of Jadeja Rajputs who had accompanied him during his period of exile were, on his request, granted as ina'm to them. Tamachi was required to assist the nazim with a force

1. Kazim op. cit, pp 771--3, 775; GH. Khare, op. cit Letter No. 62, dated 2nd June, 1667. Because of his acts of plundering and deprivations he was given the cognomen of tagad, the robber, M.S. Commissariat, A History of Gujarat. II. p 168.
of 1000 sawars and infantry of the same strength.¹

But the Jam suffered a substantial loss both in his possessions and position. The sarkar of Navanagar was not given the position of peshkashi and it remained a kharaji sarkar. The Jam was given only a portion of the sarkar, the remaining part including mahal haveli and city of Navanagar remained under the direct administration of the imperial government. The zamindari was put under the jurisdiction of the local faujdar instead of the Nazim of the subah. The single makan-i zamindari as it was treated previously, was split up into twenty two makans with reduced status.²

Thus, out of necessity all the three -- Chhatarsal, Tamachi and the emperor -- had to make room for each other. Political expediency and economic necessity thus forced the solution. With the adjustment of Tamachi's interests the territory, mainly plain and fertile, could be managed with relative ease.

The territory of the zamindar of Ramnagar, was annexed apparently for strategic considerations and it seems to have


been restored, subsequently, on economic grounds. In his bid to occupy important strategic points between Gujarat and the Deccan Prince Aurangzeb captured Baglana and annexed Ramnagar. Since the time of its annexation the administration seems to have found it difficult to meet the administrative expenses out of the revenues of the territory. Consequently the zamindari was restored to its zamindar with provision that he would pay a sum of rupees ten thousand as peshkash every year.

These zamindars do not appear to have much inclination for participating in the imperial politics as is evident from their moves during the war of succession between the sons of Shah Jahan. On the eve of the war, Prince Dara endeavoured to persuade Rao Akheraj of Sirohi to reach the imperial court. As he did not show up, the prince asked him to join Maharaja Jaswant Singh along with the other zamindars of the surrounding parts. But the Rao does not

1. Tarikh-i Mirat-ul Alam, ff. 279-80; the text says that Wilayat Ramnagar, maftuh gasht... az anja kharf az dakhlash afzun bud. But the empire seems to have retained the fort of Ramnagar, even after the restoration.

2. Ibid; Hadiqat-ul Hind, f 4.


seem to have participated in the war.\(^1\) Rao Tamachi of Bhuj had also welcomed the prince who passed through his territory before the battle of Deora. Also, the zamindar \(^2\) had engaged his daughter to Sipihr Shukoh in the hope of his own and Dara Shukhoh's future and prosperity.\(^2\) \(^3\) Dara's devastating defeat at Deora, followed by Qutubuddin Khan Khewishgi's retaliatory inroads into the zamindari and a timely imperial warning seem to have forced Rao Tamachi to change his stand.\(^4\) Instead of supporting Dara on his way back, the zamindar regarded him \(^5\) 'with complete indifference', and a little later welcomed the imperial commander into his territory, surrendered prince's precious articles and offered

1. M. Athar Ali in his Nobility Under Aurangzeh does not find the Rao among the participants in the war. However, the author of the History of Sirohi (pp 202-5) claims that he had joined Dara's side. The author of the latter work does not cite any evidence in support of his contention.


3. A mansabdar from Gujarat, he had joined (emperor) Murad's ranks and followed him to the imperial capital. Subsequent to Murad's imprisonment he became Aurangzeh's partisan who favoured him with a rise in mansab and faujdar of Pattan, a territory adjacent to Kutch. At the time Dara arrived in the subah, the Khan, instead of joining his ranks, carried raids into Bhuj.


5. Huntakhab-ul Lubab, p 137; Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, p 245.
peshkash from which he otherwise, enjoyed exemption. A little later, the zamindar was favoured with a khilat, an elephant and a mansab.

The zamindar of Bhuj was also summoned by 'emperor' Murad to join his standard before he left for the imperial capital. But the zamindar does not appear to have joined him, for a little later, he is noted to have welcomed prince Dara as pointed out above.

It is evident from the preceding discussion that the zamindars of the peshkashi sarkars ruled over their inherited territories on a hereditary basis with full autonomy under the paramountcy of Mughal emperors. Their subordin-

1. Account, f. 110 b; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, p 227.

2. Account, f. 110b; The date of awarding the mansab is not recorded. However, Tamachi had held the zamindari from 1654 to 1662 (MS Commissariat, A History of Gujarat, 'II, p 152) and the mansab was certainly awarded during Aurangzeb's reign. (M. Athar Ali, op. cit, p 208) From 1661 onward, Rao Tamachi had become a partisan of the rebel zamindar of Navanagar and opposed the emperor. It seems therefore, logical to assume that the mansab might have been granted between 1659 and 1661 presumably as reward for the coolness he had shown to Dara and the favorable attitude towards the imperial commander.

3. Murad's farman dated 20th December, 1658, Bhuj collection, Prince Murad who was subedar of Gujarat on the eve of the war of succession, proclaimed himself emperor on December 5, 1658 MS Commissariat. History of Gujarat, II, pp 133-6.

4. Murad's 'farman', op. cit. read with Prince Dara's Nishan to the ruler of Bhuj, op. cit.
tion to the empire implied rendering of military service, the offering of peshkash and accepting the circulation of Mughal coinage within their domains. Moreover the zamindars were to ensure safe passage to the travellers and traders passing through their lands. Besides, the boundaries of their respective makan, defined as they were, could not be changed of their free will by the zamindars, though they did endeavour to change and extend the sphere of their influence. The empire, in its turn, seems to have extended the protection from external threats though some time the zamindar had to face it on its own. The disputes over the gaddi could also invite imperial interference, though under normal circumstances the Mughals granted gaddi presumably to the

1. Akbarnamah, III pp 524-530, Tabqat-i Akbari, II, pp 306-9; Account, ff 110 b-11a. Thus, for instance, the zamindar of Bhuj had also tried to oppose the imperial nominee and support a rebel, presumably the man of his choice for the gaddi of Navanagar as mentioned earlier. The zamindar of the place had expelled the Baghela and Jadeja zamindars of Santalpur and the surrounding areas (sarkar Pattan) and killed the zamindar of Halwad (1577-78) during Akbar's reign. Though the zamindar was forced to vacate these lands he, however, succeeded in acquiring pargana Morbi in exchange for surrendering the last of Gujarati Sultans to imperial forces.

2. The Marathas attacked Ramnagar twice in the year 1672. On the first occasion the imperial forces came to relieve the zamindar of the pressure. On the second occasion, the Marathas captured the capital town which the zamindar is reported to have reoccupied on his own after a lapse of ten years. J.N. Sarkar, Shiva ji and his times, p 186; GS Sardesai, New History of Marathas (1600-1707), pp 193, 208, 226, 229; History of Administration of Dharampur, pp 17-8; G.N. Sharma Mewar And the Mughal Empire, Agra 1962 pp. 130-1.
zamindar's nominee at the time of each succession and recognized him as successor and granted lands in return for required obligations.¹ These zamindars, it also seems, showed an inclination for exchanging tribute for military service and by the onset of the eighteenth century a majority of them had turned exclusively peshkashi which indicates decline in the over-all imperial control.

B: zamindaran-i ismi: 15 makan

Next to the six makan of the zamindaran-i sarkarat-i peshkashi, the Account lists 'mahalat-i ismi' constituting fifteen makan-i zamindari which formed the possessions of the zamindars called ismi (zamindaran-i ismi).² The literal meaning of the term 'ismi' (renowned, nominal) does not help us to draw any comprehensive inferences except to distinguish them from the 'zamindaran-i sarkarat-i peshkashi discussed above. According to N.A. Siddiqi, "the zamindars who held a number of villages or an entire pargana and paid peshkash were known as ismi zamindars".³ He has further observed that the possessions of ismi zamindars were 'ghair

1. This inference is based on the fact that the empire is reported to have intervened only twice, once each in Dungarpur and Navanagar where disputes had arisen on the question of succession.


3. N.A. Siddiqi, op. cit, p.23.
amli\(^1\) and conditional upon the payment of fixed amount as peshkash or rendering military service in lieu thereof.\(^2\)

But in view of the explanation given below Siddiqi's view of the ismi zamindars may need to be qualified. Besides, the available evidence may also be utilized to ascertain the relative position of the ismis in terms of time and space within the category of the Superior zamindars.

In its exhaustive list of the zamindaran-\(i\) ismi the Account specifies fifteen makans in the entire subah which existed and continued to exist during the first and the second quarters of the eighteenth century.\(^3\) Against a makan-\(i\) zamindari the name of its zamindar is also specified suggesting that one makan was held by one zamindar ancestor of each, according to the same work, were confirmed in their

\[
\begin{align*}
1. \text{The ghair amli possessions were exempt from detailed revenue assessment and were held and administered by the zamindars themselves. For details see ibid, p.25.} \\
2. \text{ibid., p. 147.} \\
3. \text{Account, f 112b. The Mirat (Supplement, p.225) mentions Navanagar as one of the ismis' territory which, however, is not listed by the Account. It may be recalled that Navanagar before the year 1662 was one of the peshkashi sarkars which was declared kharaji in the said year when it was annexed. Its zamindar was however, allowed to retain a portion of the sarkar and came to be counted as ismi until he reoccupied the entire lands sometime during post- Aurangzeb period and regained his lost status of the pre-1662 period. References will be cited at the relevant place in the following pages.}
\end{align*}
\]
respective possessions during Akbar's reign.¹

By virtue of their location, the possessions of the ismi zamindars enjoyed a position of some significance. Their lands were, by and large, situated on the outskirts of the kharaji sarkars adjoining the territories of the zamindaran-i sarkarat-i peshkashi and other Superior zamindars holding lands in the former sarkars.² Besides, the territories of the ismi zamindars of Ali-Mohan, Haft-Polla (Pol), Danta, Rajpipla, Lunawada, Atlesar-Cheharmandvi, and Bansda were situated in hilly regions and infested with thick jungles, wild animals and, in some cases, surrounded by thick forests.³ Besides, the route to Porbandar and Chhaiyan was infested with thickets of acaceous trees which rendered riding through it quite difficult.⁴ These zamindars moreover, strengthened their position further by maintaining fortresses which the empire had allowed them to retain at

¹ Account, f. 112b, Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp 229, 233.

² These zamindaris were situated along the boundaries of the zamindari lands of Sirohi, Dungarpur, Banswara, Ramnagar and Jagat. Account, ff. 15a, 112b; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp 206, 209, 214, 233; Rasmala, pp 444-6, 463-4; Hamilton Walter, op. cit., I, pp 684-6; MS Commissariat, History of Gujarat, I, p. 326 n, Bombay Gazetteer, V. pp 413, 432-3, Raghubir Singh, Malwa in Transition (1678-1765), Bombay, 1936, I, p. 78.

³ Mirat-i Ahmadi, II, pp 89, 98-9. Please see also the preceding note.

the time of conquest. But unlike the zamindars of the pesh-kashi sarkars all the noticeable ismis had to surrender one of their fortresses which were held by imperial officials whereas the other was retained by the zamindar himself. ¹

The possessions of some of the ismis apparently commanded positions which were strategically very important. The territories of Rajpipla and Danta were of particular significance for the routes to the Deccan and the North passed respectively through the two zamindaris.² Likewise the Malwa-Gujarat link-route passed through the zamindari of Jhabua.³ Pargana Nadot, one of the zamindari mahals of Rajpipla seems to have attracted traders for trading activities details of which are not known.⁴ Moreover, Rajpipla was enriched with correnian mines situated at Ratanpur. The stones were taken to Limbodra where these were processed before carrying to Cambay, an imperial trade centre, by the


2. Mirat-i Ahmadi, II. p. 89, Murad's hasb-ul hukm addressed to the ruler of Bhuj, op. cit.


4. Dastak dt. 9th Ziq'a'd, I. R Y Muhammad Shah, Baroda Archives, Persian Documents, No. 91 (Hereafter Baroda).
merchants.¹ The geographical position exposed the possessions of Porbandar to sea-trade. There were in all three ports--Porbandar, Chhaiyan and Ranavao -- which were situated within the zamindari of Porbandar.²

Some information regarding the caste of the zamindar-e ismi some of whom may be identified as the direct descendants of the ex-ruling families³ is also available. Rajpipla and Ali-Mohan were held by Gahels whereas the Bheels and Kolis formed a major part of their soldiery. Pol was possessed by Rathods; Lunawada by a Solanki; Barea by Chauhan; Porbandar by Jethwas and Kesod and Jhabua were also held by the Rajput Chiefs.⁴ It seems that the Rajputs were

---


the dominant, if not the exclusive, holders of these zamindarships. Moreover, the same families continued in their possession throughout the period of the Mughal rule in Gujarat.

The possessions of each of the ismi zamindars exclusively situated within the kharaji sarkars consisted of a mahal, but less than a sarkar, in no case less than a mahal. As such the ismis enjoyed a secondary position vis-à-vis the zamindaran-i sarkarat-i peshkashi each of whom held not less than a sarkar, an administrative unit over and above a paragana and a mahal. Thirdly, the ismis were not allowed to administer their entire holdings with full autonomy as part of their zamindari was placed under direct administration, unlike the zamindars of the peshkashi.

---

1. No information regarding other zamindars' caste is available.

2. Account (ff 106b-7a, 112b) enumerates these zamindaris under the heading 'mahalat-i ismi and Mahal-hai sarkar-tailluqat-i zamindaran-i ismi. Each possession is recorded as 'mahal' of such and such place (i.e. mahal Lunawara) and mahal-i zamindar so and so. Account, ff 24b, 27a, 106b-7a, 112b, 113ab and Mirat-i Ahmadī, Supplement, pp. 205-6, 209-10, 214, 218. It may here be pointed out that mahal Kesoj was situated within the pargana of Mangrole (sarkar Soreth) which consisted of two mahals. (Ibid., p. 218). As such an ismis' possession could not, necessarily, constitute an entire pargana. The possessions of Lunawada, on the other, consisted of two mahals each of which formed a separate pargana. Ibid., pp 205-6; Account ff. 107a, 113b).

3. For references and details please see the discussion in the following lines.
sarkars who administered it on their own. Finally, the zamindaran-i ismi appear to have been the leading members of such former ruling families as had not been able to preserve unity of the family and its possessions. Thus the zamindari of Navanagar which formed a single makan-i zamindari before its annexation (1662) was split up into 22 makans at the time (1672) the chief claimant was restored to the gaddi. The leading member came to be designated as the ismi whereas the remaining 21 members of the family were termed as zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin each holding his own possession independently of others. 1 Similarly, the Rajput chiefs of Idar, Lunawada, Porbandar, Cheharmandvi and Rajpipla who were the leading descendants of their respective families enjoyed the position of ismis whereas the dependent members and vassals of the families were classified as zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin and they had direct dealings with the state. 2

Like the zamindars of the peshkashi sarkar the ismis were also required by emperor Akbar, as under the Gujarati

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


2. Account ff. 112b-3 Mirat-i Ahmadi, I pp. 189, 256 Ibid. Supplement, pp. 224-5, 228-36. read with Rasmala, pp 443-4. Therefore, it seems that the leading member of a divided family of a chief, emerged as the ismi whereas the leading dependents of the family as zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin.
sultans, to render military services and/or pay tribute. ¹

Excepting the zamindar of Rajpipla who was enjoined to furnish 1000 horse-men for service under the nazim, the details of contingents which the other ismis were likewise required to furnish are, however, not recorded in our sources. ² In the subsequent years, the zamindars of Ali-Mohan along with Rajpipla (1609-13) and Lunawada (1661-2) are noted to have served the nazim with 650, 2000 and 500 horse-men respectively. ³ Besides, the zamindar of Porbandar is noted in imperial service in 1670-71 from sometime past. ⁴ The troops of Rajpipla remained posted at Ahmadabad till the close of the seventeenth century. ⁵ The zamindar of Navanagar when installed (1672) in his new position of an ismi was directed 'to be active in rendering military service' under the nazim with 1000 horse and infantry of the same strength. ⁶ Whether all the ismis continued to serve the

¹ Accountt ff, 105b, 106b; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp. 225, 233. None of these zamindars is noted to have been awarded a mansab during the Mughal rule.

² Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, p.233.

³ Mirat-i Ahmadi, 1, pp. 189,256.

⁴ Ibid 1, p. 257.

⁵ Account, ff. 76a, 79b.

⁶ Mirat-i Ahmadi, 1, p. 284. It may be recalled that the ismi zamindar of the place and three of his brothers and sons were awarded mansabs.
empire till the anset of the eighteenth century is not specifically known.¹

Unlike the peshkashi-sarkars, the ismis' possessions were subject to the assessment and payment of mal-i wajib in addition to the peshkash-i nizamat

If and when an ismi, like the zamindars of peshkash-sarkars, was not required, or else could not be forced to render military service, he was obliged to offer tribute, called peshkash-i nizamat. The tribute, the amount of which could remain fixed (muqarrari) at the same figure for a number of years, was levied apparently whenever due on an annual (harsala) basis.² Accordingly, the zamindar of Rajpipla was under the obligation of paying 35,556 rupees sometime during Akbar's reign.³ During Jahangir's closing years the amount was reassessed and fixed at 9,077 rupees. Thereafter, it was not reassessed during the course of the

¹. The Mirat-i Ahmadi (Supplement, p. 229) and the Account (ff 76a–79b) however, suggest the continuity in the rendering of the service till the year of Aurangzeb's death.

². Account ff, 107a; 112a–3b;. For a detailed view of the peshkash-i muqarrari please see Chapter 1. (2) below.

³. Account f, 106b read with ibid, f.112b; Vir Vinod, II, p. 89 Treaties and Engagements, II, p. 41, During the same emperor's reign a sum of Rs. 100,000 was extorted. It was however the result of zamindar's rebellious act and not a part of regular payment. Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement p. 233.
The zamindar of Jhabua's recorded offering during the seventeenth century consisting of 15,000 rupees and two horses dates back to prince Murad's period of subedar. The peshkash on the zamindari parganas of Ali and Mohan was assessed at 100,000 and 52,000 Mehmudis respectively sometime between 1668 and 1670. The amount was not reassessed during the later years of the century. The peshkash due from the zamindari parganas of Atlesar and Cheharmandvi came to be assigned, sometime during the post-1662 period, in the salary of the mutasaddi of Surat, or a strong military Commander (Sahib-i quwat-o fauj) who could enforce the assessment and collection by leading military expeditions into the territory. The other ismis were also required to offer peshkash-i nizamat though the amounts and exact time of their offerings are not specified for the seventeenth century. It may, however, be submitted that

1. Peshkash, Docs. PC No. 28. The document was prepared during Mohd. Shah's reign. Having reflected the amount mentioned in the text, the document carries the expression: ba'd azin aml niyamde.

2. Account f. 126b.

3. Ibid., ff. 112b, 127a, Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, p 233.

4. Account f. 127a; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp. 205-6 The possession turned ghair-amli (immune from assessment) and its possessor, a zortalab.

5. Account ff 107a, 112b-3b, 118a-9b, 121b, 126b-7a Mirat-i Ahmadi; Supplement p. 231.
though the *peshkhash-i nizamat* was a regular annual claim, it was by and large, collected only now-and-then because the zamindars rendered military service in lieu thereof.

Even these zamindars, like those discussed in the previous pages seem to have shown a tendency of becoming *peshkashi*.

Unlike the *peshkashi-sarkars*, the *ismis*’ possessions were subject to the assessment and payment of *mal-i wajib* in addition to the *peshkash-i Nizamat* which has been discussed above.¹ The part of the possession which was subject to the payment of *mal-i wajib* appears to have been marked, and so far as our knowledge goes, was placed under direct administration. Thus, *pargana* Birpur, forming part of the possessions of the zamindars of Lunawada and port of Porbandar Chhaiyan respectively were accordingly marked and placed under the direct administration from the time of conquest.²


2. *Account*, ff. 27ab, 112b, 114b-6b; *Mirat-i Ahmadi*, l.p. 288; *Ibid. Supplement*, pp. 191-3, 209-10, 214, 231; *Yad dasht haqiqat-i Sarkar Soreth*, op. cit. Though the *Ain* does not specify the administrative position, it however, furnishes area statistics for a number of *parganas*, as will be seen below, held by the *ismis*. It is not known whether the zamindari lands thus furnished with area statistics were entirely administered by the zamindars themselves or by the imperial officials. It may be seen that the *mahals* of other *ismis* formed part of one or the other *parganas* which are furnished
The zamindars of the places, however, continued to enjoy their share amounting to a fourth of the revenues which were collected by the imperial officials. The share could also be given by setting aside a duly marked part of the otherwise directly administered lands.

Out of the revenues which they appropriated from the mal-i wajib paying lands, the zamindars were required to pay peshkash in addition to what they paid on the peskashi territory.

Reasonably adequate information reflecting the empire's attempt at ascertaining the paying capacity of the zamindars under review is also available. The Ain-i Akbari records the area statistics for the zamindari parganas of Cheharmandvi-Atlesar, Barea and of all mahals of Sarkar Nadot (excluding mahal Rajpial), thus probably including the ones constitut-

---Continued---

with jama, and sometimes with area figures. Seemingly, they were also required to pay mal-i wajib. Anyway all the ismis, as also the entire lands of them all, may not be categorised as exclusively 'peshkashi' contrary to N.A. Siddiqi's contention, op.cit; see also PC No. p 3 p 39a, p 40a, for Navanagar.
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ing possession of the zamindar of Rajpipla. The jama figures as recorded in the Ain for these zamindaris being in odd numbers also suggest some exercise having been made in calculation. When we appreciate the availability of area statistics and the nature of jama figures in the context of the desais’ appointment to the zamindaris of Rajpipla and Atlesar the success of the Imperial attempt at ascertaining the paying capacity of the ismils during Akbar’s reign may appear more meaningful.

The imperial endeavor to ascertain the zamindars' paying capacity during the post-Ain period is, on the other hand suggested by the fact that the Ain and the later works record different amount of jama for the same lands. The jama of the eleven mahals (sarkar Nadot) forming the zamindari of Rajpipla registered a rise of 5.6 percent from the

1. Ain, II, pp 120-4; The area recorded for the zamindari parganas is too meagre to suggest the entire lands were covered by the land survey. Was a part of land that during later years was held and administered by the zamindar himself, left unsurveyed?

2. Ibid, II. pp 120-4. The work doesnot mention any amount of revenue under suyrqhal. Therefore Shireen Moosvi's view that when we subtract the suyrqhal figure from the jama figure we obtain round jama figures, is not-applicable. Shireen Moosvi, Suyurqhal Statistics in the Ain-i Akbari -- An Analysis", Proc, IHC, 1975.

3. Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, p. 233 and letter of Sharif Khan Bharuachi (January 1586) to Gangadas Nagar of Ahmadabad, Pune, R. No. 47,

4. Ain., II, pp. 120-4; Jama: Subah Gujarat (1670), Pune, R.No. 70, Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp.205-6, 209-10
period of the *Ain* (67,36,228 *dam*) to the later half of the seventeenth century (71,12,870 *dam*). The increase appears to be meagre compared to the rise of 148 percent in the *jama* of Bisrai, a directly administered *paragana* of the same *sarkar*.¹ On the other hand, the zamindari *parganas* of Cheharmandvi and Atlesar registered a rise of 148 percent during the same period. It may, however, be pointed out that during the post-1672 period, Atlesar came to be categorized as *ghair-amli* and the zamindar of Cheharmandvi as *zortalab*. The former characterization indicates the termination of assessment and the latter necessitated the actual use or show of force for collecting revenues.²

Besides, the zamindars of Rajpipla and Cheharmandvi-Atlesar successfully changed the nature of revenues which they paid to the State. Since the zamindar of Rajpipla did not pay revenues, the Subedar led a military expedition

---

1. *Ain*, II. pp.121-2; *Jama, Subah Gujarat*, (1670), op. cit; *Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement*, pp. 205-6, 209-10. We have reached the above mentioned total by deducting the *jama* for Bisrai, the twelfth *pargana*, out of the total *jama* for all the *parganas* as given in the *Ain*. The course has to be adopted for the two remaining sources put the *jama* for the eleven *parganas* together whereas the same has been separately specified for the twelfth *pargana*.

(1627), extorted khichri 1 fixed the same amount as peshkash to be paid by the zamindar in future. 2 The other zamindar ceased to pay mal-i wajib from the year 167.2 He could be obliged to pay peshkash instead, by a strong military commander. 3 Thus, some of the ismils showed the tendency of turning exclusively peshkash during the course of the seventeenth, century. 4

But, then, the Mughals were neither able to exercise control in equal degree on all the ismils nor on the entire possession of each zamindar even during the period of the Ain, for neither of them finds the same treatment in the Ain. Thus, Rajpipla and Ali-Mohan are mentioned in the general description and not included in the statistical

1. Khichri was the amount of money which the authorities could collect directly from the riaya occupying the lands that were otherwise subject to the payment of mal-i wajib and had passed under a zamindar's control who could not be forced to pay the revenue by way of mal-i wajib. It could also be levied as an additional impost over and above the mal-i wajib. For details, see the discussion in Chapters V and VI.

2. Nazar-i peshkash-o Khichri waghaira, Subah Gujarat; taraf Batrak-o Mahikantha PC No. 28.


4. Also see Account, f.27a, read with Ain, II pp.121-2 Before the dawn of the eighteenth century the recalci-trance of the zamindar of Cheharmandvi-Atlesar had come to be regarded as an accepted reality though he had been subjugated during Akbar's reign.
account, though the remaining parganas of the former zamindari, as referred to above, are furnished with area statistics.\textsuperscript{1} Besides, none of the mahals of the other ismis excluding pargana Barea and Birpur of (the zamindari pargana) Lunawada and Atlesar-Cheharmandvi is even noticed in the Ain.\textsuperscript{2}

The imperial interference, particularly in revenue matters was distasteful to the zamindars. Alongwith the desai, a qazi and a waqai nigar were also appointed in the territory of Rajpipla during Akbar's reign. The zamindar resenting the appointment of the desai, killed him.\textsuperscript{3} Likewise, the zamindar of Cheharmandvi had also killed the imperial desai during the same reign.\textsuperscript{4} The zamindar of Porbandar also attacked the imperial officials holding the fort and the port of the place.\textsuperscript{5}

The zamindars of Rajpipla and Atlesar-Cheharmandvi successfully consolidated their hold over their respective

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ain}, II, pp. 120-2.
\item \textit{Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement}, p.233.
\item Sharif Khan Bharuachi's letter \textit{op. cit.}
\item Photocopy of Aurangzeb's farman, dated April, 1683, \textit{Settled (Barakhali)} case No. 1159; District Record office, Junagadh (hereafter \textit{Junagadh}) recollects the said incident which took place at an unspecified time in the past but surely during the reign of the same emperor.
\end{enumerate}
possessions sometime before 1627 and 1673, respectively.\textsuperscript{1}

There is another set of evidence reflecting further the undoing of the imperial achievement of the Ain's times during later period. The Ain, as noted above, furnishes area statistics for a number of zamindari parganas. Recording the position as existed around the year 1681-82 which persisted during the later period also, the Account, on the other hand, specifies the territories of the ismis as ghair-paimoosa.\textsuperscript{2} More important is the fact that these lands came to be regarded as exempt from survey and immune from furnishing accounts of the villages on the specific ground of being mulk-i zamindari.\textsuperscript{3} It indicates the termination of Mughal hold on revenue matters and highlights the increasing hold of the ismis over their respective territory before the close of the seventeenth century.

1. *PC* No. 28 and 38 For further references, please see discussion in the following lines.


3. Instead of the area-figures, the following expression is suffixed against the territories: *bina bar mulk-i zamindari raqba dar paimaish niyamde* or *bina bar mulk-i zamindari Sarishta-i dehat b'daftar niyamde* or *bina bar mulk-i zamindari sarishta-i dehbandi b'daftar nami ayed *ibid* ff. 24b, 25a, 27ab, also see *Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement* pp.209-10.
But all the *ismis* were not able to regain their hold entirely and similarly consolidate their position. The zamindari areas of Porbandar (Port) and Birpur continued to be administered by the imperial officials throughout the seventeenth century.¹ There were, then, certain sources of revenue which were yet controlled by the state. Within the territory of Rajpipla (*Sarkar Nadot*) taxes on merchandise were levied and collected by the imperial officials as late as 1719.² Tax levied on the pilgrims visiting Amba Bhavani in the territory of Danta were also collected by the State officials before its abolition in 1662.³ The jama for the zamindari *pargana* Ali-Mohan and *Pargana* (as different from port) Porbandar were, for the first time, recorded during the post-*Ain* period only, suggesting that the government had acquired some control over these lands.⁴

This discussion leads us to the inference that though the magnitude of overall imperial control over the *ismis* had declined long before the onset of the eighteenth century, in comparison to the *zamindaran-i sarkarat-i peshkashi* the

former were placed under the greater degree of subjugation. As pointed out above, gazis were appointed in the territory of Rajpipla and Cheharmandvi. Similar appointments were made in the territory of Porbandar and Jhabua, while at the latter place a muhtasib was also maintained during Aurangzeb's reign.\(^1\) We may infer that the Mughal system of judiciary was also enforced. The mahals held by a few of them moreover, lay within the jurisdiction of the imperial faujdars and thus would be subject to his supervision and control.\(^2\) How far did the presence of faujdars affect the zamindar's position internally? In the absence of detailed evidence it may not be possible to answer the question categorically. As regards the military command of the ismis when posted outside their zamindris, they served directly under the nazim-i Subah, a privilege enjoyed by them all.\(^3\)

The zamindaran-i ismi had only unwillingly accepted imperial control which they tried to throw away as and when possible. The zamindar of Cheharmandvi-Atlesar had established his position as zortalab before the dawn of the eighteenth century. But the zamindari of Rajpipla, during

1. *Account*, ff. 99b, 100a.


emperor Akbar's reign, was annexed in immediate response to the zamindar's rebellious act of killing the imperial desai. Having thus been fully subdued, the zamindar had no way out but to offer peshkash as the token of submission for the restoration of his lost possession.\(^1\) Rai Naraindas, the Rathor zamindar of Idar (predecessor of the ismi zamindar of Pol) had shown his solidarity with Rana Pratap of Udaipur by rising in rebellion while the latter was hard pressed by Akbar. The imperial administration annexed the territory in retaliation for a while.\(^2\) The zamindar of the place again rose in rebellion during Rajput wars (1679-80) which led to the loss of Idar, the stronghold, and large tract of territory for good.\(^3\) It suggests that the imperial authority was quick, as far as possible, in retaliating the acts of rebelliousness, though the response and nature of action would not have been invariably the same.

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


3. *Mirat-i Ahmadi*, I, pp.294-5. The Rathors finally retired to Pol which they continued to hold till recently, MS Commissariat, *A History of Gujarat*, II, 449n. However, ex-vassals of the house of Rathor seem to have been allowed in their possessions as *zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin*. Account. ff. 117ab.
During the course of the seventeenth century, some of the makan-i zamindari of the ismis lost their unity, though the specific cause of their breaking up is not known. The Ain mentions Ali-Mohan as the zamindari held by a Chauhan zamindar, later on it was broken into two; Mohan (one makan) remained in the subah Gujarat while Ali (one makan) was transferred to Khandesh.  

Similarly, Porbandar which had been treated as one makan as late as 1640, came to be split up into four makans. Atlessar and Cheharmandvi were likewise divided into two makans sometime during the post-1663 period.

To sum up, the zamindar who held an entire mahal, or more than a mahal or group of mahals but less than a sarkar paid peshkash-i nizamat or rendered military service and were subject to the payment of mal-i wajib, whose zamindaris lay (though not invariably) within the jurisdiction of fauj-

1. Ain, II, p. 120 Account, ff.107a, 112b; Mirat-i Ahmadi Supplement, pp.209, 233.

2. Nazar-i Peshkash Documents, Pune, RNo. 43, Account, f. 124b; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, p.214. The remaining three makans -- Ranavao, Chhaiyyan and Navibandar -- were categorised as zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin, i.e. inferior to the ismis in general and to Porbandar in particular. Besides, the Rana of Porbandar is said to have been regarded as the head of the four makans. Wilberforce. History of Kathiawad, p. 123; Bombay Gazetteer, IX, pt. 1, p. 126; Ibid. VIII. pp 109-10, 301.

dars and were subject to some degree of control by the imperial authority, were called ismi zamindars. Though the ismis and the zamindars of the peshkashi-sarkars enjoyed a position which was identical in more than one respect, a line of demarcation may possibly be drawn between the two:

First, the zamindars of the peshkashi-sarkars were allowed to retain their entire possessions intact whereas the ismis were deprived of a part of their ancestral land at the time of conquest of the subah. Secondly, the possessions of the zamindars of the peshkashi sarkars consisting of not less than entire sarkars constituting the highest administrative unit within the province, while those of the ismis comprised, invariably, less than a sarkar which as an administrative unit, was comparable to a pargana level administration. Thirdly, the zamindars of the peshkashi sarkar were directly subordinate to the nazims while some of the ismis fell within the jurisdiction of faujdars of sarkars, or an equivalent authority, though they served directly under the Nazim. Fourthly, the zamindars of the peshkash-i sarkar enjoyed full autonomy in the administrative sphere of their entire zamindari but the ismis were deprived of part of the possessions which was placed under direct administration. Moreover, they were subject to greater control particularly in matters concerning revenues and judiciary. As such
the *ismis* enjoyed only a semi-autonomous position within a part of their possessions while those of the *peshkashi sarkars* enjoyed autonomy in the true sense of the term. Fifthly, the zamindars of the *peshkashi sarkars* paid only *peshkash* while the *ismis* were also required to pay *mal-i wajib*. The territories of the latter therefore, were not entirely *peshkashi*. With the passage of time, it is also evident from the preceding discussion that the demarcating features were getting blurred. There had emerged signs of differentiation among members of the stratum of *ismis* as some of them had risen higher and moved closer to the zamindaran-i sarkarat-i *peshkashi*. In some spheres like rendering of military service, assigning of *jagirs*, offering *peshkash-i nizamat*, circulation of Mughal currency etc. no qualitative difference appears to have existed between them. Finally, the zamindars belonging to both the categories followed the rule of primogeniture in the matter of succession which, at least technically, was subject to imperial approval.¹

Thus there existed definite signs of differentiation between the two strata of the category of zamindars, signs

¹ See, for imperial interference in the succession of Navanagar in the year 1695 when the zamindar enjoyed the position of a *ismi*, *Mirat-i Ahmadi*, i, pp. 330-1.
of intra-stratum differentiation had emerged and inter-strata distinguishing features were, though only gradually, getting blurred.
CHAPTER 1 (2)

THE SUPERIOR ZAMINDARS

On the eve of the eighteenth century

C: ZAMINDARAN-I MAHIN O KAHIN:

In its description of the zamindaran-i Subah the Account specifies the last set of 'zamindars', called zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin. They held 518 makanat-i zamindari during the first quarter of the eighteenth century. These makans like those of the ismis were exclusively situated within the 'kharaji-sarkars', outside the makans of the zamindars discussed in the preceding pages. According to the description given in the Account the mahin-o kahin (lit. big and small) were, along with the other zamindars, confirmed in their possessions during emperor Akbar's reign.2

The appellation (mahin-o kahin) apparently indicated the size of the makan -- big and small, which by itself does not serve as a denominator to distinguish this stratum of the zamindars from the rest. However, a study of the size of their possessions makes an interesting reading. This appears to be worth examining for highlighting one of the visible signs of differentiation amongst them. Thus we come

2. Ibid, f.105b
across zamindars like Malik of mawza Kadi (pargana Kadi, sarkar Ahmadabad) and many others whose 'makan' consisted of a fraction of cultivable land confined to a single village.¹

There were also other zamindars like Bhagwant Singh of mawza Kalol whose zamindari possession spread over as many as 42 villages, still confined to portions of cultivable area forming each of the villages under him.² There was, then, another section of zamindars each of whose zamindaris consisted of a little less than a pargana and sometime even

1. Out of an entire area (6000 bighas) constituting mawza Kadi khurd the Maliks, zamindaran-i mawza held 1075 bighas out of the cultivable area (4000 bigha). The remaining cultivable area (3225 bigha) is mentioned as ralyati and the rest (2000 bigha) is categorised as raga kharij az zira't. For similar examples see, Brahman, (zinnardar) zamindar of mawza Asland; Koli zamindar of Morwali and Rajput, zamindar of village Dewrah as representative cases. The document entitled "Yad-dasht: dehat pargana-i Kadi" (PC No. 3 to 7) lists all "zamindaran" and zamindari villages in the pargana. The Account specifies zamindars, their watan possession and the area statistics of each of the 'paimooda-mawza' forming the pargana. For the examples referred to above see, P.C. No.3,4 and 5 read with Account ff. 312b, 325a, 329a for other examples of similar nature, P.C.No. 1 to 6 read with Account, ff. 316b, 320b, 323a, 324b, 327b, 330b, 331b. It will not be out of place to mention here that in the present cases we come across also expressions like Koliyan, Rajputan, Moselmanan, zinnardaran (more than one person belonging to the caste held the possession) etc, each holding a fraction of cultivable portion of land; see, P.C.No.3 read with Account ff. 309ab, 322ab. In such and similar possessions share of member-zamindar must not have extended more than a few bighas of land. Also see following pages.

2. P.C No. 3b-4b, read with Account. ff. 310a, 312a-4b, 322b-3a, 324a, 325b, 326b-7a, 329b.
more, thus considerable in size.\(^1\)

As regards the location of the possessions of the zamindaran-i mahin o kahin it is evident that these were situated in almost every pargana of each of the kharaji sarkars; they thus covered plains, the rugged and mountaineous regions.\(^2\) The geographical position of the zamindari and its distance from the seat of provincial power seem to have had some bearing on the size and extent of the zamindari as well as on the position of the zamindar within his possession.

The large sized possessions were mainly situated far off the provincial seat of power within favourable geographical surroundings. Thus the zamindari parganas comprising one makan and more than one makan-i zamindari were situated on the sea-coast of the peninsula Gujarat, i.e. Sarkar Soreth.\(^3\) Similarly, zamindari parganas of Dantiwara, Akleshwar, Tarkesar, Bundeli, Manzal, Nimdah etc. fell on the

\(^1\) Thus, the zamindari parganas of Talaja, Mhowa, Sehore, Palitana Mandvi, Gariadhar etc. were respectively held by Partap Singh, father of Bhao Singh, Jemla, Dewdas, Pirthwiraj at the opening of the 18th century. Account ff. 125b, 126a read with peshkash Documents, P.C. No. p.17, p.19, p34, p36.

\(^2\) Account ff 106b-9a, 114a-27a; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement pp.228-39 read with Ibid, pp.246-9;.

\(^3\) For example, see Mangrole, Mandvi, Chorwar, Jagat, Talaja, Amreli, Ghoga etc. Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp.212, 214-5, 217-8; Account, ff. 108b, 109a; Ain, II, pp.117-19.
outskirts of the subah adjoining the possessions of zaminda-
ran-i ismi and those of sarkarat-i peshkashi. ¹ Still other
like Lolyana, Morwara, Gohana, Duda, Baxra, Palitana, Se-
hore, Gondal, Gariadhar, Morvi etc. were located in he
hilly regions and sometime surrounded by forests and rela-
tively in distant corners. ² But no paragana level zamindari
was situated around the seat of provincial power.

How far the distance from the seat of power and geo-
graphical surroundings could prove favourable to zamindar
viz a viz the imperial government? It may be viewed from the
position of the zamindar of paragana Tarkesar who, on account
of distance (dur-i dast) and geographical surroundings (dar
kohistan waqi'shud) could not be retained under the adminis-
trative control so much so that a faujdar too could not be

¹. Account ff, 107b-9a; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, p.201-
3, 205-6, 210-1. It may be pointed out that large size
possessions of zamindars, which were situated on the
mainland, fell on the Northern and Eastern side of the
Subah. The part was, by and large, devoid of plains
and infested with hill ranges and forest. Hamilton
Walter, op.cit I, pp. 605,608,680, 683-5, Mirat-i Ahma-
di, Supplement, pp.210-1 also.

². For distance, Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp.212-5,
217-9 for geographical conditions, Ibid., pp.246-7;
Sujan Rai Bhandari Khulasat-ut tawarikh, Delhi 1918
p.57 James Tod, Travels into Western India, p.19
Wilberforce, op.cit, pp 37-9
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maintained there. Similarly the zamindaris situated on the sea coast had come to enjoy immunity from the routine administrative control.2

On the other hand none of the parganas constituting the sarkar of Ahmadabad and Baroda was entirely held by zamindars. 3 These sarkars stretched over and contained mainly the plains constituting the subah. Within the sarkar Ahmadabad there were, however, relatively big zamindars holding vast tracts of land in the pargana of Viramgaon (Jhalawar), noted for its jungles and the recalcitrant Jhala Rajputs. 4

As distinct from the makan-i zamindari of the zamindars discussed in the preceding pages (Chapter I(1)) the makan of each zamindar of the present section was not invariably held by one zamindar. Thus mawza Bhadarya formed the zamindari of Rajputs (Rajputan) who held 982 bigha 10 biswa of cultivable area in the village. 5 Similarly there were

1. Thus the text says: pargana Tarkesar- az Ahmadabad yek sad - o panj kuroh taraf junub muttasil Rajpipla ... chun dur -i dast dar kohistan waqa' shude dast-i nazim -o jagirdar namirasid. Mirat-i Ahmadi: Supplement, p.206.

3. Account (f 15a) states that dur mulk bena bar sahil darya -i shor k' bar ba'zi jahast-o kharij az tagsim ast. cf Ain II, p.124, for further references see the following discussion.


5. P.C. (Kadi), No.3 read with Account ff 9b, 322ab.
Syeds, Maliks and Khans etc respectively the zamindars of the village(s) Shali, Jarkal, and Badan, Ankhar—each (group) holding one makan-i zamindari.\textsuperscript{1} It is equally true of some of the zamindaris that consisted of entire parganas.\textsuperscript{2} It may, therefore, be contended that in the case of the zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin a zamindari makan would be held by one zamindar as also it could form collective-holding held together by more than one member who might have belonged to the same family.\textsuperscript{3}

A study of the caste composition of the zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin brings a few important points to light. In addition to various clans of Rajputs, the Ahirs, Brahmans, Kolis, Bhattis, Charans, Jats, Kathis, Syeds, Afghans, Maliks and other Muslims are also mentioned as being in possession of zamindaris in the subah.\textsuperscript{4} Among the Rajputs some clans such as Jhalas, Panwars, Bhodias, Babarias, Makwanas, Gohels

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Account} ff. 304a, 320b, 321b, 325a, 327b, 329a, 330b also see ff. 114b, 116b, 19a, 309a for additional informations.
\item \textit{Ibid}, ff 122a, 123a, 124b, 125b.
\item As will be seen below there were also the makan-i zamindari which could he held simultaneously by the members of different caste and communities.
\end{enumerate}
etc. who did not possess the zamindaris described in the preceding Chapter, are mentioned as holders of makan-i zamindari in the group under discussion. It may, therefore, be submitted that from the point of view of caste and community this section had a relatively wider social base though mainly confined to high castes.

It has been observed that there were well marked blocks of territory each consisting of a single pargana or a group of parganas under the zamindari members of the same caste.

The observation being based on the information contained in the Ain may be substantiated further with the help of other sets of information, particularly for the Mughal Subah of Gujarat. Some of the territorial blocks like Kathiawar, Jhalawar, Gohelwar, Babariawar, Jethwar etc. were named after the castes, viz; Kathis, Jhalas, Gohels, Babaria Jethwa zamindars holding zamindaris in the regions named

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


respectively against their castes. ¹ However, caste-blocks of territory need not be regarded as the exclusive holdings of the said caste. Thus Koli zamindars possessed zamindari village (Othania), in Jhalawad. ² The Kolis are also mentioned as being in possession of zamindari lands in the vicinity of Bankaner (Wankaner), one of the constituencies of Jhalawad.³ One of the four divisions into which Jhalawad was divided, was in the possession of Koli zamindars.⁴ Similarly the town of Maliya (pargana Maliya) formed part of the Jadejas' zamindari in Jhalawar itself.⁵ Therefore, the zamindars after whose caste the territory was thus identified, as is evident in the context of Jhalawar, were not the exclusive holders, they might better be described as the dominant possessors of the zamindari lands.

There were, then, as pointed out above, the parganas which were entirely held by zamindars. Vis-a-vis caste and clans of zamindars, such parganas as were exclusively za-


3. *Ibid*.


5. *Account* ff. 123b.
Zamindari holdings may be categorized into two: first, parganas forming zamindaris held by members of the same caste and clan. In this group the zamindari parganas like Sehore (Gohel), Navibandar (Jethwa), Palitana (Kathi) etc. each of which formed one makan-i zamindari may be mentioned. There were still other parganas which contained more than one makan-i zamindari, were, however held by members of the same caste. Thus pargana Jagat comprised seven independent makans and was held by Baghera (Baghela) Rajputs. Pargana Bhadarwa is mentioned as the zamindari of Rajputs (Rajputan). Parganas comprising Kathiawar (Four) consisted of 16 makan-i zamindari each of which was held by a Kathi zamindar. Among the sixteen Kathis, nine are identified as the descendents of one Khoman Kathi alone. Similarly the parganas of Porbandar, Navibandar, Ranavao and Chhaiyan (two mahals, in all) were grouped into three makans which

1. Ibid. ff. 124b, 125b, 126a; Peshkash Docs, P.C. Nos. 17,19,34, such parganas are noted as, for example: pargana Palitana-yek makan b'ism Jhala zamindar pargana mazkur.

2. Account. f.123a; peshkash Docs; P.C. No. p.20; p.38.

3. Account, f.125a;


5. Mahal Porbandar is counted as the possession of ismi zamindar mentioned already.
were held by Jethwa Rajputs. 1 Evidently the possession of a family, much less of a caste and clan, had come to be divided into separate makan-i zamindari presumably due to the working of the rule of succession and determined imperial bid to split up zamindaris into smaller units. 2

But the sub-divisioning of zamindaris among members of a family, caste or clan of Rajput and Kolis (i.e. the original possessore of land) does not explain the existence of the second category i.e. non-Koli-Rajput zamindari parganas in particular or the multi-caste zamindari parganas in general. Thus, for example, pargana Tilakwara, an exclusive zamindari pargana, contained six makans which were held by Gochar, Hafiz, Murad Khan, Partap Singh, Bhanji and two more zamindars not named in the work. 3 Similarly, the makan-i zamindari in the pargana of Sarnal were held by Malik, Syed Miyan, Khan and Rajput zamindars. 4 There were, similarly, many other independent makan-i zamindari held by persons who belonged to different castes and communities in one and the

2. For references please see discussion in the following pages.
same parganas. No precise information regarding the emergence of non-Rajput Koli zamindar during the Mughal age is available.

Some changes in the caste composition of this category of zamindars appear to have taken place during the post-Ain period. In addition to the castes of zamindars which are mentioned in the Ain, the late seventeenth and the early eighteenth century documents mention Qureshis, Brahmans, Syeds, Afghans also. Members of such castes as are not mentioned in the Ain may be noted for the parganas of Sanwas (Khans), Sonkhera (Rajputs) Nadiad (Muslims), Kadi (Solan-kis, Brahmans, Bhats, Maliks, Syeds, Kolis) etc. In yet another pargana (Sarnal) the Ain enters 'girasia' in the caste column of zamindars. During the opening years of


2. For the period of Sultans of Gujarat, See S.C. Misra, Rise of Muslim Power in Gujarat, pp.204-6, 208.

3. The inference may hold good only if the information contained in the Ain is regarded as complete.


6. Ain, II, pp.120-1; It may be pointed out that the Ain mistook girasia for a caste. The girasias were also among the possessors of superior rights in land, See Chapter V below.
the eighteenth century we come across Maliks, Syeds, Miyan and Khan zamindars holding 12 out of 14 makan-i zamindari in the same pargana. 1

No further information regarding the emergence of zamindars belonging to the castes mentioned above is available. Another set of evidence related to some other zamindaris however suggests the replacement of zamindars belonging to one caste by those belonging to another. In the Ain, Bajana, Wasara, Maliya and Ranpur are specified as parts of Jhalawar, zamindaris of which were held by Rajputs of Jhal clan. 2 During the last decades of the seventeenth century and first decades of the eighteenth Malik Bahadur Khan is mentioned as zamindar of Bajana which formed one makan-i zamindari in this region. 3 Likewise, Bahadur Khan is mentioned as the zamindar of (qasbah) Ranpur (one makan) Sahab Khan as the holder of zamindari makan of Wasara, and Maliya is specified as one makan-i zamindari held by a Jadeja Rajput. 4 Similarly, Sankhudar (Beit) is shown as the possession of Badhela Rajputs in the Ain while in the records

mentioned above the place is specified as the zamindari of one Bheema Rathor. 1

It will also be worthwhile tracing the causes of the division of caste-family possessions. But, then, no precise information regarding the process and causes of dividing of the caste-family possessions is available. Still from stray pieces of information some idea of it may be formed.

It has already been noted that the zamindari of sarkar Navanagar was treated as one makan before it was annexed in 1662. Subsequent to its restoration there we hear of 22 makan-i zamindari held by the Jadeja descendents and dependents of the ex-zamindar belonging to the same clan. 2 Similarly the Rathors' zamindari of (pargana) Idar formed one makan before it was finally annexed in 1680. During the post-annexation period the Rathor vassals and descendents of the ex-chief (a Rathor), in all, held 15 makans. 3 Excluding the zamindar of mahal Haft-Polia (Pol) each one of them came to be categorised as zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin. 4

1. Ain, II, p.117; Account, f.123a.
3. Account, ff. 119ab; Peshkash Docs. P.C. Nos. 4,10,11.
The rule of succession clearly played its role. Besides, we may take into account the chiefs' responsibility for providing sources of livelihood to the junior members of their families and their respective supporters by making land grants and the latters' willingness for and the empire's policy of entering into direct relationship with these smaller units. At the time the Jadeja chief of Navanagar was restored to his gaddi, each of his family member who had approached the emperor was granted a status independent of their chief. The chief had particularly requested for the grant of 25 villages to those Jadejas who had stood by him during his days in exile. It was these Jadejas who held the divided principality of Navanagar in the form of independent makans as zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin.

A glimpse of the division of zamindaris may be had by highlighting the position of some zamindars holding their

---


lands in pargana Kadi. In the pargana, Hathi Singh, (9 villages) and Bhagwant Singh (42 villages) held one makan-i zamindari each. In addition to that, the brotherhood (brathri) of Bhagwant Singh held 15 villages as 'zamindars' independent of chief in the same pargana. Likewise Amar Singh, zamindar of (watan) Harsoila and Pirthvi Raj, zamindar of (watan) Mansa held 34 and 16 villages respectively forming two makan's. Their kinsmen (lit. brothers) held 33 villages independently of the head of their respective families. 1 The zamindaris were split up though the caste-family identity still survived. 2

Like the zamindaran-i ismi, the zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin, were also required to render military service. All of them were enjoined upon to perform the duty of "watch and ward" (chowki-o pehra) within the villages of their respective zamindaris. 3 For ensuring the proper performance of assigned duties, the administration took an undertaking (muchalka), established thanas and faujdari stations within

1. P.C. (Kadi) Nos. 3,4,5,6,7; also Account, ff. 307b-32a. They held these villages in their capacity as 'giras-sias', i.e. primary zamindars.

2. It appears that the brotherhood was provided means of subsistence by its chief. In due course of time the dependent brotherhood entered into direct relationship with the imperial administration.

3. Account, f.106b.
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their zamindaris, and sometime at the watan village (or town) itself. In addition to policing their zamindaris, they were also required to furnish troops for imperial service whenever called upon to do so. It may be pointed out that the duty of 'watch and ward' was an essential obligation of all of them whereas the specified contingents for performing duties outside their respective zamindaris were to be furnished as and when required (ind-ul talab) otherwise they were required to pay peshkash-i nizamat in lieu of service.

Like the other constituent sections of the category of Superior zamindars, the tendency to exchange peshkash for service is discernable in the case of the present section also. By the year 1682, a section of the zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin had succeeded in exchanging peshkash for service.

There were the zamindars like those of Tarkesar, Santalpur and other places who are characterised as zortalab and

1. Ibid, f. 93a; for details of thanas Ibid, ff. 163a-4b; 166b-9a; 211b-2a, 227a-30b and passim; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp.190-238.

2. Account, f. 106b. Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, p.256. for the military service actually rendered by some of them during the reigns of Akbar and Aurangzeb see Akbarnama, III, pp.66-7, 593; Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, pp.175, 189, 256.


4. Account, f.106b; Mirat-i Ahmadi; Supplement, pp.121-2.
could be forced to pay peshkash only. 1 Also the zamindars whose possessions were located far off the seat of provincial power and in the coastal areas of peninsular Gujarat enjoyed virtual exemption from service. 2 Moreover, some of them, like that of Bargir had, for unknown reasons, been directly allowed to go peshkashi. 3

A similar view of the declining imperial control may in more definite terms be formed by having an insight into the state's economic claims in the produce of the zamindaris. Like those of the *ismis*, possessions of this section of zamindars were from the beginning of the Mughal rule subject to the payment of tribute and *mal-i wajib* which were respectively called 'peshkash-i nizamat' and 'matalba-i sarkar-i wala'. 4 The imperial administration strove, as far as possible, to ascertain the actual paying capacity of

1. Account, ff. 27b, 74b; *Mirat-i Ahmadi; Supplement*, pp.192-203, 205, 206, 214, cf. *Ain*, (II, pp.121-22) which furnishes area figures alongwith the *jama* for these zamindaris.

2. Account, ff. 15a, 27b, cf.*Ain*, II, p.124

3. *Mirat-i Ahmadi; Supplement*, p.230. The work describes the position of the zamindar of Bargir as zamindar anja b jamia't du sad sawar taqdim-i khidmat-i nazim hazir mishud.... man ba'd peshkash bar oo qarar yaft.

4. Unlike zamindaran-i sarkarat-i peshkashi who paid matalba-i sarkar-i wala by way of peshkash other zamindars with few exception paid it in the form of 'mal-i wajib'. *Yad-dasht* zamindaran-i subah, op.cit.
zamindars and to curtail powers otherwise enjoyed by them. In this attempt the empire had met with appreciable success and placed the zamindars under a greater degree of subjugation in comparison with the ones discussed in Chapter 1(1). But during the course of the seventeenth century, particularly during its latter half, some of the zamindars who, among others happened to be richer in resources and stronger as to their resisting capacity, successfully reversed the ongoing process of acquiring greater control in their favour.

The imperial administration extended land survey to cover possessions of ‘zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin’. It appears the practice had been initiated under the Mughals during Akbar's reign.¹

¹ Excluding seven parganas of Sarkar Ahmadabad and Pattan and the entire sarkar Soreth, the Ain furnishes land area statistics for all the parganas of the subah in the statistical account. Since the zamindars' possessions were located within these parganas, these lands too might have been covered by land survey. But the information in the Ain appears to be incomplete for it does not speak of the survey of the entire lands situated within the surveyed parganas. Our suspicion is strengthened by the fact that the works of later date giving the same information for the later period (c. 1682) show a rise in the land area for the same parganas over and above the ones given in the Ain. For example, Account ff. 278a, 279a-98b; 303b; 304b-7a; 351b-3a. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pargana</th>
<th>Area c.1595</th>
<th>Area c.1682</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Dholqa</td>
<td>8,34,606</td>
<td>13,68,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. SarnaI</td>
<td>80,646</td>
<td>1,37,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Mehmudabad</td>
<td>45,590</td>
<td>53,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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The evidence contained in the Account establishes it beyond doubt that the zamindars' possessions were covered by land survey and the practice was kept up even during the subsequent period. Excepting 4 out of 282 villages which formed pargana Kadi, all others were surveyed by Raja Todarmal. Another document specifies that 252 out of 282 villages of pargana Kadi contained zamindars' lands all of which had been surveyed. To be more precise, zamindar Hathi Singh whose possession in the same pargana extended

...Continued...

The latter work records the number of villages constituting the pargana and land area of each village separately, thus indicating that entire lands had been covered by land survey by the later date. However, the possibility of restructuring of parganias during the post-Ain period may not be ruled out as the Mirat-i Ahmadi (Supplement, p.190) suggests the creation of some new parganias. (Ibid. p.190 cf. Ain II, pp.120-1). The following evidence substantiates it further:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pargana</th>
<th>Area Statistics (in bighas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.1595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Piplod</td>
<td>39,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Kadi</td>
<td>9,36,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Masumabad</td>
<td>2,13,805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall in the land area was definitely the outcome of taking out of some villages from these parganias, for the later work records area of each village (excepting 7 out of 340 villages which, according to the work, were not covered by Raja Todarmal's survey) constituting the three parganias, leaving no possibility of turning the once surveyed area into ghair paimooda.

1. Account, ff. 319a, 321b, 326a, 330a.
2. Ibid, ff. 307b-32a read with P.C. (Kadi) No. 3to 7.
over eight villages possessed mawza Pethapur by way of
watan.  

The account furnishes detailed area statistics for
Pethapur the same way as it does for the ‘raiyati'
villages. 

The Account furnishes village-wise information regarding all the 28 parganas which constituted sarkar Ahmadabad. Describing the position that existed around 1682, the Account mentions 10 parganas as ghair palmooda while the rest (18) are furnished with area-figures. All the parganas which are described as ‘palmooda' contained 63 makans held by

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

1. Account, ff. 309a; P.C. (Kadi) No.3.

2. P.C.(Kadi), No.3; Peshkash Docs. P.C. No.6,7; The Account records area in the following way:

Mawza: Pethapur
raqba (total) 3900 - 10 biswas

(a) adadani waghaira 1550 - 10 biswas

i) abadani 100-0
ii) Kondra 175-0
iii) raha 345-0
iv) goristan 7-0
v) zamin-i shor 30-0
vi) hawz 10-0
vii) jungle 501-0
viii) lab-i ab 380-0
ix) devasthan 2-10

(b) Laiq-i zira't 2350 bigha

To cite yet another example, mawza Badasma, a watan village finds the description in the same way:

raqba 1000 bigha
abadani etc... 300 bigha

Laiq-e zira't 700 bigha. Account, ff. 309b, 314a.
zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin. The watan portions of their possessions are also specified in the documents. 1 The Account in its village-wise description records the area of all the villages, including the watan, which were situated within the parganas declared as 'paimoodah'. 2 It establishes beyond doubt that the imperial land survey was extended to cover even the watan possessions of zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin.

Instead of citing evidence in exhaustive detail it may, in brief, be submitted that around the year 1682, when the last land survey was undertaken, possessions of zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin which happened to be situated within the parganas of paimoodah lands, were also in equal degree, subject to the land survey. The survey covered all the zamindari villages including watan. Analogically it may be argued that possessions of the zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin

---


2. See, for example, Account, ff 307b-32b, 362b-9b. the document entitled 'Yad-dasht: Dehat-i pargana Kadi [(P.C. (Kadi) No.3to7)] specifies zamindar, watan and the rest of villages forming the entire zamindari of each zamindar holding lands in pargana Kadi. On the other hand the Account, as mentioned above, records area statistics for each of the villages constituting zamindari possessions. Evidently, land survey was extended to cover the entire lands of zamindari and no exception was made in these cases.
were not exempt from land survey and it might have been extended to cover their lands in the rest of subah also. 1

The administration had an inclination for surveying all lands, including zamindars' possession, though the policy had met only with partial success. 2

The policy of surveying all lands including those of zamindars, which was initiated under emperor Akbar was not only kept up, 3 but also enforced further to cover new parganas. The evident increase in the area statistics for the same parganas from the date of the Ain to the year 1682

1. The Account gives exhaustive details of villages and parganas forming sarkar Ahmadabad. As regards the other sarkars it does not record details below the pargana level. Ain, II, pp.120-4.

2. In the year 1682, emperor Aurangzeb had ordered the survey of lands of the parganas that had remained unsurveyed by that year. He had ordered that assistance of "zamindaran" was to be taken for that purpose. Account, ff.23a, 24a.

In the aforesaid year, entire sarkars of Soreth and Godhra and 49 mahals situated in the remaining eight kharaji sarkars are characterized as "ghair paimooda", Account, ff.23a-31a. Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, p.25. For further details see the following discussion.

3. See for example, parganas of Dholqa, Sarna!, Kadi, Mehmudabad, Masudabad, Nadiad, haveli Ahmadabad, Arhar­matar, Bheel, Piplod, Prantij etc. are furnished with area statistics in the Ain (II, pp.120-1) as well as Account (ff.23ab, 25a; 163ab, 174a-5a, 202ab, 216a-9a, 278ab, 302b-3a, 307b-8a, etc.).
may serve as a reliable indicator.\(^1\) Besides, the \textit{Ain} does not furnish area statistics for the parganas of Petlad, Thamna, Mandva, Hyderabad and Kaparbanj.\(^2\) But the \textit{Account} furnishes detailed area statistics for all these parganas.\(^3\)

A reverse trend is also noticeable. All the parganas of sarkar Godhra are furnished with area-statistics in the \textit{Ain}.\(^4\) Subsequently the entire sarkar turned ghair-paimooda.\(^5\) Similarly, nine parganas of sarkar Ahmadabad which had been surveyed during the \textit{Ain}-period, are described as 'ghair-paimooda' during Aurangzeb's reign.\(^6\) So is the picture of one pargana of sarkar Baroda, five of Bharuch, six of sarkar Champaner and eleven mahals of sarkar Godhra which had been surveyed during the sixteenth century, but came to be categorised as 'ghair-paimooda' by the ninth

\begin{enumerate}
\item An increase in the recorded area is noticeable in the parganas of Arharmatar, Bheel, Prantij, Petlad, Thamna, Dholga, Sarnal, Kapadbanj, Mehmudabad, Nadiad, \textit{haveli} Ahmadabad etc. \textit{Ain}, II, pp.120-1 cf. \textit{Account}, ff. 23ab; 25a.
\item \textit{Ain}, II, pp.120-1.
\item \textit{Account}, ff. 183a, 218a, 277a, 332b, 337b. It may also be seen that all the parganas of Sarkar Soreth and pragana Idar (sarkar Ahmadabad) remained 'ghair-paimooda' throughout the period. \textit{Ain}, II pp. 120-5; \textit{Account}, ff.28a, 168b.
\item \textit{Ain}, II, p.123.
\item \textit{Account},ff.27ab
\item \textit{Ain}, II, pp.120-1 cf \textit{Account}, ff.23b, 24a, 25a-6a.
\end{enumerate}
decade of the seventeenth century.¹ In brief five new
parganas came to be covered by land survey during the post-
Ain period, while 48 parganas and one entire sarkar (Godhra)
lost their position of surveyed areas during the same peri-
od². Inferentially, the possessions of more zamindars
stood ghair paimooda during the post-Ain period than at the
time of the Ain. However, the zamindaris that were situated
around the seat of provincial power and which could be
managed with relative ease, felt more weight of the adminis-
trative control. It appears from the fact that the parganas
which came to be covered by land survey during the later
period were located in close proximity to the seat of pro-
vincial power while the others which turned ghair-paimooda
were located in more distant places, generally touching the
zamindari possessions of ismi zamindars.³ Apparently imperi-
al control on the zamindars of distant regions was on the
decline. This may be established further with the help of
another but similar set of evidence.

Excluding a few mahals in the sarkar Pattan and sarkar
Ahmadabad and the whole of sarkar Soreth all other mahals of

2. Ain, pp.120-4 cf. Account, ff. 23a-7b.
3. Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, (pp.188-222) specifies the
distance of parganas and direction from the city of
Ahmadabad.
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the subah were covered by land survey during Akbar's reign. By the year 1682, the exclusively zamindari parganas came to enjoy immunity from land survey as well as from furnishing details of villages and revenue-returns to the Diwan-i Subah. Thus, for example, Account states 'on account of being mulk-i zamindari (bina bar mulk-i zamindari)' details of villages of the seven mahals of sarkar Godhra were not received in the Diwan's office. Thus, the zamindars who held entire parganas and mahals and whose possessions were situated in relatively distant parts came to enjoy immunity from land survey and some of them even from furnishing accounts of villages as a matter of administrative norm during the post-A'in period. These zamindars had evidently extended their administrative sway over the lands which had been surveyed and presumably placed under direct administrative control during the period of the A'in.

However, all the zamindars who came to hold entire parganas were not necessarily exempt from furnishing accounts of villages to the provincial diwan even though their lands being located in the ghair palmooda sarkar of Soreth

1. A'in, II, pp.120-21, 124.

2. Account, ff.17a, 26b, 27a, For similar position also see Ibid. ff. 26b, 27a; Mirat-i Ahmad (Supplement, pp.205, 210-11) describes these parganas as held bila qaid dehat hence the number of villages too is not specified cf. A'in, II, p.123.
were not covered by land survey. Territories of a large number of the zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin lay within the jurisdiction of desais who acted as watchdogs of imperial interest in revenue matter.

The imperial administration also maintained jama (the assessed revenue) figures for the territories of zamindars. It was maintained regardless of the position concerning land survey and the furnishing of accounts of villages. A study of the jama figures of the zamindars who turned autonomous makes an interesting reading.

1. Account, ff. 25a, 26a-8b.

2. No exemption seems to have been granted in regard to the appointment of the desais. However, the strong ones appear to have extorted the concession in the course of the seventeenth century. For details and references, please see 'desai' Chapter III below.

3. Account, ff. 23a-31a read with bid, ff. 114a-27a. Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp.205-6, 210, 211. Jama for some of the ghair-amli lands held by a few zamindars however, were not maintained.

4. Ain, II, pp.120,124, Doc. Yad dasht, Jamadami Subah Gujarat 1682-83 (partly torn), R.No.33. Pune; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp.211-1; Account, ff. 18a-20a. These parganas are not among the ones which lay within desais' jurisdiction at least during Augangzeb's reign. Please see desai Chap. III below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zamindars' Parganas (Sarkar Soreth)</th>
<th>JAMA - DAM1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Amreli</td>
<td>C.1595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Palitana</td>
<td>17,84,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dharal</td>
<td>2,40,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lathi</td>
<td>6,24,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mandvi</td>
<td>1,27,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dhatrod</td>
<td>1,27,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Malikpur</td>
<td>2,96,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dungar</td>
<td>7,60,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gariadhar</td>
<td>2,52,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Jagat</td>
<td>8,03,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident that these parganas were assessed even during the post-Ain period, the jama figures for the different points of time (1595, 1682-83 and 1719) are not the same. Secondly, the jama in the case of first seven of the ten parganas cited above records a fall in the assessed revenue demand of the state. A rise indicated in the jama of the last three parganas being too meagre does not fall in line with the general trend shown in the jama for the subah as well as the empire. Thirdly, the jama figures for the years 1682-83 and 1719 onward having remained the same suggest that the jama in respect of these zamindaris was not reassessed during post-1682-83 period, though an upward revision is evident from the jama for the non-zamindari areas as well as areas of relatively petty zamindars. Thus a recorded fall in the jama (serial Nos. 1 to 7), or a negligible rise in the amount of jama of a few (serial Nos.
8 to 10) and finally the non-revision of the same during post-1882-83 period is suggestive of an over all decline in the imperial control over the economy of the same and similar zamindars. ¹

The parganas referred to above had come to be held and administered by the zamindars themselves. ² There were also the zamindars whose makans, either entirely or partly fell within the parganas which continued to be under the direct imperial administration. ³ The entire lands including the non-zamindari ones, forming these pargana are also described as 'ghair palmooda'. However, the diwan's office maintained detailed account of each village, including the watan part of zamindars in the same way as it does for the non-zamindari villages. ⁴ No discrimination seems to have been made in

---

¹. It has been suggested that jama approximated to the hasil during the last years of emperor Akbar's reign. The gap between the two widened particularly during Shah Jahan's reign and the trend was not reversed during the subsequent period; see M. Athar Ali, Nobility Under Aurangzeb, pp.46-50. The negligible rise and more clearly the fall in the jama appreciated in the context of widening gap between the assessed sum and the actual collections go to suggest that the zamindars were able to pocket major part of their revenues. For some of the other zamindars' territories showing the same and similar trend, Ain, II, pp.123-4, read with Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp.210-8.

². Account, ff. 123a-5b, 168b-9a; 213a-4b; 274b-7a.

³. Ibid, ff. 345b-55a. Ibid, ff. 227a-37b; 300a-32b; 370a-71b.

⁴. Ibid.
the appointment of authorities responsible for assessing and collecting the revenues during the heyday of Mughal rule. 1

Among the territorial possessions of zamindars part of which was held by them while the other portion remained under the imperial officials, may be mentioned the Gohel's possessions. The zamindar administered pargana Sehore while Ghoga, a port town and a constituent of the zamindari was placed under the imperial officials. 2 The zamindar obtained his share in the revenues of the port from the provincial treasury. 3

Instead of retaining parts or entire makanas of zamindars under its direct administration, it appears that the imperial government, in some cases, remained contended with direct control over one of their sources of revenue. Thus, for instance, taxes on pilgrims visiting Amba Bhavani in the territory of Danta, a self-administered makan, were collected by the imperial officials before their abolition in 1662. 4 Likewise, taxes on traders in the region of Sehore

1. Ibid.
2. Account, ff. 126a; also Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, p.194.
3. Doc. entitled, "Yad-dasht: bandar Ghoga, R.No.39, Pune, For similar position in Jhalwad and Idar see; Account, ff. 230b-7b.
etc. (sarkar Godhra) were levied and collected by Imperial officials, though the territory had come to be held by autonomous zamindars. Moreover, the villages of Mandal, Dekawara and Hadala (Viramgaon) were held and administered by the zamindars themselves. However, the dastur-ul amals laying down rates of taxes and levies to be extorted at the nakas (entry-exit point) of the aforesaid villages housing mandis, were maintained in the diwan's office.

Not much information is available regarding the position and role of zamindars in the process of assessment and collection of mal-i wajib from the peasantry of ghair-paimooda zamindari lands which had been placed under direct control. However, the revenues for the peshkashi territory were collected and paid by the zamindars as will be seen below.

As distinct from the makanat-i zamindari referred to above, all the makans which happened to be situated within the continuously surveyed parts of the Subah, were placed under direct administration from the times of the Ain to the

2. Account, ff. 230b-6b.
3. Ibid, (ff. 227b-8b) specifies each item of trade, rates of levy, place of levying taxes and other instructions to Imperial officials regarding the coins etc. For similar references also see Ibid ff. 228b-9b.
opening of the eighteenth century. The available evidence for these zamindaris casts light on the sway of rights and position of zamindars within their possessions during the last quarter of the seventeenth century. The available information is of particular significance for it casts light on the inter-relationship between zamindars' lands and the raiyati lands from a different angle.

Even if a zamindar held merely a portion, he was indeed identified with all the villages or parganas as the case might be. The identification appears to be a mere conventional form of description rather than an indicator of the sway of the zamindar's right.

---

1. The last of the reported land surveys was ordered in 1682. The pre-1682 position of lands which continued to be surveyed till that year was, according to the document, based on Raja Todarmal's survey as revised by Nawab Shihabuddin Khan during Akbar's reign.

2. For such identification, see Irfan Habib, Agrarian System, pp.155-7. The zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin were also identified the same way. The documents describe the zamindars as : so and so zamindar of mawza/pargana such and such, or zamindar(s) so and so of mawza/pragana such and such.

3. Irfan Habib (Agrarian System, pp.141,143) and following him, B.R. Grover ("dehat-i taaluga" op.cit p.166 ) conceive of the raiyati and the zamindari villages as exclusive of each other. According to them, the raiyati could not form part of a 'zamindari' village and vice versa. N.A. Siddiqui ( op.cit, pp.146-7) also follows the same line of argument. These scholars, rule out possibility of the existence of raiyati lands in the taaluqa (zamindari) of a zamindar. Their understanding of the raiyati and zamindari rights as being other than and different from each other is quite correct. But in view of the evidence cited below their view on the existence of the raiyati lands within the
suggests that the zamindar's right could be confined to a definite portion and the rest could be the raiyati land, even if the village was reckoned as 'taalulqua-i zamindar'.

It has been pointed out above that the possessions of the Rajputs and Kolis were divided into two parts, namely; the talpad, revenues from which were attached to the government, and the bantha which was retained by its original possessors. It is yet to be seen whether the division implied the sub-division of revenues, of the land constituting the village, or of the villages themselves. Secondly, what does bantha denote--watan, share of zamindar comparable to malikana, or nankar, or else the entire zamindari out of which the zamindar was entitled to a share.1

To begin with, taalulqua of (Superior) zamindar was divided into the watan possession and the rest of the zamindari. To cite a representative example, zamindar Pirthi Singh's zamindari consisted of eight villages of which mauza Petha-

...Continued...

1. Equating bantha with watan-jagir, B.R. Grover holds that Rajputs etc. "were given one fourth of the territory known as bantha as watan villages." He argues that revenues from talpad were paid as peshkash to the state. "Nature of land rights", op.cit, p.24. Irfan Habib equates bantha of Gujarat with the malikana of North India and treats it as the share of zamindar. Agrarian System, pp.149-50. S. Nurul Hasan regards bantha as the renumeration given to the intermediary zamindars. Thoughts on Agrarian Relations p.35.
pur formed his watan-possession. The area of each of the
villages constituting his zamindari is recorded as under:

Mawza Pethapur

(Total area constituting the village) = 3901 bigha

A. (Area under) habitation etc, excluded

(minha adabad waghaira) = 1550 bigha, 10 biswa

B. Cultivable area (raaqha laiq-i zira't) = 2350 bigha, 10 biswa

a. raiyatī 1763 bigha 10 biswa

b. giras 587 bigha

Evidently the division into bantha and talpad implied
dividing of land as different from the categorisation of
villages. Instead of citing evidence which is available

1. P.C. (Kadi) No. 3, 7 and R6 Account ff. 121a, 309b. For
the composition of zamindari villages including identifi-
cation of the watan villages of the zamindaris of Jai
Singh, Roop Singh, Partap Singh, Kishandas, Abhairaj
and many others, P.C. (Kadi), Nos. 3-7, p 7, R.6; Ac-
count, ff. 309a-32a; Ibid, ff. 311a, 312b, 315a, 318a,
324b etc.

2. Account, ff. 311a, 312b, 315a; 318a, 324b, for other
similar examples, Ibid, ff. 309a-32a.

3. Here raiyatī stands for talpad and the giras for ban-
tha. For a detailed view please see discussion in the
following lines and Chapter V below.

4. The possibility of categorisation of villages on the
same lines may not be rejected out right. But, simulta-
neously it can't be regarded as the standard mode of
division. In its description of all the villages con-
stituting 28 parganas of sarkar Ahmadabad the Account
specifies only one village held entirely by way of
for hundreds of the zamindari villages it may be submitted in brief that every zamindari village, (situated within the surveyed parts) including the watan of the Superior zamindar is likewise divided into talpad and the bantha.\(^1\) Since the land of every one of the village constituting the makan-i zamindari could be divided into the talpad-bantha, the division may not be considered as the one into the watan and non-watan portions for, as pointed out above, the lands of watan possession too were divided the same way.\(^2\)

A further view of the fact that the lands were physically divided and that the division implied something more than mere categorisation into talpad and the batha, may be formed from another piece of information\(^3\) which reflects the area under actual cultivation in mawza Lekhawara (pargana Bheel, sarkar Ahmadabad), the watan possession of Amar Singh

\[\ldots\text{Continued}\ldots\]

\[\text{bantha. Ibid f. 249a.}\]

1. *Account*, ff. 174b-5a, 218b, 241a, 309a read with *Ibid*, ff. 175b-81b, 219a-20b, 241b-49b, 309b-32a. It may be pointed out here that the bantha-talpad system of dividing lands did not cover the entire subah. The system was confined to the areas which had been covered by land survey. For details, please see chapter V below.


3. The document is entitled *khāsra mazruat mawza Lekhawara pargana Bheel, fast-i-kharif...1098 fasli*(R.No. 37, Pune; hereafter *mazruat Lekhawara*). It furnishes details of the cultivators muzaria'n each cropped field, providing identity and area of the same.
Thus specifying the cropped area under the following heads and sub-heads, the document notes:

1. (Total cropped area) 4523 bigha
   A. Talpad 3560 bigha
      a. Ralayal 3130 bigha
         i). kameja 1460 bigha
         ii). paikashta 1670 bigha
   b. pusalta 211 bigha
   c. Wazifa 219 bigha
      i). khudkashta 93 bigha
      ii). (muzarian kashta) 126 bigha
   B. bantha-giras 963 bigha
      i. zamindar kashta 115 bigha
      ii. (muzarian kashta) 848 bigha

It may thus be seen that the entire cropped area (4523 bigha) consisted of the talpad (3560 bigha) and the bantha (963 bigha) which represents 2.129/- of the cropped area. But the entire bantha lands (1537 bigha) constitute 24.99% of the entire cultivable area (6150 bigha) constituting the village. Secondly, 62.65% of the total bantha area was

1. Area statistics of entire lands forming the village are as under (Account f. 174b.).

   Total area of the village - 12150 bigha
   A. Habitations etc. - 6000 bigha
   B. Cultivable area - 6150 bigha
      i. raiyati - 4613 bigha
      ii. bantha-giras - 1537 bigha
cropped whereas 77.17% of the *talpad* land was brought under cultivation during the crop season. The proportion of the cultivable and the actually cultivated area for one and the same category of land thus being different strongly suggests the existence of the two categories of physically divided lands in the village. A closer scrutiny of the plots (identity of which has been furnished in the document) and the duly named cultivators (*muzarla’n*) further reveals that neither the plots nor the cultivators were common under the two sets of land. It indicates categorisation of the cultivators, or land holders also.¹

Since the *talpad* and the *raiyati* are used to denote the same portion of land in the two documents, it would therefore, appear that the two denoted the same non-zamindari possessions. However, the difference between the two may not be lost sight of. The *talpad* lands (3560 bigha) consisted of the *raiyati* (3130 bigha) and the *wazifa* (219 bigha) and *pusaita* (211 bigha) lands. It suggests that the *raiyati* was exclusive of lands which had been set aside by way of revenue grants (conditional upon or free of service

¹ The similar categorisation of the cultivators is also noticeable amongst the ones cultivating *bantha* possession of the Primary zamindars (Chapter V below). Even though it may not be pressed too far, its significance may however not be lost sight of.
obligation) whereas the taipad was inclusive of them. So
far as the sway of the zamindar's right is concerned taipad
and the raiyati were identical to each other. Still the one
cannot be equated all the time with the other. The raiyati
could be less than, as in the present case, and presumably
even equal to the taipad. Finally, the raiyati, and for
that matter, the taipad, could exist though not necessarily
even within the taalluqa of a zamindar the sway of whose
rights thus would cover only a portion of the village other-
wise identified as a zamindari village.

Though the available evidence does not suggest it
conclusively however the zamindar (i.e. holder of the ban-
tha) does not seem to be the sole-owner of the bantha lands.
As is evident from the mazruat Lekhawara document, the
cultivators (muzaria'n, enjoying unspecified rights) culti-
vated bantha lands which were subject to direct assessment
by the government, a fact which will be discussed a little
later. Presumably the muzarian of the bantha enjoyed some
kind of rights in the land that is why they are specified in

1. For further details, Chapter V below.

2. cf. B.R. Grover, "dehat taalluqa - i zamindar" op.cit. Also cf. Irfan Habib's observation that 'raiyati land
was different from taipad and was not even originally
under the possession of the Kolis and others.' Agrarian
System. pp.142-3; Also cf. NA Siddiqui's opinion that
taipad was situated outside the taalluqa of zamindar
and the raiyati lands were situated outside the vil-
lages which contained bantha lands. op.cit, pp.146-7.
their own right. Another document mentions the zamindaran-i kameja implying that the zamindar's right was not necessarily identical to the (proprietary) rights enjoyed by the kamejas.\(^1\) Regardless of the nature of rights enjoyed by others, the zamindar does not seem to be the absolute owner of the entire bantha lands, particularly the ones other than his khudkashta lands and held by the assessee.

Even though the talpad could be found in the zamindari village but it seems to have come to fall outside the sway of the zamindar's right. According to the Mirat, talpad "was attached to the government".\(^2\) The Account terms the revenues from talpad "mal-i padshahi".\(^3\) The talpad, moreover, was identical to the raiyat\(\text{\textregistered}\) as distinct from the bantha i.e. the zamindari lands. It is therefore maintainable that the talpad did not entail (Superior and Primary) zamindar's rights.\(^4\)

\[--------------------------\]

1. Doc. Yad-dasht dehat pargana Kadi P.C. No. 3b, mazruat Mahej, P.C. NO. 209a. For a detailed view of the rights of various persons holding bantha land under the Primary zamindars, please see discussion in Chapter V, below.


3. Account f. 106b, zamin sih hissa dar har deh talpad mal-i padshahi qarar yaf.

Secondly, the revenues assessed on talpad were collected as mal-i wajib and the receipts shown as hasil in contrast to the revenue receipts from the bantha of (Superior) zamindars which were termed peshkash\(^1\). The two amounts stood exclusive of each other. The collection made as hasil (against jama) and the peshkash from the following villages which contained bantha lands\(^2\) would clarify the point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Peshkash-i zamindaran (in rupees)</th>
<th>Hasil (in rupees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Akhaliyaghara</td>
<td>151/-</td>
<td>202/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asjol</td>
<td>502/-</td>
<td>101/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adol</td>
<td>701/-</td>
<td>2716/8 annas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the amount levied as peshkash being less (Sl. No. 1 & 3) as well as more (Sl. No. 2) than that of the hasil the one did not form part of the other.

---

1. Neither all the revenues collected from the bantha were termed peshkash nor even all the amounts called peshkash were extorted from the bantha. For details please see discussion in the following lines and Chapter V, below.

2. *Account, f. 174b*, read with *ibid., f. 178b*; *ibid, f.309a* read with *ibid, f. 311b*, it may further be added that there was no *makan-i zamindari* in *pargana* Azamabad. No collection is therefore recorded as peshkash. The realised amount is reflected as hasil.
The state demanded a share in the produce of the bantha of zamindar and it was called peshkash. The origin of government claim in the bantha - revenues is traced back to the days of Sultan Muzaffar Gujarati who introduced the bantha-talpad system. Since then the peshkash came to be extorted from the bantha of the zamindaran (and salami from the bantha of the girasias) and the practice was kept up during the Mughal age.1 Under the Mughals the claimed share in the bantha revenues of the zamindaran was levied as peshkash-i nizamat.2

The peshkash-i nizamat was determined on the basis of detailed assessment. It has been submitted above that detailed information regarding the area actually cropped by individual plot-holders of the bantha of Superior zamindar were maintained in the office of diwan, the same way as for the talpad. Likewise the office maintained the dastur-ul amal specifying the proportionate share of the riaya, the state and the Superior zamindar. Thus the produce of (barani, unirrigated) polaj of the bantha was divided into four parts (chahar hissa) of which two parts (du hissa i.e.

1. Ibid, f. 106b.
2. Account, ff, 106b-9a, 339a, 340a, 409a. But entire extortions made as peshkash-i nizamat were not levied on the bantha.
half of the produce) were left with the raiyat; a fourth (chaharum hissa) was apportioned as government's share
(hissa-i sarkar) and the remaining quarter (hissa-i chaharum) as the hissa-i banthadar. Similarly produce of the
irrigated (chahi) polaj was divided into six equal parts. The state and the bantha-dar each, were entitled to a sixth
part whereas the rest (four parts of two-third) was marked as the raiyat's share. In a nutshell, the dastur-ul amal
and amal-i dastur which are available for the reigns of Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb suggest it without exception that
the part of the produce which was extorted from the peasantry of the bantha was equally divided between the state
and the zamindar. According to the available dasturs the state share could be assessed, though only exceptionally, on
lump sum basis (amal-i bitmuqte). The peshkash-1 nizamat was demanded and collected as an annual claim (harsalah)
from every makan-i zamindari as government's share in the

1. Account, ff. 339a, 340a, 409a; dastur-ul amal, P.C.Nos. 22, 25-6, 33, 41, 45-7. The earliest available dastur-ul amal dates back to the period of subedar of LIsa Tarkhan (Shahjahan's reign) who introduced the bhagwatai as the mode of assessment and collection; last of the dasturs were framed during Aurangzeb's reign and were, at least officially, not revised subsequently.


4. Account, f.339a
produce of the bantha provided the (Superior) zamindar was not called upon to render military service.\(^1\)

It may be added here that from the viewpoint of riaya no difference existed between the bantha and the talpad in terms of revenue demand. The above quoted dasturs specify the riaya's share which remains the same regardless of the category of land. The difference lies in the fact that revenue from the bantha were shared between state and banthadar whereas the one from the talpad were to be expropriated by the state at the exclusion of the banthadar.

From the preceding discussion it would appear that the 'zamindar' was neither the absolute owner nor the only claimant in the produce of the bantha lands. Since the state claimed a well defined share in the bantha revenue on regular basis in addition to extorting revenues due from talpad at the exclusion of the zamindar, it is difficult to equate bantha with the malikana which was expropriated by the (primary) zamindar alone.\(^2\)

---


Thus the sway of the zamindar's right had been curtailed and confined to the bantha, revenues from which portion were, under the rules governing assessment, shared by the zamindar and the state on equal basis. The bantha, as such, may be described as 'reduced zamindari' as distinct from the 'share of zamindar'.

The peshkash-i nizamat which was a regular claim, in the present context, on the bantha of zamindar does not seem to have borne any relationship to the jamadami which represented the talpad portion of land.

It is an established fact that the hasil denoted the revenues actually collected as against the jama which signified the 'revenues assessed. Since the hasil, stood exclusive of the peshkash-i nizamat as noted above it may be argued that the latter was neither included in nor signifi-

1. For further details, please see discussion in Chapter V.
2. Though Irfan Habib does not appear to have come across the expressions 'peshkash-i nizamat' and matalba-i sarkar-i wala but his observation that the peshkash (i.e. in its present form) was different from the jama, the two being indicators of two distinct imperial claims, levied separately, holds good. Agrarian System, pp.184-5; cf. M.A. Nayeem who notes the prevalence of two distinct claims but erroneously tries to calculate proportionate relationship between the jama and the peshkash -i nizamat without paying attention to the fact whether the former signified and represented the latter at all M.A. Nayeem, "Mughal documents Relating to the peshkash of zamindars of South India, 1694-1752", IESHR, Vol. XII, No.4, Oct-Dec 1975, pp.425-33.
fied by the *jama*.¹

The preceding discussion pertaining to the assessment of *peshkash-i nizamat* relates exclusively to the zamindaris of *paimooda* areas which were divided on *bantha-talpad* lines. But most of the zamindari *makans* were located in the regions lands of which were not surveyed. In these areas the imperial attempt at correlating the amount of the tribute with the actual yield seems to have been at variance from zamindari to zamindari as will be discussed below.

The *peshkash-i nizamat* from a section of zamindars holding lands in *ghair-paimooda* areas seem to have been determined after making some exercise in calculation. The office of *diwan* maintained details of the zamindari villages.² Secondly, nature of figures of the amount actually extorted also goes to suggest to the same effect.³ But then, there were the zamindars whose offering are invariably

¹ For further evidence, *Account*, ff, 167a, 174b-75a, 183b-4a, 275a, Since the evidenc relates to the areas which followed *banath talpad* system, the inference therefore, may hold good for the same parts.

² *Account*, f 28a. *TheMirat-i Ahmadi* (*Supplement*, pp 211-19) refers to such zamindari which did not furnish details of villages, (or *sarihta-i dehat*) implying that other zamindars furnished it.

³ See, for example the amounts of *peshkash* i.e. 2378/-, 568/8annas, 1025/- 1312/8 etc. paid by the zamindars of *sarkar* Soreth etc. during the first few years of the eighteenth century. *Peshkash* documents, *P.C* Nos. 2,9, 14a, 17a- 9b;
recorded in round figures which hardly suggests any exercise in calculation.¹ There were still other zamindars like those of Jagat, Dhatrod (Sarkar Soreth), Dantiwara, Santalpur, Kaikraj etc (Sarkar Pattan) who, sometime during the post-Ain period, ceased to furnish account of villages under them and turned zortalab.² Located in favourable geographical position far off the seat of provincial power zamindars of these places were strong enough to resist imperial interference because of their strong caste bastions also.³ Similarly ghair-amli portions of the zamindaris were immune from assessment and subject to the minimum of imperial control.⁴

As such no uniform standard of assessment was applicable to entire lands of all the zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin. The variations ranged between wide limits; on the one hand there were the zamindari lands which had been placed under

1. Thus a Koli zamindar of Chunwal paid 15000 jami during the subedari of prince Murad and Bahadur Khan. Khoman etc. zamindars of Jhalawar paid the same amount during price Dara's period of subedari, for the same and similar instances Peshkash documents, PC, Nos. 1,2,19,20 and haqiqat-i sarkar Soreth-PC, Nos. 22a, 23b.

2. ibid., 22b-9a; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp. 203,205-10,212-6,218.

3. These lands are described as miskin-i Jattan, miskin-i Kolyan or miskin-i Kathiyan etc. The reason of non-furnishing the details of villages is also ascribed to the recalcitrance of the zamindars. Account, ff. 22b-9a; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, pp 202-3,214-6.

4. Account, ff 26b-7b; N.A. Siddiqi, op.cit p.25.
direct administration, thus minimizing the difference between *peshkash* and *ma'i wajib*; on the other there were the lands which at the onset of the eighteenth century\(^1\) were not assessed at all.

It is worth submitting that *peshkash-i nizamat* was also described as "*peshkash-i mugarrari*\(^2\) which expression implies that the amount was fixed (regardless of the mode of assessment), but was 'liable to be revised after a reasonable span of time'.\(^3\) The available evidence for the latter half of the seventeenth century also suggests that the amount could remain fixed for as little as three years to as many as ten years.\(^4\) It was equally true for the offerings made by the zamindars regardless of the mode of assessment and collection.\(^5\) As such, in spite of surveying cultivable lands and maintaining details of the actually cropped area

---

1. It has already been mentioned that more of the zaminda-ris turned "*ghair paimooda*" and a number of zamindars passed out of administrative control.


and the destur-ul amals, the peshkash, for all practical purposes, was not fixed on yearly basis. Since the zamindar paid the same amount of money for a number of years the crop-season-wise assessment might not have direct and consistent bearing on the amount thus actually paid. The crop-season wise assessed paying capacity of the zamindar not being taken into account every time it would allow the zamindar some degree of freedom in revenue matters even within those zamindari lands which otherwise were placed under direct administration. Also the zamindar's income would be determined not only by his proportionate share but also by the difference in the amounts paid (peshkash) and actually collected.

In addition to appropriating land revenue a number of zamindarn-i mahin-o kahin enjoyed income from other sources also. Some of them enjoyed revenues of the ports which were situated on the coastal line of Gujarat peninsula and were obvious centers of trading activities. 1 The zamindars of Halwad and Jia Koli were allowed a share of Rs. 7/8 annas and Rs. 20/- respectively out of every Rs. 75/- from the imposts levied on merchandise at the mandis of Viramgaon, nakas (exit-entry points) of Hadala, Patri (Patdi). Wasara,

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

Janbo, Mandal, Weekawara etc. (pargana Viramgaon, sarkar Ahamdabad). Likewise the zamindar of Patdi of the same pargana enjoyed a share in the revenues collected by the officials from the namaksar (salt-ponds) located in the zamindari. Some of the zamindars held lands and villages by way of ina’m, exacted fines, levied prohibited taxes (abwab-i mamnu') and resorted to plundering activities both on land routes and the high seas.

In the light of this discussion it may summarily be submitted that:

Despite the fact that the zamindaran-i mahin-o kahin were more numerous, holding vast tracts of land all through the kharajl sarkars and enjoying wider social base, they were assigned a position secondary to those of the zamindaran-i sarkar-i peshkashl and the zamindaran-i ismi. A considerably large number of them had been the junior members and vassals of the leading chiefs of the region whose prin-

---

1. Dastur-ul amal-i mandvi gosbah Viramgaon, reproduced in the Account 227a-6b; ibid, f228b. The taxes were gathered by the state officials and the zamindars collected their share from the treasury. ibid.

2. Account ff.229-30b; for the location of the salt pans, Ain, 11, pp 148-9; Mirat-i Ahmadi, Supplement, p. 192.

cipalities had broken up as a result of ongoing political process.

This stratum was placed under greater degree of administrative control. Zamindars' geographical position on imperial map, caste-clan bastions, productivity, manageability and the capacity to resist went a long way in determining the state-zamindar relationship. Since these factors lacked uniformity and varied from place to place, the position of the zamindaran-i mahin-okahin was also at variance from one another.

Moreover, the intra-strata differences were further sharpened particularly during the second half of the seventeenth century, during which period a process suggesting qualitative change in the state-zamindar relationship is discernable. During the period two simultaneous processes viz; of acquiring a greater hold over a group and secondly conceding autonomy in greater degree to the other are noticeable. Consequently we come across a section of the zamindaran-i mahin-okahin who, by the close of the seventeenth century, had been thoroughly subjugated so much so that most of the shades of distinction subsisting between them and the Primary zamindars had been eroded. The other section that in major part had earlier been subjugated, emerged as truly autonomous, under only a nominal imperial
control. Likewise the zamindars who had been autonomous only partially, also emerged as fully autonomous. Moreover, some of them ceased to be service rendering and still others stopped paying mal-i wajib and turned exclusively peshkashi. As such the intra-stratum signs of differentiation became more prominent where a strata of them approximated in its position to the zamindaran-i sarkart-i peshkashi and the zamindaran-i ismi. Thus the process of blurring the inter-strata-distinguishing features also gained currency. It may particularly be mentioned that the zamindars who had consolidated their position by repelling imperial administrative pressure, were the ones who were relatively richer in resources and in command of considerable power in men and material. But the zamindars whose position was relatively more vulnerable, were exposed to bear the maximum of imperial administrative pressure. It is also worth appreciating that the imperial policy of promoting disunity among the caste-family members by entering into direct relationship with them and making inroads into the main source of their power could be pursued within its logical limits and on a limited scale. Therefore, the zamindars' caste bastions could not be eroded to an appreciable extent for the greater benefit of the empire.
So far we have discussed features and tried to ascertain distinguishing characteristics of the constituent sections of the (Superior) 'zamindaran' as they find description in the contemporary works, particularly the regional documents. On the basis of this discussion [Chapter -1(1) and (2)] and some other evidence it may be submitted that:

Forms of holding zamindaris and the provisions made for sharing revenues were of varying nature. Though the Mughal had adopted an overall structure of the pattern of relationship established under the Sultans of Gujarat, it had consistently made efforts for acquiring greater hold over the zamindars. In this attempt the Mughals adopted reasonably flexible attitude, presumably keeping in view the sources of their strength and power and the capacity for acquiring and retaining control over them. The pattern of relation thus established, lacked uniformity and, consequently there emerged zamindaris having definite signs of differentiation.

Beside the manageability considerations which, by and large, were governed by the geo-social compulsions, the economy factor appears to have been a strong motivating force behind the imperial attempts at acquiring control over
the zamindaris on the one hand and the zamindars' own capacity to resist and repel it on the other.

The empire pursued a definite but cautious policy towards the 'symbols and sources' of zamindars' power. Attempts were made to dislodge them from forts and fortresses and convert them into instruments of administrative control; raze the strongholds of some recalcitrant ones to ground, deny them freedom of raising new ones and, in their stead, raise its own fortresses at commanding points. But the policy, presumably as it could be, was pursued to its logical limits and a number of zamindars, particularly the stronger ones, continued in possession of their respective strongholds.

Caste-clan affiliations and family bonds seem to have constituted the main source of the Superior zamindars' strength in Gujarat also. Though the members of other


4. For some details, please see, Irfan Habib, Agrarian System, pp. 159-64.
castes and community too made inroads into the category presumably through state channel, Rajputs and Kolis continued to be in the domineering position which the state could hardly erode, even though some efforts to that effect were made. The well established practice of providing suitable means of subsistence, called jiwaee, shasun or giras to the leading caste-members and junior members of the family following the rule of primogeniture in matters of succession, might have helped the zamindars in preserving unity of the inheritance from within and resisting pressure exerted from without. But where and when found feasible the empire

---

1. For such inroads through state channel during the period of Sultans of Gujarat, S.C. Misra, *Rise of Muslim power in Gujarat* pp. 204-6, during Mughal age, Junagadh, S.C. No, 1159 (mahal, Kutiyana).

2. Rule of primogeniture applied to the larger principalities, though not invariably. (For exceptional instance, *Account*, f 109b); For the grants made by head of family, Hamilton Walter, *op. cit*, I, p.618; For the chiefs' concern for providing suitable means and respectable social status for his leading clansmen, *Mirat-i Ahmadi*, I, pp.284-5.

The sons of petty zamindars divided, though not equally, the patrimony among themselves - the 'younger brothers shared alike assigning a larger share (Motab-hag) to the eldest who was designated motabhagia and held the seal of zamindari (*Rasmala*, pp 567,569-70); *Treaties* VI, pp. 9-10). In such cases the inheritance was not physically divided, generally, it was held jointly (*Treaties*, VI, pp. 33,70; Appendix No. VI, pp xx -xxiv, Baden Powell, *Land System of British India*, London, 1889. I. p.107). The expressions such as brotherhood (*brathri* or fraternity ), brothers (*bra-thran*) children or descendents (awlad), Rajputs (Rajputan), Kolis (Kollyan) etc. used to denote holder (s) of one and the same *makan*, as pointed out earlier, testify to the existence of collective holdings. But
established direct relationship with the vassals and dependents of leading zamindars, either by eradicating or along with the head of family for dismembering the otherwise united. *makan-i zamindari.*

The imperial authority seems to have, though only exceptionally, intervened in matters concerning succession in larger principalities, the small zamindars appear to have decided the matter among themselves although they too had to procure confirmatory orders from the provincial authorities.

The Mughal state had allowed the Superior zamindars to continue in their possessions on condition of rendering military service to and sharing revenues with the empire. The service obligation, with some exceptions, was an essential obligation for all of them, and the zamindars had to serve, as they did, regardless of the award of *mansab.*

---

...Continued...

the *bhayads,* according to British works, were not averse, under given circumstances, to their coming into direct contact with the state.

1. Please, see for example the instances of Idar, Porbandar, Kadi and Navanagar referred to in the preceding discussion.

2. Only two instances one each relating to Dungarpur, Sirohi and Banswara during Akbar's reign and the last relating to Navanagar during Aurangzeb's reign are noticeable in our sources; see also, Rasmala, pp 312, 319-20; 340-2, Tarikh-i Soreth, pp. 96-7; Treaties, VI, pp. 2, 4, 20, 77, 89; Hamilton Walter, *op. cit.* i. p 640.
The State's share in the revenues was met under two major heads, viz; matalba-i sarkar-i wala (claim of Emperor) and the peshkash-i nizamat (tribute for the Governor). The former was denoted by jama and levied as peshkash from the zamindars of peshkashi sarkars, and, as mal-i wajib from the rest of them. The peshkash-i nizamat was demanded on an annual basis, if and when a zamindar was not required to serve. The state made elaborate arrangements for assessing their paying capacity and endeavoured to enter, as far as possible, into direct dealing with the riyā. In this attempt the state met with appreciable success. But, as a matter of fact, it could neither acquire hold in equal degree over all of them neither retain the acquired hold consistently. Therefore, the Superior zamindar's position vis-a-vis the empire and the riyā was at variance from one another and, consequently, they bore definite signs of differentiation amongst themselves, thus giving rise to the three distinct sections who could mainly be distinguished on the basis of extent and degree of autonomy which they enjoyed within their respective possession. The pattern of relationship established initially witnessed some significant changes before the onset of the eighteenth century.

The state, on the one hand, successfully subjugated (by and large relatively petty) Superior zamindar thoroughly
and, simultaneously conceding autonomy in greater degree to the other zamindars who, in the beginning had been placed under greater degree of administrative control. The seventeenth century witnessed a dual process of acquiring and repelling the imperial hold. In this game of see-saw a number of the Superior zamindars emerged stronger. The development led to blurring the inter-strata distinguishing features on the one hand and widening and intensification of intra-stratum differentiation.

Secondly, the Superior zamindars also tended to, and a number of them also succeeded in exchanging service for peshkash-i nizamat. Thirdly, some of them successfully transformed the nature of imperial claim from mal-i wajib to peshkash which did not necessarily bear relationship with the zamindar's paying capacity.

Alongwith the element of continuity in the attitude of imperial authorities towards the 'erring' zamindars, element of qualitative change is also discernable.

With regard to the acquisition of military service and exaction of tribute, the Mughal state was quite insistent.

1. For further references, Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, pp. 189, 256-7; ibid Supplement, p 190, = 192, 203, 205-6, 224-7, 234, 290-1; Jama dami Subah Gujarat, R.No. 47, Pune; Yaddasht haqiqat-i Peshkash-o hasil sarkar Soreth PC. Nos, 21-4; Rasmala, pp 253-4; Treaties, VII, pp 191-2. Hamilton Walter, op. cit l, p 645.
The zamindars, at times, displayed reluctance in performing the enjoined duties. The garrison placed at various places throughout the subah under the superintendence of the Governors and over all watch kept by the centre, to an appreciable extent, ensured enforcement of the assigned obligations.\(^1\)

As regards the collection of *peshkash* it was Governor's responsibility to ensure its remittance, faujdars of sarkars and parganas were in direct charge. The Governor was, however, required to undertake military expeditions for reinforcing the local administration.\(^2\) But the nazims, or else some strong commander had to directly ensure its collection from the leading recalcitrants who could not be managed by the faujdars \(^3\) Likewise the leading recalcitrants of Surat

---

1. For details of administrative arrangements, *Account*, ff 74b, 93a&b; For a general view, Q Ahmad, "Faujdars of parganas and sarkars", *Proc, IHC*, 1958, pp.352-4; and Milieu of study under Introduction to the present study's above.

2. *Account*, f. 105b; Alamgir Jamah, pp. 769-70. For expeditionary purposes the subah was divided into 30 units (zila) each of which consisted of specified makan-i zamindari number of which ranged from one to 42. Necessarily not corresponding to the boundaries of any of the administrative unit a zila could be equal to or more than a pargana and a sarkar. The zila seems to be a geo-administrative unit, comprising specified makan-i zamindari along the routes adopted by the expeditionary forces. *Account* ff. 106 b-9a.

region had to be dealt by the port officer, or else by a strong commander (Sahib-i quwwat-o fauj)\(^1\)

Occasionally one or the other zamindar evaded payment of *peshkash*, abstained from performing enjoined duties, defied command, plundered villagers, travellers and traders, rose in open rebellion and harboured imperial rebels.\(^2\) All such reported acts of rebelliousness invited administrative action which resulted in various kinds of punishment, such as imprisonment of zamindar, enhancement in the amount of *peshkash*, imposition of economic penalty and transfer or attachment of zamindari for a while.\(^3\) Simultaneously, incompetent Governors were replaced by more powerful and competent ones, strong military contingents were sent from the centre for meeting emergency and more administrative pressure was brought by establishing new *thanas*, or else the strength of the existing one was raised in the areas of

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


incidents of zamindars' rebelliousness are reported, more frequently, during Aurangzeb's reign, presumably suggesting an increase in the acts of defiance. Increased recalcitrance seems to have infuriated the emperor who, in desperation, ordered the Governor, to kill the 'mischievous, rebellious and confirmed offenders.' Harshness in the attitude of administration is equally evident from the actions reportedly taken against the defiants, particularly the smaller zamindars. Non-compromising approach is also reflected in the acts of annexation of zamindaris, a consid-


2. For example, please see, the rebellious activities of the Kolis, Rajputs and those of the zamindars of Bhuj, Idar, Ahmadnagar, Hyderabad, Kathiawar, Khanbali, Thhan Dantiwara, Nandot, Baroda region, Therad, Jagat, Kakrej, Mahumdabad, Jhalawar etc. Kazim, op. cit pp 296, 771-5; Mirat-i Ahmadi, I, pp 242-5, 253-6, 284-85 288-91, 294-5, 325, 331, 336-7, 344-5, 370, 372-3; Junagadh Sc No, 115. (Mahal Kutiyana); G.H. Khare, Aetihasik Farsi Sahitya, VI, Letter No. 62 Dt. 2nd June, 1667, Ishwardas Nagar, Futuhat-i Alamgiri, Delhi, 1978, pp. 130-1; Myse, History of Dharangdhara State, 1921, pp. 96-9 History of Kathiawar, p. 119-20.

3. Mirat-i Ahmadi I, p 279; for a moderate attitude as adopted under the preceeding emperors. ibid. I, pp. 165-6; A.R. Khan op. cit pp.78-90

4. Mirat-i Ahmadi I, pp. 244, 255-6. But the stronger ones evaded such punishment; Kazim, op. cit pp. 296, 411; Account f. 110b; Mirat-i Ahmadi I, pp 242-43.
erable number of which was extinguished during his reign.\(^1\)

The evidence cited above must, however, not lead us to infer that the administration under Aurangzeb dealt with all the defiant zamindars with equal sternness, or that the pressure once exerted was kept up all through his reign. On the contrary the emperor was obliged twice to restore Raja Chandrasen Jhala to the gaddi of Halwad in 1680 and again in 1706 under mounting pressures. The zamindar was also able to extort the privilege of exemption from paying peshkash (1680) and the Thanedari of Mhodasa (1706).\(^2\)

Likewise the emperor compromised his position with the de facto chief of Navanagar as mentioned earlier. Besides, the zamindars of Jagat, Nadot, Kolis and the Bhils of many places rose in rebellion and seem to have evaded punishment during the closing years of his reign.\(^3\) During the same emperor's reign the zamindars of Santalpur, Chunwal, Kakrej, Chehermandvi, Atlesar, Tarkesar, Jhalwar and Kalthiawar


\(^3\) \textit{Mirat-i Ahmadi} I.p. 370
successfully turned exclusively peshkashi zortalab zamindars. As such the empire if and when feasible, endeavoured to acquire greater controlling position and react effectively. But where and when such a position was difficult to attain and retain, or else react effectively, it contented itself with the exaction of tribute and retrieve its steps rather than prosecute doubtful contest. By the onset of the eighteenth century rigidity seems to have given way to compromising approach and some laxity. The process found its way into the eighteenth century when it seems to have acquired further momentum and unprecedented dimensions.

1. ibid, Supplement pp. 192, 196, 203, 205-7, 212-3, 216; yaddashti: haqiqat-i peshkash-o hasil sarkar Soreth, PC Nos, 21-4; Account, ff. 23a-7b.