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I. Introduction

1. Modern Theories on Land-Systems in Medieval Deccan

Regarding the land-systems in the medieval Deccan from the early fourteenth to the early
nineteenth century, there have been expressed broadly three different theories. The first theory
is represented by Mr. B. H. Baden-Powell and regards the ordinary agricultural lands (as
distinct from inām lands) as practically owned by the State. In his work, «The Indian
Village Community» (1896), Mr. Baden-Powell refers to the land-systems of the medieval
Deccan and states, “The land-holder had theoretically no ownership-rights at all.... In the
Dekkan and in the South, the raiyat was not allowed to sell his lands; .... Ownership was
only acknowledged in land granted revenue-free by the State, and apparently in lands held on
the privileged tenure of watan (land held in virtue of office in a village or district—Baden-
Powell)”.¹ Indeed, he calls ‘ the raiyat-wāri villagers ’ ‘ Crown tenants ’.² Against this theory
of State ownership of ordinary agricultural lands apart from the ‘land granted revenue-free
by the State’ (inām land) and the ‘lands held on the privileged tenure of watan ’ (he calls
this ‘ watan ’ lands),³ Professor A. S. Altekar emphasizes a theory of peasant ownership of all
the agricultural lands. He states in his work «A History of Village Communities in Western
India» (1927) that there was neither idea of any communal ownership nor idea of the crown
being the owner of the land in the Deccan,⁴ and he concludes, “the ownership of lands
occupied by our village communities in Western India was vested in the peasant proprietors ”.⁵
According to him, even “ the Inamdars have got the right to receive merely the revenue;
usually they have no proprietary rights in the soil ”.⁶

Between two theories mentioned above, Professor S.N. Sen expresses an intermediate

423-24.
² Ibid., p. 426.
⁴ A. S. Altekar: A History of Village Communities in Western India, Oxford University Press, 1927,
p. 85.
⁵ Ibid., p. 86.
⁶ Ibid., p. 85.
theory. In Chapter Two of Part II of his work *Administrative System of the Marathas* (1923), he discusses the ‘Village Communities’ of the eighteenth century Deccan, and writes that excepting *inām* lands held by hereditary officers and servants of the village, “the village land was divided among the Mirasdars and Uparis. The Mirasdars were residents of the village who had permanent proprietary right in their land, and could not be ejected or dispossessed so long as they paid their rent.... The property of Mirasdars was hereditary and saleable, and even when ejected for non-payment of land tax, the Mirasdars did not lose the right of recovering their ancestral farm land for a long period.... The Uparis, on the other hand, were tenants-at-will, and generally strangers holding Government land under the management of Mamlatdars”.

In other words, he distinguishes three kinds of lands (viz. *inām* lands, *mirās* lands and Government lands) and two classes of peasants (viz. *mirāsdārs* and *uparīs*).

Of the three scholars each representing a modern theory Mr. B. H. Baden-Powell was, as well known, a specialist in the land-systems of Northern India in the later nineteenth century, and was neither an expert on Medieval India nor an original enquirer in the land-systems of the Deccan. Accordingly some mistakes may be found in his statements on the land-systems of the Deccan. For example, the lands held on the privileged tenure attached to the *watan* of the hereditary officers of the village and the district were as a rule not called ‘*watan*’ lands but *inām* lands in the Medieval Deccan. On the other hand, Professor A. S. Altekar was a specialist in ancient India, so that his statements on medieval Deccan are often founded on the ancient Indian evidences. In contrast with these scholars, Professor S. N. Sen was a specialist in Marāṭhā history in his youth and has written (or translated) several books on the subject, chief one of which is *Administrative System of the Marathas* referred to above. Therefore his statement on the land-systems of the medieval Deccan seems to be the most reliable of the three theories.

But there may be some doubts even in his statement. For instance, what does he exactly mean when he states that the *uparīs* held Government land? It is also not very clear whether there were no other lands than *inām* lands, *mirās* lands and Government lands.

2. Reports of the Early British Administrators

On the other hand, we have at least three following reports on the fiscal, judicial and land-systems of the Deccan written by British administrators not long after the British conquest of Marāṭhā Kingdom in 1818. (1) M. Elphinstone: *Report on the Territories Conquered from the Paishwa* Submitted to the Supreme Government of British India, 1st ed., 1819; 2nd ed., 1820; 3rd ed., 1838, Bombay, pp. 112+lx. (2) W. Chaplin: *A Report exhibiting A View of the Fiscal and Judicial System of Administration introduced into the Conquered Territory above the Guts, under the Authority of the Commissioner in the Dekhan*, 1824, reprinted in 1877, Bombay, pp. 189. (3) W. H. Sykes: *Report of the Land Tenures of the Dekkan*, 1830; printed by the order of the House of Commons in 1866 as East India (Dekkan), pp. 32.

Of the three reports, that of M. Elphinstone is the best known: Professor S. N. Sen depends on it whenever indigenous evidences are not available and Professor A. S. Altekar

---


also occasionally refers to it, while both of them seem to have not seen other two reports. Mr. Baden-Powell mentions that while he saw a note on the Deccan villages by W. H. Sykes, he was unable to refer to three reports.9

At any rate, these reports were so written for administrative purposes of the East India Company that there are certain limitations in their contents. For example, while much attention is paid to the organization for revenue collection and to the rights in such lands that paid revenue to the Government, enough attention is hardly focused on the lands that had carried no (or almost no) revenue burdens for the Government (namely inām lands)10 or on the state of actual cultivators of the soil. Despite the limitations, however, these reports are important for the study of administrative, judicial and economic institutions of the Deccan; they explain what British administrators found there immediately after the conquest. Especially the reports of M. Elphinstone and W. H. Sykes are significant for a study of medieval Deccan, as they treat mainly the institutions of the pre-British period rather than those of the British period.

Now, there can be found a remarkable difference of opinion between Elphinstone and Sykes regarding the land-systems of the pre-British and immediate post-British Deccan.

M. Elphinstone, after explaining the functions and remunerations of the hereditary officers of a village,11 states, “With the few exceptions already mentioned (viz. village officers), all the villagers are cultivators, and these, as there are few labourers, are distinguished by their tenures into two classes, that of Meerasses or landed proprietors, and that of Ooprees, or farmers.

“....The result of these reports (of Collectors) and of my own enquiries is, that a large portion of the ryots are the proprietors of their estates, subject to the payment of a fixed land-tax to Government; that their property is hereditary and saleable, and they are never dispossessed, while they pay their tax, and even then they have for a long period, (at least 30 years—Elphinstone) the right of reclaiming their estate, on paying the dues of Government. Their land tax is fixed, but the late Marratta Government loaded it with other impositions, which reduced that advantage to a mere name; so far however was this from destroying the value of their estates, that, although the Government took advantage of their attachment to make them pay considerably more than an Oopree, and though all the Meerassdars were in ordinary cases obliged to make up for failures in the payment of each of their body, yet their lands were saleable and generally at 10 years’ purchase. This fact might lead us to suppose, that even with all the exactions of the late Marratta Government the share of the ryot must have amounted to more than half the produce of the land; but experience shews that men will keep their estates, even after becoming a losing concern, until they are obliged to part with them from absolute want, or until oppression has lasted so long, that the advantages of proprietorship, in better times, have been forgotten. The Meerassdars are perhaps more numerous than the Ooprees all over the Marratta country. In the Carnatic, I am informed by Mr. Chaplin, that they do not exist at all. Besides Meerassadar, they are called Thulkuree about Poona.

---

10 It was only in 1843 that the Bombay Government started a serious enquiry into the ināms of the Deccan. Vide A. T. Etheridge: Narrative of the Bombay Inam Commission and Supplementary Settlements, Bombay, 1874, p. 58.
An opinion prevails throughout the Marratta country, that under the old Hindoo government all the land was held by Meerassees, and that Ooprees were introduced as the old proprietors sunk under the tyranny of the Mohammedans. This opinion is supported by the fact, that the greater part of the fields, now cultivated by Ooprees, are recorded in the village books as belonging to absent proprietors; and affords, when combined with circumstances observed in other parts of the Peninsula, and with the light land-tax authorized by Menu, a strong presumption, that the Revenue system under the Hindoos...was founded on private property in the soil.

All the land which does not belong to the Meerassees belongs to Government, or those to whom Government has assigned it. The property of the zemindars in the soil has not been introduced, or even heard of, in the Marratta country.

The cultivated land belonging to Government, except some parts which it keeps in its own hands to be managed by the Mumlutdars, was always let out to Ooprees, who had a lease, with the expiration of which their claim and duties expired.

These are all the tenures on which land was held as far as regards the property of the soil. The assignments by government of its own revenue or share of the produce will be mentioned hereafter. It need only be observed, that in making these grants it could not transfer the share of a Meerassdar. Even Bajee Row (the last Peshwa), when he had occasion for Meerassee land, paid the price of it.”

In the above quotation, two points should be particularly noted here. First, there were two classes of peasants: landed proprietors called mirāsīs, mirāsdārs, or thalkarīs; and farmers or tenants called uparīs. Second, there were three kinds of agricultural lands: mirās lands owned by mirāsdārs, ‘Government lands’ or lands belonging to Government, and lands assigned or granted by Government. There is no doubt that the ‘lands assigned by Government’ mean the revenue-free inām lands held by the hereditary officers of village and district as well as by the temples, priests and other various persons.

When we keep in mind Elphinstone’s theory that there were three kinds of agricultural lands, however, we find one point in his report not very understandable. That is, he says in other part without explanation, “Every village has a portion of ground attached to it, which is committed to the management of the inhabitants”: thus he suggests the holding of lands by the village as a group. He also writes in connection with village expenses that when the expense was beyond the means of a village to defray at once, “the Village contracted a public debt, which was gradually paid by an annual assessment included in the saudir warrid puttee (extra assessment on the villagers), and sometimes provided for by mortgages or grants of land on the part of the villagers. These grants were called gaum nisbat ināms; ināms in charge of the village); if they were so small as to be admitted, or be likely to be admitted by the Government, no rent was charged on them; but if they were too large to be agreed to or to escape observation, the revenue was paid by all the other ryots, the creditor still enjoying them rent free: small grants were also made for temples, or to Brahmins, which were always acquiesced in by the Government; but the Villagers have never pretended to any property in the soil beyond the estates of the Meerassdars.” (Brackets and

12 Ibid., pp. 23–25.
13 Ibid., p. 28.
14 Ibid., p. 21.
15 Ibid., pp. 26–27.
Here, too, he states to the effect that villagers as a group granted the lands of their village on the one hand, and that they 'never pretended to any property in the soil beyond the estates of the Meerassdars'. This statement seems to be a sort of contradiction.

The characteristic feature of W.H. Sykes' theory lies in his emphasis on the holding of lands by the village and in his apparent objection to the theory of land-holding by the Government or State. To be sure, he also recognizes the existence of two classes of peasants: one is that of proprietors of land called mirāsi or mirāsdār in Arabic terms, or thalkari or thlwāhi in indigenous ones; and another is that of tenants called upari, an indigenous term meaning 'strangers'. However, whereas Elphinstone considers that the lands which were recorded in the village books as belonging to absent proprietors (such lands being called gatkul jamin in Marathi as will be discussed later) reverted to the Government and were let out to uparis as quoted above, W.H. Sykes first points out that a greater part of the agricultural lands of the villages enquired into by himself were gatkul jamin (lands of extinct families), and even such a land had usually a specific name, that was probably the surname of its original owner, (this point will be demonstrated with examples in this article later), an then he states, "Even the hereditary lands of extinct families became the property of the Pateel (headman of the village), together with all waste lands, excepting in some villages where such lands were appropriated by the village corporation; the Government distinctly sanctioning the exercise of such powers, whether by the Pateel or the village authorities" (brackets being mine and italics Sykes') during the Maratha period. He next criticizes the theory of State ownership of lands by saying as follows: "The assumption that the lordship of the soil is in the Government has occasioned the monstrous injustice of the dispossession of all the landholders of the Dekkan of their franchise. Happily, from the paternal character of the Government, it has had few practical consequences, beyond the abrogation of the rights of the Pateel, and his degradation to the level of other cultivators. It has dispossessed also the village authorities, and the Pateel, of the power of appropriating or selling the lands of extinct families, together with waste lands, similar to the common lands of an English village, the right to which is so tenaciously held by our peasantry; from our ignorance, also, of the details of the tenures and duties of the several hereditary officers, it has occasioned some untoward modifications of the relations of these parties to each other, and to the Government." And as the evidences of his theory of communal appropriation and disposition of waste lands as well as lands of extinct families, W.H. Sykes has translated and included in his report two Marathi records, one of which indicates that Patils appropriated the lands of an extinct family and manifests that they disposed of the house-site of an extinct family in their village; and another record demonstrates the village assembly having sold waste lands of the village. These two records will be utilized later in this article of mine.

At any rate, when we keep in our mind his theory of communal ownership of waste lands and lands of extinct families and his criticism of the theory of State ownership of lands, we find a point in his report rather contradictory to his theory. Namely, he refers in Chapter VI of his report to the jägir, inām, saranjam and so on, and states, "Jägir, which is a Persian word in its origin, is applied to lands given by Government for personal support, or

---

11 Ibid., pp. 3-4.
12 Ibid., p. 18.
13 Ibid., p. 29.
as a fief for the maintenance of troops for the service for the State”. (Italics are mine.)

Here he suggests State ownership of lands or at least State disposition of lands, while he does not explain who gave inām lands.

In short, these reports of British administrators agree with each other on two points: (1) there were two classes of peasants; (2) mirās lands were the lands owned by individual mirāsdārs and loaded with ordinary land tax. But they differ as to the rights in the lands of extinct families or the waste lands. They also do not clarify what kind of tenure was held in (revenue free) inām lands. Besides, it is not very clear in these reports whether there were at all the lands distinctly designated in indigenous terms as ‘State lands’ or ‘Government lands’.

3. Problems of This Article

Accordingly, this article of mine will discuss following two problems. Firstly, what kinds of agricultural lands did exist in the 18th century Deccan, and what kind of right was recognized in each of them? Secondly, which class of peasants, mirāsdārs or upāris, actually cultivated each kind of lands, and on what conditions?

An examination of these problems must be very important for the study of economic history of the medieval Deccan as well as for that of social and economic changes that may have taken place during the subsequent British period, which topic I will treat separately in a future occasion.

4. Material Sources

A few words must be mentioned regarding the material sources upon which this article is grounded. They are about ninety Marathi records of the 18th century, which are collected mostly from the following source-books.

(1) G. C. Vad prep.: Selections from the Satara Raja’s and the Peshwa’s Diaries, nine volumes, Poona, 1906–1911, edited by the Orders of the Deccan Vernacular Translation Society, Poona, and published by the Society with the permission of the Government of Bombay. (These volumes will be abbreviated as Diaries in the text and as SSRPD in the footnotes of this article).

(2) R. V. Oturkar ed.: Peshvekālin Sāmājik va Ārthik Patravyavahār, Poona, 1950. (This book will be abbreviated as Oturkar in footnotes).

(3) Bhārat Itihas Sanshodhak Mandal ed.: Aitīhāsik Sankirna Sahitya, ten volumes, Poona, 1932–57. (abbreviated as ASS in footnotes).

Beside the above source-books, two Marathi records translated into English and included in the Sykes’ report will be also used.

---

20 Ibid., p. 8.
22 This book contains two hundred and eighteen Marathi records mostly of the eighteenth century collected from the Sāsvad region and edited by Professor R. V. Oturkar with collaboration of Shri K. V. Purandare of B. I. S. Mandal of Poona.
23 These ten volumes contain nine hundred and twenty-three Marathi records mostly of the eighteenth century collected from the Deccan regions and examined, selected and edited by B. I. S. Mandal of Poona.
II. Agricultural Lands

Village in the medieval Deccan was called by the terms gāṇva (corrupt form of Sanskrit grāma), mauje (corrupt form of Arabic mauza), or Persian deh. While these three terms were used interchangeably, formally mauje was prefixed to the proper name of the village. A bigger village that included a market place (bājār) was called kasbe (town → Arabic qasbah).

It appears that the village in the eighteenth century Deccan as a rule took the collective form of inhabitation. There, the ‘inhabited area’ was called pāṇḍhari, and the ‘cultivated area’ kālī. These two terms being indigenous, the former originally meant ‘white’; the latter ‘black’. It is said that the people originally inhabited on the white soil unfit for cultivation, and turned the black soil widely found in the Deccan into their agricultural fields.

At any rate, the ‘inhabited area’ was divided into house-sites (gharθānā or gharθikānā), each of which was owned by families of Pāṭil (village-headman) and other village-officers, peasants, and village-servants. Each family built a house (ghar or vāṇa) upon it to live in. The family that had gone out of the village or passed away was called gatkūl (a corrupt compound of Sanskrit gata = gone or passed away; and kula = lineage or family), and the house-site and house that had been owned by an extinct family were called gatkūl gharθānā and gatkūl vāṇa respectively.

On the other hand, ‘cultivated area’ (kālī) was divided into perhaps twenty to forty blocks called thal (← Sanskrit sthala = land), and each thal often had a name that was perhaps the surname of original proprietor or clearer. This point will be demonstrated later. Now, each block was composed of fields variously called shet or set (← Sanskrit kshetra = field), or famtu (← Persian: ramin = land). Occasionally Sanskrit bhāmi (land) was also used to mean the fields.

Around the ‘cultivated area’, there was usually a meadow (kuran or gayerān). The meadow meant for common use of the villagers was called ‘people’s meadow’ (lokāchā kuran) and that meant for the fodder and wood used by the Government was termed ‘Government’s meadow’ (sarkārchā kuran). Villagers had to supply free labour (veth begār) to cut the fodder and wood in nearby Government’s meadow and carry them to a local office. But we are not concerned with meadows here.

Even in the territories directly administered by the King or his hereditary Peshwa (Prime Minister), namely in the territories called svarājya, there were scattered the fiefs (jāgir, saranjām, or mokā∆a) temporarily assigned to Bureaucrats. But this fief-system should be a topic to be discussed separately in connection with the general administrative system of this Kingdom, and shall not be treated here.

The subject that concerns us in this section is limited to the ‘cultivated area’ in the village. So far as the material sources demonstrate, the ‘cultivated area’ of a village was divided into:

1. mirās lands (mirās jamin or mirās set),

24 For example, ASS, vol. IV, No. 94 “...tyās kālīvar set nāhi pāṇḍhativar ghar nāhi...” (he has neither field in kālī nor house in pāṇḍhari).
26 Vide SSRPD, vol. VI, No. 751.
(2) inām lands (inām jamin or inām set),
(3) State lands variously called ‘demesne of the Government’ (sarkārchi sheri), ‘demesne fields’ (sērēchēn shet) ‘demesne’ (sheri), or ‘treasury lands’ (khālīsā jamin), and
(4) lands of extinct families (gatkēl jamin) or waste lands (pād jamin).

Now we shall enquire into the rights in these kinds of lands one by one.

1. Mirās Lands

Mirās is an Arabic word which originally meant ‘patrimony’ or ‘hereditary property’.

Now, we shall examine an important record on the mirās tenure. In Diaries dated February 6, 1772 A.D. it is written that the Secretariat (Chitnisl) of the Peshwa’s Government gave the following document (patra) to a man named V. K. Durve, ‘now residing’ (halān vasti) in Village Kothale, Tarf Karepathār, Pargane Supe:

“You came to the Hufar (Peshwa) at the camp of Poona and petitioned, ‘Maljī bin Jebājī Nhalave, peasant thalkari mirāsdār (kuṇbi thalkari mirāsdār) of Village Dhālevādī, Tarf Karepathār, Prānt Poona, has lands of 3 ruke (about 9 hectares) in the block named Tanapuri (Tanapuryāche thal) of the above village. On 7 bighas (about 2.1 hectares) out of the lands, he dug wells and turned them into an orchard (malā). Above Maljī, however, incurred so much debt and was so unable to repay it that he took Rs. 9-50 from me and self-willingly (atmasantoshe) gave me, by defining four corners, the lands of 7 bighas out of the Tanapuri block along with the wells and trees upon them for my hereditary enjoyment (vanishparaniparenē anabhavāvyās). And it was agreed that I should pay the revenue of the Government (divān depeh) as it had been paid since old, and (he) wrote and gave me (a sales-deed) attested by the witnesses (sākshi) of the Pātīl and Kulkarni (village accountant) of the above village as well as the vatandārs (hereditary office-holders) of the neighbouring villages. According to that I am enjoying. Then, the Lord (svāmi), please take the sales-deed (kharidkhat) into consideration and grant a favour to make and give a document of the Government for enjoyment (of the lands)’. Requesting like this, (you) brought and showed an authentic sales-deed (bajinas kharidkhat). Taking it into consideration, (it is evident that) Maljī bin Jebājī Nhalava, kuṇbi thalkari mirāsdār of the above village, self-willingly gave you the lands of 7 bighas as vatani mirās with wells and trees, out of 3 rukēs of the Tanapuri block. Accordingly, Government also has agreed (karār) (with the deed), and made and given this document for (thy) enjoyment. Then, thou, (enjoy) the lands of 7 bighas out of the Tanapuri block along with wells and trees upon them, dig more wells, pay the revenue of the Government (divān mahāsāl), cultivate the orchard and make it prosperous, enjoy (it) by heredity unto (thy) sons and grandsons, and live happily’.”

To make a few comments on the above record, thalkari is an indigenous term, mirāsdār is a Muslim word, and both mean a land-owning peasant, as was shown in the reports of British administrators (see pp. 34~36 of this article). Vatani is an adjective of vatān (patrimony) which is often used in records as a synonym of mirās. So the term vatani here is

not more than an adjective synonymous with and emphasizing the mirās.

Now above record demonstrates six important points regarding the mirās tenure. First, mirāsdār could sell his lands or a part of them according to his need. Second, the purchaser could be a resident of other village. In such a case, the purchaser might continue to live in his village and frequent the bought lands for cultivation (so-called pāl kāshtā) or some members of his family might shift to the village where the lands were bought. Third, selling and buying of mirās lands were required to be attested by village officers and the neighbours. But this attestation was not a ‘permission’ but rather a ‘recognition’ by the local people. Fourth, selling and buying of mirās lands were not required to get permission or recognition of the Government beforehand. This means that the Government had nothing of the sort of proprietary right in the mirās lands. Fifth, however, the purchaser was necessarily obliged to pay the revenue assessed on the bought mirās lands to the Government. And sixth, the purchaser subject to the payment of revenue was assured and protected by the Government to enjoy the bought lands. On granting a document of recognition and assurance, however, the Government used to levy an amount of money from the grantee which was usually equivalent to one-fourth of the price, though this record shown above does do manifest such an exaction.

In short, it may be said that the mirāsdār held fairly complete private proprietary right in his mirās lands. Nobody, even not the Government could arbitrarily infringe upon the mirās right. For example, when a mirāsdār of a village got his mirās right infringed upon by headman and villagers of the village, and appealed the matter to the Government, Government ordered its bureaucrats of the locality to stop the infringement of right. Further, when the population of another village so increased as to cause the shortage of house-sites, Government commanded bureaucrats, Deshmukh and Deshpande of the district and Pātīl of the village to convert ‘the lands of mirāsdārs’ situated near the ‘inhabited area’ into house-sites on the one hand, and to ‘give them (mirāsdārs) the lands of extinct families (gātkāl set) of the village in lieu of the (converted) lands’ on the other. Regarding the lands of extinct families in general as well as the new creation of mirās lands, we shall discuss in sub-section 4 of this section.

2. Inām Lands

The Arabic word inām originally meant ‘gift’ or ‘present’.

Inām in its widest sense in the Deccan terminology included three kinds of privileges. (1) The ‘inām village’, all or most of the revenues of which were held hereditarily by particular persons or institutions. (2) Mere ‘inām’, which was a hereditary grant to particular persons of a fixed amount or quantity out of the revenue from a certain village. And (3) ‘inām lands’.

According to an enquiry of the Bombay Inam Commission into the ināms of the Deccan carried out from 1843 to 1863, the income from ināms of all kinds in the regions almost equal to the former svarājya of the Marāṭhā Kingdom amounted to sixteen per cent of the land revenue of the same regions, about half of which was held by the hereditary officers of
the villages and the districts.\textsuperscript{33} Whereas the land revenue may have considerably increased since the British conquest due to the increase in population and in cultivation of waste lands, new \textit{in\text{"u}m}s were not created as a matter of principle, so that the proportion of \textit{in\text{"u}m} income to the total land revenue in the 18th century Deccan must have been considerably more than sixteen per cent. At any rate we may safely say that \textit{in\text{"u}m}s of all kinds were fairly big during the period under consideration.

Of the three kinds of \textit{in\text{"u}m}s, we shall discuss only the tenure in \textit{in\text{"u}m} lands.

The tenure in \textit{in\text{"u}m} lands was a privileged one either entirely free from tax or occasionally levied with \textit{in\text{"u}m}-tax (\textit{in\text{"u}m\ patti}) at much lower rate than the ordinary revenue imposed upon such as \textit{mir\={a}}\={s} lands.

Now, Deshmukh, Deshpande, P\={a}\={t}il,\textsuperscript{34} Kulkarn\={i}, Chaugul\={a} (assistant of the P\={a}\={t}il),\textsuperscript{48} village-watchmen,\textsuperscript{46} village-astrologer (Joshi),\textsuperscript{37} temples,\textsuperscript{38} priests,\textsuperscript{39} distinguished servants of the Government,\textsuperscript{40} and other miscellaneous persons and institutions held \textit{in\text{"u}m} lands of various size. Such examples found in our sources are too many to enumerate.

There is no doubt that the holder of \textit{in\text{"u}m} lands, \textit{viz}.\textit{in\text{"u}md\={a}}\={r} was entitled to enjoy them ' hereditarily unto the sons and grandsons ' (\textit{putrapautra\={d}i van\={s}par\={a}\={n}par\={a}\={n}en}).\textsuperscript{41} And there is also no doubt that at least such \textit{in\text{"u}m} lands that were attached to a certain hereditary office (\textit{vatan}) could be sold or disposed of by the holder along with the office. Examples to that effect are also too many to quote all. Only one instance shall be demonstrated as follows:

When the Kulkarn\={i} (village-accountant) and Jotish (astorologer) of a village in Junnar region, a Brahmin by caste, died in 1740, he had left behind neither sons nor male relatives (\textit{va\={i}\={s}h}) to succeed to the two hereditary offices (\textit{vatan}). So, his widow divided each of two offices into two equal shares, offered (\textit{d\={a}n}) half share of Kulkarn\={i} \textit{vatan} and Jotish \textit{vatan} to his son-in-law (daughter's husband, \textit{j\={a}\={v}ai}), and sold (\textit{vikat}) another half of each of two offices to a Brahmin perhaps of the same village at the price of Rs. 2,000. The seller gave a sales-deed (\textit{kharedikhat}) to the buyer, local assembly (\textit{gota}) also gave a letter of attestation (\textit{mahajar}) to the buyer, and the Government, on receipt of a request from the buyer, took the two documents submitted by him into account, and granted him an official document called \textit{vatan-patra} while levying a fee of Rs. 500 from him. This \textit{vatan-patra} (document of confirming the hereditary offices) as shown in \textit{Diaries} demonstrates that there were thirteen items of privileges (\textit{m\={a}n}) attached to the Kulkarn\={i}ship and three items of rights (\textit{hakk}) attached to the Jotishship, and that one of three rights for Jotishship was ' \textit{in\text{"u}m} lands of 25 bighas (about 8 hectares) (which would produce the net income ?) of 12.5 \textit{man} (probably about 157 kilograms) of grains'.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{33} A.T. Etheridge: \textit{Narrative of the Bombay Inam Commission and Supplementary Settlements}, Bombay, 1874, p. 90.
\textsuperscript{34} \textit{SSRPD}, vol. I, Nos. 296, 298; vol. III, Nos. 521, 522.
\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Ojurkar}: No. 56.
\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Ibid.}, No. 46.
\textsuperscript{37} \textit{SSRPD}, vol. I, No. 283.
\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Ibid.}, vol. II, Nos. 171, 181.
\textsuperscript{39} \textit{ASS}, vol. I, No. 126.
\textsuperscript{40} \textit{SSRPD}, vol. VIII, No. 711.
\textsuperscript{41} \textit{e.g.}, \textit{ASS}, vol. I, No. 126; vol. VIII, No. 46.
\textsuperscript{42} \textit{SSRPD}, vol. I, No. 283, p. 137. Similarly, examples of the sales or transfer of \textit{in\text{"u}m} lands attached to the village-headmanshiop can be found in \textit{SSRPD}, vol. III, Nos. 521 and 522.
In short, it is entirely evident that inām lands attached to a certain hereditary office could be sold or transferred along with the office by the holder according to his need. It is, however, not yet clear if such inām lands could be separated from the office to which they were attached and be sold or transferred separately.

It is also not clear whether inām lands that were attached to no hereditary offices (e.g., inām lands held by temples, tombs, monasteries, distinguished servants of the Government and so on) could be disposed of by their holders without any restrictions.

New creation of inām lands will be demonstrated in sub-sections 3 and 4 of this section.

3. State Lands

As pointed out before, what are called here collectively 'State lands' are those designated in the sources variously as sarkārchī sheri (demesne of Government), sērīchē shēt (demesne lands), shērī (demesne), or khālisā jāmin (treasury lands or Crown lands). Of these terms, shērī and shēt (or set) are indigenous while others are all Muslim words.

At any rate, there may have been a distinction between the lands owned or managed by the Government as a corporation and those owned personally by the King or the Peshwa himself among the lands so variously designated as shown above. But as I cannot confirm such a distinction at present, these kinds of lands will provisionally be all treated as 'State lands'.

Now, though it is not clear if there were lands defined and demarkated as 'State lands' in each and every village, it is evident that at least in many villages scattered over the Deccan, there were lands designated as 'State lands'. It is also evident that such lands were managed by local bureaucrats and could be disposed of by them on receipt of an order from the central Government.

Only two examples will be demonstrated here.

On July 1, 1717, the first Peshwa, Bālājī Visvanāth, sent the following letter to the Governor (Sarsubhedār) and the Clerks (Kārkūn) of District Poona:

"Greetings, name and title of the addressee, name and title of the sender, and the year) Rajshī—Swāmī (King Shāhī) has favoured Mr. Lakhmojī bin Godajī Garūda and granted upon him State waste lands (khālisā paḍ jāmin) of 2 chāvars (two hundred and forty bighas) of the first, second and third classes (avāldāmsim tin pratichi) as follows:

1 chāvar in Village Belsar of Region Sāsvad.
0.5 chāvar in Village Najhāre of Region Karepathār.
0.5 chāvar in Village Dhālevāḍī of Region Karepathār of the above District.

Total 2 chāvars of waste lands have been granted in inām hereditarily unto the sons and grandsons. The royal document (hujrātchi sanad) has been sent separately (to the grantee). Then, you, specify (nemūn) the lands of 2 chāvars in the above villages for him and let them go on as inām. (date). In the blocks (thal) of the above villages there would be lands of extinct families (gatkul set) where no peasants (kuṇbi) are present. Specify and give these lands. (concluding remarks)"

The grantee of the inām lands, Mr. Garūda, was the headman of Village Belsar that

---

45 See p. 48 of this article.
46 ASS, vol. VIII, No. 46.
46 Ibid., vol. VIII, Nos. 30-45.
appears in the above letter. Further, since the beginning of the seventeenth century, it was a custom widely prevalent in the Deccan and perhaps introduced by the Mughals to classify the agricultural lands into three classes according to quality of the soil, but we should not enter into the details of the custom here.

Another example on the State lands may be found in Diaries of the year 1783. It is written in the Diaries that the Peshwa's Government dispatched following order (sanad) to a local bureaucrat of Region Karyat-Maval:

"As the villagers (gõnvakari) residing in Village Gorhe-Budrukh (of the above Region) increased in number, Government is requested to allow the lands of 3 bighas (about 0.9 hectares) out of the Government demesne (sarkārchi sheri) existing in the above village to be used as inhabited sites (vasahatl), by levying rent (sarkārdast) from the villagers', the headman (Pātil)...(name)...of the above village has petitioned to the Government (Hujūr) in that way. Then, it is agreed that lands of 3 bighas out of the Government demesne existing in the above village be allowed to be used as inhabited sites of the villagers and the rent (sarkārdast) of Rs. 4.5 be collected from the villagers at the rate of Rs. 1.5 per bigha. Accordingly, make an enquiry, specify the above mentioned 3 bighas of lands and give them for inhabited sites. And collect Rs. 4.5 from villagers per year."

In short it is evident that there were lands designated as ‘State lands’ in many villages and managed by the local bureaucrats of the Government. It should not be imagined, however, that all the State lands were granted in inām or allowed as house-sites as demonstrated above. Many of the State lands appear to have been cultivated in such a manner as we shall discuss in the next section.

4. Lands of Extinct Families or Waste Lands

Whereas the rights in mirās lands, inām lands, and ‘State lands’ were at least de jure clearly recognized, those in lands of extinct families (gatkul jamin) and waste lands (pād jamin) are not so evident. The village-headman, the village-assembly (or local assembly) and the State all could and in fact did dispose of such lands. Accordingly, our next topic should be concerned with this question: by whom and under what conditions could lands of extinct families and waste lands be disposed of?

Before entering discussion, a few words must be mentioned regarding the indigenous terminology. As pointed out before, gatkul jamin means lands of the families that have gone away or passed away: viz. lands of extinct families. On the other hand, pād jamin means lands which are left waste due to non-cultivation for a long period of time. Accordingly there could be and in fact were pād jamin even among such lands as mirās jamin the rights in which were clearly recognized. But here we are not concerned with such waste lands. The pād jamin which interest us here are the lands left waste because of the extinction of their proprietary families.

Such waste lands were called either specifically ‘gatkul jamin’, or more generally ‘pād jamin’. That both the terms meant the same lands is evident from a record translated before (see p. 42) in which ‘the State waste lands’ (khāltsa pād jamin) of two chāvars granted in inām to a village headman by King Shahū are recapitulated as ‘lands of extinct families’

47 SSRPD, vol. VI, No. 749.
Here the term ‘State waste lands’ has appeared by chance. But this does not mean that all the waste lands were institutionalized as ‘State lands’. Usually waste lands or lands of extinct families seem to have been left simply as ‘waste lands’ or ‘lands of extinct families’. And the headman of village, the local or village assembly and the State could dispose of them as will be discussed below.

(A) Appropriation by Village-Headman

Our sources include seven records which show that headman of the village or local (village) assembly could dispose of lands of extinct families or waste lands of the village. Out of the seven records, two are concerned with headman’s appropriation and the rest five with disposal by local assembly. Here we shall examine the first two cases.

Record No. 1. Diaries dated December 17, 1741, shows a lengthy (covering 5 pages) vatan-patra (official document confirming a hereditary office) which was granted by Royal Secretariat (Chitnishi) of King Shahu to Mr. Harpala, half-headman (nime mokadam, viz. holder of half the office of village headmanship), of Village Fursangi near Poona. According to it, a dispute took place between Harpala family and Kamath family regarding the succession to headmanship of the village, so that both the disputants appealed to King Shahu. The King summoned to his court Deshmukh and Deshpande of the region, headmen of the neighbouring villages, and ‘all the inhabitants’ (samākūl pāṇḍhāri) of the village, held a justice-assembly and decided the division of the office of headmanship into two shares. What should be noted here is that the Kamaths and the Harpalas were allowed a privilege “to take half and half the lands of extinct families if there are any in the village, ...and to take half and half the vacant houses of extinct families if there are any in the village”.

Here the headmen were officially privileged ‘to take’ (ghēnei) the lands of extinct families in the village. Then what is exactly meant by ‘to take’? Were the lands that were thus taken by the headmen made revenue-free as inām? No, it seems such lands were treated as mirās lands as is evident in the next record.

Record No. 2. As pointed out before, two Marāthḥ records are translated into English and included in the report of W. H. Sykes. One of them is a mahajārnāma (document granted by a local assembly) and covers eight pages, that was written in connection with the division of headman’s office of Village Kowta, north of Sirvar, into three shares in the year 1725. Apart from the complicated circumstances of the case, there were initially two headmen in this village, abbreviated as A and B. They sold a third share of their office to C, headman of Village Multun, south of Village Kowta, in order to pay up the tax imposed on their village. But they did not actually transfer the share of the office to C, who accordingly appealed to the Peshwa. The Peshwa ordered Deshmukh and Deshpande of the region to hold a local assembly and settle the dispute. And Deshmukh, Deshpande, headmen and accountants of neighbouring twenty-five villages gathered together in Village Kowta, held an assembly and decided to divide the office into three parties. There are two points to be noted in this record. First, as all the privileges, remunerations and land properties hitherto owned both by A and B were divided into three shares, all the mirās lands owned by A and

B were also shared into three. And there were 35.25 \textit{take} (a land unit) of \textit{mirās} lands until then owned by A which included 18.75 \textit{take} of ‘lands of an extinct family named Udar’ (Oodar Shait Gutkool, viz. Udar shet gatkūl). In the same way, \textit{mirās} lands of 28.75 \textit{take} so far owned by B also included 18.75 \textit{take} of ‘lands of an extinct family named Udar’ (Oodar Shait Gutkool).\textsuperscript{50} To be sure, it is not mentioned how and when A and B acquired lands of this extinct family. But, in comparison with the Record No. 1 shown above, we have no doubt that here too, A and B had ‘taken’ the lands of the extinct family half and half at a certain former time as one of the privileges of village-headmen. And it is evident that the lands thus ‘taken’ by headmen were not recognized as revenue-free \textit{inām} lands but \textit{mirās} lands loaded with ordinary land revenue.

The second point to be noted is that when the assembly demanded both A and B to give a third share of their respective house to C, A and B complained of the inconvenience, and appealed by saying; “we give instead thereof the site of the neighbouring house of the deceased, and Gutkool Neemba Tamboolee (pan-leaf seller), in length 60 cubits, and in width 60 cubits...”: this appeal was admitted by the assembly.\textsuperscript{51} That is, headmen could appropriate the houses of extinct families (as stated in Record No. 1) or dispose of the house-sites of extinct families of the village (as is shown in Record No. 2).\textsuperscript{52}

In short, headman of village had a privilege to appropriate for himself waste lands in his village. But when he exercised this privilege, the lands thus appropriated were imposed with rather heavy land-revenue. Accordingly, it may be presumed that for him to do so and enlarge his \textit{mirās} lands was a risky business, even if he got the lands cultivated by ‘tenants’ (\textit{upars}) by share-cropping agreement as he probably did at least in the first half of the 18th century (this point shall be discussed later), because, though enlargement of his \textit{mirās} lands certainly increased his social prestige, he had to pay a certain fixed land revenue imposed on the \textit{mirās} lands irrespective of the state of harvest, unless specially remitted in case of failure of crops. It seems, therefore, that he did not often exercise this privilege and the waste lands in many villages were left unappropriated. And it also appears that when he gave up this privilege or did not exercise it for himself, he could no longer arbitrarily sell or give away the waste lands of his village. For them to be so disposed of, an agreement of the village assembly or at least of the local representatives seems to have been necessary, as will be demonstrated below.

(B) Disposal by Local Assembly

We have five records that demonstrate the disposal of waste lands by local assembly. Of the five, three are concerned with disposal of waste lands as \textit{mirās} lands, and two others show disposals as \textit{inām} lands. We shall examine the conditions of these disposals one by one.

Record No. 1. We have a ‘copy based on the original’ (\textit{nakal asal bamoji}) of a \textit{vatan-patra} dated May 9, 1752. This shows that Deshmukh and Deshpande of Region (Karyāt) Sāsvad and headman (Mokadam) of Town (Kasbe) Sāsvad jointly received a petition from two peasant brothers surnamed Sinde who were ‘now residing’ (\textit{hali vastū}) in the town for a long period of time (\textit{bahut divas}), and awarded to them permanently (\textit{putrapautrādi vānsh-paraipareṇa}) ‘lands (\textit{jamin}) of 1.5 khandi (30 bighas) in the block (\textit{tha}) named Ambā’ as

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., pp. 24–25.
\textsuperscript{52} Similar instance can be found in \textit{SSRPD}, vol. I, No. 289, p. 150.
‘mirās lands’ (*set thal mirāschei*). The condition of getting them granted was ‘to pay the land tax to Government that will be imposed according to rules’ (*divānapāhā sārā vāharti prahamana jo padal to dēn*).53

In this case it is not evident whether the granting party received a money from the peasant brothers. At any rate, this record demonstrates that it was not the headman of the town (Mokadam) himself but the Deshmukh, Deshpande and Mokadam, three representative persons of the place, that gave the lands of 1.5 *khānd* in Town Sāsvad. This was a case that took place in a fairly large town, where the Deshmukh and the Deshpande of the region usually resided. In such a place, it appears, only the representative personages of the place could dispose of the waste lands of the town, without consulting ordinary people of the place. But, when the disposal took place in a village (distinct from ‘town’) where the Deshmukh and the Deshpande of the region often did not reside, a number of ordinary villagers also took part in the disposal as shown below.

**Record No. 2.** Mr. K. V. Purandare of Sāsvad has introduced the copy of a lengthy *vatan patra* dated May 22, 1731. This record displays that a peasant belonging to the headman’s lineage (surnamed Jagdale) of Village Garāde, Tarf Karhepathār, Pragane (Pargane) Poona was conferred upon with one *chavār* of lands in ‘a block named Bhāgañik’ as *mirās* by ‘village assembly’ (*mahāli samākūl pāṇḍhār*) of above village. Those who were present (*hājir*) in the assembly were: an agent (Kamāvidār) in service of a man called Rājshri Son Thākūrbābā *ināmdār* (who must have held *inām* lands in the village), three headmen (*Patil*) surnamed Jagdale; seven peasants also surnamed Jagdale, one washerman (*Parit*), one carpenter (*Sutār*), one gardener (*Mālti*), one blacksmith (*Lohār*), one guest-bard (*Bhat mehmān*), two astrologer-accountants (*Joshi Kulkarnī*), one assistant headman (*Chaugula*), one barber (*Nhāvī*), one Mahār (untouchable), one Gurav (keeper of temple) all perhaps of the village concerned, as well as an agent of Deshpande of the region and other thirteen persons from neighbouring villages and hamlets (*majeri*), total being thirty-four persons. And the duty of the grantee imposed by the assembly was ‘to pay (the revenue) according to rules’ (*vāharti-pramānen ugaunī karnēi*).54

**Record No. 3.** One of the two Marāthī records translated into English and included in the Sykes’ report has been already discussed. Another record is a *mirās patra* which was granted by ‘the Mokuddum, chief sharers in the Pateel’s office and authority, and all the principal persons of the villages (village?) of Multun, Pergunnah, Kurdeh, Surkar, Joonur,’ to a son of headman of a nearby village, when the assembly sold ‘a chowar, namely, 12 rookas of land, from the two chowars of the thul or estate, called Sandus’ as well as ‘a site for a house’ in the village by defining four corners at the price of Rs. 100. Persons attending this assembly were: four headmen, one assistant headman (*Chougileh*), five (perhaps) peasants, one chief of shop-keepers, one gardener, one Gurao (temple-keeper) of the village as well as one gardener of other village and one person named Ballajee Bajee Rao Bhaweh (total being fifteen). The buyer is commanded by the assembly to observe the following obligation:

53 ASS, vol. V, No. 72. “...vatanpatra Rājshri Deshmukh va Mokadam va Dhondo Malhār Purandhare Karyāt Sāsvad tahā Baburāo va Tukoji bin Bhikāji Sinde hālti vasti Kasbe majkūr...(yeat)...tumhi yētīn ārī kēla je Kasbe majkuri āppa bahut divas rāhāto vāda tumhi dīlē āhe parantu set thal mirāschei āsāve tyājvarūn barāye ārī khātres āpīn Anbhalpaik jāminti dīlē āse tyās chahū tafes tivadhēkari dakhēs Mahē Supe yēthī sīva va pashchmes Jākhōji Jagthāp utares Sakṛājī Pātīl....”

“Including the well, the permanent assessment is 50 rupees yearly, and upon this there will be no other charge beyond the rights of hukdars (persons having trifling hereditary fees, or rights on the village lands) and the pay of the koolkurnee (village accountant), agreeably to the usage and practice of the village.” (Bracketed explanations are of Sykes’.) And this deed was attested by other fourteen persons of the village and handwritten by the astrologer-accountant thereof.55

Of the three records referred to above, No. 1 and No. 2 do not show if the grantees of lands paid money to the assembly, while in No. 3 the grantee paid Rs. 100. This may be explained in this way: in No. 1 the grantees were residing in the town, and in No. 2 he was of headman’s lineage of the village; viz. in both cases the grantees were residents of the place, whereas in No. 3 grantee, though a son of a village-headman, was of other village, hence he had to pay a price of the land. In any case, even in No. 3, the price of mirās land was rather very cheap compared with the assessment upon it.

The three records quoted above are concerned with the disposal of lands as mirās by the local assembly. But local assembly could dispose of lands in the village as inām as well. Such cases will be shown in the following two records.

Record No. 4. Following story is narrated in Diaries of the year 1760. Headman (surnamed Povale) of Village Kolās, Tarf Chākan, Prānt Junnar, borrowed Rs. 17,000 from a man surnamed Gāykvāḍ probably in order to pay up the taxes imposed on his village, and he transferred half of his headmanship to the creditor in lieu of Rs. 7,000. But he was unable to repay the remaining Rs. 10,000, so that “all the villagers and Povale Pātīl discussed the matter and agreed to give an inām of 2.25 khandī (45 bighas, viz. about 13.5 hectares) to Gāykvāḍ for (Rs.) 10,000, to liquidate (the debt), and to bear the land-tax (sārā) imposed upon it for themselves”.56 And they gave him a sales-deed (kharedikhat) to that effect. Government, after examining the deed, granted a vatanpatra to Gāykvāḍ and commanded a local bureaucrat as follows: “His land-tax will be properly imposed, that shall be paid by Povale Pātīl and villagers. Take it into Government item with acknowledgement. Gāykvāḍ is to have no connection with the land-tax due from the inām of 2.25 khandī mentioned above”.57

Above record clearly demonstrates that a village as a group could dispose of or sell out the waste lands thereof as inām lands according to its need, that the receiver of such inām lands was necessarily exempt from the duty of paying tax assessed upon the lands, but that Government imposed the duty upon the village as a whole.

Record No. 5. Similarly, when ‘the headman and all the villagers’ (mokadam va samast pāndhāri) gathered together and granted 72 bighas (about 21.6 hectares) of lands in the village to a Brahmin family as inām, Government decided it to be ‘inām in charge of the village’ (gānva nijbat inām) and ordered the headman and villagers ‘to pay the land-tax (sārā) and other impositions (patyā).’58

To be sure, even the inām lands granted by the village may have often been exempt from tax by the Government, if their size was small, as pointed out by M. Elphinstone. But

57 Ibid. “tyāchā sārā vājāī hōī to Povale Pātīl va ānivakari det jātīl. to sarkēr rakmēnt majurā ghet jātēn. Gāykvāḍ yājikades sadarhu savā dōn khandī ināmchāyā sārāchā tālkē nase.”
58 SSRPD, vol. VI, No. 710, p. 216. ‘ekān ardha chāvar bārā bhīghe jāmin sārā va patyā tuhī: dyāvayačhā karūn gānva nijbat jāmin inām...’
in case of large *inām* lands granted by the village, it seems to have been a rule of the Government to impose the tax due from the lands upon the village as a whole.

In short, the village as a group also could dispose of waste lands thereof. But if they are disposed of as *mirās* lands, the grantee (new *mirāsdār*) had to bear a heavy land-tax upon himself, and if as *inām* lands, the village as a whole were obliged to pay the land-tax on behalf of the grantee (new *ināmdār*) if the *inām* was of a fairly large scale. Accordingly waste lands of many villages appear to have been left 'waste' without being disposed of even by the village. And such waste lands were made use of by the Government at its pleasure as will be demonstrated below.

(C) Disposal by Government

As pointed out before, Government, on receipt of a petition from the headman of village, allowed some *mirās* lands situated near the inhabited area thereof to be used as house-sites and gave instead thereof the lands of extinct families or waste lands of the village to *mirāsdārs*.\(^{59}\) Excepting such an instance, there seem to have been mainly two ways for the Government to make use of waste lands. One is to promote their cultivation through local bureaucrats and hereditary officers of the place. Another way is to confer waste lands upon particular individuals and institutions as *inām* lands. The former way will be discussed in the next section. Examples to the effect that Government in the name of King or his Peshwa granted waste lands are found too many to be enumerated. Only some cases may be shown below.

King Shahu gave 5 *bighas* (about 1.5 hectares) of waste lands of Village Vadū of Prāšt Junnar as *inām* to a sweeper of the tomb (vīndāvan) of the late King Sambhāji situated therein for his maintenance.\(^{60}\) The third Peshwa granted 1 *chāvar* and 0.5 *chāvar* of waste lands respectively as *inām* to the bereaved families of two horsemen (shilledār) of the Government who died in battle.\(^{61}\) He also donated 5 *bighas* of waste lands as *inām* to a mosque built in a town in Salsette region,\(^{62}\) 1.5 *bighas* of waste lands as *inām* for the maintenance of a Hindu temple of a village,\(^{63}\) and about 14 *bighas* of waste lands as *inām* in Ratnagiri region to a Portuguese gunner (Firangi golandāj) who distinguished himself in the service to the Marāṭhā Government.\(^{64}\) And the seventh Peshwa also donated 1.5 *chāvar* of waste lands as *inām* to a Saîvite monastery near Aurangabad.\(^{65}\)

In short, those waste lands or lands of extinct families which were neither appropriated by the headmen of villages as their *mirās* nor disposed of by the local assembly, reverted *de facto*, if not *de jure*, to the State. Government often granted them as *inām* (exempt from tax) to such various persons and institutions as hereditary officers, priests, distinguished servants of the State as well as temples and mosques. And by making them self-supporting with an income from the *inām*, Government may have aimed at economizing the State expenditure otherwise to be spent for their maintenance, and at the same time creating the landed interests

---

59 SSRPD, vol. VI, No. 748. See p. 40 of this article.
61 Ibid., vol. II, No. 146.
62 Ibid., vol. II, No. 171.
63 Ibid., vol. II, No. 181.
64 Ibid., vol. II, No. 192.
65 Ibid., vol. VIII, No. 1038.
Thus we may conclude this section as follows:

Both the theory of Mr. Baden-Powell who regarded the agricultural lands excepting those held in inām as practically owned by the State, and the theory of Professor A.S. Altekar who emphasized the peasant ownership of all the agricultural lands may be said to have over-simplified the reality. Against these theories, Professor S.N. Sen was far more close to the actual situation in that he pointed out the existence of three kinds of lands, viz. inām lands, mirās lands, and Government lands. But he should have made it clear that there were many waste lands or lands of extinct families the legal right in which was not always clear, and that such lands could be disposed of by the village-headmen and the local (village) assemblies as well as by the State. The same comment may broadly apply to the report of M. Elphinstone. On the other hand, the report of W.H. Sykes is not clear regarding inām lands and State lands. But he has left an instructive suggestion in that he pointed out the waste lands of extinct families having existed in many of the villages, and emphasized the ‘headmen or village authorities’ having disposed of them during the Maratha period. He should, however, have stressed that the waste lands appropriated by village-headman were treated as mirās lands loaded with a heavy land-tax, and in case of waste lands disposed of by the local assembly as mirās lands, the receiver was necessarily imposed with land-tax, while those disposed of as inām lands were often converted into ‘inām in charge of village’ and the village as a whole had to bear tax assessed upon them.

At any rate, it may be said that the owner of mirās lands (mirāsdār) held a fairly well-established private proprietary right in the lands. As regards inām lands, too, at least when they were attached to a certain hereditary office, the owner could dispose of them along with the office according to his need. On the other hand, waste lands or lands of extinct families could be appropriated by the village-headmen as his mirās lands or disposed of by the local assemblies, as well as by the State.

So far we have discussed the rights in various kinds of agricultural lands that appear in our sources. Now we shall turn our attention to the next problem and enquire into what kind of persons actually cultivated the lands, and under what conditions?

III. Peasants

First we shall indicate some common features of the peasants in the early 19th century Deccan as described by British administrators.

At the beginning of this article we have quoted a lengthy statement from the report of M. Elphinstone (see pp. 34–36 of this article). From that quotation, we can point out three remarkable features of the peasants. Firstly, there were two classes of peasants: that of landed proprietors called mirāsi, mirāsdār, or thalkari; and that of farmers called upari. Secondly, Maratha Government made a mirāsdār pay more than an upari, so that there existed generally no landlord-tenant relationship between the two classes. To be sure, Elphinstone has made no distinct statement about the matter. But, that he calls mirāsdārs ‘cultivators’ indicates that he found no such relationship between the classes. And thirdly, uparis cultivated ‘lands belonging to Government’ on lease.

W. Chaplin also recognizes two classes of peasants throughout the Maratha country:
'free-holder' (mirāsdār) and 'tenant-at-will' (upari). And he mentions that the approximate proportion of families of the two classes around the year 1820 was three to one in Poona region, two to one in Sātārā region, and one to one in Ahmadnagar region.66 Further, he states that though mirāsdār occasionally let out his lands to his 'co-partners or relations', "a mirasdar may usually be considered both landlord and farmer, for as the land tax is commonly so high as to absorb all the landlord's rent, little surplus of profit is left, unless the cultivation of the land be undertaken by the mirasdar himself."67 Chaplin, then, points out that whereas mirāsdār may normally have paid fifty per cent of his gross produce, an upari actually paid much less, "for the upari having but a precarious interest, must be compensated by a higher immediate profit. The profits of uparis in some places have indeed been found so large as to tempt mirasdars to throw up their watans (viz. mirās lands) and to cultivate waste land on Cowle (Kaul, assurance of Government). This of course is not allowed, except on condition of their continuing to pay the public revenue due from their Miras (lands)."68 (Brackets are mine.)

Above statement of W. Chaplin is mainly based on the situation found about 1820, just two years after the British conquest of the Deccan. At any rate, it shows: (1) there were two classes of peasants; (2) a mirāsdār paid more than an upari, and accordingly the former was usually a landed cultivator rather than a landlord, and (3) uparis cultivated waste lands.

As quoted before (see p. 36 of this article), W. H. Sykes also admits two classes of peasants: land-proprietors (mirāsdār, thalkari, or thalwāhi) and renter (upari). He further states in 1830, "Although Mirās, or hereditary land, was assessed permanently, yet it was at a higher rate than any other land, at least if we judge from the difficulty discoverable in village papers for the last half century of letting waste land at the Mtras rate."69 He then mentions, "great part of the land in the country is without proprietors; in consequence, a very numerous class of occupiers is the Uparsi. The proper meaning of this term is a stranger, or one who cultivates land in a village in which he has not any corporate rights. In practice he holds land on the Ukti tenure, which is a land-lease by a verbal agreement for one year. In this tenure the rates are not fixed; the parties make the best terms they can;..."70

Here, although it is evident in his statement that mirāsdārs so paid more than uparis as to be unable to be landlords of the latter, he is very vague as to whose lands uparis cultivated. But it is indicated that waste lands or lands without proprietors were let out to uparis on lease.

From the above quotations from the reports written by the early British administrators, at least three questions may arise in connection with the land-systems discussed in the foregoing section.

Firstly, nothing is mentioned in these reports as to who cultivated the inām lands: viz.
their owners or uparis? Secondly, even if the mirāsdārs were landed cultivators or cultivated their mirās lands by themselves in the early decades of the 19th century as described by British administrators, was this a general situation throughout the 18th century? Was there no tendency for mirās lands to be cultivated by uparis and for mirāsdārs to become landlords? And thirdly, in connection with the above question, was it a general situation throughout the 18th century that uparis were tenants of State lands or waste lands? Was it not the case that the cultivation or reclamation of State lands or waste lands was promoted and encouraged politically at a certain period with a result that uparis were mobilized for the purpose and became the cultivators of such lands?

This section shall enquire in these questions.

Before entering into discussion, a few words should be mentioned about a limitation inherent in material sources. For this section, we shall make use of about sixty Marathi records collected from the source-books (see p. 37 of this article). Of them, what may be called private records are only seven, all of the rest being official records. Probably due to this official character of the records, peasants are called with such general terms as rayat (or rayet), loka, praja (or praja), kuła, or kunbi. In a very few cases, they are called either mirāsdārs or uparis. Of the general terms shown above, rayat is the corrupt from of Arabic raja, while loka and praja are Sanskrit words; the three terms mean ‘people’ in general and ‘peasants’ in particular. The word kuła arose from Sanskrit kuļa (=family, lineage) and meant ‘people’ in general and ‘peasants’ in particular as well as ‘family’. On the other hand, kunbi is an indigenous term and meant ‘peasants’, more especially a caste whose traditional occupation was agriculture. These terms are used interchangeably in our sources. At any rate, it should be apologized that when such a general term is used, it is often difficult to judge whether mirāsdārs or uparis were meant by it.

One more apology must be added here. I shall try to clarify in this section how heavy revenue burden (or rent) a peasant had to bear in the period under review. But the revenue system in the Marāthā Kingdom was by no means simple. As will be illustrated in this section, occasionally a certain proportion of the gross produce was collected in kind, but this method seems to have been rather an exception: more general method was that Government measurers (amin or pāhanidār) were sent to villages now and then to measure the fields and the assessment was made for different crops in cash per bigha (unit of land-measurement). In such a case it is very difficult to estimate the rate at which the assessed amount of money occupied in the gross produce of a peasant. Accordingly, a detailed enquiry into the revenue-systems of this kingdom will be made in a future occasion, and we may simply show in the footnote an old work done on this topic by Professor S. N. Sen.
1. Cultivation of Inām Lands

As stated before, the reports of British administrators did not mention how the inām lands were cultivated. So we shall begin with this topic.

The size of inām land as well as its holder was so various in the Marathā Kingdom that the mode of its cultivation was by no means uniform. Some examples will be demonstrated in this regard. In 1738, Deshmukh and Deshpande of Lalgūn Buddha Panchgātva region enquired into the duties and rights of the Mahārs (an untouchable caste) of their region and informed the result to their counterparts of Sāsvad region by a letter. This letter enumerates 17 items of duties and rights of the Mahārs, two of which were: “1. (Mahārs) should be engaged in miscellaneous labour for Pātīl while eating the harāṭi land. 1. (Mahārs) should be engaged in miscellaneous labour for Government (dīvān) while eating māhārik land”.

There is no doubt that the harāṭi land shown above means a kind of inām land given by the village as a reward to performing miscellaneous labour for the village-headman. Similarly the māhārik land is a sort of inām land given by Government to Mahārs as a compensation for labour service such as carrying the luggages of local bureaucrats on their occasional visits to the village as well as running as messengers for official purposes. ‘To eat’ (khaāūn) such a land may mean that Mahārs cultivated it for themselves.

In a similar way, mosques and Hindu temples had small inām land (e.g. 1.5 bighas or about 45 ares), and a sweeper attached to the tomb of a late King held an inām land of 5 bighas (about 1.5 hectares).

There may be no doubt that such a small inām land was cultivated by the keeper of the mosque (Mulānā), that of the temple (Gurav) or by the sweeper himself.

There were, however, large inām lands as well that were held, for example, by Deshmukh and Deshpande of the region, headman of the village, distinguished servants of the State and their families as well as noted temples, monasteries and mosques, and they were often of the size of, for instance, 0.5 chāvar (about 18 hectares), 1 chāvar (about 36 hectares), 1.5 chāvars (about 54 hectares), 2 chāvars (about 72 hectares) and so forth.

It may be presumed that such a large inām land was, as a rule, cultivated by tenants. We may show some examples.

In a town called Ambejogai, perhaps about eighty miles north-west of Poona, there was a Jain temple (devaghar) since old, which held 1 chāvar of inām land in the town as well as several ‘inām villages’ thereabout. Regarding the cultivation of this inām land, two peasants who were ‘now residing in Kasbe Ambejogāt’ submitted the following agreement (kabāl katba) dated October 2, 1701, to the temple:

(We), Rayājí Roghe and Māvji Motlaskar, peasants (mujeri), now residing in Town Ambejogāt, write and submit following agreement to you (swāmi)...(year).... You have 1 chāvar of inām land in the town, which lay waste due to a disturbance (dhāmādhām). We came and voluntarily requested you (to allow us to cultivate) the land by share-cropping (batāi) on the promise (bole) of ten years. You have put the inām land of 1 chāvar in our charge

---

77 See p. 48 of this article.
78 See pp. 42, 48 of this article.
80 M.T. Patwardhan: Fārsi-Marāthi-Kosh, Poona, 1925, p. 198 (mujeri=khe4u”t, kuṇbī).
(hāvālā) by share-cropping (batāi); (We shall) cultivate (the land), and submit to you a half (nime) of the produce (upaś) of the land including grains (gaḷa), stems (kaṇḍā), fodders (gavaṭ), greens (bhaṣ) and so on. And we shall take another half. We shall conceal (tanakhori) nothing of them. This is our... (a few words are missed).... This agreement (katba) is written by the pen of accountant (Kulkarni) Rāmāji Narasīva. Signature (date and greeting).”

The above record evinces two important points regarding the tenancy of ināṃ land. Firstly condition of tenancy was fifty-fifty sharing of gross produce between the ināṃdār and the tenants. Secondly, the two tenant-peasants are stated as ‘now residing’ (hāli vasti) in the town. This shows that they were not mirāsdār peasants living permanently in the town but upāri peasants who had migrated thereto from some other place and temporarily settled there.

To be sure, it is not certain if most of the tenants on ināṃ lands were upāri peasants. There might be mirāsdār peasants who were tenants of ināṃ lands, as well.

At any rate it appears that the tenancy on ināṃ lands was usually arranged through share-cropping system. For instance, Diaries of the year 1752 states that in a village of Karhād region ‘there is a share-cropper (vāṭekari) of Sardeshmukha, and robbers broke his (share-cropper’s) house, and stole away three oxen, four cows, and one male-buffalo; viz. total eight cattles....’ The indigenous term vāṭekari means a tenant who cultivates land by sharing (vāṇi) the produce. At any rate above record suggests that there was ināṃ land of Sardeshmukha in this village and it was cultivated by a share-cropper.

Two instances shown above that evince the share-cropping arrangement between ināṃdārs and tenants are cases where the former resided in the village or thereabout. But all the ināṃdārs did not reside in the place. Especially the distinguished servants of the State or their families who were awarded with ināṃ lands would often stay in the capital or other important cities and were, as it were, absentee landlords of the ināṃ lands. In such a case, the ināṃdār would appoint an agent and have him stay in the village. Otherwise the ināṃdār would entrust the cultivation of his ināṃ land to the headman of the village and request him to send the rent that was fixed in cash. Such an arrangement might be made directly between the ināṃdār and the headman or indirectly through a third person as will be clear in the following record.

A gentleman named Sadāshivrām Guṇe Kālekar, who may be supposed to have been an eminent bureaucrat, had an ināṃ land of 1 chāvār in Town Bīrvādī near Miraj. Regarding the cultivation of this ināṃ land, another gentleman, Pareshrām Rāmchandra by name, who

---


83 See p. 46 of this article.
is presumed by the editor of the record, Mr. S. L. Atar, to have been the famous Parashram Bhau Patvardhan, influential general of the Peshwa's Government, wrote the following letter dated October 5, 1779, to a man who may have been the headman of the town.

"(Greetings, addresssee’s name and sender’s name) Mr. Sadashivram Gune Kalekar owns inam land of 120 bighas (viz. 1 chavar) (of the profit) of Rs. 700 in the town. He is conducting through me the cultivation (ravanik) of 20 bighas out of it with (the rent of) Rs. 100. 100 bighas of land (of the rent) of Rs. 600 are still left. Please appoint (tenants for the cultivation of) the land of the first, second and third classes according to the rent (dhara) prevalent in Miraj region. (date and greetings)".84

While the two records shown before as illustrating the rent in kind are of the years 1701 and 1752 respectively, this record evincing the rent in cash is of 1779. Accordingly it may be imagined that the rent was transformed from kind to cash during that period. But I think it is not the case; the difference is due to the fact that while the former two cases are concerned with resident inamdar, the latter one is about an absentee inamdar.

At any rate, it is not clear what proportion the rent prevalent in Miraj region occupied in the gross produce of land. The rent of Rs. 5 to Rs. 6 per bigha seems to be too heavy for dry land (jiraya) and too light for wet land (bagayat) (Vide p. 58 of this article). It may be that this inam land was of wet land, tenants on it in fact had to pay more rent than shown in the record, and the difference was meant to be the income of the man who is supposed to be the headman of the town. Otherwise, even if this was wet land, enough number of tenants were available only at such low rates of rent, for tenants may have been rather scarce in the second half of the 18th century due mainly to the expanded cultivation of waste lands on more favourable terms as will be discussed later.

2. Cultivation of Miras Lands

As discussed before, miras lands were owned by individual peasants including hereditary officers of the village and imposed with ordinary land-revenue. The owner of miras land was called mirasdar or mirasi in Muslim words and thalkari or thalvai in indigenous terms.

We can find at least sixteen records that refer to mirasdar or owner of miras land. They include five records from Poona region,85 six from Sasmad region,86 three from Junnar region,87 one from Satara region,88 and one from Ratnagiri region.89 They evince very little of the mode of cultivation of miras land. Out of them, however, there are two records, one of which indicates miras land being let out to upari peasants, while another shows that


85 SSRPD, vol. I, No. 296 (thalkari), No. 298 (thalvaiik k upholbi); vol. III, No. 397 (vatandar k upholbi); vol. VII, No. 433 (k upholbi thalkari mirasdar). Oturkar, No. 70 (thalkari).

86 SSRPD, vol. III, No. 327 (mirashichie sheten). Oturkar, No. 37 (thalvaiik k upholbi), No. 48 (thalvaii), No. 49 (thalvaii), No. 56 (mirashichie sete), No. 139 (thalkari).

87 SSRPD, vol. III, No. 327 (mirasdar k upholbi), No. 522 (mirashichie sheten); vol. VI, No. 748 (mirasdaro).


89 Ibid., vol. VII, No. 546 (vatani shet).
mīrās land was cultivated by its owner. We shall examine these two records.

Record No. 1. In the first half of the 18th century, unstable peace was maintained between the Marathas and the Mughals on the border regions such as Junnar and Ahmadnagar by sharing equally the revenue of the areas between the two Governments. And parts of such regions were also assigned to bureaucrats in jāgīr (fief). In such a situation, the following record may be found in the Diaries dated January 1, 1742. A clerk under a jāgīrdār assigned with three villages in Junnar region petitioned to the third Peshwa, “Headman and mīrāsdr peasants (of the three villages) have absconded due to the shortage of rainfalls and to the oppression by the Mughals. (But) upāri peasants are in the villages. If an assurance for share-cropping (bātāı) be kindly granted to them (upāri peasants), (they) will carry out the cultivation for the next year.” Then Peshwa’s Government sent the following assurance-letter (abhayalpatra) to each of the three villages as well as a similar order (tākid) to the clerk: “Collect the produce (māl) of the winter-crops (rābi), deduct the seeds (bīj) (used for the winter-crops), divide the remaining produce as well as the produce (māl) of the summer-crops (khārīf) into three shares (tin hisse), and (distribute) one share to the rayat, one of the remaining two to our Government (svarājya, here the jāgīrdār), and another one to the Mughals. Besides, if there are any income (ākār) of extra cash-impositions (naktābāb), tax on fig-trees (unbar-potti), business-tax (mohatarfa-bāb), mango-tax (ānhāānhāli) and kamāvīs-tax (fines and other miscellaneous dues), pay half of them to svarājya and another half to the Mughals. Rest assured and carry out cultivations according to rules.”

To be sure, this record does not explain what the upāri peasants had been doing in the villages till headmen and mīrāsdr peasants absconded. It may, however, be supposed that the former had been cultivating the mīrās lands of the latter, for we can draw two inferences from the fact that when headmen and mīrāsdr ran away from the villages, upāris remained there. Firstly, whereas the fact that the former absconded because of the shortage of rains and the oppression of the Mughals no doubt indicates that they were obliged to pay a fixed amount of land-revenue straight to the administrations, the fact that upāris did not run away suggests that they were under no obligation of that kind. In other words, this fact infers that upāris did not cultivate State lands or waste lands with the duty to pay a certain amount of revenue direct to the administrations, but cultivated some privately owned lands, viz. mīrās lands, as share-cropping tenants. Hence they were not necessitated to abscond. Secondly, the date of this record (January 1) evinces that the winter-cultivation was already over and winter-harvest was soon to begin. This means that upāris were not only not necessitated to run away, but also had to be present there to do harvesting and to receive their own shares of produce. The prospect of crops was so bad that headmen and mīrāsdr resorted to temporary abscording without waiting for the}

---

91 Ibid., vol. III, No. 327. “...sadarhu tin gānvin pāśpānti nāhin va Mongalāche kasāle bhāi yajkariān pātīl va mīrāsdr kūṇbi parāgaṇādā jāle. upāri kūṇbi gānvināvār āhet tyāṃs bāftāchā kaul diltēyēnē pēstar sālcī kirē hoēn yeit hmaṇon Mir Mahāmīd Khan jāhāgīrdār yāngkaḍūl Govind Yashvant kārknē Hūjar yeēn vidit kēlen.”
92 Ibid., vol. III, No. 327. “tyāvarun māṃurtīvāra nājaṃ deūn bāftāchā kaul sādā kēla rābichē mālēcēn bij uhe rāss kāḍhīn, rāhilē māl va kharīfāchē māl jāsā hoē hol tyāṃs tin hisse pātīn ek hissē rayatēs; don hisse rāhilē tyās ek hissē svarājya va ek hissē Mongalāī yēnēprāmāṇē, va nakābāb unbarpotti va mohatarfa bāb va anbā ānhāli va kāmāvīs yēcē hoē akār hoēl to nīmēn svarājya va nīmēn Mongalāī yēnēprāmāṇē deūn sukrūp rāhān kird māmulprāmāṇē kār;pēn hmaṇon…”
harvest. Accordingly uparis felt uneasy as to whom to pay the rent, how much, and how to undertake the cultivation for the next season, so that they appealed to the jägirdär's clerk present there for an assurance. The clerk requested the Government for the same, and the Government assured the uparis that they were required to pay to the administrations neither more nor less than the shares (viz. two-thirds of gross produce) ‘according to rules’, which were otherwise due to the mirāsdārs landlords.

The above record seems to make sense only when interpreted in that way. The provision that uparis were allowed to deduct the seeds only from the winter-crops may be a special concession because of the bad prospect of winter-harvest.

Now it should be borne in mind that the above record indicating landlord-tenant relationship between mirāsdārs and uparis is of the year 1742, and that British administrators found mirāsdārs generally as cultivating their mirās lands and uparis as tenants of State lands or waste lands in the early nineteenth century. This suggests: (1) during the second half of the eighteenth century, the cultivation of State lands and waste lands was promoted, and uparis were mobilized for the purpose, and (2) accordingly, mirāsdārs came to cultivate their mirās land themselves. The first suggestion pointed above will be discussed in the next subsection. Here we may show an interesting record in connection with the second suggestion.

Record No. 2. On October 7, 1764, Police Office of the Centrally Administered Area of Koregā District (Divān Thāne Māhāl Khālsā Sarkār Koregā) sent the following letter to a man, Jānāpā Vāṇī by name, who was assistant headman (Chaugūlā) of Village Taḍvāle of the above District, but was ‘now residing’ in Village Hāsīchivāḍī:

“(a seal, name of office, name of the addressee, his present residence, year) The headman of the above (Village Taḍvāle) has informed that thou, being the vātandār chaugulā, hast absconded from the village. What is the reason for absconding? Now this letter is sent (to thee). Then you should come back to the village and cultivate your mirās land, and perform the work of assistant headmanship. Do have no fear on any matter and come back with peace of mind. The land attached to thy vātandārship (viz. inām land for assistant headmanship) shall also be given to thee. Therefore come back (date)”.93 (Brackets and italics are mine.)

This record demonstrates that in 1764 even assistant headman of the village did, or at least should, cultivate his mirās land for himself. Moreover, if we judge by his own name, this assistant headman did not belong to peasant caste but to merchant caste (viz. vāṇī).

3. Cultivation of State Lands and Waste Lands

As is well known, the Marāthā Kingdom reached its heyday during the reign of the second Peshwa Bājirāo I (1720–1740 in office). During his reign, the power of the Marāthās expanded up to the northern India, and the Marāthā feudatory states were firmly established in Gujarat, Malwa, central and northern India.94 This expansion of territories, however, re-

93 Oturkar, No. 56. “(Haitratrō Bhāvanishankarachā aṣhtakoni aspaṣṭha Marāthi 6 eṭīchā shikkā) Ajdvān Thāne Māhāl Khālsā Sarkār Koregā tahā Jānāpā Vāṇī chaugulā Mauje Taḍvāle Sarkār majkār āhār vāt Mauje Hāsīchivāḍī suhārsana khamas sitain mayā alaf tā vātandār chaugulā gavātān parāgada jahāḷā āhā mhanān pāṭl majkār yāṁ vidiī kele tāri parāgada hovayaśi kārṇē kāyē hālē patri sadār kele ahe tare tāri tumbhi gavāvarī yeīn āpi mūrsichī sete kārṇē va chaugulākīcha kārbhār kārṇē kon-hāvīsī vavasā na dharītā sukhrūp yeīn tujhe vātandārīche sete tujlā deī tāri yeīn chh 11 Raviākhar mortab sud”.

94 Vide V. G. Dighe: Peshwa Bajirao I & Maratha Expansion, Bombay, 1944.
sulted in an increased expenditure for administrative and military purposes by the Peshwa’s Government at Poona rather than an inflow of wealth thereto, so that when the third Peshwa Bālāji Bājrāo (1740–1761 in office) succeeded to the Peshwaship in 1740, there is said to have been accumulated a debt of the order of Rs. 1.45 millions at the Government of Poona. In order to liquidate this debt the third Peshwa resorted to predatory expeditions to the Hindu Kingdoms in the south India as well as Rajasthan. But the expeditions invited counter-expeditions, so that the financial condition of Poona Government became worse. Moreover, luxurious tendency also had become more conspicuous among the nobles and high-class bureaucrats of the Government. Accordingly when the third Peshwa died in 1761, the debt accumulated at the Government of Poona is estimated variously to have come around Rs. 1.7 millions, Rs. 5 millions or Rs. 10 millions.

In order to mitigate the financial stringency, the third Peshwa not only resorted to the predatory expeditions, but also appears to have paid much attention to the increase in agricultural production. A significant fact in this connection is that during the reign of the third Peshwa the majority of soldiers under his direct control were recruited from the north and south Indians as well as Pathâns and Arabs as mercenaries. This resulted in the demoralization of the Marāthā army and was to become an important military factor for the decline of the Kingdom. As the reason for this ‘denationalization’ of soldiers, Professor S.N. Sen says, “The Marathas were not very eager to spend whole year away from their home provinces and Balaji (the third Peshwa) enlisted mercenaries from all parts of India and outside India”. But this explanation appears to be incorrect, if we remember that before this time a large number of Marāthās had marched to other provinces as bureaucrats and soldiers, established many feudatory states and settled there. A more adequate explanation may be that the third Peshwa as a measure of his agrarian policies sent back home or at least discouraged recruiting the indigenous soldiers most of whom were peasants by origin, and enlisted instead thereof the foreign mercenaries.

At any rate, so far as our sources indicate, the cultivation of State lands and waste lands appears to have been suddenly promoted and encouraged during and after the reign of the third Peshwa.

Bālāji Bājrāo became the third Peshwa in June of 1740, and five months after that, Diaries dated November 15, 1740 mentions that Government sent a letter to headmen of five villages in Konkan region, informing them that there were ‘Government demesne’ (sarkārchī sheri) in the villages and ‘half-and-half share-croppers of Government’ (sarkārche ardhelī) were cultivating it, and ordering them that as there were, besides, ‘Government sugar-cane land of 2.5 bighas’ (sarkārchā ās jamin bighe 2.5) in the villages, they should be cultivated on the condition that the outer husk of the cane (tūś) and the expenditure of cultivation be given by the Government. Then on October 24, 1744, Government ordered hereditary officer of Village Vāḍajhiren of Tarf Karde (about ninety miles north-east of Poona), “There is demesne land (sheriche shet) (in the above village), which is put in charge of Government. You have been ordered to get it cultivated. Then appoint share-croppers (sarkī) and have (them) cultivate that demesne land. Of the produce (ākār) therefrom, give (half) to share-
croppers and send the cash of remaining half (bāki urlā nīme aivaj) to Government”.

The term satīk is the corrupt form of Arabic sharik and means a ‘ sharer ’ as the indigenous term vatekari shown before. At any rate it may hardly be doubted that the cultivation of State lands was promoted in many places on fifty-fifty share-cropping basis during 1740’s.

Next, it seems that cultivation of waste lands was greatly encouraged after 1750. For instance Diaries dated February 15, 1750 mentions that Government gave an assurance (abhaya) of seven items to Pargana Pinpalgaṇva Basavaṇt and Pargana Chāṇḍvaḍ of Junnar region, which included the following three items:

(1) “When waste land is brought under new cultivation, the rule of getting revenue (ugavī) per bigha for that land is defined as follows:
A. rupees per bigha of dry black soil (kāle jāmīn).
   Rs. 0.25 in the first year, Rs. 0.5 in the second year, Rs. 1 in the third year, Rs. 1.5 in the fourth year, Rs. 2 in the fifth year. (the standard rent—dhārā—of the already cultivated dry black soil being Rs. 2 per bigha per year)
B. rupees per bigha of hillside sandy soil (baraḍ māl jāmīn).
   Rs. 0.125 in the first year, Rs. 0.25 in the second year, Rs. 0.5 in the third year, Rs. 0.75 in the fourth year, Rs. 1 in the fifth year. (the standard rent of the already cultivated hillside sandy soil being Rs. 1 per bigha per year)”.

(2) “When water-canal (ādavyā pāṭ) is constructed on waste land, to turn it into wet land (baḍgaẏāṭ), the rule of revenue per bigha of the land is: Rs. 5 per bigha in the first year, Rs. 6 per bigha in the second year, Rs. 7 per bigha in the third year, Rs. 8 per bigha in the fourth year, Rs. 10 per bigha in the fifth year. (the standard rent of the already cultivated wet land being Rs. 10 per bigha per year)”.

(3) “The business people (udmi loka) who are now in the villages should pay the revenue (mahāsaḷ) according to rule. If new families (of business people) are brought with an assurance, they shall be exempt (pāṭ) from tax for three years, and from the fourth year, they ought to pay according to rule”.

Here the first two items are important. They show that those who reclaim the waste lands were levied with ‘annually increasing rent’ (vīz. āstāवa rent) for the first four years, and standard rent after the fifth.

99 Ibid., vol. III, No. 333. “Mauje Vadajhiren Tarf Karde yethil sherichen shet āhe; ten sarkārānt thevileṇ ahe. tyāchā lāvaṇi karāvyyāśi tuhmāṅs ājnā keli ase. tari te sheriche shetāchā lānvī sarik theün karāṇ. tehīl akār hōll to sarikās deūn bākī urlā nīme aivaj sarkārānt pātvā karāṇ. hmaṅ on Rāmājī Nārāyaṇ ajhat kulkarṇī Mauje majkār yās pātra”.
100 SSRPD, vol. III, No. 339, p. 211. “nāvī lānvī padjaminnichī hōll, te jaminis darbighā ugaṇvī karāvyyāchā shirastā yēṇēpamānēn karār karūn dīhā ase:
   kāle jaminis dar bighā rūpāye 0.25 pahiule sālīṇ. 0.125 pahiule sālīṇ.
   0.5 dusre sālīṇ. 1.5 chauthe sālīṇ. 0.25 dusre sālīṇ. 0.75 chauthe sālīṇ.
   1 tisre sālīṇ. 2 pānchve sālīṇ. 0.5 tisre sālīṇ. 1 pānchve sālīṇ. 101 Ibid., vol. III, No. 339, p. 211. “padjaminn asel tyās dar bighīyaś ugaṇvī shirastā ādavyā pātāche jaminis rūpāye pahiule sālīṇ dar bighā rūpāye 5, dusre sālīṇ dar bighā rūpāye 6, tisre sālīṇ dar bighā rūpāye 7, chauthe sālīṇ dar bighā rūpāye 8, pānchve sālīṇ dar bighā rūpāye 10”.
At this point of time, Government seems to have only passively received the petition from the hereditary officers of the region for assurance and confirmed and granted it. But soon, Government came to make it a duty of the local revenue collectors to promote the cultivation of waste land.

For example, on February 17, 1760 when Government appointed a collector (Kamavisdār) to Puntambe region of Sangamner District, it specified eighteen items of his duties, which included such items as: “if waste land lies waste, undertake its cultivation by giving assurance of two years, three years, four years. Do not leave waste land” (padjamin padli āhe, tichi lāvni dusālā, tisālā, chausālā, kaul deun karāvi padjamin rāhūn na dyāvi), and “if the cultivation of waste land is not performed, (your) office shall not last long” (padjamin lāvni na jāli tar mānlā parichchhinna rāhnār nāhīn). Further, on December 13 of the same year when Government appointed another collector (Kamavisdār) to Pargana Van and Pargana Diṅḍorī to the north of Nāṣik, he was commanded by the Government as follows: “if there is waste land in villages of the above Parganas, undertake its cultivation. Undertake the cultivation in two or three years from this year. If the cultivation of waste land is not performed, (your) office shall not last long” (Pargane majkuriri gāṅvaganna pad jamin asel tichi lāvni karāvi, sālmajkuraṇaśaṇīn do ti salā lāvni karāvi, pad jaminichi lāvni na jāli tari parichchhinna mānlā rāhnār nāhīn).

Although the cultivation of waste land was promoted in that way, the financial situation of Poona Government did not improve. And after the short reigns of the fourth, the fifth and the sixth Peshwas, the seventh Peshwa Madhavrao Nārāyān (1774–1796 in office) encouraged creating ‘new fields’ (nūtan jamin or nūtan shet) by reclamation at least in Ratnagiri region (narrow belt-like region between the Western Ghats and the Arabian Sea). For instance, on January 4, 1775 Government issued the following assurance to the local bureaucrats, the headmen of villages and the peasants (rayāni) of Anjanvel area of Ratnagiri region: 1. “Those peasants (rayat) who create new fields (nūtan jamin) out of rocky land (dagaṇ saṇa) with neither trees nor grass growing by bringing earth from other places and filling it up therewith, or those peasants who create new fields (nūtan shet) by breaking rocky hills and filling them up with earth” shall have half of the new fields in inām, while another half shall be exempt (māḍi) from rent for twenty years, levied with light rent (kaudhārā) for the next five years, and thereafter assessed according to the standard rule. 2. “Those peasants (rayat) who create new fields (nūtan shet) by constructing dams (bāndhbandist) on the drained land along sea-coast” shall have one-fourth of the new fields in inām, while the periods of exemption and of light rent shall be decided after considering the expenditure and the labour spent for the purpose.

And after forty days, on February 13, 1775, a similar assurance was given to Svarnadurg area of the same region, too.

It is not clear if those peasants who brought State land, waste land, or ‘rocky land’ into

104 Ibid., vol. III, No. 431, p. 293.
106 Ibid., p. 243. “dāryāgark kāṁhinis bāṇḍh bandist karūn nūtan shet hoy aisen karāvyās rayat umedvār āhe”.
107 Ibid., vol. VI, No. 738.
cultivation were awarded with the *mirās* right in the land excepting the land specially granted in *inām*. It may be presumed that they were not, for the early British administrators found the cultivators of Government lands and the like to be tenants, but not to be *mirāsdārs*. At any rate, the foregoing discussion may have made it clear that the cultivation of State land, waste land and so forth was promoted and encouraged on certain favourable terms since the time of the third Peshwa.

Now the problem is: what kind of peasants were mobilized for the cultivation, and from where?

At present, we cannot be definite about the matter. But it seems improbable that a large number of peasants were brought into *svarājya* of the Marāṭhā Kingdom from other provinces of India during the second half of the eighteenth century. Nor does it appear presumable that a great number of *upari* peasants were suddenly generated during the same period inside the *svarājya*. Rather we must suppose that fairly great number of *upari* peasants did already exist in the *svarājya* before the middle of the eighteenth century as illustrated in two examples shown before (see pp. 53 & 55 of this article). Accordingly it may hardly be doubted that *upari* peasants scattered in the *svarājya* were mobilized for the cultivation through the following three methods. Firstly, there were cases where *upari* peasants were cultivating the *mirās* lands of *mirāsdaṛs* of the village on the condition of paying perhaps two-thirds of gross produce to the landowners as indicated before (see p. 55 of this article). In such a case, these *upari* peasants would be mobilized for the cultivation of State lands, waste lands and so forth on more favourable terms. Secondly, in the year 1765, for instance, when an epidemic took place in a village of Kalyān region and many of the villagers died or absconded, Government is said to have ordered a bureaucrat of the region as follows: “There may be closely neighbouring villages. Make them cultivate the lands (of the vacated village) by visiting cultivation (*pāyinkasta*)”.

Accordingly, when there were not enough number of *upari* peasants in a certain village, those who were by chance residing in the neighbouring villages would be mobilized also for the cultivation of State lands and so on of the village by visiting cultivation. And thirdly, as shown before, two Parganas of Junnar region were assured by the Government that ‘if new families (of business people) are brought with an assurance, they shall be exempt from tax for three years’. (See p. 58 of this article). Similar measure was resorted to regarding peasants also. For example, in the year 1814 when a man, probably a hereditary officer, of Bassein region, wished to reclaim, by constructing a dam, a land in a village of the region, which had been exposed to the sea-water and lain waste for many decades, and he petitioned to the Government for granting an exemption from rent, the last Peshwa assured him of the exemption for twenty-five years through the governor (Subhedār) of the region. At the end of this assurance-letter, the following words are stated, “If peasants of other areas are brought for the cultivation of the land, they will build their houses on the border of the village, chain up their cattle, and live. They shall be exempt from house-tax and forced labour. Rest assured, construct the dam, and undertake agriculture. This is assured”.

---

or neighbouring ones, local bureaucrats or hereditary officers of the place went to ‘other areas’, showed some favourable terms to the peasants thereof, and brought them back for the cultivation of waste lands and so forth. And those peasants who responded to the favourable terms and were thus brought to the new place would be usually uparis rather than mirāsdārs.

IV. Concluding Remarks

We may conclude our study as follows.

In the eighteenth century Marāṭhā Kingdom, the mode of cultivation of inām land was by no means uniform. Small inām land would be cultivated by its owner himself, while that of larger size was as a rule let out to tenants. The tenants would be usually upari peasants. The rent was paid either in kind or in cash. At any rate, the rent would normally amount to a half of gross produce. It may, however, be presumed that the proportion of inām-rent was gradually decreased in the second half of the eighteenth century as the cultivation of State land or waste land was promoted and expanded.

On the other hand, many of mirāsdārs seem to have let out their mirās lands to uparis by share-cropping arrangement, rent being probably two-thirds of gross produce, before the middle of the eighteenth century.

But since the reign of the third Peshwa, Government of Poona appears to have promoted the cultivation of State land in order to mitigate the financial difficulty on the fifty-fifty share-cropping basis. And after 1750 onward, the cultivation of waste lands and even rocky lands was encouraged on more favourable terms. The peasants who responded to such promotion and encouragement seem to have usually been uparis who had been tenants of ināms lands and more especially of mirās lands.

As a result, mirāsdār peasants would come to cultivate their mirās lands by themselves during the second half of the eighteenth century.

Hence, British administrators generally observed the mirāsdārs as landed cultivators and uparis as tenants of State lands or waste lands in the first decades of the nineteenth century.

At any rate it appears that some remarkable changes took place in the agrarian economy of the Marāṭhā Kingdom in the second half of the eighteenth century.

(March 15, 1965)