CHAPTER II: THE VILLAGE SOCIETY
STRUCTURE AND STRATIFICATION

A number of scholarly studies have thrown light on the structure and stratification of the Indian village society. One may conclude on the basis of these studies that it was far from being an "undifferentiated mass of pauperised peasants". A number of different terms were in use to denote different sections of the society in different parts of the country. The documents pertaining to 18th century Hadauti are also interspersed with many such terms. In these documents peasants have been referred to as kisanu, karsa, pahi karsa and hali. Those who enjoyed institutional means of access to agrarian resources have been referred to as the himayatis, which included the jagirdars, Rajput thakurs, state officials such as khawas or badaran etc. and some of the Brahmins and sahas enjoying concessional revenue rates. There are several references to bhom and bhomias as well as to the religious and charitable grant holders i.e. the dohli. Differentiating between the agriculturist and the non-agriculturist section, the artisans and menials as well as those sahas, bohras and Brahmins who were not involved in agriculture, have been referred to as kholed and also as thalad in the later half of 18th century. Thus it is clear that the village society was complex and stratified. In order to understand its structure and stratification the present study proposes to examine it as a caste and class formation and relationship of different classes of cultivators with land.

A major section of the village society was the peasant proprietors. The population data available for pargana Nand gaon (Kota) suggests that most of the villages were original agrarian caste settlements. The peasant population

1 T. Roychoudhary, "The State and the Economy", the Cambridge Economic History of India, vol. I, ed. T. Roychoudhary. I. Habib, Delhi, 1984, p. 176. Some of the well known studies are, Irfan Habib, The Agrarian system of Mughal India. Bombay, 1983; S. Chandra * Some Aspect of Indian Village Society in Northern India During the 18th Century*, I.H.R., 1974; B.R. Grover, *The concept of Village Community in North India During the Mughal Age and the Pre-British
in most of the villages was overwhelmingly of the same caste, often of the same lineage group. Even in 18th century a village could be easily identified as a Dhakar or Meena or a Jat village. For instance, in mauza Bhadaheda out of the 85 peasant households, 80 were Dhakar and only five were Brahmmin, Bohra and Saha. In mauza Babli of pargana Baran most of the plough units belonged to the Meenas. Further, in pargana Nand gaon most of the village belonged to the Dhakar peasants while in pargana Baran to the Meenas. On the basis of this information it can be conjectured that most of the peasants were the descendants of the original colonisers and the process of establishment of villages was intimately associated with the horizontal spread of peasant caste in different parts of Hadauti. However, by early 18th century some of the villages had acquired a mixed peasant population, though one or the other caste was still in a dominating position. The peasants were addressed as ‘Kisanu’ or ‘karsa’ by the state. They sought to legitimise their claim on the village land by deifying the first coloniser as khetrapal or guardian of the area belonging to the village. Inner cohesion of the karsa based upon caste and lineage ties can also be testified by their strong community life style. The pattern of residence was based on guwari, which ensured an intimate relationship amongst those who shared a common lineage. In a guwari huts or crudely built housed were built around a small open space facing each other. Several guwaris connected to each other through narrow passages formed the village cluster. If the village had a thakur’s haveli, it was generally in the center of the cluster. The housed of mahajans and Brahmmins were situated on one side of the haveli while the
guwaris of the karsa and of the artisans on the other two sides\(^8\). Guwaris of the menials were situated on the same side as that of the artisans but at some distance from the main cluster\(^9\). The peasants shared a number of community facilities like the margha and beed, which were the common pasture, chapar, which was cleared space in the adjacent forest for the village cattle to rest at noon, and the chaura, which was a common house for guest and visitors\(^10\). Many of the villages have a few red stone memorials for the warriors who had died fighting, one times in defense of the village and its cattle. The villagers for held these stones in reverence ‘sadmanta’. In mauza Rawtha, Satta Hada who had died in s. 1661 / c. 1604 was to beheld in reverence by “the gops of all the seven puras”\(^11\). Some of the Meena villages also had memorials of jujhars, made of black stone, without any thing inscribed on them, perhaps to commemorate the local Meena warriors.\(^12\)

However, it does not mean that the karsa was an undifferentiated class. Inspite of lineage and cast ties and a strong community life style, stratification within the karsa had been growing. By the later half of 18\(^{th}\) century in pargana Baran, the top ten percent of the karsa household were holding 40 percent of the land owned 35 percent of the bullocks and used 70 percent of the halis (agricultural labourers). Almost 75 percent of the karsa households held merely 20 percent of the land, 28 percent of the bullocks and rarely used the halis\(^13\). References to various types of cultivators show that there was always a considerable differentiation within the peasantry. They were described differently, as halpati, haljota, pahi etc\(^14\). The difference between the halpatis

---

\(^8\) Ibid.
\(^9\) Ibid.
\(^10\) Ibid
\(^11\) I saw the memorial stone of Satta Hada of s. 1761 and another stone of s. 1405 in 1998 during my visit to mauza Rawtha. These stones have not been surveyed so far by the A.S I.
\(^12\) I saw one of such stones at village Tokad in district Bundi that is situated on the highway from Jaipur to Bundi, at some distance from Deoli. The stone had a figure of a mounted horseman. The size of the stone slab was about 1 ft. x 1.50 ft. and it was placed on a 'chautra' or pedestal. The villagers described the stone as that of a 'jujar' (warrior).
\(^13\) See, Appendix II,Pattern of Distribution of Land Bullock and Hired Labour
\(^14\) Gharpati and Dhuandehl papers, s. 1771, K.B. 1/276 (Kota) mentions the term 'halpati' and 'haljote'.
and haljotas has nowhere been clearly explained but appears to be related to use of hired agricultural labour by the peasant proprietors. Those who used halis were the haljotas while those who cultivated through their own family labour were the halpati assami. Another difference was made on the basis of the relationship of a cultivator to the land under his ploughs\textsuperscript{15}. Some of the halpatis were quite prosperous as the amount realised from them, as dhuan-dehl (a cess realised per households) was three times higher than the average of rupee 1 per household\textsuperscript{16}. A section within the karsa enjoyed ‘bapoti’, which was a hereditary claim on the land under their ploughs. A peasant who had the ‘bapoti’ claim on the land under his ploughs could give it in batai if unable to cultivate it on his own or even mortgage it\textsuperscript{17}. An order issued in c. 1721 reiterated some of the customary privileges enjoyed by this section of cultivators. They were exempt from bai thi begar and khai (a cess) and lag (cess) on marriages. They were to cart the village produce only up to the ganj (local grain market) and in case of being ordered to take the grains up to Nand gaon (Kota) were to receive bhada (cartage). In case of opting to grow relatively new crops like maize and tobacco they were granted ‘sherkhani jama’. Although, the term ‘sherkhani jama’ has no where been explained clearly but the reference to ‘manahak’ suggests that it was to be calculated as a share of the assumed produce per beegha according to some standard schedule\textsuperscript{18}.

The karsa considered land to be their most important resource. It is clearly brought out by the traditional notion of village boundary known as kankad. Since, the notion of kankad had evolved prior to the fixation of the chak beeghas of a village by the state it show the importance which the karsa attached to its claim on a track. If the chak beeghas of a village fixed by state

\textsuperscript{15} The term ‘bapoti’ was used by a peasant while referring to his land in a dispute about, see likhant of Mali Kisna, Asadh Vadi 2, s. 1766, and orders of Bheern Singh Jeth Sudi 3, Asadh Vadi 1, Asadh Vadi 4, and Mohandas's letter to Pande Mana attached to it, s. 1766, K.B. 1/61
\textsuperscript{16} Ugapai Dhuan Dehal ki, s.1771, KB 1/276, Kota
\textsuperscript{17} Likhant of Mali Kisna op. Cit.
\textsuperscript{18} Arjan Singh to hawalgir of kasba Awa etc. Chait Sudi 10, s. 1778, K.B. 1/127; for Shershah's standard schedule see, The cambridge Economic History Vol I, op. cit. P. 236
clashed with the traditional *kankad* it caused tensions amongst the neighboring villages. The *karsa* of *mauz* Mehrana in c. 1699 had reoccupied the land, which according to them was within their village *kankad* but was being cultivated by the peasants of *mauz* Mandwara. On being reprimanded by the state they stood up to defend their claim and arguing that it was under the *amal* of Kirat Singh Hada, that some of their village land had been given to the *karsa* or *mauz* Mandwara for cultivation. Since, it was this land which was being reclaimed now, there was nothing wrong in this act. Similarly, the patwari of *mauz* Rampura did not allow the *karsa* of M. Tathedi to cultivate the land in his village, for which he had to pay a huge fine of rupees 291. Whenever the state measured the *chak* of a village afresh, it was found to be more than the *kadim chak beeghas*. Thus even if there was no developed market in land shift from the traditional notion of *kankad* to the measured and fixed *chak beeghas*, often became a source of conflict amongst the neighboring villages, shows that land was considered to be a valuable agrarian resource by the *karsa*. *Karsa*’s claim on village land and other resources got reinforced by the state holding the *karsa* collectively responsible for cultivation of the village land. It was a normal practice to seek an undertaking from the patel patwari and *karsa* to cultivate the entire *samhi* land and to bring the village *beed* and *khol* under cultivation. If the arrangement made by them did not materialise they were to pay for the land left *parat*. If any new cultivators were allowed to settle down in the village with uncleared dues in their original village, they were asked to be sent back or the responsibility of clearing their outstanding dues had to be shouldered. If the *karsa* was unable to cultivate the entire village land on its own, they

---

19 *Likhart of patel and patwari of mauza Mehrana*, dated Sawan sudi 7, s. 1756, K.B. 1/40
20 *Likhart of patwari Saha Sukh Ram*, Posh Sudi 11, s. 1808, K.B. 1/135
21 For instance see the *jamabandi* of *mauz* Kurahad, *Tafa Arankheda*, s. 1818, K.B. 1/135
22 Umed Singh to patel patwari of *mauz* Domra, and Chatarpura, *pargana* Sangod, Sawan Vadi 9, s. 1836 K.B. 1/135
23 See, the *likhart* of patel, patwari of *mauz* Mehrana nad Khedli, Asadh Sudi 5, s. 1765, K.B. 1/59
24 *Kasht ka patta*, *mauz* Raroti, Asadh Vadi 6, s. 1776, K.B. 1/85
25 Umed Singh to Rathor Narain Singh and the patel of *mauz* Neewli, *pargana* Reechwa, Jeth sudi 15, s. 1845 and patel patwari and *jagirdar* of *kasba* Sangod, Jeth Sudi 10, s. 1845, khate, K.B. 3/1
sought the approval of the state to call *pahi* (non-resident) cultivators for this task as well as the rate of *jama* to be charged from them\(^{26}\). It was the responsibility of the village *karsa* to pay the revenue on the land cultivated by the *pahis*. In *mauza* Vasi thirty *beeghas* of *hakat* which was under *pahi* cultivation had remained *parat*, therefore, rupee one per *beegha* was to be charged from the village *karsa* on this land, although, later on, the total amount payable was reduced to rupees twelve\(^{27}\). At the same time, if any one wished to cultivate more than already under his plough, he had the obligation to cultivate *beed* and *parat* land within his own village, instead of undertaking cultivation as a *pahi* in another village\(^{28}\). Thus, the traditional claim of the *karsa* on the village land and other resources was recognised and reinforced by the state but had been linked to the obligation of maintaining the production cycle. The fact that even in 18th century the official’s orders were loaded with terminology like ‘*reet rawat*’ (customary practice) ‘*sadamadi*’ (as always) ‘*des-sar*’ (locally prevailing) or ‘*budkuli*’ (as decided by the elders) suggests that the hold of the *karsa* on the village affairs was still quite strong\(^{29}\).

Another section within the karsa was the *pahi* cultivators. From some of the references it appears that the state generally disapproved of the *karsa* taking up *pahi* cultivation in the adjacent villages\(^{30}\). Whereas the *karsa* was keen to work as *pahi* cultivators to take advantage of lighter revenue rates for the *pahis*. The *pahi* cultivators were allowed by the state only in extreme situations. For instance, in *mauza* Char ka kheda, which was severely affected by the political disturbances of c. 1727, the *pahis* from distant villages (*par gaon ka pahi*) were allowed to take up cultivation during the *kharif*

\(^{26}\) Duljan Sal to Byas Uda, *mauza* Khedii, Bhadwa Sudi 1, s. 1787, K.B. 13125

\(^{27}\) Kishan Das (Bheem Singh) to patel patwari of *mauza* Vasai, Jeth Sudi 13, s. 1775, K.B. 1/85

\(^{28}\) *Likhant* patel Godhu *mauza* Kiradya, Asadh Vadi 9, s. 1783, K.B. 1/118

\(^{29}\) *Kasht* ka *pattas* issued by the rulers were full of such terminology, for instance see the various *pattas* cited in this narrative.

\(^{30}\) Duljan Sal to hawalgir of *pargana* Sangod, Jeth Vadi 9, s. 1783, K.B. 1/118 Clearly disapproves *pahi* cultivation by the *karsa*; *likhant* of patel Godhu of *mauza* Kiradya, Asadh Vadi 9, s. 1783, K.B. 1/118 vouching for not to cultivate as a *pahi*. 

season, though, in *rabi* there was no reference to the *pahis*.\(^{31}\) It suggests that the *pahis* were allowed, either, because some of the original cultivators had disserted the village or, because it was not possible for the village *karsa* alone to prepare the field for cultivation as they had been lying unploughed for three to four years. However, the revenue rates for the *pahis* in this case were the same as given to the *karsa* in the previous season\(^{32}\). Thus the *pahi* cultivation was allowed, either, as an adhoc arrangement, or, as a method to provide support to the *karsa*. The *himayatis* who enjoyed concessional revenue rates were also expected to give preference to the local *karsa* over the outsiders and were allowed to get *pahis* only in case of non-availability of local *karsa*\(^{33}\). Thus, the number of *pahis* remained much smaller than the village *karsa*. Therefore, the option to work as *pahi* remained limited and was available only in special situations.

Sometimes the state for its own reasons encouraged migration of peasants from populous *pargana* to *ujad* (disserted) villages. For instance, Patel Balu Meena was allowed to migrate with his kinsmen from *pargana* Binayaga to *pargana* Khatakheri, where cultivable land seems to have been available in several villages\(^{34}\). The revenue rates offered to Balu Meena were the same as the local peasants. However, the local peasants managed to retain their edge over the migratory peasants, as the rates for bringing the *beed* under cultivation were lighter for them. They were to pay rupee one per ten *beeghas*, while Balu Meena’s men were to pay rupee one per five *beeghas*. The customary share of the Patel in the village’s produce was also higher for the patels of the local peasants\(^{35}\). This migration appears to have been induced by the possibility of either, high value cash crop cultivation or availability of more land in the *pargana*. Some other stray references to

\(^{31}\) Durjan Sal to *hawalgar* of Digodh, Phagun Sudi 3, s. 1786, to patel patwari, *karsa* and *pargao ka pahi*, Sawan Vadi 1, s. 1786, K.B. 1/125

\(^{32}\) Ibid

\(^{33}\) Durjan Sal to Byas Uda, op. cit instructing to get *pahis* to prevent the *samhi* land being left *parat*.

\(^{34}\) Bheem Singh to *hawalgar* of *pargana* Khatakheri, Baisakh Vadi 6, s. 1765, K.B. 1/59

\(^{35}\) Ibid.
individual migrations suggest that there were several different reasons for it. Dhakar Ganga Ram moved away from a vasi in pargana Sangod and the hawalgir was ordered to settle him elsewhere. Patel Todar of mauza Khodsawa wanted to migrate because of the poor quality of the land he cultivated, in that village. The patels were instructed to give him better land. In one case a patel migrated to Khinchiwada because he had lost the resources to undertake the task of jameet as a patel. Thus many of the individual migrations and settlement took place with the permission of state, through the hawalgir of the pargana. The local thakurs could not allow any new settlements at their own discretion. Rathor Lal Singh who had invited some of his kinsmen to settle in mauza Goinda could not do so as the hawalgir objected and the permission was granted only after a nazrana of rupees 525 was paid to the Kota chief.

The migrations were of various types; some were planned or adventurous in order to acquire fresh resources, while others were rooted basically in a situation of distress. However, the purpose was always to gain access to fresh resources. Such migrations were invariably from one village to another village without leading to any drastic change in the rural urban population ratio. These migrations would have been certainly helpful in emergence of village with karsa of more than one cast. For instance in mauza Kurahd in c. 1714 out of the 78 peasant households only 51 were Dhakars, who were perhaps the original colonisers while the remaining were Kirad, taili and bohra. The above village not only had a mixed peasant population but also relatively a very large number of non-agriculturist populations. It had 51 non-agriculturist household besides the 42 halis (ploughmen) who were cultivating some one
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36 Bheem Singh to Dhakar Gangaram, Jeth Vadi 1. S. 1766, K.B. 1/61
37 Bheem Singh to hawalgir of pargana Dighodh, Asadh vadi 8, s. 1765, K.B. 1/60
38 Kirad Geedha of mauza Jaitpura, pargana Bambhori had migrated because he did not have sardha (capacity) to carry on and the pateli was granted to one of his nephews, collection of jamabandi from mauza Jaitpura, s. 1808, K.B. 1/135
39 Likhant of Bhopot Singh Daulat Singh and Keshoji Rathor, Baisakh Vadi 1, s. 1784, K.B. 1/119
40 Uglai Dhuan-dehl-ki, Aghan Vadi 9, s. 1771, K.B. 1/276 (Kota)
else’s land. It may be argued on the basis of this information that the urge to acquire fresh resources through migration tended to intensify the process of multicity cast villages.

Another emerging contrast in the rural society was between a Patel and the ordinary peasant proprietors. They patels enjoyed concessional revenue rate for pateli halas and paid some of the cesses like neg. and kansari also at a lower rate than the karsa. They also received a share in the revenue realised from the village as pateli hasir. The state recognised a patel as a key figure in the village community because he generally “descended from first colonisers of the village.” The social ties of a patel were not confined to the village where he held his pateli biswas and patti but also exited in the neighboring village through the caste network. A patel who instead of paying the dand had fled away was pressurised through the patels of two other villages who were his sagas (related through marriage) and had stood surety for him. They were ordered to produce the absconding patel and to convince him to surrender his moveable possessions to the darbar in order to settle the outstanding dues. If there was more than one patel in a village their respective jurisdiction was clearly stated as pattis and their share was expressed as biswas. The administrative authority enjoyed by a patel was wide ranging. He had a decisive role in the jameet of plough units for the season, and played an important role in the process of bata and lata. He authorised to distribute concessions and rebate approved by the state for
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41 Ibid
42 Likhant patel of M. Patuda, Phagun sudi 4 s. 1784, K.B. 1/121-233
43 Ibid
44 Dilbagh Singh, op.cit, p. 176
45 The zamins of patel of mauza Gugalhedi were his sagas from three neighbouring village, likhant of Pura, op.cit.
46 Ibid
47 Although, the lata was conducted by the hawalgir and tahalwa of jagirdar but they were assisted by the patel who ensured any transgression by the former, see likhant of patel patwari of mauza Badoli reporting against the tahalwa of the jagirdar about violation of the norm for realising kansari, Posh Sudi 12, s. 1784, K.B. 1/121
48 All the orders for jameet were involved the patel invariably who also sent reports about the jameet to the state, Likhant of patel patwari mauza Dhansuri, pargana Barod, Chait Vadi 13, s. 1760, K.B. 1/59
dilasa (to boost the morale) of the peasants\textsuperscript{49}. He was empowered to catch muda (concealment of crop) and to realise taksir (fine) fixed by the state\textsuperscript{50}. He was responsible for maintaining the dastur (customary share) of patwari, chaudary, kanungo and bhomia. Thus the patel had become an integral and most important part of the local administrative machine along with the patwari and tahalwa of jagirdar. At times, the state even used the patels to keep a check on the jagirdars.

In case of the village being given in mukata the patels surrendered their pattis and gave an undertaking that they would not object to any one coming from anywhere to cultivate the land in their pattis\textsuperscript{51}. It shows that jurisdiction of a patel over a patti implied some sort of a decision making about maintaining cultivation on the land falling in his patti. The patel may or may not allow a new cultivator to cultivate the land in his patti. Since, in every village a number of peasants were cultivating less than or just about one plough unit, there is every possibility that in each pateli patti also there were a number of small and poor peasants who would be needing same kind of material support from time to time. The position enjoyed by a patel was intricately related to the process of production itself. Although, there is no direct evidence on this aspect but it appears from the adhsatta of mauza Babli that whenever a patel moved away some of the peasants also went away with him. In mauza Babli there were five patels and some of them had decided to cultivate the dohli land in c. 1727, for which they were reprimanded by the state. Consequently they gave a joint undertaking that his year they had sown the dohli land but from next year they would not do so. In the bahi of existing halas in the village for that year, names of all the other patels are found, except one patel Hathu who was earlier cultivating 240 beeghas of samhi land. So perhaps he was the one who had shifted his plough to dohli land in that year. Along with him three peasants who were earlier cultivating 78, 34 and 45 beeghas

\textsuperscript{49} Bheem Singh to patel patwari of mauza Kurahad, Aghan Vadi 9, s. 1772, K.B. 1/72  
\textsuperscript{50} Likhant of patel patwari of mauza Mundana, Chait Sudi 8, s. 1779, K.B. 1/97
respectively also do not figure into the *bahi*. They also might have joined patel Hathu for cultivating *dohli* in that year.\(^2\) The reason for the patel and peasants shifting together could be the resource support provided by the patel, which tied them to each other firmly. Since, all of them were from the same caste; it is quite possible that genealogical ties also existed between them but nothing can be said with certainty. Thus a patel by virtue of his agrarian resource base and caste and kinship ties was a crucial link between the state and peasants.

As a result of the power enjoyed at the local level many of the patels had become quite wealthy. The assets of patel Pura of *mauza* Gugalhedi included a horse and 25 buffaloes in c. 1703.\(^3\) The two patels of *mauza* Jaithal fled away leaving behind not only 71 *manis* of grain but also utensils of brass and iron, a sword, shield and dagger, two Gujrati and one local lock, stitched clothes, two *hukkas* made of lead and two hanging lamps in c. 1714.\(^4\) Pateli had become a status symbol in the rural society. Any one who could pool enough material and labour resources tried to acquire pateli either through colonisation or purchase.

The revenue records of Kota State refer to a section of rural population as *kholad* or *thalad* *assamis* for the purpose of collecting the cess *kholdi* or *jamdari* in contrast to the *karsa* living in a village who paid the land revenue and *bighori*. These cesses were realised from each *kholad* or *thalad* household at fixed rate.\(^5\) Etymology of these two terms and the caste composition of the section paying these cesses suggest that it was the non-agriculturist section of the rural society. They made their living through practicing either, a specialised skill or by rendering some service to the *karsa* and the *himayatis* living in a village. It included some of the Brahmans.

---

51 *Likhant* of patels, Sawan Vadi 1, s. 1785 contained in *adhsatta mauza* Babli, K.B. 1/121-133
52 *Adhsatta* M. Babli, s. 1784, K.B. 1/121-133
53 *Likhant* of patel Pura, Asadh Sudi 4, s. 1761 K.B. 1/60
54 *Patel Chokha Sunder ko suwar*, s. 1771, K.B. 1/276 (Kota)
bohras, sahas and most of the artisans and menials living in a village. Literally, a kholad assami implied a person who had his dwelling in the village. Since, he practiced his profession or rendered service by virtue of living in that village, he paid the cess kholdi. It was being realised from the artisans and menials living in a village even in 17th century and was retained throughout the 18th century. The patel and karsa had to send an undertaking at the time of each cropping season about the actual number of artisans and menials living in the village and also report about those who had migrated or disserted. In early 18th century we find that some of the artisans who rendered services were pahi (non-resident) but were included in the kholi assamis of the village. The rate for kholdi for such artisans was half of the resident artisans. Thus whatever might have been the original basis of realising this cess by 18th century it had been related to the earnings an assami was able to make, by rendering service or labour to a village. The term thalad appeared in 18th century when the agriculturist and non-agriculturist section of the rural society were subjected to two new levies bighori and jamdari respectively. Even now in Rajasthan an idler is described as a thala. The term thalad covered not only the artisans and menials but also the halis, some of the Brahmmins, bohras and sahas living as non-agriculturists in a village. The halis who were agriculturists but had no permanent claim on the fields on which they worked were also included amongst the thalads. Thus a village had come to be perceived as primarily an agricultural settlement because all those persons who were not agriculturists and did not possess land, the most important agrarian resource, were identified as thalad.

Since, the artisans and menials were the most indispensable component of the village society; almost every village had some of these households even if

55 See for instance, adhsatta mauza Babli, op. cit.; Khate bighori jamdari ke s. 1843, K.B. 1/66
56 For instance, likhant of patel and patwari of mauza Kurahad Bhadva Sudi 12, s. 1773 informing the state about wrong entries of kholad assami names K.B 1/72
57 Adhsatta mauza Babli, op. cit., a kumhar and luhar were pahi so paid only half the amount realised from the others.
there were no Brahmans, sahas or bohras living there. Even in small villages there were 8 to 10 while in the larger villages there were even 30 to 40 artisan and menial households. In some of the villages the proportion of such households to the karsa population was relatively high. For instance, in mauza Digonya, which had peasants of more than one caste, inspite of a small number of halpati assamis (owner of plough units), a relatively large number of artisans and menials lived. Out of 16 halpatis there were 2 Dhakars, 2 Meenas, 2 Jats, 3 Pandits, 2 Rajputs, 4 patels and 1 kalawant (artist). Against just 16 halpati households there was 14 artisan and menial households, Moreover, 34 households were categorised as phutkar. In this category there were 9 sahas, 3 pandits, 5 cheepas (calico printers) and 3 tailis (oil pressmen), 1 sunar (goldsmith), 1 bhopa (narrator of folk lore), 3 Gujar pastoralists, 1 banjara, 1 Rajput, 1 Muslim and 7 Khangars. Similarly, mauza Thakurwada where most of the halpati assamis were the bhomia thakurs or dohli holders also had a very large number of non-agriculturists. Against the 46 halpatis there were 72 assamis who paid jamdari. These assamis included artisans, menials, sahas, bohras, halis and some Dhakars. It is not clear why some of the Dhakars who were primarily an agriculturist caste were subjected to jamdari instead of bighori. Obviously, this unusually large non-agriculturist population in some of these village was related not only to the service requirements of the halpatis but also to the possibilities of independent manufacturing and trading activities available in these village.

As opposed to this picture was the growing scarcity of kholad assamis in some of the villages. In mauza Mundana and Khedli together, there were just eight kholads, while the area under cultivation was that of twenty-nine

---

58 **Khate bighori jamdari ke**, op. cit.
59 See, Appendix III, Distribution Pattern of Artisan and Menial Population
60 *Ugai Dhuan Dehal ki* op. cit
61 Ibid.
62 *Likhant of patel Neto, bohra Kheewsi etc. Jeth Vadi 11, s. 1808, K.B. 1/135
63 In *mauza Godelya hedi*, three new kholads were settled with the incentive of taking kholdi at half of the usual rate, Durjan Sal to hawalgir of Kethun, Asadh vadi 1, s. 1796, K.B. 1/135
halas\textsuperscript{64}. In mauza Babli there were just eleven kholad assamis in c. 1727, out of these also some had migrated due to bankruptcy and a kumhar and a luhar had to be called to the village as a pahi (non-resident). So, there were just eight kholad assamis available in a village, which had a cultivable area of 3623 beeghas. Three out of these eight were a dhobi, a kalal and a khati. So basically two chamars and three mehars were available to supplement the labour required for cultivation. As a result the dohli land holders of the village faced with shortage of labour started getting their land cultivated through the karsa, which was not acceptable to the state, as it was bound to affect the revenue adversely. The fact that some of the samhi land had been left parat and no initiative had been taken to undertake cultivation on the beed\textsuperscript{65}(virgin land) was enough to alarm the state. Shortage of kholads in village also gave a valid excuse to the karsa for not expanding the area under cultivation. In c. 1731 the Patel and patwari of mauza Dhapa explained that the land of 2.12 halas was lying parat because of death of one and migration of two kholads\textsuperscript{66}. It seems that this shortage of kholad population in villages was a general phenomenon and got accentuated because of their specific grievances in a village. In mauza Dhapa, even those kholads who were living in the village had stopped working for the peasants, although the patel and patwari did not mention the cause\textsuperscript{67}. The resentment and frustration of kholads was related to their general plight in villages.

The relationship of the agriculturist and non-agriculturist section of the village society was governed by the customary practices. The artisans and menials were given a share of the village produce, which was realised from the karsa in the form of a cess known as khunchi. In the khalsa villages the state officials who conducted the process of lata distributed the grains realised as

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{64} Jamabandi mauza Mundana and Khedi, s. 1766, likhant of patel patwari and kisan, K.B. 1/61
\item \textsuperscript{65} Adhsatta mauza Babli, op. cit, the patel and patwari gave an understanding not to cultivate dohli is even in late 18th century, Umed Singh to patel patwari and karsa of mauza Sarinal, Pargana Barod, Jeth sudi 2, s. 1845, K.B. 3/1
\item \textsuperscript{66} Likhant of patel patwari mauza Dhapa, s. 1788, K.B. 1/126
\item \textsuperscript{67} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
khunchi to them. It can be assumed that in the jagir villages too, khunchi would have been distributed by the jagirdars. Thus the relationship of artisans and menials with the karsa had come to be regulated by the state as far as their share in the village produce was concerned. Besides the artisans and menials also held small strips of land for subsistence. In mauza Mundana size of these strips ranged from 20 beeghas to 4 beeghas. Some of the artisans also received cash payments like the sunars who received a taki in lieu of parkhai or testing the purity of coins. Although, the rural artisans and menials worked primarily for the village in which they lived but at least on some occasions the state also sent its demand. Goods furnished against such demand were known as lawazma. For instance in c. 1731 kumhars and chamars of 103 villages were ordered to furnish earthen pots against 'kolu ki hazri' and pair of shoes, and aghoris (animal hide) against the 'parti' (collection of dead animal skins). Out of these in 66 villages this demand was commuted into cash and rupees. 60 were realised from the kumhars and chamars. Thus the state also claimed some goods and services from this section over and above the karsa and himayatis living in the village. The state also took initiative to settle down new kholad assamis by giving incentives in the form of reducing the amount realised as kholdi. In c. 1739 one luhar, one dhobi, and a taili women was settled in mauza Godelyahedi through the hawalgir of Kethun. In case of any violation of norms the state could also impose a dand on them, although they in turn could appeal against the dand. The poni of mauza Mundana appealed to Bheem Singh in c. 1710 against the dand on the plea of meager earnings. The state appeased them by waving off Rupees 19.50 imposed upon two sunars and one taili who were found to be natwan (poor) while the remaining amount had to be paid. Thus the artisans

---

68 In mauza Chandelpur such payments were made to the kumeens by the officers who had realised dhuan dehl, see, ugai dhuan dehl ki op.cit
69 Mauza Jonpura ki halon ki bahi shows two chamars and one tamoli held, 10, 19 and 15 beeghas of land strips in s. 1777, K.B. 1/95
70 Adhsatta mauza Mundana, s. 1766, K.B. 1/61
71 Ibid
72 Toji, s. 1788, K.B. 1/126
73 Durjan Sal to hawalgir of Kethun, Asadh Vadi 1, s. 1796 K.B. 1/61
74 Bheem Singh to hawalgir and patel patwari of mauza Mundana, op. cit.
and menials living in the village served not only the village but also the state by providing goods and services whenever required. Their lives and activities were governed by the state and not by the village society alone. If any household migrated, the matter was reported to the state. The new kho/ads were brought to the village through the state. Thus the state had emerged as the authority to regulate the relation of the agriculturist and the non-agriculturist section of the society.

Inspite of plenty of beed available in every village most of the artisans and menials cultivated only small strips of land. Although, there was no legal restriction on their shifting to agriculture yet except the malis and tailis no other artisan or menial caste was able to adopt agriculture in a big way. Many of them were not even able to cultivate the small strips of land held by them customarily. In mauza Mundana land of 6 artisans and menials was under the ploughs of Brahmans or bohras. Such an arrangement could only be related to lack of required agricultural inputs, either, due to a situation of distress or the need to make some quick money. Since, the customary share of these sections in village produce was hardly one percent, they were unable to mobilise enough resources to cultivate a sizeable piece of land. Some of them in order to enhance their resource base rendered services to more than one village. But in such a situation they would be short of labour time to work on their own strips. Moreover, the greatest need for some of the specialised services was felt by the karsa during the cropping and harvesting seasons. So they found themselves busiest at the time of main agricultural operations. For instance, a kumhar who supplied the earthen pots for the rahat ki khedi would hardly have any time to undertake asadh ki jameet (ploughing the fields before the onset of monsoon) on his own field. Therefore, the easiest option was to allow some one else to cultivate their strip in lieu of either, a fixed

---

75 Likhant of patel patwari mauza Dhapa, (undated) s. 1788 K.B. 1/126
76 Durjan Sal to hawalgir of Kethun, Asadh Vadi 1, s. 1796, K.B. 1/135, and to Khati and Kumhar of mauza Domrali, Asadh Sudi 14, s. 1805, K.B. 5/8
77 Adhsatta mauza Mundaha, op. cit
78 D. Singh, The State, p. 28
annual sum or a share of the produce and pursue their profession. Thus inadequate capital inputs and shortage of labour time hindered their shift to agriculture. Those artisans and menials who were employed by the state and who had received land against *chakri* were in a better position. They had a better access to agrarian resources and could also proceed to *desh* whenever required for agricultural operations instead of remaining in *huzuri*\(^\text{79}\). Those artisans who proceeded to *desh* for agricultural operations had to pay an additional cess known as *khai bhomi*. Those who stayed back in *huzuri* and managed their land either, through family labour or through *batai* were exempt from this cess\(^\text{80}\). As a result such artisans were able to pursue agriculture for subsistence. Some of them could even amass considerable surplus resources. For instance *Kahar Ajaba* who was in *chakri* had turned into a usurer and considered himself to be a *bohra*\(^\text{81}\). There was a relatively prosperous section amongst the artisans and menials. They were the ones who had got land from the state to grow commercial crops like *al*, *kasumbo*, indigo, vegetables, oil seeds, sugarcane etc.\(^\text{82}\) For instance the *neelgars* and *rangrez* grew indigo *al* and *kasumbo* and the *malis* and *tailis* grew vegetables and oil seeds respectively. They were able to take advantage of the state policy of promoting commercial crops and instead of paying the cess *kholdi* and *jamdari* got themselves enlisted as *karsa*. The reason for their success in shifting to agriculture was two folds. Firstly, the nature of service, which they rendered to the village, did not obstruct them from agricultural operations and secondly they were processing or marketing the products, which they grew. Those artisans and menials whose service were necessary for carrying out the agricultural operations smoothly such as the *khati*, *luhar*, *kumhar* did not have this advantage. However, if any of them could *manage* to cultivate at

\[^{79}\text{For instance Luhar Danu was in desh while Luhar Achlo was in huzuri, therefore, the one in desh had to pay while the one in huzuri was exempt from khai bhom, Arjan Singh to hawaligir, patel patwari of mauza Abhaypura, Posh Vadi 4, s. 1778, K.B 1/96}\]

\[^{80}\text{Ibid., Arjan Singh to hawaligir of mauza Jakhoda, Aghan Vadi 5, s. 1778, K.B 1/96 in case of Lakhman Paswan.}\]

\[^{81}\text{Patras of Kahar Ajba, s. 1767, K.B. 1/64}\]

\[^{82}\text{Durjan Sal to Neelgar Dula of Kethun, Asadh Vadi 10, s. 1777, K.B. 1/125; to patel patwari of mauza Devli Arba for Kachi Bhau's al field, Jeth sud1 10, s. 1780, K.B. 1/108 to mali Dayal, mauza Pohlai Buzurg, Magh Vadi 8, s. 1783 K.B. 1/118}\]
Plate III.1: The Kali temple and the gurudwara, nestle against each other - the old structures of Kalka.

Plate III.2: Old buildings, narrow winding lanes near the temple complex signifying initial unplanned settlement. The Thakur Dwara temple visible in the background.
least one plough unit, kholdi and lawazma could be exempted and they could be included amongst the karsa. Luhar Rupa of mauza Batavda had given an undertaking to cultivate one plough unit and was therefore to be exempt from kholdi and lawazma83. Their meager share in village produce and difficulties involved in shifting to full time agriculture left no option but to migrate towards kasbas in search of better opportunities. As a result in some of the villages there was a growing scarcity of the artisans and menials84 against their growing concentration in some of the villages and kasbas in the first half of 18th century85.

Another important section of the village society were the himayatis,86 The himayatis were an assorted group of bhomias, rawat, dohli grant holders and the state officials. They had emerged in the process of redistribution of agricultural surplus. They enjoyed a powerful position in the village society as a result of their access to the agrarian resources in the form of land grants, concessional revenue rates, a share in the village revenue resources etc. Although, the patels also enjoyed some of the institutional means of access to agrarian resources but they were not considered to be the himayatis. They enjoyed this access primarily due to the official position bestowed upon them in order to use their caste and community ties with the karsa and their own agrarian resources base, in order to maintain the production cycle. Creation of a large himayatis class had strengthened the hold of state on the village affairs. It brought about a significant change in the power structure at the village level. Their interests and outlook was bound to act as a check upon the claims of Kars on the village resources. The main forms of institutional

83 Likhant of Luhar Rupa, Posh Sudi 15, s. 1836, K.B. 1/62
84 Some of the villages had to kholad assamis, like mauza Arjanpura in pargana Nandgaon, s. 1771, K.B. 1/276
85 See, for data on kasba population the chapter, State Merchants and Markets
86 The term himayati appears in several documents for instance in Arjan Singh's order to hawalgit patel and patwari of kasba Awa, dated Chait Sudi 10, s. 1778, K.B. 1/96. It referred to those who enjoyed a privileged position as a result of association with the state as in mauza Manas gaon where a khawas, a badaran and two pandits were bracketed as himayatis, s. 1789, K.B. 1/127; the himayatis enjoyed concessional revenue rates, Malba, mauza Arankheda, s. 1755, K.B. 1/30
mean of access to agrarian resources enjoyed by the himayatis were bhom, vasi, dohli and tailbhog, gharuhalas and jagir.

The bhomias or the holders of bhom were a relatively small group amongst the himayatis. The bhom rights had emerged in the process of subjugation of the Meenas, Bheels and other non-Hada Rajputs clans. These rights had came to be recognised or could even be conferred by the state for the purpose of subsistence. The bhomias have been considered to be similar to the Mughal zamindars to some extent although, these rights could not be sold or alienated like the zamindari right. It was considered to be a highly 'cherished' grant. In Kota documents there are reference to boom, khai bhom and mana bhom. The term bhom' was used to denote an original claim on a specified piece of land which was known as 'bhomi-ki-dharti' and certain customary privileges known as 'bhomi-ka-lawazma'. Lawazma appears to be a blanket term to denote neg-dastur, lagat and bhomi-ki-taki. Out of these neg-dastur was a bhomia's share in the revenue of the bhom village, lagat was his share in the customary cesses, fines and penalties imposed upon the village population, and taki was realised by him from the traders passing through the village and the local melas. Bhomi-ki-dharti was assessed at normal rate but was exempt from kharch partially or fully. In later half of 18th century all the privileges enjoyed by the bhomias had been commuted into 'chauthan-ki-dharti' which was a piece of land assessed at ¼ bata. This created a new situation and the state as well as bhomias tried to interpret the change to their own advantage. Some of the bhomias asserted that chauthan-ki-dharti covered their claims only on the agricultural produce of the village.

87 S.P. Gupta, Eastern Rajasthan, p. 134
88 Dilbagh Singh, The State, pp. 42-44
89 Tod, A A R, p. 138
90 Durjan Sal to hawalgar of pargana Madhkargarh, Asadh Vadi
91 Bheem Singh to tehalwa of Bhai Sam Singh, Asadh Sudi 7, s. 1771, K.B. 1/134
92 Kotwali Chautra Sahar Kota ki jama, s. 1752, shows the share of bhomia in various fines, K.B. 1/19
93 Umed Singh to bhomia Mohobat Singh, Phagun Sudi 13, s. 1846, Khate, K.B. 3
94 Anjan Singh to hawalgar of kasba Kelhun, Magh Sudi 11, s. 1771, K.B. 1/134; Bhomi ki dharti ki upti, mauza Bhadaheda, pargana Sangod, s. 1786, K.B. 1/125
95 Umed Singh to Mohobat Singh, op. cit
Therefore, they could still realise *lagat* from the artisans and menials\(^9\). The state ordered he *bhomanias* enjoying *chauthan-ki-dharti*, to restrain themselves from realising *lagat* from artisans and menials, as the chauthan-ki-dharti covered their entire claim\(^9\). To redefine the position enjoyed by the *bhomanias*, the state distinguished between the *karsa* of a *bhomania* and that of the *jagirdars*\(^9\). One of the *bhomanias* was ordered not to compel the *karsa* of the *jagirdar* to cultivate the land under his (bhomania) jurisdiction\(^9\). It was not allowed to extend the area of a *bhom* village. The state also asserted its claim to realise assessed revenue from *bhomi-dharti*. This land was held in lieu of the privileges enjoyed by the *bhomanias* prior to being commuted into chauthan-ki-dharti. Therefore, this land was to be assessed at a concessional rate of \(\frac{1}{4}\) bata. In case of a *bhomania* being zortalab, even an extreme step of placing the *bhom* land and lawazma in khalsa could be taken\(^9\). In case of a *bhomania* picking up issue with the state, the *budkal* (elder) patels of the neighbouring villages could be rallied, to resist the *bhomania*\(^10\). Thus, inspite of recognising the original *bhomanias* the policy was to restrict or even replace them and to strengthen the administrative hold upon the *bhom* villages.

The state had begun to confer *bhom* rights, and even to give the *bhom* rights in *mukata*. A piece of land could be given by the state in *bhom* as a mark of favour to its officials, *jagirdars*, chief’s family members and even moneylenders. For instance, Mukund Singh was given 330 beeghas for rendering service to the fort of Aton and Kujod and saha Deva was given 60 beeghas for bringing new peasants to *pargana* Madhukargarh\(^11\). Bahuji Gangawat, Heera *badarani* and Moti Ram enjoyed similar grants\(^12\). On these

\(^9\) Ibid
\(^9\) Ibid
\(^9\) Umed Singh to Mohobat Singh, op .cit
\(^9\) Ibid
\(^9\) Durjan Sal to *hawalgir* of *pargana* Madhukargarh, op. cit.
\(^10\) Umed Singh to *budkal* patels of *pargana* Delanpur, Aghan Vadi 4, s. 1846, khafe, K.B. 3; to patel patwari of *mauz* Rajpura, *tafa* Kethun, Asadh Sudi 1, s. 1846, K.B. 3
\(^11\) Durjan Sal to *hawalgir* of *kasba* Aton, Jeth Sudi 11, s. 1783, K.B. 1/118
\(^12\) Durjan Sal to *hawalgir* of *pargana* Sangod, Chait Vadi 4, s. 1784, K.B. 1/118; *Likhant* of patel, patwari of *mauz* Rangpura, Sawan Vadi 10, s. 1780, K.B. 1/108; Durjan Sal to *hawalgir* of *mauz* Rawtha, s. 1783, k.B. 1/135
grants a cess known as *khai bhom* was charged at the rate of rupees four per hundred *beeghas*\(^{103}\). It could be exempted partially or fully, if the land was under the *gharuhalas* and could be reduced to half, if the land was in *gharujov*\(^{104}\). The difference between *gharuhalas* and *gharujov* is rather ambiguous. The land in *gharuhalas* was cultivated under direct supervision with the help of *halis*, and was assessed at concessional revenue rates. The land under *gharujov* did not enjoy any such concession in the revenue rate. However, it was exempted from *khai bhom* for the *Raj hissa* (state share) which was realised only upon the other half i.e. *raiti hissa* (peasant’s share)\(^{105}\). Such land could be given by the grantee for cultivation to the peasants of the village. However, in many cases a written order to this effect was obtained from the state, for which an amount for “*kandi*”, at the rate of rupee one per *beegha* had to be paid\(^{106}\). This amount was to be paid by the person taking the land for cultivation\(^{107}\). Whether this order was a mere recognition or some role of necessary permission remains ambiguous.

Many of the kinsmen and other *Rajput* mansabdars holding *jagirs* in the territory of Kota chief, had also acquired *bhomi* rights\(^{108}\). They were entitled to *bhomi-lag* and *mana-ki-dharti*, which was a measured tract of land\(^{109}\). They had to give a share of the *hasil* from this land to the state, as *mana-bhom*. This share was sent in two or three installments\(^{110}\). In case of any delay or effort to evade *mana-bhom* state instructed the patwari to hand over his share of village produce only when the state share of *mana-bhom* had been dispatched\(^{111}\). In some cases a *bohra* also furnished security for the same\(^{112}\).

\(^{103}\) *Ijamabandi, mauza* Shahpura, s. 1796, K.B 1/135
\(^{104}\) Ibid
\(^{105}\) Ibid
\(^{106}\) Durjan Sal to *hawalgir* of *pargana* Sangod, op. cit; to *patel patwari* pf *mauza* Rangpura, op. cit
\(^{107}\) Durjan Sal to *hawalgir* of *pargana* Sangod, op. cit; to *patel patwari* of *mauza* Rangpura, op. cit.
\(^{108}\) Parsa Ram Hada to *Pancholi* Danat Rai etc. Katik *Sudi* 15, s. 1766 K.B. 1/61
\(^{109}\) Ibid
\(^{110}\) Ibid
\(^{111}\) *Likhant* of *patel* and *patwari* of *mauza* Jakhreli, Baisakh *Sudi* 1, s. 1777, K.B. 1/95
\(^{112}\) *Likhant* of *bohra* Daulat Ram of *mauza* Mandawara, undated, s. 1777. K.B. 1/95
Many a times, the state instead of demanding an exact share of the realisation made by such jagirdars gave it in mukata for a fixed annual sum. In c. 1709 six Rajput, mansabdars out of which four were the Kota chief’s kinsmen, two Kachwaha and Tanwar Rajputs, held 17 villages in mana-bhom in pargana Barod in which 2457 beeghas of land was designated as ‘mana-ki-dharti’\textsuperscript{113}. For realising the bhomi lag from these 17 villages, they paid rupees 1024 to the Kota chief, in three instalments in a year. Another Rajput, Sadaram Dahiya also held the mana-bhom right in three villages. He was also realising hasil from a local mela and rahdari from the traders, but was resisting the payment of mana-bhom. Therefore, the local hawalgir recommended giving the ‘mulk’ in mukata\textsuperscript{114}. It seems that the practice of conferring bhom was to develop a working relationship with those powerful Rajput sardars, who could not be displaced and whose position had been further strengthened by the grant of imperial mansab.

Another institutional means of access to the agrarian resources was vasi, a privilege granted only to a Rajput sardar. It was considered to be the symbol of his strength and status, because it ensured his hold on the agrarian resources base of the village. A village was considered to be suitable for establishing the vasi of a ‘bada thakur’ if it had abundance of uncultivated land and only a small population of raiyat\textsuperscript{115}. In a vasi a Rawat was granted land for his gharuhalas, for the halas of his extended family, dependents, purohit and pradhan. In mauza Jonpura the number of vasi halas was equal to the number of karsa halas, and still 500 beeghas of land was beed\textsuperscript{116}. In mauza Rasulpura, the number of vasi halas was 47.50 while the old halas of the karsa were just 8.50\textsuperscript{117}. Establishing a vasi in a village which, had a large cultivable area but was thinly populated also served another purpose as well. It added life to a lonely and desolate village to develop its full agricultural

\textsuperscript{113} Parsa Ram Hada to Pancholi Danat Rai etc. op. cit.
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid
\textsuperscript{115} Vigat, I, pp. 410,503
\textsuperscript{116} Mauza Jonpura ke halon ki bahi, k.B. 1/95
\textsuperscript{117} Mauza Rsulpura takhmina of halas, s. 1766, K.B. 1/60
potential. For instance, *mauza* Cheeparda in *pargana* Barod was earmarked for the *vasi* of Rawat Dev karan in c. 1698\. This added to the village 24 *halas* of the Rawat, 6 *halas* of his brothers and 13 *halas* of his *purohit* and *pradhan*. Since, these *halas* were given concessional revenue rates the 49 *karsa halas* preexisting in the village were also extended some concessions as incentives. The *kholads*, however, were not given any concession\. The *karsa* and *kholads* of a *vasi* village were to be treated as *raiti* (subjects) of the *vasi* but the Rawat could not fix the revenue rates arbitrarily. Normally, the *bata* for the *gharuhalas* of the Rawat was fixed at ¼ *nekarcha*, while the *halas* of the *karsa* and *tahalwa* of the *vasi* were to be assessed according to *des-bar-basti* (customary rate prevailing in the area), but were to be given some concession in *neg* and *kansan*\.\n
A *vasi* was deemed to be a permanent place for a Rawat's establishment but at times, it could be made *khalsa* or transferred. The village of *Bhai* Sujan Singh's *vasi* was made *khalsa* in c. 1703 but when he agreed to pay a *peshkash* of rupees 700, he was allowed to retain it\. The population of a *vasi* village was divided into two categories, the *vasilok* i.e. the Rawat's extended family, *purohit*, *pradhan*, *tahalwa* etc. and the *raiti* i.e. the *karsa* and the *kholads*. If there were any disputes between the *vasilok* and *raiti* the *taksir* (penalty) was to be fixed by the Rawat\. The *lag* on marriages (*toran* and *thambh*) of the *vasilok* was to be fixed by the Rawat, but the *lag* on marriages in *raiti* families was to be realised at the customary rate\. Thus the *raiti* of a *vasi* village was subjected to the authority and exactions of the Rawat, but the revenue rates and customary cesses were to be realised only as specified by the state\. At times, the *raiti* could dissert the *Vasi* and settle

---

118 *Patta of Vasi* issued to Rawat Dev Karan, Jeth Vadi 6, s. 1755, K.B. 1/30
119 Ibid
120 Ram Singh to *hawalgir* of *pargana* Barod, Magh Vadi 13, s. 1760, K.B. 1/37
121 *Likhan* of Sri Sujan Singh, Phagun Sudi 11, s. 1760 K.B. 1/37
122 *Patta of Vasi* issued to Inder Bhan Gaud, Baisakh Sudi, 7, s. 1766, k.B. 1/61
123 Ibid
124 Ibid
125 Durjan Sal to *hawalgir* of *pargana* Madhukargarh about the *raiti* of Inder Hada's Vasi, Asadh Sudi 10, s. 1783, K.B. 1/118
elsewhere. Dhakar Gangaram migrated with his *halas* from a *vasi* in *pargana* Sangod. He was allowed to settle down elsewhere at the recommendation of the *hawaldir*, but was ordered to pay a *peshkash*, which he was not in a position to pay. Eventually the amount of *peshkash* was also reduced.\(^{126}\) Similarly, the *raiti* of Raghunath Singh Rajawat's *vasi* in *mauza* Deegana fled away, apparently because of the unbearable economic burden and petitioned to the Kota ruler for relief. They were brought back by the *hawaldir* by giving some concessions.\(^{127}\) It appears that although the state stipulated the revenue rates and cesses at the time of settling a *vasi*, yet the subjection of the *karsa* as *raiti* to a *Rawat*, could lead to over burdening, causing migration and flight. The intervention made by the state in such cases in favour of the *karsa* shows that the state did not allow a *Rawat* to consider a *vasi* to be his independent domain.

*Dohli* and *tail-bhog* were the religious endowments given mostly to the Brahmans but at times also to saints and religious institutions. The grant given to an individual for his maintenance was termed *dohli*. For instances, Maniram's *dohli* land *beegha* fifty\(^{128}\), while the grant given to a temple for meeting the daily expenses of the rituals to be performed in the name of the temple deity was *tail-bhog*, such as 'Sanwala ji's *tail-bhog* *ki dharti*'.\(^{129}\) These grants were made by issuing a *sanad* specifying the land and the village where it was granted. If a *sanad* was lost fresh orders were to be procured.\(^{130}\) There are references to grants made to individuals being renewed or being objected to but not of the temples. It suggests, that *tail-bhog* was a permanent grant while *dohli* was to be verified and renewed from time to time. The *dohli* holders of *pargana* Itawa complained in c. 1703, they were not being allowed to take the *hasil* unless a fresh *sanad* was produced.\(^{131}\) The reference to 'hasil' gives an impression that such grants were an assignment of state share

\(^{126}\) Bheem Singh to Dhakar Gangaram, Jeth Vadi 1, s. 1766, k.B. 1/63  
\(^{127}\) Bheem Singh to *hawaldir* of Kanwas, Baisakh Vadi 13, s. 1766, K.B. 1/63  
\(^{128}\) Arjan Singh to *hawaldir* of *pargana* Baran, Asadh Sudi 10, s. 1778, K.B. 1/96  
\(^{129}\) Arjan Singh to *hawaldir* of *pargana* Kujod, Bhadva Sudi 3, s. 1778, K.B 1/96  
\(^{130}\) Ibid  
\(^{131}\) Ibid
of revenue from the specified land. However, in practice it implied the entire produce of this land. It is clear from several other references that dohli was a right on the land itself. For instance in c. 1709 when Bheem singh issued fresh orders for the dohli land-holders of Ram Singh's period they were in terms of area and not revenue. The land given in dohli could be made hereditary, to be retained by the family of the grantee after his death.

Dohli and tail-bhog were treated as revenue free land grants, therefore, were kept out of the assessed area of a village at the time of preparing the khasra documents. The dohli land in every village was measured from time to time to ascertain the actual area under dohli. At times because of redistribution of village chak beeghas the land given in one village could get transferred to another village. The dohli landholders were supposed to carry on cultivation, either, through their family labour, or through halis. The state took a strong view if the dohli land was given out to the karsa of the village, who were expected to expand the area under cultivation instead of cultivating the dohli land.

Jagirdars, ijaradar and even the karsa in various ways often harassed the dohli landholders. In c. 1711 some of the dohli land holders of mauza Pohit in pargana Mangrol complained that their land had been seized by the new jagirdar, Jaitra Singh and had been redistributed to his own himayatiyas. The patel patwari and tapdar have got their land measured for preparing the khasra. Since, the land once assessed could not be exempted from revenue in that year, state instructed the local officials to pay one of them in

---

131 Likhant of dohli holders of pargana Itawa, Sawan Sudi 3, s. 1760, K.B. 1/37
132 Bheem Singh to jagirdars of Ranikhedi, Jeth Sudi 3, s. 1766, K.B 1/62
133 Arjan Singh's order to hawalgar of pargana Baran, op.cit.
134 Likhant of Daulat Singh and patel Rajaram to thakur Sadaram Chaudhary and Muluk chand, dated Jeth Vadi 13, S. 1766, Jamabandi mauza Vohit, pargana Mangrol, K.B. 1/85
135 Zalim Singh's order to patel patwari, mauza Bharvo, tafa Jolwa, Jeth Sudi 15, s. 1845, Khate, K.B. 3/2
136 Adhasatta, Mauza Babli, s. 1784, Toji, K.b. 1/118 Umed Singh's order to Patel patwari and karsa of mauza Sarinal, pargana Barod, dated Jeth Sudi 2, s. 1845, Khate, K.B. 3/2
137 Ibid
138 Likhant of Daulat Ram and patel Rajaram, op. cit.
cash in lieu of the hasil from that land\textsuperscript{139}. Jaitra Singh was also asked to reconsider the case of at least one of the dohli landholders. All the others were to retain the land only at his discretion, as these grants had been made by the previous jagirdar\textsuperscript{140}. The ijaradars also tried to bring the land of dohli under assessment on the plea of taking ijara of the whole village, and only when the state agreed to reduce the amount of ijara, spared the dohli land\textsuperscript{141}.

In one case the village karsa tried to occupy the dohli land after original assignee's death on the grounds that the deceased owed them some money. Only after the state asserted that the land had been conferred by the darbar and did not belong to the grantee, it could be restored to his family\textsuperscript{142}.

In 18\textsuperscript{th} century even the dohli land-holders had to pay various lags and birads to the imperial administration, as well as, to the Kota chiefs. In c. 1727 the dohli land holders enjoying grants since 17\textsuperscript{th} century pleaded to be exempted from the demand imposed by the sadr. They argued that just one of the grantees, fakhir Jando enjoying the khairat (charity) of “sri patshah” while all the other including the Idgah of Sangod, held the grants by the local rulers and were thus outside the purview of such demand\textsuperscript{143}. The rulers of Kota also levied dohli birad from time to time. The dohli land-holders accustomed to revenue free grants pleaded for exemption on the ground of poor yield\textsuperscript{144}. If the dohli land was given in batai instead of keeping it in gharujov, they were made to pay ani\textsuperscript{145}. At times, the dohli land holders complained about dohli birad being demanded even on the parat land\textsuperscript{146}. The dohli birad and other levies could amount to as much as rupees 2.50 per beegha in the second half of 18\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{147}. At times, there was some exaction by the jagirdars also,

\textsuperscript{139} Ibid
\textsuperscript{140} Ibid
\textsuperscript{141} Umed Singh to samsat dohli land holders of pargana Baran, Baisakh Sudi, s .1841, Khate, K.B. 3
\textsuperscript{142} Arjan Singh’s order to hawalgi of pargana Baran , op. cit
\textsuperscript{143} Durjan Sal to hawalgi of pargana Sangod, Sawan Sudi 13, s. 1784, Toji. K.B. 1/118
\textsuperscript{144} Likhant of dohli holders of Kethun, Magh Sudi 15, s. 1789, K.B. 1/129
\textsuperscript{145} Umed Singh’s order to Pancholi BRAj Lal, Patel Patwa of mauza Notaro, pargana Barod, Jeth Vadi 10, s. 1848, Khate, K.B. 3/2
\textsuperscript{146} Umed Singh’s order to Baba Gomundgar, Bhadva Sudi 2, s. 1845, Khate, K.B .3/1
\textsuperscript{147} Umed Singh to Bhatt Jodha of Lunra, Asoj Vadi 4, s. 1845, Khate, K.B. 3/1
which were not sanctioned by the state. For instance, in *pargana* Baran, eleven *man* out of hundred *man* of grain produced on *dohl* land was realised by the *jagirdar* for two consecutive years\(^{148}\).

The policy of granting land against *chakri* (service) created a new class of privileged cultivators. State freely granted land to the *huzuri chakars*. Whereas, the land grants given to the artisans and menials such as *khati, luhar, kahar, mahavat, kalal* who worked for state were for subsistence, land grants to the *Pancholis, Pradhans, Rajputs and Sahas* were a mark of favour and deemed to be a privilege. It is difficult to tabulate the exact proportion of such land grants to the land cultivated by the *karsa*, but in many villages it was quite substantial. In c. 1696 Ram Singh had given 1565 *beeghas* to his *chakars*\(^{149}\). In c. 1711 the entire (*dar-o-bast*) land of *mauza* Arlai was being cultivated by the *chakars*\(^{150}\). In c. 1744 ten *chakars* cultivated 323 *beeghas* of land in *mauza* Mundla\(^{151}\). The land grants given by Ram Singh to his *chakars* consisted of *hakuwai* and *tagiri*, former was the land which was to be brought under cultivation and the later was the land which was already under cultivation but was being transferred from one *chakar* to another\(^{152}\). In early 18\(^{th}\) century land to be given in *chakri* was to be a combination of \(\frac{3}{4}\) *samhi* and \(\frac{1}{4}\) *beed*\(^{153}\). If a *chakar* got land cultivated through *karsa* a cess known as *khai bhom* was to be charged, but it was in his *gharuhala* it was exempted\(^{154}\). This exemption could be availed only when the *chakar* was in *huzuri* (on duty) but if he retired to *desh* (village) it was withdrawn\(^{155}\).

The different means of access to agrarian resources had created a large privileged section in the rural society. Since, this section enjoyed concessional

\(^{148}\) Arjana Singh's order to *hawalgi* of *pargana* Baran, Magh Vadi 4, s. 1778, K.B. 1/96
\(^{149}\) Ram Singh's orders, *Toji* Tambapatra, s. 1754, K.B. 1/35
\(^{150}\) *Toji* Taqsim, *pargana* Ghatoli, s. 1768, K.B. 6/41
\(^{151}\) *Likhat* of *mauza* Mundla's *patel* *patwari* and *karsa*, dated Asoj Vadi 5, s. 1794, *toji*, K.B. 1/134
\(^{152}\) Ram Singh's orders, op. cit.
\(^{153}\) Kishan Das's (*Bheem Singh*) order to *hawalgi* of *pargana* Barod's 1775, op. cit
\(^{154}\) Ibid.
\(^{155}\) Durjan Sal's order to *hawalgi* of Sahupura, dated Baisakh Vadi 3, s. 1800, *toji*, K.B. 1
revenue rates, its resource base had expanded considerably by 18th century. They utilized their additional capital resources in cash crop cultivation, money lending and acquiring additional land to expand their plough units. A section within the patels who enjoyed the institutional means of access to village revenue resources in the form of pateli hasil and and biswas were also able to expand their resource base considerably. A rough idea of the difference in the resources of a patel and an ordinary peasant can be obtained by comparing their assets. Although, such a comparison has a limited value as the peasants and the patels whose assets have been compared belonged to three different villages. Moreover, their real assets would have been more than what have been shown here because these were only the seized or surrendered assets. However, the time period being almost the same it can give a broad idea of the difference in the resource position of the two.

Difference in the Assets of Patels and Peasants: c 1703 - 1709

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Peasant</th>
<th>Patel I</th>
<th>Patel II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food grain</td>
<td>Wheat 4.25 man</td>
<td>Jowar value Rs. 6.50</td>
<td>Rabi and Kharif Crop of 1 plough unit and 3 pateli halas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implements</td>
<td>1 Khurpa 1 Dantla</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1 Hala 1 Kuli 1 Dori 1 Jali 1 Cart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>1 Bullock 1 Cow 1 Calf</td>
<td>1 Bullock 7 Buffaloes 18 Buffalo calves 1 Horse</td>
<td>4 Bullock 1 Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Goods</td>
<td>1 Cot ---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4 Cot 2 Brass water containers Brass Lamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Value in Rupees</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>46.50 (excluding the cattle)</td>
<td>(Value not given)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that the resources of a patel far exceeded that of an ordinary peasants in terms of cattle, grain stock, superior crops, household

156 The information presented here is based on the details given about Meh Reewa's assets in Firohi hasil of pargana Barod, s 1760, K.B. 1/37 and likhant of patel Pura, Asadh Sudi 4, 1761, K.B. 1/47 about surrender of his assets and 'sumar' (evaluation) of patel Bachu's assets, Likhant of patel patwari mauza Kurahad, Aghan Vadi 5, s. 1766, K.B. 1/66
items and agricultural tools and implements. These resources were used by the patels for acquiring more land and going for cash crop cultivation. Many of them were ready to pay heavy amount of kandi to the state to acquire the right to cultivate the parat (unploughed) land. Thus the institutional means of access to village revenue resources had helped not only the himayatis but also a section within the peasants to make economic gains and improve its position.

The notion of property in rural society had become linked to the chief agrarian resource, i.e. land. Those who did not possess land were considered to be a thalad. At times they were called poni. It has been suggested that the term implied ¼. However, in view of the fact that, they received a meager share of the village produce it is more appropriate to think that the term originated as pavani or the one who was entitled to pavna. Since, most of the artisans and menials did not possess land; their economic condition remained poor. Inspite of serving the village karsa, some of them on growing old like kumhar Khema in mauza Kurahad were compelled to live as beggars. Even while rendering service, some of them were too poor even to pay the dand (penalty) for violating the existing social norms. It was reported that sunar kanhe and taili Khema were too poor (natawan) to pay their share in the dand imposed upon the poni of mauza Mundana buzurg.

Thus the structure of village society was based upon one's relation to land. Those who acquired it through institutional means and enjoyed concessional rates of revenue on their land were considered to be the himayatis i.e. the ones favored by the state. Those who were the first colonisers were the karsa holding bapoti rights but those who came to work on a village land from

---

157 Toji dharti ki kandi ki, s. 1780, K.B. 1/108, patel Daula and Dhakar Sunder had taken 100 beeghas of land by paying rupee 1 per beegha for kandi, Durjan Sal to patel patwari of mauza Rangpura, Asadh Sudi 5, s. 1780, K.B. 1/108
158 For use of this term see, Bheem Singh's order dated Bhadva Vadi Amavasya, s. 1767, k.B. 1/61
159 Likhant of Patwar Mauza Kurahad, Bhadva Sudi 12, s. 1773, K.B. 1/72
another village were the *pahis*. Those who did not possess land were the *poni* or *thalad* or *hali*, while those who possessed land were the *halpati* or *haljota*\(^{161}\). Thus the land being the chief agrarian resource had become the base of the village society. The power structure in the village society also got related to land and to the means of acquiring land. Those who acquired it through their own colonising effort were ordinary peasants or at best could acquire the pateli rights but those who acquired it through *vasi, bhom, dohli* were the *himayatis* enjoying a superior social position as well. Within the *karsa*, also, those who could obtain pateli right and thus develop an access to the village surplus through institutional means and got assimilated in the local power structure, gained superior status even within their own caste and community.

Thus inter-relationship of different sections of the village society structured by the pattern of distribution of agrarian resources was regulated by the customary ties. Any changes in the administrative arrangement for the village made by the state could also lead to changes in the pattern of resource distribution and agricultural production. Since, village was an agricultural production unit, such changes were bound to affect the inter-relationships of various sections of the rural society. It is amply demonstrated by the changes taking place in M. Rasulpura between c.1698 and c.1709 in the process of being shifted from *khalsa to vasi* and *mukata*\(^{162}\). The village had 10 *himayatis* with 20p.c. of the cultivated area under the *himayati halas*. The patels had about 13.75 p.c. and the peasants 66.66 p.c. of cultivated area under the pateli and *karsa halas, respectively*. In c. 1709 the village was given in *mukata* to Sadaram Bhankrot, an imperial *jagirdar* for an annual sum of rupees 2501 as well as the permission to settle his *vasi* here. A *vasi* was a customary privilege extended to a *sardar* in Rajput polity as discussed earlier. The pattern of distribution of land as well as of agricultural production in the

\(^{160}\) Bheem Singh’s order op. cit.

\(^{161}\) Ugaì Dhuan Dehl and Gharpati ki. S. 1771, K.B. 1/276 (Kota)

\(^{162}\) *Mukata* of M. Rasulpura, s.1775, K.B.1/30 and s.1766, K.B.1/60
village changed under the new arrangement. Most of the old *himayatis*, which included one *chaudhary* one *bohra* and four *thakurs*, had disappeared, instead there were 15 new *himayatis* and the land under their *halas* was almost 38 percent of the cultivated area in the village. Most of the old peasants and patels also disappeared and new peasants had settled down either, as *raiti* of the *vasi* or as *pahis*. Interestingly, most of the *pahis* were *sahas*. Whether the old patels and peasants were also treated as *raiti* of the *vasi* or not remains ambiguous. The pattern of agricultural production in c. 1698 and under the new arrangement in c. 1709 was also significantly different. Firstly instead of using the entire cultivable area for *kharif*, 29 percent was reserved for *rabi* to grow superior varieties of grains like wheat and gram. Secondly, in *kharif*, 23 percent of the land was used for cash crops like cotton, indigo, dyes and sugarcane plantation. Whereas, in c. 1698, even the *himayatis* were using their land for growing only *kharif*, and were using less than two percent of their land for cash crop cultivation. The patels were using 8.83 percent and the *karsa* 5.62 percent of their land for cash crop cultivation in *kharif*. Thus in c. 1698 most of the capital, labour and land resources were being used mainly for jowar cultivation. These changes in the resource distribution and production pattern show that the *himayatis* could successfully use their political, social and economic linkages to play a lead role in the village affairs, such as choice of right crops, arrangement of agricultural inputs (seeds, manure, bullocks) and seasonal labour.

Role of the *himayatis* had become crucial for agricultural expansion in the region. However, it was not sufficient to have an access to agrarian resources but there was a need for a proper utilisation of these resources as well. Unfortunately, there is little evidence to ascertain whether these changes made M. Rasulpura in c. 1709 could be sustained or not, but there were similar changes in many more villages in the later half of 18th century through a variety of new arrangements. Some of these arrangements have been examined in detail in a separate chapter. The evidence presented here is sufficient to show that the relationships of the various sections could no longer
remain confined to the customary ties. With the growth of market continuous exchange of information, techniques, skills and resources became necessary between various sections. The himayatis could not longer remain complacent, about their claim in the village surplus, as it could hardly be maintained in a ruined or deserted village. As a result of these changes, relationship of various sections of the village society with each other and their customary roles had to be redefined. The agricultural resource distribution pattern also changed as well as the production strategies. Impact of these changes upon the village society has been examined in the chapter, The Changing Agrarian scene in the later half of 18th century, of the thesis.
### Peasant caste settlement pattern in Hadauti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>No. of Peasant Households</th>
<th>No. of Dominant caste Households</th>
<th>No. of Other Caste Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.Nandgaon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandelpur</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33 Dhakar</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiradya</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16 Jat</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurahad</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51 Dhakar</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhadaheda</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85 Dhakar</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aranya</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26 Meena</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorkheri</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17 Dhakar</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangpura</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51 Dhakar</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanwas</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>All Dhakars</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Peasant caste settlement pattern in Hadauti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>No. of Peasant Households</th>
<th>No. of Dominant Caste Households</th>
<th>No. of Other Castes Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babli</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22 Meena</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budana</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26 Meena</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundana</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>All Meenas</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vamanhera</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>All Meenas</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jangar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>All Dhakars</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motpur</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-- Dhakar</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-- Ahir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kothi</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25 Meena</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narsinghpura</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15 Meena</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bambula</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15 Meena</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** These tables have been prepared on the basis of information found in this Gharpati and Dhuan Dehl records of s. 1771 K.B. 1 (Kota) and Toji Topkhana Paltan ki, s.1853, K.B. 1 (Bikaner)
Pattern of distribution of Land, Bullocks and Hired Labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Households</th>
<th>Total Land in beeghas</th>
<th>No. of Bullocks</th>
<th>Incidence of using Hired Labour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Non - Agriculturists</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Agriculturists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding upto 60 beeghas</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2859</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 120 beeghas</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3570</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 to 180 beeghas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2218</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 to 240 beeghas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 beeghas and above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>10876</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>10876</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
1. Average Land holding per household 47.91 beeghas.
2. 1 Bullock per 40.88 beegha land.
3. 1.17 Bullock per household
Appendix III

Distribution of Artisan and Menial population in c.1714

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Agriculturists</th>
<th>Non – Agriculturists</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Artisan and Menial</td>
<td>Hali</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhadaheda</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangpura</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bheel 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aranya</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandelpur</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiradya</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digonya</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Phutkar 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurahad</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sahas 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorkhedi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>Agriculturists + Non - Agriculturists</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>