

Dhananjayrao Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-008274

Appendix A.

INDO-PERSIAN TERMS FOR LAND-REVENUE

VARIOUS expressions which occur in the literature of the Moslem period have been treated by translators as synonyms, and rendered as "land-revenue," or more shortly, "revenue," a word which, as used in India, is itself ambiguous. For the purpose of interpretation it is necessary to distinguish between some of these expressions, and to formulate a precise phraseology. The conclusions stated in this appendix are derived from a collection of all the relevant passages which I have found in the Indo-Persian literature recorded in the List of Authorities (Appendix I), from the thirteenth century *Tabaqāt-i Nāsiri*, down to the chronicle of *Khawāfi Khān*, which is nearly five centuries later.

For the present purpose it is advisable to discard the ambiguous word "revenue," and I use the following terms in the precise sense stated opposite to each.

✓ **PRODUCE.**—The gross yield of crops, whether stated by weight or by value.

DEMAND.—The amount or value of Produce claimed as the share of the State, whatever the system of assessment, and whoever the actual claimant.

INCOME.—The amount realised or expected from the Demand granted or assigned to an individual.

VALUATION.—An estimate of the probable future Income from any area, required in order to facilitate the allocation of Grants or Assignments to claimants entitled to a stated Income.

The expressions which require consideration are as follows:—

I. **KHARĀJ.** As explained in Chapter I, sec. 3, this is a precise term of Islamic law, denoting the tribute claimed from conquered land left in the possession of non-Moslems, and enuring for the benefit of Moslems in general. With the development of separate Moslem States, this latter incident came to be eliminated in practice, and *kharāj* was expended by the King who collected it from his dominions. The word gradually becomes less common in the literature, being replaced by other expressions noted below, but, almost wherever it is used, it is precise in

the sense of Demand; the only exceptions which have been noticed are a few rhetorical passages where the plural is used to signify exactions in a wide sense—"demands," not "Demand,"—and these are easily recognised.

2. MĀL. The general sense is "wealth," or "property," but in administrative use two special senses are found.

(a) In the military department, the word meant "booty taken in war."

(b) In fiscal administration, it ordinarily meant Demand; but occasionally it was used more widely to denote the whole system under which Demand was assessed and collected, as in the phrase *mulki wa māli*, which corresponds to the now familiar "general" and "revenue" administration.

The two special senses are sometimes difficult to distinguish. Thus in a passage in the Akbarnāma (iii. 316), Mr. Beveridge rendered "revenue," where I think "booty" would make better sense, because the officers whose morale was being destroyed by untimely claims for māl were not usually Demand-payers; the point is, I think, that they were being pressed to account for booty which they were alleged to have misappropriated. Ordinarily, however, there is no difficulty in discovering which sense is intended.

Māl is sometimes found in combination. Mālwājibi is a recognised term for Demand, and is not ambiguous. Mālguzār is usually adjectival, meaning "Demand-paying"; the modern use as a substantive, "Demand-payer," has not been noted in the literature earlier than Khwāfi Khān, where it appears (e.g. i. 704). Mālguzārī denotes the act, or process, of Demand-paying. I have not found it used in its modern sense of Demand in the Persian literature; but the sense occurs in one of the earliest British records (Rev. Sel., i. 169).

3. Next may be noted a group of expressions which are picturesque but also precise, denoting Demand, regarded as the King's remuneration. They are compounded of a word meaning wages, such as pāranj or dastmuzd, and another meaning sovereignty (as jahānbāni), or guardianship (as pāsbāni). They have been noticed only in sixteenth-century documents, e.g. Aīn, i. 298.

4. BĀZKHWĀST and BĀZYĀFT are occasionally used for the Demand on cultivation, but they belong properly to the Accounts side of the administration, and usually mean "recovery"; that

is, they may refer to any claim made by the State against an individual, whether it be for Demand, or for a debt, or for property misappropriated, or for the balance of an account. So far as I can find, the two words are synonymous.

5. **MUTĀLABA.** In the earlier literature this word denotes "the process of demanding." The modern use as "Demand" seems to occur first in the *Bādshāhnāma* (II. 365); it is well established in *Khawāfi Khān*.

6. **MAHSŪL.**—This word does not occur in any general sense, and its technical use is ambiguous. Ordinarily it means Demand, but in some cases it certainly denotes Produce, and, in a few, average-Produce. *Khawāfi Khān* sometimes distinguished the first two senses by writing *mahsul-i jinsī* for Produce, and *mahsūl-i māl* for Demand (*a.g.* i. 731, 734); but as a rule he, like the earlier writers, used the word by itself, and the context is the only guide to its interpretation.

The earliest writers usually meant Demand, and this sense prevails throughout the unofficial literature. A clear instance of "Produce" is *Ain*, i. 286, which refers to the *mahsūl* having been removed from the field; another is in *Aurangzeb's farmān* to *Muhammad Hāshim*, where (4, 14) the Demand is fixed at half the *mahsūl*; and there are a few cases elsewhere in which the word can be read as Produce, but they are not entirely free from ambiguity.

The special meaning of "average-Produce," occurs in *Ain*, i. 297 ff, and there is no doubt about it, because we have a formal definition, followed by numerical examples, showing how the average was calculated. The same sense is appropriate in one or two other passages in the *Ain*, but I think it must be regarded purely as office-jargon, and it would be dangerous to read it into the unofficial literature.

7. **HĀSIL**, which is etymologically related to *mahsūl*, has, like it, the two meanings of Demand and Produce; and the two words are sometimes used for the sake of variety of diction, as when *Jahāngir* wrote (*Tūzuk*, 252), that there is no *mahsūl* on fruit-trees, and that the *hāsil* is remitted when cultivated land is planted as a garden. Here the word obviously means Demand; equally clearly it means Produce in the phrase *hukm-i hāsil*, which *Ziyā Barnī* uses to denote assessment by Sharing.

The commonest use of the word is, however, to denote Income: in this use it is contrasted with Valuation, as in the passages

given below. It will be remembered that an officer's remuneration was usually fixed in cash. Sometimes the salary was paid by the treasury, but ordinarily it was adjusted by assignment of the Demand on a stated area. The Income actually received from an Assignment necessarily varied with the season and other causes; and did not necessarily agree with the Valuation, or estimate of Income, on the basis of which the Assignment had been allocated.

8. JAMA.—This word carries the general sense of "aggregation" or "total," and occurs in the literature both in this meaning and also in at least three specialised senses.

(a) In the Accounts department, it meant the receipt-side of a cash account, as contrasted with *kharch*, the expenditure-side.

(b), (c). In revenue administration, it may mean either Demand or Valuation according to the context; and the failure of translators to recognise this ambiguity probably accounts for most of the difficulty experienced by students in understanding the technical literature of the subject.

(b) *Demand*. Khwāfi Khān occasionally (e.g. i. 403, 714) wrote the full phrase, *jama-i māl*, or "aggregate of Demand," and wherever this phrase occurs, the sense of Demand is clear. This writer, however, also used *jama* alone, and some earlier writers followed the same practice; in such cases, the context is the only guide to the meaning. In some official documents, all of them referring to local administration, the sense of Demand is clear. The most noteworthy case is Aurangzeb's *farmān* to Rashik Dās, where *jama* is used consistently to denote the Demand on a peasant; and the same meaning is appropriate in Akbar's rules for collectors and their clerks (Aīn, i. 286-88), though in some of these passages the word need not mean more than "total." In the unofficial literature, the sense of Demand is exceedingly rare, and I have found no clear instance earlier than the eighteenth century; it is appropriate in one passage in Sāqī (345), and it occurs in Khwāfi Khān (e.g. i. 583, ii. 782) alongside of the alternative sense.

(c) *Valuation*. When used in connection with the headquarters administration, *jama* refers uniformly to the Valuation for Assignment; and, according to the context, may denote either the figure at which a particular area was valued, or the record of Valuation of the Empire as a whole. Apparently the

word in this sense is an abbreviation. Afif wrote (94) *jama-i mamlakat*, or "valuation of the kingdom"; in the *Akbarnāma* (ii. 270), we have *jama-i parganāt*, "valuation of the parganas"; in the *Ain* (i. 347), *jama-i wilāyat*, "valuation of the country"; and in the *Iqbāl-nāma* (ii. 287), *jama-i qasbāt wa qariyāt*, "valuation of the parganas and villages." In the course of the seventeenth century, these phrases, which I take to be equivalent, gave way to *jama-i dāmi*, "the valuation in dāms," which is common in *Khawāfi Khān*, and must refer to the fact that salaries continued to be stated in terms of dāms, though for other administrative purposes the rupee was the ordinary unit of value.

The first Valuation we meet in the literature is that which was sanctioned by Fīrūz. The passage relating to it is discussed in Appendix C; the passages relating to Akbar's general Valuations are examined in Appendix E; and here it will suffice to refer to two incidents of his reign which go far to establish the technical sense of the word.

(1) After the conquest of Gujarāt, Todar Mal made a hurried journey in order to effect the "ascertainment of the aggregate" (*tahqīq-i jama*) of the newly acquired territory (*Akbarnāma*, iii. 65-67). This operation is described in Mr. Beveridge's translation as a "settlement of the revenue," a technical phrase which nowadays denotes assessment of the Demand; but the circumstances and the context show that this was not the object of Todar Mal's visit. The country had just been distributed among assignees, whose business it was to establish the Mogul administration; and there was neither time nor scope for an assessment of the Demand throughout the provinces. The clear meaning of the passage is that Todar Mal made a summary Valuation of the Assignments which had recently been granted, and, on return to the capital, handed over the Valuation statement to the headquarter record-office, so that it could be used by the clerks in adjusting the accounts of the assignees.

This interpretation is placed beyond doubt by the parallel passages¹ in the *Tabaqāt-i Akbari*. The first of these tells us

¹ Add. 6543 ff., 229, 230. The rendering in Elliot, v. 370, "the revenues of Gujarāt had not been paid up satisfactorily," misses the point of the first passage. It was not a question of "paying up" the *jama*, but of a document reaching the headquarter record-office; under no conceivable circumstances could the record-office handle "revenues." The phrase "royal exchequer," again, does not accurately represent *daftar-khāna*.

that "since the jama-i mamālik of Gujarāt had not reached the headquarter record-office after ascertainment, Rāja Todar Mal was sent to Gujarāt to determine the jama-i wilāyat accurately, and to make over the amended schedule to the record-office." The second records that the Rāja, "who had gone to Gujarāt to correct the jama-i wilāyat, returned to Court, and [after compliments] presented the amended record relating to the jama of Gujarāt." We may infer that the provincial administration had been instructed to ascertain the true Valuation, but had failed to do so; consequently, the Rāja was deputed to effect the business. It will be noticed that this writer speaks first of the "aggregate of the provinces," then of the "aggregate of the country," and then of the "aggregate of Gujarāt," the three phrases being obviously synonymous.

(2) Again, the Akbarnāma (iii. 726 ff) attributes the peasants' rebellion in Kashmīr shortly after its annexation to the oppression exercised by the new assignees, who (besides other mistakes) had foolishly demanded the full jama. Here jama cannot mean Demand, because to demand the Demand would be neither folly nor oppression. The point is that the original Valuation on which the Assignments were granted was excessive; and the attempts of the assignees to realise their full expected Income, without consideration of the actual position, drove the peasants into rebellion. That this is the true reading is clear from the action taken by the Emperor. First, in order to deal with the actual emergency, he limited the assignees' Income to one-half of the Produce, in accordance with the local standard of Demand, and ordered them to refund to the peasants whatever they had collected in excess of this amount; next, in order to provide for the future (Iqbāl-nāma, ii. 453), he ordered the preparation of a new Valuation, which should be in accordance with the facts, and would thus prevent the recurrence of similar trouble.

The sense "Valuation" persists in the literature of the seventeenth century. Thus the Bādshāhnāma records (II. 360), that when the Chief of Pālāmau was, after some trouble, brought into the Empire, a jama of one kror of dāms was fixed on his country, which was then assigned to him at this figure. Here jama cannot possibly mean the Demand on the peasants: the transaction was, I take it, purely formal, in the sense that there was no question of any money being received or paid. All

that was done was to fix an arbitrary Valuation, and allow the Chief to retain his actual position, but in point of form as an assignee instead of an independent ruler.

The contrast between the Valuation, or estimated Income, and the Hāsil, or Income actually realised, is brought out in a passage in the same chronicle (II. 397), which records the grant as reward (inām) of the port of Surat, the Valuation of which was one kror of dāms, or 2½ lakhs of rupees, but the Income (hāsil) had risen to 5 lakhs owing to the increase in foreign trade. Similarly we read (II. 108) that the Income of Baglāna had fallen to one-half of the Valuation after the famine of 1630; and numerous passages in this chronicle and in those which follow it give the Valuation of districts or provinces as an indication of their wealth or importance.

As is explained in Chapter V, Assignments had become unpopular early in the eighteenth century, and, in the troubles of the time, the idea of a Valuation seems to have become unfamiliar. The changes introduced early in the British period, under which the Demand was assessed for a term of years, resulted in a coalescence of the two ideas denoted by jama, because a Demand intended to be paid for a term of years is substantially the same thing as an estimate of the Income derivable during those years. Thus in modern times, the "revenue" is both Demand and Valuation, because the two figures have coalesced; but the idea of Valuation still persists in the "nominal revenue," which is assessed for administrative purposes on revenue-free villages. This nominal revenue is not meant to be paid, and consequently is not Demand; it is in fact a Valuation calculated on the income of the landholders, on the basis of which various cesses are assessed.

Appendix B.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNORS IN THE THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES.¹

THE words "Province" and "Governor" are used in Chapter II to represent two groups of terms, which I take to be either precisely synonymous, or else distinguished only by minor differences, of no practical importance for our present purpose. The first group is *wilāyat*, *wālī*. The word *wilāyat* is used in the chronicles in various senses, which can almost always be recognised with certainty from the context: it may mean (1) a definite portion of the kingdom, that is, a province; (2) an indefinite portion of the kingdom, that is, a tract or region; (3) the kingdom as a whole; (4) a foreign country; (5) the home-country of a foreigner (in which last sense a derived form has recently become naturalised in English as "Blighty"). *Wālī* occasionally means the ruler of a foreign country, but the ordinary sense is Governor of a province of the kingdom, that is to say, a localised officer serving directly under the orders of the King or his Ministers.

So far as I know, it has never been suggested that the *Wālī* held anything but a bureaucratic position at this period, and the word Governor represents it precisely, as is the case throughout the history of Western Asia. The position is different in regard to the second group of terms, *iqṭā*, *muḳṭī* (more precisely, *iqṭā'*, *muḳṭī'*). Various translators in the nineteenth century rendered these terms by phrases appropriated from the feudal system of Europe; their practice has been followed by some recent writers, in whose pages we meet "fiefs," "feudal chiefs," and such entities; and the ordinary reader is forced to conclude that the organisation of the kingdom of Delhi was heterogeneous, with some provinces ruled by bureaucratic Governors (*Wālī*), but most of the country held in portions (*iqṭā*) by persons (*Mūḳṭī*), whose position resembled that of the barons of contemporary Europe. It is necessary, therefore to examine the question whether these expressions represent the facts, or, in

¹ The substance of this Appendix was printed in the *Journal of Indian History*, April, 1928.

other words, whether the kingdom contained any element to which the nomenclature of the feudal system can properly be applied. The question is one of fact. The nature of the European feudal system is tolerably well known to students: the position of the Muqtis in the Delhi kingdom can be ascertained from the chronicles; and comparison will show whether the use of these archaic terms brings light or confusion into the agrarian history of Northern India.

The ordinary meaning of Iqtā in Indo-Persian literature is an Assignment of revenue conditional on future service. The word appears in this sense frequently in the Mogul period as a synonym (along with tuyūl) of the more familiar jāgīr; and that it might carry the same sense in the thirteenth century is established, among several passages, by the story told by Barnī (60, 61) of the 2000 troopers who held Assignments, but evaded the services on which the Assignments were conditional. The villages held by these men are described as their iqtās, and the men themselves as iqtādārs. At this period, however, the word iqtā was used commonly in a more restricted sense, as in the phrase "the twenty iqtās," used by Barnī (50) to denote the bulk of the kingdom. It is obvious that "the twenty iqtās" points to something of a different order from the 2000 iqtās in the passage just quoted; and all through the chronicles, we find particular iqtās referred to as administrative charges, and not mere Assignments. The distinction between the two senses is marked most clearly by the use of the derivative nouns of possession; at this period, iqtādār always means an assignee in the ordinary sense, but Muqti always means the holder of one of these charges. The question then is, was the Muqti's position feudal or bureaucratic?

To begin with, we may consider the origin of the nobility from whom the Muqtis were chosen. The earliest chronicler gives us the biographies¹ of all the chief nobles of his time, and we find from them that in the middle of the thirteenth century practically every man who is recorded as having held the position of Muqti began his career as a royal slave. Shamsuddin Iltutmish, the second effective king of Delhi, who had himself been the property of the first king, bought foreign slaves in great numbers, employed them in his household, and promoted them, according to his judgment of their capacities, to the highest

¹ T. Nāsiri, book xxii., p. 229 ff. I follow the Cambridge History in using the form Iltutmish for the name usually written Altamsh.

positions in his kingdom. The following are a few sample biographies condensed from this chronicle.

Taghān Khān (p. 242) was purchased by Shamsuddīn, and employed in succession as page, keeper of the pen-case,¹ food-taster, master of the stable, Muqti of Badāūn, and Muqti of Lakhnautī, where the insignia of royalty were eventually conferred on him.

Saifuddīn Aibak (p. 259) was purchased by the king, and employed successively as keeper of the wardrobe, sword-bearer, Muqti of Samāna, Muqti of Baran, and finally Vakīl-i dar, apparently, at this period, the highest ceremonial post at Court.²

Tughril Khān (p. 261) also a slave, was successively deputy-taster, court-usher, master of the elephants, master of the stable, Muqti of Sirhind, and later of Lahore, Kanauj, and Awadh in succession; finally he received Lakhnautī, where he assumed the title of king.

Ulugh Khān (p. 281), afterwards King Balban, is said to have belonged to a noble family in Turkistan,³ but was enslaved in circumstances which are not recorded. He was taken for sale to Baghdad, and thence to Gujarāt, from where a dealer brought him to Delhi, and sold him to the King. He was employed first as personal attendant, then as master of sport, then master of the stable, then Muqti of Hānsī, then Lord Chamberlain, and subsequently became, first, deputy-King of Delhi, and then King in his own right.

It seems to me to be quite impossible to think of such a nobility in terms of a feudal system with a king merely first among his territorial vassals: what we see is a royal household full of slaves, who could rise, by merit or favour, from servile duties to the charge of a province, or even of a kingdom—essentially a bureaucracy of the normal Asiatic type. The same conclusion follows from an examination of the Muqti's actual position: it is nowhere, so far as I know, described in set terms, but the incidents recorded in the chronicles justify the following summary.

I. A Muqti had no territorial position of his own, and no claim to any particular region: he was appointed by the King,

¹ *Dawāt-dār*. The dictionary-meaning of "Secretary of State" does not seem to be appropriate here, for we are told that on one occasion Taghān Khān was sharply punished for losing the king's jewelled pen-case, and I take the phrase to denote the official responsible for the care of the king's writing materials. In later times the Chief *Dawātdār* was a high officer.

² The exact status of the *vakīl-i dar* at this period is a rather complex question, but its discussion is not necessary for the present purpose.

³ The chronicler is so fulsome in his praise of Balban, under whom he was writing, that this statement may be merely a piece of flattery, but there is nothing intrinsically improbable in it, having regard to the circumstances of the time. Writing in the next century, Ibn Batūta recorded (iii. 171) a much less complimentary tradition; it is unnecessary for me to enquire which account is true, because both are in agreement on the essential point, that Balban was brought to India as a slave.

who could remove him, or transfer him to another charge, at any time. The passages proving this statement are too numerous to quote: one cannot usually read ten pages or so without finding instances of this exercise of the royal authority. The biographies already summarised suffice to show that in the thirteenth century a Muqti had no necessary connection with any particular locality; he might be posted anywhere from Lahore to Lakhnauti at the King's discretion. Similarly, to take one example from the next century, Barni (427 ff.) tells how Ghiyās-uddīn Tughlaq, on his accession, allotted the iqtās among his relatives and adherents, men who had no previous territorial connection with the places where they were posted, but who were apparently chosen for their administrative capacity. Such arrangements are the antithesis of anything which can properly be described as a feudal system.

2. The Muqti was essentially administrator of the charge to which he was posted. This fact will be obvious to any careful reader of the chronicles, and many examples could be given, but the two following are perhaps sufficient. Barni (p. 96) tells at some length how Balban placed his son Bughrā Khān on the throne of Bengal, and records the advice which he gave on the occasion. Knowing his son to be slack and lazy, he insisted specially on the need for active vigilance if a king was to keep his throne, and in this connection he drew a distinction between the position of King (*iqtimdārī*) and that of Governor (*wilāyatdārī*); a King's mistakes were, he argued, apt to be irretrievable, and fatal to his family, while a Muqti who was negligent or inefficient in his governorship (*wilāyatdārī*), though he was liable to fine or dismissal, need not fear for his life or his family, and could still hope to return to favour. The essential function of a Muqti was thus governorship, and he was liable to fine or dismissal if he failed in his duties.

As an instance from the next century, we may take the story told by Afif (414), how a noble named Ainulmulk, who was employed in the Revenue Ministry, quarrelled with the Minister, and was in consequence dismissed. The King then offered him the post of Muqti of Multān, saying, "Go to that province (iqtā), and occupy yourself in the duties (*kārḥā wa kardārḥā*) of that place." Ainulmulk replied: "When I undertake the administration (*amāl*) in the iqtā, and perform the duties of that place, it will be impossible for me to submit the accounts to the Revenue

Ministry; I will submit them to the Throne." On this, the King excluded the affairs of Multān from the Revenue Ministry, and Ainulmulk duly took up the appointment. The language of the passage shows the position of a Muqti as purely administrative.

3. It was the Muqti's duty to maintain a body of troops available at any time for the King's service. The status of these troops can best be seen from the orders which Ghiyāsuddīn Tughlaq issued¹ to the nobles "to whom he gave iqtās and wilāyāts." "Do not," he said, "covet the smallest fraction of the pay of the troops. Whether you give or do not give them a little of your own rests with you to decide; but if you expect a small portion of what is deducted in the name of the troops, then the title of noble ought not to be applied to you; and the noble who consumes any portion of the pay of servants had better consume dust." This passage makes it clear that the strength and pay of the Muqti's troops were fixed by the King, who provided the cost; the Muqti could, if he chose, increase their pay out of his own pocket, but that was the limit of his discretionary power in regard to them.

4. The Muqti had to collect the revenue due from his charge, and, after defraying sanctioned expenditure, such as the pay of the troops, to remit the surplus to the King's treasury at the capital. To take one instance (Barnī, 220 ff.), when Alāuddīn Khaljī (before his accession) was Muqti of Karra and Awadh, and was planning his incursion into the Deccan, he applied for a postponement of the demand for the surplus-revenue of his provinces, so that he could employ the money in raising additional troops; and promised that, when he returned, he would pay the postponed surplus-revenue, along with the booty, into the King's treasury.

5. The Muqti's financial transactions in regard to both receipts and expenditure were audited by the officials of the Revenue Ministry, and any balance found to be due from him was recovered by processes which, under some kings, were remarkably severe. The orders of Ghiyāsuddīn Tughlaq, quoted above, indicate that under his predecessors holders of iqtās and wilāyāts had been greatly harassed in the course of these processes, and he directed that they were not to be treated like minor officials in this matter. Severity seems to have been re-established in the reign of his son Muhammad, for Barnī

¹ Barnī, 431. For a full translation of the passage, see Appendix C.

insists (pp. 556, 574) on the contrast furnished by the wise and lenient administration of Firūz, under whom "no Wāli or Muqti" came to ruin from this cause. The processes of audit and recovery thus varied in point of severity, but they were throughout a normal feature of the administration.

This statement of the Muqti's position indicates on the face of it a purely bureaucratic organisation. We have officers posted to their charges by the King, and transferred, removed, or punished, at his pleasure, administering their charges under his orders, and subjected to the strict financial control of the Revenue Ministry. None of these features has any counterpart in the feudal system of Europe; and, as a student of European history to whom I showed the foregoing summary observed, the analogy is not with the feudal organisation, but with the bureaucracies which rulers like Henry II of England attempted to set up as an alternative to feudalism. The use of feudal terminology was presumably inspired by the fact that some of the nobles of the Delhi kingdom occasionally behaved like feudal barons, that is to say, they rebelled, or took sides in disputed successions to the throne; but, in Asia at least, bureaucrats can rebel as well as barons, and the analogy is much too slight and superficial to justify the importation of feudal terms and all the misleading ideas which they connote. The kingdom was not a mixture of bureaucracy with feudalism: its administration was bureaucratic throughout.

The question remains whether there were differences in status or functions between the Wāli and the Muqti. The chronicles mention a Wāli so rarely that it is impossible to prepare from them a statement similar to what has been offered for the Muqti. The constantly recurring double phrases, wālis and muqtis, or iqtās and wilāyats, show that the two institutions were, at any rate, of the same general nature, but they cannot be pressed so far as to exclude the possibility of differences in detail. A recent writer has stated that the difference was one of distance from the capital,¹ the nearer provinces being iqtās and the remote ones

¹ Qanungo's *Sher Shah*, p. 349, 350. Barni, however, applies the term wilāyat to provinces near Delhi such as Baran (p. 58), Amroha (p. 58), or Samāna (p. 483); while Multān (p. 584) and Marhat, or the Marātha country (p. 390) are described as iqtā. Some of the distant provinces had apparently a different status in parts of the fourteenth century, being under a Minister (Vazir) instead of a Governor (Barni, 379, 397, 454, &c.), but they cannot be distinguished either as wilāyats or as iqtās.

wilāyats; but this view is not borne out by detailed analysis of the language of the chronicles. Looking at the words themselves, it is clear that Wālī is the correct Islamic term for a bureaucratic Governor; it was used in this sense by Abū Yūsuf (*e.g.* pp. 161, 163) in Baghdad, in the eighth century, and it is still familiar in the same sense in Turkey at the present day. I have not traced the terms Iqtā or Muqti in the early Islamic literature to which I have access through translations, but taking the sense of Assignment in which the former persisted in India, we may fairly infer that the application of iqtā to a province meant originally that the province was assigned, that is to say, that the Governor was under obligation to maintain a body of troops for the king's service. It is possible then that, at some period, the distinction between Wālī and Muqti may have lain in the fact that the former had not to maintain troops, while the latter had; but, if this was the original difference, it had become obsolete, at any rate, by the time of Ghiyāsuddin Tughlaq, whose orders regarding the troops applied equally to both classes, to "the nobles to whom he gave iqtās and wilāyats."

The chronicles indicate no other possible distinction between Wālī and Muqti, and the fact that we occasionally read¹ of the Muqti of a Wilāyat suggests that the terms were, at least practically, synonymous. The possibility is not excluded that there were minor differences in position, for instance, in regard to the accounts procedure of the Revenue Ministry, but these would not be significant from the point of view of agrarian administration. In my opinion, then, we are justified in rejecting absolutely the view that the kingdom of Delhi contained any element to which the terminology of the feudal system can properly be applied. Apart from the regions directly under the Revenue Ministry, the entire kingdom was divided into provinces administered by bureaucratic Governors; possibly there may have been differences in the relations between these Governors and the Ministry, but, so far as concerns the agrarian administration of a province, it is safe to treat Wālī and Muqti as practically, if not absolutely, synonymous.

It may be added that the latter term did not survive for long. In the Tārikh-i Mubārakshāhī, written about the middle of the fifteenth century, the title is preserved in summaries of earlier

¹ For instance, T. Nāsiri; Muqti of the Wilāyat of Awadh (246, 247); Muqti of the Wilāyat of Sarsuti (p. 256). As has been said above, Barnī (96) describes the duties of a Muqti by the term Wilāyatdār.

chronicles, but in dealing with his own times the writer consistently uses the term Amīr. This term had already been used by Ibn Batūta a century earlier; he speaks of Indian Governors sometimes as Wālī, sometimes as Amīr, but never, so far as I can find, as Muqti; and possibly Amīr was already coming into popular use in his time. Nizāmuddīn Ahmad, writing under Akbar, usually substituted Hākīm, as is apparent from a comparison of his language with that of Barnī, whom he summarised; Firishta occasionally reproduced the word Muqti, but more commonly used Hākīm, Sipahsālār, or some other modern equivalent; and Muqti was clearly an archaism in the time of Akbar.

Appendix C.

SOME -FOURTEENTH-CENTURY PASSAGES

SOME of the most important passages bearing on the agrarian system of the fourteenth century are difficult to follow, and extant translations, where any exist, are not always exact. The renderings of these passages offered below are meant to be strictly literal, any departure from the original being indicated by brackets; the technical expressions are discussed in the notes which follow the translations. The clauses are set out, punctuated, and numbered for convenience of reference; the texts are continuous, and as a rule are not punctuated.

I. ALĀUDDĪN'S REVENUE DECREE.

(Text, Barnī, 287. Translations, Elliot, iii. 182, and J.A.S.B. vol. xxxix. p. 382, the last with Blochmann's notes).

1. Sultān Alāuddīn demanded from learned men rules and regulations, so that the Hindu(1) should be ground down,
2. and property and possessions, which are the cause of disaffection and rebellion, should not remain in his house;
3. and in the payment of the Demand one rule should be made for all alike from Chief to sweeper(2);
4. and the Demand on the strong should not fall on the weak;
5. and so much should not remain to the Hindu(1) that they should ride on horseback, and carry weapons, and wear fine clothes, and enjoy themselves;
6. and to make two regulations(3) in pursuance of the aforesaid object, which is the chief of all objects of government.
7. The first [regulation],—that those who cultivate, whether small or great, shall cultivate according to the rule of measurement and the biswa-yield(4),
8. and shall pay half without any deduction;
9. and in this paying there should be no distinction between Chiefs and sweepers(2);
10. and not a jot should be left to the Chiefs by way of Chiefs' perquisites(5).

(The text goes on to the second regulation, imposing a tax on grazing.)

NOTES.

(1) "Hindu." As explained in Chapter II, Barni uses this word in a narrow sense, to denote the classes above the ordinary peasants, so that in fact it is almost a synonym for Chiefs and headmen in this context.

(2) "From Chief to sweeper." As *khūṭa wa balāhar*. Balāhar is not a Persian word, and it is quite safe to follow Blochmann in identifying it with the common Hindi name for a low-caste menial, employed in the village as a general drudge. In the Upper Doāb, which was Barni's country, the balāhar is almost always a sweeper by caste,¹ and, since the word is obviously used to denote the lowest rank of the rural population, the rendering "sweeper" probably gives what was in the writer's mind; there is no actual English equivalent.

The word transliterated provisionally as khūṭa has not been found elsewhere in the literature, and has to be interpreted from the parallel passages, which are fairly numerous in Barni. It appears indifferently as khūt and khūṭa, and these cannot be distinguished. The antithesis to balāhar indicates that the khūt must be looked for among the rural aristocracy, and all the passages confirm this. Khūt is commonly coupled with the headman or muqaddam (e.g. 288, 291, 324, 430, 479, 554), while in two passages (288) he is linked with the chaudhri, or pargana headman, as well as with the muqaddam; and his perquisites were on the same footing (430) as those of the muqaddam.

Barni does not use the word zamīndār for a Chief (subject to the King) until nearly the end of his book (539, 589), and it never appears in his discussions of agrarian policy; we find khūt wherever we should expect to find zamīndār, and the only reasonable interpretation is that the latter word was coming into use during his lifetime, and gradually superseding khūt, so that the two are in fact synonymous. If we read zamīndār in every passage where khūt occurs, we get perfectly good sense; if they are not synonyms, then we must hold that the important class of khūts, as known to Barni, had become absolutely extinct when the next chronicler wrote, and that the equally important class of zamīndārs had mysteriously come into existence, a hypothesis as unreasonable as unnecessary.

The identity of the word khūt is doubtful. Blochmann took it as the rare Arabic word, rendered by Steingass as "a limber twig; a corpulent man, yet handsome and active," but did not indicate how such a word could come to denote a Chief. The MSS. I have seen do not show the vowels, and it is possible that the pronunciation was different, and that we are dealing with a word formed independently in India; but, whatever be the origin of the word, its meaning in Barni is clearly that of Chief. Blochmann arrived by analysis at the correct result, that the phrase indicates the extremes of rural society, but the rendering "landowners and tenants" which he endorsed involves both a logical non-sequitur and an historical anachronism.

The suggestion has been made that the word under discussion is really Indian in origin, being identical with the Marāṭhī word *khōt*, which is familiar in the Konkān; but the fact that Barni wrote the word with two Arabic letters (*kh* and *t*) makes its derivation from any sanskrit language highly improbable. The word *khōt* has not been traced further back than

¹ For the balāhar's position, see Rev. Sel., ii. 97.

the sixteenth century kingdom of Bijapur, and a possible explanation of it is that the Arabic *khūt* passed into the Deccan at the time of Alāuddīn's conquest, and became naturalised there as *khōt*. That there were *khōts* in Gujarāt also, before the Mogul conquest, appears from a document published by Professor Hodivala (*Studies in Parsi History*, p. 204), but their position is not explained; it is possible that the Arabic word, which quickly became obsolete in the North, survived in Gujarāt, as in the Konkān, in an Indianised form, but more documentary evidence is necessary on this point.

(3) This clause is ungrammatical as it stands. It would be easy to read *āwardand* for *āwardan*, putting a full stop at the end of clause 5. The translation would then be: "And two regulations were made in pursuance of the aforesaid object," which makes grammar and sense. Barnī's grammar, however, is not immaculate, and the text may show what he actually wrote.

(4) "The rule of Measurement and the biswa-yield," *hukm-i masāhat wa wafā-i biswa*.

Barnī mentions two "hukms" or rules for assessment, *Masāhat* and *Hāsil*, i.e. "measurement" and "produce"; he does not describe the methods, but the passage which follows will make it clear that *Masāhat* involved allowances for crop-failure, which were not required in *Hāsil*. Unless we take these two terms to denote methods which have become entirely forgotten, we must identify them with the two which I have called Measurement and Sharing, which, as we have seen, were equally familiar to Hindus and Moslems at this period, which reappear, though with different names, in the sixteenth century, and which persisted into the nineteenth. The word *Masāhat* gives place to *jarīb* or *paimāish* in the official records of the Mogul period, but it seems to have survived in local use, for as late as 1832 the "native measuring staff" was known as the "masahut establishment" (*Rev. Sel.*, ii. 378). *Hāsil* can be read quite naturally as denoting the process of Sharing the produce, and, so far as I can see, it can carry no other suggestion.

The phrase "*wafā-i biswā*" does not occur except in Barnī, and can be read here merely as a repetition or duplication of what precedes it, "reliance on the unit of area," "*biswa*" denoting the smaller unit, 1/20th of the *bigha*. Passages in the next two chronicles, however, indicate that the word *wafā* had acquired the technical meaning of "yield of crops," and this is probably the meaning here; "*biswa-yield*" would then indicate the standard outturn per unit of area, which was a necessary datum for the method of Measurement. The decisive passage is in T. Mubārak-shāhī (Or. 5318, f. 34r.), where, in a description of the oppression in the River Country under Muhammad Tughlaq, we read *kisht-hā mī-paimūdand wa wafā-hā farmānī mī-bastand*; "they used to measure the fields and fix the yields by ordinance." Here it does not seem possible to take *wafāhā* in any other sense. The same sense is required in Afif, 180, where the word occurs twice; and taking these examples into account, it is permissible to infer that Barnī also was familiar with this technical use of the word. I have not found this use in the Mogul period, and presumably it became obsolete.

(5) "Chiefs' perquisites"; *huqūq-i khātān*. It can be inferred from the passage which follows that these perquisites consisted of exemption from revenue of a proportion of land, allowed to the Chiefs in return for the services they rendered; Ghiyāsuddīn considered that they should be satisfied with this allowance, so its amount must have been substantial, but there is no record of the extent of land allowed. The same passage shows that the Chiefs were suspected of levying revenue for themselves from the peasants: this is probably the implication of clause 4, that the peasants were in fact paying revenue which ought to fall on the Chiefs or headmen.

II. GHIYĀSUDDĪN'S AGRARIAN POLICY.

(Text, Barni, 429, checked by Or. 2039. Translation, J.A.S.B., vol. xl. p. 229. The translation in Elliot, iii. 230, is very incomplete.)

I applied to Mr. R. Paget Dewhurst for help with this exceedingly crabbed passage, and he generously furnished me with the following translation. The notes marked [D] are also his; the others are mine.

1. He fixed the revenue of the territories of the kingdom equitably according to the "rule of the produce"(1),

2. and relieved the peasants of the territories and the kingdom from innovations and apportionments based on crop-failure(2);

3. and with regard to the provinces and country of the kingdom he did not listen to the tales of spies and the speeches of enhancement-mongers(3) and the bids (literally, acceptances) of revenue-farmers.

4. He also ordered that spies and enhancement-mongers and revenue-farmers and land-wreckers should not be allowed to hang (literally, wander) round the office of the Ministry.

5. and he instructed the office of the Ministry not to make an increase of more than one-tenth or one-eleventh on the provinces and country on surmise and guess-work or on the reports of spies and the representations of enhancement-mongers,

6. and that efforts should be made that cultivation should increase every year and the revenue be enhanced very gradually,

7. and not in such a way that the country should be ruined all at once by heavy pressure and the path of increase closed.

8. Sultān Tughlaq Shāh frequently remarked that the revenue should be taken from the country in such a way that the peasants of the country should extend cultivation,

9. and the established cultivation become settled, and every year a small increase should take place.

10. He used to say that you ought not to take all at once so much that neither the established cultivation should be maintained nor any extension be made in the future.

11. When kingdoms are obviously ruined (literally, are ruined and show themselves ruined) it is due to the oppressiveness of the revenue and the excessive royal demand,

12. and ruin proceeds from destructive Muqtis and officials.

13. Also with regard to the exaction of revenue from the peasants Sultān Tughlaq Shāh used to give instructions to all the Muqtis and governors of the territories of the kingdom,

14. that the Hindu should be kept in such a condition that he should not become blinded and rebellious and refractory from excessive affluence,

15. and that he should not be compelled by poverty and destitution to abandon cultivation and tillage.

16. The observing of the standards and principles mentioned in collecting the revenue can be carried out by typically eminent statesmen and experts,

17. and the essence of the art of statesmanship in regard to Hindus(4) is the fulfilment of the aforesaid instruction.

18. Further in regard to the collection of revenue it is related of Sultān Ghiyāsuddin Tughlaq Shāh, who was a very experienced, far-sighted, and prudent sovereign,

19. that he urged on the Muqtis and governors investigation and consistency in the collection of revenue,

20. so that Chiefs and headmen should not impose a separate assessment on the peasants apart from the king's revenue;

21. and if their own cultivation and pasturage be not brought under assessment, perhaps their perquisites as Chiefs and headmen, on the supposition that they pay nothing on this, may suffice them and they may make no additional demand.

22. It cannot be denied that abundant responsibilities rest on the neck of Chiefs and headmen, so that if they too contribute a share in the same way as the peasants, the advantage of being Chief or headman would disappear.

23. And as for those among the amirs and maliks (5)whom Sultān Ghiyāsuddin advanced, and to whom he gave iqtās and provinces,

24. he used not to hold it permissible that they should be brought before the Ministry just like (ordinary) officials(6)

and that the revenue should be demanded from them as from officials with rudeness and severity,

25. but he used to give instructions to them saying,

26. "If you wish to be exempt from the burden of being summoned before the office of the Ministry and that you should not be exposed to pressure and discourtesy,

27. and that your credit as an amīr or malik should not be changed to humiliation and discredit,

28. make slender demands on your iqtās,

29. and reserve out of that slender demand something for your own agents,

30. and do not covet the smallest fraction of the pay of the troops.

31. Whether you give or do not give a little of your own to the troops rests with you to decide.

32. But if you expect a small portion of what is deducted in the name of the troops,

33. then the name of amīr and malik ought not to be employed by the tongue in respect of you,

34. and the amīr who devours a portion of the pay of servants had better consume dust.

35. But if maliks and amīrs expect from their own country and provinces a half-tenth or half-eleventh and the one-tenth or one-fifteenth of the revenue,

36. and take the perquisites of iqtā-holding and governors,

37. no occasion has arisen to forbid this to them, and to demand it back and to exact it by pressure on the amīrs would be altogether deplorable.

38. Similarly if the agents and deputies(7) of the country and provinces should appropriate a half or one per cent. in addition to their salary,

39. they ought not to be disgraced for this amount, and it ought not to be recovered from them by beating and torture and imprisonment and fetters.

40. But if they appropriate considerable sums(8) and write off deductions from the revenue demand, and carry off large sums by way of mutual sharing from the provinces and country,

41. such treacherous persons and thieves should be given disgrace and humiliation with beating and torture and imprisonment and fetters, and what they have abstracted should be taken from them together with their family stock."

TEXT-NOTES.

- Cl. 3. "Bids." Paz raftanîhâ in text is clearly a blunder for paz-fruftanîhâ [D].
4. "Land-wreckers," reading mukharribân for muhazzibân. Or. 2039 can be so read.
7. "not in such a way," reading na for tâ, as Or. 2039.
26. "If you wish," reading khwâhed for khwâhad, as Or. 2039.
- "not to be exposed," reading nayuftad for biyuftad, as Or. 2039.
38. "should appropriate," reading iṣâbat for iṣâyat, as Or. 2039.

NOTES.

(1) "Rule of the produce," *kuhm-i hâṣil*. See note 3 to the preceding passage.

(2) "Crop-failure," *bûd wa nâbûd-hâ*. The technical force of this phrase, literally "existence and non-existences," is fixed by Akbar's assessment rules (Ain, i. 288), in which the clerk is directed to deduct the nâbûd and record the bûd, that is, to exclude from the measured area the area on which the crop had failed. Presumably the word apportionments, *qismât*, refers to the process of classifying the area of failure. The word "nabood" survived into the nineteenth century in the wider sense of a deduction from the gross assessment (*Rev. Sel.*, i. 305).

(3) "Enhancement-mongers," *muwaffirân*. This word, which is not in the dictionaries, may safely be referred to the technical sense of taufir as any secret profit derived from land. In a later passage (574), Barni uses the equivalent taufir-numâyân, *i.e.* discloser of secret profit. It is clearly a bit of office jargon, and Mr. Dewhurst adopted the expression "enhancement-monger," which I coined as a rough equivalent.

(4) "Hindu" in this passage has obviously the same restricted meaning as in that which precedes it.

(5) "Amirs and maliks." At this time there were three recognised titles of nobility, Khân, Amir, and Malik; here the words are best read loosely as denoting "nobles."

(6) "Officials," *âmilân*, *ummâl*. The word âmil had not yet been specialised to denote a definite post, but meant any executive official.

(7) "Agents and deputies," *hârkumân wa mutasarrifân*. Kârkun is etymologically an agent. I am not clear whether by this time it had become specialised as "clerk," the meaning it usually bears in the sixteenth century; some passages can be read in this way, but others are doubtful, and perhaps specialisation was in progress, but was not complete. I have found no passage to indicate whether or not mutasarrif denoted a particular post; the word occurs in connection with the local bureaucracy, and may mean either subordinates in general, or a particular class of subordinates.

(8) "Considerable sums," *mu'tadd-hâ*. I take this to mean "a considerable sum," literally "a thing counted," and hence "a thing worth counting." [D.]

The words iqtâ and Muqti, which are preserved in the translation, have been discussed in Appendix B. Their preservation is intended to bring out the force of the recurring duplications.

III. FĪRŪZ SHĀH'S SECOND REGULATION.

(Text, Barni, 574; no published translation has come to my notice. The chapter containing this Regulation, along with several others, is highly eulogistic and rhetorical, and too great weight must not be given to all the assertions which it contains, but there is no reason to distrust the account of the general policy adopted by Fīrūz).

1. *Second regulation.* It was ordered that the revenue-Demand and the poll-tax(1) shall be collected according to the "rule of the produce";

2. and "apportionments," and "increase of demands," and "crop-failures," and "large demands based on surmise," were entirely removed from among the peasants(2);

3. and revenue-farmers and land-wreckers and enhancement-mongers(3) were not allowed to infest the provinces and the kingdom.

4. And a reduction was made in the *mahsūl-i mu'malāt*(4), so that the peasants may pay willingly without difficulty or severity;

(5) and no roughness or violence was used towards the cultivators, who are the keepers of the treasury(5) of Moslems.

NOTES.

(1) The reference to the poll-tax, *jīziya*, is puzzling. According to Aff (383), this tax in Delhi was a fixed sum per head payable in cash. It is possible that, in the case of peasants, it may have been assessed along with the revenue, and varied with it; but it is equally possible that the phrase is loose, "revenue and poll-tax" being used to describe the liabilities of non-Moslem subjects in general terms.

(2) This clause must be read as enumerating the familiar exactions on the peasants. Apportionments, *qisṣat*, and crop-failures, *nabūdhā*, occur in the preceding passage. *Mu'taddhā* is there taken as exactions of considerable amount, and the addition here of *ta'sammari* must mean that these exactions were arbitrary, "based on surmise."

(3) This clause also is an echo of part of the previous passage, referring to the various pests that appeared naturally in connection with the revenue-assessment.

(4) *Mahsūl-i mu'malāt*. I have not found any parallel passage to indicate the meaning of this phrase. From the context, it appears to denote some impost on the peasants, different from the *kharāj* or revenue, but its nature is a matter for conjecture.

(5) Treasury, *bait-ul-māl*. This is a precise phrase of Islamic law, denoting the receptacle for *kharāj* and other sources of income which were in theory for the benefit of Moslems in general, though by this time in India they were in fact part of the revenue of the State.

IV. FIRŪZ SHĀH'S ASSESSMENT.

(Text, Afif, 94. I have found no translation; only one sentence is given in Elliot, iii. 288.)

1. The king . . . settled the Demand(1) of the kingdom afresh. And for the settlement of that Demand Khwāja Hisā-muddīn Junīd was appointed.

2. The excellent Khwāja, having spent six years in the kingdom,

3. [and] having settled the Demand according to the "rule of inspection,"(2)

4. determined the "aggregate"(3) of the kingdom at 675 lakhs of tankas in accordance with the principle of sovereignty.

5. During forty years during the reign of Firūz Shāh the "aggregate" of Delhi was the same.

NOTES.

(1) "Demand," *mahṣūl*. Afif occasionally uses this word in the sense of revenue Demand, that is, as a synonym for *hharāj*, never, so far as I can find, in the other sense of "produce of the soil," which occurs in some later writers.

(2) "Rule of inspection," *ḥukm-i mushāhada*, occurs, so far as I know, nowhere else in the literature. Barnī tells us in the preceding passage that Firūz, at his accession, adopted the "rule of the produce." Afif's account refers to the same period, for this appointment was made very soon after the King's first arrival at Delhi; either then one of the writers made a mistake, or the two expressions mean the same thing. A mistake is improbable, for old bureaucrats like the writers do not misuse technical terms: on the other hand, Afif's vocabulary differs from that of Barnī in several cases, such as "khūt" or "pargana," so that verbal divergence need not suggest error. The general idea conveyed by *mushāhada* is "witnessing," "observing"; and in order to reconcile the two statements, all that is necessary is to take this word as denoting Sharing-by-estimation, the reference being to the persons who observe or inspect the condition of the growing crop in order to estimate the yield. We may say then that, while Barnī tells us that Sharing was prescribed, Afif tells us that it was Sharing by Estimation, not actual Division. On this interpretation the disappearance of the term *mushāhada* can be readily understood, because the official literature of the Mogul period employs the Hindi name *amānāt* to denote the process in question.

The revenue-Demand under this system varied from season to season with the area sown and the produce reaped, so that the phrase "to settle," *bastan*, must not be read in the sense of fixing beforehand the number of tankas to be paid; I take the meaning to be that the arrangements for assessment were reorganised after the confusion which had developed during the previous reign.

(3) "Aggregate," *jama*, has in the later literature two well-defined senses, as has been explained in Appendix A. Used for *jama-i māil*, it

denotes the aggregate revenue-Demand; used for jama-i wilāyat (or parganāt), it means the Valuation on the basis of which assignments were allocated. In this passage it cannot bear the former sense, because the determination of the aggregate is stated as a separate process from the settlement of the revenue-Demand, while a Demand varying with the season is obviously incompatible with a Demand remaining unchanged for forty years. In the text we have jama-i mamlakat, which may fairly be read as a variant of the later phrase jama-i wilāyat, and Valuation makes perfectly good sense. We have seen in Ch. II that a Valuation existed in the previous reign, and it is in fact a necessary feature of any system of Assignments; we have seen also that the existing Valuation had diverged widely from the facts. I read this passage as telling us that the Khwāja brought the assessment-system into order, and, on the basis of six years' experience, framed a new Valuation, which remained in use throughout the reign.

Appendix D.

ASSESSMENT BY *NASAQ*.

IN the text I have followed generally the description of Akbar's methods of assessment which was offered in a paper written some years ago in collaboration with Mr. Yusuf Ali (J.R.A.S., 1918, pp. 8 ff.). I have seen no published criticism of the conclusions there put forward, but some scholars have informed me that objection has been taken in India to the identification of the term *nasaq* with a particular method of assessment, and it is perhaps desirable to go into this point in some little detail. The objection, as it has been represented to me, is to the effect that, since *nasaq* bears a well-defined sense in the general literature of the period, this sense must be accepted throughout, and it is not permissible to deduce another, and inconsistent, sense from isolated passages. My answer is that the general sense of the word makes nonsense of passages written by expert officials; and that, since we are not entitled to assume that they wrote nonsense, we must infer that, in these passages, the word is used in a specialised, technical sense, which prevailed at the time alongside of the general meaning, but subsequently became obsolete. The coexistence of two senses, general and technical, is of course no isolated phenomenon. In English at the present day, we may write of the manners and customs of a foreign nation, and equally we may write of the customs levied at a foreign seaport: in the first case we are using the word "custom" in its general sense, in the second we give it the specialised, technical meaning of taxes on imports levied by the State, taxes into which no element of custom now enters. Similarly, the Persian word *dastūr*, which in our period had various general meanings, one of them being "custom," meant also, in its technical use, a schedule of assessment-rates fixed by authority, and in no sense customary. There is no difficulty then in the co-existence of a general and a specialised meaning for a particular word.

In its general sense *nasaq* means "administration," and at this period it was used as one of a group of terms denoting the administrative charge of a country, province, or district. We

read frequently of a Viceroy being posted to the *nāzm wa nāsaq*, or to the *zabt wa rabt*, or to the *hīrāsāt wa hukūmat*, of his province, and we meet also the connected expression *tansiq wa tanzīm* in cases where an officer was posted to organise the administration in newly-acquired territory. The general sense is thus clear, and it may be observed that the objection under consideration applies equally to the interpretation of *zabt* adopted in the text, though I have not heard that this interpretation has been questioned.

That this general meaning may make nonsense in some contexts can be shown by examples. The Aīn tells us (i. 296) that, under Sher Shāh and Salīm Shāh, Hindustan passed from *ghalla-bakhsht* to *zabt*. No one, so far as I know, has disputed the identification of the former term with the method of assessment which I describe as Sharing, the division of the crop between State and Peasant; and in this passage *zabt* must be an alternative method. To say that Hindustan passed from Sharing to Administration (in the general sense) makes nonsense: *zabt* must mean a method of assessment different from Sharing, and the other passages where the word is used in the Aīn bear out the interpretation that it denotes the method of Measurement, but usually with the implication of rates fixed in cash and not in grain. This sense is rare in the general literature of the period, but it occurs in a passage in the Akbarnāma (ii. 333), which tells us that in the 13th year Shihābuddīn Ahmad Khān, on appointment to the charge of the Reserved lands, "having set aside the annual *zabt*, established a *nāsaq*." Here again the general meanings of the two words make nonsense, or at least I can get no idea out of the statement that "the annual administration was replaced by an administration." In order to make sense, the two words must be taken as denoting different species of the same genus; and since *zabt* is one method of assessment, *nāsaq* must be some alternative method. The same interpretation is necessary in order to make sense of the description of the Gujarāt practice (Aīn, i. 485), "mostly *nāsaq*, and *paimāish* is little practised," where the contrast between two alternative methods is unmistakable; and it brings sense and order into the classification employed in the "Account of the Twelve Provinces," where Multān, for instance, is described as "wholly *zabt*," Allahabad as partly *zabt*, Berār as "for a long time *nāsaq*," while in Bengal (i. 389) "the demanding of revenue proceeds on

nasaq." This last phrase, indeed, is sufficient by itself to establish the proposition that *nasaq* denotes a particular method of assessment.

In the official literature of the period then, *nasaq* must be read as denoting a particular method of assessment other than Sharing or Measurement, with both of which it is specifically contrasted. Apart from Farming, the only other method disclosed by the literature is that which I describe as Group-assessment, viz. assessment of a lump sum on the village (or occasionally the pargana) by agreement with the headmen as representing the peasants, the distribution of the assessment over the individual peasants being left in the headmen's hands. *Nasaq* is nowhere defined in the literature of Akbar's reign, but the few facts on record regarding it allow us to identify it with Group-assessment, for which no other specific name has been found. Thus the reasons for Shihābuddīn Ahmad's change of method already referred to are indicated in the statements that the work of assessing the Reserved lands was heavy, while honest officials were scarce, and that the annual *zabt* involved very great expense and led to corrupt embezzlement: consequently, the object of the change of method was to simplify and cheapen procedure, and diminish opportunities for official corruption; and these would be secured by Group-assessment. Again, *nasaq* might clearly be made with the headmen, for Akbar's rules for collectors laid down (Ain, i. 286) that in Reserved areas *nasaq* should not be made with the headmen, because of the risk of inefficiency and oppression. Thus *nasaq* might be made with the headmen, was simpler and cheaper than Measurement, and offered fewer opportunities for official corruption, but involved the risk of oppression if the headmen were strong, and of loss if they were weak. This description applies precisely to the method of Group-assessment as we meet it in Aurangzeb's farmān (which is discussed in Ch. V.), and in the earliest English records (Ch. VI.): while there is nothing said about *nasaq* which is in any way inconsistent with the identification. We have then either two methods of assessment, not distinguishable by any recorded fact, and certainly very much alike, or else we have one method, named but not described in the official records of Akbar's reign, described but not named in Aurangzeb's farmān. It seems to me [that the latter alternative may reasonably be accepted, at least until some evidence comes to light showing that a real difference existed.

There remains, however, a possibility that the term may have been used in a wider sense so as to cover Farming as well as Group-assessment. As has been pointed out elsewhere, the two methods look very much alike when viewed from above, though the difference may be obvious and important to the peasant inside the village. In each case the collector has to deal with an individual who has engaged to pay a lump sum on account of a village, or some larger area; it may make little difference to him whether that individual is a member of the village or an outsider; and it is, I think, conceivable that, in the official view, a single term might have been used to cover both arrangements. I have found no passage which lends any direct support to the view that *nasag*, in the restricted, specialised, sense, may refer to Farming: this restricted use appears, so far as I know, only in the literature of Akbar's reign, and there is nothing to suggest that he countenanced Farming, the method of all others most opposed to his recorded ideals; the details which we possess point rather to Group-assessment; and, on the evidence available, I think it is permissible to adopt the interpretation I have given above. The possibility that the term includes Farming cannot, however, be definitely ruled out; and the matter must be left open pending the discovery of further evidence.

Appendix E.

AĪN-I DAHSĀLA.

THE primary source for the development of Akbar's revenue administration is a short chapter in the AĪn (i. 347), bearing this title. Its interpretation is exceedingly difficult, for the account is greatly condensed, the language is technical, and there are some grounds for suspecting that the concluding passage may have been mutilated. Blochmann's text of this chapter is not satisfactory. In one important passage it cannot be interpreted; it differs materially from his best MS., that which he denoted H, and which is now numbered Or. 2169 in the British Museum; and there are no footnotes to indicate the various readings which in fact exist. I have found in the literature no satisfactory interpretation of the chapter as a whole, while various misleading inferences have been based on phrases divorced from their context.

The following MSS. have been used in the interpretation which I now offer; those in the Bodleian Library were examined for me by Sir Richard Burn, the rest by myself.

British Museum, Or. 2169: Add. 5609, 5645, 6546, 6552, 7652.

Royal Asiatic Society, 116 (Morley).

India Office, 264-68, and 270 (Ethé).

Cambridge University Library, NN. 3, 57, 15.

Bodleian Library, 214-16.

These MSS. have not yet been critically studied as a whole, and their relative value is consequently uncertain. Judging by dates, where these are known, Or. 2169 is decidedly the best, but, as Blochmann recorded in his preface, it is "by no means excellent," and there are a few obvious errors in the chapter under examination; nevertheless, it is probably much nearer to the original in point of time than any other in the list. Of the others, RAS. 116 belongs to the middle of the seventeenth century, and this is probably true also of Add. 6552; the remainder are apparently later.

The text of the chapter falls into five paragraphs, which I mark with capital letters, and discuss in order. The translation

offered is meant to be quite literal, except that conventional compliments are omitted or condensed; ambiguous expressions are given in the original, and discussed in the interpretation.

[A]

TRANSLATION. From¹ (or, At) the beginning of the reign, every year experts used to ascertain the price-currents, and lay them before the throne²;

and, taking the schedule of crop-yields and the prices thereof, used to fix the schedule of cash-rates;

and abundant distress used to occur.

NOTES.—(1) The MSS. vary, as usual, between the prepositions *az* and *dar*.

(2) The words *wālā dargāh* show that the prices to be used in commutation required the Emperor's sanction, a detail of some importance, because it helps to explain why commutation ultimately broke down.

INTERPRETATION. This paragraph repeats the information given in an earlier chapter (i. 297), that at first Akbar adopted a schedule of crop-rates (*ray'*) which had been sanctioned by Sher Shāh, commuting the grain-Demand based on it into cash-rates (*dastūr*) on the basis of current prices; it adds only that the result was very unsatisfactory.

[B]

TRANSLATION. When Khwāja Abdul Majid Āsaf Khān was Vazīr, the *jama-i wilāyat* was *raqamī*,

and "they" used to show¹ whatever they pleased with the pen of enhanced salary.²

Seeing that the kingdom was not extensive, and that promotion of officers used to be frequent,

there used to be increase and decrease from bribe-taking and self-interest.

NOTES. (1) There is no subject for the verb, which must be read as the common locution, impersonal for passive; I mark this locution by inverted commas.

(2) *Afzūdātan* is not in the dictionaries. I take *tan* in the regular office-sense of "salary," the phrase indicating that a rising salary-list was the motive for whatever was done at this time.

INTERPRETATION. Abdul Majid had ceased to be Vazīr in the eighth year of the reign, when he had "turned from the pen to

the sword" (Akbarnāma, ii. 182). I have not traced the date of his appointment to the post, but a passage quoted below shows that the reference is to the fifth year or earlier.

As has been explained in Appendix A, the word *jama*, standing by itself, is ambiguous, and may mean either Demand or Valuation. Taking the former sense, the passage could mean only that at this time the Demand on the peasants was fixed arbitrarily to meet the rising salary-bill, and that corruption supervened. The word *raqamī*, which by itself does not mean more than "written," would on this interpretation have a derived sense, pointing to an assessment made merely with the pen, that is to say, not based on the facts of productivity, but framed to meet requirements.

The following objections apply to this interpretation :—

(1) The phrase *jama-i wilāyat* is of the type which in other passages points to Valuation, not Demand. (2) At this time, salaries were ordinarily paid by Assignment, so that the change would not meet the emergency which is indicated: arbitrarily increased assessments might bring more money into the treasury from Reserved lands, but the treasury did not pay salaries as a general rule. (3) These arbitrary assessments would supersede the methods described in paragraph A, and would render detailed assessment-rates unnecessary: we should therefore have to regard the assessment-rates from the sixth year onwards, tabulated in *Aīn Nūzdahsāla*, as irrelevant to the actual assessments. We should have two processes going on side by side—seasonal calculation of a mass of assessment-rates not intended to be used, and arbitrary fixing of the Demand without reference to the rates. (4) The idea of assessments fixed in the lump is something of an anachronism: all the discussions of this period point to rates applied to varying crop-areas, not to sums independent of the area of production. (5) We know from the *Akbarnāma* (ii. 333) that assessment by rates charged on the measured area, the practice described in paragraph A, was in fact still in force in the Reserved areas in the twelfth year, because its discontinuance is recorded in the thirteenth year. We should have to infer then that this period of arbitrary assessments intervened between two periods of Measurement, though the resumption of Measurement is nowhere stated.

All these difficulties disappear if we take the phrase *jama-i wilāyat* to denote the Valuation. On this reading, the word *raqamī* might either carry the meaning "arbitrary," as suggested

above, or, what is, I think, more probable, it would be the office-name of the record in question, used to distinguish it from some other Valuation which it had superseded. In the latter case, it might have meant merely "written," or, as Mr. Beveridge has suggested in a note on the passage in the Akbarnāma discussed below, it might indicate that the record was in the *raqam* notation; but, whatever its origin, it would be in fact a label.

On this reading, the first sentence tells us that, while assessment was proceeding on the lines given in paragraph A, the Valuation in use was "arbitrary," or "the Raqamī," according to the guess adopted; and we are told further that the figures in it were altered to meet the needs of the moment, and that corruption ensued. The salary-list became excessive owing to frequent promotions, and the kingdom was too small to bear the charge; the Revenue Ministry consequently wrote up the Valuation without reference to facts, so that officers would get Assignments which, on paper, were adequate to meet their claims, but which could not, in fact, yield the Income charged on them. With this procedure, corruption was obviously inevitable.

Taking the paragraph by itself, then, "Valuation" is a much more probable interpretation than "Demand," and this view is confirmed by two parallel passages.

(a) The Akbarnāma (ii. 270) tells us that in the 11th year Akbar "turned his attention to the *jama-i parganāt*, and under his orders Muzaffar Khān set aside the *jama-i raqamī-i qalamī*, which, in the time of Bairām Khān, had been nominally increased for the sake of appearances owing to the number of men and the smallness of the country; and that [*sc.* the increase] had always remained entered in the public records, and was tools of corruption."

The force of *qalamī* in this passage is uncertain. My friend Mr. R. Paget Dewhurst has suggested to me that it is merely a repetition of *raqamī*, and that the two words together mean "recorded"; my own idea is that it may point to the phrase *ahl-i qalam*, "folk of the pen," commonly used for the clerks in the public offices, so that it is a sort of apology for writing jargon—"the *raqamī jama*, to use the office name." Bairām Khān's "time" ended in the fifth regnal year; we can thus date the transaction as lying in his regency, and in Abdul Majid's *vazārat*, not later than the fifth year.

It seems to me to be quite impossible to read this passage as referring to a new assessment-system introduced after the failure of the one described in paragraph A. It tells us distinctly that certain figures had been nominally increased for the sake of appearances, a statement which cannot possibly refer to Demand-to-be-collected; it tells us, as the *Ain* tells us, that the point was a heavy salary bill in a small kingdom; and it tells us also that the nominal increases made in or before the 5th year still remained in the records in the 11th year, and were used for corrupt purposes. Clearly we are not concerned here with any annual assessment of Demand; but if we follow the opening phrase, as I read it, and take the subject of the orders as the Valuation, the meaning is obvious. In the early years, the salary bill exceeded the available resources, and the Valuation in use was written up for the sake of appearances, so that officers would get Assignments yielding the sanctioned Income on paper, but not in fact; and these false entries remained in the Valuation until Akbar ordered a new one to be prepared.

(b) Another account of the same transaction is given in the *Iqbāl-nāma* (p. 213); it is clearly a paraphrase of the *Akbarnāma*, but different wording enables us to see how the later writer understood the earlier. "In the beginning of the reign, when Bairām Khān was Chief Minister, the revenue officials, having fixed the *jama* of the Empire (*mamālik-i mahrūsa*), by summary computation and estimate, [and], because of the large numbers of the army and the narrowness of the Empire, having made a pillar of snow, offered it to men as salary."

The phrase "pillar of snow" almost explains itself, but it may be illustrated from an anecdote told by Khwāfi Khān (i. 735). The accountants had on one occasion prepared a long and fantastic list of recovery-demands against a certain collector: on seeing it, the Minister said, "Bring this pillar of snow into the sunshine, and recover whatever remains of it after the hot weather." We have then a "*jama* of the Empire," so inflated that it could be described in this contemptuous phrase, offered as salary. A Demand meant to be collected could not possibly be described in these terms; and, taking the three passages together, we must conclude that *jama-i wilāyat*, or *parganāt*, or *mamālik-i mahrūsa*, denotes the Valuation, on the basis of which Assignments were allocated.

It follows that paragraphs A and B are to be read as referring

to the same period: they give us, not two successive assessment-systems, but the first phase of Akbar's revenue administration. There were two main branches, assessment of the Demand, and allocation of Assignments: we are told how the first broke down, and how the second was affected by falsified figures. There was thus urgent need for reform in both branches, and the next paragraph indicates what was done in the second phase.

[C]

TRANSLATION. And when this supreme office [*sc.* the *vazārat*] fell to Muzaffar Khān and Rāja Todar Mal,

in the 15th Ilahī year "they" took the *taqsimāt-i mulk* from the *qānūngos*,

[and] having completed the *maḥsūl* by estimate and computation, a new *jama* came into force.

Ten *qānūngos* were appointed, who, having received the schedules from the local *qānūngos*, continued to deposit them in the record-office.

Although it [*sc.* the new *jama*] fell somewhat below the former, yet there was a very great distance from it [*sc.* the former] to the *ḥāsil*.

INTERPRETATION. These clauses give in succession (a) the action taken, (b) the method of work, and (c) the result. The action was in three stages, *taqsimāt-i mulk*, *maḥsūl*, and *jama*. The first phrase has no parallel, while the second and third are ambiguous; and the parallel passages must be examined in order to ascertain the meaning.

We have seen already that the Akbarnāma tells us that in the 11th year Muzaffar Khān set aside the original Valuation, described as *raqamī*: the passage continues, "qānūngos and experts of the whole Empire, having, according to their own ideas, recorded the actual-yield (*ḥāl ḥāsil*) of the country, fixed another *jama*. Although in point of fact it [the new *jama*] was not an actual yield, yet in comparison with the former *jama* it is not far [*sc.* from the truth] to call it an actual yield."

Allowing that in this passage the Akbarnāma is dealing with Valuation, and not with assessment, the passage explains itself. The experts determined the actual-yield and made a new Valuation on its basis, not taking it as it stood, but keeping near it.

As has been explained in Appendix A, the commonest meaning of *hāsil* is the Income derived by an assignee, as contrasted with with the Valuation of his assignment; but the word is also used simply as a synonym for *maḥsūl* (in the sense of Demand), and may be taken here in this meaning, as being an elegant variation of the language of the Aīn. This passage thus fixes the sense of *jama* and *maḥsūl* in paragraph C, but throws no light on *taqsimāt*.

The parallel passage in the Iqbāl-nāma, already quoted in part, goes on to tell that Akbar ordered Muzaffar Khān "to summon the qānūngos and chaudhris of the parganas to Court, and having determined an actual-yield (*hāl hāsil*) in accordance with the facts, to determine the *jama* of the country intelligently, equitably, and accurately." This passage agrees closely with the Akbarnāma, on which it is obviously based.

We have then to see what meaning can be assigned to *taqsimāt-i mulk*, a term for which I have found no parallel in the literature. The root QSM points to the idea of dividing the produce, as in the phrases *qismat-i ghalla*, or *kharāj-i muqāsama*. To my mind, the only reasonable view is that *taqsimāt-i mulk* was the office-name for the schedules which, as a subsequent clause tells us, were taken from the local qānūngos and deposited in the record office: each schedule would be headed "Apportionment (*taqsim*) of Pargana so-and-so," and the whole file would be called "The apportionments of the Empire." This view explains the awkward plural of the abstract noun, and makes perfectly good sense. It also explains why the phrase is unique; there is no other known occasion on which this procedure was followed, and no other reference to these particular schedules, which became obsolete a few years later.

I think then that the Aīn, having in the preceding paragraphs stated the case for reform in both branches of the revenue administration, here deals with the reforms in both in a single sentence, a process which is justified by the fact that the two, though distinct, were closely connected. The stages were:—

(1) Qānūngos prepared new schedules showing the apportionment of produce on the lines of Sher Shāh's schedule, but separately for each pargana, instead of a single schedule for the whole Empire. These would, by themselves, provide the necessary reform in assessment, but not all the materials for a new Valuation.

(2) From these schedules, the Demand (*maḥsūl*), or actual-yield (*hāl hāsil*), of the Empire was calculated or estimated.

This could easily be done by applying the rates shown in the new schedules to actual, or estimated, crop-areas. Actual areas would be on record for the Reserved lands, but in the case of Assignments it might be necessary to estimate, if the records of area were not considered satisfactory, or were not available.

(3) On the basis of these calculations a new Valuation was made: not, as we are told, identical with the calculated Demand, but near it, and thus a great improvement on the old Valuation, which had lost all touch with facts.

The reform then was twofold, providing new schedules of assessment-rates, and also a new Valuation, the two things which were wanted. The *Ain* mentions both: the *Akbarnāma* is dealing only with Valuation, and says nothing about assessment-rates, which the author had not in view.

The schedules are not described, or incorporated, in the *Ain*, but it is possible to infer their nature. We know from another chapter in the *Ain* (i. 297) that the basic rule—one-third of the average produce—which gave the original Demand-rates, was still in force in the fortieth regnal year, and we are justified in inferring that the *taqsim*s conformed to it. We know further that the *taqsim*s, like the original schedule, showed the Demand in terms of produce, because seasonal commutation was still required, as the next paragraph of the text will show. The fact that the work was done by the *qānūngos*, the repositories of local agrarian knowledge, makes it certain that the schedules were local. A separate schedule was prepared for each *pargana*, and deposited, as such, in the record-office: this can mean only that assessment was now based on local productivity, not on the average productivity of the empire. Analysis of the rates actually charged, as given in *Ain Nūzdahsāla*, shows clearly that there was in fact a general change in assessment in the 15th year; new crops then come into the schedules, the provinces diverge more widely, and, inside each province, the gap between maximum and minimum rates widens—as would necessarily follow when local schedules replaced a general one, because there would then be, inside the province, two variables instead of one, rates and prices, instead of prices only.

These considerations, taken together, appear to me to settle the nature of the *taqsimāl-i mulk*. That they were not incorporated in the *Ain* can be accounted for by their bulk. The original schedule, which is given as a historical document, fills

nearly three pages of Blochmann's text: from Multān to Allahabad, the country to which this chapter applies, there were more than a thousand parganas, so that some 3000 pages would have been needed to give *taqsims* prepared on the same lines for each pargana.

There remains an apparent discrepancy in date. The *Ain* speaks of the 15th year, while the *Akbarnāma* and *Iqbāl-nāma* have the parallel passages under the 11th year. Mr. Beveridge, in a note to his translation of the *Akbarnāma*, suggested that there had been confusion somewhere between the two words, which are nearly identical in Persian script; the only real difference is between *ḥ* and *y*, and this is a matter of three dots instead of two. The suggestion, however, raises difficulties. So far as the *Akbarnāma* is concerned, there is no question of a copyist's error: it is a strictly chronological work, and we should have to suppose that Abul Fazl, whose chronology is ordinarily precise, put this event four years too early, a mistake which is conceivable but distinctly improbable. It would be easy to alter 15th to 11th in the text of the *Ain*, but in my opinion it would not be justifiable. Of the 12 MSS. which I have myself examined, 10 have the initial *ḥ* clearly marked, and the remaining two are nearer *ḥ* than *y*: copyists must have been quite familiar with this pitfall, and the obvious efforts to make the *ḥ* clear cannot be disregarded.¹

Again, the table of rates, which indicates a general change in assessment in the 15th year, indicates equally an absence of change between the 10th and the 12th. Again, the *Akbarnāma* tells us (ii. 333) that in the 13th year, the assessment of the Reserved lands by Measurement was given up, and Group-assessment substituted: it is highly improbable that revised rates sanctioned in the 11th year should be discarded in the 13th, but it is quite likely that rates which had absolutely broken down should be discarded, and a temporary arrangement made, while waiting for the new rates to be sanctioned.

My reading is that Akbar took up the question in the 11th year, as the *Akbarnāma*, followed by the *Iqbāl-nāma*, states, and ordered a new Valuation to be prepared; that it took three years to make the necessary enquiries and calculations; and that, as the *Ain* states, the new Valuation came into force in the

¹ Sir Richard Burn informs me that, of the Bodleian MSS., 15th is quite clear in 214, but 215 has 11th.

15th year, when the new assessment-rates also began to operate. The interval does not appear to be excessive when we remember that over a thousand qānūngos were concerned, with only ten supervisors—one man to a hundred or more—and that schedules for adjoining parganas must have required comparison and agreement, so that the sickness or slackness of one man might have delayed the work of many parganas. That the process was gradual is shown by the use of the past-continuous tense, and the probabilities are that it went on for a considerable time.

My interpretation of paragraph C, taken with the other relevant passages, is thus that the defects recorded in paragraphs A and B were noticed, and reform was ordered, in the 11th year; that the reforms took time, and the method of assessing the Reserved lands was changed temporarily in the 13th year without waiting for their completion; but that in the 15th year, new assessment-schedules and a new Valuation came into force. Our authorities were, however, interested in the latter rather than the former: they do not say expressly that new schedules were introduced, but the Aīn mentions them in the cryptic phrase *taqsimāt-i mulk*, and figures given in the preceding chapter show that they were in fact introduced.

At this point there is a notable omission in the Aīn, which tells nothing of the fate of this second Valuation. The gap can be filled from the Akbarnāma, which records (iii. 117) that before the 19th year the officials at headquarters used to increase the Valuation arbitrarily, and used to open the hand of corruption in decreasing and increasing, so that the Emperor's officers were dissatisfied and ungrateful. To remedy the evil, Akbar placed most of his officers on cash-salaries, and brought most of the Empire under direct administration (so that for the time being no Valuation would be required). The reason for the Aīn's silence on this important change can only be guessed: we may assume bad drafting, or we may infer departmental *amour propre*, since it was clearly discreditable to the Ministry that a Valuation should have to be set aside within a few years of its introduction, because it had been falsified; but all we know is that the account is incomplete, and that here, as in some later years, facts are recorded in the Akbarnāma which ought to have appeared in the Aīn.

The next clause, D, passes to the breakdown of commutation.

[D]

TRANSLATION. And when, through the wisdom of the Sovereign, the Empire was greatly extended,

every year there used to be abundant distress in price-ascertainment,

and various difficulties used to arise from delay.

Sometimes the peasant would have to complain of [?] excess-demand,

and sometimes the assignee would have to lament arrears.

His Majesty proposed a remedy, and established the *jama-i dahsāla* (which gave general satisfaction).

INTERPRETATION. The emergency is clear. With the extension of the Empire, delays in fixing commutation-prices became serious, and caused much inconvenience. Obviously, collections must start promptly if they are to be made at all; and, when the prices required Imperial sanction, as we have seen was the case, local officers would sometimes have to start collections in advance of orders. Then, when the orders came, there would be difficulties if the sanctioned rates proved to be different from those which had been assumed. I am not sure of the exact force of *afzūnkhwāhī*. If it means "excess-demands" as I have rendered it, the point would be that peasants had paid too much: if it means "supplementary-demands," they would have paid too little; but in either case the inconvenience to peasants, as well as to assignees, is obvious.

The emergency then is clear, but the remedy is obscure. So far in this chapter of the *Ain jama* has meant Valuation, but a new Valuation would be no remedy for the evil stated. If the word has here its other technical sense of Demand, we must suppose that Akbar fixed cash-demands in lump sums, as they are fixed at the present day; but we know from other passages, notably Akbarnāma, iii. 381, and *Ain-i Amalguzār*, that such demands were not fixed. What was done was to introduce the *Dastūrs*, or schedules of cash-Demand rates, applicable in place of grain-rates, so that the need for commutation disappeared. I know of no passage where *jama* can possibly mean schedules of rates, or anything of the kind: in both the technical senses, the root-idea of "aggregate" is clearly present.

The parallel passage in the Akbarnāma (iii. 282), is again important. One of the occurrences of the 24th year

was, we read, "the fixing of the *jama-i dahsāla*." We then read that local prices used to be reported regularly for use in commutation, and that, as the Empire extended, delays in the reports caused dissatisfaction, while some of the reporters were suspected of "straying from the path of rectitude." Thus the emergency was the same: and it is added that the officials were helpless, but that Akbar himself solved the problem.

In both records then, and I have found no other account, the *jama-i dahsāla* is named as furnishing an alternative to commutation; and, since we know what the actual alternative was, we must infer that this known alternative could be described officially by this title. How the title can have come into use, is a question which must be reserved until the remaining paragraph has been discussed.

[E]

TRANSLATION. From the 15th to the 24th year "they" added up the *maḥṣūl-i dahsāla*, and took 1/10th of that as *harsāla*;

but "they" took the 20th to 24th years as ascertained, and the five previous from the statements of upright men.

And also taking into account the [figures known as] *māl-i jins-i kāmīl*, "they" took the year which was greatest, as the table shows.

INTERPRETATION. *Maḥṣūl* obviously cannot mean "produce" in this context, and must be taken as Demand. The first two clauses are plain. An average was struck of the Demand for ten years. Actual figures for the last five were available, because, as we have seen, most of the provinces had been brought under direct administration by orders issued in the 19th year; for the earlier years there would not be complete figures for Demand, because most of the country was then assigned, and consequently it would be necessary to collect whatever data were available, presumably from *qānūngos* and from managers employed by assignees. Clearly, then, the *Ain* speaks of averaging the Demand, and not the demand-rates, because the rates were on record (they are in *Ain Nūzdahsāla*), for the whole period, and collection of secondary data for them would not have been required.

Interpretation of the third clause depends on the reading adopted. Here, Blochmann's text is not supported by any of the MSS. I have consulted, and is contradicted by Or. 2169,

which was his best authority. The MSS. I have seen fall into two groups. One group runs the two parts of the clause into one, reading "*wa har sāl jins-i kāmīl afzūn būd*" (RAS. 116, and I.O. 266, 267, 268, 270). *Jins-i kāmīl* bears the precise meaning of high-grade crops, such as sugarcane or poppy, which were encouraged by the Revenue Ministry on fiscal grounds, as yielding a larger Demand per bigha: this reading then asserts as a fact that cropping steadily improved. The assertion would not be absolutely irrelevant, because it would record the success of the new arrangements, but it is awkwardly placed, and does not fit in with the concluding words, because there is in fact no table showing such an increase. My reason for rejecting this reading is that, if it were the original, I do not see how the other readings could have arisen from it by gloss or error. On the other hand, a copyist, confronted with some of the alternative readings, might in despair pick out enough to make an intelligible sentence, omitting the apparently surplus words; or possibly the original MS. may have been altered in editing at this point, and the alterations were obscure.

In the remaining MSS. the texts agree generally except for the second and third words, and for a few casual variations, which can be neglected. The second and third words stand as follows:—

har sāl	printed text.
har māl	I.O. 264, Add. 6546, 7652.
partāl	I.O. 265.
har sāl bar māl	Add. 5645.
tar māl	Add. 5609.
har hāl	Cambridge.
niz māl	Or. 2169, Add. 6552.

Such diversity is very unusual, and I can account for it only on the view that the original contained some highly technical phrase, which was unintelligible to copyists outside the Ministry, that it was distorted almost from the outset, and that various attempts were then made to obtain sense. Or. 2169 is much the earliest of the dated MSS., and Add. 6552 is also early, "probably 17th century"; their reading gives a technical sense, much better than anything which can be read into any of the remainder; while it is easy to see how distortion can have come, if the cryptic phrase *māl-i jins-i kāmīl* were either badly written or misunderstood. I therefore adopt this reading.

As to distortion, *māl* is easily misread as *sāl* if the loop of the *mim* is left open, as sometimes happens; and, given *sāl*, to turn *niz* into *har* would be easy and natural. *Har hāl, tar māl, and partāl* would be "shots," made by puzzled copyists; *har sāl bar māl*, the work of a man with conflicting MSS. before him. At any rate, the authority for *māl* is much better than that for *sāl*.

As to meaning, *māl-i jins-i kāmīl* denotes Demand-on-high-grade-crops. Now, from the 14th to the 17th century, we find the development of high-grade crops forming one of the two main lines of the policy of the Revenue Ministry, the other being extension of cultivation: it is, at the least, probable that the Ministry tabulated figures year by year to show the progress made in this direction; and I read the text as saying that, having struck an average of the Demand, the officials also took into account these figures for the Demand on high-grade crops, and, for them, took the maximum instead of the average.

Now the averaging of the Demand, as to which the text is clear, would not be the way to obtain the new Demand-rates, which we know were introduced at this time, but would be an obviously proper basis for a useful Valuation. This consideration proves, to my mind, that paragraph E tells of the preparation of a new Valuation, not new Demand-rates. It is clear that an average Demand for the past ten years was struck: would this average be a good Valuation by itself? or would it require adjustment? We must remember that the work was in charge of Shāh Mansūr, whose reputation as a meticulous accountant is notorious. One can almost hear him insisting that such an average would be unfair to the State, because it would undervalue villages where high-grade crops were extending. "We must accept the average," he would argue, "for crops dependent on the rains; but in a case where the State has sunk wells, or made advances, and thereby fostered a large extension of sugarcane or poppy, why should we surrender any part of the benefit to the assignee? Suppose sugarcane has risen steadily from 2 to 10 in the course of the decade, why value the village as if the figure were only 6? The wells are there, the assignee can maintain the area at 10 by proper management, and, if he fails to do so, he deserves to lose. To make the Valuation fair to the State, we must raise the calculated average-Demand by substituting the maximum for the average on these high-grade

crops." That is what the Aīn tells us was done, on the reading I adopt.

According to the reading, then, the Aīn tells us that what was done was either to strike an average of Demand, or else to strike an average and then adjust it. Either course is irrelevant to the emergency caused by the breakdown of commutation; both are equally relevant to the preparation of a new Valuation, and thus paragraphs D and E are apparently illogical. The emergency was that commutation had broken down: the remedy was a new *jama*, which, from the details given, was obviously a Valuation. The last words of the paragraph give a further illogicality. They refer to "the table," but the tables which follow in the text, as we have it, are those of the Demand-rates, which we know were introduced at this time to meet the commutation emergency.

One other point must be mentioned. As has been shown in Chapter IV., numerous detailed references in the Akbarnāma prove that the practice of Assignment was in fact reintroduced in the old provinces in, or just after, the 24th year. This must have been intentional, though no order is on record, and consequently a new Valuation must have been prepared at this time, because Assignments could not be made without one; the paragraph under examination can be understood only as describing the preparation of this third Valuation; so that, from the facts on record, it is certain that two distinct, but connected, operations were carried out at this time—preparation of the cash-Demand schedules, and of the third Valuation. The account in the Aīn points to both of these, but so obscurely that we must infer either that it was badly drafted, or that it was mutilated in editing.

We must now turn to the parallel passage in the Akbarnāma, (iii. 282). It tells, as we have seen, that Akbar devised the *jama-i dahsāla* as a remedy for the breakdown of commutation, and proceeds:—"the essence of the device is that, having determined the *ḥāl-i dahsāla* of each pargana from the variations of cultivation and the range of prices, he established 1/10th thereof as *māl-i harsāla*, as is explained in detail in the last volume of this work." The Aīn is the last volume of the Akbarnāma, and hence this sentence should be read as a condensed paraphrase of what we are examining. In that case, *ḥāl-i dahsāla* represents *maḥsūl-i dahsāla*, and *māl-i harsāla* represents *harsāla*. The latter may be accepted as the same thing in more elegant

language; *māl* is the widest of the revenue terms, and, while it often means Demand in the strict sense, there is no difficulty in reading it as the average calculated from the actual figures of Demand. I have found no parallel for *hāl-i dahsāla*, but *hāl* is a very wide word, and we can render "a ten-year state" without straining it. The figures for Demand would include the effect of variations of cultivation and prices, because they had been assessed on the actual cultivation in each season, at rates which varied with prices; and the passage can thus be read as an elegant, but inadequate, summary of what the *Ain* records, while it cannot be read as complementary, supplying something which the *Ain* omits.

There is nothing then in the *Akbarnāma* to clear up the apparent illogicalities in the *Ain*. The last of them would disappear if we assume that, following the words, "the table shows," the draft contained a statement of the third Valuation, and then an explanation of the Demand schedules; that the former was struck out as unnecessary, because the Account of the XII Provinces was to contain the Valuation brought up-to date; and that the latter disappeared accidentally in the process of revision, so that the Demand schedules were made to follow directly on the account of the Valuation. This is possible, for there are other signs of hasty editing, but there is no evidence on the point.

As to the main illogicality, two explanations can be suggested. In the first place it is possible that this portion of the chapter may have been substantially altered, a first and full draft having been greatly curtailed by the editor. As has been related in Chapter IV, various passages in the *Akbarnāma* show that, about this time, there was friction in the Ministry between Shāh Mansūr, who was there all the time, and Todar Mal, who returned from time to time in the intervals of military duty. It is quite conceivable that the draft may have contained a good deal about these old squabbles, which was struck out by the editor as unnecessary or inconvenient. Shāh Mansūr was in fact an inconvenient topic,¹ for there were doubts whether his execution for treason was justified; Abul Fazl deals with him cautiously in the *Akbarnāma*; and it is noteworthy that his name does not appear in paragraphs D and E, though he was solely responsible for carrying out the operations they

¹ See V. Smith, *Akbar the Great Mogul*, 194 ff.

record, and the responsible officers are duly named in the earlier paragraphs. Faulty condensation of a lengthy draft might produce the illogicality of the text as it stands, but more than this cannot be said.

The alternative is to treat the expression *jama-i dahsāla* as a bit of jargon which had gained temporary currency in the Ministry, and has survived only in these passages, denoting neither aggregate-Demand nor Valuation, but the whole of the special operations carried out in the Ministry in the 24th year, operations which produced both the new schedules of Demand and the new Valuation, each of them based on "the Decade," and consequently very closely related, though the calculations must have been distinct. Taking the phrase as an office-label of this sort, the illogicality disappears, because the special operations denoted by it did in fact offer a remedy for the emergency. The inadequacy of the account remains, because only one operation is described where there must have been two; but we have seen already that the Aīn is on occasion incomplete. In regard to the change in the 19th year, the hiatus can be filled, as we have seen, from the Akbarnāma; in the present case, the Akbarnāma merely summarises the Aīn, and does not complete it, but we are not entitled to hold Abul Fazl down to meticulous detail, and it is not matter for surprise that he should have contented himself with summarising his materials on a matter of purely technical interest. Office-labels may depart far from etymology, and the use of a name properly applicable to a part in order to denote the whole is not inconceivable, when that part was the most important in the eyes of the men who used the label.

This alternative then seems to me to be quite tenable, but it is not established by evidence. The established facts are: (1) new schedules of Demand-rates were introduced at this time, and are on record in the Aīn; (2) a new Valuation was required at this time, because the practice of Assignment was being revived; (3) the operation described in paragraph E would give a satisfactory Valuation, but would not give the Demand-schedules which are on record, and which we know to have been used for assessment from this time onwards. The paragraph must be read as describing the preparation of the new Valuation, because it cannot be read in any other way consistent with the established facts: the only point which remains uncertain is the reason why it took its actual form.

Appendix F.

LEGENDS OF TODAR MAL.

I HAVE mentioned in Chapter IV that, in describing Todar Mal's work, I have followed the contemporary records, and discarded the account contained in the eighteenth-century chronicle of Khwāfi Khān: my reasons for discarding it are given in this Appendix.

The account in question is introduced by the statement that Todar Mal's work was proverbial throughout Hindustan, and consequently some notice of him was required. It then records in succession his activities in connection with the coinage, his methods of assessment, and his system of advances to peasants; and then breaks into a long lament on the degeneracy of the writer's days, when nobody paid any heed to the peasants, the land had reverted to jungle, and an upright official was popularly regarded as an incompetent fool.

As regards coinage, this account asserts definitely that Todar Mal introduced the silver rupee of 11 (*sic*) māshas, superseding the "black" tanka, which up to his time was the only currency; silver tankas had indeed been struck, but they were used only for rewards to foreign envoys and to artists, were not generally current, and were sold as bullion. Now the Aīn records (i. 26) that the silver rupee, of 11½ māshas, was introduced in the time of Sher Shāh. It is quite incredible that the official record of Akbar's administration should deprive him of the credit of this reform if he was entitled to it; while the extant specimens of the silver coinage of Sher Shāh and Islām Shāh are so numerous as to place the fact of their currency beyond dispute. In this case, then, the writer of the account has clearly credited his hero, Todar Mal, with the achievement of an earlier reformer; and consequently the account as a whole is not above suspicion.

As regards Todar Mal's methods of assessment, the description given is as follows:

For grain-crops of both seasons depending on the rains, Todar Mal settled that half the yield should be taken as revenue.

For irrigated crops (grain, pulse, sugarcane, opium, turmeric, etc.), after one-fourth had been deducted for expenses, one-third was taken for grain, while for high-class crops like sugarcane, etc., the rates varied, 1/4, 1/5, 1/6, or 1/7, according to the crop.

If desired, a fixed cash-charge was levied on the bigha for each crop, which was called Rāja Todar Mal's *dastūr-ul 'amal* and *dhārā*.

This account points to two alternative methods of assessment, differential Sharing, and Measurement at cash rates. The contemporary records which I have followed in the text give no hint of differential Sharing; and they show clearly that Todar Mal's Measurement-rates were not fixed in cash, but were stated in grain, and commuted on annual prices. The discrepancy is therefore serious.

In estimating the value of this account, it must be remembered that the text of the chronicle is very uncertain. Colonel W. N. Lees is quoted in Elliot's *History* (vii. 210) as writing that "no two copies that I have met with—and I have compared five apparently very good MSS.—are exactly alike, while some present such dissimilarities as almost to warrant the supposition that they are distinct works." So far as I know, no attempt to settle the text has yet been made: the first volume issued in *Bibliotheca Indica* promised a critical preface, but the promise has not yet been fulfilled, and no description is extant of the MSS. which were used by the editor. In the present case, however, it is apparent that this account did not form part of the original chronicle, but is a later insertion. It is given in two places in the printed text, the notes to which show that in two MSS. it is inserted (p. 155) under the sixth year of Akbar's reign, while in a third (p. 195), it appears under the 34th year. It is scarcely possible to suppose that an integral portion of the original chronicle should have become displaced in this way; the facts point clearly to a later insertion, which was made in two copies at the first mention of Todar Mal, and in another at the record of his death. I am not prepared to express a definite opinion on the question whether the insertion was made by Khwāfi Khān, or by someone else. The style of the chronicle is not uniform: this account resembles some portions of it, but not others; and it may well be that the portions which it resembles are other insertions by the same hand.

The account, whoever wrote it, is thus separated from the facts by 150 years or more. It is also separated from them by distance, for the chronicle belongs to the literature of the Deccan, not of Hindustan. The word *dhārā*, which is given as a synonym for *dastūr-ul 'amal* points to the locality of origin: in Hindi it means primarily a stream, and the dictionaries of Forbes and

Platts indicate no technical use, but in Molesworth's Marāthī Dictionary it is rendered as "the usual rate (of rents, prices, etc.)." No Moslem writing in Hindustan would have needed to give such a word as an equivalent for a common expression like *dastūr-ul 'amal*, but the Marāthī synonym comes in naturally in the Deccan. We have then a late account drawn up in the Deccan.

Now the methods of assessment described in it are substantially those which, as is related in Chapter VII, Murshid Qulī Khān had introduced into the Deccan about the year 1655, and which clearly left a strong impression on the locality. There is no reason for supposing that Murshid Qulī was practically familiar with the word of Todar Mal, but there is no difficulty in the idea that, when he started work in the Deccan as a stranger, he should have invoked the traditional authority of Todar Mal for his innovations. Where he established Measurement, he was in fact working on Todar Mal's lines, and the Deccan, which had no first-hand knowledge of Todar Mal, might very easily attribute to him the whole of Murshid Qulī's work, when in fact he was entitled to credit for only portions of it. To the extent that Murshid Qulī introduced Measurement, he was a follower, though not a servile copyist, of Todar Mal: if his method of differential Sharing was, as it seems to me, a novelty in India, then the traditional fame of Todar Mal was sufficiently great, and also sufficiently vague, to carry it also. At any rate, it is clear from the accounts of Murshid Qulī's work that it was regarded in the Deccan as based on that of Todar Mal; Khwāfī Khān (i. 732), and the *Maāsīrulumra* (iii. 497) are in agreement on this point, though not on others; and it was doubtless this southern tradition which was absorbed later in the century by James Grant, when he described Murshid Qulī's work as servilely copied from that of Todar Mal.

It may be noted that this southern account of the work of Todar Mal is not in agreement with the *Maāsīrulumra*, which was also compiled in the Deccan during the eighteenth century. The description there given (i. 127) is clearly condensed from the *Ain* and the *Akbarnāma*, and gives no support to the view that the Rāja's methods included differential Sharing. I have found no other relevant passage in the literature, so that the account in Khwāfī Khān appears to stand alone; and, taking its date and locality into account, it cannot be accepted as contradicting the contemporary evidence on which I have relied in Chapter IV.

I think then that the statement that Murshid Quli was a servile copyist of Todar Mal may fairly be described as legendary. Another legend, found in some early English writers, is that Todar Mal was himself a copyist, and that the *Ain-i Akbari* derives directly from Timūr's *Institutes*. The original of this work is not known to be in existence, but a Persian version, said to have been made in the reign of Shāhjahān, was published in 1783, along with an English translation by Major Davy, under the editorship of Joseph White. Doubts have been thrown on the authenticity of this work. If it is a later forgery, the idea that Todar Mal copied from it is ruled out; but, assuming it to be genuine, a comparison of it with the *Ain* negatives decisively the view of direct derivation. Naturally some of Timūr's institutions, particularly in the military departments, survived into Akbar's time, and consequently some resemblances in detail exist between the two works; but (1) the assessment-system, and (2) the practice in regard to Assignments, show material differences.

(1) Timūr's assessment-system, as described on pp. 360 ff. of White's edition is of the distinctive Islamic type, based on differences in the water-supply, while the *Ain* nowhere recognises such differences.

(2) Timūr's practice regarding Assignments (pp. 236 ff.) was that allocation was made by lot, that an Assignment was held for three years, that it was then inspected, and that, if the assignee was found to have oppressed the peasants, he received no salary for the next three years. In Mogul India, allocation was not by lot, but by favour of the *Dīwān*, the term of holding was indeterminate, and there is no record of any process of inspection, or of a prescribed penalty for oppression.

There is nothing in the *Ain* to suggest that Akbar's Revenue Ministry accepted the *Institutes* as authoritative, or indeed had even heard of them. The work is not mentioned in the historical essay on taxation (i. 289), where we should expect to meet it, while the fact (if it be a fact) that a translation had to be made in the reign of Shāhjahān suggests that nothing of the kind existed previously. There are no grounds, therefore, for the view that Todar Mal used the *Institutes* as his guide; and all that can be said is, that, if he knew of their existence, he departed widely from their provisions in his practice.

Appendix G.

THE AGRARIAN STATISTICS IN THE AĪN.

IN this Appendix I discuss certain features of the statistical matter contained in the "Account of the Twelve Provinces," which has been described in Chapter IV, sec. 6. At the end of the account of each province there is a paragraph giving the provincial figures; following this, each district (*sarkār*) is treated in order, a sentence giving the district figures being followed by a table giving those for each sub-division (*pargana* or *mahal*), together with occasional notes showing the existence of forts, minerals, or, in a few cases, natural curiosities. The general arrangement may be exemplified by the paragraph dealing with the province of Agra (Ain, i. 442).

"Sixteen districts and 203 subdivisions belong to it. Measured land, 2,78,62,189 bīghas, and 18 biswas. Aggregate (*jama*), 54,62,50,304 dāms. Out of this, 1,21,05,703½ dāms, Grants. Local force, 50,681 cavalry, and 577,570 infantry; 221 elephants."

The paragraphs dealing with the other provinces are generally in the same form, the most important variation being the omission of any reference to measured land in the case of certain provinces.

We may regard these statistics either as compiled specially for record in the Aīn, or, more probably, as a reproduction of records already existing in the Revenue Ministry; but on either hypothesis we must treat them as a whole, and recognise that, to the compilers, there was probably some connection between the different items, which justified them in setting out, for instance, the strength of the local forces alongside of the Aggregate and the Grants.

Looking first at the figures for Measured land, we find areas given for the whole, or the greater part, of ten provinces—Multān, Lahore, Delhi, Agra, Awadh, Allahabad, Mālwa, Ajmer, Bihār and Gujarāt. The first eight of these are the provinces which Akbar brought under direct administration in the 19th year; we know therefore that in them (or rather in the greater part of them) the cultivated land had in fact been measured for assessment during a series of years. On the other hand there is no record of area for any part of Bengal (including Orissa), Khandesh, Berār, Sind, Kashmīr, and Kābul, provinces where

there is no reason for thinking that assessment by Measurement had ever been introduced. It is reasonable to infer from these facts that the records of area are confined to the regions which had at one time or other been so assessed; and this inference is supported by an examination of the cases in which areas are not recorded for a portion of a province. The following districts in the ten measured provinces have no record of areas: Kumāūn in Delhi, Bhathghora in Allahabad, Garha and Marosor in Mālwa, Jodhpur, Sirohī, and Bikānīr in Ajmer, Monghyr in Bihār, and Sorath in Gujarāt. In all these districts we either know or have good reason to believe that either the Mogul administration did not function effectively, or that it functioned through the local Chiefs.

So far then as the provinces and districts are concerned, we may infer a connection between the record of areas, and the practice, at some period, of assessment by Measurement; in the cases of Bihār and Gujarāt, we have to assume that Measurement had been introduced for a time, not in the 19th year, but probably at some later period.

Area-figures are wanting for a number of subdivisions in districts which as a whole had been measured. It is possible to suppose that in these cases, or in some of them, the figures had been lost; but it seems to me more probable that, in some of them at least, the subdivisions had in fact escaped Measurement, and that local jurisdiction in them remained in the hands of Chiefs.

Turning now to the figures given in dāms as Aggregate, the question arises whether these represent the Demand made on the peasants in some particular year or series of years, or the Valuation used in the Ministry for administrative purposes. The former view has been taken by, I think, all previous writers on the subject, including myself; and it was reasonable, or at least tenable, on one or other of two hypotheses, firstly, the hypothesis of an assessment fixed in money, secondly, the hypothesis of a continuance of direct administration. If, however, both of these have to be rejected, we are almost driven to the conclusion that the figures must represent Valuation, not Demand.

The first hypothesis was accepted by various writers in the nineteenth century, who considered that the operations of the 24th year consisted in fixing a cash-Demand to be paid year by year by each village, in the same way as the Demand has usually been fixed during the British period. The idea comes naturally

to British administrators, but I think it is an anachronism, and it is certainly contradicted by the records of Akbar's time. Thus the first of Todar Mal's amending regulations sanctioned in the 27th year insisted (Akbar-nāma, iii. 351) that the assessment should be made strictly according to the *dastūr-ul 'amal*, or schedule of cash-rates to be charged on the area under each crop, and subsequent clauses dealt with the measurement of crop-areas in each season. Similarly the rules for collectors and their clerks (Ain, i. 286-288) show the assessment-procedure in detail. The crops on the ground were measured, areas of crop-failures were deducted, the Demand on each peasant was calculated on the area so adjusted, and these figures were then totalled for the village, giving an assessment statement on the basis of which the revenue for the season was to be collected. If these documents mean anything at all, they mean that in the 27th year, and in the 40th, the prescribed method of assessment was Measurement; the Demand on a village was not a lump sum fixed beforehand, but was calculated by applying fixed Demand-rates to the area cropped in each season.

As to the second hypothesis, so long as direct administration continued, with the Demand assessed by Measurement, it would have been possible to provide figures showing the aggregate of Demand. The rules for collectors and their clerks show that assessment-statements for each village were forwarded to headquarters season by season, and, so long as this procedure was followed, there would have been no difficulty in compiling the figures for aggregate Demand on subdivisions, districts, and provinces; in fact it would be safe to assume that such compilation was regularly carried out for administrative purposes, so that the figures would be available for the officials who drafted the Account of the Twelve Provinces.

If, however, we accept the conclusion reached in Chapter IV, and it seems to me to be fully established by the evidence, that direct administration lasted for only five years, after which the Assignment-system was re-introduced, then it is scarcely possible that the figures under discussion can represent an existing record of the Demand at the period when the Ain was compiled. There is no suggestion in the rules, or elsewhere, that seasonal assessment-statements were required from assignees, and the figures for current Demand available at headquarters would be limited to the comparatively small portions of the Empire which were then Reserved. On the other hand, the prevalence of Assignments

from the 24th year onwards makes it certain that a Valuation of the Empire must have been in regular use in the Revenue Ministry. We must then choose between two alternatives: either the compilers of the Account incorporated the Valuation current at the time; or they collected a vast amount of information, not already on record, regarding the current Demand made on the peasants by a multitude of assignees, which they incorporated with the Ministry's figures for Demand in the Reserved areas. The former course would be obvious, natural, and easy; the latter would be exceedingly difficult, and I doubt whether it would have even suggested itself to the compilers in the circumstances of the time. I have found no direct evidence on the question, and it is necessary to enquire which alternative is supported by the statistics.

We may allow that it would have been possible, though difficult, to collect figures for Demand from the assignees; and that, in the provinces where Measurement was in force, the areas assessed could have been obtained from the same sources with a few exceptions, represented by the blanks for some subdivisions in the statistics. We may allow further that it might have been possible to obtain figures for Chiefs' holdings, representing either the tribute paid by the Chiefs, or their Demand on their peasants—we cannot say which. There remains what seems to me the insuperable difficulty of accounting for the figures for areas lying outside the Empire. These are found principally under the province of Bengal: how can we explain the detailed figures for, e.g. the district of Chittagong (Ain, i. 406), which was never administered by Akbar, either directly or through assignees? I can detect no relevance in the collocation of Demand with the strength of the local forces, or various other details given in the statistics, but these are matters of minor importance: the figures for areas outside the Empire are, to my mind, the great obstacle to accepting the hypothesis that we are dealing with statements of Demand, compiled specially for the "Account."

The alternative view, that we have here the current Valuation of the Empire, presents no difficulty. For the older provinces, this would be the Valuation made in the 24th year, but kept up to date; while for the newer provinces we would have figures representing the Valuation made at the time of annexation. Taking as an example of the older provinces the paragraph relating to Agra, which has been quoted above, we have, first, the total Valuation. From the latter we have of course to

exclude the Grants, because, where a Grant was in existence, its Income would not be available for the assignee of that region. The record of Valuation might be expected to contain the particulars which would have to be entered in the documents issued to the assignee, and he would certainly have to know the Grants already existing within the limits of his Assignment. He would equally require to know the strength of the local forces. The *Ain* contains no rules for the embodiment or control of these forces, and tells us only (i. 175) that they were furnished by the Chiefs. To call them up would be the work of the local administration, of the collector or the assignee, as the case might be; and the latter would require to know the extent of his liabilities in this respect. We must assume that the original record specified each village in each subdivision, and that the figures we possess are the totals which the original record contained, first for the subdivision, then for the district, then for the province: such a record, in the form we possess, would be necessary, and also sufficient, for furnishing the assignee with a precise statement of his claims and his liabilities, whether he received a single village or an entire district.

Turning to the later acquisitions, we have seen in Appendix A that, in the cases where the procedure is on record, the first step after conquest was to distribute the territory among assignees, whose business it was to organise the administration; and that a Valuation was made summarily in order to enable the Revenue Ministry to regulate the assignees' accounts. In the case of Gujarāt, the time spent by Todar Mal in the country was too short for anything in the nature of detailed local investigations, and the most probable view is that he obtained access to the records of the previous Government, and made the Valuation on their basis. It is possible that the figures given for Gujarāt are this initial Valuation, as amended by Todar Mal in the 23rd year, and in that case the area-figures might date from before annexation; but I think it is more probable that the area-figures indicate that assessment by Measurement had been introduced for a time after annexation, though the fact is not mentioned in the chronicles.

The figures we possess for Bengal can be interpreted on the view that they represent a summary Valuation made on the same lines, that is to say, that they were based on the records of the previous Government, which included Chittagong and the other tracts recently lost to Arakān. The same view accounts

for certain peculiarities in their presentation, such as the inclusion of miscellaneous revenue as a "subdivision," the entire absence of any reference to Grants, and the omission of any detail of the local forces by subdivisions. I find it impossible to suggest an alternative hypothesis which would account for all these features, but they fall naturally into line on the view that the record, as we have it, was based on records kept by the previous Government, and consequently reproduced peculiarities in which the local practice had differed from that of the older Mogul provinces. Taking it as a preliminary Valuation of this kind, we may infer that it was found to be unsatisfactory, for one of Jahāngīr's earliest recorded actions (Tūzuk, 9) was to appoint a Dīwān to revise the Valuation; there is, however, no record of the result, and from the later history discussed in Chapter VII it appears as if the figures given in the Aīn remained substantially unaltered till the middle of the seventeenth century.

As regards Khāndesh, which in the Aīn is called Dāndes, we find (i. 474) the "aggregate" given in Berār tankas (of 24 dāms), and we are told that Akbar increased the original figures by 50 per cent. at the time when the fortress of Asīr was taken, this event marking the definitive conquest of the country. We thus have the old and the new aggregate, and the action taken here was clearly what I have suggested was taken in Bengal, in that existing figures were adopted as a basis. It is hard to believe that Akbar should have signalled his conquest by summarily raising the Demand on the peasants by so large a proportion, a course which would necessarily increase the difficulties of establishing his rule; but, if "aggregate" here means Valuation, what happened was that Akbar, having reason to believe that the old Valuation understated the facts, ordered such an increase that the new Valuation should correspond more closely with the Income which his assignees could hope to realise. Here, as in Bengal, there is no record of Grants, while the local forces are not enumerated, though their existence is mentioned.

In Berār, the "original aggregate" of 3½ kroris of the local tankas had been raised (i. 478) by the "Deccanis," that is to say, the previous rulers, and a further increase was made after the Mogul conquest. Here we have another instance of figures being taken over from the previous régime, and enhanced by the new government, and again there is the improbability of an enhancement of Demand at conquest; while, on the other hand,

an adjustment of the existing Valuation would be a natural proceeding.

The figures for Tatta, or Lower Sind, which was also a later acquisition, contain no indications of value for the present purpose; but, taking Bengal, Khāndesh, and Berār together, it may fairly be said that there is no difficulty in the view that the figures which we possess represent initial Valuations made at, or shortly after, annexation, and based on the records of the previous governments. In the case of Bengal, we do not know whether the earlier figures were accepted as they stood, or were adjusted; in the other two provinces, we know that the earlier figures were increased by the first Mogul rulers. On the other hand, the Bengal figures cannot be read as a statement of the actual Demand; and there is no particular reason for taking the figures for Khāndesh or Berār in this sense.

The considerations which have now been stated do not amount to formal proof, but they seem to me to establish a definite probability that the statistics in the "Account" reproduce the Valuation which was in use in the Revenue Ministry at the time when it was compiled. On this view, their value for the historian is substantially greater than I had previously supposed. Taking them as representing the Demand for a single, unspecified, year, it was necessary to ask whether the year was typical of the period, or was exceptional, and that question could not be answered with entire confidence. Taking them as representing the Valuation, we have the data on which the Ministry relied for a very important branch of the administration. It is true that similar data had been falsified on two occasions earlier in the reign; but it is also true that on each occasion Akbar had intervened to put things right. It is reasonable to suppose that he took measures to secure that the third Valuation for the older provinces, made in the 24th year, should be honestly maintained, and the absence of any later record of a general re-Valuation suggests that this was done effectively. For the older provinces, then, we have, on this view, data which were good enough for the administration, indicating the Income which could be expected to accrue: the figures for the later acquisitions would necessarily be of less value, because based on less experience.

I suggest then that the figures we possess for the older provinces are most probably the Valuation based on the ten-year average of assessed area and Demand calculated in the 24th year, but modified in detail on experience gained in the next

15 years, so as to be more or less up to date at the time when the record was incorporated in the *Ain*. I have found only a single passage indicating that modification took place, but it suggests that the practice was normal; it is Bāyazīd's account of the dispute over his pension,¹ which has been referred to in the notes to Chapter IV. When Bāyazīd was getting past work, Akbar granted him by way of pension a pargana which was entered at a Valuation of 14½ lakhs of dāms; when he went to the Revenue Ministry to settle the matter, Todar Mal objected that another claimant had agreed to a figure of 16 lakhs for the pargana in question, and urged him to do the same, the result being, I take it, that he would have had to pay the difference to the Treasury. Bāyazīd refused, Todar Mal lost his temper, and, when neither would give way, Fathulla Shīrāzī, who was then Imperial Commissioner, intervened, and took the case to Akbar, who ruled that Bāyazīd was to have the pargana at the old Valuation. This anecdote suggests, what is in itself probable, that the Revenue Ministry, concerned primarily with finance, made a practice of raising the existing Valuation in any case where there was reason to regard it as below the truth. In the ordinary course, we could not expect to find any record of such a practice, part of the routine of the Ministry, and for this isolated notice we have to thank the garrulity of the old collector, who inserted his personal experiences into what was intended to be a chronicle of the period.

The view that the Valuation was modified in detail would help to explain a feature of the statistics which has been the subject of frequent comment—discrepancies between recorded totals and the sum of the items. In some cases such apparent discrepancies probably result from copyists' errors, in others from accidents in printing,² but it is obvious that they might also arise from piecemeal modifications. It would be a nuisance to correct the successive totals for subdivision, district, province, and Empire, on each occasion when the figures for a village were modified, and it would be a greater nuisance to distribute the modification over subdivisions and villages in cases where an officer accepted

¹ Bāyazīd, f. 154.

² The Arabic digits used in Blochmann's text are particularly liable to break in printing, and traces of such an accident are not always visible. I have found that owing to this cause two copies of the printed text may differ materially, one having a line of, say, seven digits, while another has six, or eight.

an entire district at an enhanced Valuation; it is quite possible therefore that some of the discrepancies were in fact present in the original record from which the statistics were reproduced.

One of the most interesting questions arising out of these statistics is the interpretation of the figures relating to country in the possession of Chiefs. As an example, we may take the "district" of Bikānīr, in the province of Ajmer (Ain, i. 512). It contained 11 subdivisions, with an aggregate of 4,750,000 dāms, and furnished a local force of 12,000 horse and 50,000 foot. The subdivisions are named, but no figures for them are given, the district being clearly treated as a unit; and there are naturally no figures for area. I think these entries can safely be taken as indicating that this "district" was in fact the territory of Rāja Rai Singh, who served as one of Akbar's high officers, and that the local force represents the contingent which he had undertaken to furnish when required. The aggregate may be read in one of two ways, either as tribute, or as a nominal figure. We know that at some periods Chiefs paid an annual tribute, not assessed by the year, but fixed by agreement in advance; and, from the financial standpoint, such a tribute would be properly regarded as a Valuation, because it would indicate the probable future Income, though, from the nature of the case, this particular Income would not ordinarily be assigned to anyone except the Chief. I have, however, found nothing to show whether Akbar in fact claimed tribute from Bikānīr or the other Chiefs in Ajmer, and it is possible that the figure is purely nominal.

An example of how such nominal figures might come into the Valuation is given by the account in the Bādshāhnāma (II. 360) of the submission of the Chief of Pālamau. The Viceroy of Bihār had been ordered to reduce this Chief to submission, and marched into his territory. Eventually the Chief agreed to pay a lakh of rupees as *peshkāsh*, or present, and he was then appointed formally to the Emperor's Service, his country was valued at a kror of dāms, and was forthwith assigned to him. In this case the Valuation must be regarded as purely nominal. The Chief retained his country, but in point of form he now held it in Assignment from the Emperor instead of as an independent ruler, and there was no question of tribute being paid, apart from the ceremonial *peshkāsh*. Such an arrangement was so obviously convenient that there is no difficulty in supposing it to represent a common practice; and, in the absence of positive

evidence, the question remains open whether the recorded Valuation of a Chief's country represents tribute actually paid, or is merely a nominal figure, arrived at in the course of negotiations for a formal submission. My own guess is that practice varied, and that some Chiefs paid tribute while others did not, but, so far as Akbar's reign is concerned, I cannot advance facts in its support.

Another example of the entries relating to Chief's country may be taken from the district of Kumāūn in the province of Delhi (Aīn, i. 521). Here, out of 21 subdivisions, the Valuation of five was "undetermined," or, in other words, no arrangement had been come to with the Chiefs; for the remaining 16, the Valuation is given without further details; and as in the case of Bīkānīr, the question remains open whether any payment of tribute was actually made or claimed. Further examples of the same kind will be found in other provinces, but I have discovered no case in which it is possible to say with certainty whether Akbar claimed tribute or not; and the only point on which we can be reasonably sure is that the figures do not represent what the country was worth to the Chiefs, or, in other words, they furnish no indication of the Demand made by the Chiefs on the peasants in those regions.

So far then as the more important Chiefs are concerned, it is possible, subject to the ambiguity as to payment of tribute, to interpret the statistics in the light of our knowledge of the period: the question remains whether it is possible to trace the smaller Chiefs, who certainly existed at this period. The statistics treat each subdivision as a unit, and consequently it is hopeless to look for traces of Chiefs holding less than a complete subdivision; but there are certain indications, of varying value, which suggest that some entire subdivisions were held by Chiefs, and it may be of service to students of local history to explain what these indications are.

(a) In a measured district, the absence of area-figures for a subdivision suggests that it may have been left in the hands of a Chief, so that assessment by Measurement had not been extended to it.

(b) When the Valuation is given in a round figure, there is a suggestion that it may have been fixed in a lump, and not built up from the figures of the constituent villages.

(c) The absence of any record of Grants points vaguely in the

same direction; or it would be more accurate to say that a record of Grants suggests that there was no Chief, since it is scarcely conceivable that Grants would have been made in a Chief's territory.

(d) Other indications may occasionally be found in the composition of the local forces; while a note of the existence of a fort may be significant, because one can scarcely think of a Chief without a fort.

As an example of the way in which such indications may serve, we may take the subdivision of Ajaigarh in the district of Kalinjar (Ain, i. 430). It is the only subdivision of the district for which area-figures are missing; the Valuation is a round figure (two lakhs of dāms), the only one in the district; there are no Grants; and there is "a stone fort on a hill." These facts make it permissible to conjecture that at this period a Chief was left in possession of this wild bit of country, either paying a small sum as tribute, or merely recorded as "worth" that sum; the student of local history may find here something to explain or corroborate local records or traditions, in themselves of uncertain validity.

Appendix H.

GLOSSARY.

NOTE.—The words explained in this Glossary are given in the simplified spelling used in the text, the precise transliteration being added in brackets where necessary. The numbers, with c. affixed, denote the period, in centuries.

ĀBĀDĪ. Carries the general sense of populated and cultivated country, population and cultivation necessarily going together. Used to describe a condition, it is best rendered as "prosperity": when applied to a process, it denotes "development." The modern sense, "the village site," does not occur in the literature. The related word, *ābādānī*, denotes "development."

ĀLTAMGHĀ (*Āltamghā*). Grant-under-seal; a special tenure introduced by *Jahāngīr* (*vide* Ch. V, sec. 1).

AMIL (*Āmil*). In 13-15c. an executive official in general. From Akbar's time onward, has also the specialised meaning of collector of Reserved revenue, as a variant of the official designation *'amalguzār*: in this sense, synonymous with *krorī*. In 18c. used also to denote a Governor, *i.s.* an officer in charge of the general administration.

AMĪN. An official designation. Under Sher Shāh, probably one of the two chief officials in a *pargana* (but see under *Amīr*). Under Akbar, an official on the staff of a Viceroy, whose precise duties are not explained. In 17c., a revenue-assessor under the provincial *Dīwān*. May also, apparently, be used in a wider sense to denote an officer's "deputy" or "assistant."

AMĪN-UL MULK. The designation of Fathulla Shīrāzī, when appointed by Akbar to control *Todar Mal*: may be rendered "Imperial Commissioner." The designation does not recur.

AMĪR. In 13-14c., a rank of nobility, inferior to *Khān* and superior to *Malik*. In 15c., also a provincial Governor. In Bayley's version of the *T. Shershāhī* (Elliot, iv.), used for a *pargana* official, but all the MSS. I have seen have *Amīn*, and I take this to be the correct reading.

- BALĀHAR.** A Hindi word denoting a village menial; discussed in Appendix C.
- BANJĀRA.** Itinerant grain-merchant: synonym, *kārāvānī*.
- BATĀĪ** (Baṭāī). Sharing produce by Division.
- BĪGHA.** The ordinary unit of area; its size varied within very wide limits, both by place and by period.
- BISWA.** One-twentieth of a bigha.
- CHAKLA** (Chakla). In 17c., the area of Reserved land placed in charge of an officer denoted *chakladār*. In 18c., an administrative area in Bengal.
- CHAUDHRI** (Chaudhrī). The headman of a pargana.
- CHAUTH** (Chauth). The claim, nominally one-fourth of the revenue, made by the Marāthas on country which they overran, but did not administer.
- DAFTAR.** A record. *Daftarkhāna*, record office.
- DĀM.** Under Akbar, a copper coin, worth about 1/40 rupee, but varying in exchange with the silver price of copper. In 17-18c., a nominal unit (40 to the rupee) in which the Valuation was recorded, and in terms of which salaries were fixed, and Assignments made.
- DASTŪR.** Has various general senses, "custom," "permission," "a Minister." Under Akbar and later, a schedule of assessment-rates stated in money; an abbreviation of *dastūr-ul 'amal*.
- DEH.** A village in the Indian sense, which is nearly that of "civil parish," that is, a small area recognised as an administrative unit, not necessarily inhabited: synonyms, *Mauza*, *Qariyat*.
- DHĀRA.** A Marāthī word, applied in 18c. to Murshid Qulī's schedule of assessment-rates.
- DHARMA.** The Hindu Sacred Law, prescribing the duties of all classes, including kings, and not liable, in theory, to alteration.
- DIWĀN, DĪWĀNĪ.** Discussed in Introduction. In 13-14c., *Diwān* meant a Ministry. In 16c., (1) the Revenue Minister, (2) a nobleman's steward. In 17c., (1) a high official in the Revenue Ministry, (2) the provincial Revenue Officer. *Dīwānī* in 16c. meant the Revenue Ministry; in 17c. and later the revenue and financial administration as a whole; in 19c., the Civil Courts.
- DOĀB** (Dū-āb). A region lying between two rivers, especially that between the Ganges and the Jumna (*vide* Ch. II, sec. 1).

- FARMĀN. A formal order issued by Emperor or King.
- FATWA. An opinion given by a jurist on a question of Islamic Law.
- FAUJDĀR. In 14c., a military officer, corresponding roughly to General of Division, as being directly under the General in chief command. In 16-18c., an officer in charge of the general administration of a portion of a province: ordinarily he was not concerned with the revenue administration, but in 18c. an officer was occasionally Dīwān as well as Faujdār. Faujdārī. The post, or the charge, of a Faujdār: from 17c., also the general, as distinct from the revenue, administration; and hence, in later times, criminal, as distinct from civil, jurisdiction.
- FAWĀZIL (Fawāzil). In 13-14c., the surplus-revenue which a provincial Governor had to remit to the Treasury, after defraying sanctioned expenditure.
- GRAM. Anglicised from Portuguese *grão*: a pulse (*Cicer arietinum*).
- GUMĀSHTA (Gumāshṭa). An assistant or subordinate. In the Aīn, applied to subordinates employed by the collector in Reserved land.
- GUNJĀYISH (Gunjāyish). "Capacity," "room." The technical sense is obscure: discussed in Ch. V, sec. 2.
- HĀKIM (Hākim). Not a precise designation, but used to denote any high executive officer, whether Viceroy of a province or Governor of a smaller area.
- HAQQ (Ḥaqq). In addition to the general senses—right, justice, truth, etc.—denoted in 13-14c., the perquisites allowed to Chiefs, usually in the form of land free from assessment. Haqq-i shirb, a term of Islamic law, denoting the right accruing to a person who provided water for irrigation.
- HĀSIL (Ḥāsil). Discussed in App. A. Sometimes used as synonym for Mahsūl, denoting either Produce or Demand, according to the context. From 16c., usually means Income, as contrasted with Valuation.
- HAVĀLĪ (Havālī). Environs; but in 13-14c., havālī-i Dehli denoted a definite administrative area west of the Jumna.
- HINDU (Hīndū). Usually carries the ordinary sense, but in Barnī (14c.) restricted to the Hindu rural aristocracy, or classes superior to ordinary peasants.

HINDUSTAN (Hindūstān). In 13-14c., the country lying East or South of the centre of Moslem power; in 14c., usually the country beyond the Ganges; from 16c., India North of the Narbada.

IJĀRA. 16-18c., a Farm of revenue. The Farmer is usually Ijāradār; also Mustājir.

INĀM (In'ām). A reward. Applied specially to gifts made by the King, whether in the form of a sum of money, or a stipend paid in cash, or a Grant of revenue. In 17c., commonly a Grant of revenue made to a high officer as a supplement to his Assignment.

IQTĀ (Iqtā'). An Assignment of revenue; synonyms, Jāgīr, Tuyūl. In 13-14c., also a Province, *vide* App. B.

IQTĀDĀR (Iqtā'dār). Holder of an Assignment. (Not used in the sense of Governor of a Province, who was designated Muqti.)

JĀGĪR. An Assignment of revenue. Synonyms, Iqtā, Tuyūl.

JAMA (In Arabic, Jam', in Urdu, usually Jama'). Aggregate. Discussed in App. A. (1) In accounts, the credit-side. (2) In Revenue, either Demand or Valuation, according to the context. The phrase *jama-i dahsāla* is discussed in App. E.

JARIB. A land measure; also, the measuring instrument. In 16c., used to denote assessment by Measurement, as synonym of Paimāish.

JIZIYA. The personal tax imposed by Islamic law on non-Moslem subjects.

JOWĀR. A millet. (*Andropogon sorghum*.)

KĀRĀVĀNIYĀN. Used by Barnī to denote the itinerant grain-merchants, usually called Banjāras.

KĀRKUN. Literally, agent or deputy. From 16c., usually means clerk, writer. The same meaning is appropriate in some 13-14c. passages, but they are too few to show with certainty whether the word had become specialised by that period.

KHĀLISA (Khālīṣa). Land Reserved for the State, as opposed to land Assigned or Granted to individuals.

KHARĀJ (Kharāj). Discussed in App. A. The tribute imposed by Islamic Law on non-Moslems permitted to remain in occupation of conquered land: in India, revenue-Demand. Kharājī denotes country liable to Kharāj, as distinguished from country paying tithe (Ushr).

KHARĪF (*Khariḥ*). The rains season, and the crops grown in it.
KHIDMATĪ (*Khidmatī*). A present given by an inferior to a superior.

KHŪT (*Khūt*). Discussed in App. C. Used only by Barnī, to denote Chiefs.

KHWĀJA (*Khwāja*). Usually an honorific title. In 13c., designation of an officer on the staff of a province, whose functions are not clearly indicated.

KROH. A measure of distance, about $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles.

KROR. Ten millions (100 lakhs).

KRORĪ. In 16c., the popular designation of the collector of Reserved revenue, known officially as 'Amalguzār. In 17c., used officially in this sense, and also to denote the collector employed by an Assignee.

LAKH. One hundred thousand.

MADAD-I MA'ĀSH. A Grant of land for subsistence.

MAHAL (*Maḥal*). Under Akbar, a revenue-subdivision, corresponding usually, but not invariably, with pargana; and occasionally applied also to a head of miscellaneous revenue. The modern form, mahāl, does not appear before 18c.

MAHSŪL (*Maḥsūl*). Discussed in App. A. May mean, according to the context, either Produce or Demand; and, in 16c. official documents, also the average-Produce calculated for assessment-purposes.

MĀL. Discussed in App. A. General sense, property or possessions. In agrarian matters usually means Demand, but sometimes has the wider sense of revenue-administration. In the Army, denoted booty taken in war.

MALIK. In 13-14c., a rank of nobility, inferior to Amīr. Later, an honorific title used more vaguely.

MĀLIK. Carries the general idea of sovereignty or dominion. In Islamic law, applied to an occupant of land, and used in one of Aurangzeb's farmāns to denote a peasant.

Mālikāna, in the British period, denotes an allowance made to a landholder, or claimant, excluded from possession.

MASĀHAT (*Masāḥat*). Measurement, Survey. In 14c., denoted the process of assessment by Measurement, which in later times was called Jarīb, or Paimāish.

MĀSHA. An Indian weight, equal to 15 grains.

MAUND. Anglicised form of Mann, a unit of weight containing 40 ser. The size of the unit varied with both time and locality.

- MAUZA** (Mauza') In 13c., used generally in a wide sense as a place or locality; later, denotes a village (in the Indian sense); synonym of Deh.
- MILK.** A Grant for subsistence, resumable at pleasure.
- MOTH** (Moṭh). A pulse (*Phaseolus Aconitifolius*).
- MUHĀSABA** (Muḥāsaba). Audit of an official's accounts.
- MUHASSIL** (Muḥaṣṣil). Etymologically, a collector. In 14c., an official with unspecified functions, appointed by the King in the territory of a Chief.
- Muhassilāna, in 16c., denoted fees paid in connection with revenue-collection.
- MUQADDAM.** In 13-14c., sometimes a leading or prominent man; sometimes, specifically a village-headman. From 16c., the latter use predominates.
- MUQĀSAMA.** In Islamic Law, assessment on production, as opposed to occupation (which latter is Muwazzaf—*vide* Wazīfa).
- MUQTĪ** (Muqt'ī). Discussed in App. B. In 13-14c., a provincial Governor; obsolete by 16c.
- MUQTĪ'Ī** (Muqtī'ī). This word has been found only in one passage (Ain, i. 296), and its meaning is uncertain; it may point to either Farming or Assignment.
- MUSHĀHADA** (Mushāhada). Discussed in App. C., where I interpret the word as Sharing-by-estimation, the Hindi kankūt. Does not occur after 14c.
- MUTĀLABA** (Muṭālaba). Discussed in App. A. The early use is to denote the process of demanding, or recovery: from 17c., it may mean the amount of the revenue-Demand.
- MUTASARRIF** (Mutaṣarrif). Minor officials; I am doubtful whether it denotes some particular official, or a class of officials.
- NĀIB.** Deputy. In 13-14c., denotes an officer sent to a province to perform the duties of the Governor, when the Governor held also a Court appointment, or was employed on other duty.
- NASAQ.** Discussed in App. D. The general sense is "order" or "administration." Under Akbar, applied to a particular form of revenue-administration, which I identify with Group-assessment, though it may cover also Farming.
- PAIMĀISH** (Paimāish). Measurement. In 16c., denoted the process of assessment by Measurement, as a synonym for Jarīb.

PARGANA. The Indian name for an aggregate of villages. Came into official Moslem use in 14c., partially superseding Qasba.

PATTA (Paṭṭā). Lease. The document given to a revenue-payer, indicating the sum which he had to pay.

PATWĀRĪ (Paṭwārī). The village-accountant, a Hindi term adopted from the outset in Moslem administration.

QABŪLIYAT. Written undertaking given for the payment of revenue; the counterpart of a Patta.

QĀNŪNGO. The pargana accountant and registrar. The position certainly existed in the Hindu period, but the Hindi designation appears nowhere in the chronicles. The word Qānūn in 13-14c. had not acquired the modern sense of "law," but denoted "custom" or "practice"; and Qānūngo must be interpreted, not as "expounder of law," but as "interpreter of custom," *i.e.* it denotes the men to whom Moslem administrators looked for information regarding the customs of their Hindu subjects.

QARIYAT. A village, synonym of Deh. ¶

QASBA (Qaṣba). The current meaning "town" has not been found in the chronicles. The earliest writers used qasba to denote a pargana; from Afif onwards, pargana was adopted as a Persian word, but qasba survived as an occasional synonym.

QĀZĪ (Qāzī). An official in the Islamic system, with duties mainly judicial, but also executive: there is no precise English equivalent, but in the Mogul period the Qāzī might be described as the judicial assistant of the Governor.

QISMAT-I GHALLA (. . . Ghalla). Division of grain. In 16c. a name for assessment by Sharing.

RABĪ (Rabī'). In India, the winter; the crops grown in winter and harvested in spring.

RĀĪ, RĀJA, RĀNA, RĀO. Hindi terms denoting a King or Chief, whether independent, or paying tribute or revenue to the Moslem King.

RAQAMĪ. A description applied to Akbar's first Valuation. Its precise significance is obscure, as explained in App. E.

RAY'. In 16c., denotes a schedule of crop-rates prepared for assessment purposes, and showing the Demand in terms of produce: opposed to Dastūr, a schedule of cash assessment rates. The word has survived locally in Benares in the sense of "rent-rate."

- RYOT** (Anglicised form of Ra'iyat). A herd, the peasantry as a body. The use to denote an individual peasant has not been found in the chronicles; the use to denote a particular form of tenure (ryotwārī) belongs wholly to the British period.
- SADR** (Sadr). In the Mogul period, the designation of a high officer whose duties included the supervision of Grants. (*Vide* Blochmann's note on the Sadr's of Akbar's reign, in his translation of the Aīn, i. 270 ff.)
- SALĀMI**. A present offered to an official on approaching him.
- SARKĀR**. In the chronicles usually means a treasury, whether belonging to the king or to a noble. Under Sher Shāh, denoted an administrative district, *i.e.* an aggregate of parganas: under Akbar, a revenue-district. The modern meaning "Government" does not appear clearly in the chronicles.
- SER**. A unit of weight, one-fortieth of a maund, and, like the maund, varying with time and with locality.
- SHIQQ** (Shiqq). Division. Apparently at first a military term; an expeditionary force (lashkar) was divided into main groups (fauj), and these again into smaller groups (shiqq). In 14c., an administrative area, either a province, or a division of a province (*vide* Ch. II, sec. 1). In 15c., a province. Not used in later times in this sense.
- SHIQQDĀR** (Shiqqdār). At first, a military rank (*vide* shiqq); later a revenue subordinate. Under Sher Shāh, one of the officers on the staff of a pargana, also a revenue-collector employed by an Assignee. The term survived into 18c. to denote a subordinate revenue-official, usually an Assignee's servant.
- SŪBA** (Sūba). In the Mogul period, a province of the Empire.
- SUYŪRGHĀL** (Suyūrgḥāl). In the Mogul period, allowances granted by the Emperor, whether paid in cash, or by Grants of land.
- TAFRIQ**. The distribution of the Demand, determined by Group-assessment, over the individuals composing the group.
- TALUQ** (Ta'alluq). Dependency. Came into use at end of 17c. (*vide* Ch. V, sec. 5), to denote possession of land, whatever the title. Has been specialised in the British period to denote particular titles, which differ in different provinces. Taluqdār denotes the holder of a taluq.

- TANKA.** The chief monetary unit, 13-16c. (See Thomas, *Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi*, where the unit is discussed at length.)
- TUYŪL.** An Assignment of revenue, synonymous with Jāgīr, Iqtā.
- USHR** ('Ushr). The tithe levied under Islamic law. *Ushr* denotes country liable to tithe, as opposed to *kharājī*.
- VAKĪL.** In 13-14c., the Vakīl-i dar was apparently the highest ceremonial officer at the Delhi Court. In the Mogul period, the Vakīl was Prime Minister, and superior to the Vazīr; but the post was not always filled, and, when it was vacant, the Vazīr was practically Prime Minister.
- VAZĪR.** In 13-14c., the Prime Minister, who in practice held charge of the revenue and financial administration. In the Mogul period, when there was a Vakīl (*q.v.*), the Vazīr was Revenue and Finance Minister, and was sometimes described as Dīwān; when there was no Vakīl, the Vazīr was in charge of general, as well as revenue, administration.
- Vazārat denotes the post of Vazīr.
- WAFĀ.** Lit. "faith," "reliance," was used in 14-15c. in the technical sense of the yield of crops (*vide* App. C.).
- WĀLĪ.** Usually a provincial Governor (*vide* App. B): sometimes the ruler of a foreign country.
- WAZĪFA** (Wazīfa). In Islamic Law, denotes a periodical payment for the occupation of land, and the derived word *muwazzaf* denotes assessment on occupation, or what I call Contract-holding (*vide* Ch. V, sec. 3). In the chronicles, Wazīfa usually means a charitable or compassionate allowance granted by the King, and paid in cash, as distinguished from a Grant of land or revenue (milk, or madad-i ma'āsh); occasionally it is applied to a Grant of revenue.
- WILĀYAT.** Commonly in 13-14c., a province under a Wālī (*vide* App. B); but may mean also, (1) the kingdom, (2) a tract or region, (3) a foreign country, (4) the home-country of a foreigner. The meaning "province" had practically disappeared in the Mogul period.
- WĪRĀN.** Deserted. Applied to a village which had been abandoned and was uncultivated.
- ZABT** (Zabt). Discussed in App. D. In Akbar's time, the system of assessment by Measurement as then practised. The adjective *zabtī* was used to denote an area where the

system was in force. In later times *zabtī* denoted a revenue-rate, or rent-rate, levied on the area sown, and varying with the crop.

ZAMĪNDĀR. Lit. "land-holder." The word does not necessarily imply any particular claim or title, and in 18c. was used in Bengal to denote any sort of holder (*vide* Ch. VII, sec. 2). In the literature of North India, from 14c. onwards, it meant what I have called a Chief, that is, a landholder with title or claim antecedent to Moslem rule, commonly a Rāja, Rāo, or some other Hindu King, or ex-King, who had become tributary to the Moslem State. It is occasionally applied also to rulers who had not become tributary.

Appendix I.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES.

NOTE.—This list is not intended to be a complete bibliography of the subject, but is confined to those authorities which I have found it convenient to cite by abbreviated titles. Other works which are quoted rarely will be found fully described in the text or notes.

- ABU YUSUF. Abou Yousof Yakoub. *Kitāb el-Kharādj*, tr. E. Fagnan. Paris, 1921.
- ADD. The recognised description of one series of the MSS. in the British Museum. The number which follows the word is that of the particular MS. in Rieu's catalogue, or in the list of later additions.
- AFIF. Shams-i Sirāj Afif. *Tārīkh-i Firūz Shāhi*, *Bibl. Ind.* Partial translation in Elliot, iii. 269.
- AIN. Shaikh Abul Fazl 'Allāmī. *Ain-i Akbarī*. *Bibl. Ind.* The MSS. consulted by me are detailed in Appendix E. Translation by Blochmann and Jarrett, *Bibl. Ind.*
- AIYANGAR. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, *Ancient India*. London and Madras, 1911.
- AKBARNAMA. Shaikh Abul Fazl 'Allāmī. *Akbarnāma*, *Bibl. Ind.* Translation by Beveridge, *Bibl. Ind.*
- ARTHASASTRA. *Kautiliya's Arthasāstra*, tr. R. Shamasastri. 2nd edn. Mysore, 1923.
- BABURNAMA. The Emperor Bābur. *Bāburnāma*, tr. A. S. Beveridge. London, 1921.
- BADAUNI. Abdul Qādir al Badā'ōnī. *Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh*. *Bibl. Ind.* Translation by Rankin and Lowe in *Bibl. Ind.*
- BADSHAHNAMA. Abdul Hamīd Lāhawrī. *Bādshāhnāmah*. *Bibl. Ind.* Partial translation in Elliot, vii, 3.
- BARNI. Ziyāuddīn Barnī. *Tārīkh-i Feroz Shāhi*. *Bibl. Ind.* I have referred also to Or. 2039. Partial translation in Elliot, iii. 93.
- BĀYAZĪD. Bāyazīd Sultān. *Tārīkh-i Humāyūn*. MS. in the India Office (Ethé, 223). MS. translation by Erskine, Add. 26610.

- BAYLEY. Sir E. C. Bayley. *The Local Muhammadan Dynasties, Gujarat*. London, 1886.
- BERNIER. François Bernier. *Travels in the Mogul Empire*, translation edited by Constable. London, 1891.
- BIBL. IND. *Bibliotheca Indica*, the general title of the series of texts and translations issued by the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- BLOCHMANN. H. Blochmann's translation of vol. i. of the *Ain* (q.v.).
- CAMBRIDGE HISTORY. *The Cambridge History of India*, Vol. III, edited by Sir Wolseley Haig. Cambridge, 1928.
- DELHI RECORDS. Punjab Government Records, vol. i. *Delhi Residency and Agency, 1807-57*. Lahore, 1911.
- DUNCAN RECORDS. A Shakespear. *Selections from the Duncan Records*. Benares, 1873.
- EARLY ANNALS. C. R. Wilson. *Early Annals of the English in Bengal*. Calcutta, 1895-1917.
- EARLY TRAVELS. *Early Travels in India, 1583-1619*. Edited by W. Foster. London, 1921.
- ELLIOT. *The History of India as told by its own Historians*. Edited from the posthumous papers of Sir H. Elliot, by J. Dowson. London, 1867-77.
- FIRISHTA. Muhammad Kāsim Firishta. *Tārīkh-i Firishta*. Lithographed text. Cawnpore, 1873. Translation, entitled *History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India till the year A.D. 1612*, by J. Briggs. London, 1829.
- FIRMINGER. *The Fifth Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the affairs of the East India Company, 28th July, 1812*. Edited by the Venerable W. K. Firminger. Calcutta, 1917.
- FUTŪHĀT. Sultān Firūz Shāh. *Futūhāt-i Firūz Shāhi*. MS. Or. 2039. Translation in Elliot, iii. 374.
- GUJARAT REPORT. Dutch MS. report on the markets of Gujarāt before 1630 A.D. No. 28 of the W. Geleynssen de Jongh Collection in the Record Office at The Hague. The text has now been issued by the Linschoten Society as *De Remonstrantie van W. Geleynssen De Jongh*, The Hague, 1929.
- GULBADAN. Gulbadan Begam. *History of Humāyūn*. Text with translation by A. S. Beveridge. London, 1902.
- IBN BATŪTA. C. Defrémery and B. R. Sanguinetti. *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*. Text and translation. Paris, 1874-79.

- IMPERIAL GAZETTEER. *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*. Oxford, 1909.
- I.O. The India Office. I.O. (Ethé) stands for Ethé's catalogue of the Persian MSS. I.O. Records stands for the MS. records preserved in the Office.
- IQBĀLNĀMA. Mu'tamad Khān. *Iqbālnāma-i Jahāngīrī*. Lithographed text. Lucknow, 1870. Extracts translated in Elliot, vi. 400.
- JARRETT. H. S. Jarrett's translation of vols. ii and iii of the *Ain* (q.v.).
- J.A.S.B. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*. Calcutta.
- J.R.A.S. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*. London.
- KHWĀFI. Muhammad Hāshim Khwāfi Khān. *Muntakhab-ul Lubāb*. *Bibl. Ind.* Partial translation in Elliot, vii. 207.
- MAASIRULUMRA. Shāh Nawāz Khān. *Ma'āsir-ul Umrā*. *Bibl. Ind.*
- OLD FORT WILLIAM. C. R. Wilson. *Old Fort William in Bengal*. London, 1906.
- OR. The recognised description of one series of the MSS. in the British Museum. The number which follows the word is that of the particular MS. in Rieu's catalogue, or in the list of later additions.
- PELSAERT. *The Remonstrantie of Francisco Pelsaert*, translated as "Jahangir's India," by W. H. Moreland and P. Geyl. Cambridge, 1925.
- REV. SEL. *Selections from the Revenue Records, North-West Provinces*. Vol. i, covering 1818-20, Calcutta, 1866. Vol. ii, 1822-33, Allahabad, 1872.
- ROE. *The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe to India*, edited by Sir W. Foster. London, 1926.
- RAS, (Morley). Morley's catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society.
- SALIH. Muhammad Sālih Kambū. *'Amal-i Sālih*. *Bibl. Ind.* Extracts translated in Elliot, vii. 123.
- SAQI. Muhammad Sāqī Musta'idd Khān. *Ma'āstr-i 'Alamgīrī*. *Bibl. Ind.* Extracts translated in Elliot, vii. 181.
- T. AKBARI. Nizāmuddīn Ahmad. *Tabaqāt-i Akbarī* (or *Akbar-shāhī*). Partly published in *Bibl. Ind.*; partial translation in Elliot, v. 177. For the unpublished portions I have used Or. 2274, Add. 6543, and RAS, 46 (Morley).

- T. MUBARAKSHAHI. Yahya bin Ahmad. *Tārīkh-i Mubārakshāhī*. MSS. Or. 5318, Or. 1673. Partial translation in Elliot, iv. 6.
- T. NASIRI. Minhāj-us Sirāj. *Tabaqāt-i Nāsiri*. The portion relating to India is in *Bibl. Ind.* Partial translation in Elliot, ii. 259.
- T. SHERSHAHI. 'Abbās Khān Sarwānī. *Tārīkh-i Shershāhī*. MSS. Or. 164 and 1782; I.O. (Ethé) 219 and 220. Partial translation in Elliot, iv. 301.
- TERPSTRA. H. Terpstra. *De Opkomst der Wester-Kwartieren van de Oost-Indische Compagnie*. The Hague, 1918.
- TUZUK. The Emperor Jahāngīr. *Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī*. Text edited by Syud Ahmud. Aligarh, 1864. Translation, "Memoirs of Jahāngīr," by A. Rogers, ed. H. Beveridge. London, 1909-14.

Index

- ABDUL Majid Asaf Khān, Khwāja,** 239
Abdul Qādir Badāūnī quoted, *passim*;
 estimated, 100
Absconding, causes and conse-
quences, 135, 142-3, 144ff.,
 152, 165, 189, 205, 207
Abū Yūsuf Yaqūb, 281, quoted,
 14, 15
Abul Fazl 'Allāmi, Shaikh, 280;
 quoted, *passim*; estimated,
 80-1
 "Account of the Twelve Provinces,"
 117ff., 259ff.
Afghan Dynasty, see Lodi
Afghan Kings, Governors in Hin-
dustan, 21, 72
Affī, see Shams Affī
Agra, Province of, under Akbar
 Assessments of, 82, 90, 118
 Direct administration of, 96
 Statistics of, 259, 262
Agrarian Conditions
 Hindu (*see also* Dharma), 12, 13
 Moslem, 14ff., *passim*
Agrarian History of
 Bengal, 180ff.
 Deccan, the, 180ff.
 Mogul Empire, 82ff.
Agrarian Policy of
Akbar, 111ff.
 Alāuddin Khaljī, 26, 37, 38, 202,
 203-4
 Āsaf Jāh, 187, 188
 Aurangzeb, 124, 125, 132ff., 148,
 171n., 204, 236
 Successors of, 175ff.
 Balban, 27-8, 30-1
 Farīd Khān, 69ff.
 Firūz, 59ff.
 Ghiyāsuddin, 40-1, 43, 45, 54,
 227ff.
 Jahāngīr, 127-8, 211
 Moslem rulers, 62-3
 Summary of, 201ff.
 Mubammad Tughlaq, 46ff.
 Murshid Qull Khān, 17, 184
 Sayyid dynasty, 57
 Shāhjahān, 131
 Sher Shāh, 74ff., 203, 235
Agrarian Statistics in the Ain,
 117ff., 259ff.
- Agrarian System**
 British period, diversity of, 166,
 167
 Hindu period, 2ff., 201-2
 Moslem period, 14ff.
 13th and 14th centuries,
 summary, 62
 Summary, 201ff.
Agricultural Land, Competition for,
 xii
 British period, 161-2
 Moslem period, 129, 189, 207
 Ownership of, discussed, 4, 63,
 64, 139-40, 157-8
Ahmadnagar, 181
 Malik Ambar's Assessment Sys-
 tem in, 182-3
 Position of, under Akbar, 118
Ain-i Akbarī, the, 280; quoted as
Ain, 73-4, 80-1ff., *passim*;
 estimated, 81, 117-18; re-
 lation of, to the *Akbar-*
nāma, 80ff.
 Agrarian Statistics in, 117ff.,
 259ff.
Ain-i Dahsāla, discussed, 238ff.
Ain-i Nūzdahsāla, 240, 245
 Ainulmulk, 219-20
 Aiyangar, Prof. S. K., 280, quoted, 12
 Ajaigarh, position of, 269
 Ajmer (Rajputana), Province, 24,
 34, 145
 Agrarian statistics of, 259, 260
 Chiefs in, 119, 122
 Direct administration in, 96
 Position of, under
 Akbar, 119
 Alāuddin Khaljī, 34
 Ajudhiya, *see* Awadh
Akbar, Mogul Emperor
 Reign of, 80ff., *et passim*
 Authorities for *ib.*, 280
 Agrarian policy of, 111
 Annexations by, assessments in,
 181, 185n., 199
 Assessment methods of, 82ff.,
 118ff., 149, 177, 181, 185n.,
 189, 199, 235, 244, 261
 Assignments under, 92ff., 116,
 248-9, 252, 254, 261
 Audit and Recovery under, 43,
 106-7

- Akbar, Mogul Emperor—*continued*
 Ceases abolished by, 61, 138
 Chiefs under, 118ff., 193, 267ff.
 Coinage of, 255, 271
 Collections under, in cash, 69, 76, 83, 114, 126
 Collectors under, 96, 100ff., 184
 Rules for, 111-12, 133
 Crop-rates under, 170, 175, 239
 Demand under, 83, 86-7, 261
 Direct administration under, 96, 100ff., 247
 Grants under, 98ff.
 Headmen under, 111, 112
 Provinces under, position of, 117ff.
 Reclamation rules of, 113-14, 129
 Regulation system of, 110ff., 118ff.
 Reserved areas under, 85, 109, 110, 116-17, 125, 240, 246
 Share of Produce claimed by, 17, 82-3, 119, 135
 Summary, 117ff.
 Valuations under, 77-8, 94ff., 156, 213ff., 240, 259, 262ff.
Akbarnāma, the, 280; quoted, *passim*; estimated, 80
 Relation of, to the *Ain-i Akbari*, 80-1
 Alāuddīn Khaljī, King of Delhi, 23, 31ff., 201; reign of, authorities for 31, &n. ff., 280
 Agrarian policy of, 26, 31, 37, 38, 202, 203-4
 Assessments under, 38
 Assignments under, 35, 39, 40
 Attitude of, to Islamic Law, 19-20
 Chiefs under, 32ff., 224, 227
 Collection in grain under, 37, 38, 62
 Conquest by, of the Deccan, 25, 31, 180-1
 Grants by, 32, 39
 Headmen under, extortion by, 34, 69-70
 Price control by, 36
 Reforms and Regulations of, 26, 29, 32ff., 48, 64, 69-70, 170n., 178
 Revenue measures of, 33ff., 44, 178, 202-3
 Text of Decree, rendering of, and notes, 224ff.
 Reserved regions under, 38
 Share of Produce claimed by, 17, 33, 44, 62
 Summary, 38
 Alī Mardān Khān, 184
 Aligarh = Kol, 23
 Allahabad, Province of, under Akbar, 82, 118, 122
 Assessment in, 90, 235
 Direct administration of, 96
 Statistics of, 118, 259, 260
Ātamgha, *see* Grant under Seal
Āmil = Official, 230
 or Krori, the, under Aurangzeb, 134n., 135
Āmīn = Assessor, 135; discussed, 74 &n., 270; under Aurangzeb, 133n., 134
Āmīr, use of the term, 74, 223, 230, 270
 Amroha, Province, 24
Āpastamba, quoted, 3n.
Arthasastra, 281, quoted, 4n., 5n., 12n., 13
 Āsaf Jāh of Hyderabad, Agrarian policy of, 187, 188
Āsāmī, term discussed, 159
 Assessment (*see also* Group and Individual Assessment, Measurement, *Nasaq*, Sharing), 40, 41
 on Brotherhoods, 171
 in the Deccan by
 Malik Ambar, 182
 Murshid Qulī Khān, 184
 Through Intermediaries, 6, 8ff.
 Tīmūr's system of, 258
 Todar Mal's methods of, 86, 255ff.
 Under Moslem rulers
 Akbar, 82ff., 118ff., 149, 177, 181, 185, 189, 199, 235, 244, 261
 Alāuddīn Khaljī, 38
 Aurangzeb, 129, 135ff.
 Bābur, 79
 Farīd Khān, 70-1
 Fīrūz, 54, 232
 Ghīyāsuddīn Tughlaq, 40, 71
 Jahāngīr, 127, 211
 Muhammad Tughlaq, 46ff.
 Sher Shāh, 75ff., 113, 149
 Assessment circles, 86, 88, 176
 Assets, concealment of, 171
 Assignees, 9, 12, 91, 129, 149, 150, 205, 248
 Assignments (*see also* Valuation), 12, 13, 16; 62-3, 217, 246; explained, 9-10
 Audit of, 151
 Decay of system of, 150ff.
 Duties attached to, 151, 217
 Moslem period
 Akbar, 92ff., 116, 248-9, 252, 254

- Moslem period—*continued*
 Alāuddīn, 35, 39, 40
 Aurangzeb, 138
 Bābur, 79
 Firūz, 55ff., 67
 Humāyūn, 79
 Islām Shāh, 78
 Jāhāngir, 97-8, 130-1
 Muhammad Tughlaq, 51-2
 Lodi dynasty, 67-8, 72, 73
 Sayyid dynasty, 67
 Shāh Alam, 151
 Shāhjahān, 126
 Sikandar Lodi, 72
 Summary, 205-6
 Various regions
 Bahmani Kingdom, 181
 Bengal, 197
 Deccan, 181
 Gujarāt, 129, 180
 Mālwa, 180
 Audit and Recovery, 42-3, 54, 106,
 151, 220-1
 Aurangzeb, Viceroy of the Deccan,
 183, and Mogul Emperor,
 116
 Administrative dyarchy under,
 133
 Agrarian policy of, 124, 125,
 132ff., 148, 171n., 204
 Assessments under, 124, 129, 135
 Assignments under, 138, 151, 215
 Cesses abolished by, 61, 138
 Farming under, 148
 Finance of, 126
 Intermediaries under, 150ff., 198
 Islamic ideas applied by, 132ff.,
 139ff.
 Orders of, 124, 125, 132ff., 148,
 171n., 177, 204, 236
 Reserved areas under, 132, 133,
 148
 Share of produce claimed by,
 135, 198
 Sharing under, 135
 Awadh=Oudh, Province, 24
 Under Akbar, 82
 Direct administration of, 96
 Regulation system in, 118
 Statistics of, 259
 BĀBUR, Mogul Emperor
 Assignments by, 79
 Chiefs under, 79
 Memoirs by (Bāburnāma), 79,
 280
 Badāūn, Province, 24
 Badāūnī, Abdul Qādir, 280; quoted,
passim; estimated, 100
 Baden-Powell, B. H., quoted, 171
 Bādshāhnāma, the, 280; quoted,
passim
 Baglāna, Valuation of, 215
 Bahlūl, founder of the Lodi dynasty,
 67
 Bahmani Kingdom, 181
 Bahraich, Province, 24
 Bairām Khān, 82, 95, 241
 Baīṭ-ul māī=Treasury (*q.v.*), 231
 Balāhar=Village servant (*q.v.*),
 176 &n.; 224, 225
 Balban, King, 25, 26 &n., 27, 45,
 218, 219
 Agrarian policy of, 27-8, 30-1
 Attitude of, to Islamic Law, 19
 Biography of, 218
 Baliya, 138
 Bal Krishna, Dr., quoted, 3n.
 Baran, Province, 23
 Barnī, *see* Ziyā Barnī
 Baudhayana, quoted 3n., 5n.
 Bāyāna, Province, 24
 Bāyazīd, 94n., 108n., 117, 266
 Bāshkwāst, defined, 210-11
 Bāryāst, defined, 210-11
 Benares Province or Zemindarry,
 157.
 Bengal, Kingdom, 24, 62
 Bengal, Province,
 Assessment of, 120, 189ff., 235
 Assignments in, 197
 Cesses in, 195
 Chiefs in, 191, 194
 Farming in, 190, 195, 199
 Statistics of, 262ff.
 Valuation of, 155, 196
 Zamīndārs in, 191ff.
 Berār, Chiefs in, 122
 Position of, under Akbar, 118
 Assessment by *nasaq*, 181,
 185n., 235
 Statistics of, 259
 Valuation of, 264, 265
 Bernier, F., 281; quoted, *passim*;
 estimated, 146
 Bhatghora District, Position of,
 under Akbar, 118
 Statistics of, 260
 Btdar, 181
 Bihār, Province, 24
 Position of, under Akbar, 120,
 122
 Statistics of, 259, 260
 Bihar, North, *see* Tirhut
 Bījapur, Kingdom of, 181, 188
 Bilkānir District, position of, under
 Akbar, 119
 Statistics of, 260, 267
 Blochmann, H., 281; quoted, 81,
 225, 238

- Brihaspati*, quoted, 3ⁿ., 4ⁿ.
 British administration, beginnings of, 157ff.
 Brotherhoods, described, 161ff., 178-9
 Assessment on, 171
 Bulandshahr, *see* Baran
- CEDD** and Conquered Provinces, 157
 Intermediaries in, 158, 172ff.
 Village organisation, 160ff.
 Cesses abolished by
 Akbar, 61, 138
 Aurangzeb, 61, 138
 Firūz, 61, 138
 Private, 198
Chahla = circle, under Aurangzeb, 134, 271
Chapparband or *Khudhāshī* explained, 161
 Charitable tenures, 161, 177
Chaudhri = Pargana-headman (*q.v.*) 19, 69, 271
Chawth, explained, 152, 271
 Chiefs, Hindu
 Described, 8
 British period, 172, 173ff.
 Moslem period,
 Akbar, 118ff., 193, 267
 Alāuddin, 32ff., 224, 227
 Bābur, 79
 Farīd Khān, 69, 71
 Firūz, 58-9
 Ghiyāsuddīn Tughlaq, 41-2
 Lodī Kings, 69, 71
 Sayyid Kings, 66
 Sher Shāh, 75
 Right or perquisite of, 28, 30, 174, 225, 227
 Titles of, 8, 18 & n., 276
 Chitor, Province, 25
 Position of, under Akbar, 119
 Chittagong, District, 196
 Statistics of, 262, 263
 Chunār, Assignment attached to, 96
 Cliques, dominant, under Aurangzeb, 136n.
 Coinage, 255, 271
 Collections, 8
 Cash
 British period, 170
 Hindu period, 5ff.
 Moslem period, 11, 21, 37, 69, 83, 204-5, 239
 Reign of
 Akbar, 69, 76, 83, 114, 126
 Aurangzeb, 132, 136-7
 Tipū Sultān, 188-9
- Collections—*continued*
 Grain, various periods, 37-8, 62, 68-9, 72, 204-5
 Reigns of
 Alāuddin, 37, 38, 62
 Lodī Kings, 68, 72, 76
 Summary, 201ff.
 Collectors, under
 Akbar, 96, 100ff., 184
 Regulations for, 111-12, 133
 Tipū Sultān, Regulations for, 188-9
 Commutation under Akbar, 84
 Failure of, 87, 248-9, 252
 Competition for Land, *see* Agricultural Land, Competition for
 Contract-holdings, explained, 8
 British period, 162, 170
 in Mysore, 188
 in Udaipur, 13, 141
 under Aurangzeb, 140-1
 Crop-failure, 65
 Allowances for, under
 Akbar, 90, 113-14, 230
 Aurangzeb, 134
 Firūz, 231
 Ghiyāsuddīn Tughlaq, 40, 41, 227, 230
 Crop-rates, under Akbar, 85, 170, 175, 239
 Cropping, improvement of, 50, 59, 112, 134, 189
 Cultivation, efforts to increase, made by
 Akbar, 101, 112-13
 Aurangzeb, 132, 134-144
 Firūz, 65
 Muhammad Tughlaq, 50, 51
 Cultivator, *see* Peasant
- Daksāla*, *see* *Ain-i Daksāla*
 Dām (coin), 271
 Dandes, *see* Khāndesh
Dastūr, meanings of, 234, 271
Dastūr-ul 'amal, 256, 257, 261 and *Dhārā*, 256-7
 Daulatābād = Deogir, Province, 25, 48
 Deccan, the Kingdom of, 62
 Provinces of, Conquest of, by Alāuddin Khaljl, 25, 31, 180-1
 Agrarian history of, 180ff.
 Assessments of, 181
 Malik Ambar's, 182-3
 Murshid Qulī Khān's, 17, 184ff.
 Assignments in, 181

- Provinces of—*continued*
Chauth in, 152, 271
 Differential Sharing in, 185, 186
 Famine in, 183, 215
 Farming in, 181
 Headmen in, 182, 184, 185
 Measurement in, 185-6
 Mogul administration of, 183ff.
 Region defined, 180-1
 Defaulters, treatment of, 101, 142, 188
Deh=Village (*q.v.*), 18, 271
 Delhi, Country of, described, 23, desolated, 48
 Delhi, Moslem Kingdom of, 15, 17, 19, 21ff., 34, 62
 Administrative organisation of, 21ff.
 Collapse of, 62, 153
 Moslem Governors, 21
 Delhi, Province under Akbar, 82, 118
 Assessment of, reduced, 90
 Direct administration of, 96
 Regulation System in, 118
 Statistics of, 259, 260
 Demand=Revenue, 16-17 *passim*
 Distribution of, 137 & n., 277
 Indo-Persian terms for, 209ff., 232-3, 240, 241
 Term explained, 33n.
 Terminology discussed, 232-3, 240ff.
 Under Moslem rulers
 Akbar, 83, 86-7, 260, 262
 Alauddin, 33, 62
 Aurangzeb, 135ff.
 Farid Khān, 69, 70
 Firūz, 54, 56
 Ghiyāsuddin Tughlaq, 40, 43
 Lodi dynasty, 73, 76
 Shāh Shuja, in Bengal, 195, 197
 During Last Phase, 168ff.
 Deogir=Daulatābād, Province, 25
 Capital of Muhammad Tughlaq, 48
 Dependency, history of the term, 153-4
 Bengal, 191
 17th and 18th Centuries, 150ff., 172ff.
 Depopulation, (*see also* Absconding), 49, 145, 146-7, 207-8
Dharmā, 2ff., 16, 17, 271
 on property, 174
 on Share of Produce claimable by King, 204
 Differential Sharing, 16, 17, 255-6
 in the Deccan, 185, 186
 Dīpālpur, Province, 24
 Direct administration, under Akbar, 96, 100ff., 247
 Division, sharing by, 7
Diwān, *Diwāni*, history of the terms, xiv-xv, meanings of, at different periods, 78, 271
 Provincial, 109, 133ff., 148, 197
 Aurangzeb's Orders and, 132ff.
 Doāb, the, 34, 271
 Misuse of name, 23
 Peasants' payments in, British period, 169-70
 Dorn, A., quoted, 67n.
 Dowson, Prof., quoted, 45
 Duncan, Jonathan, Records of, 281, quoted, 157n., 160ff.
 Dyarchy, Administrative, Mogul period, 109, 272
 Reign of Aurangzeb, 133
 EAST INDIA CO., in Bengal, 189ff.
 Ejectment or dispossession of Defaulters, 9, 142
 Elliots' *History*, 281, quoted, *passim*
 Epidemics, 145-6
 Estimation, Sharing by, 7
 FAMINE, Barni's use of the term, 36n.
 13th and 14th Centuries, 36n., 50
 17th Century, 145, 183
 Farid Khān, *see also* Sher Shāh
 Agrarian policy of, 69ff.
 Assessment under, 70ff., 90-1
 Assignments under, 69ff.
 Chiefs under, 69, 71
 Share of produce claimed by, 70
 Sharing under, 69
 Treatment by, of rebels, 70
 Farmāns of Aurangzeb, described, 132
 Terminology of, 133
 Farming
 British period, 172-3
 Hindu period, 3, 10ff., 16
 Moslem period, 10, 15, 203
 Summary, 205
 Reigns of
 Alauddin Khalji, 39, 40, 181
 Aurangzeb, and his successors, 148, 154-5, 158
 Firūz, 61
 Ghiyāsuddin, 42
 Jahāngir, 128

- Moslem period—
 Reigns of,—*continued*
 Lodi Kings, 73
 Muhammad Tughlaq, 46-7, 52
 Qutbuddin, 40
 Sher Shāh, 73
 Various regions
 Bengal, 190, 199
 Bijapur, 187, 188
 Deccan, 181
 Golconda, 187, 188
 Mysore, 189
 Farrukhsiyar, Emperor, 191
 Fathulla Shirāzi, 105, 109, 266
Fatwas, 139
Faujdar, *Faujdarī*, 109, 272
Fauzari, *see* Surplus-income
 Firishṭa, Muhammad Qāsim, 181,
 281; quoted, *passim*
 Firūz Shāh, King of Delhi, 22, 24,
 62; reign of, 52ff.; author-
 ities for, 52, 281
 Agrarian policy of, 59ff.
 Assessment under, 52, 232
 Assignments under, 55ff., 67
 Attitude of, to Islamic law, 20,
 53, 61
 Cesses abolished by, 61, 138
 Character of, 53
 Chiefs under, 58-9
 Farming under, 61
 Governors under, 43
 Grants, liberal by, 58, 63
 Irrigation works of, 59ff., 65
Memoir by, 52
 Parentage of, 38-9
 Prices under, 57
 Relations of, with Peasants, 59ff.
 Revenue Regulations of, 53-4,
 57, 60, 61, 213, 214
 Share of Produce claimed by,
 53-4
 Valuation under, 57, 60, 61, 213,
 232-3
 Water-rate of, 60-1
 Fortesque, T., quoted, 164-5
 Fruit-trees, assessment of, 127, 211
Fuzūlī, quoted, *passim*, 281
Fyzābād, *see* Awadh
- GARHA District, statistics of, 260
 Gautama, quoted, 3π., 5π.
Ghalla-bakkāsi, meaning of, 235
 Ghiyāsuddin Tughlaq, King of
 Delhi, reign of, 40ff., 222,
 authority for, 40π.
 Agrarian policy of, 40-1, 43, 45,
 54, 227ff.
 Assessment under, 40, 71
 Ghiyāsuddin Tughlaq,—*continued*
 Chiefs under, 41-2
 Farming under, 42
 Governors under, 42-3, 220
 Revenue measures of, 40ff., 78, 227
 Share of Produce claimed by, 40,
 43, 44
 Ghūr, tribute from, 16
 Golconda, 181, 187, 188
 Gondwāna, 122
 Gorakhpur, 24, 58, 163
 Governors of Provinces, 15
 13th and 14th centuries, 21-2,
 216ff.
 Reigns of
 Alāuddin, 38-9
 Firūz, 43, 54-5
 Ghiyāsuddin, 42-3, 220
 Sayyid Kings, 66
 Grant, James, quoted and dis-
 cussed, 182, 194ff., 257
 Grant-Duff, James, quoted, 182, 183
 Grant-under-Seal, 127-8
 Grants, term explained, 10
 Hindu period, 10
 Moslem period, 10
 13th century, 27
 Reigns of
 Akbar, 90ff., 268-9
 Alāuddin, 32, 39
 Firūz, 58, 63
 Islām Shāh, 78
 Lodi Kings, 72, 73
 Group-Assessment
 Hindu period, 9, 13
 Moslem period, 13, 15, 149
Nasaq identified with, 85, 236-7
 System discussed, 125
 Reigns of
 Akbar, 83, 85, 112-13, 125
 Aurangzeb, 124, 135, 136, 137
 Jahāngir, 125
 Lodi Kings, 67
 Gujarāt, Kingdom of, 62, 180
 Gujarāt, Province, 24
 Agrarian system in, 129ff., 180
 Assessment of, 235
 Assignments in, 129, 180
 Position of, under Akbar, 121-2
 Grants reduced in, 99
 Statistics of, 259, 260
 Valuation in, 213-14, 263
 Gulbadan Begam, 281, quoted, 79
passim
Gurjāyishā, 272, discussed, 136π.
 Gwalior, 24
 Hākim, 223, 272
 Hānsi, Province, 24
 Irrigation in, 60

- Harsha, King of Kanauj, 5*n.*, 12
Hāsil, meanings of, 211-13, 226, 230, 243*ff.*, 272
Hāsil-i-hāmil, 155-6
Hāsil-i sanuāt, 155
Havāli, 23 & *n.*
 Hawkins, W., quoted, 94*n.*, 117*n.*, 130
 Headmen, *see also* Village Organisation
 Pargana, 10, 11, 19, 32*n.*, 34, 69
 Village, 10, 11
 British period, 163*ff.*
 Hindu period, 19, 225
 Moslem period, 19, 177
 in the Deccan, 184, 185
 Duties of, 168
 Extortion by, 34, 69-70, 135-6
 13th Century, 30, 34
 17th Century, 149
 Perquisites of, 111, 225
 Under Akbar, 111, 112
 Alāuddīn, 34, 69-70
 Aurangzeb, 135, 136, 137
 Jahāngīr, 127-8
 Lodi dynasty (Farīd Khān), 69
 Usurping, 164, 171
Hedaya, The, quoted, 60
 Hindu, restricted meaning of, 32*n.*, 225, 228, 230
 Hindu Agrarian system, 2*ff.*, 201-2
 Hindu Sacred Law, *see* Dharma
 Hindustan (*passim*), defined, 21*n.*, 273
 Hissār, *see* Hānsī
 Holt Mackenzie, quoted, 149, 159-60, 189, 206
 Hūglī river, Farming along, 190*ff.*
 Humāyūn, Mogul Emperor, Assignments under, 79
 Hyderabad, agrarian policy in, 187, 188

 IBN Batūta, 281, quoted, *passim*
 Ibrāhīm Lodi, of Agra, 70
 Collections under, in grain, 68
 Imperial Service under Akbar, 93, 95, 101-2
Indām, *see* Rewards
 Income (*see also* *Hāsil*), defined, 209
 Indo-Persian term for, 211-12
 Reign of Akbar, 93*ff.*, 241*ff.*
 Aurangzeb, 151, 155
 Fīrūz, 56, 57
 Lodi Kings, 72
 M. Tughlaq, 51, 52
 Individual Assessment, 7
 Indo-Persian terms for Land-Revenue, 209*ff.*

 Inspection, Rule of, 232
 Intermediaries, assessment through, 6, 8*ff.*
 Defined, 3
 Moslem period, 11, 15
 Payments of, assessed and made in terms of cash, 11
 Intermediaries under, and in Aurangzeb and his successors, 150*ff.*
 Fīrūz, 58
 British period, 172*ff.*
Iqbāl-nāma, the, 282, quoted, *passim*
Iqtā, *Iqtādārs*, 27-8, 216*ff.*, 273
 Irrigation Works, under
 Aurangzeb, 134
 Fīrūz, 59*ff.*, 65
 Shāhjahān, 131
 Tipū Sultān, 188
 Islām Shāh, Assignments under, 78
 Coinage of, 255
 Grants under, 78
 Islamic Agrarian System, 14*ff.* *
 Islamic Law
 Attitude to, of
 Alāuddīn Khaljī, 19-20
 Aurangzeb, 132*ff.*, 139*ff.*
 Balban, 19
 Fīrūz, 20, 53, 61
 Muhammad Tughlaq, 20

 JAFAR Khān, 184*n.*, 195, 197
 Jāgir = Assignment (*q.v.*), 12, 217
 Jahāngīr, Mogul Emperor, reign of, 124*ff.*
 Administration of, 126
 Agrarian policy of, 127-8
 Allamgha grants of, 127-8
 Assessments under, 127, 211
 Assignments under, 97-8, 130-1
 Farming under, 128
 Finance under, 126, 128
 Peasants under, position of, 129*ff.*, 211
 Reserved areas under, 128
 Valuation of Bengal under, 155, 264
Jama = Valuation (*q.v.*), meanings of, discussed, 79*n.*, 197, 212, 232-3, 240
Jama-i dāmi, *see* Valuation
Jarīb, term explained, 69*n.*, 273
 Jāt revolt, 153
 Jaunpur, Kingdom of, 62
 Jaunpur, Province and City, 24
Jins-i hāmil, and *māl-i jins-i hāmil*, terms discussed, 249, 250*ff.*
Jiriya = Personal, or Poll, tax, 14, 231, 273

- Jodhpur District, position under Akbar, 119
 Statistics of, 260
- KABUL Province, Statistics of, 259
 Kalinjar District, Statistics of, 269
 Kanauj, Province, 24, 119n.
 Karra, Province, 24
Kārkhum, meaning discussed, 230, 273
 Kashmīr, under Akbar, Statistics of, 259
 Valuation in, 214
Khālisa, *see* Reserved Land
 Khalji and Tughlaq dynasties, Moslem Agrarian system under, summary of, 62ff.
 Khān, title, 230
 Khāndesh, Kingdom of, 62, 181
 Position of, under Akbar, 118, 121, 181, 264, 265
 Khānjahān Maqbūl, 53n.
Kharāj, 273; discussed, 209-20; term explained, 14-15
Kharājī, *see* Tribute-land
 Khondamīr, quoted, 79
Khatī=Chief, 18, 274; term discussed, 225-6
 Khwāfī Khan, 282; quoted, *passim*; estimated, 150, 255ff.
 King, Hindu, Position and duties of, 2, 3
 King and Peasant, relations between Hindu period, 2ff.
 13th century, 30-1
 Kol, *see* Aligarh
 Krorts, the, under Akbar, 100ff.
 Aurangzeb, 133n., 134
 Kumāūn District, under Akbar
 Chiefs' rule in, 118
 Statistics of, 260, 268
- LABOURERS, 3, 160
 Lahore, Province, 24, 62
 Position of, under Akbar, 82
 Enhancement in, 90
 Direct administration of, 96
 Regulation system in, 118
 Statistics of, 259
 Lakhnautī, 24
 Lambardār, 163n.
 Landholder, evolution of, 149-50
 Landowners, British (early) administration and, 157-8
 Land-revenue, *passim*, defined, 15
 Indo-persian terms for, 209ff.
 Law, Sacred Hindu, *see* *Dharma*
- Lees, Colonel W. N., quoted, 256
 Local forces, 259, 262, 263, 264, 267, 269
 Lodi dynasty, the, 67ff.
 Assignments under, 67-8, 72, 73
 Chiefs under, 69, 71
 Chronicles of, 67ff.
 Collection in grain under, 68, 72, 76
 Farming under, 73
 Group-assessment under, 67
 Grants by, 72, 73
 Prices under, 68-9
 Reserved Lands under, 68
 Share of produce claimed by, 72, 74
- Ma'āsir-ul Umrā*, the, 282; quoted, *passim*; estimated, 126
Madad-i ma'āsh, term explained, 99n.
 Mahoba, Province, 24
Mahsūl, term discussed, 211, 232, 243, 244, 249
Mahsūl-i daksāla, the, 249
Mahsūl-i mu'āmalatī, term discussed, 231
Māl, and compounds, defined, 210
Māl-i jins-i hāmīl, term discussed, 249ff.
Malik, 230, 274
Mālik, 139, 274
 Malik Ambar, assessment system of, 182-3
Mālikhāna, term explained, 143, 274
 Mālwa, Kingdom of, 62, 180
 Mālwa, Province, under Akbar, 82, 119, 122
 Chiefs in, 122
 Direct administration of, 96
 Statistics of, 259, 260
 under Alauddīn, 34
 Manrique, quoted, 142-3
 Manu, quoted, 3n., 5n., 12
 Marāthās in the Deccan, 152
 Marosor District, statistics of, 260
Masākat=rule of assessment, 226
Masāliq-ul Absār, quoted, 51
Mausa=Village, 18, 275
 Measurement (*see also* Jarīb), explained, 7
 British period, 149, 171
 Hindu period, 7, 13, 202
 in Islamic System, 15ff., *passim*
 13th and 14th Centuries, 34
 17th Century, 124-5
 Under
 Akbar, 88ff., 112ff., 255-6, 250ff.
 Alauddīn Khaljī, 33, 224, 226

- Measurement—Under—*continued*
 Aurangzeb, 124, 135, 137
 Farid Khān, 69
 Ghiyāsuddīn Tughlaq, 40-1
 Lodi dynasty, 67
 Sher Shāh, 73, 74, 75, 77
 Various regions
 Deccan, 185-6, 257
 Twelve Provinces, 259ff.
 Udaipur-Mewār, 13
- Meerut Province, 23
- Mehendy Ally Khan, quoted, 171n.
- Merchants, professional, 13th century, 37 & n.
- Methwold, W., quoted, 187
- Mewāt, 23, 37; under Bābur, 79
- Milk, explained, 99n., 275
- Minhāj-ul-Sirāj, 282; quoted, *passim*; estimated, 26
- Mogul Empire, agrarian history of, 82ff.
- Moirā, Lord, quoted, 149
- Monghyr District, statistics of, 260
- Mongols on frontier, 13th Century, 24, 31, 35
- Moslem period, agrarian system in, 14ff., summary of, 62, 201ff.
- Assignments in: summary of, 205-6
- Muhammad Tughlaq, King of Delhi, 23, 43; reign of, 45ff., authorities for, 45, 280, 281
- Agrarian policy of, 46
 Centralizing attempted, 46
 Assessments under, 46ff.
 Assignments under, 51-2
 Attitude of, to Islamic Law, 20
 Capital transferred by, 48, 49
 Character of, 45-6
 Development policy of, 49-50
 Farming under, 46, 47, 52
 in the Deccan, 181
 Reserved Land under, 48ff.
 River country desolated under, 48 *sqq.*, 65, 208
 Valuation under, 52
- Muhāsaba*, see Audit and Recovery
- Multān, Province of, 24
 Demand in, *temp.* Sher Shāh, 75
 Under Akbar, 82, 118, 235
 Direct administration in, 96
 Regulation system in, 181
 Statistics of, 259
- Muqaddam*, see Headman
- Muqāsama* tenure, 140, 275
- Muqti*, 216ff., 275
- Muqti'i*, term discussed, 74, 275
- Murshid Quli Khān, career of, 184
 Revenue system of, in the Deccan, 17, 184ff.
- Mushāhada*, 275; discussed, 232
- Mutālaba*, 275; discussed, 211
- Mutasarrif*, 230, 275
- Muwaffivān*, 227, 230
- Muwazzaf*=*wasifa* tenure (*q.v.*), 140
- Muzaffar Khān, 85, 86, 96, 104, 105, 243ff.
- Mysore, Revenue system in, 188-9
- NARADA, quoted, 3n., 5n.
- Nasaq* (see also Group-assessment), 85, 234ff., 275, in
 Bengal, 120, 196
 Berār, 121, 181
 Gujārāt, 121
 Khāndesh, 121, 181
 Orissa, 121
- Nineteen Year, *Ain* discussed, 83ff.
- Nizāmuddīn Ahmad, 282, quoted, *passim*
- Nuniz, quoted, 12n.
- Nūzdahsāla*, see Nineteen Year *Ain*
- OFFICIAL misconduct under
 Akbar, 101, 103
 Alāuddīn Khaljī, 35
 Muhammad Tughlaq, 50
- Orders of Aurangzeb, see under Aurangzeb
- Orissa, Position of, under Akbar, 121, 122; statistics of, 259
- Oudh, see also Awadh
 Chiefs in, Mogul period, 123
 Struggle for territory, 153
 Traditional histories of, 174-5
 Landholders of (Talūqdars), 174, 175
- Ownership of Land, see under Agricultural Land
- Pakihāshi*, explained, 161
- Paimāish*=Measurement, 226, 235, 275
- Pālāmau, Valuation in, 214, 267-8
- Pargana=aggregate of villages, 18-19
- Pargana-accountant, see *Qāwūngo*, 19, 34, 69, 271
- Pargana-headman, 9, 19, 34, 69, 271
- Pargana-officials, 19
- Patta*, explained, 71, 164, 192
- Pattidārs*, see Brotherhood
- Patwārī*, see Village Accountant

- Peasants, *passim*, defined, 3
 Classification of, British period, 161
 Defaulting, 142-3
 Duties of, 3
 Position of, under
 Akbar, 115
 Jahāngir, 129ff.
 Shāhjahān, 131-2
 Tipū Sultān, 188-9
 Rights of, in
 British period, 161
 Hindu period, 4
 Moslem period, under Aurangzeb, 140ff.
 Scarcity of, under Aurangzeb, 146-7, 152, and in the early 19th century, 161-2
 Pelsaert, F., 282, quoted, *passim*
 Personal Tax = *Jiziya*, 14, 231
Peshkash, paid by Chiefs, 267
 Plague, 17th century, 145-6
 Plough-revenue, Deccan, 185
 Poll-tax = *Jiziya*, 14, 231
 Population, growth of, 17th century, 144
 Portuguese, the, in India, Farming by, 190
 Prasād, Mr. Ishwari, quoted, 17n., 44n., 45
 Prices, and Price-control, under
 Alāuddīn, 36
 Akbar, 84-5
 Lodī dynasty, 68-9
 Later rulers in Bengal, 198
 Produce (*passim*), defined, 3, 209
 Indo-Persian terms for, 211
 Share of, *see* Share of Produce
 Property, and Chiefs' Right, distinction between, 174
 Province, defined, 23, 216
 Provinces, *passim*, *see also* Ceded and Conquered Provinces
 Divisions of, 25
 Position of, under Akbar, 82ff., 96-7, 117ff.
 13th and 14th Centuries, enumerated, 23ff., organisation of, 25-6
 Punjab Provinces, 34
Qabāliyat, explained, 71
Qānūngo = Fargana Accountant, 19, 73, 86, 243, 276
Qanungo, Prof., quoted, 76n., 221
Qānūngo-rates, 73, 82, 83, 86ff., 244
Qasba, defined, 18, 19, 276
Qismat-i ghalla = Sharing, 69n., 276
Qutbuddin, King of Delhi, 21
 Qutbuddin Khalji, King of Delhi, reign of, 40, 44
 Rāī, rank, 8, 18, 58, 276
 Rā'iyat, term explained, 18, 277
 Rājā, rank, 276
 Rajputana, *see* Ajmer
 Rāna, rank, 8, 18, 276
 Ranthambhor, Assignment attached to, 96
 Rao, Mr. C. H., quoted, 5n.
 Rāo, rank, 8, 276
Raqamī, 276; term discussed, 240-1
 Reclamation Rules of Akbar, 113-14, 129
 Record of Rights, the first, 158
 Recovery (*see also* Audit and Recovery), Indo-Persian terms for, 210-11
 Regulation system of Akbar, 110ff., 118ff., general view of, 115ff.
 Rent, Fixed, 183
 Representatives (*see also* Intermediaries) Assessment through, 9
 Reservation and Assignment, distinction between, 117, 125
 Reserved Land = *Khālisa*, defined, 29
 Administration of, under
 Akbar, 83ff., 109ff., 240, 246
 Alāuddīn, 38
 Aurangzeb, 132, 133, 148
 Bahmanī kingdom, 181
 Bengal, 197
 Jahāngir, 128
 Lodī Kings, 68
 Muhammad Tughlaq, 48ff.
 13th century, 29
 17th century, 125
 Shāhjahān, 126, 147
 Revenue Ministry, *see* Dīwān, Dīwān
 Rewards (*Inām*), 93 & n., 98
 River Country, the, described, 23
 Under Alāuddīn Khalji, 34, 37, 38
 Muhammad Tughlaq, 48-51, 208
 Robertson, C., quoted, 182-3
 Roe, Sir T., 282; quoted, 128n.
 Rohilkhand, 34, 38, 169
 Rupee, introduction of, 255
 Ryot (*see also* Peasant), 3n., 18, 277
 Ryotwārī, 277; term discussed, 205-6

- SACRED Law, Hindu, *see* *Dharma*
Sadr, office of, 99, 277
 Saifuddin Aibak, 218
 Sâlih, 282
Sâl-i kâmil, *see* Year, Standard
 Salm Shâh, assessment under, 235
 Samâna, Province, 24
 Sambhal, Province, 24
 Measurement in, 75
 Sandila, Province, 24
 Sâqî, 282
Sarbasta, term discussed, 137n.
Sarkâr, or district, 73; other meanings, 277
 Sarkar, Prof. J., quoted, *passim*
 Sâtgâon, 190
 Sayyid Dynasty, 66
 Agrarian conditions under, 67
 Assignments under, 67
 Chiefs under, 66
 Security of tenure, 63, 64; under
 Jahângir, 127
 Serfs, 3
 Service tenure, 161, 176 &n.
 Shâh Alam, Assignments under, 151
 Shâhjahân, Mogul Emperor, reign
 of, 126 /
 Administration under, 126, 131,
 147
 Agrarian policy of, 131
 Assignments under, 126
 Finance under, 126
 Irrigation works of, 65, 131
 Peasants' position under, 131-2
 Reserved areas under, 126, 147
 Shâh Mansûr, 104, 105, 251ff.
 Shâh Shuja, Demand under, 195,
 197
 Shams Afif, 280; quoted, *passim*;
 estimated, 22, 52-3
 Shamsuddin Iltutmish, King of
 Delhi, 217
 Sharaf Qâi, minister of Alâuddin,
 34, 35
 Share of Produce claimed by Rulers
 or Kings
 British period, 168
 Hindu period, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9
 Moslem period under
 Islamic system, 8ff., 15
 Akbar, 17, 82-3, 119, 135
 Alâuddin, 17, 33, 44, 62
 Aurangzeb, 135, 198
 Firûz Shâh, 53-4
 Ghiyâsuddin Tughlaq, 40, 43,
 44
 Jahângir, 125
 Lodi dynasty, 72, 74
 Sher Shâh, 17, 73, 76
 Summary, 62-3, 201, 203, 204
 Share of Produce—*continued*
 Various regions
 Bengal, 158
 Deccan, 185
 Mysore, 188
 Udaipur, 13, 204
 Sharing, *passim*, term defined, 6, 7,
 235
 by Division and by Estimation,
 7, 232
 British period, 168
 Hindu period, 3, 7, 13
 Moslem period, under Islamic
 system, 15, 202, under,
 and in
 Akbar, 112, 119
 Aurangzeb, 135
 Farîd Khân, 69
 Firûz, 54, 61
 Ghiyâsuddin Tughlaq, 40, 41,
 43-4
 Sayyid dynasty, 67
 17th century, 149
 19th Century, 149
 Various regions
 Deccan, 185
 Mysore, 188
 Tatta, 119
 Udaipur-Mewâr, 13
 Sher Shâh, King of Hindustan
 (*see also* Farîd Khân), 69,
 72; reign of, 74ff., authori-
 ties for, 74 &n.
 Administrative measures of, 74ff.
 Agrarian policy of, 74ff., 203
 Assessments under, 75ff., 82-3
 Coinage of, 255
 Collections under, 239
 Measurement under, 41, 73, 74,
 75, 77
 Share of Produce claimed by,
 17, 75, 76
 Shihâbuddin Ahmad Khân, 85, 235,
 236
Shiqq, 277; discussed, 25, 74n.
Shiqqdâr, 277; discussed, 74 &n.
 Shore, Sir John, quoted, 193, 196
 Sikandar Lodi, Assignments under,
 72
 Sind, Arabs in, Differential Scale
 of, 17n.
 Statistics of, 259
 Sind, Lower, *see* Tatta
 Sirhind, Province, 24
 Sirohi District, position under
 Akbar, 119; statistics of,
 260
 Slaves, royal, 217-18
 Soil-rates, 169, 170, 175
 Sorath District, Statistics of, 260

- Suhvanīī*, the, quoted, 17
 Surplus-income, 29 *ḍ*n.
Suyūrghāl, term explained, 98, 271
 Sweeper caste (Balāhar), 176n.,
 224, 225
- Tabaqāt-i Akbarī*, the, 282; quoted,
passim
Tabaqāt-i Nāsiri, 283; quoted,
passim; estimated, 26
Tafriq, term explained, 137n., 277
 Taghān Khān, 218
Taluq, 277; defined, 150
Taluqdār, 277; term defined, 194
Tanka, 255
Taqsimdī-i mulk, 243, 245
Tārikh-i Mubārakshāhī, the, 283;
 quoted, *passim*; estimated,
 66
Tārikh-i Shor Shāhī, the, 283;
 estimated, 69n.
 Tatta, position of, under Akbar,
 119
 Sharing in, 119
 Valuation in, 265
 Ten-year rates of Akbar, 82, 88, 89,
 248ff.; enhanced and re-
 duced in Lahore, 90;
 applicable to Assignments,
 91-2
 Tenures (*see also* Assignments)
 security and insecurity of,
 63, 64, 205; under Jahān-
 ghīr, 127, 130-1
 Charitable, 161, 177
 Service, 161, 176
 Terminology, discussed, xiii, xiv,
 191ff., 209ff.
 of Aurangzeb's Farmāns, 133
 in British period, 159, 189, 190ff.
 Hindu, 19
 Moslem, 18-19
 Terry, E., quoted, 130 *ḍ*n.
 Thomas, E., quoted 60n.
 Three Towns, the, 180ff., 195
 Timariots = Assignees, 148n.
Timūr's Institutes, 258
 Tipū Sultān, Regulations of, 188-9
 Tirhut, Province, 24
 Tithe-land and Tribute-land, dis-
 tinction between, 14-15,
 20, 140, 273
 Todar Mal, Rāja, 196, 201, 253
 Assessment rates of, 86ff., 94n.,
 110ff., 243, 261, in Bengal
 182, 194, 195, 196
 Audit measures of, 101, 103, 106
 Legends of, 103ff., 255ff., 266
 Position and Career of, 103ff.
- Torture, recovery by, 42-3
 Treasury, the, 231 *ḍ*n.
 Trench, Mr. G. C., quoted, 13
 Tribute-land, *see* Tithe-land and
 Tribute-land
 Tughril Khān, 218
 Tūzuk, 283; quoted, *passim*
 Twining, T., quoted, 162n.
- UDAIPUR-MEWAR, Agrarian system
 in, 13
 contract-holdings in, 13, 141
 King's share of produce in, 13, 204
Ushr, *Ushri* = Tithe land, *q. v.*
- VALUATION (*see also* Jama), term
 explained, 56, 209, 212,
 240
 Indo-Persian terms for, 212ff.
 Made under
 Akbar, 94ff., 213ff., 240ff., 259,
 262ff.
 Fīrūz, 57, 60, 61, 213, 232-3
 Jahāngīr, 153, 264
 Muhammad Tughlaq, 52
 Sikandar Lodi, 72
 17th Century, 155-6
 Statistics of, in
 Baglāna, 215
 Bengal, 155, 196, 197, 262ff.
 Berār, 264, 268
 Gujarāt, 213-14, 263
 Kashmīr, 214
 Pālāmau, 214, 267-8
 Surat, 215
 Tatta, 265
 Van Twist, J., quoted, 129n., 130
Vasīshka, quoted, 3n., 5n.
 Vazīr, history of the term, xiv, xv,
 278
 Vijāyanagar, Kingdom of, 180
 Agrarian System in, 12
 Villages, *passim*; terms for, 18-19,
 271, 276
 Village-accountants = *Patwāri*, 19,
 63, 171n., 276
 Under Akbar, 114, 177, 178
 Alāuddin Khaljī, 35, 178
 Aurangzeb, 136, 177, 178
 Sher Shāh, 73
 Village Headmen, *see* Headmen,
 Village
 Village organisation, (*see also*
 \ Brotherhood), 19, 160ff.
 14th century, 63ff.
 Under Akbar, 111
 Aurangzeb, 136-7
 Successors of, 175, 177ff.

- Village-servants, 160, 161, 166,
176 *cfn.*, 225
- Villages, derelict, 165, 166
- Vishnu*, quoted, 3*n.*
- Wāli* = Governor (*q.v.*), 216ff., 278
- Water-rate, 60-1, 131
- Wazīfa*, 278; term explained, 99*n.*,
140*n.*
- Wilāyat*, explained, 216ff., 278
- YEAR, standard, 156
- Yuan Chwang, quoted, 5*n.*, 12
- Zabt, Zabti*, 278; meaning of, 169*n.*,
235
- Zabti* rates, 169*n.*, 278-9
- Zafarābād, Province, 24
- Zamīndār = Chief, 8, 18 *cfn.*, 159*n.*,
178; discussed, 225, 278
in Bengal, 191ff.
- Zamīndāri, 205-6
- Zamīndārs, Village, explained,
149 *cfn.*
- Ziyā Barni, 280; quoted, *passim*;
estimated, 27, 45



PRINTED BY
W. HEFFER & SONS LTD.
CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

82

27

28 DEC 1928

THE AGRARIAN SYSTEM OF MOSLEM INDIA



LONDON AGENTS
SIMPKIN MARSHALL LTD.

3274

THE AGRARIAN SYSTEM
OF MOSLEM INDIA

A Historical Essay with Appendices

BY

W. H. MORELAND

C.S.I., C.I.E.

Author of India at the Death of Akbar, and From Akbar to Aurangzeb

CAMBRIDGE

W. HEFFER & SONS LIMITED

1929

X723.2.M5

F9

8274

PRINTED IN ENGLAND

Preface.

THE object and scope of this essay are described sufficiently in the Introduction, and here it is only necessary to mention a few points of detail which may be of assistance to the reader.

I have tried to write in English, and to get away from the polyglot, and often ambiguous, jargon in which agrarian topics are commonly treated in India. In order to do this, I have had to frame a precise terminology, choosing those names which carry the fewest misleading connotations. The terms which I have selected for use are printed throughout with an initial capital letter, as a tacit reminder to the reader that they bear the definite sense which has been explained at their first mention.

It has not, however, been possible to avoid altogether the introduction of Persian words and phrases, because the meaning of these frequently requires discussion, and the subject of the discussion must be indicated. In transliteration I have used as a basis the system recommended by the Council of the Royal Asiatic Society, in which the vowels have the continental values, and the consonants are, where necessary, distinguished by lines or dots¹ placed under them. Unfortunately, these lines and dots, which are indispensable to the linguistic scholar, are offensive to ordinary readers, and greatly increase the difficulty of accurate printing. Since I am writing mainly for students who are not interested in linguistic details, I have adopted the following compromise.

(1) In the text, the transliteration is simplified. The vowels have the continental values, and the long vowels are marked as such; but the consonants are not distinguished, except that the otherwise unemployed *q* is used to represent a particular Arabic guttural. An inverted comma denotes the Arabic letter 'ain, in cases where its indication has seemed to be desirable.

(2) The precise transliteration of the words so given in the text will be found in the glossary (Appendix H), following the simplified form.

(3) In the Appendices, the precise transliteration is used in cases where the terms or phrases under discussion seem to require it.

(4) Proper names are given only in simplified form. Linguistic scholars do not need to be reminded that the *h* in Muhammad, for instance, is different from the *h* in Humāyūn, while ordinary readers are not interested in the difference.

(5) I have retained the ordinary spelling of words such as Moslem or Mogul, and of names such as Calcutta or Lahore, which have become incorporated in the English language.

It will be noticed that my simplified transliteration is very nearly that which is used in Volume III of the *Cambridge History of India*; and the resemblance is not confined to transliteration, for the views taken of the principal characters, and the main authorities, of the period in the two books are substantially identical. It may be well therefore to explain that my chapters dealing with this period were ready for the printer before Sir Wolseley Haig's exhaustive volume was published; the similarity of standpoint, and even the occasional verbal coincidences, are not due to imitation or consultation, but are the result of independent study of the same authorities. In a few cases where Sir Wolseley Haig's interpretation of passages bearing on agrarian matters differs from mine, I have re-examined the evidence, but I have not found occasion to modify the views which I had previously formed.

The method of citing authorities is conditioned by the facts that the titles are commonly long, and frequently similar. In order to reduce the footnotes to reasonable bulk, I have selected arbitrary key-words to denote the principal authorities, the full titles being set out under these key-words in Appendix I.

In bringing together information drawn from so many heterogeneous sources, I have necessarily been dependent on the assistance of scholars working in many different fields.

For help on particular points I am indebted to the late Right Honourable Syed Ameer Ali, and to Mr. C. E. Carrington, Sir Atul Chatterjee, Mr. W. Christie, Mr. G. L. M. Clauson, Mr. U. M. Daudpota, Mr. E. Edwards, Sir William Foster, Professor S. H. Hodivala, Sir Walter Hose, Mr. S. G. Kanhere, Sir Edward Maclagan, Mr. C. E. A. W. Oldham, and Mr. G. Chenevix Trench. Dr. L. D. Barnett kindly read through the draft of Chapter I, and supplied me with valuable references to literature dealing with the Hindu period. Mr. R. Paget Dewhurst, besides contributing a substantial portion of Appendix C, has been most generous in interpreting obscure phrases in the Persian chronicles. Sir Richard Burn supplied me with a critical examination of the draft of Appendix E, and helped me in many other ways. Mr. B. C. Burt rendered me great assistance in the search for illustrative documents in Indian collections. I have drawn freely on some unpublished notes written in consultation with Mr. A. Yusuf Ali when we worked together some years ago on the authorities for the reign of Akbar. Lastly I must acknowledge the assistance so willingly rendered throughout my work by Mrs. R. W. Frazer and Miss F. H. Latimer, of the staff of the Royal Asiatic Society.

W. H. MORELAND.

July, 1929.

Table of Contents.

	PAGE
PREFACE - - - - -	v
INTRODUCTION - - - - -	xi
CHAPTER I. ANTECEDENTS.	
1. The Hindu Sacred Law - - - - -	1
2. Developments of the Fundamental Relation - - - - -	6
3. The Islamic System - - - - -	14
CHAPTER II. THE THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES.	
1. The Moslem Kingdom of Delhi - - - - -	21
2. The Thirteenth Century - - - - -	26
3. Alāuddīn Khaljī (1296-1316) ✓ - - - - -	31
4. Ghiyāsuddīn Tughlaq (1320-25) ✓ - - - - -	40
5. Muhammad Tughlaq (1325-51) ✓ - - - - -	45
6. Firūz Shāh (1351-88) ✓ - - - - -	52
7. Summary - - - - -	62
CHAPTER III. THE SAYYID AND AFGHAN DYNASTIES.	
1. From Firūz to Bābur (1388-1526) - - - - -	66
2. Sher Shāh and his Successors (1541-55) ✓ - - - - -	74
CHAPTER IV. THE REIGN OF AKBAR (1556-1605). ✓	
1. Introductory - - - - -	79
2. The Methods of Assessment - - - - -	82
3. The Assignments - - - - -	92
4. The Collectors - - - - -	100
5. The Working of the Regulation System - - - - -	110
6. The Final Position - - - - -	117
CHAPTER V. THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.	
1. Jahāngīr and Shāhjahān (1605-58) - - - - -	124
2. Aurangzeb's Orders (1665-69) - - - - -	132
3. The Application of Islamic Ideas ✓ - - - - -	139
4. The Scarcity of Peasants - - - - -	144
5. Intermediaries under Aurangzeb and his Successors - - - - -	150

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER VI. THE LAST PHASE IN NORTHERN INDIA. ✓	
1. Introductory - - - - -	157
2. Village Organisation - - - - -	160
3. The Peasant's Payments - - - - -	168
4. The Intermediaries - - - - -	172
5. Concluding Remarks - - - - -	175
CHAPTER VII. THE OUTLYING REGIONS. ✓	
1. The Deccan - - - - -	180
2. Bengal - - - - -	189
CHAPTER VIII. CONCLUSION - - - - -	201
APPENDICES	
A. INDO-PERSIAN TERMS FOR LAND-REVENUE - - -	209
B. PROVINCIAL GOVERNORS IN THE THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES - - - - -	216
C. SOME FOURTEENTH-CENTURY PASSAGES - - -	224
D. ASSESSMENT BY NASAQ - - - - -	234
E. AĪN-I DAHSĀLA - - - - -	238
F. LEGENDS OF TODAR MAL - - - - -	255
G. THE AGRARIAN STATISTICS IN THE AĪN - - -	259
H. GLOSSARY - - - - -	270
I. LIST OF AUTHORITIES - - - - -	280
INDEX - - - - -	285

Introduction.

THIS book may be described as an essay in institutional history. During the main period of Moslem rule in India, lasting from the thirteenth to the eighteenth century, a kingdom had three essential constituents, the Sovereign who ruled it, the Army which supported the throne, and the Peasantry which paid for both; and the relation subsisting between these entities was aptly presented in an aphorism current in the early days, that "troops and peasants are the two arms of the kingdom." The dynastic and military history of the period is now tolerably accessible to students, but it is impossible to obtain from the existing literature a general or connected view of the position of the peasants in their relations with the State, and it is this gap which I now attempt to fill.

The contents of my essay will possibly come as something of a surprise to readers who are interested primarily in the agrarian questions of the present day, and who may expect to find it occupied mainly by discussions of the rights enjoyed or claimed by landholders and their tenants. The prominence of questions of right is, however, a recent development in Indian agrarian history, and belongs almost entirely to the British period: (in Moslem India, (as in the India of the Hindus, the agrarian system was a matter of duties rather than rights. At its root lay the conception that it was the duty of the peasants to till the soil, and pay a share of their produce to the State; so far as private rights or claims were recognised, they were subordinate to this fundamental obligation.) The main subject-matter of my essay is consequently an examination of the methods by which the State's share of the peasant's produce was assessed and collected, and of the arrangements under which portions of it were alienated in favour of the classes whom I describe collectively as Intermediaries.

It is not part of my present purpose to trace in detail the transition from the Moslem system to that which now

exists, but a brief reference is required to the main factors which have operated, because it is only by consciously eliminating these factors that we can reach a just idea of the conditions which prevailed in the earlier period. It is a commonplace of history that the nineteenth century brought to Northern India a degree of internal tranquillity which had not previously been enjoyed; and that the result was seen in a rapid growth of population, and the development of competition for productive land. In the Moslem period, such competition scarcely existed, outside relatively small areas; and we have to bear in mind that, in most parts of the country, land was waiting for men with the resources necessary for its cultivation. Another gift of the nineteenth century was what is conventionally described as the Rule of Law, superseding by degrees the personal rule of the Moslem period; while a third factor, which is perhaps less generally recognised, was the spread of benevolent or philanthropic ideals which characterised the century, not merely in India, but throughout the civilised world. To trace the operation of these factors is the task of the historian of the British period: my object in mentioning them here is merely to emphasise the point that, in trying to appreciate the Moslem system, we must be careful to exclude them from our estimate. In other words, we must get away from the ideas of competition for land, of respect for written law or precedent, and of modern administrative philanthropy.

Such is the scope of my essay, but in order to explain the method of study a few words must be said regarding its genesis. The importance of the subject was impressed forcibly on me some years ago, when I was collecting materials for a sketch of the economic situation of India in the time of Akbar. The fact that in the Mogul period the State disposed of from a third to a half of the gross produce of the land constituted it by far the most potent factor in the distribution of the national income; while its action in regard to distribution inevitably reacted on production, so much so that we are justified in concluding that, next only to the weather, the administration was the dominant fact in the economic life of the country.

Accordingly, in two earlier books, *India at the death of Akbar*, and *From Akbar to Aurangzeb*, I included condensed accounts of the relations which at that period subsisted between the administration and the peasants. These accounts were based mainly on the original authorities, but, in interpreting the obscure and crabbed texts, I followed the work of previous students, who I assumed had mastered the technical terminology of the subject; and, usually accepting their renderings, I offered a description of the main lines of the agrarian administration, reserving for subsequent study some difficulties which appeared to be matters of detail.

On returning to the subject, I found that these apparent details increased in importance when scrutinised more closely; and I was driven gradually to the conclusion that the guides I had accepted, Blochmann, Jarrett, Dowson, and other writers of the last century, busied, as they were, in exploring an entirely unknown field, had not fully mastered the terminology employed in the literature of the period, but had borrowed from modern practice in India, or sometimes from medieval practice in Europe, terms of art, or picturesque phrases, which did not always give the precise meaning of the originals, and occasionally involved serious misrepresentation. It was necessary, therefore, to study the terminology afresh; and for this purpose I worked through the printed literature of the period, together with such relevant manuscripts as I found in this country, extracting every passage in which an apparently technical term occurred, and then bringing the passages together, and inferring from them the meaning, or meanings, borne by each term at different periods, or in different parts of India.

The results obtained in the course of this study form the basis of the present essay, and sufficient illustrations of my methods will be found in the notes and appendices; but at the outset it may be well to insist on the fact that the terminology employed in the literature is fluid, so that both time and place may condition the interpretation of a particular passage. The Persian language, as it was used in Moslem India, possessed a wealth of synonyms; and most of the authorities observed what may be described as

the canon of variety of diction, or, in other words, they would do almost anything in order to avoid verbal repetition. It is natural, therefore, that a particular thing should appear under various names; but at the same time it must be remembered that bureaucracy was highly developed in India from the outset of the Moslem period, and, inside the public offices, words already in general use were adopted as precise terms of art, just as happens at the present day, so that general and technical senses might co-exist. Sometimes, indeed, we find that different departments might use a word in different senses, as in the familiar case of *māl*. An ordinary writer meant by that word "property" or "possessions," but in the military department it denoted "booty taken in war," while in the jargon of the financial offices it signified "land-revenue"; its meaning in any particular passage has to be inferred from the context. These terms of art in some cases persisted, and in others changed with the centuries, so that from time to time old things appear under new names; while, on the other hand, changes in practice might result in giving a substantially new meaning to an old-established term. Differences in respect of locality are also important; and, in particular, it is noteworthy that, two centuries ago, the agrarian language of Calcutta differed materially from that of Delhi, a fact which later on was to contribute to the misapprehensions of the early British administrators in the North.

This fluidity of the terminology is a matter of such significance for the historian that it may be well to give here one illustration where the main facts are not open to dispute. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Arabic word *Diwān* was used by Indo-Persian writers in a specific sense corresponding almost exactly to the modern terms "Department" or "Ministry". Thus the "Vazīr's *diwān*" denoted the Revenue Ministry, because finance was the main business of the Vazīr; and, when a new department was constituted, as happened from time to time, it was styled the *diwān* of the particular branch of administration with which it was charged.

The literature of the fifteenth century is scanty, and I do not know when the change occurred; but, by the time of

Akbar, the word *Dīwān* had come to denote a person, not an institution. In public affairs the *Dīwān* was now the Revenue Minister; and, since the *Vazīr* dealt with revenue-business, for a time the two words, *Vazīr* and *Dīwān*, became in practice almost synonymous. In private business, *Dīwān* denoted, doubtless by analogy, a man who managed a high officer's financial affairs, and is conveniently rendered as "steward." The Revenue Ministry was now called *Dīwānī*, a term which does not appear in the earlier literature; and at this period the word was not applied to any other Ministry than that which dealt with the business of the revenue.

As administrative organisation progressed, we find two further developments. Inside the Ministry, each departmental head came to be called *Dīwān*. Outside it, a *Dīwān*, or Revenue Officer, was appointed in each province; and when these provincial *Dīwāns* had been brought under the direct authority of the Minister at Court, a new implication was gradually imported. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, *dīwānī*, or the revenue administration as a whole, was contrasted with *nizāmat*, or *faujdārī*, terms which denoted the general administration, concerned primarily with the preservation of the peace.

The appointment of the East India Company as *Dīwān* of the province of Bengal led to a further change: the new *Dīwān* found it desirable to establish its own court of justice, which was duly named *Dīwānī Adālat*, or "the *Dīwānī* Court"; and, as the result of subsequent developments, at the present day *dīwānī* has almost entirely lost its older meaning of revenue-administration, and in current use signifies the civil courts of law. *Dīwān*, as a synonym for *Vazīr*, has survived in some Indian States, where the Chief Minister is so designated; elsewhere it is an honorific title, conferred by the Government, or adopted by prominent men of some communities, as the case may be. The word has thus travelled a long way from the time when a minister could be described as "sitting in the *dīwān*."

It does not appear to me to be necessary to justify at length the method of study which I have described: its justification is found in the facts, firstly, that there is no

alternative, and, secondly, that it is fruitful of results. There is, however, a practical difficulty in presenting these results in convincing form. To set out all the relevant passages, with, in each case, enough of the context to show their bearing, and to demonstrate how successive possibilities must be ruled out, until the certain, or probable, meaning is reached by a process of elimination—all this would require a substantial number of volumes before the subject was exhausted; while my object is to present the results as shortly as may be, and, if possible, in a form which shall not be entirely unreadable. The course I have adopted is as follows. Having first ascertained the nature of a thing, I have chosen an English term to denote it, giving preference to that one which carries the fewest misleading connotations, explaining each term at the point where it is introduced, and adhering consistently to a single use. Detailed discussions of the precise nature of various Persian expressions have been placed in footnotes or appendices, which indicate the crucial passages, where any have been found, or, failing them, a number of illustrative passages which I hope will be sufficient for the critical student, while the path of the general reader is encumbered by as few obstacles as the nature of the subject permits.

The arrangement of the essay is chronological, not topical. At one time I was tempted to adopt the latter course, giving first a connected narrative of assessment, then of assignments, and so on; but the various topics are closely inter-related, and so much depends on the personality of autocratic rulers, that, after a few experiments, I reverted to arrangement by periods, which, as it happens, are well defined. In the course of Chapters VI and VII I have endeavoured to indicate the first stages in the transition from the Moslem to the British agrarian system, but, as I have said above, it is no part of my present purpose to describe the development of the latter in detail; and I have not dealt with the transition in those regions where a period of Sikh or Marātha rule intervened.

In bringing this essay to a conclusion, I wish to make quite clear that I do not offer it as a final treatment of the subject. Probably there is still extant in India a body of

literature which, when collected and explored, will throw much additional light on some of the topics where I have felt the lack of material most acutely; and, despite the pessimistic views prevalent in some quarters on the subject, I hold to the belief that, scattered here and there, mainly in private hands, there must be many documents relating to grants, assignments, and other forms of tenure, as well as to certain other aspects of agrarian administration, which, if they could be brought to light, would enable some future student to convert this essay into a history, by correcting my mistakes, and filling the gaps in my information. We know that such documents must have existed in, literally, enormous quantities; we know that a few of them have come to light in the present century; we do not know how many survive; and all we can be sure of is that the survivors are perishing year by year. I cannot now take an active part in the search for such documents, but I must not let pass this opportunity of appealing to the local historical societies and similar bodies at work in India, to grapple with this question in earnest, and to investigate in particular the treasures of the families which have a long tradition of service under the State, as qānūngos, or in other positions in the local administration. Discoveries may be few, but the value of such documents rises in proportion to their rarity, and their location cannot be foreseen. Our knowledge of the form and content of Akbar's charitable grants of land has been materially increased by the discovery of a bundle of old papers preserved by a Parsī family in Gujarāt, a locality where one would scarcely have set out to search for Mogul documents; and it is still possible to hope for other discoveries of the same kind. The systematic collection and publication of such documents would furnish material of inestimable value for the future historian, not merely of the agrarian system, but of the whole life of the people of India.