Considerable controversy exists about the rise of the ta'alluqadāri tenures in Awadh. It has been assumed that it was a part of the well-defined policy of the British after the tragedy of 1857 to "preserve this class (of ta'alluqadors) for useful purpose, and to prevent its impoverishment by idleness." Although Lord Canning did not have a favourable opinion about the growth of these tenures, he yet thought the continuance of such tenures necessary for "obtain(ing) a hold over the country which shall be beneficial to all the classes of its people." But his view of their origin was that it lay in a delegation or usurpation of government claims to revenue, and not in any previous existing allodial property. An extract from Lord Canning's letter is worth reproduction:

"When we assumed the government of Oude in 1858, the greater part of the province was held by the ta'alluqadors, who represented it. They have been called 'Barons of Oude'. But this term applied to them as a class is misleading. Some had received titles from the kings of Oude, for service rendered or by court favours,


2. Ibid.
some few are the representatives of ancient families; but the majority are men distinguished neither by birth, good service or connection with the soil, who having held office under the native government as nazims or chakledārs, or having formed the revenues of extensive tracts, had taken advantage of the weakness of the 'native' government and its indifference to all considerations of justice, so long as it received revenues, had abused the authority confided to them by that government, and by means of deeds of sale, sometimes exerted by violence, sometimes obtained by fraud, had become the nominal proprietors and the actual possessors of the villages, or the majority of the villages which formed what they called their ta'alluga or estate.¹

Indeed such an impression was popular enough to receive the attention of Marx as well. He discussed the issue of the ownership of land at some length in his despatches to New York Daily Tribune. Although he made certain untenable assumptions in this regard, such as that "the property of the land was in the village corporation, in which resided the power of allotting it out to individuals for cultivation", he asserted explicitly that "the zamindārs and ta'llugadārs were nothing in their origin, but officers

¹. Ibid., 111-2.
of the government appointed to look after, to collect and
to pay over to the prince the assessment due from the
class.\(^1\) Marx was led to the conclusion that the proprie-
tary rights claimed by the *ta'allugdārs* and the *zamindārs*
originated "in usurpation at once against the government
and the cultivators." The period between the annexation
of Awadh and the Mutiny was to prove a testing ground for
the future survival of *ta'allugdārs*. The British government
made every effort, "to get rid of them, as an incubus on
the real cultivator of the soil and the general improvement
of the country." Still the fact remains that under the
feeble reign of the *nawābs*, they were able to establish,
somehow, their legal claims over the land, and it was but
natural for the settlement officers to be engulfed in an
"acrimonious controversy with them as to the extent of
their rights." Ultimately this resulted in a state of
discontent and, "led them (the *ta'allugdārs*) to make common
cause with the revolted sepoys.\(^2\)"

---

1. Karl Marx, 'Lord Canning's Proclamation and Land Tenure
in India' *New York Daily Tribune* No. 5344 of 7th June
1858. However, the articles are included in *The First*
Indian War of Independence published by the Progressive

2. Ibid., pp. 141-2.
This view of the position of the *ta'allugadārs* preceded the annexation. In 1849 it was contended that the *ta'allugadārs* enjoyed their rights as a result of the delegation of the rights by government officials in respect of revenue-collection. The *ta'allugadar* was a "person previously unconnected with the spot, and (was) permitted to realize on his own account the share of the produce otherwise due to the state."¹

At the same time there was another view prevailing as well it was argued that the class the *ta'allugadārs* did not solely consist of the people elevated to their position by the rulers, but a good number of them were the representatives of the hereditary chiefs, in possession of large estates in their own right. And a recognition was accorded to their superior proprietary rights by successive governments. This school took the view that the *ta'allugadārs* could not just have been favoured outsiders.² Charles Elliott in Chronicles of Oonab, examined the issue at some length and concluded that a number of the big *ta'allugadarī* houses in the district of Oonao, Fyzabad and Sultanpur were the descendants of old hereditary chieftains. But at the

---

1. C.A. Elliott, Chronicles of Oonao, Allahabad 1862, p. The passage has been quoted by the author from an article published in *Calcutta Review* (Dec. 1849) p. 422.
2. Elliott, p. 156.
same time, he too admitted that on occasions, it so happened that the revenue-officials seized the opportunity of acquiring superior proprietary rights by way of ta'alluga arrangements. It would be unhistorical, argued Elliott, to regard Raja Daya Shankar Dikshit of Purenda, or Gulab Singh, the Purihar of Surosec, or Dost Ali, the Saiyyed of Donao, as persons having acquired their possessions without any previous backgrounds of their own.

On the Indian side Lalji, a well-informed critic of the Awadh regime prior to the Annexation, analysed the question in details under a separate chapter in his Mirat-ul-Auza entitled, "Reasons for the ability of the ta'allugadars to increase the malquzari." He describes the actual mechanism through which a ta'allugadar applied fraudulent or forcible means to enlarge his landed possessions at the cost of the government and weak neighbours. He says that most of the villages included in the estates of the ta'allugadars actually belonged to those zamindars, who had little means of defending their villages. The ta'allugadars even did not bother to get, any sort of deed executed in their favour. Similarly, some zamindars, in order to escape the high-handedness of the 'amils, sought the help of the ta'allugadars by putting

1. Ibid.

2. Lalji, Mirat-ul-Auza Ms. in Maulana Azad Library, A.M.U., Collection (Supplementary) Farsi Tarikh-60; fl. 71b-75b.
their possessions under their 'fam'. But this often subverted the zamindars' own position. For, after a year or two, the ta'allugadar used to take tamassuk from the zamindar under the pretext that so much amount had been paid to the 'amil on his account. Ultimately, such fictitious amounts would grow too heavy for the zamindars to pay and then the ta'allugadar would get them to transfer their lands to him by a fictitious sale. If the aggrieved zamindar ever thought of approaching the court, he could receive no relief. It was through the use of such methods, comments Lalji, that Beni Madha Buksh, ta'allugadar of Shankarpur, Raghunath Singh of Khajurgaon (in Baisnara distt.), Harpal Singh of Sapehi in Sultanpur, and Ram Dutt Pandey of Gonda had been able to seize innumerable villages yielding them lakh of rupees.

The nazims and the chakledars, too, did not lag behind in making out fortunes by such methods. Lalji, especially points out the case of Raja Darshan Singh and his family. They had seized the villages of the defaulting zamindars. In return for large sums of pretended balances of the revenues, the zamindars were forced to execute sale-deeds. Any scrutiny of the titles of the family would reveal says Lalji, that only a negligible portion of the entire state, was held by them as hereditary. The rest was acquired in the above described manner. However, few exceptions to
the generally prevailing chaotic conditions have also been recorded. Lalji informs us that the tal'ulugadar of Tulsipur and Balrampur, and Debi Buksh, the tal'ulugadar of Gonda had already held hereditary zamindaris worth lakh of rupees.

Thus two categories of the tal'ulugadars viz. one of hereditary zamindars the other of outsiders, came to be firmly established before the end of the kingdom of Awadh. It is necessary to enquire about their origin, and privileges during the 17th and 18th centuries, so as to understand the degree which they attained subsequently.

Etymologically, the word, 'tal'uluga' means connection. But technically it was "used in the sense of land or area over which any kind of right was claimed." Nothing can be said with certainty as to when this term came into ordinary use. The Ain-i-Akbari does not use the word at all. But from the 17th century, it begins to appear in documents. The testimony of Patrick Cornegy, "who have seen them (the terms) mentioned in a deed of the year 1642, under the seal of the emperor Shahjahan." is difficult to prove or disprove.

1. Irfan Habib, Agrarian System, p. 171 and notes.

2. Patrick Cornegy, Notes on the land-revenue assessment of Upper India, London, 1874, pp. 69-70. However, a petition seeking redress against the high handedness of the chaudharies of pargana Bilgiram of course refers the word, tal'uluga, as early as in 1668, but in a different context. See Bilgiram Documents (in the department of History, AMU, No. 4).
In Awadh, the earliest reference known to me where the assessee has been styled as *malik-wa-ta'allugadar* of certain villages, comes from a *gaül-o-qarâr* executed in *sarkâr* Jahraich in 1635 A.D. It seems that in case of the village in question the assessee possessed the rights of both *zamindâri* and revenue farm. This contention is further supported by the explanation in Khwaja Yasin's *Glossary* who says that the *ta'allugadârs* are a kind of "*zamindâr* who contracted to pay revenue not only for his own *zamindâri*, but also for the *zamindâri* of other persons." Generally such arrangements were made by the *āmils* and later on by the *nâzims* or the *chakledârs* owing to the convenience of revenue collection through big *ta'allugadârs*, instead of making the same settlement with a number of intermediaries, or small *zamindârs*.

The *ta'allugadârs* might have the *zamindâri* rights over a few villages of his *ta'alluga*; but in case of the remaining villages, in which he was only an intermediary, *zamindâri* rights would be vested with other persons. Thus to be a *zamindâr* was something more substantial than to be simply a *ta'allugadâr* of the same area.

2. *Add. 6603*, ff. 54b-55a.
3. A reference in *Fathiya 'Ibriya* lends support to this assumption. The claimant to the throne of Arkan joined

Contd........
Similarly Ḥulām Hazrat in *Kwaif-i-Gorakhpur* describes three types of *zamindāri* tenures and says that the *ta'allugādar*, or the owners of the *ta'allugā* are like ḍajās. Theoretically, they were recognised as the owners of the villages included in their jurisdiction. In most of such villages the *bīrtiyās* also existed, and they always claimed *jalkar* and *bankar*, while they paid only the land revenue to the *ta'allugādārs*, and at the time of assessment, these (bīrtiyās) were entitled to *do-biswa* (rights), or 10% of the revenue. It seems that *ta'allugā* arrangements in *sarkār* Gorakhpur were made on an extensive scale during the 18th century. A letter in the *Mansur-ul-Maktubāt* explicitly mentions that Nawab Badr-ud-din Khan, son of Nawab Wazir-ul-Mumālik (?) had became a wondering ascetic, and his exact whereabouts was unknown. He was heard last, when he went to,

(Continued from the previous page)

the Mughal banners during Shāhistā Khan's chittagong campaign in the hope that at least, "if they could not become ḍajās, they might become zamindārs, if not zamindar, then *ta'allugādar.*" ff. 155b-156a, Cf. Irfan Habib, op.cit., p. 172.

"bargana" Hansi and Gorakhourg in the ta'alluga" of the Banjaras. We know for certain that, it was during the 18th century that the Banjaras emerged at the political horizon of the eastern parts of Awadh. The origin of their landed possessions lay exclusively in their numerical strength and the use of violence against the hereditary chief.

One is struck by the fact that barring a few stray and often insignificant references, there is little information about the growth of ta'allugadâri tenures and about the actual position of ta'allugadârs in the Awadh kingdom during the 18th century. Persian texts and documents have used the word ta'alluga often in connotations different from that in which it was used during the first half of the 19th century.

---

1. Awadhi Lal, Inshâ-i-Mansur or Mansur-ul-Maktubât. It consists of the letters drafted by Santakh Rai, munshi of Safdarganj. These letters were addressed to Emperor Muhammad Shah and Wazir Qamaruddin Khan. The only known copy of this important manuscript is preserved at Tagore Library, Lucknow University.

2. Sanjara depredators acquired considerable notoriety and in course of time they not only carved out a territory for themselves, but became a scourge for almost the entire region. No individual chieftain was able to withstand their onslaughts. To meet the threat posed by the Banjaras, the Jisim Raja of Majhaulî abandoned a large portion of his estate to the newly established estates of Tamkhuli & Padraune. Thus created a powerful buffer zone between his domain and that of the Sanjaras. These conditions came to an end with the cession of this territory to the East India Co. (HR Neyill District Gazetteers, Vols. 44 & 45) pp.
The ta'allugadāri tenures seem to have grown rapidly in Awadh as a result of the slackness which crept into the administrative machinery of the kingdom after the death of Nawao Sa'adat Ali Khan in 1814. Elliott points out that as a result of the ijārādāri system, things had become quite favourable for the growth of ta'alluga tenures. As long as the amāni system was practised, "the collector of the revenue had no need to be over bearing.....if the harvest failed or sickness broke-out, he had but to state the impossibility of the collection and the amount was remitted."

But under the contract system, the revenue contractor was bound to pay the entire stipulated amount irrespective of natural calamities or difficulties of collection. Often it happened that some new speculator without having an accurate

1. 'Imad-us-Sa'adat uses the word raja for Mohan Singh of Tiloin, who had his skirmishes with Sa'adat Khan Burhānul Mulk, while 'I'rāt-ul-Auzā' explicitly calls him the ta'allugadār of Tiloin (f.76a). It is quite possible that the local chieftains who enjoyed considerable power were by now reduced to the mere status of the ta'allugadār.

2. See Akhābārāt in Central Records Office Hyderabad-AR-No. 5746 (dated 20th Rajab 1213 AH/28th Dec. 1798). Some of these have been published along with English translations by Yousuf Husain Khan, News letters: 1767-1799, Hyderabad, 1955, p.66.
knowledge of the revenue paying capacity of the area might enter upon an agreement with the government. On such occasions he was forced in self-preservation to extort more than was due from the payers." The Awadh government on its part placed unlimited powers in their hands by, "shut (ting) its eyes to the way in which they re-imbursed themselves." Under such circumstances it was thought to be more useful for the collectors of revenue to avoid dealing with small zamindārs and to convert big zamindārs into ta'allugadārs or intermediaries between the smaller zamindārs and government. As such the cost of collection too was minimized "beside making the receipt of the revenue much safer."

As a necessary corollary of such arrangements, there was always a possibility that the power and the influence of the respective ta'allugadār might grow to great proportions, and in case of their going on to rebellion, "large amount of the revenue would be imperilled." In case of any such eventuality, the chakledārs and other government officers were often compelled to moderate their ambitions. Even underhand methods were applied to keep 'peace' with the ta'allugadārs as to reduce the risks to the minimum, "by throwing him a sop of an extra village or two at judicious

moments", while the ta'allugadārs "were nothing both to accept these sops." As a result of such a state of affairs, the, "old ta'alluga" waxed fact, and new ones sprang up on all sides under this vivifying influence.¹ Such a policy in the long run had the result of continuously enlarging the ta'allugās. In the pargana of Fyzabad in 1814, there was no ta'alluga which could pay a revenue of Rs. 10,000; but by 1856, one estate was capable of paying an amount of Rs. 2 lacs to the treasury, while 2 estates paid Rs. 70,000 each, one had Rs. 50,000 as its rent roll, while there were several estates yielding Rs. 30,000 annually to the state treasury.²

Broadly speaking, all the ta'allugadārs in Awadh during the 19th century could be divided into two major categories. The first belonged to the hereditary chiefs who had been in the possession of their estates since long and took advantage of their hereditary position to enlarge their estates by the use of 'force, fraud and violence'. A comparison of the Ain's data with those of the 19th century suggests that the clans which had been recorded by Abul Fazl as zamindārs of certain parganas were able to make ta'alluga

---

1. Ibid., p. 134.
2. Ibid., note.
arrangements made in 18th and 19th centuries. But it should not be assumed at the same time that all the ta'allugadārs or even most of them had a hereditary basis for possessing the large estates under these tenures. The two classes of ta'allugadārs deserve separate treatment which we offer below:

(i) The Zamindārs:

In the category of the hereditary chiefs turned ta'allugadārs mention may be made of the Tiloin estate. The Kanhpuria Rajputs held sway over the area since the Mughal times. Although Abul Fa'izl has recorded pargana Jais (where the possessions of the Raja Tiloin lay) under the zamindāri possession of 'various castes', in all probability the dominant position was even then occupied by the members of Kanhpuria Rajputs, a fact testified by the latter accounts.

Little information is available about the fortunes of the family during the 17th century. It is almost certain that they enjoyed considerable power and position. With the


appointment of Sa'adat Khan Surhānul Mulk as the subedar of Awadh, they made an appearance at the political horizon of the province. In the battle between Surhānul Mulk and Raja Mohan Singh, the Raja was killed and all his possessions which lay in the province of Awadh were seized. Next we hear of the Tiloin Chief when he raised the banners of rebellion against Safdar Jung. But again he was defeated and killed. However, because of the internal disorder and the financial difficulties, the nawab invited the "fugitive Raja to Lucknow and was invested with the government of the estates, which were subsequently divided among, and are still held by, seven of his descendants." The senior most Shakar Singh was styled Raja and he, on behalf of the entire estate, paid an amount of Rs. 7,50,000 to the chakledar annually as the land-revenue.

Although highly critical of the administrative arrangements of the nawab-wazirs, Better praises the good and judicious administration of the Tiloin estate. He thought it as a 'pleasing oasis' 'amid wide-spread social waste.'

---

1. Shulam Husain Khan, Imad us Saadat, Nawal Kishore, Lucknow, pp. 7-8.
brothers of Raja too were called Raja, while his nephews were called Chakurs. All share-holders paid their share of it revenue to the head of the family, who in turn paid to the chaklejar. He had the jurisdiction over civil and criminal disputes as well as boundary disputes among the sub-proprietors.

Apart from these share-holders there were a number of the zamindars in all parts of the Tiloin estates, whose share of the revenue was also realized by the Rajas of the respective regions accompanied by the chakledar. In case these zamindars showed any obstinacy they were, "left to be dealt with by the chakledars" but, at the same time, the presence of the Raja with the chakledar ensured that the latter could not "make any undue demand from the zamindars." State when the Tiloin Rajas came to be styled ta'allugadars.

Similarly, the Shaikhzada zamindars of pargana Fatehpur, sarkar Lucknow were able to maintain the uninterrupted hold since the days of Akbar to the 19th century. Indeed they had much enlarged their landed possessions by this period. The ta'allugadar of Mehmoodabad was the most

important member of the family, while the minor branches were established at Bilhora and Bhatwama. The ta'alluga of Mohabodabad under the efficient management of Nawab Ali achieved its furthest limits, while originally they were merely zamindārs. During course of time they have augmented their territory greatly, absorbing into it the estates and villages of their weaker neighbours. We are told specifically about his resources which lay in "money at command to purchase influence and a brave and well-armed force to aid the nāzim in crushing a refractory land-holder. He was able to enlarge his possessions to the extent of being able to pay Rs. 1,50,000 to the government in 1849."

(ii) Non-hereditary Ta'allugadārs:

This class consisted of bankers, merchants, and the agricultural capitalists on the one hand and the ijarādārs, nāzims, charōdārs and other officials on the other. As compared to their counterparts, the hereditary claiments of the superior rights, they had grown more numerous as well as powerful at the close of the Awadh kingdom.
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Bankers and traders possessing large capitals came to enjoy a significant position in the official establishment of the revenue department. They often stood as sureties for zamindārs and the ta’āllugādārs, before the chaklēdār or the nāzims for the payment of revenue-debts. On occasions it so happened that the amount of 'debt' and interest became too heavy for the land-holders to repay; sales of rights therefore followed, by which the creditors obtained the ta’āllugās of the debtors. Some of the bankers enlarged their estates by way of genuine purchases as well. But generally the cases of bankers turning ta’āllugadārs in Awadh were few.

The details of the ta’āllugadāri possessions held by Raja Gauri Shankar of Mauranwan and Chudan Lal offers us an opportunity to study how the bankers had spread their net throughout the kingdom. The ancestor of these ta’āllugadārs, one Seth Goorun Mal, was actually a resident of Agra was brought to Awadh by Jurrul Mulk. After some time, he was relieved from the service of the nawāb and Rao Murdan of Jundiya Khera pursued him to settle there and to act as the family banker and chief accountant of the estate. But their successors could not pull-up together for longer, having developed a bitter quarrel over the issue of the rate of interest and the accounts of the estate. The family bankers used to pay the government demand of land-
revenue, on behalf of the taʿālūgādārs. Such advances were always debited against the 'estate' to be paid with interest. The rāo wanted that the rate of interest should be reduced to 12% from 24%, while the banker insisted on the old rate, his plea being that since he advanced loans to other land-holders at the rate of 30%, he would 'in our heavy losses in case he yielded to the rāo's pressure. As the dispute went on the banker along with his establishment though it expedient to leave Dundiyakhera secretly and settle down at Jaya Ram's Katra, near Murarman Gradually he increased his land holdings, and ultimately became one of the big taʿālūgādārs of Unnao district. His rapid growth might be judged by the fact that in the year 1300, Raja Sauri Shankar was not a land owner at all but in the mid 19th century his taʿālūqa had become prosperous enough to pay Rs. 1,18,900 annually to the government.

In a similar manner Chandan Lal made a great fortunes in the nizāmat of Jainswara. In 1816 A.D. he possessed only 3 villages, but in 1825, his estate paid Rs. 2$\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs to the government. His un-interrupted possession continued till 1350, when Jnulam Ali, the naib-nāzīm tried to raise the revenue demand by Rs. 50,000, and this led to a conflict

between the parties. As a result, Chundan Lal was thrown out of his possessions, but his influential friends at the court sought the 'king's intervention and ultimately the possessions were restored to Chundan Lal.1

Another important ta‘āluguqa of this class was held by one Ramdut Randey in the nizāmat of Gonda-Bahraich. He was, "one of the most substantial and respectable of the agricultural capitalists of Oude, and highest of his rank and class." 2 His wealth and position can be judged from the fact that he used to stand surety for the punctual payments of the revenue dues of the principal land-holders to the extent of `s.6 to 8 lakhs for a year. On such loans, a certain percentage of interest was charged varying with the character and capability of the land holders. He enlarged his own landed possessions occasionally by taking advantage of the necessities of his clients and his influence over "the local authorities of the government." 3 His ta‘āluguqa paid Rs. 1,66,744 to the nāzim. But some differences arose between him and the nāzim, Muḥammad Husain over the amount of loan and interest. Consequently the 'estate' was attached, he was

3. Ibid.
killed and the property worth Rs. 12 Lakh plundered. However, the influential friends of the banker at the court succeeded in restoring the possessions to the family though on the condition that the demand be increased by Rs. 40,000. About 1850, the rent roll of the ta'âlluga was Rs. 2,06,744 per annum.

Another segment of this category of the ta'âllugâdârs comprised of the government officials such as the châkledârs and nâzims. After the death of Nawab Saadat Ali Khan the states control over the activities of the officials greatly slackened. Hence these ofTicials had immense latitude in exercise of their powers and in collecting and depositing taxes, thus enriching themselves at the cost of both the government and the land holders. As a result they were able to carve out same territory for themselves in hereditary tenures. There were cases of actual and forcible sales, usurpations and seizures. In case any small land-holder refused the payment of government claims, an invasion of his 'estate' was sanctioned, and his estate was given over to some ta'âllugâdâr.

Among the officials who turned into ta'âllugâdârs with sizeable landed possession and had attained a prominent

1. Ibid.
position in agrarian society, mention may be made of the families of Bukhtawar Singh and his younger brother Darshan Singh. Their father had migrated from Buxar in Bihar to settle at Faizabad in Awadh. Bakhtawar Singh was the first to enter the service of Saadat Ali Khan as one of his "favourite orderlies" and rose to the command of a regiment of Nujeeba in 1814. It was in the reign of nawab Ghaziuddin Haider, that the fortunes of the family began to grow to astonishing dimensions. For the first time in 1817, Darshan Singh was entrusted with the contract of Bhadarse and five of its adjacent villages for an annual amount of Rs.60,000.

With this beginning and his sustained effort for a name, he held the contract for Rs. 59 lacs during the years 1827-30, and between 1830-36, for Rs. 58 lacs per annum; while in 1837 the annual amount payable in ijara stood to 47 lacs. Most of his ijara was included in the Sultanpur-Fyzabad nizamat. With such enormous resources and his high status, it was quite easy for him to raise the stipulated demand from the zamindaris. In case of their inability to meet out their new-revenue obligation, he could force the defaulting proprietors to sell their villages. Thus during his own life-time, Darshan Singh was able to carve out a large ta'alluqa for himself; the process was continued by his son with the active support of the still influential uncle.

Bukhtawar Singh. W.H. Sleeman estimated that the rent-roll of Darshan Singh's family amounted to Rs. 2,54,000, out of which Rs. 68,000 was admitted as nāŋkār. Hence the total amount payable to the exchequer was only Rs. 1,86,000.1 Similarly Bukhtawar Singh had also come to possess an estate having the rent roll of Rs. 2,52,000 per year.

Hakim Lehdi was the Prime minister of Awadh during the reign of Amjad Ali Shah, and his heir and nephew Munawwaruddaulah was able to acquire the possession over 300 villages in Khairabad nizāmat under ta'āllugādāri tenures. The revenue obligation of his estate amounted to Rs. 40,000 per annum.2

The ta'ālluga arrangements had became so popular and common by the close of the Awadh dynasty, that every district contained a number of ta'āllugās, and many ta'āllugādārs wielded considerable power and influence through being the important officials of the state. They maintained large numbers of armed retainers and had built a number of mud-forts (garhis). The use of fire-arms and deployment of large cannon for the defence of garhis was also a common phenomenon.

Fortunately we possess a detailed break-up of the total number of the villages held under ta'āllugādārī tenures at the time of the summary settlement in 1856. Keeping in view the methods adopted by the ta'āllugādārs to enlarge their possessions, one need not be astonished to find that out of 35,174 villages as many as 23,522 or 67% were settled with the ta'āllugādārs, while only 11,652 or 33% of the total villages were under the possession of the village proprietors. The district wise statistics are tabulated below:

Zamindārs and Pattidārs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District: Villages</th>
<th>Ta'ālluqa Tenures</th>
<th>Other Tenures</th>
<th>% of C to B</th>
<th>% of D to B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich 3,949</td>
<td>3,761</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonda 4,129</td>
<td>3,434</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partapgarh 3,633</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faizabad 4,215</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rae Bareli 1,591</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultanpur 3,351</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Major Jorrow's memorandum relative to the Summary Settlement of the province of Oudh FSC No. 34-50 dated 8th Dec., 1859 NAI Delhi. I could not trace the work I have extracted the table from A.A. Azami, "Position of the ta'āllugādārs in Oudh-1814-1856".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>PCR</th>
<th>PCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sitapur</td>
<td>4,421</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>1,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mohammadi</td>
<td>3,131</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>1,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Daryabad</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>1,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lucknow</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hardaui</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Onao</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>